

## LaRouche: It is a deadly blunder to back Yeltsin

*Lyndon LaRouche made these remarks on Sept. 24, concerning the Clinton administration's backing for Boris Yeltsin's cold coup.*

What must be looked at primarily is the axiomatics. Obviously, this was cooked up primarily with the United States, through the Chernomyrdin and other channels. This represents a full mobilization by the United States establishment, or that section around the White House, to devise what it may think is a solution to the global crisis, to bring the kind of stability in which the President can proceed with NAFTA, secondarily, but primarily with the Hillary Clinton health plan package. . . .

The crucial fact is that Washington has proceeded from a very obvious geopolitical axiomatic, and that is simply to restore the Versailles-Yalta style of condominium relationship with their designated person in Moscow, in this case Yeltsin, his being for the moment the visible aspect of the designated forces. They've put everything into it.

Now this has a certain crushing effect on the opposition to Yeltsin; but that must not blind us to the larger reality, that the whole concoction is a failure from the get-go. That does not mean that it will blow up immediately; it means it's a failure. It's going to lead the world to a new level of greater disaster, precisely because the agreement fails to address anything.

First of all, if you're going to have a condominium among powers, that means that you're going to have powers. So this way of enforcing globalism doesn't work. As a matter of fact, globalism doesn't work precisely because it must deny the existence of any nation-state as a sovereign power. In this case, the assumption is that if a foreign power, such as the United States, *controls* the Russian

partner, then they can have a Russian power, but since the ruling force in Russia is subordinate in some sense, that that somehow enables them to reinforce the globalist policy; it also creates a situation in which they cheerfully hope that they can *ignore* the laws of economics.

### The coming explosion

Now we're going into winter, we're going into a great period of instability at all levels inside the former Soviet Union and eastern Europe, at the same time that the world economy as a whole is collapsing. So nothing is going to stand still. This is going to blow up; but we're going to have an explosion on a lower level of metastability, qualitatively lower, than had existed over the course of the recent summer.

So the essential thing here is *not* whether or not Washington has achieved stability for Yeltsin. That question cannot be answered, because the question is an absurd one. The question is: What kind of a new instability does this action by the United States to try to prop up and control Yeltsin, as the case of Yegor Gaidar, the case of Jeffrey Sachs, typifies it? What kind of explosion is this going to set off? We don't know the timetable yet; there are too many things to consider. Nonetheless, weeks or months is about the proper phase for a new explosion.

So this was a piece of insanity, which could lead, as some others have observed, either to Yeltsin becoming Boris Godunov, or into anarchy. We had this in Russian history before, remember, in the wake of Ivan Grozny [the Terrible], in the period between Ivan Grozny and the rise of the Romanovs. Russia could be going into that kind of process right now, on a reduced time scale or a similar time scale, in some cases. And that is the point to which the bungling by the Washington administration and its establishment core, has brought the world.

So this is a deadly blunder on the part of Washington, which demonstrates how little Washington understands the reality. As a matter of fact, Washington does not wish *to hear* about reality.

sive forces in Russia by refusing to accept the continued genocide in Bosnia. It would prove to them that the West would not tolerate this type of butchery without impunity. This mistake must be reversed now."

And what will happen in Russia proper? The present chaotic process could last three to four years. "There are no parties in the real sense of the term in Russia today, but rather movements with names, amorphous groups," said Scherer. There were attempts in 1990 to form political parties, but these attempts failed. "The leadership strata will be replaced. The way this would happen concretely could depend on hun-

dreds of different parameters. Scherer gave 13 different scenarios. In the worst of cases, with continued economic disintegration in Russia, extreme elements could take control in Moscow. "They may have the attitude, 'We are going to hell, therefore, we will also take the West to hell.'" This, combined with current nuclear capabilities, "would not only mean limited civil war with nuclear weapons, but a real strategic confrontation with the West."

In Scherer's judgment, all efforts to dismantle the military capabilities of the West, in Europe and in the United States, are extreme folly and should cease immediately.