

(Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan).” The first troika represents the clear leaders of the organization, which initiate various questions and decisions to be adopted by the organization as a whole. The creation of an “axis of democracy” from the Baltic to Georgia, and the “Greater Central Asia” (GCA) and other American projects, are prompting actions in response, by Moscow and Beijing, and will continue to do so. Vladimir Putin and Hu Jintao have been able, in the framework of the unified SCO project, to offer the Central Asia region their agenda of security, development, and modernization. This agenda is attractive for the local elites, because it does not propose a radical “democratization” of the existing regimes, according to the well-known American scenario. Rather, it fully supports them and provides an opportunity for the more underdeveloped countries (Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan) to enjoy economic development, based on the resources of the more developed ones: China, Russia, and Kazakstan. Modernization, security, and stability in the region are the main points on the SCO’s agenda today.

Beijing’s contribution to the SCO is of great economic significance. At a certain point, Beijing succeeded in convincing Moscow and the Central Asian Republics, that the organization’s range of activity should encompass as many areas as possible, including economic, humanitarian, and integration matters, not merely security alone. Accordingly, in 2005 the P.R.C. offered \$900 million for the development of economic projects. Procedures for operation of this “second wheel,” economic cooperation, were set in motion, so that the organization’s activity became truly more comprehensive. Humanitarian activity and the “second road” also took shape, in the form of the SCO Forum, etc. China’s long-term and well-conceived policy of “harmonizing the SCO” met full support from the other five members at the summit. It is quite likely that the SCO project is only one aspect of China’s longer-term strategic design for Central Asia.

Thus, despite its discussions being internal, the SCO has outgrown its “regional suit” and is trying on larger “geopolitical clothes.” The organization’s sphere of interests today encompasses Central and Northeast Asia. In the medium term, this will extend to South Asia and the Middle East. At the same time, the organization has, in effect, institutionalized the famous Russia-India-China “triangle,” in a certain way, considering that India is an observer. It is planned to hold SCO military exercises in Russia during 2007, with units from all six member countries taking part. The Russian-Chinese exercises, Peace Mission-2005, already took place in the P.R.C., while there were a series of Russian-Indian ground and naval maneuvers during 2004-05.

### **Prospects and Prognoses for 2006-08**

If India and Pakistan join as full members, this could be a major geopolitical factor in the strengthening of the SCO. Russia’s priority partner in that pair is India, while for China, despite the radical improvements in relations between Beijing

and New Delhi, it remains Pakistan. Besides the moratorium on enlarging the number of SCO members, the Kashmir problem and the non-adherence of India and Pakistan to the NPT are obstacles to their joining. The latter violates the other SCO members’ formal commitment to strictly following non-proliferation procedures. Equally difficult is the situation with Iran. Participation in the SCO gives the leadership of the Islamic Republic of Iran the possibility of obtaining an additional political resource in its stand-off with the U.S.A. and its allies. Iran’s energy potential is attractive for the SCO, since it is a major oil and gas producer, providing resources that India and China would like to use. As is well known, a major Iranian-Indian gas project, involving the supply of gas to India, is already under implementation. Pakistan, which wants to hook in to Iranian gas, has an objective interest in this project. Russia is interested, because of the deepening Russian-Iranian cooperation in the area of peaceful nuclear power (construction of the Bushehr nuclear power plant) and the development of north-south transport “corridors,” which are beneficial for Moscow.

At the same time, the SCO’s rapprochement with Iran brings with it the danger of a worsening of the organization’s relations with the U.S.A. This concerns India, Russia, and Pakistan, first and foremost. Understandably the SCO, as an organization that represents an alternative to American projects, has some interest in political rapprochement with Iran, but within certain limits. There are concerns in Moscow, Beijing, and New Delhi, that Iran might at some point break away from any influence, not only of the SCO, but of the entire world community.

## **The SCO and 50-Year Development Prospects**

by R.G. Tomberg

*Professor Tomberg is a scholar at the Center for External Economic Research, Institute of Economics, Russian Academy of Sciences (RAS), Moscow. He sent this letter to the Berlin conference on Sept. 4.*

Dr. [Dmitri] Sorokin [of the Institute of Economics, RAS] was kind enough to inform the Center for External Economic Research, which since 2005 has been an integral part of the RAS Institute of Economic Studies, about the forthcoming international web conference in Berlin on the strategic perspectives of mankind for the next 50 years, with a special emphasis on the Eurasian role in world development. . . .

As you mentioned the eventual role of the Shanghai Organization for Cooperation as “one of the key parts of the

emerging world system of economic cooperation between sovereign nation states,” I venture to make some brief comments on this issue.

Evidently, this organization was established by very dynamic nations of Central and East Asia, including Russia, and its role in regional and world policy is steadily increasing. But up til 2005-06, the economic cooperation between member states was not more than a declaration and a desire for the future. Furthermore, the experience of establishing feasible economic cooperation and corresponding structures between CIS [Community of Independent States] members is still limited, and very decisive actions are needed to bring to life the economic agenda proclaimed at the last summit of the organization. This is a real challenge for SOC.

Another challenge is the problem of poverty—global, in the developing world—and in SOC countries, even in Russia and China. The resolution of this problem is one of the critical issues for solving today’s strategic crisis and “economic recovery of the Earth,” as Mr. L. LaRouche mentioned.

May I wish all success to the conference in Berlin.

R.G. Tomberg

## Primakov Issues Book On Mideast Prospects

*Vladimir B. Isakov, the vice president of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation, who works directly under the president of the Chamber of Commerce, Yevgeni M. Primakov, former Prime Minister of Russia, sent this contribution to the Berlin conference. Dr. Isakov regretted that he would be travelling during the conference, but conveyed his best wishes for its success, and submitted the text of this statement, which was delivered by Primakov on Sept. 4 in Moscow at a press conference to launch his book, Confidential: The Middle East in the Spotlight, and Behind the Scenes. The translation was done by EIR, and subheads have been added.*

*For Lyndon LaRouche’s comment on Primakov’s thesis, as the latter was summarized at the Berlin meeting, see last week’s EIR.*

This book is about one of the main aspects of what I have experienced in my life. I have been dealing with the Middle East for over half a century, as a journalist, a scholar, and a politician. As Yesenin wrote, “What we cannot see, face to face/ Big things are seen from a distance.” The book reflects this, to a certain degree. This is not only because certain documents, which were previously not generally accessible, have been published here for the first time. For the first time in many years, I opened my diaries, some of which have yel-



DoD/R.D. Ward

*Yevgeni Primakov. In his press conference statement, relayed to the Berlin meeting by his associate V.B. Isakov, Primakov called for an international conference to work out a peace settlement plan for Israel and the Palestinians.*

lowed pages, and read them over again. The book includes a reconsideration of certain events, certain processes.

Naturally, the book will be criticized. In any event, for one thing, there are many established notions, with which it does not coincide. At the same time, however, it does not share nihilistic evaluations of everything from Soviet times. I have tried to write an objective book.

Now it goes before the court of the readers, as they say. . . .

### Two Nationalisms

I would like to take the opportunity of our meeting today, to share with you some thoughts about problems, related to a settlement of the Middle East conflict—a chronic, bloody, and dangerous conflict, which touches the interests of practically the entire world community, in one way or another. This conflict is not, and I would like to emphasize this, either religious or social in character; whether or not we recognize the fact, it is a clash between two nationalisms. So, is it possible to reach a settlement of this conflict?

Henry Kissinger, who is one of the most experienced and intelligent politicians of the 20th Century, concluded that regional conflicts are more susceptible of being settled, when they are in a “hot phase.” In principle, I agree with this way of posing the question, although, of course, that does not mean that conflicts ought to be “heated up,” in order to settle them. I am grateful to Kissinger for writing the preface to my book, *The World After September 11 and the Invasion of Iraq*, which was published in English in the U.S.A., but my opinion of him as an analyst is by no means predetermined by the fact that he wrote it, nor by some assumption that I would share all of his approaches to the Middle East and related matters.

But, let us turn to the facts.

**The 1967 war.** After it ended, efforts to achieve a settlement failed. Israel did not want to vacate the occupied territories for anything. And the Arab leaders, motivated by their