

Ukraine a trigger point

In a radio interview on Dec. 8, Lyndon LaRouche commented on NATO's decision to exclude eastern European countries from joining the alliance. Excerpts follow:

A new generation is now leading the United States, which has inherited the terrible features of policy-shaping left over from the wreckage of the Bush administration, which is still all over the Clinton administration. They have a very specific, easily recognized problem, easily recognized to anyone who has studied the history, for example, of the 18th century in Europe or the early 20th century. This problem, in technical language, is called a *cabinet warfare mentality*. But they are people who have . . . never been educated in history. . . . They don't understand what cabinet warfare is. . . .

In the Ukraine case, the administration is operating . . . together with London . . . to establish Bush's policy of a new global-imperial condominium, with Russia.

This is also a delusion, one should be reminded, like the delusions of the early part of this century, before World War I, and the greater delusions which took over much of U.S. policy among the more credulous people in

the 1930s that we were not going to world war when we were; we're in that same kind of delusion now.

[Yet] before World War I, the British and leading Americans around Wilson and Roosevelt in this country, for example, knew we were going to war. . . . In the 1930s, all the leading establishment, from at least 1936 on in the United States, knew the United States was going to war against Germany. . . . *Today*, the difference is, the *highest* level of policy-shaping in London and in Washington, those in power around the Clinton administration, around Major, *don't know*. . . .

Bush made a speech in Kiev. . . and told the Ukrainians to submit to Gorbachov and not to seek independence. . . . You had two key people in the Bush administration, apart from Baker. . . . Now, who are Brent Scowcroft and Larry Eagleburger? They were formerly employees of Kissinger Associates. . . . Now, the Eagleburger/Thatcher/Scowcroft/Bush policy—is still the policy of the Clinton/Christopher State Department, in modified terms: It's different theorems, but the same axioms.

Ukraine is a trigger point for general world war. If the United States backs down on this issue of Ukraine, then they set the forces in motion for a Russian Third Rome dictatorship with very confidently aggressive foreign aims, beyond the so-called Near Abroad, for a present-day Russia.

not extend security guarantees to Moscow's former eastern European colonies.

Russian armtwisting

Russian pressure on NATO on this issue has been intense. A week before the Brussels meeting, Russian foreign intelligence head Yevgeny Primakov issued a statement warning NATO not to oppose Russia's wishes, ominously asserting that an expansion of NATO would force Moscow into "fundamental" countermeasures. In effect, western Europe and the United States have given Russia a veto over NATO affairs, and, in the process, have de facto conceded that the old Soviet sphere of influence in eastern Europe remains—no matter what talk of "peace and democracy" Boris Yeltsin and his entourage may indulge in.

Foreign Minister Kozyrev made no bones about the fact that Russia was pleased with NATO's capitulation. After meeting with Christopher in Brussels following the NATO conference, Kozyrev gloated to reporters that the Partnership for Peace is "a good idea. Partnership is the key word." And Clinton Defense Secretary Les Aspin, speaking at a conference in Washington on Dec. 3, commented (with no irony apparent) that NATO's adoption of the Christopher plan "gives Russia less heartburn. This is a proposal they find

very comforting and they have been very supportive of it."

Not surprisingly, the NATO decision elicited strong responses from those who see it as yet another indication that the West, and the United States and Britain in particular, are seeking to establish a New Yalta deal with Moscow, at the expense of smaller powers.

Polish officials were among those said to be "deeply disappointed" with the outcome of the Brussels meeting. The Polish deputy defense minister gave a press conference on Dec. 7 in which he asserted that NATO membership remains one of Poland's chief strategic goals, and asserted that Russian fears on this score were groundless.

Jan Nowak, national director of the Polish American Congress, believes that the Clinton administration's Partnership for Peace plan "may be perceived in Moscow as a 'green light' for ambitions to restore the Russian empire and to regain its sphere of influence in East Central Europe."

"What looked like prompt acceptance by the United States and its allies of Moscow's 'veto' against the NATO membership of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech and Slovak republics will have an encouraging impact on those politicians around Boris Yeltsin who are seeking recognition of Russia as the sole 'peacemaker' for the entire area of the former Soviet Union," Nowak warned.