

---

## Lyndon LaRouche on Ukraine

---

# Russian peril created by Anglo-American policy

*Lyndon LaRouche was asked about the CIA assessment of Ukraine, in his weekly "EIR Talks" radio interview with Mel Klenetsky on Jan. 27. His critique of the scenarios for Russia and Ukraine forms a fitting context for the article which follows, on the history behind today's events.*

**EIR:** A recent CIA report which was presented to the Senate Intelligence Committee by CIA director James Woolsey, predicted a possible civil war in Ukraine. Woolsey said he sees the hyperinflation and unemployment in Ukraine and the secession moves in Crimea, as leading to possible civil war, and maybe even Russian intervention. Do you think of this as a possibility, and what could it do to the global strategic balance?

**LaRouche:** I think that, insofar as that is what Woolsey said, that Woolsey's off base. Yes, all kinds of things are possible in respect to Ukraine. The Russian policy at present is a Third Rome, imperial policy, whose constituency base is the combination of the Russian military and the Russian security forces establishment. What we have to see is not the possibility of problems in Ukraine; there obviously is a very immediate threat to the stability of Ukraine, a threat which is being created largely by the policies of the governments of Britain and the United States. So, if we don't like what's happening to Ukraine, or we want to lament it, let us remember that beginning with George Bush's "Chicken Kiev" speech, in support of his great Communist buddy Gorbachov, in Kiev, that U.S. policy toward eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union has been to kick the true independence movements in the face, in favor of conciliating the old apparatus in Moscow—a conciliation which really doesn't work.

What Woolsey said in part is true. But to say it in isolation, as though this were simply something that involved Ukraine by itself, is wrong. The reason Ukraine is in trouble, is because of the Thatcher-Bush policies of shock therapy and International Monetary Fund conditionalities, and also the way that Thatcher and Bush played games with first Gorbachov, and then Yeltsin, around the theme of maintaining Russian hegemony, as long as the Russians—first Gorbachov and then Yeltsin—were willing to carry out the financial and related policies demanded of them by the financial circles of London and New York City.

It is this financial policy which has brought forth the Rush

Limbaugh of Moscow, Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, as a symptom—not a cause, but a symptom—not of fascism, but rather of a Russian Third Rome global thermonuclear hostility, a new Cold War with hot implications, toward the United States in particular.

That's the danger. It's from that danger that the threat to Ukraine flows. U.S. policy, the Bush policy on auto-pilot—which is what people like Safire want, or the *New York Times* wants, the continuation of that lunatic policy, at a time that it has already driven Russia into a Third Rome military, or military-tinged, imperial policy—that is the threat to Ukraine. To ignore that factor, that *that* is the threat, and that our own policy is causing the threat, that's a fallacy in composition. Woolsey is wrong. He's right in his facts, but he's wrong in his analysis.

**EIR:** Continuing on this Third Rome imperial policy, Kozyrev, the foreign minister of Russia, has been discussing the various problems that Russia has, and how Russia should handle its problems in the "near abroad," that is the contiguous republics from the former Soviet Union. How should the United States and the West respond to this concept of a spheres of influence policy?

**LaRouche:** The term "near abroad" as used by the Russians means "Russian Empire." Before the invention of modern republics, which occurred effectively during the middle of the 15th century, the world was dominated by empires. That is, in some region of the world, there would be a dominant power, such as the Russian power in its own region, the Russian Muscovite power, and the Muscovites would dominate a number of peoples around them, who would have some degree of cultural or other autonomy, be recognized as separate, but would be under the fiefdom of Moscow. Now that's what this "near abroad" means. Moscow is saying: These countries which were either formerly part of greater Russia, or which were formerly spheres of influence of imperial Russia, such as Poland or so forth, or northern Iran at least, the Caucasus and so forth—these belong to us. Either they are part of the Russian Empire or they are border regions which we insist on dominating without any outside interference.

That's what the term "near abroad" means in practice. What it signifies is that the mentality of the Russian leaders, including the Yeltsin state apparatus and the Yeltsin-Chernomyrdin government, has already been committed to a Third Rome imperial Russian perspective; and that this perspective is based on military hostility, a military posture, an enemy image against, particularly, the Anglo-American powers. That's where we stand. And to piddle around with trying to analyze "near abroad" as if it meant "vertically challenged" instead of "short" is just nonsense. This is imperialism. And unless we change our policy, that's what we are going to have: a thermonuclear global power called the Russian Empire looking down our throats as we tear ourselves apart.