

Interview: Lyndon LaRouche



Clinton's Moscow trip is a transition to policy changes

Lyndon LaRouche was interviewed on the weekly radio program "EIR Talks" on Jan. 5. The interviewer is Mel Klenetsky.

EIR: President Clinton is about to make a trip to Moscow, a major summit meeting. He's going to be going over to the NATO summit meeting as well, where he's going to be discussing his "Partnership for Peace" proposal with the eastern European and NATO countries. What do you expect will occur in these discussions?

LaRouche: Well, it's hard to say. What *will* occur, is the bad effects of a partial, inconclusive, and therefore unworkable proposal. This does not address the issue.

We have the same thing on the conflicts around the administration which surfaced after Clinton's speech referencing the problem and, more notably, Vice President Al Gore's statements denouncing the International Monetary Fund policies applied to Russia, in his press conferences from Russia.

There's division in the administration, and there's division in the U.S. establishment, and elsewhere, about this IMF policy. And that is key to the waffling on the issue of NATO membership for the relevant eastern European countries, specifically Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary, which are the test cases.

The problem here is that Russia is being asset-stripped; that is, Russian assets are being *stolen* by Russians working with people like George Soros. These people take a Russian asset, get it for a song, way below its cost of replacement, flood the thing on the international market, such as raw materials, gold, jewelry, everything; get a profit, because they bought it so cheap, which is the Soros operation; and put their money in Swiss banks.

The result is, Russia is being bankrupted.

However, look at what Soros is doing. Soros has become a big factor in the U.S. real estate market. Where is he getting the money? It's stolen from eastern Europe; from Poland, from the Czech Republic, from Hungary, from Russia. Actually, Soros, morally, is stealing. He's stealing on the scale of Genghis Khan, together with all his little helping-men there who do that. They take the money from their stealing and the net proceeds float into the United States into the

derivatives market.

Now look at the administration. The administration has tremendous pressure, not so much from Wall Street, not just from the Treasury or from the Federal Reserve, but from Goldman Sachs et al., the big-money people who handle the mutual funds money. These people, as are people in Europe, such as Swiss bankers, are like alcoholics when it comes to this kind of asset-stripping operation, derivatives operation. They *absolutely, fanatically must have their next drink*; in this case, of more speculation and more looting. As long as they get their next drink in the next hour, they don't care what happens tomorrow. The fact that they're going to be drunk or dead or hung over or lose their job tomorrow or lose their family, does not deter them from taking that drink. And the Clinton administration is under tremendous pressure from those parts of the establishment, within the United States and abroad, which are insisting on the next drink of this free-trade derivatives bubble.

As a result of that, U.S. Russian policy, ever since Robert Strauss was sent to Moscow as U.S. ambassador by George Bush, has been that the profits from looting Russia in the manner typified by Soros and his friends, *are a vital strategic asset of the United States*, which goes together with the views of those who say that by destroying Russia economically, we're eliminating a potential adversary in the future.

What then happens, of course, is that the Russians, not being exactly stupid, recognize this process. And those who are not themselves intoxicated with stealing, such as the Russian friends of Soros and so forth, or [Yegor] Gaidar, say, "We're being destroyed deliberately by Washington and London and especially Washington."

This feeds into the military-security forces base which owns Boris Yeltsin, Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, and so forth, saying, "We're going to destroy the West. These guys are trying to kill us, and we are not going to be killed. We have thermonuclear and other weapons, and we're not going to be pushed around." Thus, they make ugly noises about NATO operations in eastern Europe, i.e., Poland wants to join NATO, the United States says, "No." NATO says, "No. You can have this associate membership, you can have this junior, Cub Scout membership, but you can't join the Boy Scouts."

And the same thing is said to the Czech Republic, to Hungary, and so forth.

Now, what Clinton is given, at this point, unless he changes in midstream, is a package of taking over associate Cub Scout members to people who want to join the Boy Scouts; and he's telling them this is a good thing. And they're looking at what they're getting, and they're looking at what they're *not* getting, which they say they desperately need, which people like Zbigniew Brzezinski, for example, would say, "Yes, they desperately need this."

So it's a failed package. But we can't say the Clinton administration is entirely a failure on that point. What you have to do, is look at a process which is ongoing.

The Clinton administration has been, in foreign policy, sailing along largely on the basis of, as the *New York Times* once described it, "Bush policies on autopilot." That has been the essential character of U.S. foreign policy up to this point. The Clinton administration is making some moves which propose to change that from the Bush-Thatcher policies. These changes are coming slowly and with a dangerous slowness, and that's what's here.

Now, Clinton is going to go to Moscow in the whole process. And in Moscow I think the President will at least be moved toward an active perception of some of the problems which are arising over there, he and his associates who make the trip, and will look at the situation somewhat differently then, as Al Gore came to, than he does perhaps at this moment.

So I think that this is not a trip that's going to *settle* a policy, this is a trip which may appear to seem to settle a policy, but which will actually be a transition to a next round of rapid changes in U.S. policy.

EIR: President Clinton is coming under increasing criticisms and fire. There is a call for a special prosecutor now by Sen. Robert Dole (R-Kan.) and Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), and even moderate Republicans such as Rep. Jim Leach (R-Iowa), to look into the Whitewater Development issue. Is this a partisan operation or is it a larger operation? Why do so many people want to expose this at this time? It's an old story.

LaRouche: Why assume that it's "so many people"? They're *not* so many people, only a few people.

This operation was started through the new magazine or newly surfaced magazine which was really coasting along for years at about 30,000 circulation, which suddenly zoomed to a very large circulation, relatively speaking, zooming up toward 100,000.

This is a magazine called the *American Spectator*, run by a known entity called Terrell, a magazine which zoomed to prominence when it ran a featured investigative reporter's story on Anita Hill. That boosted its newsstand circulation.

More recently, it did a story by a guy called Brock, this story against Clinton. The story sat there, and it was picked

up by CNN and the *New Republic*. CNN ran this story for over a day, 36 hours approximately, repeatedly: bang, bang, bang, bang. That is, Jane Fonda's husband's network ran the story for about 36 hours. The story then took off, and the major media picked it up.

This is not a "breaking news story"; this, buddy, is an intelligence operation, the use of a news story in an attempt to destabilize a government—it happens all the time. And that's what's going on.

The cottage-industry people develop stories; then patrons in the mass media who are politically motivated, get one or two of the mass media to break the story out of the cottage-industry, small-publication area into major national news. The news media then goes on a feeding frenzy with the story. They don't care what the truth is; all they want to do is, be the first in the ballgame around the story. It's orchestrated.

This is coming from Bush-league people. I don't know where Bush stands on it, but I can say: This is Bush-league people out to destroy Clinton. The reason they're out to destroy Clinton—not the reason that Brock did the story with the *American Spectator*, but the reason it was picked up by CNN, by Jane Fonda's husband's network to attack Clinton—has to do with Clinton's administration's struggle over policy. And these people, not purely for 1994 electoral reasons, although that's a factor on the part of some Republicans who jump in on the feeding frenzy, but because they're trying to destabilize the Clinton administration, because they want their policy toward Russia and related policies to stay in place, and they don't want Clinton touching those policies, say, "We'll fix this bugger. We'll tie him up with a scandal, and he won't have the credibility or ability to maneuver," and that will be the case.

So look at this as what it is, which anybody who knows what this is from seeing these operations around the world: This is an intelligence operation aimed at destabilizing the Clinton administration in pretty much the same way that news media operations are used to build up Jean-Bertrand Aristide [in Haiti], who is a mass murderer and a psychotic, and so forth and so on, in various parts of the world. Old story come home. Nasty business. It should be seen for what it is. It's a dirty story used to attempt to destabilize the government of the United States; and that's the way I react to it.

For readers who wish to inform their radio stations about EIR Talks: The program is put up on satellite each week. The program is aired at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time on Satcom C5, Transponder 15, Channel 16-0. Any radio station anywhere can pull the program down either to air at the time it is put up on satellite, or to tape for later broadcast. Audio cassettes are also available from EIR press staff. The interview itself is 43 minutes long, formatted with breaks for commercials and news blocks, so that it can air over the course of an hour. For further information, call Frank Bell at (703) 777-9451.