

'Who lost Russia?' debate breaks out in West after Yeltsin coup

by Konstantin George and EIR Staff

After the 1949 Communist takeover of China, which was aided and abetted by the British establishment and its followers in the U.S. State Department who were telling the public that the ferociously anti-western dictator Mao Zedong and his cohorts were "democrats" and "agrarian reformers," a debate broke out in the West over "Who lost China?"

Now, in the wake of the Oct. 4 coup in Russia under President Boris Yeltsin, and the backing of the coup as a "victory of the democrats" by western governments, a similar "Who lost Russia?" debate has erupted. In the radio program "EIR's Talks" on Oct. 28, U.S. statesman Lyndon LaRouche commented: "The question that's going to come from the Republicans in the 1994 election campaign is 'Who lost Russia?' And they're going to blame Bush, of course, who is responsible for the United States losing the opportunity for extended peaceful cooperation with Russia. But they, probably, being Republicans, will be partisan about it and pick on Clinton."

'Marshall Plan' versus insanity

The debate came to the fore in an interview with former U.S. President Gerald Ford in the Italian daily *Corriere della Sera* on Oct. 18. Asked about his policies toward the communist bloc during 1974-76, Ford responded: "I had the idea of launching a Marshall Plan for the communist countries, thinking that we could prevail over them by showing them the benefits of western freedom and wealth. But the CIA had a much different vision. They were giving me completely false information." According to Ford, the CIA was handing him reports that the U.S.S.R. and its Warsaw Pact allies were close to achieving military and economic superiority over the United States, and therefore any economic aid package to them would hurt U.S. strategic interests.

Ford did not mention any names, but the CIA head during Ford's last year in office was George Bush, who adamantly opposed any comprehensive economic development plan for Russia and eastern Europe during his presidency (1989-92). His policy, and that of former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, of insisting on savage International Monetary Fund shock therapy policies, coupled with the launching of the Persian Gulf war and setting up the Balkan war to further the destabilization of Eurasia, were the causes of the policy debacle.

LaRouche commented on the policies which could have won the peace after the Soviet Union crumbled. "Kennedy was moving toward a policy of, 'Let's cut out all the monkey business, such as the local wars, the surrogate warfare, and let's stick to having a war-winning capability,' and, if he hadn't been shot, he'd have announced that policy. And on the other hand, offer the Russians and the communist states . . . some kind of economic cooperation and try to win the war through economic collaboration, where possible, hoping that by using a deterrent of war-winning capability, that we can put the fight on the economic level and win it there.

"Now, there was some of that around Nixon. Ford played with that. That was my policy; and my policy for the Arab-Israeli conflict, too, in the mid-1970s, at the time Ford was playing with this idea of a Marshall Plan for Russia. It was my policy behind the Strategic Defense Initiative that we not only have a war-detering capability, that is, preventing a first strike by using new physical weapon systems of the types that the Soviet were then developing, and cooperate on that, but that we use the opportunity posed by the need to introduce anti-ballistic missile strategic defense to set up economic cooperation, not only between the United States and Russia, but also with other countries, and thus hope to bring about world peace."

A leading Swiss expert on Russia commented: "It is logical to believe that Ford had Bush in mind when he brought up the CIA problem. I think this is linked to the criticism of Bush's handling of the end of communism. This criticism is spreading very fast in Europe, and Ford, speaking from Italy, might have sensed it." He added that the debate "was started by another former President, Richard Nixon, one year ago."

This view was echoed by an Italian source, who stressed that Ford had spoken out because "someone in the United States" is thinking of a "new approach to Russia."

By supporting the dictatorship, the world "is heading very fast toward a new Cold War," the Swiss expert said. "We are not supporting Yeltsin, no matter how often we say it; we are really supporting, in fact, the unitarists, the centralists, the authoritarians, the people in the military and the military-industrial complex who seek to rebuild Russian power. If we had challenged Russian designs in Estonia or Georgia, everything would have been different, but our refusal to do so has guaranteed that these centralizers will come

out ahead. All this talk of democracy, the market economy, free elections, censorship and so on, is irrelevant. We have lost out already in Russia.”

A source in Britain with decades of expertise on Russia contrasted the Ford interview with the recent release of the Thatcher memoirs, which he described as designed to reinforce “the mythology of a wonderful Thatcher-Reagan-Bush synergism that was responsible for bringing down the Soviet empire and defeating communism. It’s all absurd, but that is what that woman wants people to believe.” His urgent warnings to reverse the idiotic “support of Yeltsin” and “democracy” have so far fallen on deaf ears: “Nobody bothers to listen when you tell them that ‘you are about to lose Yeltsin,’ and that it’s a moral disaster for the West to be so enthusiastic about a man who is nothing more than a Bolshevik thug.”

A shock for the ‘therapists’

Evidence of how Russian policymakers now view the West was seen in a letter to the Oct. 27 *International Herald Tribune* by Viktor A. Kremenyuk, professor of political science at the Institute of U.S.A. and Canada Studies in Moscow. His wrote: “I would understand support for the Russian President by Bill Clinton or other western leaders if this had been a case of aggression against Russia from the outside. But in the case of domestic struggles, usually such support amounts to interference in favor of one Russian group against another. Imagine a Russian, Chinese, or other leader supporting a U.S. President against his opponents in Congress when they debate the budget or any other domestic program. Second, the International Monetary Fund and other western financial institutions have taken a strong stand on economic reform in Russia. They in fact have conditioned their loans and credits on the compliance of the Russian government with some prescribed recipes that are regarded by many Russian experts as destructive. . . . Now, after several years of turmoil and suffering, more and more educated, as well as uneducated, Russians have come to the conclusion that western policy in Russia is motivated by the desire to disarm it, to contribute to its deindustrialization, and to make it a weak and dependent partner.”

Another denunciation of western policy toward Russia was given several days earlier by Kremenyuk’s boss, Georgi Arbatov, director of the U.S.A.-Canada Institute, in a speech at the German Evangelical Church academy in Tutzing (see *EIR*, Oct. 22, p. 4).

The Russian response to western attempts to weaken their country has been to begin to rearm. Frank Gaffney, director of the Center for Security Policy, in the *Washington Times* on Oct. 25 cited testimony by Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Ak.) that Russia is building a new generation of MIRVed fixed-site, land-based ICBMs in violation of the START II Treaty. This followed the Russian renunciations in September of the CFE Treaty on conventional force limitations respecting the Cau-

casus and its military district adjacent to the Baltics, Finland, and Norway.

The Russian policy to allocate, in addition to the non-Russian republics within the Community of Independent States, as much as possible of eastern Europe and the Balkans to its sphere of influence, was restated by Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev in an address on Oct. 27 to the Royal Institute for International Affairs in London. As reported in the Oct. 28 London *Guardian*, Kozyrev stated that Russia was determined to prevent the admission of its former Warsaw Pact allies into NATO. He “advised” the eastern European nations to “join Russia in transforming the CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe] into a full-fledged regional organization for ensuring peace and stability in Europe.” Through thinly veiled references to NATO’s capitulation to Serbian genocide against Bosnia, he told the eastern Europeans to accommodate to Russia, because NATO would never intervene on their behalf. Kozyrev noted that NATO had “no appetite for addressing ethnic and nationalist conflict in Europe,” and was therefore “unlikely to satisfy” eastern European security needs. He threatened that any such NATO attempt would lead to a new Cold War, provoking “a return to the destructive logic of blocs and counter-blocs.”

Ukraine sees the danger

Asked about the recent rejection by Ukraine of proposals to disarm, LaRouche commented that Ukraine is aware of the danger. “The Ukrainians see that the United States is pushing Moscow toward the emergence of what the Ukrainians recognize as a Third Rome form of empire. That Yeltsin is essentially a *figurehead* of various forces centered around the old KGB forces and of the military. It was the military that made the decision which allowed Yeltsin to stay in power. They’re going to say, ‘All right, the United States does not have the power anymore to check Russia.’ And they are very worried, and they say, ‘We’re sticking to our guns, for the time being.’

“Washington is saying, ‘Let’s have a condominium, a new New Yalta agreement, with the new military-KGB masters in Moscow. We’re going to go over there, and we’re going to kiss hands and say, ‘You guys are our *partners* in running the world.’ And they’re going to talk to the Russians about keeping the Third World countries in line, as a kind of condominium, the kind of thing that Henry Kissinger specialized in, in constantly saying that the world is run from London and Washington and Moscow; that whatever the three powers agree upon, the rest of the world will get in line, and obey.

“The Ukrainians say, ‘Okay, the United States has *sold us out*, and we’re going to maintain at least a marginal bargaining power in this situation, in order to preserve our national independence; and if we have to submit, we’re going to demand major concessions, which will stand our children good in the future.’ ”