

The Nature of anti-Putin NGOs (2005)

Matthew Raphael Johnson

This article was written in Chambersburg, PA in 2005. It was at a time when the clear success of Putin's economic policies was undeniable and came right after the "Orange Revolution" in Ukraine. I had termed it the "Banker's Revolution" Further, Putin had made it abundantly clear that he was not going to do the bidding of the US, Israel or any other empire. Unsurprisingly, the world's elites were antsy and, from the early part of that decade until today, 2016, have declared war on Putin and the ideological ground upon which he stands – MRJ

The late Jack Kemp and Senator John Edwards, representing the Council of Foreign Relations Russia Project (or something to that effect), recently wrote a letter condemning Russia and Vladimir Putin. It is one of the more noteworthy, pompous, bureaucratic-sounding condemnations of Russia's continued economic recovery under Putin. Part of it reads:

As you may know, members of President Putin's party and other fractions of the State Duma introduced legislation last week that would, among other things, keep foreign NGOs from maintaining "representative offices" or branches in Russia and deny foreign funds to Russian organizations that engage in (undefined) "political" activities. Virtually the entire non-profit sector – from human-rights monitors to policy think-tanks, even public-health alliances – is likely to be affected.

The impact of this measure, if it became law, should be obvious: it would roll back pluralism in Russia and curtail contact between our societies. It would mark a complete breach of the commitment to strengthen such contact that President Putin made when you and he met in Bratislava on February 24, 2005. And it raises an almost unthinkable prospect, that the president of Russia might serve as chairman of the G-8 at the same time that laws come into force in his country to choke off contacts with global society. This piece of legislation is all the more disturbing to us because it does not come out of nowhere. It is part of the clear negative pattern of growing state control over society, about which you and Secretary Rice have properly raised America's concern.

The creation of modern political, social, and economic institutions in Russia is a truly historic process, and both countries will be the losers if it is cut short. Russian officials and legislators are, of course, likely to insist that they are doing no more than blocking political interference in their internal affairs. Even with its unsettling echoes of Soviet times, we recognize this as a legitimate interest. But if the only issue were how to protect the integrity of Russia's electoral process and political campaigns, the problem would be easily solved. Other countries, including our own, do so without encroaching on fundamental freedoms. The aim of the proposed legislation, to judge by the way its sponsors talk about it, is clearly far broader. Senior Russian officials have described their own NGOs as a "fifth column" in Russian society and even as fronts for foreign intelligence

services. If this proposal comes into force, the government will clearly have in its hands the authority to close down public organizations simply because it finds their views and activities inconvenient.¹

Lets talk facts, for once. First, the CFR is an association, arising out of the British Roundtables, that is little more than the institutionalization of America's oligarchs. It was founded by the Rockefeller family and its membership consists of elites from every sector of American society. In short, it is the ruling class of the ruling class, the bosses' boss.

Jack Kemp is an ignorant jock² used by various elements of the neocon establishment in DC to do their speaking and public appearances. He is essentially a hologram. Neither of the men whose names appear on this letter know the first thing about Russian history or its politics, but knowledge has long ceased to be a prerequisite for having authority over Russian affairs. Neither he nor Senator Edwards wrote the letter nor had anything to do with it except to promulgate it.

Anyone who knows anything about the CFR or its agenda should be laughing himself sick: the oligarchs of global society are attacking someone who is attacking other oligarchs. Someone has the gall to complain about their unearned wealth, near-dictatorial power and absolute control over the global economy. The CFR is infinitely more powerful than George Bush, Putin or any other global figure. They are a shadowy organization using – almost exclusively – informal channels to control much of the globe. They demand that others use public and transparent means. They are the absolute opposite of what they are advocating for Russia. They are what democracy really is but can never admit.

This letter is rather damning for Russian liberals and their hangers-on in the English speaking world. It proves, once and for all, that the global ruling class hates Putin, and, furthermore, that they want to use their immense and inhuman amounts of money to alter Russia to suit their personal, psychological, economic and political needs and whims. This is the very substance of liberalism in Russia. Republican systems of government are designed for the primary purpose of protecting the wealth of their founders and permitting such opposition to exist that does not make that obvious. There are certainly exceptions, but the “privatization” scams were created by oligarchs to help and assist other oligarchs to become even more so.

Here is a list of the public members of the Council and thus are responsible for the above letter. These are the oligarchs that deal with Russian affairs. These are the people who collectively, I term the “Regime” –

Stephen E. Biegun, Ford Motor Company
Coit D. Blacker, Stanford University
Robert D. Blackwill, Barbour Griffith & Rogers, International
Antonina W. Bouis, Andrei Sakharov Foundation
Mark F. Brzezinski, McGuire Woods, LLP
Richard R. Burt, Dilligence, Inc.
Lorne W. Craner, International Republican Institute
Robert J. Einhorn, Center for Strategic & International Studies
John L. Gaddis, Yale University
John A. Gordon, General, USAF, Retired

1 The letter is archived here: <http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/rtf-letter.pdf>

2 I would not have used these harsh words if he were dead at the time. Kemp died in 2009.

James A. Harmon, Harmon & Co.
Steven E. Hellman, OILspace, Inc.
Fiona Hill, The Brookings Institution
George Joulwan, General, USA, Retired; One Team, Inc.
Clifford A. Kupchan, Eurasia Group
Jessica T. Mathews, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Michael A. McFaul, Hoover Institution
Mark C. Medish, Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld
David R. Slade, Allen & Overy
Walter B. Slocombe, Caplin & Drysdale, Chartered
Strobe Talbott, The Brookings Institution
Judyth L. Twigg, Virginia Commonwealth University
Margaret D. Williams, World Wildlife Fund
Daniel H. Yergin, Cambridge Energy Research Associates
Dov S. Zakheim, Booz Allen Hamilton

I use the term “Regime” with a capital “R” to denote the New World Order, or that combination of private capital, government, media and academia working together without clear institutionalization for a single goal: a one world market overseen by themselves. These are the people who are behind the NGOs in Russia seeking to install their own form of government there. Here are the people who are solely responsible for all those scholarships and fellowships for “Russian experts.”

These people are collectively the pimps for the political whores that regularly show up on the television as “Russia experts” or “analysts.” They are the problem. This is the cult that makes their private interest a public, universal ideology. Their power is unlimited and so is their capital. When Satan tempted Christ with all the kingdoms of the world, it implied that he had possession of them. The above list are those that have been deputized by the Dark One to temporarily govern his domains. When you use the word “system,” as in phrases like “the system is corrupt,” this is what you mean.

The Economist (December 3-9, 2005), had this to say about Putin’s Russia:

Squint, just a bit, and it could almost be that the cold war never ended. Russia's relations with America and Europe have turned frostier since Ukraine's orange revolution a year ago wrested a rigged election from Vladimir Putin's preferred candidate. Since then, Mr Putin has turned his orange-tinted pique on Poland (Ukraine's supporter) and his Baltic neighbors, openly backed the bloody suppression of democracy protests in Uzbekistan, and let it be known that Russia will “stand by” Iran and Syria, fending off UN sanctions.

At home, Mr Putin's allies have proposed a new law to throttle foreign-financed NGOs and subject Russian ones to Soviet-style bureaucratic harassment. And he is sticking more cronies on the boards of key companies not already under his control. All this makes Mr Putin's Russia an awkward partner for the West. There is an added awkwardness, too: Russia is shortly to become chairman-for-a-year of the G8 group of (until Russia joined the original G7) rich, market-driven democracies. The G8 is not the world-steering mechanism its members like to

think it is. But, elevated prematurely to membership in hopes of encouraging it towards greater democracy and economic reform, Russia has done less and less to earn its place. The true picture is not entirely bleak. Russia is not reverting to communism. Its economy, though increasingly manipulated, is still open for private business. Though Mr Putin regrets the collapse of the Soviet Union earlier this year he called it “the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the 20th century” he is more nouveau tsar than commissar. Nor is there anything wrong with Russia pursuing its own foreign-policy interests in relations with America or Europe. The real problem for Russia is how narrowly Mr Putin defines those interests. That, and his increasing crankiness with those who challenge him, which compounds the mistake.

There is one difference: during the so-called “Cold War,” there was a huge “peace party.” These were assorted leftists who sought an easier and more pleasant relationship with the Stalinists. They were dominant in academia and media, less so in the security services, but present in Congress and the Senate. Today, there is no peace party. All factions demand war against Russia. That's a huge difference between 1961 and today. Since most Americans do not care what happens in Moscow, there must be another reason for this surprising consensus.

In many respects, this piece of the editorial sums up most of what the bulk of “Russia experts” in America and England have been saying for some time. Keep in mind, however, that The Economist is the mouthpiece of the Rothschild financial empire, who funds many NGOs in Russia seeking the overthrow of Putin, as well as being business partners with Mikhail Khodorkovsky. Therefore, their objectivity is seriously in doubt.

Let us turn to the data: A desire to return to a single-party system is currently being expressed by a highly significant proportion (38%) of Russian citizens (Levada-Center). Expressions of support for a single strong party most frequently come from CPRF (Communist Party of the Russian Federation) and United Russia supporters (44% and 42% respectively), as well as over half of those who vote “against all” for all races. Only 4% of citizens are “certain” of the need for a large number of parties. 67% percent of Russians said that they regretted the end of the USSR, far more than the 55 percent of Belorussians, 52 percent of Ukrainians and 41 percent of Kazakhs who expressed that view. A far higher percentage of Russians said they “unqualifiedly” regretted the USSR's end (42 percent) than did the others.

Only 17% of Belorussians, 10% of Ukrainians and 12% of Kazakhs said they would like to see a renewed Soviet Union, but at the same time, only 25% of Belorussians, 20% of Ukrainians and 33% of Kazakhs said they wanted their states to remain separate from others.

All of these figures are damning for Regime propaganda and its backers. These figures have been widely circulated around Russia, but have only a limited hearing in the West. Of course, these figures completely contradict, ideologically speaking, the pompous squealings of the Rothschilds and their pet journalists. Here are a few conclusions to be drawn from the data:

1. Russians care about results, not procedures. Of course, so do the Rothschilds, which makes the prattlings about abstract procedural “democracy” so meaningless.
2. Russians love strong leaders, not bureaucratic political parties or abstract procedures. There is nothing wrong with this from a moral point of view. Russia is a state under siege from all directions. It seems natural, then, for this preference for strong individual leadership to be very pronounced.

3. The only rigging done in the Ukrainian election of 2004 was from foreigners and Yushchenko. It turns out that Yanukovich was the true representative of Ukrainian opinion after all. Given the nature of the 2004 campaign, this polling data cannot be squared with the results, when only 20 percent of Ukrainians want separate statehood. It is one thing to demand independence from a decaying and dying USSR, another altogether to want separation from an increasingly prosperous Russia. Further, the issue over foreign NGOs is underscored by Berezovsky's temper tantrum at the Ukrainian government when the latter denied the Orange Revolution was funded by him. The dethroned emperor was livid that he did not get the "credit" for funding the "bankers revolution."

Therefore, with this in mind, it remains clear that the bulk of foreign NGOs, ultimately funded by a handful of foreign oligarchs such as George Soros, The Carnegie Institute(s), The Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, Citibank and a few others, are actively working against the wishes of the Russian and other Slavic people. The NGO bill exists for one reason and one reason alone, to restrict the efforts of the globe's billionaires from thwarting elections and political processes that invariably bring nationalists to power. Yushchenko in Ukraine was not elected. Ukrainian vote rigging was far more prominent in the west than in the east, and his ultimate victory was assured by violent protests funded by the very NGOs Putin and the bulk of Russia want to see restricted. So far, the loudest voices against the NGO bill are precisely those institutions that have the most to lose by it.

The present war against Putin is nothing less than a war against nationalism, represented by Putin, *Rodina* and Lukashenko. They stand against the banking cabal, the New World Order, represented in Russia by the NGOs, who demand a Russia open to the unhindered exploitation of her educated population, natural resources and military technology for the benefit of the western elite. There is no other issue here.

The assumption that NGOs are somehow separated from big money has necessitated a decades-long campaign to convince the cosmos that repression can only come from the state. Of course, the state is an instrument of the billionaires, not the other way around. The reality is that the propaganda emanating from the NGO fronts is far more insidious, far more slick and thus more effective than anything coming from the state. The state apparatus in modern times is a rather inferior method of coercion when contrasted with "independent" sources of money and power.

Some of the actual mechanisms of control at the disposal of the NGO fronts include the creation of code phrases such as "civil society," the funding of ever-malleable academics, manipulating and funding political candidates, the creation of political movements such as *Pora* (a wholly owned subsidiary of George Soros), creating and funding lobbying organizations, and, in short, to create an entire intellectual infrastructure that supports the agenda of those who fund the organizations in question. The entire "Orange Revolution" in Ukraine was the creation of NGOs, largely those controlled by Soros.

Human Rights Watch chimes in: "This law signals a new chapter in the government's crackdown on civil society institutions," said Holly Cartner, Europe and Central Asia director at Human Rights Watch. "Now that the Kremlin has neutralized other checks and balances, NGOs remain among the last independent voices that can criticize the government and demand accountability in Russia."

In the new briefing paper, “Managing Civil Society: Are NGOs Next?” Human Rights Watch analyses how the “Kremlin” eliminated most independent media, destroyed regional elites as a political force, installed a pliant parliament, and undermined the independence of the judiciary. The draft law comes against the backdrop of these deliberately attempts to dismantle the system of checks and balances to in President Vladimir Putin's favor.

Only one problem Holly, according to all polls, the Russians don't think Putin has done enough to increase his power, and are demanding he run for a third term, even if he has to alter the constitution to do it! Holly Cartner has taken positions as a major figure in HRW on nearly everything, but every one of her plastic opinions are identical with those taken by the Carnegie Institute, the financier of HRW in Eastern Europe. Not that that should surprise, elite institutions such as HRW require that sort of bureaucratic mentality, an easily manipulated woman provided with her opinions by the crowd back at the West side of Manhattan, and led to feel that she is “smart” and “making a difference” by doing so. Well, who is this crowd? Again no surprises: here are the members of Carnegie's board, those who control HRW:

Helene L. Kaplan, Chairman Of Counsel Skadden, Arp, Slate, Meagher & Flom
Martin L. Leibowitz, Vice Chair Managing Director, Morgan Stanley
Vartan Gregorian, President Carnegie Corporation of New York
Bruce Alberts, Professor University of California, San Francisco
Pedro Aspe, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer Protego Asesores Financieros
Geoffrey T. Boisi, J.P. Morgan Chase Richard H. Brodhead President, Duke University
Fiona Druckenmiller
James B. Hunt, Partner Womble, Carlyle, Sandridge & Rice
Thomas Kean, President, Drew University
Olara A. Otunnu, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict United Nations
William A. Owens, President and Chief Executive Officer Nortel Networks
Norman Pearlstine, Editor-In-Chief Time, Inc.
Thomas R. Pickering, Senior Vice President for International Relations Boeing Company
Richard W. Riley, Senior Partner Nelson, Mullins, Riley & Scarborough, L.L.P.
Janet L. Robinson, President and Chief Executive Officer The New York Times Company
Raymond W. Smith, Chairman Rothschild, Inc. Founding Partner Arlington Capital Partners

These two lists speak volumes. They show, once and for all, the conflict of interest in liberal opinion on Russia. Now, of course, in Russia, all American media are freely disseminated, but, in this case, these organizations can now lobby for political power as well, political power completely outside the “checks and balances” Carnegie/HRW are hypocritically complaining about. Their power, I might add, is completely outside of said “checks and balances,” they speak of and their immense power is largely wielded in secret. The only check or balance to the Carnegie/HRW financial complex is Putin's drive to limit their organization in Russia.

Liberalism in Russia is exclusively and completely foreign. There is no native liberal opinion. Without Soros and the Carnegie/HRW financial complex creating political groups and candidates, whoever will challenge Putin will end up with the typical 1% of the vote liberals actually get in fair elections. Pro-western/capitalist parties in Russia, despite millions in western money, both state and NGO, can only poll about 3 or 4% of the vote combined, generally speaking.