

---

## Interview: Lyndon LaRouche

---

# Crisis in Russia reflects global breakdown crisis



Mel Klenetsky interviewed Lyndon LaRouche on the weekly radio program "EIR Talks" on Sept. 22.

**EIR:** On Sept. 21, Russian President Boris Yeltsin disbanded Parliament until elections are held on Dec. 11-12. What's going on?

**LaRouche:** The evaluation that I have from inside Moscow at a high level, is that Yeltsin is in, in military terms, flight forward. This obviously occurred with fore-discussion with the government of the United States and others; maybe not in all the details, but certainly a great deal of it was discussed. And it was immediately pre-qualified, to try to make it work, by getting an alignment of various governments on it.

The other aspect of this which has to be taken into account to appreciate the weight of it, is the Polish elections, which involved an estimated 40% abstention by voters . . . which produced a de facto communist return to power—maybe as a minority government, who knows what.

The point is that the shock therapy, the International Monetary Fund conditionalities, are producing an effect in Russia which we see forecast in the crisis developments in Poland and elsewhere. That's producing a social crisis. The efforts now are to implement political measures to put lids on the social and economic crises generated by this insane Sen. Phil Gramm- or Thatcher-type thinking. And this has produced a coup and an attempted counter-coup and who knows what else to come in Moscow.

This occurs at a time when the United States is running blind. Washington is saying the democracy policy is going to work, the economic policy is going to work, the Russia policy is going to work—well, none of them are going to work. But Washington *insists* on being optimistic about those results.

And so we have a pattern of governments and leading nations which are all ready to fall, not only in Moscow, in the former communist countries of eastern Europe, but in Germany, where the government is very vulnerable; Italy, of course; Spain; Greece; Britain; the Canadian government is going through an overturn; and the governments of South and Central America, including, ultimately, the Clinton administration if it continues on this track.

We have come to a turning point. The United States is whistling in the dark on military policy, saying that Russia is

only a regional military power. Russia is emerging again as a great thermonuclear global power; it's still exercising those military capabilities, albeit on a reduced scale. We have a crisis in China of undetermined magnitude. And Washington is whistling as it walks by its own graveyard—at least, that's the way things are going now. And the Russian situation reflects the fact that none of the policies which are currently popular with the U.S. press are going to work. These policies, as policy complexes, are coming to the end of their road.

**EIR:** Would you say that the return of Yegor Gaidar indicates a return to shock therapy economic policies?

**LaRouche:** That's what the U.S. press and official Washington will tend to say. But that's nonsense. Gaidar returned because he's popular among the western powers, because Yeltsin received a little pocket money from the United States, because the Russians are playing the situation for all they can; and so he is a *symptom* of Yeltsin's relationship with the government of the United States. That's all he represents. He represents *nothing* in and of himself. On the Russian side, he represents the fact that they have not decided what policy they're going to follow. But Washington has it completely wrong.

**EIR:** There is a struggle between Yeltsin and the Parliament. Some say there's a bigger struggle between the regions and the Moscow center. What does this indicate?

**LaRouche:** The crisis in Russia is a reflection of a global breakdown crisis, which, contrary to some complacent and foolish fellows in the United States, includes the United States. *The U.S. economy is collapsing.* The world economy is collapsing. I'm talking about physical economy. The growing magnitude of so-called GNP is measured largely in fictitious paper, that is, paper values which have nothing behind them, or an increase in paper values which has nothing behind it.

The real economy is collapsing. Employment is collapsing. Business is collapsing. The tax revenue base is collapsing in the United States. The per capita real purchasing power per family is collapsing.

The only thing that's increasing, is these so-called paper markets, speculative market values, a financial bubble. The

same situation is true in Europe. It's catastrophic on the continent of Europe. The same thing is true in China; China is headed toward a possible civil war, dissolution. Not that these will necessarily occur, but this is the direction in which things are moving. Japan is retrenching. Go on around the world the same way.

So what is happening in Russia, is a reflection of a general breakdown crisis of physical economy and also of political institutions around the world. This is accompanied by the fact that the so-called political class in leading European countries and others, is collapsing. Therefore, you have a crisis of indecision in Washington. The political class in Washington is disintegrating. We see a similar phenomenon in Germany. Since the Brandt education reforms of 1970, Germany has been going downhill in terms of renewing the leading political class and the economic and other intellectual cadres of the country.

France is similar, since 1963-68, with the educational reforms there, which led to the bringing down of de Gaulle, and then other problems—an erosive process.

Italy—a similar kind of process. The country is being disintegrated, partly from the outside. Britain—the political class is in a crisis. The continuation of the monarchy is in question; all kinds of things.

So we have a general breakdown crisis, a physical economic breakdown crisis, which is affecting everything; we're on the verge of the greatest financial blowout in history, at least in modern history in relative scale. In absolute scale, of course, in history as a whole.

The ruling political classes, institutions of countries, are disintegrating. That is, the group of powerful families, the Establishment and their foundation hangers-on, are disintegrating. So as you get to the age group under 50, and even under 60, you get to people who are no longer capable of functioning as those who are now either deceased or in their late 60s or 70s, say, my generation or older. We have a younger generation which is showing the effects of miseducation, disorientation, confusion, of the New Age policy. They simply just don't know how to handle these kinds of things, and they're not realistic. The ruling political class in all of these countries is showing the loss of power to govern.

You may have a turn on the Republican side to [Senate Minority Leader Robert] Dole. Dole is about 73 years of age. He is not the greatest genius in the world, but he is an old-style political-class figure; and you may find a popular turn, back toward people in the over-60, over-65 age group as a replacement political leadership of institutions in the United States, because the younger generation now in power doesn't seem to be able to handle the situation. And that's true all around the world.

**EIR:** Some western governments are looking at the GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] and NAFTA [North American Free Trade Agreement] as a panacea for

their problems. Can this possibly help?

**LaRouche:** No, it cannot help. It can only make things worse. I see absolute insanity erupting from among circles which I used to think were quite sane. The insanity takes the form of the desperate effort to reconcile themselves intellectually with the idea that NAFTA and GATT are inevitable.

On the great sucking sound theme as such, Ross Perot is absolutely correct. We are shipping jobs and businesses out of the United States into developing sector countries, in search of cheap labor—essentially, slave labor. The argument is that this means that the goods that Americans consume, imported from Mexico, China, and so forth, will be cheaper than if those goods were produced in American firms in the United States by American labor.

The question is, where are the American firms, and where is the American population going to find the purchasing power to buy these goods? Where is the government going to find the tax revenue base to support even the existing levels of federal, state, and local budgets? If we do not have a tax revenue base which is generated primarily by agriculture, industry, and infrastructure, and other kinds of employment that benefit from that, we don't have the ability to support a country. If we do not provide skilled employment—technologically progressive skilled employment—where do we find the means to increase our productivity? To increase our purchasing power to meet our needs? To resist the attrition of old technologies? We don't.

The same thing is true for Germany or France or Italy. This idea of exporting jobs to places where the cost of labor is ostensibly cheaper is one of the greatest pieces of insanity ever conceived. The idea is to protect your national economy so that within your nation, you have national economic security in the sense that you either *produce* what you need for domestic manufacturing business and producers' consumption and households' consumption, or you produce a surplus of something which can be exchanged on the world market for some of the things you need for your market basket, such as, say, bananas for the breakfast table. We don't grow them much in the United States; we could, with hothouses and with a lot of potassium fertilization of the soil. But it's much better to get them from Nicaragua or Panama than it is to get them in the United States. So we ship something to Panama, Nicaragua, whatnot, to get our bananas—we are not violating national economic self-sufficiency. But if you export your jobs in general, if you make yourself dependent in net upon what you can steal from other parts of the world by monetary jiggery-pokery, then your nation is going downhill.

You see this in education, with this absolute lunacy of cutting education to eliminate the cognitive elements of education. Let me just give you an example of that. Suppose I were to insist, as President, that every teacher in the United States could not be federally certified as qualified to teach unless they could pass a basic examination, number one, in plane and solid geometry; two, unless they could pass an

examination in U.S. and world history, which would ask the prospective teacher to answer such questions as, for example, "What was the evidence which caused American officials to believe that the British government was behind British agent Booth's assassination of Abraham Lincoln?" Questions of that sort.

If a person could not answer such ordinary questions to such examinations competently, they would not be recognized as qualified for the teaching profession. If we were to do that, you would eliminate most of the teachers in the school systems today, which is merely a way of saying that most teachers in the school systems today are not qualified to teach—at least not in a general way.

Now they're shifting away from what they call cognitive education, that is, education of the mind, to brainwashing of emotional attitudes, which is called "outcome-based education," or "core curriculum," or "world class education." We are destroying our children. We are destroying our labor force. And that goes along with deindustrialization and shipping our work out to coolies abroad, and then training our people to be fit for nothing here, with our children and our grandchildren to be good for nothing but slave-labor coolies into the next century.

So that is the most stupid thing imaginable.

Now, we are coming up to a point where I think GATT is going to flop. NAFTA is certainly going to flop. We have a Canadian election coming up, and unless somebody puts some bayonets in there to force the voters to go against their inclination, the Campbell government, the pro-NAFTA government of Canada, is going to be out. GATT is virtually an unworkable, dead letter. It's being held together by baling wire and blow torches right now. But if the Canadian elections upset NAFTA, that will be part of a process which will ensure that GATT will blow up too. So everything on which the U.S. government is presumably *presently* premising the idea of a political consensus is about to go down the tubes.

**EIR:** In the 1970s, Henry Kissinger had a program for using food as a strategic weapon. Is this what the restructuring policy and GATT is all about?

**LaRouche:** That's only part of it. It's population control. Kissinger, of course, was for starving most of the people who have darker skin colors, or letting epidemic diseases take over the famine-ridden and cut down the numbers. There are people who are talking about reducing the U.S. population down to 130 million; there are those who are talking about reducing the world population to below 1 billion by methods of famine and epidemic disease. Kissinger is a leader in that, and that is very much international U.N. policy today. . . .

In the context of the export of jobs and things of that sort, there is a plan simply to use up the human race, for example, in Mexico or in China. Let's take China. We've mentioned this before in our discussions. You have about 400 million adult Chinese in the interior who may be considered actually

or imminently surplus with respect to agricultural production as it's now programmed. These people are being funneled in streams of millions of persons toward Guangdong, Hainan, Shanghai, and so forth.

It reminds me, with an awful sensation of *déjà vu*, of the cattle cars carrying the Jews from the Warsaw Ghetto to the slave-labor camps where most of them died. Perhaps the political and physical condition of Chinese coolies of this sort, going into Chinese *maquiladoras*, is better than that of the unfortunate victims of the Nazi ethnic cleansing policy, but the principle is the same.

We have people going to work at wages which, by and large, as in the Mexican *maquiladoras*, are below the cost at which a working adult can support a family—or even himself or herself—in an adequate standard of living by local standards. When we employ people so, we are effectively *melting down* living human bodies for whatever profit we can squeeze out of them—like squeezing lemon juice out of a lemon. We're talking about the scale in China of about 400 million people who face at least the prospect of that kind of population reduction. The same is true in most of the world. That is the basis for this notion of cheap labor outside the United States.

We're destroying the United States; we're destroying the interior of western Europe. We're destroying the possibility, possibly, of human life on this planet (at least as we have known it in the past 400-500 years) by these kinds of policies.

The solution is only to go back to what I have proposed and others have endorsed, which is paralleled by the views of some others, such as the Vatican.

We've got to go to a rule of this planet by moral natural law. And by natural law, I mean the demonstration that humanity is *distinct* from the beasts by the fact that humanity, through development of reason, can alter human behavior collectively, through individual scientific and related discoveries, to increase man's power over nature per capita and per square kilometer.

That is the way the human race has survived for the past 2.2 million years or so. And if we abandon that, we are not going to survive now.

Go back to the idea that the individual, by virtue of containing this potential for reason which no animal has, that the individual is in the image of God as Creator—the son of God in that respect—and that the family, which is the instrument of birth and nurture of these young individuals into and through adolescence, therefore must be an absolutely protected institution; that anyone who wants to come in from the outside and break up the family, or put it under the administration of a local school counselor under outcome-based education, that such people must be imprisoned or whatever is necessary, to keep them away from "messing with the families," as we'd say.

In order to have nations which function, we must have sovereign nation-state republics, constitutional republics,

which are committed to these principles of law, as our Declaration of Independence and the Preamble of our Constitution commit us; and that these states must have absolute sovereignty, and be the vehicle by which the people rule themselves through participation in their own national sovereignty; that we must have agreement among such sovereign nation-state republics upon this planet, to agree that those are the principles by which each nation may conduct its affairs, and those are the principles of natural law which should govern relations among states on this planet. Get rid of this New Age, satanic hocus-pocus, which is becoming so popular recently in the name of George Bush's and Margaret Thatcher's globalism.

NAFTA and GATT are simply instruments of globalism, which are aimed to destroy, in the name of democracy, in the name of free trade, the national sovereignty of states; to destroy the family, as outcome-based education, a concoction of Satanists working through the United Nations, typifies the attempt to destroy the idea of the individual as sacred.

**EIR:** President Clinton seems to think he has a program for health reform. Unfortunately, the program includes almost \$250 billion in cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. Can this program possibly fly, and if it does, what are the implications?

**LaRouche:** Fly or not, it's an Auschwitz program. The proposition is very simple. If I kill off the people who are over 65 years of age, which is a growing segment of the U.S. population and the part of the population which requires the highest per capita rate of health care; if I also kill off people who are over 40, over 50, or whatnot, who are severely chronically ill or severely incapacitated, then I will reduce the national health care cost per capita for the survivors of this genocidal program, and thus I may have the funds available for free band-aids or low-level medical care for the survivors.

But whatever the health plan is that's voted in—and it will be voted in with the idea of budget-balancing as part of the health care program (and some people have already said that the health care program must cut the federal budget)—if that goes into effect, it means that there will be a perceptibly increasing similarity between such a health care package and what Hitler did to the so-called useless eaters in Nazi Germany and in Nazi-occupied territories in Europe.

I don't care what they call it. If they are out to make these kinds of cuts in care for those who need it by trying to lop off the most costly part of health care, which is generally the chronically ill, seriously ill, and those over 60 or 65, while cutting down Social Security for the aged, you're going to increase the death rate among your parents and grandparents at a catastrophic rate, just as the victims, the so-called useless eaters, were killed off by the Nazis in the Nazi-occupied parts of wartime Europe. And morally, that's where it goes.

I don't know what is in Mr. Clinton or Mrs. Clinton's minds on this. They may have amiable intentions, but the

realities are such that as long as we are operating under this present New Age policy, however amiable the intention of the sponsors of the health care package, it is going to be a disaster unless we change fundamentally, and get away from this New Age post-industrial policy and GATT and NAFTA-like policies.

**EIR:** Tim Wirth, the counselor to the State Department, addressed President Clinton's new drug policy. He's talking about revising the policy from interdiction to going at the problem at the sources in terms of counseling. Is this part of this New Age approach to social problems?

**LaRouche:** Counseling is a completely worthless expenditure. Cut it out. Don't kid yourself. The counseling programs of which I know, will actually increase the propensity for use of drugs—or suicide. Because the counseling methods which are used, such as in the DARE [Drug Abuse Resistance Education] program, which is part of the same business, actually lowers the intrinsic self-esteem of the person. And if I lower the intrinsic self-esteem of the person, as these drug-counseling programs do, then I'm going to have a person who is weaker, who lacks will power.

I'll give an example of this. There's a case up in Washington of a guy who was suing in small claims court for something like \$1,300 from the tobacco company, which was the price of a cigarette rejection program, for kicking the habit.

Obviously, knowing what cigarette habits are, anyone who wishes to kick the habit of smoking a cigarette, can kick that on the instant. He looks at the cigarette, he crushes it, puts it out; takes the pack, crushes it, gets rid of it; and never takes a cigarette for the rest of his life.

If he wishes to do that, he can do that. If he can't do that, it's because he lacks will power. And I don't think it was right for a court to give somebody compensation for the price of a kick-the-habit cigarette course, because that simply indicated that they lacked the will power to do it themselves. And the cigarette companies are not to blame for their lack of will power.

The same thing is true generally in drugs. Yes, there is need for medical and other assistance in dealing with the aftereffects of a recreational drug habit; sometimes this is very severe. That's needed. But, essentially, the drug policy in the United States since about 1983 has been fraudulent. When I devised an anti-drug program, I devised first of all exposing the nature of the problem, how it came about. There was no drug problem in the United States prior to 1964. It was incidental; it was not a general cultural drug problem; it didn't exist. The drugs existed, but the problem didn't exist.

It was the New Age counterculture, the rock-drug-sex counterculture, and other things, that brought it in. So expose that: This is an attempt to destroy the nation by people who had New Age ideas. The way to deal with it otherwise is by interdiction, and by assisting countries which were the victims of the growing drug traffic.