

## **EIR Feature**

# **LaRouche says West must change policy toward Russia—fast**

by Nora Hamerman

“Only days after General Scherer discussed with me his warnings of 14 potential destabilizing scenarios in Russia—tending to anarchy, dictatorship, and war—historic, breaking developments conforming to his strategic analysis have begun in Moscow. What is significant is the unfolding of an ongoing process, and not the immediate headline development at the end of each day.”

With these words, imprisoned U.S. statesman and presidential pre-candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. began a memorandum on Oct. 3 on events in Moscow, as Boris Yeltsin and his clique took violent action to suppress an alleged parliamentary “coup.” The memorandum sped out over the wires to *EIR* bureaus on four continents. Early Monday morning, Oct. 4, it was being distributed in thousands of copies, hitting policymaking centers from the Pentagon to the United Nations to local, state, and federal government offices and Capitol Hill, and was distributed in translations in major cities abroad.

The flyer was soberly received by many who recognize LaRouche’s longstanding authority as an analyst of Moscow politics, who has consistently been vindicated, while the media pundits, think-tankers, and government specialists have been proven tragically wrong.

### **Third Rome matrix**

As LaRouche reiterated throughout the week of Oct. 3, there can be no grasp of current events without facing the reality that Muscovite Russian politics is dominated by a “Third Rome” matrix, and will be “until someone changes the cultural paradigm.” The Third Rome, Moscow’s self-description as the capital of a third and final world empire, dates back to the 1440s when Moscow’s rulers rejected the western Renaissance, under the influence of Venice and Mt. Athos, and it was consolidated around 1510. It was this cultural matrix that caused the Andropov regime and (and Andropov’s heir Gorbachov) to reject a shared development with the West of the new, peace-winning military doctrine which



*Patriarch Aleksii II of Moscow, with U.S. Speaker of the House Tom Foley, in Washington, D.C., November 1991. The Russian Orthodox Church is a pillar of the new ruling junta in Moscow, which is using Boris Yeltsin as a dispensable tool. Yeltsin's "coup" brings to the fore the old Orthodox cultural matrix, the belief that Moscow is the Third Rome, the capital of a new world empire.*

LaRouche had created, and which was essentially adopted by President Ronald Reagan in March 1983 as the Strategic Defense Initiative.

After Andropov rebuffed the SDI publicly in early April 1983, LaRouche quickly identified the problem. His first in-depth analyses of the "Third Rome" cultural paradigm were printed in *EIR* in the June 7 and 14, 1983 issues. He advised, "There is only one way to deal with such a beast, to offer it peace and Russian survival from a standpoint of overwhelming raw power and manifest determination to use that power if necessary. As long as we refuse to present Moscow such a clear set of alternatives of this exact type, [the Russian leader] will alternately hiss and smile—like a cobra—until he strikes."

LaRouche also wrote in 1983, "Over the middle 1960s, recognizably 'Marxist' philosophy lost efficient grip in the shaping of Soviet policies, except as part of institutions left over from preceding periods. . . . By 1972, the drift toward a Third Rome policy-paradigm in Soviet foreign policy was sufficiently evident, that the author and his associates elaborated and published a review of these features of 'détente' which we entitled 'The New Constantinople' hypothesis."

At the time, LaRouche and his associates extensively discussed this analysis with the National Security Council, the CIA, and other U.S. officials. Blinded by geopolitics—the delusion that history is made not by ideas but by manipulating the accidents of geography—they refused to see the danger. Then, starting in 1984, they unleashed the attacks on

LaRouche demanded by the Gorbachov crowd, which led to LaRouche's jailing in 1989.

LaRouche explained the danger of the Third Rome-inspired "Holy Mother Russia" cultural matrix to millions of Americans in nationally televised election broadcasts for his 1984 and 1988 presidential campaigns. In 1990 and in 1992, running from prison first for Congress, and then for President, Lyndon LaRouche urged the United States to adopt his plan for a European development Triangle bounded by Paris, Berlin, and Vienna, where high-speed rail and other advanced transport links would lay the basis for a leap in industrial production to drive forward the entire world economy. This would, he said, be the only hope for rapidly bettering living conditions in the countries emerging out of communism, and hence, make it possible for the Russians themselves—at a moment when the small pro-western grouping in Russia enjoyed a peak of goodwill and influence—to replace the Third Rome paradigm.

The chance was squandered by western governments. Now the question is whether those who rejected LaRouche's analysis over the last decade will have the courage to admit they were wrong—not just in their conclusions, but in their fundamental *method* of policy making.

### **A turning point has been reached**

LaRouche stated in his Oct. 3, 1993 memorandum: "It is obvious that a new point of inflection, at the very minimum, has been reached in Moscow today. . . . Whatever the results

of today's developments, the fact is that, given the current Anglo-American policy, and given the submission of Moscow to International Monetary Fund [IMF] specifications, the only possibilities in the former Soviet Union are combinations of dictatorship, chaos, war, and possible general thermonuclear war coming out of it, including attacks upon the United States, with thermonuclear weapons." He underscored: "That is inevitable, as long as this policy continues." On the other hand, "There are alternatives in Russia, but they all depend upon overturning that policy framework."

LaRouche identified "the recently emphasized policy of the Clinton administration" as "essentially nothing but a continuation of the Bush policy." It "follows Francis Fukuyama's ideology with the utopian dogma affecting both our military posture and other strategic postures: stating that the utopian conception of global democracy and global free trade as a universal system is the only goal of U.S. military and other strategic policy. As long as that continues, particularly in conjunction with IMF-World Bank and shock therapy dictates, we can expect the world to blow up."

"So, we must look at today's events, or the past week's events, as a new point of inflection . . . comparable in importance to the events unleashed during October-November of 1989, when the Berlin Wall began to crumble."

### **Clinton, come to your senses**

The problem in Washington is "the superficiality of thinking around . . . hegemonic institutions of policy-shaping, at least at the top level. Exemplary is the emphasis upon the utopian goals of global democracy/global free trade, as enunciated by Anthony Lake, Les Aspin, Madeleine Albright, echoed by Clinton himself. There is a oneness on the part of Washington to deny and ignore every uncomfortable fact which would show this utopian policy to be ill-conceived. And it is the blindness, the unwillingness to face the fact that that policy, which is nothing but an inheritance of the Bush administration, is a total failure, and a dangerous—even a suicidal—one," the imprisoned statesman said.

"Therefore, I must appeal to the Clinton administration, and to others, to come their senses; to wake up before it is too late, while there's still a possibility of changing the situation: *to dump that crazy bit of globaloney left over from George Bush.*"

Unlike the "psychotic, dictatorial character of the Bush administration," which increased over his term in office, LaRouche remarked, "the Clinton administration has brought more openness to Washington. And one would hope that this openness . . . would be utilized to the maximum now to bring about an abandonment and rejection of Bush policy and to go ahead with a new policy, which recognizes that the United States, for its own internal economic reasons, and for foreign policy reasons, must abandon the free trade, utopian model, for a return to the much-needed economic policy on which the United States was founded—that of

Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, the Careys, and Abraham Lincoln."

### **The Russian enemy-image**

LaRouche described how the events in the former Soviet Union pose a future threat of general thermonuclear war: "The ingrained enemy-image in all Soviet, and thus Russian, institutions, in general—be they governmental or related—over the past years, especially since 1948-49 has been that the United States is the credible enemy."

The "very foolish" U.S. "insistence on the continued imposition of the so-called reform (i.e., IMF conditionalities and shock therapy) which is causing hunger and other misery inside Russia and other countries, has revived, particularly in the recent period, that enemy-image problem, and embedded it more broadly in the population," said LaRouche. As reported on page 25, Yeltsin's Sept. 28 decree removed all remaining subsidies for food and rents. To grasp how incendiary this is, consider the fact that already in April, with earlier steps toward price liberalization, a pensioner spending one-sixth of his income on rent and utilities and all the rest on food, could only buy bread and potatoes to eat.

As a result, the historic "enemy-image," LaRouche says, "is multiplied by the fact that the Russians feel that, when the Russians gave their trust to the United States, the United States rudely betrayed it. So, we have not merely a revival of the enemy-image problem; we have it revived with a very specific, added *frenzy* installed."

"In the event of Russians killing Russians in any kind of civil conflict, and the corresponding emergence of a dictatorship (if any government at all, in fact, emerges from such a mess), would mean that the unification of the former Soviet forces under a 'Great Russian'—not a communist—leadership, of course, would be characterized by a bitter, more frenzied hatred of the United States than was true in the period prior to 1983-89." Thus, if the U.S. continues to support the so-called reform policy, the Fukuyama fantasy of democracy and free trade, and civil war breaks out in Russia, this will assure "beyond the point of no-return at some distances of weeks, months, years, whatever, a commitment to thermonuclear war against the United States."

During the last week of September, retired Brig. Gen. Paul-Albert Scherer, the former chief of West German military intelligence, had held discussions with LaRouche at the Federal Medical Facility in Rochester, Minnesota, and then briefed diplomats, press, and government and congressional officials in Washington on his evaluation of the strategic situation in the former Soviet empire. On pages 30-43, we highlight General Scherer's analysis as delivered to our staff on Sept. 30. Konstantin George's news report on page 25 is based on first-hand accounts. Our short roundup of world reactions shows that while some in Germany suffer even crazier geopolitical delusions than in Washington, most observers see the firestorm in Russia as only beginning.