

Clinton team applauds Russia-China summit

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Contrary to persistently lying accounts in all of the major American print and electronic media, the agreements reached the week of April 21 between President Boris Yeltsin of Russia, President Jiang Zemin of China, and the heads of state of the three bordering Central Asian republics, do not represent a threat to vital United States interests. The extremely positive character of the economic and security accords among the five Eurasian nations has been fully recognized by the Clinton administration, and administration officials have explained in great detail, why the Russian-Chinese cooperation agreements advance, rather than detract from, U.S. global strategic interests.

The fact that the Clinton administration has come out wholeheartedly supporting the Yeltsin-Jiang summit results, has been blacked out of the American media. Instead, the *New York Times* lied, on April 24: "President Boris N. Yeltsin of Russia and President Jiang Zemin of China pledged today to work together to limit American power and influence in the world." The *Washington Times*, the same day, did not even bother to assign its own reporters to pen their disinformation. They merely republished a British "Big Lie" story from the pages of the Manchester *Guardian*, which began: "Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Chinese President Jiang Zemin proclaimed a new 'multipolar' world order yesterday in which both nations set themselves against the U.S. claim to be the only superpower."

What provoked this latest rash of coordinated Anglo-American media disinformation? For readers of *EIR*, the answer should be very obvious: The historic agreements signed by the Presidents of Russia, China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan represent an important advance of the Eurasian Land-Bridge policy, which policy, for well over a hundred years, has been a *casus belli* for the British oligarchy, and its

allies and assets abroad. To the extent that the United States government supports the construction of what the Chinese refer to as the "New Silk Road," the prospects of Eurasian peace and prosperity are greatly enhanced.

Kissingerian 'triangular diplomacy' rejected

On April 24, State Department spokesman Nick Burns, speaking on behalf of the administration, delivered an unambiguous statement of support for the achievements of the Moscow summit. He chided the American press for their misrepresentations.

"The United States welcomes the agreement signed between Russia and China," Burns said, in prepared remarks at the regular State Department briefing, "because we hope that Russia and China will fully normalize their bilateral relationship and take efforts to make sure that the long border between those two countries is stable and peaceful. All of us remember the 1960s and '70s and into the '80s, when there were considerable problems along that border, and that wasn't good for the United States. No one wants to see these two very important countries fighting, or not in agreement.

"Now, Mr. Jiang Zemin is also going to be signing a treaty with Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan, which is a very important treaty. Those four countries have a 4,300-mile border, and there have been some border problems with the Central Asian countries as well as with Russia. This treaty leads to greater transparency in the military relationships among those countries, and we hope it will lead to an improvement on the situation along that common border.

"I would also say, some of the press has been touting the Jiang Zemin/Boris Yeltsin meeting as some kind of face-off with the United States. That is not how we see it. We're in the 1990s now. We're not back in the '70s, when Henry Kissinger

and others were playing triangular diplomacy among Russia, China, and the United States. The world has changed. The United States then had a competitive rivalry with the Soviet Union. Now the United States has a friendship and partnership with the Russian Federation. . . . We have a policy of engagement with China. And all of this improves stability, security, and the chances for peace in Europe and Asia.

“So I was surprised at a lot of the press commentary and coverage that, somehow, this is a bad thing for the United States. We think the meeting has been positive, and we want to work with both of those countries in the next century for peace on two continents and in two oceans.”

LaRouche: ‘Very good news’

Upon being informed of the Clinton administration’s reaction to the Moscow events, Lyndon LaRouche, an architect and leading advocate of the Eurasian Land-Bridge policy, made the following observation:

“The agreements announced this week in Moscow are a key part of what we have been working on for some time. This will change the world situation. At a point when many things in the world are going badly, this is very good news. I hope that these working agreements on economic and security cooperation will help stabilize the region of the former Soviet Union.

“We attempted, beginning in 1989, to promote this policy, through the European Productive Triangle; however, the Four Powers administering Germany interceded to prevent this, and, instead, imposed a policy now known as Maastricht. Now, the Eurasian development issue has been revived. This time, the development initiative is moving from China toward Europe, rather than from Europe to China. By bringing the nations of the former Soviet Union into this process as full participants, this is proceeding along the same lines as our earlier Productive Triangle approach. We join with the State Department in applauding this development.”

Albright’s remarks on China

The Clinton administration’s response to the Moscow summit was consistent with the President’s policy of “constructive engagement” with China. In the face of a frontal assault by the majority of the British and U.S. Anglophile political establishment, against his policy toward China—an assault documented recently in *EIR*—President Clinton has stood his ground, and publicly rejected the “yellow peril” propaganda that China is the new enemy, and must be contained.

This administration policy was very clearly spelled out by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, in an April 15 Forrester Lecture at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland. That speech, too, was blacked out of the American media.

After discussing the broad issues defining American policy toward the Asia-Pacific region, Secretary Albright had the

following to say about America’s China policy:

“No nation will play a larger role in shaping the course of 21st-century Asia than China. With its huge population and vast territory, China’s emergence as a modern, growing economic and military power is a major historical event.

“In the United States, there are some, alarmed by China’s rise, who suggest that our policy should be to contain China. Such a policy assumes and would, in fact, guarantee an outcome contrary to American interests. A policy of containment would divide our Asian allies and encourage China to withdraw into narrow nationalism and militarism. Our interests are served by an Asia that is coming together, not splitting apart—and by a China that is neither threatening nor threatened.”

She continued: “What we see in Asia today is not a clash of civilizations, but a test of civilization. And that test is whether we can seize the opportunity for mutually beneficial cooperation that now exists, for we are privileged to live in an era when the protection of security and prosperity is not a zero-sum game.

“The U.S.-China relationship is guided by principles set out in the 1972 Shanghai and two later communiqués. Pursuant to these documents, we recognize the government of the P.R.C. as the sole legal government of China.

“At the same time, under the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, we have maintained strong unofficial ties with the people of Taiwan, thereby helping to propel Taiwan’s flourishing democracy.

“Although leaders in both the P.R.C. and Taiwan recognize the need to resolve differences peacefully, those differences remain a potential source of instability. That is why we have stressed to both Beijing and Taipei that our ‘one China’ policy is firm, and that they should do all they can to build mutual confidence and avoid provocative actions and words.”

She concluded: “Later this month, we will welcome Vice Premier Qian Qichen to Washington. And later this year, we look forward to a meeting between President Clinton and China’s President Jiang Zemin. Throughout, we will continue efforts to narrow differences, expand cooperation, and build understanding. And we anticipate that the larger process of increased ties between the American and Chinese peoples will accelerate with profoundly positive results.”

This unambiguous rejection of Kissinger- and Brzezinski-style geopolitics toward Russia and China, on the part of the Clinton administration, comes at a critical moment. It is only through the rapid implementation of the Land-Bridge policy, of building technology-intensive development corridors, criss-crossing the vast expanse of Eurasia, that the world can avoid plunging into the new Dark Age, toward which the British oligarchy and their fellow-travellers are propelling us. For the Land-Bridge policy to become reality, the United States must be an active and visible participant. The Moscow summit, and the Clinton administration’s response, moved the world a few steps closer to achieving that goal.