

Russia Urges U.S.: No Flight Forward

by Jonathan Tennenbaum

On hearing first news of the World Trade Center attack, Lyndon LaRouche called for the U.S. government to immediately get into contact with Russian President Vladimir Putin, and then together with leaders of other countries, to calm the situation and avoid irrational responses that could bring disaster.

As the first world leader, other than President Bush, to respond to the attack, President Putin went on television to deliver his condolences, offering Russia's cooperation. In the following hours and days, both in public statements and in discussions with *EIR*, high-level Russian officials and security experts made a series of extremely important observations, comments, and warnings. Here is a representative overview of some of the most significant Russian comments, in chronological order.

On the evening of Sept. 11, *EIR* briefed an experienced Russian intelligence expert on what LaRouche had said on the Stockwell radio show (see *Feature*). He responded: "There are very important things in what LaRouche stated. Especially his point about capabilities. No Arab organization has the capability and coordination to carry out something like this. This operation had to have been prepared over a rather long time, a half-year at least. The magnitude and scale required would include at least 25 persons at the spearhead, but a couple of hundred people would have to have been involved in one way or another.

"The only possibility is illegal or terrorist organizations controlled by intelligence agencies through various means. Of course this may not have been done on direct order, but under framework guidance. There must have been conspirators inside the [U.S.] government, very powerful people who could conspire."

The same night, in a comment to the Russian press service RBC, the chairman of the Russian State Duma Committee on International Affairs, Dmitri Rogozin, expressed amazement over the fact, that U.S. intelligence services did not anticipate the terrorist action. He suggested, that an American or some "transnational organization" might be behind it.

An Inside Operation

A well-known Russian political figure, who did not want to be publicly identified, warned on Sept. 12 that what hap-

pened is a "direct attack against the United States," coming from "a transnational elite having enormous financial resources and a colossal network. These are satanists and fanatical neo-malthusians. They actively desire to destroy the world economy and accelerate the collapse of the world population.

"In my view, this is the beginning of the hot phase of a world war of a fundamentally new type—a financial-economic-religious-political war against human civilization."

"This was an inside operation, like a coup," said a military intelligence-linked Russian observer, the same day. "We could see a destabilization of the whole world situation, with U.S. attacks on Iran, Iraq, and Syria. This could lead to World War III. Russia should propose the establishment of a special intelligence center in the UN, and world leaders should meet to coordinate actions." He also emphasized that "there was a total failure of the U.S. intelligence services."

At the same time, Yevgeni Kozhokin, director of the government-linked Russian Institute for Strategic Studies (RISS), gave an interview to the Russian news service Strana.ru, warning against a cover-up. "I think there are good chances that some leads will be found to the organizers of the attack. But whether this crime will be cleared up completely, is a complicated question. It is possible that the world will never know some things. For one simple reason: It is possible that besides the people who directly carried out the attack, a whole series of other persons, connected with the attacks—people participating in the preparation of the operation—may be killed. Not killed by the American [authorities], but by those, who have an interest in making sure that the identities of the people who indirectly ordered the attack, will never become known.

"If the investigation of the crime ends in a blind alley, or if it turns out that the attack was prepared by some domestic sect or terrorist group . . . like for example the '100% American' Timothy McVeigh, who blew up the Federal Building in Oklahoma in 1995—then we have a second complex of problems connected with the internal politics of the U.S.A.," Kozhokin said.

Also on Sept. 12, a leader of the famous IMEMO institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences warned, that wild U.S. reprisals could destabilize the world situation, particularly if Iran became a target. That could lead to serious problems between the United States and Russia. He also commented, somewhat bitterly:

"These events are very sad, but in a certain sense this is a logical result of the Americans' own behavior. The United States has acted as if she would remain safe forever, while creating all kinds of problems around the world. . . . When [former Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni] Primakov had warned them that the Kosovo operation would lead to a disaster, the Americans wouldn't listen. Also, the Taliban was supported by the U.S., and Bin Laden was a creation of the

U.S. and Israel, now out of control. I don't know who is directly responsible for this, but somehow it is the price for U.S. behavior in the past."

Escalation To Nuclear Weapons?

The next day, Sept. 13, saw intense discussion in Russia, about the consequences of possible U.S. military operations against alleged terrorists and countries accused of supporting them. The former head of the Russian National Security Council, Andrei Kokoshin, created a sensation by talking about the possibility, that the U.S. might even use *nuclear weapons* in such an operation. In a live interview with the radio station Ekho Moskv, Kokoshin was asked, if he thought the United States might employ weapons of mass destruction. Kokoshin answered, yes, they could. "It's not an abstract possibility, since there are various types of nuclear weapons. There are small nuclear warheads, and ultra-low-yield warheads, with various sorts of destructive effects. Therefore, hypothetically they could certainly use them. And there are no bans against this, neither in international law nor in American military doctrine."

To avoid disaster, Kokoshin urged, the UN Security Council should be called in. "I think this is not simply an American affair, but concerns the international community as a whole. . . . I am afraid that the Americans will not respond in an appropriate way. In the words of their leaders, already, they have declared that they will decide everything themselves. . . . But you see that the consequences have already taken on a global character. . . . The effects could become even bigger, if the American reaction is out of proportion, not thought out, and if it disregards leading states and institutions of international relations. Therefore . . . the U.S.A. should consult with the leading nations of the world, and the response should be adopted in a certain degree of agreement, at least with the Permanent Members of the UN Security Council."

Asked by the Russian press service RBK to comment on Kokoshin's statement, the chairman of the Duma Defense Committee, Andrei Nikolayev, warned that U.S. reprisals "will have a scale comparable to what the U.S. suffered," and that "the Americans will bring their entire power into play."

Duma International Affairs Committee head Dmitri Rogozin stated, "I fear that an attack on Afghanistan is completely possible." He noted that the political pressure on Bush is high. "But such an act could threaten danger to Russia, due to our close proximity to the region." Indeed, a reckless U.S. military intervention into Afghanistan could easily set fire to the whole Central Asia region.

All Russian observers reached by *EIR*, showed "electric" interest in LaRouche's call for rationality and calm, and for close contacts and deliberation between the U.S. Administration and Putin. There is much good will in Russia, for a United States that were ready to listen to Reason.

Ariel Sharon and Israel's Honor

by Theo Klein

Theo Klein is a lawyer and honorary President of the Representative Council of Jewish Institutions in France. His letter was published in the Paris daily Le Monde of Sept. 6, 2001, and translated by EIR.

Ariel Sharon, if I have decided to address this letter to you publicly, as head of the government of Israel, by way of *Le Monde*, it is because I have come to the conclusion that it is necessary to say loud and clear that Israel's policy of *réplique* [response] has reached its extreme point of absurdity.

This is no longer a policy—which would imply thinking, and an objective considered possible—it is a tragic brawl which is, unfortunately, engulfing all our moral values.

Yes, this action is absurd, because it only fuels passions and hatred, because it rallies the Palestinian population around those they consider to be their fighters, and because it holds the Israeli population in the illusion of a false security.

When will you admit that it is Israeli tanks and missiles that stir up the winds of revolt which is daily fed by fighting, searches, and a systematic mistrust that gives our neighbors the impression of being constantly suspected of being terrorists, simply because they are not Israelis? How can you not understand that even this so-called security action, if it is done every day, ends up being an element of insecurity?

This understandable, but insanely carried-out action—which is necessarily brutal given the lack of appropriate men and means—has become a goal in itself, and repeating it again and again arouses, among the youth, an even stronger will to fight and to sacrifice.

How could we, who, through pain and suffering, learned how to survive against brutal force, forget that a people never bows down without fighting? You, who claim to represent the Jewish tradition, should remember the words of our prophets: "For it is not force that makes the conqueror," Samuel said; whereas Zacharias stated some centuries later: "Neither by force nor by the army, but by the mind."

It is up to you as leader of a state—with all its history and the creativity of its citizens, it is up to you to make the political gesture which would end the hopeless spiral of violence. It is incumbent upon you to take the difficult but necessary initiative. Stefan Zweig wrote, "For intelligent