

concrete program of action. The purpose of our Rodina bloc is to do precisely that.

Glazyev to Gazeta, Dec. 9:

Q: The Rodina bloc built up steam suspiciously fast. Wasn't some "administrative backing" activated on your behalf?

Glazyev: What administrative backing? What are you talking about?! I don't see anything surprising in our results! We ran for the Duma with well-known candidates, people of undoubted authority. There is no need to whip up hysteria about "the danger of a national-socialist offensive," as the SPS [Union of Right Forces] is doing. At the end of the campaign, it became clear that [Zhirinovskiy's] LDPR and the SPS are two sides of the same coin, two parties servicing the interests of the oligarchs. That is why they jointly waged a slander and black-PR campaign against Rodina.

Q: SPS leader Boris Nemtsov said that a tectonic shift has occurred in the country. . . .

Glazyev: It may be that a tectonic shift has occurred in the life of Nemtsov, whereas what happened in the country is simply that SPS has ceased to have any influence on policy. The programs that the "rightists" offered the government were programs to service the interests of the oligarchs. . . . At the end of the election campaign, the SPS resorted to outright slanders against us, because they perceived Rodina as the only force capable of opposing the oligarchs. We had excellent candidates. We could not be bought, we could not be intimidated, we could not be bribed.

Q: Who will go along with Rodina? Will you make friends with United Russia?

Glazyev: We can unite all the patriotic forces in the country, although ambitions have hindered that at times. United Russia will act however the President says. In principle, the President supports the idea of a special tax on superprofits [from raw materials exploitation]. Earlier, adoption of such a law was impeded by corruption in the State Duma; the fact that certain government ministers had an interest in the matter was an obstacle. I hope that now, with the crash of the ideology of liberal fascism, which the SPS personified, we shall achieve mutual understanding in the Duma.

From Glazyev's polemical article "How Liberalissimus Shot Himself in the Foot," in *Novyye Izvestia*, Nov. 4, 2003:

Things must be going badly for United Energy Systems of Russia head Anatoli Chubais, if one of the destroyers of "the Soviet Empire" is talking on the eve of elections not about electricity rates, but about none other than the ideology of imperialism. And not just talking about it; he has urgently called on Russians to adopt a new ideology—the ideology of liberal imperialism. Never mind the population! He has posed this goal to the Russian state itself, saying that it's high time to roll up our sleeves and get to work building a liberal empire.

Enflaming imaginations with such wild fantasies, it would

not be a bad idea to take into account even just the most recent lessons of history. Argentina, for example. Without any verbal bells and whistles, that country has been building a "liberal empire" since 1991; building it together with other Latin American countries, which strictly followed the advice and prescriptions of the United States and the International Monetary Fund. But Argentina was the "star pupil." And the results of neoliberal policy there have been miserable: Since 2000, the country has been shaken by one economic crisis after another. The system of linkage between the local currency and the dollar broke down. Unemployment soared to 18%. According even to official statistics, 36.1% of the population lives below the poverty level, while almost 9% are destitute. Parties and politicians, who yesterday supported the economic reforms, today in a chorus call them "barbaric" and demand a return to the destroyed system of social responsibility on the part of the state.

Is that not like the current situation in Russia?! With the sole difference, that we had a rather larger "stability reserve," so we are still afloat. All that was missing was for us to undertake to build a "liberal empire," then everything would have been destroyed for good, and we would have turned, like Argentina, into a country with the highest conceivable level of banditry, thievery, and street robberies.

LaRouche Interviewed In Russian Magazine

The December 2003 issue of *Valyutny Spekulyant* (Currency Dealer), the Russian financial monthly, carries interviews with regular authors—including EIR Founder and Contributing Editor Lyndon LaRouche, whom VS asked to answer their questionnaire on behalf of the many EIR authors published in *Valyutny Spekulyant*.

In the one-page interview, LaRouche zeroes in on the unique role of the U.S. Presidency at a moment of world economic breakdown, and of his own candidacy, given that the Baby-Boomer generation, holding power in most countries, suffers from the debilitating effects of the same 1960s cultural paradigm shift that caused the economic crisis. A return to the policymaking principles of Franklin Delano Roosevelt means "a virtual revolution," LaRouche tells the Russian readers, but it is "the only visible option" for the United States and the world.

Dennis Small's Oct. 10, 2003 EIR article on the vulture funds picking over Argentina appears in the same issue, under the headline, "What Do Vulture Funds Eat?" An editorial note of introduction reminds readers that the (now soundly defeated) Russian neo-liberals attempted to impose the "Argentine model" on Russia in 1998.

The December issue of VS, which went to the printer on

the eve of Russia's Dec. 7 State Duma elections, also carries an article on the initiative by Rodina (Homeland) electoral bloc leader Sergei Glazyev, to increase the "natural rent" fees for companies exploiting Russian raw materials.

Excerpts from LaRouche's interview follow below.

Valyutny Spekulyant's authors are not geographically limited to Russia and the CIS. Our magazine regularly publishes articles written by citizens of Australia, Germany, the Netherlands and the U.S.A. Of special interest are the contributions from analysts at the American weekly Executive Intelligence Review (www.larouchepub.com). During 2003, VS readers could enjoy the offerings of Lothar Komp, expert in European economics and finance; Cynthia Rush and Dennis Small, whose lessons on "bankers' arithmetic" demonstrate why the foreign debt of many countries will never be paid; Jeffrey Steinberg, with his unrivalled knowledge of the U.S. political scene; banking analyst John Hoefle; Marsha Freeman, expert on energy policy and space exploration; and Richard Freeman, known for his exposés of fraud in official economic statistics. At the request of these authors, Lyndon LaRouche, director of EIR, agreed to answer our questionnaire.

Lyndon LaRouche is a U.S. candidate for the 2004 Democratic Party's U.S. Presidential nomination, editor, and economist; born Sept. 8, 1922 in the U.S. Federal state of New Hampshire; married to German national and political figure Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Since the end of wartime military service, in 1946, has been a dedicated opponent of the policies of nuclear-warfare utopian Bertrand Russell, and also an opponent of those changes, away from the policies of President Franklin Roosevelt, associated with Presidents Truman, Nixon, Carter, Reagan, both Bushes, and also Clinton.

1. [Omitted. Question about Valyutny Spekulyant, as such.]

2. What is your forecast for the Russian [American] economy in 2004 (as well as the next two-three years)? What do you view most positively, what puts you on guard? Will the upcoming Parliamentary and Presidential [in the U.S., Presidential] elections affect the Russian [American] economy?

LaRouche: The existing world monetary-financial system (e.g., IMF floating-exchange-rate system) is in the end-phase of a process leading toward an early, general breakdown-crisis, unless a new, fixed-exchange-rate monetary-financial system is installed to prevent such a political-economic breakdown from reaching maturity.

This breakdown, while formally datable from the 1971-72 changes in the monetary system, developed as a by-product of a cultural paradigm-shift which was brought about by the combined after-effects of the succession of the 1962 missiles crisis, the 1963 assassination of President Kennedy, and the launching of the official U.S. 1964-1972 Indo-China war. The result of those 1962-1972 developments, was a shift of the social values of a growing, younger portion of the emerging

adult population, away from the values of a U.S.A. as the world's leading producer society, to a U.S. descent into the role of an increasingly economically predatory, "post-industrial"/consumer society, echoing the post-Second Punic War decadence of ancient Rome into an predatory imperial power relying upon the substitution of bread-and-circuses for production in Italy itself. This cultural paradigm-shift devolved into the self-doomed, hyperinflated world monetary-financial system of today.

Since the end of the 18th Century, the world has been repeatedly threatened by a banker-directed force which became known as that Synarchist International which gave us the Mussolini, Hitler, Franco, etc. fascist regimes of the 1922-1945 interval. Today, U.S. Vice-President Cheney's self-styled "neo-conservative" circles represent the leading U.S. element of that same Synarchist network. This Synarchist current, long identified with that Bertrand Russell-like nuclear-utopian circles within the U.S.A. and London which President Eisenhower termed a "military-industrial complex," is the most immediate, most dangerous threat to civilization as a whole today.

For various reasons, the way in which the U.S. political institutions turn during the immediate weeks and months ahead, will largely predetermine history, as much or more than Hitler's assumption of dictatorial powers during late February 1933 determined much of the trend of world affairs over the 1933-1945 interval. The only visible option, would be a return to the policy-shaping outlook which President Franklin Roosevelt brought to the U.S. government in March 1933.

3. What is your forecast for world markets in 2004 (you may choose the sector you are most interested in—stock, commodities, spot or currency markets)?

LaRouche: Virtually all of this will be swept away, in one form or another.

4. What would you personally desire for yourself in 2004?

LaRouche: As the only Presidential candidate who has a grasp on the current realities, I must become President. During 1962-2003, the U.S.A., and also much of the world at large, has undergone a profound cultural paradigm-shift. The habituated values of most of those in the 30s-50s age-interval in the U.S. (as elsewhere) are the political-cultural knee-jerk reflexes which have caused the present world crisis; only a leader who recognizes that the long-term cultural trend of the 1962-2003 era is virtually dead and rotting, is capable of making the kinds of crucial responses to crises which would address any of the leading problems now facing the world at large. Any workable solution will therefore appear to most observers, as President Franklin Roosevelt's actions did, as a virtual revolution. Only such a revolutionary is of much use to either the U.S.A. or humanity at large under the presently erupting circumstances.