

Russian scientists debate LaRouche's economic policies

by Rachel Douglas

Before an audience of 90 invited guests, the distinguished veteran of Russian space science Dr. P.G. Kuznetsov announced in Moscow on Jan. 27 a new "International Complex Special Program" called "President." Dr. Kuznetsov issued an "Appeal to world political leaders, the world scientific community, and the hierarchs of all confessions," in which he explained its purpose: to apply the experience of developing life-support systems for spaceships and orbital stations, to the question of the survival of human life on Earth. Kuznetsov argues that such survival has nothing to do with monetarist practices and everything to do with "the principles of natural science . . . which Lyndon H. LaRouche calls 'physical economy.' "

A major presentation to the gathering, co-sponsored by the Schiller Institute in Moscow, was made by Prof. Taras V. Muranivsky, who developed the history of the warring schools of economics: the monetarism of Adam Smith and David Ricardo, and physical economy from Leibniz through LaRouche.

Interested members of the audience, which included other scientists who worked on Soviet space programs, as well as specialists from other fields, will meet monthly to further the "President" project launched by Kuznetsov.

In his appeal, Dr. Kuznetsov took note of LaRouche's status as a political prisoner, a fate he also shared. He said, "It was with great surprise that I learned that [LaRouche has been] incarcerated in Rochester, Minnesota. Having become acquainted with LaRouche's scientific views, which reflect anguish for the future fate of mankind, I am convinced that this is a case of persecution 'for convictions.' . . . Since I personally had the opportunity to taste the 'charm' of incarceration 'for convictions' (ten years under Stalin and a year and a half under Brezhnev), I cannot be reconciled with such a fate befalling another prisoner of conscience."

Threat of genocide

Dr. Kuznetsov further raised the question of whether "world government" should be on the agenda for mankind. "The first phase of work," however, "will entail the development of a program of a 'national President.' This means that

there will be a certain historical period, during which those elements in any national economy will be identified, which will remain valid in a system of management for the further course of the history of mankind." Citing the U.S. presidential campaigns of Lyndon LaRouche, Kuznetsov called LaRouche "the first person who does not want to be a President *cum* fire chief, dashing from one fire of the economy to another. He proposes a physical approach to global problems, which cannot be solved by the monetarists."

The reason for addressing "the hierarchs of all confessions," said Kuznetsov, is that "we see a growing danger of genocide for the greater part of mankind, in the form of conflict among confessions. This conflict is bred by the world monetary system. . . . The existence of a developed life-support system [for Earth] will make it possible to solve difficult social problems in the contemporary world and will create the conviction that the world really is guided by the reason of the Creator. I believe that our work is dictated by reason or the Creator's will. . . . Man, in his scientific creativity, comprehends the will of Providence and needs the support of the hierarchs of all churches."

The science of physical economy

The Moscow debate over LaRouche's ideas was extended further with a quarter-page article in the widely read Russian daily *Nezavisimaya Gazeta* of Jan. 29 by Prof. Taras Muranivsky, one of the participants in the Moscow symposium. Professor Muranivsky, an Academician of the International Ecological Academy, described the science of physical economy as developed by LaRouche as the best means by which to understand the failure of so-called economic reforms in Russia. The article appeared on *Nezavisimaya's* "polemics" page, since Muranivsky replied to a Jan. 4 article by economists Valeri Fyodorov and Stella Boiko, who maintained that the reforms failed because social reproduction cannot be regulated and economic processes are generally "unknownable."

In his reply, Muranivsky wrote:

"Economic science is highly politicized. . . . A new paradigm in economic science, which in my opinion will make

it less politicized, is the physical economy of the American economist, corresponding member of the International Ecological Academy (IEA) Lyndon LaRouche, about whom *Nezavisimaya Gazeta* has already written (May 5, 1993, Oct. 1, 1993 and elsewhere). True, LaRouche himself considers the well-known German thinker Gottfried Leibniz to be the founder of physical economy. In Russia, D. Mendeleyev, S. Witte, V. Vernadsky and others developed ideas close to this conception.

“For physical economy, economic processes are not the ‘free market’ and not money. It opposes the monetarist idea in economics, the idea based on the principle that economic science is ‘the science of how to get rich.’ In physical economy, the main goal of economic development is the continual growth of production on the basis of scientific and technological progress. The market and money are viewed as necessary instruments for economic relations.

“Contemporary reformers acting on the basis of monetarism are essentially attempting to ‘cure’ not the economy itself but money, which is a system serving the economy. But proclaiming money as the aim and essence of people’s lives leads to corruption at the top, the gangsterism of mafia structures, criminal elements running wild in society, and other problems. . . .

“The monetarist-mercantilist approach is the reason reformers cannot clearly define the goal of their intended reforms or the paths to overcome the growing crisis. Thus in Russia, first the goal was proclaimed to be acceleration, then perestroika, and finally the ‘market economy.’ But all these are methods, not goals. As a result of the development solely of trade manipulations, production is continuing to decline already for the second year. The country is losing its scientific and technological potential, the so-called conversion of the military industrial complex has assumed distorted forms, and there is a growing threat of massive unemployment.

“Breakdowns in the economy cannot be ignored even by the most zealous supporters of ‘a free market.’ They present this, however, as so-called objective regularities, cycles, inevitable crises, etc. LaRouche has told of American experts who tried to explain their inability to understand the reasons for undesirable processes in the economy by invoking Kondratyev’s ‘long waves’ or other ‘objective’ regularities.

“Physical economy explains economic depressions accompanied by severe social conflicts as the result not of ‘objective laws,’ but of the lack of common sense (or even the presence of bad intentions) on the part of the political leaders who are formulating and implementing economic policies.

“To criticize erroneous views on economic processes does not at all mean to reject the need for a philosophical analysis of them. The goal of any science is to find the truth. Economic science is called upon to study the sources and means on which the normal life, prolonged existence and progressive development of human society depend.”

Lyndon LaRouche Comments

We can’t afford not to go into space

The following is excerpted from Lyndon LaRouche’s “EIR Talks” radio interview of Feb. 2:

EIR: Recently, the Schiller Institute, of which you are a founding member, had a conference in Moscow, and a veteran of the Russian space science program, Dr. P.G. Kuznetsov, announced a new, special program, called “President.” This was an appeal on his part to the world leaders to apply the knowledge of sustaining life in space to the survival of human life on Earth. What advice can you give for helping to put this kind of program into policy, in various parts around the world?

LaRouche: Dr. Kuznetsov is one of the world’s leading experts on the matter of sustaining human life in space orbit—the Russian program for these long-term space expeditions that they did, the tests. So, he knows, really, whereof he speaks, from that standpoint; he’s probably one of the world’s leading authorities on that sort of thing, if not *the* world’s leading authority.

I’ve always taken the view, as did the founders of the space program in the United States—the Kennedy program during the 1960s—that, when we’re going into space, and developing space technologies, we are testing the limits of man’s capability, and we’re developing discoveries and technologies which operate to sustain man at the limit of known human capability. The obvious thing is, for example, as I emphasized in connection with my Mars design, back in the winter of 1986 and into the spring of 1986, that if we can build a city on Mars, sustain a group of engineers and scientists for the purpose of work in space nearby on spectroscopy, on phased-array kind of antennae, then we can certainly make the desert habitable on Earth.

Similarly, when we take man to what is, relatively, the limit of man’s endurance—life in the zero or fractional gravity in space—if we can keep people alive under those conditions in space, we can keep them more easily alive on the planet Earth. So, in general, in all scientific work, ever since at least the time of Plato, with the work of Eudoxus in geometry, whose principle was always, as was Plato’s: Drive every proposition to its uttermost limit, and look back at the whole problem from the standpoint of this uttermost limit; and you’re most likely to find discoveries.

So, he’s saying something which is startling, perhaps, to people who don’t recognize the principle, but probably not