

‘Sensible Forces’ Join Against U.S. Policy

General Leonid G. Ivashov, vice president of the Geopolitical Studies Academy in Moscow, formerly headed the International Relations Directorate of the Russian Ministry of Defense. His warnings about the deadly potential consequences of a U.S.-led war in Eurasia are widely known in Russia, and his view of the current U.S. leadership is shared by many strategic analysts there. This discussion between General Ivashov, and Karl-Michael Vitt and Prof. Yuri Gromyko for EIR, took place on Feb. 12 in Moscow. It has been translated from Russian by EIR.

EIR: One well-known analyst has suggested that [U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald] Rumsfeld is aiding the cause of peace, because he’s uniting Europe.

General Ivashov: I think that not only is the current policy and action strategy of the United States leading exactly to that, to the unification of sensible forces in Europe, but it is pushing the entire community of nations to consolidate and begin to form a second pole. In order for a second pole to be formed, there has to be some idea, some adversary. Now, one has appeared, in the person of the United States, Great Britain, and Israel, and this adversary really is a threat to the majority of countries in the world. First of all, it threatens politically to destroy the whole system of international security, developed during the “balance of power” period.

Secondly, the United States chose a strategy of providing for its own standard of living and way of life, based on the notion that all humanity cannot be prosperous. They want to prosper, but at others’ expense. This forces others to seek some means of counteracting the United States, both with respect to preserving the system that took shape during the “balance of power” period, which suits the majority of nations, and with respect to defending their own interests—not only the standard and quality of living, but even just their right to survive. For most of them, the question is posed like this: If the Americans seize the basic resources and establish control over the planet’s resources, many will end up on a knife’s edge between survival and death. That American strategy, naturally, prompts the formation of new geopolitical blocs, as can be observed at the present time.

EIR: Lyndon LaRouche issued a statement [Feb. 7], exposing that one of Colin Powell’s speeches contained material, plagiarized from a graduate student (see *EIR*, Feb. 21, “Powell

Victim of Apparent Hoax”). At the same time, LaRouche poses the problem of how a movement in America can oppose the possible military aggression. The German Interior Minister has said that there are no grounds for linking what is happening [around Iraq] with al-Qaeda. How do you evaluate the situation?

General Ivashov: The world financial mafia and U.S. national capital, or its most radical wing, have chosen a strategy of establishing hegemony and destroying rival consumers. This means annihilating a large number of people, but they are not yet prepared to challenge the entire human race. Therefore, they appear to waver, in an attempt to create some semblance of legitimacy. This is the reason for their waging this struggle within the UN Security Council, and for attempts to come up with some justification. It was obvious to us that the events of Sept. 11 were the doing of a powerful organization, a strong organization that had penetrated the American intelligence services, government institutions, and so forth.

EIR: LaRouche says that the rug could be pulled out from under the people who are trying to launch aggression, if a number of countries began to discuss a new financial architecture. It is LaRouche’s view that the militaristic excesses are occurring in the context of the disintegration of the financial system.

General Ivashov: Yes, that is one of the factors, one of the causes. The structural crisis in the U.S.A.—this disorganization of the world financial system as a result of the virtual dollar bubble—is one of the reasons; but it seems to me that it is an ancillary cause. The main cause is still that the consumer society has run up against a shortage of resources.

Essentially, all the forces in power in all countries, and all the political forces aspiring to come to power in all countries in the world, promise in their campaign platforms to raise the material standard of living. Meanwhile, the world’s population will increase by more than a billion inhabitants by 2015. On the other hand, look at what our ecologists and resource specialists say at international conferences. They say that the ecological system of the planet is on the brink of crisis, close to the point where a certain concentration of negative circumstances will come together and the ecological system could collapse. And they also say that no more than 50-60 years’ worth is left, of the basic resources for sustaining human life on the planet. This was most clearly enunciated in the analysis of John Gannon, chairman of the [U.S.] National Intelligence Council, in his December 2000 forecast of developments to 2015. . . .

EIR: LaRouche associates the present crisis with the shift of values in the United States in the 1960s, where values involved with the development of science and culture were replaced by those of a consumer society, and the mass rock-drug-sex counterculture. From the standpoint of rolling back that paradigm shift, LaRouche believes that [Vladimir

Vernadsky's idea, the idea of the cosmos and the noösphere, the understanding of our location in the universe, is very important for the development of civilization.

General Ivashov: Yes. And today the Americans are inflicting enormous damage on human civilization in the moral domain. Mankind is in a systemic crisis today, thanks to the Americans' strategy and policies. It's a political crisis, an economic one, and a crisis of security. But the basis of everything is the moral crisis. And the values Mr. LaRouche talks about, that shift of values, became the groundwork for the crisis in every other sphere of human activity, because these are the most degraded, bestial feelings—though it's probably an insult to the beasts, to call them that. It is the Americans, who are spreading this degraded type of instincts, the instincts of a biological object, to all humanity. And that is the worst of all.

EIR: If we look at the current situation from the standpoint of geopolitics, the key to changing the existing American geopolitics would be to put Eurasia and its development potential center stage. This is a central idea of LaRouche, that a new community of principle should be created, which would promote common spiritual and cultural principles, as against the old geopolitical outlook of occupation and exploitation. It would be interesting to know your opinion on the question of Eurasia, because the development of Eurasia, the concept of development bridges and development corridors, can be opposed to the standard principles of British geopolitics, which pits nations against each other.

LaRouche points to the American President John Quincy Adams, who at one time served as Ambassador in St. Petersburg, and who called for an entirely different foreign policy, based on a community of principle.

General Ivashov: Allow me to comment about what we see in American geopolitics today. For the Americans are not merely trying to seize key resource regions. If we look at the geography of their application of force, the Americans have begun to wage war for the Heartland, and thereby Eurasia. Why? Well, Halford Mackinder was the first, and then Haushofer, to say, "He who rules the Heartland, rules Eurasia. Whoever controls Eurasia, determines the fate of the world." Thus, by establishing control over the Heartland, the Americans pursue two goals. The first is resources, for themselves. The second is to take control of their rivals' supply lines: the European Union, China, Southeast Asia, the Middle East—just control them. That's how to understand what they are doing, and this is what's important.

But when Lyndon LaRouche says that America ought to create a new philosophical bloc—I don't think America will ever take such a step, as long as it is stronger than other nations. In our view, it would be possible to begin to create a new geopolitical bloc of countries with a continental orientation. Continental nations have less of a tendency to be cut-

throats than do maritime nations. They are based on more of a spiritually communal, collectivist ideology. We propose such an option, having in mind a bloc based on Russia, China, India, and Iran. And here it is very important, for Germany and France, in Europe, to join in building it; they, too, are close to such spiritually communal values. Through competition and rivalry, giving the world two poles, such a bloc would force the United States to seek a better system for all mankind.

EIR: If LaRouche were to win the 2004 Presidential elections, he would change the entire policy back to the principles of Quincy Adams and Abraham Lincoln, when Tsar Alexander II was the best friend of the United States. The problem is that this intellectual tradition has not been present in the White House, which has been controlled by different tendencies. But this tradition does exist.

General Ivashov: For the Americans today, the main question is probably whether or not America belongs to the Americans, because world financial institutions essentially run America's finances today. Through finance, they exercise their power. Therefore, even if Lyndon LaRouche were to win the election, this powerful financial structure would remain to be defeated, and it is quite powerful. There need to be other nations and other political forces in the coalition.

EIR: The question is whether it is possible to return to the U.S. Founding Fathers, to Hamilton and others, who maintained that a national bank should be national, not private. Russia has this problem, too.

General Ivashov: Yes, this is a problem for Russia, but in Russia the financial elite, closely connected with the international banks and the International Monetary Fund and acting according to their strategy, has almost solved the problem. The Russian population, 85% of the population, controls only 7% of the wealth, and is poor, debilitated and dying out. In America, it seems to me, this process is yet to come, because a situation where 5% of the population consumes as much as 40% of what is produced, and controls a corresponding portion of the resources, cannot last long. Therefore America inevitably will slide into a crisis, in which the American way of life and levels of consumption will change. They will decline. But if one proposed such a paradigm to Americans today, they would not accept it. They are accustomed to living well at the expense of other countries' resources and their own hollow dollar. Therefore it will be extremely difficult to change the situation.

EIR: The crisis has gripped Europe, as well. This is chiefly because of the state of finances, which is why the idea has come up of returning to Bretton Woods, replacing the floating exchange rates with fixed parities. The British press reports that some countries are thinking about the need for new infrastructure projects, in order to escape from the speculative

system by developing something in the real sector. The Italian Parliament has a standing initiative to return to the Bretton Woods system. What do you think about that?

General Ivashov: Yes, this would be an attempt to bring mankind into harmony in a civilized, evolutionary way. It seems to me, however, that the Americans are not prepared for this at the present time. Any reorganization of the financial structures will aim to reduce the role of the dollar and restrict the dollar within certain limits. The Americans will accept such a turn of events only after a very severe crisis or, possibly, their defeat in a serious war. Not necessarily a military war, but a war with terrorism, or a war involving political and financial pressure. Only through a severe crisis like that, would the Americans agree to seek such evolutionary models of changing the world financial and economic system.

EIR: On the other hand, a case can be made that during the past 30 years the consumption levels of the U.S. population at large have already declined. The people can see that during 30 years of talk about the Information Society and the New Economy, in reality, consumption levels fell, the cost of living rose, unemployment increased, social ghettos were formed, and infrastructure was destroyed.

In that connection, LaRouche's ideas command growing interest among young people.

[Seventy] years ago, there was a danger that America would move towards fascism, because of the crisis. But, thanks to Roosevelt, America was saved from fascism. He turned America in a different direction, demonstrating how the right kind of political philosophy can turn a country from the brink of fascism and catastrophe, in a different direction.

Therefore, LaRouche today is trying to resurrect and implement the principles of Roosevelt. And he is very glad that the recent period's system of exploitation is kaput, because this system is unjust for the United States, as well. What is needed, is a return to Roosevelt's policy, which could rescue the country from the danger of fascism and military dictatorship.

General Ivashov: But today we have to look at the actual policy of the U.S.A., which leads us to the conclusion that America has taken the path to fascism. Its policy towards other countries contains a fascist element; it has all the hallmarks of fascism, even with respect to Europe. Here it must be borne in mind what the political situation was in 1929 and the early 1930s, what the political forces were, and how the system came unwound. The Democratic Party of that period was less under the influence of the world financial oligarchy. Today it is totally controlled.

Something else to take into account is that Hoover, a Republican, was the first to adopt unpopular measures in 1929 and the early 1930s. The public did not accept them, because its standard of living was falling. Then came Roosevelt, and the Republicans were out of power until General Eisenhower.

A whole generation of Republicans came along, without being in power. It seems to me that there is no Roosevelt as a leader of one of the powerful political parties. Therefore, in order to change the situation in the United States, Lyndon LaRouche and his supporters have to create a political base. He can't rely on either the Democratic or the Republican Party today. It is a question of creating a new force, which would accept new ideas and attract public support.

EIR: Roosevelt faced no less of a problem, because the Democratic Party in 1929, like the Republican Party, was a party of racists. He raised the need for a paradigm shift away from the shameless racist policy, and he succeeded. Therefore, Lyndon LaRouche understands perfectly well that the party's culture has to be changed. This is why he is currently working especially with the youth, drawing young people into serious culture, since the role of American youth is very important.

General Ivashov: And he is based in the Democratic Party? . . . In the early 1930s, the Democratic Party was not so dependent on the international oligarchy.

EIR: This is why LaRouche is attacking Marc Rich, who represents these ties to the oligarchy. It is important to wage a targeted struggle against the elements in the party that represent the financial oligarchy, in order to discredit them and kick them out. I think that LaRouche has the forces to free the Democratic Party from the power of the financial oligarchy. And he has the experience of his 80 years.

General Ivashov: In order for society to accept new ideas, there must be a strong elite, whom the public would trust.

EIR: In California, the law on electricity deregulation was repealed. And, there has been some success in organizing a group of generals, who criticize U.S. military strategy. In addition, there are certain sensible elements in the Republican Party, who have opposed Bush's policies. They call the latter "chicken-hawk" policies, because they can show that the people pushing for the war, were draft-dodgers. Those who experienced the war, oppose war today.

General Ivashov: Yes, it would be interesting to create a movement of generals and admirals. Today, in a war period, special attention is paid to ranking military officers.

WEEKLY INTERNET
AUDIO TALK SHOW
The LaRouche Show
EVERY SATURDAY
3:00-4:00 p.m. Eastern Time
<http://www.larouchepub.com/radio>