

LaRouche, on Moscow TV, Outlines Four-Power Strategy for War Avoidance

Lyndon LaRouche gave this interview in Moscow May 16 to the economist Mikhail Khazin, host of the “A+ in Economics” weekly program on the Spas Channel, a satellite TV station linked with the Russian Orthodox Church. The interview aired on Friday, May 18 at 9:00 p.m., and was repeated several times during the following week. Khazin’s program on the recently founded Spas Channel has a following among policy-making circles in Moscow, since it is the only weekly show dedicated to economic analysis, appearing on Russian television.

Khazin: The first question has to do with the following situation. Over the past approximately 35 years, let’s say in particular since 1971, there has been developing a crisis of the financial system, and monetary system, based on the dollar.

You were the first person in the U.S. establishment who began to discuss this topic in those terms. We won’t mention what was said in the Soviet Union, which was a lot on that theme, but it was not very convincing. For this reason, it is extremely interesting for us to hear your opinion about how this crisis, specifically the world financial-monetary crisis, will develop further.

LaRouche: The crisis is an existential crisis of the entire world system. It is not a financial crisis; it’s worse. You have a crisis of ungovernability in Western and Central Europe. You have to look at the U.S. dollar, not as a U.S. problem, but as a systemic world problem. For example, a collapse of the dollar by 20 or 30% is possible any time now. You can not exactly predict human behavior, but you can say this: that the present system, as it exists, is doomed.

To illustrate that, what happens to the Chinese assets, and economy, if the U.S. dollar collapses? Or take the Russian security investment [Stabilization Fund]. A sudden collapse of the dollar would mean a collapse in China. It would mean a crisis for the present government in Russia.

Because, the dollar is still the standard valuation worldwide, as a currency.

Khazin: It’s the measure of value.

LaRouche: Yes, right. Because it’s a reserve currency. And

the world depends upon the maintenance of the value of the dollar, as a reserve currency, not as an internal currency, but a reserve currency for the world.

Now the amount of dollar assets in the world, as financial assets, could never be repaid. So therefore, the world as a whole is in a hyperinflationary crisis. Every part of the world is tied up in that crisis. You’re in a situation where only a replacement for the present monetary system, worldwide, would define a way to avoid a general breakdown crisis of the world system.

Khazin: I’d like to interject something here. Precisely because of what you’re saying is why I wanted to emphasize the role of the financial system, and indeed to replace the system based on the dollar, with something else.

LaRouche: You can’t. You can’t! What you have to do is you have to reorganize the dollar system.

For example, what I propose is this. We can do it, technically we can do it.

Politically is the problem. I can illustrate that simply: We have heard from President Putin, and from other circles in Russia, particularly in the recent celebration of the end of the war, we’ve heard much about Roosevelt and the American System under Roosevelt. President Putin and his circles on this question are right.

Khazin: You mean his system of reforms in the 1930s?

LaRouche: Yes, exactly. It was more than internal reforms. It was a world reform, which, by the end of the war, Roosevelt had achieved a world reform.

Khazin: With the Bretton Woods agreements of 1944?

LaRouche: Yes. President Putin is correct. You must look at the change of Roosevelt to Truman. Truman and Churchill were the enemy of the United States. What you had is a process in which the U.S. system, which was the dominant system in the world at that time, financial and so forth, went through a succession of changes in the world system.

Now immediately, the policy of building a post-war world, in cooperation with the Soviet Union and Roosevelt, collapsed at that point. Now you had then, something



EIRNS/Rachel Douglas

Economist Mikhail Khazin's (left) interview of LaRouche on satellite TV from Moscow aired May 18, and was repeated several times during the week. Khazin's program is the only weekly show featuring economics analysis on Russian TV.

similar to now. You had an Anglo-American turn for conflict with the Soviet Union. Here's where the thing becomes tricky for the case of modern Russia.

The control of this was from the British Empire. What happened was that the enemies of Roosevelt, in alliance with Churchill's crowd in England, changed their policy, and the faction within the United States, the financier faction in the United States, which had supported Hitler earlier, took predominant control of U.S. policy. So what happened then, was we went through a series of changes in the world monetary system, beginning with the assassination of President Kennedy.

Khazin: I'd like to add a little something. Actually, since you raised it, concerning the question of those who financed and supported Hitler, it would be quite useful to have a few words about the role of the Bush family. This information is not well known in Russia.

LaRouche: Bush's career was dependent upon Averell Harriman. It was Averell Harriman, whose subordinate was Prescott Bush. This was the same Averell Harriman who had supported Hitler's rise to power in Germany, particularly in 1933. Roosevelt had succeeded in getting the British to break from Hitler. With Roosevelt's death, they flipped back. So the New York-centered financial crowd took over the United States, together with the British. And they used the conflict that was created with the Soviet Union, with Stalin personally, in particular, to take over the world, first, by the self-destruction of the United States, by the Vietnam War. They destroyed the United States by having a long war.

Khazin: So, would it be a fair summary to say that the

grouping, which was an American national elite that had coalesced around Roosevelt, was replaced by control on the part of a grouping of supranational financiers centered in London?

LaRouche: British Empire is the right word. The British Empire is not simply a monarchical empire. It's an empire of finance-capital. And it's a world empire. And its whole game since 1945, has been to return the British finance-capital interests back to a world power.

Khazin: The Rothschilds?

LaRouche: No, no. That's too simple. It's a financial bloc. It's the financial bloc which created Hitler, and created Mussolini earlier. See, most people don't know the details of this change from the inside, and therefore it's difficult sometimes to understand these things. It's trying to navigate without a map.

Khazin: My view is that the history of the 1920s and '30s has been subject to the greatest degree of falsification of any other period in world history.

LaRouche: It's probable—that's fair. You could say exceptions, but this crowd is trying to destroy the United States, now.

Look what happened in ancient Greece, for example. How was ancient Greece destroyed by itself? They defeated the Persian Empire, but they were destroyed by corruption, called Sophistry. And by a famous long war, the Peloponnesian War.

How was the United States destroyed from the inside? By a so-called Cold War, by the war in Indo-China, a long war—a Peloponnesian war. Eh? And by successive wars, and by near wars.

Look at Iraq, the Iraq War's a perfect example: It's a war started by lies, like the Vietnam War. Hence, the United States is being destroyed, the military of the United States is being destroyed by the Iraq War. And our so-called formal political class in the Senate and the House of Representatives, many of whom are my friends, are behaving like asses. The only people that see the situation clearly in the United States, are people like me, and the old boys from the institutions of the military, the CIA, the diplomatic services, and similar people.

It's like the politicians and government all over Western Europe—they're insane. They have no comprehension of reality. And the only way we can get them, from inside the United States, to wake up, is with the work of the old boys.

Khazin: Maybe you could put it this way: That these politicians have been dealing always with virtual reality, rather than with what's actually happening. But, in the last few decades, the virtual reality has departed so far, diverged so far from what is actually going on.

LaRouche: It's generational. The generation, the white-collar generation that was born in 1945 to 1958, this group is dominant in the political party institutions, by a financial group which is based in London and in the Cayman Islands. Then you can understand the problem. Now you say, what happened in 1971-72?

Since 1945, the financial world has depended upon the U.S. dollar as a reserve currency. And since 1971-1972, the dollar reserve system has been controlled from London. It doesn't show in the British government as such. It's the British who mainly control the world system by a financier oligarchy, whose political headquarters is London.

The only significant opposition to this strategically is from Russia, China, and, to some degree, India. From the standpoint of existing world nation-states, this situation can not be solved, unless the United States approaches Russia, China, and India to make a new world reserve system, based on a reorganized dollar.

Khazin: On this reorganization, I have a theoretical question. How, theoretically, could this happen today, given the current political correlation of forces?

LaRouche: The political correlation of forces can be smashed very easily, if the will exists in certain quarters.

Khazin: I agree with that, but here's an example. Today, the United States is clearly pushing to recreate Atlantic solidarity with Europe. And the U.S. is forging its alliance not around any forces that would be interested in such reforms, but rather relying on those same financial circles that you're talking about in London.

LaRouche: Europe does not function right now. All Europe west of Russia/Belarus, is in a state of ungovernability. As an American, I can say this. I wouldn't put my opinion on the Russians, but as an American, I can tell the truth about this. I wouldn't ask you to adopt this policy publicly. I take advantage of my freedom to tell the truth.

The British Empire, as I have described it, is determined to have a war with Russia, China, and India. Since the agreements, the Maastricht agreements, and now with the French elections, all of continental Europe west of Russia/Belarus, is nonfunctional. What has been going on in Southwest Asia is the lever for a conflict with Russia, China, and India.

You see, because if you take Russia, China, and India, combined with certain forces in South America, it's the only part of the world that's not kissing the feet of globalization. To establish the new kind of empire intended, they must therefore destroy the sense of sovereignty in Russia, China, and India. Together with my friends, who are an important part of the United States system.

Therefore if Russia, under President Putin, can succeed in finding a response, in connection with key institutions

within the United States, it will become possible to turn the objective reality of the situation, into an understanding of common policy.

You need a response from the United States for what President Putin, and other people in Russia today, have said about the Roosevelt tradition. We have to go back to the global philosophy which existed before the death of Franklin Roosevelt. Conditions are different, but the policy should be the same. It should be travelled on the same road, or to the same destination by a slightly different road.

Which comes back to my answer to your original question: If you have an understanding of this, between U.S. circles and Russian circles, drawing in China and India into the discussion, and other nations. . . . But to take the territory of the former Soviet Union, the territory of Russia today, China and India, what percentage of the world territory and population is that? What are the vast mineral resources existing in Siberia, which Russian scientists have in their archives, knowledge of how to approach this? You would have a fundamental change in the world system, based on a *science-driven policy*.

The British know this. They are determined to prevent this from ever happening. They're prepared to destroy the world.

Khazin: Let me ask a rather immediate question: Who of the current candidates for the U.S. Presidency, let's not say, would be prepared to implement all of this, but would be prepared at least to understand that it's right, and necessary?

LaRouche: The candidate system, the party system, in the United States, is in a crisis of self-destruction. I, in a very strange way, am a friend of Bill Clinton, who is, fortunately, distant from Al Gore, and whose wife [Sen. Hillary Clinton] is very ambitious. As of now, there's not a single candidate for the Presidency I know of, who's competent to become President. The only competence in the United States comes from certain institutions, chiefly associated with the Presidency. Now this group understands that Cheney, who's a British asset, not an American asset; Cheney is a thug—he's not even an important person intellectually. Cheney's wife is the evil one, who controls him. They are controlled by London, by the Fabian Society faction behind Blair, the Blair government. The same crowd. They are controlled in the United States, in cooperation with London, by George Shultz.

George Shultz—he's the one who did the job in breaking up the Bretton Woods system. He used the old Nazis to put Pinochet into power in Chile. Nazis. Bush, Jr., the President, is an idiot, Bush is an idiot. He's actually a mental case, technically. This is a problem of statecraft. In certain parts of history, including Russian history, you've had idiots in charge as head of state.

Khazin: We also have such a term as a dry drunk.

LaRouche: Yes, with vodka. The dry vodka.

The problem here is that we have institutions, the older people who are officially active, or formerly active, like general officers, flag officers; former—but they're actually still active—diplomats, professional diplomats; certain tendencies in the intelligence services; in other institutions of government, the professional institutions, who work very closely with their friends who've gone out of government. This is our political elite. In general, we refer to these as the institutions. You have a comparable phenomenon in Russia today, still.

Khazin: Do you think that this grouping, these forces, are capable of overcoming the desperate opposition of the pro-British, or pro-financier forces, who, in the recent period, have been set at calling the tune?

LaRouche: That's my job. My job is to create an intellectual conception of what the solutions are, and what must be done. The problem is, you can not act, to fight a war or something similar, without a clear understanding of what you're doing. Once you have that understanding, now you must find a figure you put into a key position, controlling position, as the official leader.

Now I, as an American, can take responsibility for saying the following point: The present President of Russia was put in that position because he was perceived to be a person in the position to become President, who might carry out the job. From 1994 on, since I was visiting Russia, in that period, my concern, which I shared with many of my Russian friends in high positions, was to try to get an understanding with President Clinton, and people in Russia. So, some of the key people here in Russia organized a meeting which I addressed in Moscow. They were prepared, through me, because they knew my connection to Clinton, to open a new channel of economic understanding and cooperation with the United States. [Academician Gennadi] Osipov was one of the leaders of that group, to organize it. The former [Soviet] Prime Minister, [Valentin] Pavlov, was part of it. But the Vice President of the United States, Al Gore, was a close friend of Yeltsin, and they put pressure on Clinton not to do it.

Finally, in 1998, in August and September, Clinton recognized I had been right. So they pulled a scandal to try to pull down the Clinton Presidency. Today, I think Bill Clinton himself understands I was completely right about Gore. Unfortunately, Clinton's wife, who's a very bright woman, is not very strong on principle.

We face a situation now like a Great War situation. Obviously, there are circles in Russia who appreciate this, in one degree or another. Very important senior circles, from institutions in the United States, understand this. How do we put the two together? Do we have available a com-

plete solution to this problem? But the human factor of having the right leaders in position, together at the right time, is crucial. That's what I'm focussed on.

The policy that we must agree upon, among people in the United States, Russia, and so forth, is clear. We could probably win over enough people to do that. But in both Russia and the United States, we have to function through a Presidential system. We don't have a President in the United States, or a Vice President, who's worth anything. So, we have to go through a preliminary stage, we're now in a preliminary phase of the task, which is my function and concern. We must have a dialogue between Russia and the United States, involving other countries, like China, India, and so on, who understand that we believe the same thing about the present world crisis, and can understand what we must do for the next 50 years.

Khazin: If I may. Would you say there are a number of very concrete problems on this pathway? There are. This became very clear at the end of last year, when President Putin attempted to give Germany a way to be separate, to get away from this, how should we say it, financial group that's directing things in the world. At the moment, the EU, and a good deal of the Russian elite, and the American elite, are addicted financially. It's just not clear how either people in the European Union, Russia, or America could really get free of being captive of these supranational financial interests.

LaRouche: *Forget Europe.* What Putin was trying to do in Germany, when we still had the former government in Germany, was a very good idea. But that failed because the German government failed. Now you have, from the border of Russia and Belarus, west—

Khazin: It's no accident that the government was changed in Germany.

LaRouche: That's true. So, therefore, now Germany still has the objective potential of playing that kind of role with Russia. That has been the case since the Liberation Wars against Napoleon. That was Bismarck's policy. So, objectively, if we created the right world conditions, this potential within Germany becomes crucial, the kind of agreement Putin was probably trying to get with the Chancellor.

Khazin: Thank you, we've run out of time here. It was very interesting. And to a certain extent, we've gotten a picture of the world that is not possible to obtain from merely reading newspapers. And I hope that this will have a certain influence on the opinions of those people who understand that something needs to be done. But they don't have the information of what it is that has to be done.

LaRouche: That's why I'm happy to be here. It's my mission to do something for this.