

It's Time to Leave the Valley of the Clueless: Watch 'The Putin Interviews'

by Rachel Brown

June 26—U.S. statesman Lyndon LaRouche has often cited the role of the leadership of Russian President Vladimir Putin as providing a crucial strategic factor in current world affairs. “The Putin Interviews,” Oliver Stone’s recent 20 hours of discussion with the Russian leader available on “[Showtime](#),” gives many valuable examples of just how this is the case, and how it is that creative interventions and long-term thinking are the principles which always guide actually successful action among nations.

Not to be forgotten in Putin’s strategic thinking is his close personal connection to the defeat of fascism; during the brutal Nazi siege of Leningrad, his older brother died of starvation and his mother was left for dead, only to be revived by Putin’s father. These memories are one of Putin’s driving forces as a leader, and are deeply connected with his love for his country and its people.

Now take a mental step to another location: the area in East Germany around Dresden, located in the Elbe Valley, known in post-World-War-II history as “The Valley of the Clueless,” because television signals from West Germany were not able to enter the area, and residents were virtually clueless as to the goings-on in the outside world, other than what was provided by East German media propaganda. Today, 320 million Americans are living in our own “Valley of the Clueless,” as the reality of the world outside has been left “at the door” so to speak, ignored by all significant media outlets.

Putin’s interviews provide

today’s American a vantage point by which to attain a more truthful experience of the world. Many issues are addressed in a manner outside the current “narrative,” with a plethora of insightful glimpses into the quality of creative thinking which LaRouche has frequently cited in Putin’s personality.

On Creativity, *Per Se*

A few segments shed light on Putin’s personal sense of the need for creativity in statecraft. In the first interview, Stone asks Putin, “Your theory of life, they say, is summed up in the philosophy of Judo?” Putin answers, “Yes, more or less. The main idea—the flexible way, as it were—that is the main idea in Judo. You must be flexible. Sometimes you can give way to others. If that is the way leading to victory.” The patience exemplified

by Putin in resisting hasty responses to numerous provocations, such as the Turkish shooting down of a Russian plane over Syria, or continual personal attacks, are examples of pursuing a path above emotional reaction or immediate gratification, toward greater future victory.

In a later interview, Stone asks Putin a personal question:

Stone: I was speaking to my producer who’s here, Fernando—we were talking about you earlier, and he said you are an excellent CEO, Chief Executive Officer of a company—Russia is your company. You kick the tires, you deal with these problems and you try to solve them on the spot. Let’s say the problem is this, and you



wikipedia

go into the detail here, and the detail gets smaller, and you do a micro detail, and the micro detail has another micro detail, and before you know it you've lost the forest for the trees as they say. That could be very irritating—you could probably go to bed at night not having solved some of these things and it really drives you nuts.

Vladimir Putin: It's not about unresolved issues; it's about the very process of resolving those issues. I try to make it more creative. Just imagine a painter is working and it's dinnertime, and he just quits his picture and goes to dinner. [Pauses.] But that's not how it happens. The painter tries to complete something, and only after that, is he ready to have some rest.

Stone: [To translator] He says he needs to complete something?

Putin: Yes, I have to have this sense of completion. I am not trying to compare myself to a creative professional, but the search for answers is similar in process to what creative professionals do.

Compare this to the method of a Bush, Obama, or Hillary Clinton, who were fully committed to carrying out policies of regime change and perpetual war on behalf of the British empire, and you see why Putin is under attack today. A great leader must think like an artist, or a great general in war, who can act on the basis of a future effect by implementing a creative hypothesis that changes the field of activity.

The Threat of Nuclear War

The defining characteristic of the U.S.-Russian relationship since 1945 has been the threat of global nuclear war. As opposed to the attitude of some British-run U.S. strategists who choose to remain ignorant of the implications of their “playing with fire,” or even some who think a nuclear war against Russia would be winnable, Putin demonstrates a sober understanding of the reality presented by a world with nuclear weapons. He repeatedly called for the joint development of missile defense systems, as Lyndon LaRouche had also proposed with his [Strategic Defense Initiative](#), which President Reagan adopted in 1983.

In this interview, on July 4th, they are taking a walk in a wooded, sunny area.

Stone: In a hot war, is the U.S. dominant, yes or no?

Putin: No.

Stone: No. It would be a case of Russia surviving it?

Putin: [Gravely.] I don't think anyone would survive such a conflict.

Stone: [Considers the weight of this statement.] Even with the missile shield...?

Putin: As of now, a missile shield would not protect the entire territory of the United States. There is a threat deriving from the illusion of being protected, and this might lead to more aggressive behavior. That is why it is so important to prevent unilateral actions. That is why we propose to work jointly on the anti-ballistic missile system.

Putin later provides an unexpected, and probably to most observers, shocking description of U.S.-Russian relations after the death of FDR.

Putin says to Stone: Who gave the intelligence regarding nuclear weapon research in the United States to the Soviets after World War II?

Putin continued: “The scientists themselves—those who developed the atomic bomb. Why did they do that? Because they understood the dangers. They let the genie out of the bottle [with emphasis] and now the genie cannot be put back. And this international team of scientists—I think they were more intelligent than the politicians. They provided this information to the Soviet Union of their own volition to restore the nuclear balance in the world. And what are we doing right now? We're trying to destroy this balance. And that's a great mistake.”

There have been several overt violations by the United States, under British command, of the global strategic balance. One was the decision by the United States to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which Putin states was “the cornerstone of the system of national security as a whole. It was the foundation of international security.” He described the violation of the promise not to expand NATO after the dissolution of the Soviet Union:

Stone: I mean from what I've heard from Mr. Gorbachov, as well as read from American officials including James Baker, there was a deal with the Soviet Union not to expand NATO eastward.

Putin: Yes, I talked about that publicly—including in Munich [in 2007]. And when the decision was made on the reunification of Germany, back then, the dignitaries both in the United States and the United Nations

Secretary General, and the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany—they were all saying there was one thing that the Soviet Union could be sure of—that the eastern border of NATO would not be extended any further than the eastern border of the German Democratic Republic.

Putin's remarks at that Munich Security Conference have frequently been interpreted as anti-American, which is not true, as he made clear.

'Democracy Can Not Be Imported'

The Putin-Stone interchange is an important complement to the current U.S. shift away from the 16 years of Bush-Obama policy of perpetual war.

Putin elaborates further his thinking in 2007 in Munich, and now.

"I thought it was unacceptable what the United States was doing. And I said we saw what was happening and that we had to take measures. I was saying that we would not let ourselves be dragged to the slaughterhouse and applaud that at the same time. . . .

"I just want to emphasize that that approach is dangerous. . . . I told you that democracy could not be exported. It cannot be imported from outside. It has to emerge from within society. And this work is more promising even though it is more difficult; it requires patience, it requires much time, and it requires attention. Certainly it's easier to send bombers. And what then? What comes next? And then a surge of terrorism and the need to take the next step to fight terrorism. Take ISIS. Where do they recruit new members? [Putin is referring to Stone's question about U.S. attacks on Libya, Iraq, and Syria.] There are many countries sending people there."

Stone's interview of Putin should remind us that "regime-change" policies have done nothing to better the nations involved or increase world safety. Terrorism has only increased with the covert support of British policies over the recent two decades. The way to improve the lives of citizens is not through externally enforced "democracy," but by creating stability in the world through economic cooperation and the development of basic infrastructure and culture. China and Russia, in partnership with many other countries through the Belt and Road Initiative (New Silk Road), the BRICS, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and other international initiatives, have clearly identified and are acting on this concept.

On the New Silk Road

Oliver Stone raised the subject of the New Silk Road with President Putin. Putin highlighted one of the perhaps unintended consequences of Western sanctions against Russia, its turn toward the East.

Putin told Stone that "the so-called sanctions introduced by the West simply pushed this process forward. . . . We also have plans for developing the so-called trans-Siberian Railroad and the trans-Baikal Railroad, and it all corresponds well to the Chinese plans for reviving the Silk Road."

On Looking into the Future

The attitude of the U.S. media towards Russia is increasingly hostile, and many Congressmen have sought to paint themselves as better patriots by denouncing Putin or calling for actions against Russia (which could lead to nuclear war). One example was Sen. McCain's call for a Senate veto against the cancellation of Russian sanctions by President Trump. To this, Putin responded:

"People with such convictions as the Senator you mentioned—they still live in the Old World. And they're reluctant to look into the future; they are unwilling to recognize how fast the world is changing. They do not see the real threat, and they cannot leave behind the past which is always dragging them back.

"We supported the U.S. fight for independence. We were allies during World War I and World War II. Right now there are common threats we are both facing, like international terrorism. We've got to fight poverty across the world, and the environmental deterioration which is the real threat to all humanity. After all, we've piled up so many nuclear weapons that it has become a threat to the whole world as well. And it would be good for us to give it some thought."

These interviews underline the reality that the paradigm must be changed. Overcoming the seemingly insurmountable mode of continual conflict, both within the United States and in its relations to other countries, can be achieved only by looking at the world as a whole, by facing the inevitable threat of nuclear war which will erupt if it is not overcome through mutual development. We must take up the repeated offers of cooperation to the United States by the two most important countries in the world—Russia and China. Putin has demonstrated he is already acting for the future—for the next 25 to 100 years. The United States must act on this intention as well.