

## Russian Anti-Missile Defense Proposals

On Feb. 20, Russian Defense Minister Igor Sergeyev handed to NATO Secretary General George Robertson, in a Moscow meeting, the text of a Russian proposal to Europe, for an Eastern and Western European anti-missile defense. European press reports purporting to identify the specifics of the Russian proposal, have so far turned out to be unsubstantiated. However, on the following day, Feb. 21, Minister Sergeyev gave interviews in which he emphasized that Russia has all the necessary technical capacities for creating a European ballistic missile defense system. "Russia has testing areas, research centers, and testing facilities. And if we team up with our European partners, I believe we will manage to do everything that we have proposed and planned." Sergeyev did confirm that Russia has suggested to the European countries, using Russian S-300 mobile missile complexes in the structure of a Euro-

pean ABM system.

Eight years ago, on April 2, 1993, the Russian daily *Izvestia* had published an article suggesting Russian thinking about collaborative anti-ballistic missile (ABM) development among the major nations. The Russian proposal, *Izvestia* reported, was known by the project name "Trust," and involved plasma and electromagnetic-pulse anti-missile weapons (see **Figure 1**, the illustration printed by *Izvestia* at that time). The then-Deputy Chairman of the Russian Federation for Defense Industry, Yuri Glybin, called the "Trust" proposal "an alternative to the SDI." Glybin stressed that the ABM Treaty of 1972 does not at all prohibit "joint work on global defense against missile attack. Twenty years ago, it could not have entered anyone's mind, that such a thing were possible." In other words, the Russian idea for collaborative development of anti-missile defenses (in that case, with the United States under President Bill Clinton), was clearly focussed on the "new physical principles" involved in directed-energy beams, the development of which is explicitly excluded from the 1972 Treaty prohibitions.

tary systems tend to be "hardened" against EMP effects, although most of the targetted nation will be shut down, with lasting effects. The military-retaliatory capability of the targetted power is not eliminated, or reduced to doomsday response-capabilities. Rather, a threshold condition is induced, at which negotiations of peaceful conditions begin, or doomsday may ensue.

Thus, a strategic EMP effect does not necessarily invoke a doomsday counterstrike by the nuclear arsenal. Rather, it challenges the targetted nation to face a doomsday sort of nuclear exchange, or to back away from the conflict and accept mutual damage done, rather than escalate to doomsday.

This is precisely the "scenario" most suited to the present capabilities and state of mind of the military institutions of the U.S. and Russia. It is a scenario which neither power would employ, except in extreme circumstances, but it typifies the most likely response should there arise what it perceives to be, for it, an extreme condition.

On this account, the most likely threat comes from the present Bush administration. It is that threat which must be taken into account, to estimate the actuality of an "EMP effect" event on the strategic horizon.

Apart from the proudly unconcealed intellectual limitations of the new "education" President, as long as the new administration remains in its present form, it is doomed to early self-destruction, and much of the rest of the world with it. Here, in the new administration's acute intellectual incapacities, lies the very real threat of some combination of de-

velopments such as deployment of "EMP effect" and outrightly doomsday capabilities.

The principal relevant intellectual and moral defects of the new administration, are three.

First, there is the case of the already referenced intellectual shortfalls of the new head of state, the worst possible choice of figure to put into such a position for a crisis of the severity now onrushing. He is personally incapable of a competent crisis-decision, unless that decision were forced upon him, more or less against his will. Second, there is the principal popular political base of the new administration, typified by pathetic pieces of intellectual and emotional wreckage such as Senator Phil Gramm, and the irrational fanatics dominating the ranks of the "religious" admirers of the new Attorney-General, John Ashcroft. Third, there is the factor typified by the pack of predatory parasites known as the Carlyle Group.<sup>13</sup> All three, combined, are fairly described

13. *New York Times*, Monday, March 5, 2001, "Elder Bush in Big GOP Cast Toiling for Top Equity Firm." This front-page profile of the Carlyle Group highlights the role of George Bush, Sr., James Baker III, and Frank Carlucci, in building up the Washington, D.C. corporate takeover outfit into the country's largest private equity fund, surpassing Kohlberg Kravis Roberts (KKR). In addition to the ex-President, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense, Carlyle also includes Richard Darman, former Indiana Senator and putative Bush nominee for Ambassador to Germany Dan Coats, and such foreign luminaries as John Major, Karl Otto Pöhl, Fidel Ramos, and former South Korean President Park Tae Joon as directors, advisors, or directors of subsidiaries. The \$12 billion firm has ownership stakes in 164 companies worldwide, is the 11th largest defense contractor in America, and owns *Le*