
Discussion

How does the world stop genocide?

Anno Hellenbroich: *Thank you, Professor Menshikov. I think we have about a half-hour to discuss the subjects presented. I'll open for the first question. Professor Hankel:*

Professor Hankel

I share the views of Professor Menshikov in many respects, just to say that up-front, but I am a disciplined person. We have come here, or I at least have come, to keep to the subject. The subject is money, not war.

As for the reform which is necessary, I, too, have no illusions, as little as Mr. Menshikov has. Naturally, “vested interests” will always defend themselves. The function of the U.S.A. and of the dollar is a “vested interest,” a privilege. I never heard of anyone who voluntarily gave up a privilege.

But there is a law, shall I say, of evolution, or of democracy—I see no great difference there—which says that when views assert themselves, politics must follow. And that is a slow process, a very slow one. But no government, with the exception, perhaps, of Mr. Milosevic, can dare to govern against a majority. And that is why it is infinitely important—also in circles which have nothing to do with economics, but who also suffer under economics, and that means most people—to spread the view that the reform of the world monetary system is nothing abstract, but is a contribution to a global welfare state, to globalism in social policy.

We cannot have a reasonable social policy in any country on Earth if we continue to live with this system—because this system means “full employment,” but not for people: full employment for capital. That is what has to be made clear. Owners of capital have no problem living with this system. People who have to live from their work—they have many problems.

That is why the system has to be changed. And for that we need a democratic opinion-forming process, and that is the reason why I am here to speak to you. I will always, as long as I live, advertise for this project, so that social policy at home is not disrupted by globalism. And if success does not come today, then it will come tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow. We need this dream and this vision, and that is why I am never disappointed if it does not succeed today, because it will succeed tomorrow. We just have to get under way, patiently, explain the problems, because a problem that can't be explained, can't be solved. And I am here to explain the problem. Thank you.

Lyndon LaRouche

On this problem of opinion and policy. My view on the approach to the financial situation generally, always starts from the standpoint of production, especially physical production, and things essential to physical production, and I always look at monetary processes as being required to adapt to the reality, which is defined in a sphere of production and development: ideas, for example; education, for example.

So, what has happened is that, with the change in society, which was introduced in the wake of a number of things—the 1963 retirement of Chancellor Adenauer, the beginning of the targeting for assassination of President Charles de Gaulle, the ouster of Macmillan and the Profumo scandal, the assassination of Kennedy, and the rapid change in policy introduced by McGeorge Bundy. After Kennedy's assassination, Bundy reversed the ruling and had Johnson sign it, which started the Vietnam War. In this period, there was a change in the way in which people think. It was a cultural paradigm-shift, and it was associated in Europe most acutely with a phenomenon called the “'68ers,” or the so-called Baby-Boomers in the United States. The strata that went into the universities in the middle of the 1960s, and came out to do what was called in Germany “the march through the institutions,” brought with them a fundamental change in the shape of policy-making. It was a change based on utopian illusions, largely Frankfurt School type—illusions which could not work. The result was a shift to what is called a post-industrial society, based on the delusion that somehow the circulation of information, which is mostly lies anyway these days, would somehow take the place of economy.

What we've had in the United States in particular, you see it in the parties, you see it in Europe, is an increasing disassociation of the general population, most acutely in the United States, but you see it developing similarly in Europe. Disassociation in the general population from both the government and the political parties. So, the political parties, in a sense, are more and more divorced from the reality that corresponds to the reality of the population. The population, sensing it has no real advocate, or no advocate with power, goes into a state of illusions. The characteristic of the general population of the United States, as typified by the television entertainment phenomenon, is a flight from reality into vacations, illusions, and so forth.

Here I am, 76 years of age, and you know that in my lifetime, the changes in the relationship of the population to reality and to politics, the change in my time is tremendous, especially from the time of the 1963-64 change. We can no longer recognize in my generation, what we are hearing from the voices of our children. You get that in Germany, the teenage children in Germany. Real disassociation relative to our times, a sense of disassociation from reality.

The problem, therefore, becomes not really opinion about reality. The problem becomes: You have a divorce between reality and opinion, which affects ruling institutions, which

have the illusion of power. I'm reminded of revolutionary situations. I'm reminded, for example, of one case, in June and July of 1792. Lazare Carnot who, as the "Author of Victory," had saved France over those preceding years from what had been the inevitable defeat and dismemberment of France, by his great economic and other leadership of the French military forces, was now about to be sent to the guillotine by Saint-Just and Robespierre. The following month called Thermidore, it was Robespierre and Saint-Just who went to the guillotine.

We now exist in a period where governments are very unstable and very fragile, even the ones which pretend to have great power and stability. We are in times of sudden change. We're in a period which we would describe, in terms of physics, as a period of great phase-change. Now, people who look at the past will say, what are the trends up till now? Forget the trends up till now! Forget yesterday, the sooner the better in some respects. Think about tomorrow. Tomorrow will not be a statistical projection of yesterday. The world is ready to explode. It will explode for the better or for the worse. In the case of the conflict between Carnot and Robespierre, we got a better decision, but not a really good one, because Carnot did not take the leadership of France, other people did.

So, this is the kind of period we're in, and therefore I think that we must expect that the collision of actual crises will bring forth a moment in which existing governments and institutions suddenly lose power. They lose the perception of power, as is characteristic of revolutionary situations. We are globally in a revolutionary situation. I am, therefore, more optimistic than those who shared the podium with me today, because I believe that we're at the point that our job is to present the ideas which are appropriate to reality, and let the collapse, the crisis of confidence in existing institutions, lead the population to seize upon those ideas. In such a situation, one must borrow the lesson of leadership from military science, that this is a time in which leaders do not ask the troops how to fight the war. You may use the principle of *Auftrags-taktik*, in the way the troops carry out the war. But the leaders must take leadership, established leadership, and let the population *choose* new leadership.

Our job, in my opinion, is to provide the ideas and the personalities who represent the new leadership upon which desperate populations may turn to, in a revolutionary moment of crisis. And, I think we're at that moment of crisis in the immediate future.

Michael Liebig of EIR, Germany

I would like to say something briefly on the issue of the world financial crisis, the world economic crisis, and war—war, as it was defined here by Mr. LaRouche, not as a simplistic concept, but as the danger of an era, where wars, so to speak, are born out of each other, and thus establish a new global-strategic reality. So: today the Balkans, then the Mideast, then North Korea, and Africa.

To me, the first essential point seems to be—to emphasize this once more—the non-action in the economic-financial area, the non-solving the systemic problem in this area. And that is just what happened over the course of 1998. There was a massive need to act, and that was not done. And this non-action in the economic, financial, and political area then produces—not in a mechanical way, but nevertheless quite real—shifts in the general political direction, where the unsolved economic, financial, and political problems are solved, tententially, with other means.

And the third point, it seems to me: Since we are now in

We are globally in a revolutionary situation. . . . I believe that we're at the point that our job is to present the ideas which are appropriate to reality, and let the collapse, the crisis of confidence in existing institutions, lead the population to seize upon those ideas.

—Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

the reality of war in the Balkans—and we notice it directly, indirectly, immediately, and mediatingly, it penetrates every aspect of the discussion, and the process of discussion today is very different today than it would have been three or six months ago. It is simply present.

Now, this war in the Balkans is not running according to plan. This war is running into a dead-end. And I think that the fascinating aspect of the discussions this morning is to do something paradoxical: to take the apparently most difficult problem, the war in the Balkans, which is going into a geostrategic dead-end, that is what we take in a global strategic judogrip, in order to get at the global strategic, underlying fundamental issues.

Russia is weak, and Russia is in a horrible situation economically, but it is quite clear: If we want to find a way out of this crisis, we need Russia, and that is not only an issue of Russia and the Balkans, but also the issue of Russia and the IMF, the policy of the West as a whole toward Russia, which is suddenly on the table. And in an indirect way, the same goes for China as well.

From that point of view, I would like to indicate that this initially paradoxical and apparently very complicated approach—which has the potential, in my opinion, of becoming a liberating blow—that this idea is taken up, and that, either for reasons of cowardice or unwillingness to act, and in open obstruction with respect to the issue of solving the world

financial and economic crisis, that now, under extraordinarily deteriorated circumstances, that this is just what offers a chance for a solution.

Professor Menshikov

Just one point. When Professor Hankel says that we came here to discuss finance, not war, I think he is not completely right, because as LaRouche put it, the subject of this symposium is actually the new Cold War.

What I wanted to point out, there's also, apart from the financial and economic roots of this new Cold War, or whatever you call it, there are also political processes that are occurring. I pointed to these two particular points, which are working independently. You could say that they have economic roots. For example, the fact that the United States is acting in such a way and together with NATO, may have its economic roots. For some reason, the United States is not satisfied with its leading position in the world, but it is a fact. It should be satisfied, but it isn't. Maybe it perceives a danger to its economic domination in the creation of the Economic Community of Europe, and the expansion of the Economic Community of Europe, I don't know.

If that is the case, this also has to come into the picture, because we can't just talk about a new financial system as being the root, because the phrase that Europe cannot settle matters, and that the U.S. has to come into the situation, is not just a simple phrase. It is something that shows that the United States does perceive the European Economic Community as a possible new center that, if it emerges as an independent political entity of its own and on the same scale as the United States, will create the conditions for a change in the unipolar world. And that is another additional motivation for the United States to take the course it is taking now, not just this narrow approach to save the hedge funds and so on.

So, I thought we have to take these political processes, and look at the economic roots of those political processes, to make the picture more complete and more manifold than just emanating from the fact that we have a financial system that needs reform.

Dr. Barban from Qatar

I would like to comment on Professor Menshikov's remarks concerning the war and Europe. I think that when you hear what he said, it is as if you are in the old days of the Cold War; it reminds me of the rhetoric of the fight of communism against capitalism. I think this is not the way, the democratic way, that we are living now. In Europe, it is quite different from this approach to this problem. And, on the other hand, he also had wrong conceptions about Yugoslavia itself. Remember, last year, the democratic movement in Yugoslavia? How Milosevic crushed this movement? And now the professor didn't even mention one word about what he is doing in Kosovo. You put the blame on the people of Kosovo, and not on Slobodan Milosevic. This is not an objective approach to

the problem, with all respect to the brotherhood, or whatever you call it, between Russia and Serbia.

Faris Nanic of Bosnia

I'm the secretary general of the Party of Democratic Action of Bosnia in Croatia. I would like to comment on what has been said by the professor from Russia and the colleague from Qatar. I have to assure the professor that Milosevic is a fascist, and there is no doubt about it. We have to go back a couple of years, and remember the ethnic-cleansing campaigns that were led, financed, directed, and conducted by the Milosevic regime. When nobody, or almost nobody, from the international community, respecting the present international political system, has done anything to prevent, or at least to stop, the genocide.

I also have to remind you that the five permanent members of the Security Council, with God-given rights of veto power, set a condition to the victims of the Milosevic aggression in 1991 and 1992, by binding their hands to defend themselves. They have been deprived of the basic right of self-defense. What happened to the political system then? Where was Russia then, to defend the political system of collective defense of the nation-state, or at least the right to self-defense? This is what we have to think about.

I totally agree that Russia, together with the United States, with European countries, with China, with India, and a couple of others, have to sit at the same table and discuss the international political, financial, and economic order. But I do think that Russia finally has to realize that it has inherited — by I don't know what God-given right — both the permanent membership on the Security Council of the former Soviet Union, just automatically, and that Russia has to finally respect some principles. Milosevic, dear professor, is a fascist. He has a record of ethnic cleansing and genocide over three peoples in the Balkans. If he remains in power, I don't know where he is going to stop.

That doesn't mean that I agree with this kind of imposed war on Yugoslavia. But my question to all of you gentlemen is: How can we immediately stop the aggression and genocide over any people, anywhere? Unfortunately, due to the present political constitution, the present political system that we have, which I see Russia at least is trying to defend, there is no way to defend a people from extermination. Especially if the permanent members of the Security Council misuse their veto power, as we witnessed back in 1991 and 1992.

Klaus Kliovich of Germany

I have some experience in business, in government, and now I teach at the university. One of my main interests is probably international. I realize here that there is a common denominator in the interventions of the different speakers. That we are confronted with a systems problem. I argue that the systems problem that you have discovered, and that others see, can only be solved, or can be better solved, if we attack it in a broader way. You are requesting a qualitative jump,

for a new order, you speak about the monetary and financial orders, and you have the big projects, and others have mentioned different things, though I argue what we need is constitutionalizing the international, political, legal relations.

Why is that so? In the past, we had several phases of public international law, we had the old-fashioned time of coexistence, sovereignty. After the war, we entered into the phase of public international law of cooperation, which was mainly diplomatic, government-driven. Now we have some sort of strange situation that is not called government, but governance. Governance, which is muddling through, piecemeal engineering, there are networks. . . . There are certain legal frameworks like the WTO [World Trade Organization] and others. There's a law of war and peace in public international law; there's a UN Charter; there are human rights instruments. But, the present crisis in Kosovo clearly shows that there are problems, and people are asking for a further development of public international law.

Now, I think that this idea of big industrial policy, of having financial architecture, a new Bretton Woods, this is important. But it won't be sufficient, because you, Professor Hankel, will be confronted with a problem of accountability, of democratic legitimation. Today, in the WTO, people demonstrate in front of this, so to speak, technocratic organization, asking, "Where is the democratic accountability of this organization?" The same will happen if you have the World Bank and central bank — has its own drawing rights, and people will say it's not accountable, these are technocrats. Just to take this example. So, having said all this, what we need is a constitutionalization, we have to be ambitious. We have seen that the Europeans are weak to some extent, but on the other hand, they are strong. They have developed a beautiful model, where without the hegemonial power, sovereign states — they are still to some extent sovereign, Mr. LaRouche — are able to live together. They have to have constitutionalized their relationship.

So, what I think, is that we have to integrate the Land-Bridge, the monetary system, into a big package deal where everybody has to find himself. . . .

Lyndon LaRouche

What is relevant is that we have many situations as bad or worse than Kosovo. The situation in Central Africa is far worse. I can prove it, although I'm not going to do it here. The whole story's been documented before. The entirety of the genocide in Central Africa, which now totals many times in excess of the total population of Kosovo, over 6 million. If you take other areas affected, it's much more. Six million Africans have been butchered on the instruction, and under the direction, of the British monarchy, and no one else. Others have been complicit. The Israelis have been complicit. People in the U.S. military associated with the Oliver North/Iran-Contra tradition are involved. But it is the British government, the Thatcher crowd, including Baroness Caroline Cox, who are directly responsible for the ongoing mass genocide in

Africa which is wiping out whole nations, and nobody in Europe or at the United Nations has so far been willing to touch it. Though I'd say that Kofi Annan in general is a positive figure, and the problem is not with him, but the problem is that he needs more support on some of these things in the world, as in the case of the Balkans crisis.

On the question of the system, you cannot systemize or constitutionalize a world order. Very simply, it's an economic question. When people talk about economy, they think about buying and selling. They don't understand how an economy works. It's partly a problem with our educational system. A modern economy is able to work — and I ask you to look at one thing: the growth of the population curve of the planet's population, life expectancy, conditions of life, the demographic conditions of life since the middle of the fifteenth century in Europe. Look at the growth of population and demographic modalities of life in these hundreds of years. This growth is due to the spread of the establishment of the modern sovereign notion of nation-state, which central idea was the responsibility of the nation-state for the general welfare, or the common welfare, of all the people. This means that you have to have educational systems, you have to have provision for health care, you must have large investments in infrastructure, to organize the soil in a certain manner. You must have financial systems which are the responsibility of the state, in order to ensure the orderly process of production and commerce. Without the sovereign nation-state, these cannot exist.

To have a sovereign nation-state, you must have the participation of the population, which means that you must have a literate form of language, participation in self-government through a literate form of language and culture. These are absolutely essential. What we need on this planet is the understanding that we must eliminate once and for all the relics of imperialism. We must eliminate once and for all systems which regard some human beings as human cattle, either virtually or actually, either by commission or by negligence. If nations agree, and when I spoke of this relationship with the Eurasian nations, Europe and the President of the United States, if we can establish an agreement among these nations in this time of great peril, to create a just, new economic order among sovereign nation-states, we will have done the best we could do to create the kind of order among nation-states to guarantee general security, as much as is possible, because you can never guarantee everything.

On the other things, on the issue in the Balkans, the issue is several things. First of all, the refusal to take responsibility for action, from the beginning of the Balkans war in 1991. Second, the obstacles to taking action by those who wanted to take it, particularly, initially, by the French and the British, especially the British, who are the authors of this problem in the first place. In the case of the Kosovo problem, remember what happened in Rambouillet. We were close to the point that nations were ready to agree. Cook and other representatives of the Blair government went into Rambouillet, took this crazy

creature, Madeleine Half-Bright, and used her to organize a secession movement and to make it a *fait accompli*, and to make sure that nothing would happen which would get Clinton together with Primakov, and negotiate. The genocide. And also, remember, the removal of the security forces which were protecting the Kosovars from this situation. Remember the security forces, which were there to prevent this bloodshed, this so-called ethnic cleansing, and that's the problem.

We have to realize that we are living in a world in which combined wrong actions, as in Africa, inaction when action is morally required, a general disregard for moral responsibility, and a refusal to name the names of the actual criminals — as in this case, the British monarchy — is the thing that leads into these types of crises. Yes, Faris Nanic and I are well known to each other, this has been our concern. The problem is that you cannot go around starting wars. You must proceed according to the law of justified war. The crime lies with the European and other states which refused to take action when they should, or which have obstructed action, as in the case of Africa; when one nation, Britain, prevents anybody from doing anything about the most massive genocide on this planet, now going on in Central Africa.

Professor Menshikov

Well, I was surprised that the gentlemen from Qatar and Croatia thought that I was a supporter of Milosevic. I am not a supporter of Milosevic. In fact, I don't think that Russia is a supporter of whatever Milosevic has been doing in Kosovo. From the very beginning, Russia has been telling Milosevic that he was committing either an error or a blunder, and that's a diplomatic way of saying it, when he refused autonomy to Kosovo way back ten years ago. . . . I've been to Yugoslavia many times, and I know the situation. This is out of the question. The question is not that. The Croatian gentleman should remember something about ethnic cleansing done by the Croatsians also. So, he should be a little bit more neutral in his assessment about the Serbs: 300,000 Serbs were cleansed out of parts of Bosnia just a few years ago, during the final stages of the war there. Let's not talk about this. This has been going on in that country from various sides. Let's not take sides there. Everybody's to blame, everybody's been doing that. Who is doing more, who is doing less — once you've committed that, you are to blame. It doesn't matter, 10,000 more or 10,000 less. It's not a question of that. The Croatsians are brought to trial in The Hague in the same way that the Serbs are brought to trial for war crimes. So, let's not talk about that. It's obvious that all sides there have been doing wrong things.

The important thing is, what do we *do* about genocide when it happens, when it starts? How do you stop genocide? Can you stop it by bombing? I'm not sure you can. What happened in Kosovo is just an example. We can take any other example. Could you stop the Rwandan genocide by bombing somebody? I'm not sure. I don't know the answer to that, it's not my specialty. But the gentleman from Croatia correctly

put that issue. He said how do you stop genocide? Yes, it is one of the most important questions.

Now, in Russia, on orders of Yeltsin, genocide was created, close to genocide was created, in Chechnya. Everybody knows that. The Russian Parliament has been trying to impeach Yeltsin, on that point as well. What is the reaction in the West to that? Don't do that, Yeltsin is our ally, he's the only supporter of democracy, tra la la. Again, you see, what I am against is a double standard. Genocide is genocide, wherever it happens. If it happens in Russia, the man who gave orders to do it should be taken to task in the same way that the Milosevic has been taken to task, and anybody. . . .

Look into that seriously. What did the bombings bring in Kosovo? Did it bring the Albanians back to their homes? No. It drove them out of their homes. Every day we are looking at the results. Are these purely the results of the bombings? No, of course not. Of course, Milosevic is also to blame. Who started this, is not the question. The question is, you have hundreds of thousands of people misplaced: If there were no bombings, would it be better? Probably it would be better, but it's not a method of solving, that's what I was trying to say. Bombing is not a method of solving that issue. And particularly, that is not a method prescribed by a country or a group of countries, just because they don't like somebody and they do it. You know, they had enough power to pressure the Turks not to do what they do to the Kurds — again, a double standard. In Iraq, they have created a no-fly zone in the north of Iraq to protect the Kurds. Okay, fine. They are protecting the Kurds there. Why don't they protect the Kurds in Turkey? Again, these are all double-standard wars.

I am for solving the issue. And the United Nations is, of course, just closing its eyes, sitting there and saying nothing. And I think the Russian diplomacy is committing serious blunders now. Instead of saying, okay, let's have full-fledged sessions in which we discuss this question, discuss this issue, how to go about it fully — as there used to be in the United Nations. You'll remember times during the Cold War — some say listening to me was like an old Cold War speech. Not at all! I'm not against America at all, so there's no Cold War ideology at all. In my opinion, there's a group in America which is overreaching itself and looking for more than it really needs.

Lyndon LaRouche says this is because of the British monarchy. I don't know, maybe Queen Elizabeth is not aware of that. I'm not sure. Just pointing fingers, and saying, "Aha, that is the monarchy." That's not the issue. I say, let's get together. It's not a question of who has the power of veto. In the Security Council, in the General Assembly, let's have a serious discussion on how to stop these things, in a democratic way instead of saying bombs, cruise missiles. Whether it's the Russians against Chechnya or the Americans against the Yugoslavs, it doesn't matter. This has to stop once and forever. If we don't stop it, we'll have a twenty-first-century war. That's what I'm saying.