

Russian paper: U.S. nixed joint SDI plan

by Rachel Douglas

Russian disappointment in the U.S. posture on cooperation for anti-missile defense was expressed in a June 19 article in the Moscow daily *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, titled "Bill Clinton Has Shut Down 'Star Wars': How This Could Threaten Conversion of the Military-Industrial Complex in Russia." Author Andrei Vaganov reported that at the Vancouver summit of April 1993, Russian President Boris Yeltsin handed President Bill Clinton a proposal for joint work on an anti-missile "plasma weapon," but there was no positive response to the idea.

Meanwhile, wrote Vaganov, "the current U.S. administration adopted a decision to give up further work on the 'Star Wars' program. The argument given is, in my view, completely unconvincing: With the disappearance of the U.S.S.R., supposedly the necessity for a global system of strategic defense has also disappeared." Vaganov argued that such thinking ignored the deteriorating security situation in Russia and the threatened exit of countries like North Korea from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. He queried: "What made the Americans give up not simply some class of weapons, but a program, which had been put forward as nothing less than an object of national pride, as a national challenge to the rest of the world (practically analogous to the program for landing American astronauts on the Moon)?"

Save Russia's scientific capabilities

Vaganov went on to cite Russian economists who say it would be crazy to fritter away the accumulated capacities of the Russian military-industrial complex (MIC). The way to put those capacities to work, he wrote, "paradoxical as it may be, lies in the internationalization of defense industry efforts and, to an even greater degree, defense-linked science; in posing for them a qualitatively new, single super-task. Many analysts in recent years have leaned towards the view, that a variant of the well-known Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which acquired the unofficial name of the 'Star Wars' program, could be such a super-task."

According to Vaganov, "The civilian economy and the MIC are Siamese twins: two individuals, united by a single circulatory system. The main economic interest of the MIC (under both socialism and capitalism) consists in guaranteed subsidies for the production of technologically complex

products. . . . The creation of a global system of strategic defense . . . would automatically presume the creation of a channel of guaranteed financing, without which MICs cannot live, among nations." He said that an international supervisory agency was envisioned, which would have overseen "the gradual reorientation of 'Star Wars' from military-political tasks to the tasks of the civilian economy, those of pure science, and the tasks of civil society."

While Russian military technology is "fully competitive on the world market," western powers have shied away from investing in its development, and the State Department instructed U.S. firms, "Don't sink your capital into conversion of [military] production in Russia," wrote Vaganov.

Demoralization and dissipation of Russia's skilled scientists, a prominent theme of discussion in Moscow lately, was highlighted by Vaganov, in relation to conversion of the defense industry to civilian use. Vaganov wrote: "Whether deliberately or not, the American administration in giving up the 'Star Wars' program is threatening the process of conversion of the Russian military-industrial complex, and above all of its high-technology, science-intensive branches. The participation of the Russian side in 'Star Wars' gave us a chance to carry out the conversion process in the least wasteful way. And the most important thing was preserved—the high scientific and technological potential of the defense industry, engaged in solving tasks appropriate for its level."

He pointed out that the Russian proposal for joint Russian-American experiments on deflecting missiles by creation of plasmoids in the atmosphere was the work of leading military research institutes in Russia.

Vaganov concluded with a suggestion: "The way out? There's only one, if you will: to try nevertheless to bring to life the slogan, 'Military-Industrial Complexes of All Countries, Unite!' This is a difficult task, an often thankless one, but we are left with no other choice."

Commentary: Lyndon LaRouche

Lyndon LaRouche made these remarks about the Nezavisimaya Gazeta article, in his weekly radio interview "EIR Talks with LaRouche," on June 30:

Remember that one of the principal resources for President Reagan's March 23, 1983 address [inaugurating the SDI], was my back-channel discussion with Moscow over the 11 or 13 months preceding the President's announcement; and that was the chief resource which the National Security Council was able to use in late 1982 and in early 1983 to judge

how to advise the President on proceeding with what we had called then, strategic ballistic missile defense based on new physical principles.

I would date most of this, not from the President's address, but from the message which I received for the Reagan administration from Moscow, in a discussion we had in Washington [with Soviet representatives] in February of 1983, a little more than a month and a half before the President's announcement. I outlined again, and we discussed afresh—as we had discussed several times before—exactly what President Reagan would offer, *if* he decided to do it, and the question was, how would the Russians (or the Soviets at that time), respond to the President's offer, if he made it? There was always this big "*if* he makes it, how would you people respond?"

The response was, of course, that they accepted the conception which I offered, number one, based on new physical principles—not Danny Graham's silly "High Frontier" nonsense, but a real laser-based, etc., system. They recognized that, as we have seen recently, with their offer of this "Trust" offer, made to Clinton on the plasmoid defense system; that's new physical principles, not this High Frontier fast rocket junk.

Secondly, they agreed very much, as the article indicates, with the principle of spinning off high-technology military technology in the SDI field through the machine-tool sector into the civilian sector.

But thirdly, they disagreed, and said they would reject the thing at that time, because they thought the United States would do a better job and would move faster with these spin-offs than Russia and therefore we would win the race, and therefore they said that they would not cooperate with the United States, they would not share technology with the United States, but they would develop their own system.

I indicated at that time, that their economy would break down within about five years if they tried to do it that way, whereas if they did it the way we proposed, we would work our way toward a war-avoidance situation which would be more durable. And so that's what Reagan offered.

What you see in this article, is that Russian circles which are tied to the high-tech section of the military-industrial complex, and others, are offering *exactly what I offered* tentatively on behalf of the Reagan administration back during 1982 through February 1983, and what the President offered actually in his address on March 23, 1983. And they have come around to that. It is very interesting.

But then there is a faction in Russia which is going the other way, which is going toward a hard line. . . . These people are going toward an Asiatic hard-line Russian thermo-nuclear confrontation very rapidly. And over the period from this fall, I would say—even the summer—but by September of this year, September of next year, unless there is a change in the U.S. government posture on many questions, we are going to see the rapid emergence of a very hardline Great Russian, or Russian imperial impulse, out of Moscow. . . .

The 'Greater' China 'Venetian' policy to

by Michael O. Billington

Henry Kissinger's syndicated article published in several leading press organs around the world in mid-June advanced his proposals for Anglo-American domination of Asia in the coming decade. Befitting his professed status as the spokesman for 19th-century British "balance of power" politics, Kissinger compared modern Asia to 19th-century Europe: "There are three 'Great Powers' of comparable potential—Japan, China and Russia. . . . There is even a balancer—the United States—which [is] like 19th-century Britain." Also in keeping with his oft-stated defense of Deng Xiaoping's bloody dictatorship in Beijing, Kissinger insisted that such Anglo-American support is "needed to balance Japan and a possibly re-emerging Russia."

On the other hand, Kissinger is also the leading proponent (and one of the primary beneficiaries) of the massive looting of the Chinese labor force through the devastating free trade "reforms" under Deng, which have brought China's vast interior to a state of collapse.

This geopolitical policy, to build up communist China's influence in Asia while actually destroying its population and economy, has recently been enhanced by the pursuit of a "Greater China" alliance, linking the four primarily Chinese states of Asia—the China mainland, Taiwan, Hongkong, and Singapore. A major step in this direction was the creation of the "New China Hongkong Group, Ltd.," discussed further below, which brought together business and political leaders from the Chinese diaspora, based on the current disastrous policy of grinding up mainland peasants as coolie labor in free trade zone sweatshops. While this policy is proving itself to be the cause of the destruction of the already meager means of subsistence of the majority of Chinese, the "geopoliticians" foresee at least three "advantages" to this approach. First, the vast, virtual slave-labor pool of desperate unemployed Chinese peasants—approaching 200 million out of an estimated labor force of 513 million—provides not only a source of exploitation for quick profit by depression-racked western corporations, but also serves as a means of preventing the successful development of the labor power of China and the other developing Asian nations, which must compete with the near-zero labor costs of the mainland. In fact, several Southeast Asian nations with large Chinese nationalities are being drawn into semi-membership in "Greater China," through the large banking and business conglomerates that are run by Chinese-descent nationals (see map).