

TWO VERY DIFFERENT MEETINGS

EU-Russia Summit in Samara; LaRouche Mission to Moscow

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

The appointment in Samara¹ ended with an open conflict between German Chancellor Angela Merkel and Russia's President Vladimir Putin. Already in the preceding days and weeks, the dissonances around such strategic problems as Kosovo, Iraq, Iran, and the proposed U.S. anti-missile systems in Eastern Europe, were so serious that both sides were ready to call it a success if the summit took place at all. It did take place, but it was certainly no success. Yet it revealed how little Mrs. Merkel understands how to use Germany's six-month presidency of the European Union (EU) for a real politics of peace. This development is in no way astonishing. It is only the logical consequence of the policy which the EU has pursued since, at latest 2004, and in a broader sense, since 1989.

While former Chancellor Gerhardt Schröder knew how to counterbalance the expansion policy of the EU, seen as hostile to Russia, through his friendship with Putin, Chancellor Merkel has gambled away this valuable relationship, and carps against Russian actions against demonstrators—a bit hastily, as it came to pass. It turned out that Russian dissident Gary Kasparov could very well have gone to Samara without interference, but he preferred to give a press conference against Putin instead. And Putin said the obvious: What about the West European police round-ups against anti-Group of Eight demonstrators?

Poorly done, Mrs. Merkel—whether this behavior was the result of a total lack of diplomatic intuition, or the result of the new Sarkozy-Brown-Merkel constellation in the EU. For she must have known that Russia has long equated the policies of NATO and the EU as a policy of encirclement and

destabilization of Russia. And what is slandered in Western media as Putin's dictatorial policy, is perceived in Russia as a patriotic effort to reverse the selling-off of Russia to robber-capitalism during the Yeltsin period, and the degradation of Russia to a raw-materials supplier. If only Mrs. Merkel showed similar spine against the selling-off of Germany to the locust-funds.

This EU-Russia summit, unfortunately, confirmed that nothing positive is to be expected from Europe at this time, and in any case, no sort of initiative which might address the existential problems of humanity in any way.

Russia Looks to the Future

In complete contrast was a series of events and meetings in which my husband, Lyndon LaRouche, and I participated in Moscow over the past days (see *LaRouche in Russia*, this issue). Their center was the double festivities on the occasion of the 80th birthday of Prof. Stanislav Menshikov, a member of the Academy of Sciences, a top expert on the United States, author of many books, and, most important, an original thinker gifted with incorruptible humor and love of truth. Menshikov, who wrote and published one of his books with President Franklin Roosevelt's advisor John Kenneth Galbraith, and many of his birthday guests, represented a completely different axiomatic basis for the relations between Russia and the West.

Professor Menshikov laid down the leitmotiv himself in his opening address to the birthday ceremony: what the world will look like at the time of his 100th birthday in 2027. It is foreseeable that China, the United States, Russia, India, and Japan will be the strongest economic powers, and it is obvious that they must find means of collaboration. Menshikov thereby took up the main message

1. Chancellor Merkel, representing Germany's presidency of the European Union this year, met with President Putin in Samara, Russia on May 17-18.

Sarkozy Regime Is 'Break With French History'

Jacques Cheminade, former French Presidential candidate, leader of the Solidarité et Progrès party, and co-thinker of Lyndon LaRouche, issued from Paris on May 18 a strong condemnation of the stated policies of the newly elected French government of President Nicolas Sarkozy. "The Sarkozy government represents a break with the history of the France as a nation-state and the policies since the victory over Nazism," declared Cheminade, citing "the support from American neo-con Richard Perle, banker Felix Rohatyn, and Bush pal Tony Blair. Even the conservative daily *Le Figaro* of May 7 wrote: 'With the election of Nicolas Sarkozy, France is taking a neo-conservative turn of the same nature as Britain did under Margaret Thatcher, America under Ronald Reagan, Spain under José María Aznar, or Italy under Silvio Berlusconi.'"

Under a neo-liberal Sarkozy regime, the Finance Ministry is to be chopped up in order to carry out deep cuts in the public sector, in order to hand over the most profitable parts to the private sector. The slogan, "Work more to earn more!" thus means enriching speculators, service sector

tycoons, and the beneficiaries of public contracts.

Sarko's foreign policy is of a piece: Bernard Kouchner, the new Foreign Minister, is a pseudo-"man of the left" who supported the Bush-Cheney war against Iraq. Jean-David Levitte, who will be Sarkozy's close diplomatic advisor at the Presidential palace, re-established contacts with the Bush Administration after outgoing President Jacques Chirac and Prime Minister Dominique Villepin imposed the French veto against Cheney's Iraq adventure. Secretary of State for European Affairs Jean-Pierre Jouyet intends to make France adopt a European Union mini-treaty to reverse the 2005 "no" vote which rejected the supranational European Constitution.

Cheminade concluded: "At the very moment that the process leading to the impeachment of Vice President Cheney is shaping up in the United States under the guidance of my American friends, and at a time when economic cooperation among Russia, India, and China is intensifying, the Sarkozy government is stripping France of any power for independent intervention."

In the face of this, the Solidarité et Progrès movement has taken up the mission "to inspire and catalyze a wide range of forces committed to social justice, to human creativity and its economic expression, and opposed to the predatory logic of short-term profit which degenerates into a war of each against all," Cheminade stated.

stressed by LaRouche in many speeches and conversations in Moscow: that the relation between the U.S. and Russia, but also with China and India, must be pursued on the basis of Franklin Roosevelt's policy: the final ending of colonialism, and the cooperation of sovereign states for the common aims of mankind.

Because many of the participating members of the Academy of Sciences were living witnesses of the Russian-American collaboration at Roosevelt's time, the projection of this policy into the future was easy for them to conceive. And so, many conversations turned around the Bering Strait section of the Eurasian Land-Bridge as a conscious policy of war-avoidance.² The urgency of finding an alternative to the worsening atmosphere of strategic discussion, was very conscious in many discussions.

The toasts made at the birthday banquet showed that the perspective of an optimistic vision of the future can establish in action, the plane on which the contradictions can be overcome, in the sense of Nicholas of Cusa. The idea that at the time of Professor Menshikov's 100th birthday, the transport corridor

between Alaska and Siberia over the Bering Strait will already be extensively developed, found spirited agreement.

A Warning to the European Union

Maybe it was coincidence, that the location of the EU-Russia summit was the Russian city of Samara. In any case, the name brings to mind the famous story "Appointment in Samarra," ascribed to a Sufi sage of the Ninth Century. It tells of a servant, who, meeting Death in the marketplace of Baghdad, flees to distant Samarra to escape it. But Death, in answer to the question of why he was astonished to see the servant in Baghdad, answered that he had an appointment with him that night in Samarra.

In an extended sense, the unhappy appointment in Samara should remind the people of the EU countries that, if man cannot escape his destiny, he can nevertheless influence and change the course of history. For the European countries, this means that we must cease to imitate the imperialist policy of NATO through the EU. Instead we must support a new world order in the tradition of Roosevelt, and affiliate ourselves to a relationship between the U.S. and Russia on this basis. We don't need a policy of baby-steps; we need a vision of how we can shape the 21st Century. And that lies in the construction of the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

2. See "Russian-American Team: World Needs Bering Strait Tunnel!" *EIR*, May 4, 2007 (with accompanying articles); and "Appeal for Bering Link Directed to G-8 Summit" and "Bering Strait Conference Marked 'Major Phase Shift'" (an interview with Dr. Hal Cooper), *EIR*, May 11, 2007.