
Interview: Gen. Andrei Nikolayev

Russian candidate: Military professionals can help solve the crisis

Gen. Andrei Nikolayev heads "The Union of People's Power and Labor," one of 28 electoral blocs running in the Dec. 19 Russian State Duma (lower house of Parliament) elections. A career military officer, now 50, General Nikolayev is a graduate of the Frunze Military Academy and the Military Academy of the U.S.S.R. Armed Forces General Staff. In 1992-93, he served at the General Staff of the Russian Armed Forces, including as its First Deputy Chief. From 1993 to 1997, he was Commander-in-Chief of the Border Troops of the Russian Federation, then director of the country's Federal Border Service. General Nikolayev resigned from active duty in December 1997. He was elected to the State Duma from a suburban Moscow district in a by-election in April 1998.

Prof. Taras Muranivsky interviewed Gen. Nikolayev for EIR on Oct. 19, 1999 in Moscow. This is Part I of their dialogue.

Muranivsky: Andrei Ivanovich, I would like to ask you to answer a number of questions for *Executive Intelligence Review* magazine, founded by the well-known American economist and politician Lyndon LaRouche, who is currently a candidate for U.S. President in the year 2000 from the independent wing of the Democratic Party. *EIR* circulates abroad, as well as in the United States, including in Congress and at the White House. It has some 100 readers in Russia, in scientific, government, and parliamentary circles.

Nikolayev: Very well. I shall try to answer your questions, if you indicate what they are.

Muranivsky: Since you are a military man, Andrei Ivanovich, I would like to begin with the question of the role of military men in politics. There are well-known cases of military men coming to power at critical moments in history. I have in mind not only General Pinochet's junta or other military coups, from Latin American countries to today's Pakistan. After the Second World War, General Eisenhower was elected President of the United States, while General de Gaulle was elected President of France. The latter's accomplishments included his effective economic policy, based on the principles of indicative planning. This policy made it possible not only to revive the economy of France, which had been destroyed by war, but also to release Algeria from colo-

nial dependency. Might it be, that military men have some superior qualities in politics, compared with civilians?

The second group of questions concerns the all-Russian political and social movement that you head, "The Union of People's Power and Labor," your collaboration with Academician S.N. Fyodorov, chairman of the "Workers' Self-Management" party, and your joint electoral bloc. How do you define your strategic tasks, and what are your tactics? I mean all aspects: economic, political, your view of military doctrine, especially the new one, and the mechanisms for implementation of your ideas.

Thirdly, it is natural that today one cannot omit your opinion and attitude to the problems of the Caucasus. The recently published, 12th issue of the journal you oversee, *Rossiyskoye Analiticheskoye Obozreniye (Russian Analytical Review)*, included an interview with my American colleague, Lyndon LaRouche, who believes that the hand of Britain may be discerned in the events in the Caucasus. He emphasizes that this is a continuation of the policy of British imperialism in Russia, which began in the 19th century under Palmerston. Well-known British circles, and their henchmen in the United States like Zbigniew Brzezinski, use the Wahhabites as cannon fodder.

I would also like to ask you about your resources and media access. I understood that you had hoped to have a newspaper, *Otechestvo (Fatherland)*, but that this did not work out. You have the *Russian Analytical Review*, but are there other mass media you can rely on?

Finally, it would be of interest to know your thinking on the present economic crisis. What is your strategy for an exit from the crisis? I am interested in your evaluations, broadly speaking, in economics, politics, governance, defense, security, morals, and other aspects, as they are interconnected. How do you assess the Russian crisis overall? What part is our own fault, and what is due to outside interference in our affairs? Do you think that Russia is one link in the world financial and monetary crisis, which is afflicting the planet for the third year now? These are the questions I would like you to address.

Nikolayev: With regard to military men in politics, you mentioned rather well-known people in world history, who made a significant impact. One could name other military figures in



Gen. Andrei Nikolayev: "We need laws—not the kind of law that Yeltsin doesn't give a hoot for, but laws that are observed by those in power. We need laws that are in the interest of the majority of people in the country."

politics, starting with Napoleon. You mentioned Eisenhower and de Gaulle. One could name Franco, and Pinochet. The point is, that it is not the profession that determines the role and place of a person in politics, but rather his system of views, how he looks at the world around him and at the solution of problems of the state and the society, in which he lives. It is just as natural for military professionals to enter politics as, for example, for financiers, economists, artists, people from the world of culture, or simply talented people. I think that there ought not to be an oversensitive reaction to a military professional's maturing to the level of understanding matters of state. The entry into politics of a military man, who is a disciplined and organized person, should not frighten anyone, including in Russia.

Muranivsky: I agree.

Nikolayev: It is a great misconception, to see a military man exclusively as a "strong hand." I think that there are relatively more military men, who know that military force must not be used for achieving many political aims, which should be

reached by other methods. The civilian, in a sense, places great hopes in the force of the military component, on the force of arms, because he does not encounter it in everyday life and does not realize the destructive power of arms. The military man knows this, he sees it, he senses that he is a professional, and he understands very well, that many political goals are simply not achievable by military means. Therefore, I am a convinced partisan of the view that, if we put together what has taken place in the past, with hindsight, and what we can achieve today, the entry of military men into politics is fine. Of course, the person must be up to the level of the tasks he takes on.

Muranivsky: The moral aspect is also important. Our ordinary people, civilians, developed during the Soviet period a very high opinion of an officer's honor, and simply the decency of a person in uniform. People trusted the military man as the most honest and upright person.

Nikolayev: So it should be, I think, because the very idea of military service requires total self-sacrifice from a person. It is impossible, naturally, to make a person serve for money. Imagine the territory of Russia—those far-flung borders. There are places located in the most unfavorable climatic, geographical, and other conditions. Do you think one could *make* a person serve for the miserable salary, which our officers do not even receive these days, or their families, who are with them, carrying out really the same tasks as the military men themselves? Nonetheless, people enlist in the military, because even today, the military profession remains the personification of commitment to the state. The military man does not belong to himself, in the full sense of the word, like an ordinary person. He belongs to the state; it is to him that people look, when things go badly for the country. Something happens, and they always run to the person in uniform. Therefore, I believe that it is quite possible for former military men to enter politics, including Russian politics. We often hear that there are too many military men in politics. I think there ought to be just as many, as reach the level of maturity that this requires.

One other element of this question, is that I believe it would be right to require a military man, who enters politics, to take off his military uniform. I would advocate a ban on wearing military uniforms in the State Duma or the Federation Council. On the street—be my guest. But a person should not be publicly engaged in politics, wearing epaulets. Military service precludes the kind of liberties, which the public politician allows himself. If you want to go into politics, welcome!—but, take off your uniform and hang it in the closet.

You ask about the strategy and tactics of our movement, the "Union of People's Power and Labor," our bloc, our coalition, with respect to politics, economics, and military doctrine.

The essence of what is happening in Russia today is the following. I think that there is really no economic, financial,

social, or other crisis in Russia. As a citizen of Russia, you understand very well that a country that has 14% of the world's land mass and (simplifying things somewhat) one-third of all the resources in the world, cannot be in an economic crisis. It is impossible, by definition. We are the only self-sufficient country. We have everything, which other countries lack. This means that we, as citizens, should simply understand that what we are seeing, is the result of illiterate governance of the country, the state, and society. Neither the state (as a system and instrument of power) nor society (as a social formation, and our collective interest) is being governed at all. It is a crisis of management.

Of course, it is possible to drive the best-endowed and excellent country into the same situation, by illiterate governance. If our politicians, who have been in power in Russia the past 10-12 years, were to be sent to America right now, within five years they would turn that America into the most neglected country in the world. They are capable of that. Let's export our politicians to Germany, and they will turn Germany into the most run-down country of Europe within three to five years. Then we'll understand, what the people who personify our state have been doing in politics — the President, the government, the Federal Assembly, that Supreme Soviet, the first and second sessions of the State Duma, and the political parties and movements.

What is a crisis? Remember what Professor Preobrazhensky, the hero of Mikhail Bulgakov's famous story, said, "The collapse is not in the stairwell, the collapse is in people's heads." That's us he was talking about. It should be understood that the problem, more often than not, is located not in real phenomena, but in slovenliness inside our heads. For instance, we quite seriously wanted to change everything in 500 days (remember the famous program of Yavlinsky, Shatalin, et al.): We were living in one society, and 500 days later we were going to be in another. Or, to take another example: There was capitalism in Russia until Oct. 25, 1917, and on the 26th, we woke up and there was socialism. But, nothing had changed!

It is time for us to understand that such a simplified approach to people, to their relationships, to economic construction, and to the problems that concern each person, ultimately leads to the tragedies of Russian and Soviet history. The way we do things is to say: This is bad, therefore we shall throw everything out, top to bottom, and then build a new world. We proclaim that socialism is all wrong, illiterate, and completely useless. Let's destroy it, then there will be capitalism, all our problems will be solved, and we'll be rich. The crisis we are experiencing is caused not only by the fact that the country is being run by illiterates, who are simply incapable of governing such systems, but also by the absence of goal-setting in Russian politics. What do we want to accomplish? What state do we want to live in? What kind of society do we want to build? What is my personal, specific role in the life of that state, that society?

Muranivsky: How do you, yourself, answer those questions? What is your program?

Nikolayev: Our program differs from others in its simplicity and clarity. The programs of all political parties and movements set down: the state, the economy, finances, society, and man. In our program alone, of those existing in Russia today, the order is different: man, the family, society, the state. Everything must begin with solving the problems of the individual person. We should say to our people: "Gentlemen, comrades, esteemed fellow citizens, tell us, do you really think that the President or the government can do something for you? We need all these authorities — the President, the government, the parties, legislators, and so forth — only in order to create conditions for us." That means that the authorities ought to deal with two basic problems for the people: creation of jobs, and the adoption and enforcement of laws, defending the interests of the citizens.

Regarding the first problem, we each choose a profession, while the authorities create the jobs. We find possibilities to use our intellectual and physical qualities in the best possible way for the good of the cause, for our country and our own welfare. If I can work better, I earn more and provide for myself and the family I'll have; I can acquire housing and other property. But, there are many problems that I cannot solve alone or with my family. Certain of our benefits, we redistribute in the framework of society, and we solve our problems together.

Moreover, we need a common defense, security, transport, an education system, health care, and many other things. For this, we hire the state. But, in our country everything is upside down. People work, creating a certain surplus value, after which they come to the White House [Parliament building], bang their helmets, and demand money from the government. But, insofar as they don't maintain that government, the question should be posed in a different way: "Why do we need this government, which takes our money, does nothing for us, and really just mocks us?" That is what the question of labor would look like, if it were posed properly. From this, it follows that the imperative for any authorities in power in this country, is to create jobs. But have I ever heard, from President Yeltsin or from the governments that have existed in Russia in the recent period, one single time that the main thing in Russian politics is to create jobs? Never!

Muranivsky: On the contrary, unemployment is viewed as a law of the market. In order for job-creation to become an imperative for the government, unemployment would first have to be declared a social ill, which it actually is. Our liberal economists, however, parrot the Western authors of "economics," assuring the government that an invented "natural level of unemployment" is a necessity. Therefore, instead of creating jobs, our people are proud that unemployment in Russia is no lower than in the West.

Nikolayev: Indeed, 40% of our work-capable population

The profession of builder should become the main profession in our country. I don't mean the literal sense of the word, but a builder as creator.

suffers from unemployment. There are 36 million unemployed in our country! In order to end this, the people must be told: You will live according to what you earn. We, who are in power, shall create the best possible conditions for you personally to earn. The better you work, the more vigorous society and the nation will be. And you will live better, first and foremost. That is what should be presented to people, and that is what we present. We use the term "social orientation," which means the ability to satisfy the right to education, health care, childhood, motherhood, housing, leisure time, and security. There will be as much social orientation and socialism in the country, as we earn. Not how much we demand from the government or the President. Who are they? They live on our money, they don't produce anything. Not only do they not produce, they don't govern us. And since they don't govern, we are totally abandoned, from which state of affairs all our problems derive. Thus, there should be as much socialism in the country as we really earn. If we work better, we'll live better.

The second question, which each of us would like those in power, the people we have hired, to answer, is, according to the logic of Nikolayev and his co-thinkers, the question of laws. We need laws—not the kind of law that Yeltsin doesn't give a hoot for, but laws that are observed by those in power. We need laws that are in the interest of the majority of people in the country.

The current session of the State Duma has passed 1,800 laws. Neither you, nor other citizens, are obliged to know them all. But, as a tax-paying citizen, you know quite well that if there are laws in the country, there is a certain order. Your son or grandson gets up in the morning and goes to school. That is order. Someone in your family, God forbid, falls ill. You pick up the phone and dial 03, and an ambulance comes. That is order. You and your wife go out for a walk at 8 p.m. and are not attacked by bandits. That is order. Why do you need to know that somebody adopted some laws? What you know, is that you have paid, you have hired yourself a representative, a government, and a President, and they are adopting decisions. You have work, and you have order.

Thus, law in action is order. Law, when it doesn't function, is the mess we see today.

We have two slogans on our banners, so to speak. The first is labor—jobs as an instrument for solving the country's problems in general, and as the main working goal of those in power. When Yeltsin gives a speech, he talks about what he sees. What does Clinton say? He gives an accounting of things: Today our administration would like to address the

American people with a report on what we are doing. That's how Clinton reports to the Congress. He tells them that unemployment in the United States is the lowest it has been in 40 years. He says that we have created 18 million jobs in four years, and that people's incomes are growing at double the rate of price increases. He lists these concrete actions. And the American citizen therefore says: We elected him, so that my personal business would be more effective. That is why I select someone to be in power. We should achieve the same.

Muranivsky: Andrei Ivanovich, you draw interesting parallels between Russia and the United States, and there is a kernel of truth in what you say. But, you also are aware of their problems. Therefore, I would not like our readers to see this theme as an attempt to hold up the political and economic system of the United States as a model. Please tell us your vision of our Russian economic and political problems, identified at the outset of our conversation.

Nikolayev: In politics and economics, we have nothing coherent going on in the country. Our most recent politicians may be compared with paratroopers. The airplane is flying, and you are told, "Jump!" You jump, land, take off your parachute, and ask, "What country?" The answer comes: "Russia." You say, "Come on, let's go." And everybody follows you. Then the next paratrooper jumps, lands in another place, and asks, "What country is this?" "Russia." "Let's go over there." That's in 1993. The next one jumps. "What country?" "Russia." "Let's get out of here." And we keep following. But, we never really move, we're running in place.

What's in the heads of those in power is the politics of this kind of paratrooper, who came down from the sky into a troubled country and has no idea what is happening there. They're constantly saying that we should go somewhere, but we do nothing and go nowhere. Nobody has said to us, "Look over there, that's the goal up there. We can't reach it all at once; we have to take ten steps, or fifteen. Each step is a year. In order to traverse that path, we must work. I cannot make it alone, we'll have to go together. Let's get a person who can lead us on that path."

We hire authorities for ourselves, who organize our common work. It turns out that we not only have to move forward, we also have to lay the roadway. If that's the case, it becomes clear what to do. But, in all this time, not once has a goal been defined: where we are going, in what kind of society we are going to live, what is the role of the state, and what is the role of the individual.

Russia has lived through eleven centuries, and has a path

before it, to travel farther. According to the present logic of things, we are being spun around at will, because the people spinning us are not interested in what has come before. They start each day with a clean slate. Therefore, no matter where we try to go, we get Brownian motion. If, however, what has happened in the past were forged into a vector of historical development, the path for Russia to traverse would be charted.

In books, I have sought our wellsprings, so to speak, the founts of our philosophy. I explain that the most perfectly correct German model cannot be applied in Russia, nor a Chinese model, an American one, or a Swedish. I recall meeting with some Swedes, who asked us, "Do you want to introduce Swedish socialism in Russia?" [Moscow Mayor] Luzhkov replied, "Yes," but I said, "No." "Why?" the Swedes asked in surprise. I said, "Tell me, please, do you think Americans live better than Swedes?" They said, "Yes, they live better, they are richer." So, the question arises: Why don't you live like the Americans? They say, "Because we're Swedes." And we are Russians. Therefore, we can never live like the Swedes or the Germans; we must live by our own wits.

Sometimes we fail to understand, that power in Russia is organized on two levels: state power at the federal level, and state power in the city of Moscow and the constituent territories of the Federation. Have you ever been told, where your taxes go? As an inhabitant of Moscow and a citizen, do you know for which of your taxes the central authorities are answerable to you, and for which the Mayor of Moscow? Everything is all mixed up. Nobody knows, who is responsible for what.

There are three levels, responsible for education. The central power pays, the constituent territory pays, and the local power pays. As a result, nobody pays, and teachers fail to receive their salaries for months on end. With higher education, the federal authorities are supposed to be responsible. You can receive an education in Khabarovsk, then move to Leningrad Province, and you will receive the same Russian diploma, recognized around the world.

The constituent territory should be responsible for secondary and vocational education—the province, territory, or republic. Take the question of standard textbooks. We have a situation today, where someone from Yekaterinburg, who graduated using the textbooks of Sverdlovsk Province, cannot enter an institute in Moscow, because the programs are different.

Let the local authorities take care of pre-school education. It's the same thing with roads. Let's have 12 or 15 federal highways and, finally, Russia will have an auto highway from Moscow to Vladivostok, which should be built with funds from the federal budget. Secondary roads within the borders of a given constituent territory are provincial roads. It should be clear to me, as a taxpayer, what road construction fund is receiving my tax monies, and where I should complain if the need arises.

One other idea, which is not original with me: We still don't have a Russian state. There's a car parked in the driveway. It's a single mechanism, a single system. Cut it into 15 parts, and you'll have 15 pieces. That's what they did with the Soviet Union as a single system—tore it into 15 pieces and declared that, mechanically, 15 countries were the result.

Muranivsky: What we got, was 15 pieces.

Nikolayev: We got 15 pieces. Russia received the biggest chunk, but it is not a state. Here, I would like to cross over to the Army. There is no doctrine in Russia, and there cannot be one, by definition.

Let's make a matrix, "Nikolayev's matrix," you can call it. [Sketches.] The rows show four levels, from bottom to top. The first is the conceptual level, which encompasses a period of a century. The next is the 15- to 25-year level of doctrine, defined by a new generation of equipment and technology, re-equipping of the Armed Forces, discoveries in science, and so forth. The third level is the level of strategy, which lasts four, five, or seven years, depending on the structure of state power and how planning is done. A five-year period is convenient for us, since we got used to five-year plans, although we have elections every four years. Finally, there is the level of tactics, or everyday life—one year.

What I have drawn here, is how it should be: The conceptual level is the foundation, where the choice of goals is made. The level of doctrine defines what should be done during one generation, approximately 25 years. Then, the strategic tasks for a five-year period are formulated, and tactics annually.

Intersecting all these levels, we construct vertical columns for the interrelated, principal lines of activity of the state: politics, economics, military affairs, science, the social sphere, health care, education, etc. You see, we get a grid like a brick wall.

Now, let us locate military doctrine in this matrix. There is the "brick," the cell where the level of doctrine intersects "military affairs." It is declared that Russia has a new military doctrine, that this "brick" has been adopted. But, can you lay that brick into the wall, when there is nothing around it but empty space? How is it possible to give birth to a doctrine, if the country has no political doctrine, no economic doctrine, no scientific doctrine, and no concept? It's all nonsense. There will be no doctrine, if it has no components, nothing to rest upon, and nothing with which to interact. By the same token, it is impossible to solve any question of payments, or other economic questions, in isolation at the tactical level.

With this example, I try very simply to explain the utter lack of any logic whatsoever, in how decisions, doctrines, and so forth are adopted. I have always said that politics, economics, military affairs, and any other questions should be clearly delineated on three basic levels. The first defines what must be done immediately. Concretely, in our present

situation, what specific steps must be taken in order for the country to live. These are fire-brigade actions. Our house is on fire—Russia. We have called the fire department, or you and I are the fire department. The fire trucks come, and we put out the fire. The Putin government is putting out the fire. Let's say they have put it out. Have you ever seen a fire brigade stick around and start rebuilding or repairing the house? No, they stow their hoses and off they go. Somebody else will work on rebuilding the house. Thus, on the one hand, we do need fire-brigade actions, to prevent the fire from spreading and to solve immediate problems. On the other hand, we need a group of people to develop a conception for the country's development. That is the next level.

Muranivsky: All Russian governments in recent years have been working on the fire-brigade principle.

Nikolayev: That means that we shall never have a normal life. Things might be settled in one place, while they burn down in another. Why do we put the fire out? What next? Who will build anything? The profession of builder should become the main profession in our country. I don't mean the literal sense of the word, but a builder as creator.

Today, on the other hand, the whole system in our country is organized according the principle: appropriate—divide up—occupy. You have a family, and well may you ask: Will

you live normally, if you can't work, your wife doesn't work, nobody is working, and you divide up what the family has, while trying to take something away from your neighbors? How long can you sustain that? Should that be the national policy? No. The country is facing the questions: What is to be done now, what is to be done in five years, and what is to be done in 15-25 years? These are the three levels, which must be decided right away. I have proposed that a special group be formed for this purpose.

Muranivsky: You have posed the tasks. What is the mechanism for implementing the fine ideas, which you have laid out?

Nikolayev: I shall not restate our program, which you can read. But, first of all, I'll simply tell you that I am trying to find answers to all these questions in, for example, my work, "The Idea of the Russian State." We must seek the well-springs, in ourselves.

As for a "mechanism," I can note the following. First of all, it means a consolidation of society. Second, a change in the make-up of the State Duma, the representative branch of power—the formation of a majority, which reflects the interests of the majority of society. Then, elections to choose a President for this consolidated majority.

To be continued.

EIR SPECIAL REPORT

The True Story Behind The Fall of the House of Windsor

Reprints of EIR's 1994-1997 groundbreaking exposés

What political battles lie behind the assassination of Princess Diana? Why do 22 out of 30 top terrorist groups have their headquarters in London? EIR's series on the House of Windsor is indispensable for understanding today's news.

- The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor** (Oct. 28, 1994)
- The Sun Never Sets on the New British Empire** (May 24, 1996)
- Britain's "Invisible" Empire Unleashes the Dogs of War,** (Aug. 22, 1997)
- Epilogue: Can the House of Windsor Survive Diana's Death?** (Sept. 12, 1997)

Order from:

EIR News Service

P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390 Order number EIR 97-004 **\$75**

