

The Russia House: A Class Analysis By Steven Jonas

March 6, 2017

The Russia House was a 1990 movie starring Sean Connery in his post-James Bond mature period. Moviefone summarized the plot as follows:

While visiting Moscow, British publisher Barley Blair (Sean Connery) learns of a manuscript detailing the Soviet Union's nuclear missile capabilities. British intelligence and the CIA consider the book to contain crucial information and recruit Blair to investigate its editor, Katya Orlova (Michelle Pfeiffer). As Blair learns the origin of the manuscript and discovers Russian military secrets, he falls in love with Katya and fights to protect her family."

I did see the movie, for I have been a big Sean Connery fan since he hit the big time in that very first James Bond film, Dr. No. I don't recall much of it, but it did involve spycraft, Moscow, the Soviet and British secret services, and, of course, romance.

And so, what do we have here, in "L'Affaire Trump/Russe?" (which may be as fictional as The Russia House was, or then again, maybe not). We have spycraft for sure, in the person of the former British secret service member Christopher Steele. He may or may not be telling the truth, but a) his reportage has been verified by various European secret services and b) at one time the FBI planned to retain and pay him for his services. (This is the same FBI that worked hard in an attempt to prevent the election of Hillary Clinton.) Then there's the nuclear weapons angle, for the Russians are apparently in the process of modernizing theirs (whatever that means) and Trump would like to do the same for the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Then there's the seamy side of the Steele "dossier" which would introduce a touch of sex, if not romance, into the plot.

And finally, there are the two leading men. Trump likely regards himself as a James Bond type, at least when he is dealing with the ladies (and of course, for Trump, with his legendary attention span, it would very easy for him to confuse Sean Connery and James Bond, just as Ronald Reagan actually visualized himself participating in the liberation of a Nazi concentration camp when, during World War II, he never left the Hollywood back-lots).

As for Putin, who was a real-life KGB agent, one or more characters like him appeared in the movie. Given what we know about him and his ego, e.g., in his 60s still playing hockey (good for him) and scoring a lot (what, you say the defense and the goal-tender on the other team ease up on him?), he may well fancy himself as an actor too, and would just love to play one of those roles (in a movie in which, of course, the Soviet Union/Russia would come out on top).

Turning to the more serious side of this narrative, as is very well-known there is considerable controversy over the following issues. Not necessarily in order of importance:

- Did the Russians somehow interfere with the U.S. electoral process in 2016?
- If so, did they ally themselves with Trumpian interests?
- If so, did one or more Trump agents and representatives collude with the Russians in doing so?
- Despite his blanket denials, does Trump have business interests in Russia and/or do one or more of the Russian robber-baron-capitalists otherwise known as the oligarchs have investments with President Trump, in Russia and/or elsewhere?
- How many more high-level Trump appointees are going to get caught up in the mess, before it possibly reaches Trump

himself?

- And so on and so forth.

Now, there is massive controversy over the issues laid out briefly above and many other related ones. There are numerous folks on the Left, including several close friends of mine, who are convinced that the whole Russia-interfered-with-the-election thing was/is an effort by what is called the "Deep State," centered on the U.S. intelligence agencies, to one way or another remove Trump from office. Why? Because he is too friendly with Russia. Indeed, Trump has criticized all sorts of foreign leaders, governments, and organizations, like NATO, the European Union, Mexico, Angela Merkel, China, the Australian Prime Minister (if hanging up on a foreign leader in the midst of a phone conversation can be considered criticism), to name a few. But he has yet to go after President Putin, or Russia. So, what is going on here?