

LaRouche comments on Qaddafi interview

The political-intelligence specialist, and average citizen must study the Qaddafi interview in *Wir Selbst*—and Qaddafi's Hitler-like operations against the nations of Africa—as reflecting the mental state of Moscow's tool. We must judge the mental state of the presently ruling combination in Moscow from such actions as the brutal murder of 269 airliner passengers, and Moscow's choice of partners.

Qaddafi, like the forces behind the separatist and terrorist movements, is essentially a Nazi. He has certain resemblances to Adolf Hitler in the manner he conducts foreign policy, but he is not so much a Hitler follower as a Sufi variety of “national bolshevist,” a follower of the cult of dionysian chaos of the ultra-fascist Friedrich Nietzsche. *The Conservative Revolution* of the Siemens Stiftung's Dr. Armin Mohler is the most compact reference-source available on the roots of both the Nazis and today's “universal fascists.”

The Soviet leadership has no illusions about its Nazi International and similar qualities of allies today. Although Moscow continues, so far, to honor a special relationship to governments such as that of India, the general trend of the past fifteen years has been Soviet preference for allies from among those it itself earlier denounced as the most unspeakable scoundrels. This is the case in the Middle East, in Western continental Europe, and in the case of Qaddafi. This pattern of choice of allies is of one piece with the Moscow command's orders to destroy a civilian airliner over the Sea of Japan.

The significance of Qaddafi's interview in *Wir Selbst*, together with the destruction of the airliner, is that these reflect the political-philosophical outlook of the presently ruling combination in Moscow. True, Moscow played with the “national bolshevist” variety of fascist from the early 1920s, and was more deeply involved with use of Nazi and related instruments throughout the post-war period than most observers not intimately informed of the facts would wish to believe. That is nasty, but it is not the same thing as Moscow's openly associating itself with such forces as political allies, and using Moscow's own resources to build up the strength of Nazis and other sordid elements in the West and developing sector.

A very profound change in Moscow's political-philosophical

outlook has occurred, most noticeably over the recent fifteen years. Three features of this process of change are broadly evident.

First, from about the middle 1960s, reliance upon Soviet Leninism as a guiding philosophical outlook for policy-making has vanished. Much of the vocabulary persisted, but the content was shifted to an increasingly pragmatic sort of cynical realpolitik. Essentially, from their vantage-point, “Leninism” had failed in both the industrialized and developing nations, and had degenerated to posturing by aging, increasingly corrupt bureaucrats inside the Soviet Union itself.

Second, this collapse of faith in Leninism was accompanied by a resurgence of old Russian culture from Czarist days, signalled by a resurgence of mass attendance at Russian churches and growing political power of the Russian Church apparatus within the Soviet domestic and foreign-policy apparatus.

Third, as I assessed the course this process was taking as early as 1972, the deepening of Soviet commitment to nuclear deterrence and détente was reflected in shifts in Soviet foreign-policy posture, in the direction of building a Russian (Eastern) division of a Byzantine-like world-empire. This I described at the time as a “New Constantinople” perspective visible in Soviet foreign-policy. Criton Zoakos published a summary of the picture of this “New Constantinople” shift during 1973. I later discovered that this was precisely the policy agreed upon between certain Western and Soviet leaders through the Pugwash Conference back-channel beginning no later than 1958. The Willy Brandt Ostpolitik, the signing of SALT I, and the signing of the 1972 ABM treaty had consolidated this new, imperialist foreign-policy outlook in Soviet policy.

These three factors—cultural pessimism, reversion to old Raskolniki varieties of beliefs, and revival of Russian imperial perspectives modelled on the “Third Rome” tradition—produced in the Soviet leadership and elsewhere an emergence of what is best described as a **Soviet Dostoevskian mentality**.

It is early to say that the Soviet Union will become a full-fledged fascist state in the sense of Mussolini's Italy or Hitler's Germany, however, the tendency is present and pronounced. There are prominent, identifiable points of coincidence between the direction of political-philosophical developments in the Soviet leadership today and, most emphatically, the “national bolshevist” currents within German Nazism. The fact that the “Third Reich” ideology of the Nazis was copied directly from Dostoevsky's “Third Rome” ravings is one. When “solidarism” was adopted as the model of socio-economic policy by the Strasser and Rosenberg currents of the Nazis, the argument was explicitly and emphatically made that German Nazi solidarism and the Tolstoyan solidarism of the Russian Mir were essentially identical. The German “blood and soil” doctrines of the Nazis and the Nazis' leading fascist competitors of that same period of German history were then explicitly represented as akin to the Russian “blood and soil” cultural model. Nazism was largely the

introduction of Eastern values of this sort against the Judeo-Christian rationalism of Schiller's and Humboldt's Germany.

The Moscow clearance to order the shooting-down of the Korean airliner is a characteristic expression of a world-outlook akin to the Nazis' Nietzschean philosophy of the Triumph of the Will, the anti-rationalist conception of Will associated with William of Ockham, Bernard of Clairvaux, and others. To deal with the West by display of a terrifying exertion of the Russian Will, is the essence of the airliner incident.

It was a Hitler-like expression in foreign-policy, a characteristically brutal expression of a "Third Rome" state of mind.

It is the same state of mind which prompts the Soviet command to deem a beast as morally and mentally depraved as Khomeini to impose its "dark age" upon the people of Iran, to unleash Qaddafi against the nations and peoples of Africa. It is that same wicked state of mind which prompts the Soviet leadership to adopt the cause of the forces of a new dark age in Germany, the Green Party, and which brings Soviet asset Qaddafi, the Nazi-linked international separatist movement, and the Green Party into convergence within Germany today.

We must recognize this political-philosophical outlook in Moscow, not only as a matter of evaluation pertaining to our own practice in related matters. Unless the Soviet Union is confronted with our knowledge of the cultural degeneration in progress in the Soviet leadership, men and women of conscience in the Soviet Union will not be encouraged to change the direction of things.

This is not to propose that Marxism and Soviet Marxism in particular are in any sense desirable ideals. I have dealt with these matters amply in numerous published locations, and do not propose to repeat that analysis here at this moment. The working-point here is that the formal commitment to technological progress, and to recognizing as "progressive" nations and political forces committed to delivering the benefits of rationality and technological progress as what the Soviets called "progressive forces" was a kind of morality, a morality which they have repudiated in their present foreign-policy and related practice.

We could have hoped to persuade them that our conceptions of the role of the individual in an environment of technological progress was superior in performance and implications to their own conception of this policy. This rabid, fanatically xenophobic disregard for the sanctity of life of defenseless airliner passengers, and the promotion of their asset Qaddafi, bespeaks an immoral irrationalism which is a thermonuclear menace to all civilized life.

They will clamor that we have influential and evil fellows in the West. Who could disagree with that honestly! Yet, the fellows who perpetrated the offenses to which Moscow will now point liberally, have been recently the Soviets' preferred political allies through such back-channels as Pugwash. In condemning the West for the wickedness of such fellows, the Soviets merely more completely condemn themselves. We know them by the company they keep.

The 'general staff' for a in Western Europe, and

Jo Leinen, a leader of the German "peace movement" and speaker of the BBU environmentalist association, announced last October that "the Federal Republic should be made un-governable" if necessary to stop deployment of U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles. A year later, the peace movement is efficiently organized to accomplish this goal. Police report that a tightly knit "general staff" stands ready to direct an army of up to three million demonstrators, plus an approximately 10,000-strong elite corps operating with guerrilla-warfare methods. Now Leinen hints at worse to come in 1984: "October may just have been a luke-warm spring."

The effect on the European peace movement of the Soviet Union's murder of 269 civilians aboard Korean Air Lines' flight 007 remains to be seen, although first readings from West Germany point to confusion among "moderates" within the peace movement and to widespread pro-Americanism

Qaddafi's marching orders to Europe's greenies

Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi, in a speech to 200 representatives of primarily the European peace and green movements in Tripoli in June of 1982, demanded a total war mobilization against the nation-states—and particularly the military facilities—of Europe. What Qaddafi described, and has financed lavishly since that time, is now on the drawing boards of the "activists," set to erupt at any moment.

"The masses must take control of everything," Qaddafi said. "All other institutions, like governments, parties, trade unions, and regular armies must disappear. Only then will there be peace. . . . The Greens must win. . . . The U.S. bases in Europe must go. This must be done by mass demonstrations and protests. . . . Instead