

World Leaders Ignore Russian Shift at Their Peril

by Rachel Douglas

Political shocks from the weekend of Aug. 12-13, when the nuclear submarine *Kursk* went down in the Barents Sea, continue to reverberate in Russia. But, the world at large has not accepted the reality of how the process, which Lyndon LaRouche diagnosed and warned about in his “Storm Over Asia” video briefing of October 1999, did lead to an incident that could have meant a thermonuclear exchange between Russia and the United States.

Nor would one know, from the press and would-be strategists in the West, who present the latest events in Russia as a string of discrete disasters — the bomb blast that killed a dozen people in central Moscow, the sinking of the *Kursk*, and the burning of the Ostankino television tower on Aug. 26-27 — that shifts of great import are under way, albeit not certain in their outcome, in crucial policy areas in Russia. They are a response to the battering of the country’s very basis for national security.

In “Storm Over Asia,” LaRouche said that a mercenary force of British origin was threatening China and India, the world’s two largest nations. “Iran is also threatened; but, more notably, Russia,” he warned. “If these nations are pushed to the wall by a continuing escalation of a war which is modelled on the wars which the British ran against Russia, China, and so forth, during the Nineteenth Century and early Twentieth Century, this will lead to the point that Russia has to make the decision to accept the disintegration of Russia as a nation, or to resort to the means it has, to exact terrible penalties on those who are attacking it, going closer and closer to the source, the forces behind the mercenaries — which includes, of course, Turkey, which is a prime NATO asset being used as a cover for much of this mercenary operation in the North Caucasus and in Central Asia.” (See *Strategic Studies* section

in this issue and video ad on the back cover.)

Any such confrontation with Russia is of global strategic dimensions, LaRouche explained: “The weapons the Russians have, are no longer the large armies, the capabilities we thought of under the old Ogarkov Plan of the 1980s. Those vast armies are dissipated, weakened. Russia is ruined almost, by a vast economic destruction, caused by IMF [International Monetary Fund] policies, and related policies. But Russia still has an arsenal, an arsenal of advanced weapons, and laboratories which can match the weaponry — most advanced weaponry — being developed in the United States, Israel, Britain, and elsewhere.

“If Russia is pushed to the wall, or decides to disintegrate willfully, or fight back, the likely thing is, it will fight back. It will use the weapons it has. It does not have the weapons to win a war, but it has the weapons sufficient to impose a powerful, deadly deterrent on the nations behind the mercenary forces which are presently attacking it. There lies the danger.

“Unfortunately, most people in the United States are living under the delusion, that with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the combined military power of the United States and its British Commonwealth allies . . . , these Anglo-American forces, are so powerful, that they can ignore the United Nations Security Council, and conduct wars on their own, with impunity.”

The Russian Nationalist Reaction

In the pages that follow, *EIR* continues from last week’s issue our dossier of Russian statements, largely blacked out of the international press. They include an analysis of the *Kursk* incident, attributed to Russian military intelligence and

situating the ship's sinking in the framework of a global showdown between nuclear superpowers. On the political side, we have the voices of a profound Russian nationalist response to the sinking of the *Kursk*, not only in and of itself, but as an inflection point in a decade-long assault on Russia's dignity as a nation and its ability to survive.

The 18 authors of the statement "In the Hour of Trouble," represent the "left-patriotic" tendency, which was the main opposition force in the Yeltsin years. The former Communist Party Presidential candidate, Gennadi Zyuganov, was a signer. But the anger they express, and the national pride in Russia's ability to come back from the brink of extinction, are the same that President Vladimir Putin addressed in the population, with his televised interview on Aug. 23 (*EIR*, Sept. 1, p. 28).

In the United States, we recognize a "Pearl Harbor Effect," as when Franklin Delano Roosevelt mobilized the nation after the Japanese bombing of the naval base in Hawaii. There are many such reference points in Russian cultural and political history, as the Statement of the Eighteen recalls, of which the most recent was the "Barbarossa Reflex." When the invading armies of Hitler's Operation Barbarossa had swept through the Soviet Union to the gates of Moscow, and to Stalingrad on the lower Volga, the Communist leader Stalin joined with the Russian Orthodox Church and the Red Army generals, to rally the nation under the slogan "Not One Step Back!"—this far, and no farther.

Whether a "Barbarossa Reflex," after the sustained assault on Russian nationhood by Western-backed economic looting and geopolitical schemes, leads to a confrontationist posture and generates still more crisis moments like the weekend of Aug. 12-13, or if a Russian fight for national survival and sovereignty finds partnership with other nations so engaged, depends on the quality of leadership in other countries, especially the United States.

Economic Strategy

Some of our sources in Moscow express concern, that President Putin might squander the present moment of shock, rather than making the decisive break in economic policy that a revival of Russia would require. An intense fight over industrial and investment policy is shaping up, going far beyond the demand for increased defense spending in 2001, which has come from the Communist Party and from former Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov's Fatherland-All Russia alliance.

On Aug. 28, after the Ostankino TV tower fire was extinguished, President Putin proclaimed, "This new emergency shows what condition our most vital facilities, and the country as a whole, are in. Only economic development will allow us to avoid such calamities in the future."

Putin had spent much of Aug. 16, in the middle of the *Kursk* crisis, in sessions with the leadership of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Security Council Secretary Sergei Iva-

nov, and Deputy Prime Minister Ilya Klebanov, who handles defense industries. In planning the formation of a new Science Council, Putin spoke to the meeting about the decisive role of the Academy and other drastically underfunded science centers, "for industry, defense, and the national security."

Zyuganov, in a message dated Aug. 25, called on Putin to launch "an extraordinary national salvation program," by convening a state assembly of the President, his cabinet, both houses of Parliament, and prominent scientists and experts, to discuss a package of emergency measures. These measures would deal with "the terrifying, horrible, and criminal conditions, already a decade old in Russian society, which is being destroyed under slogans of democratization and market reforms."

A more elaborated Strategy for National Industrial Development was circulated at the end of August by Yuri Maslyukov, the industry expert, who was the last head of the Soviet Gosplan, served as First Deputy Prime Minister in the Primakov government (1998-99), and currently chairs the State Duma's (lower house of parliament) Committee on Industry, Construction, and Science-Intensive Technologies. A member of the Communist Party, Maslyukov has often voted independently of the CP group in the Duma, and is well respected in government as well as parliamentary circles. His thinking has come into renewed prominence, in the context of the increasingly intense discussions within the Russian government, as well as the Duma, about the national security requirement for measures to revive the real sector of the economy.

Maslyukov's memo was issued after hearings he convened, to launch what the Pravda.ru press service called "serious discussion about an economic program, which would be an alternative to the well-known program of German Gref"—the Minister of Trade and Economy, whose tome on a ten-year perspective of monetarist maneuvers and deregulation was presented to Putin earlier this year. Maslyukov's point of departure is, that if the government talks about "GDP growth of 5-10% per annum," it must distinguish between growth merely of the financial sector, which is caused (in the whole world, not just Russia, he points out) by pumping up a "financial bubble," and "the development of the real sector, industry first and foremost."

Putin has not endorsed the proposals of Maslyukov or Zyuganov, but agreement that real industry needs more than lip service came from Prime Minister Mikhail Kasyanov in an Aug. 28 interview with *Vremya Novosti*. Reporting on Russia's attempts to restructure its "Paris Club" (Soviet-era state-to-state loans) debt, Kasyanov said that, "of course, we can make an effort and pay \$4 billion" next year. "But, in my opinion, this would be wrong." The Premier noted that "we hear from the State Duma: 'Once again we have a debt budget [for 2001]; the country should not spend more than 30% of its revenue on debt service.' We also believe that this is wrong."

In that interview, Kasyanov stated that "banking reform is the key element of the entire reform." For one of his banking

policy preferences, Kasyanov was attacked Aug. 30 in the *Moscow Times*, by Media-Most journalist Yulia Latynina. She complained that Kasyanov has brought to life a project that Primakov as Prime Minister and Maslyukov as his deputy, promoted. That is the Russian Development Bank, which Kasyanov has now shepherded into existence. It was licensed on July 21 and will receive 5 billion rubles (\$180 million) in the 2001 budget.

Documentation

Statement of the Eighteen

Communist Party leader and former Presidential candidate Gennadi Zyuganov, State Duma Economic Policy Committee Chairman Sergei Glazyev, Academician Gennadi Osipov, and the Soviet Navy Commander in Chief in the 1980s, Adm. V.N. Chernavin, were among 18 prominent political leaders who issued an appeal on Aug. 22, for a mobilization to save Russia from destruction in war—a war in which, they say, the sinking of the Kursk was one battle. The statement, titled “In the Hour of Trouble,” came out on the eve of the national day of mourning for the Kursk crew, Aug. 23. The appeal of the 18 representatives of what is known as the “left-patriotic” tendency, gives some sense of the profound response inside Russia, to the sinking of the Kursk. Signers included writers, journalists, retired military men, two regional officials, two industrial managers, a space scientist, and a high-ranking monk of the Russian Orthodox Church:

In these tragic days for our Motherland, as the nation grieves for the loss of the *Kursk*, the best ship in the Northern Fleet, and the grief of the mothers and fathers, wives and children, who lost their dearest and most beloved ones in the sea deep, has become the grief of every family in Russia—in these days of mourning and prayerful remembrance, we are very clearly aware of the magnitude of the trouble, into which Russia has been plunged. Great is the scope of the war, which our people have been fighting for a decade, losing 1 million of our population each year, and leaving on the battlefield burning cities, blown-up apartment buildings, crashed airplanes, sunken ships, and devastated, depopulated regions, as well as countless graves of our compatriots. The 118 sailors, these best and most honorable men, who perished in the iron box of this ship, were participants in the war, which the country is waging for the right to call itself Russia, to control the territory between three oceans, to speak its native language, to worship its holy things, and to honor its heroes and forebears.

It was not any accident with the ship's equipment, nor a miscalculation by the crew, that caused her death. She went down in the battle, which the people, and Russian statehood, are waging today, trying with their last strength to put ships

out to sea and squadrons in the air, to pump oil and natural gas, to heat the houses, educate the children, nurse the orphans, and to keep faith in its sovereignty and inviolability, and in the inevitable Russian Victory. The havoc, which the enemy has wrought in our homes, in our ministries and staffs, and in our minds and hearts, is comparable with the darkest and most hellish deeds in Russian history, and with the most merciless and lethal invasions. This enemy, feigning itself “reformer” and “benefactor,” has been doing conscious evil for ten years, preying upon Russia, withering our health and will, taking our last money and bread, and condemning us to spiritual paralysis and despair.

The mystery of the loss of the *Kursk* has not yet been solved, but within it is hidden, as if inside a “black box,” the terrible fact, that it is Russia that was rammed.

The loss of the *Kursk* is an awesome and tragic occasion, to think through this moment of current history, not to fall into disconsolate grief and panic, but to exhibit the will and concentration, which were always characteristic of Russians, when defeats brought them to the edge of the abyss. Thus, after the defeat of Igor's Campaign, there was the sacred Victory at Kulikovo Field. After the treason of the boyars and the Polish orgies in the Kremlin, came the victorious host of Minin and Pozharsky. After Peter's defeat at Narva, his brilliant Poltava. After Borodino and the burning of Moscow—Russian standards on the Champs Elysées. The sinking of our squadron at Tsushima gave birth to the immortal feat of the *Varyag*. The brutal defeats of the Red Army at Kiev and Smolensk, led to victory at Moscow, Stalingrad, and Kursk, and to the red flag over Berlin. The heroic death of the Sixth Airborne in Argun Gorge made that company a sacred one, and armed the Army with a luminous, triumphant force. The loss of the *Kursk* will not divide or weaken us, but will unite and consolidate us, and will help to overcome the schism within the people, which reigns when the clever enemy splinters us into groups, pounds us into powder and meal. The people will answer the tragedy in the Barents Sea and the *Kursk* sailors' feat of martyrdom, with unity and steadfastness.

Many in the country had hopes: that after the insanities of “perestroika,” after the bankruptcy of “liberal reforms,” the leadership, which has made declarations about the State, about Russia, and about the Motherland, would not revel at gaudy rituals in restored Tsarist palaces. Many wanted to believe, that those in power would reject the insane economic policy, which destroyed the Soviet Union, and is now finishing off Russia, depriving the people of their last kopeks, bringing our giant factories to a halt, and making it impossible for the country to have doctors or deep-sea divers, and to keep either submarines or whole scientific schools afloat. We demand that the leadership, learning from the present bitter loss, not begin anew the previous ruinous policy of “radical liberalism,” disgusting and ridiculous as it is, but rather mobilize the remains of our national resources, the remains of our fi-

nances and productive forces, and economic and political will. We shall fight for our people, having gathered the resources of our state into one, spiritually mobilized and united, to win the battle for a Russian 21st Century.

We are convinced that there will be a response to this mobilizing impulse—from the heroic Navy of Russia, which will not quit the expanses of the World Ocean. From the brave Russian Army, finishing off the terrorists in Chechnya. From science, which preserves the greatest discoveries of our time in its laboratories with the power cut off. From patriotic culture, never tired of preaching the Good, Love, and Mercy. From the Church, lighting holy lamps over the graves of our heroes, and praying for all who care for the salvation of Russia.

We know that the tragedy of the *Kursk*, the tears of the living and the holy martyrdom of those who died, will unite us into an invincible people. And that a new nuclear-powered *Kursk*, its construction funded by the people's savings as was done in the times of great troubles, will put out to sea. Into the great ocean of the history of our Fatherland.

Zyuganov's 'National Salvation Program'

Sent to President Putin on Aug. 25, the main points of Communist Party leader Gennadi Zyuganov's platform were summarized by Interfax.

1. To qualitatively change budget-making procedures. To use every possibility to radically increase the budget, primarily through the restoration of government control over leading companies taken away through unlawful privatization. To nationalize the country's natural resources and make them public property.

2. To significantly raise funding levels for science, education, and health protection. To earmark the necessary means for the armed forces and all institutions responsible for the security of both the nation and its people.

3. To tighten executive discipline. To create a full-fledged system of public and government control. To give the Federal Assembly powers to control the enforcement of the law and to conduct parliamentary investigations. To create conditions for the effective efforts of the judicial system, prosecutor's offices, and law-enforcement agencies to protect the rights and liberties of the individual.

4. To strengthen the economic and intellectual foundations of the state. To guarantee true freedom of speech. To stop the anti-state propaganda dominating national TV and radio. To guarantee free comparison of all points of view and unbiased coverage of news and events. To set up supervisory councils in the government-owned media outlets for this purpose.

5. To mercilessly suppress separatist and terrorist forces. To resolutely stop the implementation of a strategy of tension aimed at creating an atmosphere of lawlessness, fear, and apathy and the destruction of the foundations of the state system and morals.

End 'Beggarly Conditions' for the Armed Forces

The respected Russian economist Stanislav Menshikov published the article "Playing with Defense Money Led to Kursk Disaster," in the Moscow Tribune of Aug. 25.

While the immediate causes of the Kursk submarine disaster are probably technical, or results of human error or sabotage of some sort, the larger and more important lesson is that Russia has not been spending enough money and resources on maintaining its defense capacity in an adequate condition. The Northern Fleet . . . reports that so far it has been receiving less than 10% of its funding requirements. . . . Under such conditions tragic incidents such as the one that happened are bound to happen and it is sheer luck that they have not occurred more often.

Beggarly conditions are not peculiar to the Northern Fleet, but are shared by the armed forces in general. . . . Another result is the current pressure to scrap most of the nation's nuclear arsenal, eliminate ground anti-aircraft defenses, and

France's Védrine: Putin Passed a Difficult Test

French Foreign Minister Hubert Védrine presented his insights into President Vladimir Putin's handling of the *Kursk* crisis, during an interview on Aug. 29 with Europe 1 radio. He rejected the idea that Putin had waited a too long before requesting Western help because of his "mistrust" of the West. Given the limited information Putin had at that point, Védrine could only suggest that the Russian Navy did not communicate adequate information on the catastrophe to Putin with sufficient haste.

Europe 1 asked whether Putin was facing up to his first crisis as a leader, to which Védrine replied that Putin had done so. Again stating that his knowledge was limited, Védrine said, however, that his "intuition" was that Putin reacted "well and quickly" once he had all information in hand. Védrine continued, Putin spoke to the Russians, as no other leader had spoken to them before, acknowledging his portion of responsibility in the mishandling of the catastrophe, but, at the same time, counterattacking against the Russian oligarchs.

This entire affair, he said, is taking place in the midst of a struggle for power in Moscow: Putin has not yet asserted his power over the politicians, the military, the oligarchs, and the mafia, offering his evaluation that "this drama will be an episode in the establishment of real power for Putin." —*Christine Bierre*

after the *Kursk* catastrophe even demands to cancel plans to expand the nuclear submarine fleet.

It is useless to blame Mr. Putin for this sorry state of affairs, which he inherited from the Yeltsin Administration. Throughout the 1990s, rigid financial policies were actively strangling whatever remained of the military establishment after the initial Gaidar shock. The defense budget was sharply reduced, in line with the new concept of national security, but normally only half or less of these official budgetary appropriations were actually allocated to the armed forces by the Finance Ministry, particularly under Mr. Chubais. These policies were pursued by the same liberals who are today castigating the government and the President for inattention or worse toward the *Kursk* crew and the “useless” war in Chechnya. And who are also claiming (with support from foreign sympathizers) that Russia is not in a position to pay for the military posture of a great power and should further reduce its nuclear shield.

The Putin administration is rightly disregarding these claims. It seems to agree with the view that in a growing economy the nation can afford to spend more on defense and slowly mend the financial condition of its armed forces. Draft budget figures for 2001 suggest that the government intends to raise defense expenditure from this year’s 2.39% of GDP to 2.66%. . . . In real terms this entails a yearly boost of 17%. Nothing like this has happened before Putin, and it is certainly a step in the right direction.

But is this a genuine change of heart in the Finance Ministry, or is it simply playing the numbers game to satisfy the President and the defense establishment? According to Defense Minister Igor Sergeyev, the military are still getting less than half of the appropriated monies. How much will the military really receive in 2001? The numbers game can easily reduce the projected 52 billion rubles increase in the defense budget to zero if left out of public control. These issues have never been seriously raised and discussed in public, as they should have been. But it is they that underlie the fate of the nation’s submarines and their crews, rather than which official should be where at the time when a disaster happens.

It should be stressed that we are not advocating a resumption of the armaments race, but simply arguing in favor of allocating adequate resources for defense.

Collision Was the ‘Most Probable’ Cause

On Aug. 29, the website of the Russian weekly Zavtra, known for its ties to Russian military intelligence, posted an undated report, described as “a report on the course of the investigation of the loss of the nuclear submarine Kursk.” An editorial note described the document as having been received from “our friends in naval intelligence.” The authenticity of the report, or parts of it, has not been verified, but elements of it coincide with remarks made several days earlier by Russian Defense Minister Marshal Igor Sergeyev (noting three explo-

sions, not two, and calling a collision “the main theory” among ten being analyzed), and with accounts previously leaked through the daily Segodnya. The text of the report was published without commentary by Zavtra, and is translated here in full:

According to the available data, the current main version of the loss of the APRK [nuclear submarine missile cruiser] *Kursk* is this. The submarine sustained catastrophic damage as the result of the detonation of a portion of the ammunition in its forward torpedo compartment, which caused extensive destruction to the hull in the area of the first and second compartments and broke the hermetic seal of the bulkheads of the third and fourth compartments, leading to the rapid (within 110-120 seconds) sinking of the ship and the death of the crew.

The following main possible causes of such an explosion can be listed, through analysis.

Detonation of part of the ammunition (missiles and torpedoes, which are mounted on special racks) as a result of a mechanical impact. For example, a dynamic blow from a hard-hulled ship at a speed of over 40 kilometers per hour is capable of tearing these objects from their installations. Under these conditions, so could a collision with the sea bottom, caused by the loss of floatability, as a result of a command error or the rapid flooding of the forward compartments.

Detonation of part of the ammunition (missiles, torpedoes) by another explosion. This could be a direct hit on the APRK by a missile or torpedo in the region of the first compartment, with a subsequent shock wave impact on one or several of the warheads, mounted on racks along the side.

The explosion of one of the warheads by an applied charge, equivalent to 200-300 grams of TNT.

The detonation on board the APRK of free hydrogen, resulting from a leak in a battery, a fire, and the detonation of part of a weapon.

Available records from hydroacoustical instruments indicate that three explosions were recorded in the vicinity of the sinking of the APRK *Kursk*. The first, at 07:30 on Aug. 12, was small—the equivalent of 300 grams of TNT. The second, 145 seconds later, was very powerful—up to 1,700 kilograms of TNT equivalent. And the third, 45 minutes and 18 seconds later, was small—the equivalent of 400 grams of TNT. The first and second were identified with the location of the *Kursk*, with a margin of error of plus or minus 150 meters. The third was recorded at approximately 700-1,000 meters from the point, where the APRK *Kursk* is located.

Acoustical instruments also recorded a loud noise between the first and second explosions, which may be identified as the sound of water penetrating the hull.

The above-mentioned evidence allows us to conclude that there appears to be insufficient evidence, at present, for the version of the APRK *Kursk*’s being struck by a missile, an explosion of hydrogen, or a mine. The time interval between the first two explosions cannot be explained under

that scenario. The available evidence indicates that the probable cause of the detonation of a warhead in the first torpedo compartment could have been the collision of the APRK *Kursk* with the bottom of the Barents Sea, following the first explosion, at 07:30 on the morning of Aug. 12. The total absence of any attempts whatsoever by the crew of the submarine, during the subsequent 145 seconds, to activate any rescue equipment or emergency signals indicates that the submarine lost guidance within the first 10-20 seconds after the beginning of the catastrophe, which could have resulted only from the rapid total flooding (or burning) of the second compartment, where the command point is located, which has four levels and a total volume of 500 cubic meters. Such extensive destruction of the APRK by the small explosion, recorded at 07:30, is highly improbable. Calculations show that the strength of the submarine's hull and its reserve viability make it possible to maintain command of such ships, under conditions of one compartment being hit by a guided weapon, with a warhead having an explosive charge of up to 500 kg TNT equivalent. Therefore, this explosion should correctly be viewed not as the cause of the loss of the APRK *Kursk*, but as one of the symptoms of the unfolding catastrophe. According to data from the designers, such an explosion could have been caused by a mechanical blow to one of the high-pressure tanks, located between the outer skin and the hull in the region of the bulkhead between the first and second compartments.

In that case, the version of a collision between the APRK *Kursk* and an underwater object becomes the most probable.

According to radio intelligence data and acoustical scans, two U.S. nuclear submarines were present in the region where the Northern Fleet of the Russian Federation Navy was conducting maneuvers, from Aug. 7 through 12. One of them was a Los Angeles-class submarine, and the other is presumptively identified as a Sea Wolf. The Norwegian Navy's intelligence ship *Mariata* was also working the area, as were five Orion reconnaissance aircraft.

Almost immediately after the catastrophe with the APRK *Kursk*, the intelligence-gathering activity abruptly stopped, which is atypical of NATO naval operations in such situations, which customarily attempt to collect as much detailed information as possible, under such circumstances. Instead, it may be stated, that NATO naval forces were pulled out of the area of the exercises and withdrawn to bases in Norway. Then, less than two days after the APRK disaster, the United States offered to airlift its rescue equipment into the area of the disaster. Despite the Russian side's declining U.S. Navy participation in the rescue operation, a group of submarine specialists, with equipment, was transferred from their base at Norfolk (U.S.A.) to Great Britain, and thence to Norway.

Virtually immediately after the catastrophe with the APRK *Kursk*, the American nuclear submarines left the area of the exercises, but from that moment on, all information

ceased about one of the submarines that had been there. The *Ohio* [sic; it was the *Memphis*], a Los Angeles-class submarine, entered a base in Norway, where there was a change of crew. The location of the second, Sea Wolf-class submarine, has not yet been established. There is virtually no available evidence about it, from the moment the search and rescue operation began.

Calculations show that the strength (type of steel alloys, thickness of the hull) and construction features of some types of U.S. submarines (ice-breaking defenses, augmented speed) allow for contingencies, where the damage sustained in the event of a collision with an oncoming vessel, at a large angle of attack, relative to the axis of the ship being struck, would not be catastrophic for the ramming submarine.

In the situation of the APRK *Kursk*, the probable scenario is that the ramming submarine, effectively tearing into the cruiser where the first and second compartments adjoin, was "lifted" by it and pushed to the surface, which gave the crew time to organize a fight to survive, while simultaneously becoming an extra "load" on the damaged *Kursk*, accelerating the flooding of its damaged compartments and increasing the angle at which it sank.

All of this backs the version of the loss of the APRK *Kursk* as a result of a collision with a foreign nuclear submarine, as the main version.

GENOCIDE RUSSIA AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER



Russia in the 1990s: "The rate of annual population loss has been more than double the rate of loss during the period of Stalinist repression and mass famine in the first half of the 1930s . . . There has been nothing like this in the thousand-year history of Russia."

—Sergei Glazyev

Paperback, with a preface by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

\$20

Order #ER 2267



Economist Dr. Sergei Glazyev was Minister of Foreign Economic Relations in Boris Yeltsin's first cabinet, and was the only member of the government to resign in protest of the abolition of Parliament in 1993.

Order from

EIR News Service, Inc.

P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

OR Order by phone, toll-free: **888-EIR-3258**

OR Send e-mail with Visa or MasterCard number and expiration date to: **eirns@larouchepub.com**

Shipping and handling: \$4.00 for first book, \$1.00 for each additional book.