

area and over 40% of its population. As the world's largest and most populous developing nations, whose very maintenance requires enormous inputs of science and technology, India and China have a strong common interest in stabilizing and developing Russia. Russia, for its part, can only survive by bringing its scientific and technological potentials into full economic play, which in turn requires large and stable markets for the kinds of industrial goods it can best produce. All three nations have a vital joint interest in Central Asia, and so forth.

They also share, in different ways, the experience of significant joint development in the 1950s. At that time, both India and China profitted greatly from close scientific and technological cooperation with the former Soviet Union—a partnership which was also key, in its direct and indirect effects, to the relatively rapid rates of industrial growth in the Soviet Union in that period. In a limited, but significant way, the transfer of industrial technology and know-how from the Soviet Union to China and India, in that period, helped shape the Non-Aligned Movement's later striving for a "new, just world economic order."

For all these and other reasons, a profound *community of interest* now exists among the three giant nations. That community of interest is by no means limited to the three alone, but explicitly includes the concept of joint cooperation in other developing countries. It should be noted, for example, that the Russian-Indian agreements signed during Prime Minister Primakov's visit, provide for joint exploration and exploitation of oil and gas resources not only on each other's territories, but also in Kazakstan, Central Asia, and Iraq. Iraq has already been an important oil supplier to India, and India and Russia both have considerable interest in developing petroleum resources there.

But the pathway to consolidation of the Russia-China-India triangle is by no means an easy one. It will be necessary to overcome a long heritage of British geopolitical manipulation in Eurasia. That heritage is lodged above all in false axioms and habits of thinking among the elites, which have permitted the nations of the region again and again to be manipulated against each other in the name of falsely defined, so-called "competitive national interests." The earlier triangle was effectively smashed in the late 1950s and early 1960s, by geopolitical manipulations whose fruits included the Sino-Soviet split, the Sino-Indian war, the apparently "insoluble" Indo-Pakistan conflict, and so on. One of the notable tools in those British-directed manipulations, incidentally, was none other than the late Armand Hammer, sponsor of the Gore family and supposed "great friend" of the Soviet Union. Some painful rethinking of old mistakes will be needed on all sides, if Russia and its partners want the "Great Triangle" to succeed today. That means above all gaining a more competent understanding of the historical conflict between the United States and Britain—or in other words, why Lyndon LaRouche has the friends and foes he has.

LaRouche's ideas circulate in Russia

by Rachel Douglas

One new publication and one reprint, issued in Moscow at the end of 1998, have put key strategic writings of Lyndon LaRouche into circulation among Russian-speakers.

Bulletin No. 8 of the Schiller Institute for Science and Culture (Moscow) is headlined "Russia's Relation to Universal History," and features LaRouche's "Letter to a Russian Friend," which was published under that title in *EIR* of Nov. 29, 1996. The subject-matter resonates with Chinese President Jiang Zemin's recent address to Russian scientists at the Novosibirsk center of the Russian Academy of Sciences (see *EIR*, Dec. 4, 1998), as LaRouche develops why the greatest strength of Russia, defining its potential to make a decisive contribution to saving mankind, is the quality of bold, "dissident" thinking by the Russian scientific intelligentsia. The preservation of Russian science and collaboration with Russia on "such great projects of reconstruction and progress as are urgently wanted for the benefit of both Russia itself and Eurasia more generally," LaRouche writes, is in the vital interests of every nation, especially the United States.

Pictured here is the other just-issued publication, a reprint of the proceedings of the April 24, 1996 round table held at the Free Economic Society in Moscow, at which LaRouche was hosted by Academicians Leonid Abalkin and Gennadi Osipov, to speak on "Russia, the U.S.A., and the Global Financial Crisis." The 92-page booklet is published by the Institute of Social and Political Research (ISPI) of the Russian Academy of Sciences, with an introduction by ISPI's director, Academician Osipov. In his keynote at the round table, LaRouche developed the need to revive Franklin Delano Roosevelt's design of collaboration among the United States, Russia, and China for genuinely post-colonial development of nations after World War II. (An English translation of the round table proceedings appeared in *EIR*, May 31, 1996.)



The timeliness of the round table reprint was underscored when its themes were echoed in a major article on U.S.-Russian relations by Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov, in the daily *Nezavisimaya Gazeta* of Dec. 16. Ivanov cited the precedent of Prince Gorchakov, negotiator of Tsar Alexander II's alliance with Abraham Lincoln during the American Civil War, for his perception of "natural solidarity of interests and sympathy" between the United States and Russia at that time (which was a time of intense hostility towards both on the part of Great Britain).

Ivanov's article contained an important, new formulation on the potential for U.S.-Russian cooperation today, in the context of efforts to address the global financial crisis. That potential is directly attacked by the British-orchestrated bombing of Iraq, which provoked a furious reaction from Russia. Reviewing various aspects of U.S.-Russian relations in a now "multi-polar" world, Ivanov wrote, "*Now that we have a joint global adversary—the world economic crisis, it is especially urgent to step up interaction.*"

Also in the second half of 1998, the Russian periodical *Kto yest kto* ("Who Is Who") carried a biographical article on LaRouche, which emphasized his decades-long battle to defeat monetarism and the tyranny of the International Monetary Fund. Excerpts from the magazine's interview with LaRouche, which accompanied the article, appear below.

LaRouche in Russian 'Who Is Who'

Kto yest kto, the Russian journal *Who Is Who*, printed its interview with Lyndon LaRouche in Issue No. 4 of 1998. LaRouche answered written questions from editor Zakhar Bolshakov in March 1998.

Q: What are some episodes that characterize various periods of your life?

LaRouche: a) Hearing the voice of President Franklin Roosevelt on the fateful morning of Dec. 7, 1941, and watching the sudden transformation of the mental outlook of most U.S. persons I saw during the next several hours.

b) The struggle, against the British tyrant, for national independence of India, as a U.S. soldier temporarily stationed in Calcutta, during Winter and early Spring 1946.

c) The terrible shock of returning to a U.S., under Truman, rather than Roosevelt, during April-May 1946.

d) The 1962 missile crisis.

e) The assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

f) The Aug. 15-16, 1971 collapse of the Bretton Woods Agreements.

g) My March 1973 meeting, for discussion of a research

project, with the young woman who was to become my wife four and a half years later.

h) The Ibero-America Crisis of Spring-Summer 1982, from Britain's war against Argentina, and the crushing of Mexico in October 1982.

Q: What family legends and history of your relatives are of most significance for you?

LaRouche: The continued living influence, at the family dinner-table during the 1920s, of a great-great grandfather, Daniel Wood, of the same generation as President Abraham Lincoln, who had been a prominent fighter against slavery during the middle of the Nineteenth Century.

Q: What did you want to be, at the ages of 10, 18, and 30?

LaRouche: Philosopher-scientist.

Q: What do you value in yourself, and in other people?

LaRouche: A passion for truth and justice.

Q: Do you have any adversaries? In what do they oppose you?

LaRouche: The only adversaries of importance are London-centered networks of financier-oligarchs and their lackeys, such as the circles around the recently deceased McGeorge Bundy, here in the U.S.A. The issues are the same as those for which the same class of oligarchs hated and murdered President Abraham Lincoln.

Q: How do you define the meaning of your life?

LaRouche: To be as an angel, who accepts the mission which circumstances of life present to him, and to pass on from life as having been a person whose existence has been useful to mankind.

Q: What was the beginning of your political activity?

LaRouche: India, 1946.

Q: Who are (or have been) your opponents in the elections?

LaRouche: The only important enemies have been personalities and agencies of the Anglo-American financier oligarchy, such as McGeorge Bundy and George Bush, or, their lackeys, such as Leo Cherne and Henry A. Kissinger. As Cherne explained this to Stefan Possony, in deploying Possony against me, in Summer 1976, the issue was that I represented a threat to the interest of "the families."

Q: What meetings, during your life, left the greatest impression?

LaRouche: My meeting with Mexico's President José López Portillo, during Spring 1982. What impressed me was his patriotism, and his later courage to act along lines I had proposed for that coming crisis, during the relevant events of August-September 1982.