

LaRouche offers new policy for reunification in Berlin

If independent U.S. Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche's optimism proves justified, the next U.S. administration may attempt to bring about the reunification of Germany.

LaRouche outlined his proposed policy in a statement presented to an Oct. 12 morning press conference, held at Berlin's Hotel Bristol. Large segments of the statement delivered in Berlin are scheduled to be a feature of a half-hour, nationwide television broadcast in the U.S.A.

He emphasized that there are two approaches to the reunification process. He posed the question: "Will this be brought about by assimilating the Federal Republic into the East bloc's sphere of influence, or can it be arranged differently? In other words, is a united Germany to become part of a Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, as President de Gaulle proposed, or, as Mr. Gorbachov desires, a Europe from the Urals to the Atlantic?"

"I see the possibility, that the process of reunification could develop as de Gaulle proposed. I base this possibility upon the reality of a terrible worldwide food crisis which has erupted during the past several months, and will dominate the world's politics for at least two years to come."

The candidate emphasized that the Soviet bloc has entered into a worsening economic crisis in every respect, not food shortages alone. Speaking as an economist, he reported that no amount of restructuring or Western credits, by themselves, could reverse the down-slide of the Soviet and Eastern European economies over the coming period. In his statement, and in answers to a question from a reporter from a Berlin daily, LaRouche emphasized, that as soon as Moscow recognizes this economic fact, it will be forced to consider new options. It is under those conditions, that Moscow might change its mind, and consider seriously the new U.S. policy which LaRouche is submitting to the next U.S. administration.

LaRouche warned against hope for truly peaceful relations between Moscow and the West sooner than "30 or 40 years ahead." In the meantime, "The best we can do in the name of peace, is to avoid a new general war between the powers." While we maintain military strength and political will in face of continuing threats of Soviet adventures, we must follow the advice of "Nicolò Machiavelli: We must always provide an adversary with a safe route of escape. . . . We must rebuild our economies to the level at which we can provide the nations of the Soviet bloc an escape from the terrible effects of their economic suffering."

The food crisis

He cited the food crisis as an example of such economic diplomacy, emphasizing that the world grain available during 1988 is not expected to reach above 1.7 billion tons, "already a disastrous shortage." Moscow will probably demand at least "80 million tons from the West during 1989, as a bare minimum for the needs of its population." LaRouche proposed that nations act to ensure that at least 2.4 billion tons of grain are available for each of the coming two years. This would require "scrapping the present agricultural policies of many governments and supranational institutions, but it could be accomplished. If we are serious about avoiding the danger of war during the coming two years, we will do just that.

"By adopting these kinds of policies, in food supplies and other crucial economic matters, the West can foster the kinds of conditions under which the desirable approach to reunification . . . can proceed on the basis a majority of Germans on both sides of the Wall desire it should."

LaRouche described his proposed shift in U.S. policy: "I shall propose the following concrete perspective to my government. We say to Moscow: 'We will help you. We shall act to establish Food for Peace agreements among the international community, with the included goal that neither the

people of the Soviet bloc nor the developing nations shall go hungry. In response to our good faith in doing that for you, let us do something which will set an example of what can be done to help solve the economic crisis throughout the Soviet bloc generally.' ”

He proposed: “Let us say that the United States and Western Europe will cooperate to accomplish the successful rebuilding of the economy of Poland. There will be no interference in the political system of government; but only a kind of ‘Marshall Plan’ aid to rebuild Poland’s industry and agriculture. If Germany agrees to this, let a process aimed at the reunification of the economies of Germany begin, and let this be the *punctum saliens* for Western cooperation in assisting the rebuilding of the economy of Poland.”

LaRouche in Berlin

The U.S. candidate explained his reasons for releasing this statement in Berlin, as including the fact, that although Moscow has denounced LaRouche as its “public enemy number one” in its press, “Moscow regards me with a curious sort of fascination, and, since President Reagan first announced the SDI, considers everything I say on policy-matters to be influential, and very credible.”

He assured the audience, that Moscow would be studying his statement at the highest level, “within hours.” He predicted, that once Moscow sees echoes of the LaRouche proposal from other Western quarters, Moscow will treat the proposal as a very serious one, and will react accordingly.

LaRouche emphasized that he shares with his German friends the “loving memory of Leibniz, Schiller, Beethoven, Humboldt, and that great statesman of freedom, Freiherr vom Stein.” On the basis of that personal instinct, “I believe that if what I have set afoot here today is brought to success, the included result will be that the Reichstag building over there, will become the seat of Germany’s future parliament, and the beautiful Charlottenburger Schloss, the future seat of government.”

The Soviet economy

Back in spring 1985, LaRouche predicted a 1988 breakdown of the Soviet and East bloc economies under Mikhail Gorbachov’s policies. This analysis was reported and summarized in a widely circulated, 366-page Special Report, *Global Showdown*, published by *EIR* on July 24, 1985. That forecast of a 1988 Soviet economic crisis of the type now occurring, was based upon a study of what LaRouche labeled “Soviet Plan A,” the model of *perestroika* followed by the Gorbachov leadership so far.

In spring 1985, LaRouche estimated that the kind of “forced-draft” military buildup designed by Yuri Andropov and Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov would exhaust the Soviet and East bloc economies over a period of approximately five years. Since Andropov had set the program into operation as soon as Leonid Brezhnev died, that meant that 1988 was the

crucial year to be watched.

True, following Andropov’s sudden death, there were slippages under interim General Secretary Chernenko. This did not lessen the economic pressures, but only made them worse. When Gorbachov was installed in power, in March 1985, he launched a desperate game of “catch-up,” trying to make up for the lost time of the Chernenko interregnum; this only made the original problem worse. Now, Moscow does not expect to reach the Andropov-Ogarkov military buildup’s objectives until about 1991, instead of the originally scheduled 1988. However, in 1988, the Soviet bloc economy is already showing all the signs of crisis which LaRouche forecast back in spring 1985.

LaRouche explains the problem as follows.

This kind of Soviet economic crisis has a history. Back during the mid-1920s, during the so-called “Great Soviet Industrialization Debate,” Bukharin critic, and leading Soviet economist Evgenii Preobrazhensky discussed a policy which he termed “socialist primitive accumulation.” When Stalin overthrew Bukharin and launched his First Five-Year Plan, Stalin took over Preobrazhensky’s “socialist primitive accumulation” doctrine as his own. The Andropov-Ogarkov Plan is an echo of that First Five-Year Plan. The circumstances are different, but the general effect is the same.

The most important difference, is the fact that the postwar Soviet economic reconstruction was based upon the looting of Central and Eastern Europe. Ever since the end of the war, Moscow’s economy has depended upon skimming off a large ratio of the product and labor of Eastern Europe. Up through 1982, Moscow took all the milk, so to speak; from 1983 onward, under “Plan A,” Moscow has been taking the cow’s blood, too. As a result, the cow is becoming very, very sick, and is giving very little milk.

In the meantime, “Plan A” has cut down into the bone of Soviet industrial potential, and Soviet agriculture has become progressively worse, as it has been ever since Khrushchov ruined Soviet agriculture, from 1959 onwards, with his “Virgin Lands” package-program.

The global drought of 1988-90 is the most conspicuous problem confronting Moscow today, but, as LaRouche said in his Berlin statement, “the Soviet economy as a whole has reached the critical point, that, in its present form, it will continue to slide downhill from here on, even if the present worldwide food crisis had not erupted.”

One cannot keep running Soviet and East bloc labor, land, factories, and economic infrastructure into the ground, as “Plan A’s” version of “socialist primitive accumulation” has done for military buildup purposes, without coming to the point that the cow who has given too much blood, not only stops giving milk, but dies.

In recent writings, LaRouche has warned repeatedly, that the present levels of collapse which Soviet “blood-taking” policies have brought upon Romania, Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria, most emphatically, mean a chain-reaction collapse

inside the Soviet economy itself. Without massive economic subsidies from captive Eastern Europe, the postwar Soviet economic system breaks down. Soviet intensified looting of Eastern Europe since 1982, has brought most of Eastern Europe to the point that the blood-drained cow could no longer supply milk, no matter how much it might wish to please the Soviet overlords by doing so.

Without the critical margin of Eastern European supplies, the Soviet economy is pushed toward physical collapse, at least entire sections of the Soviet Union are brought to that point. The Soviet machine-tool sector is suffering signs of exhaustion; this means greater relative dependency upon the German Democratic Republic (G.D.R.) and Czechoslovakia, which are better off than other Eastern European economies, but are also suffering five years under "Plan A."

Naturally, Moscow believes that if the Federal Republic of Germany joins the G.D.R. in subsidizing the Soviet economy, some of these pressures can be relieved. It believes that an injection of about DM 200 billion credit from Western Europe, Japan, and the U.S.A. will tend to solve the problem. Some influentials in the West seem to believe this, too, LaRouche comments; but, he insists, that cannot succeed.

"The older generations of Western industrial managers and bankers would have understood the problem," LaRouche says; "but the new breed of industrialists and bankers do not. They have risen to their positions after about 20 years of brainwashing in ideas of the so-called 'post-industrial society.' For example," LaRouche said at his Berlin press conference, "In Western European culture, we have demonstrated that the successes of the nations of big industries depends upon the technologically progressive independent farmer, and what you call in Germany the *Mittelstand* [independent small entrepreneurs—ed.]. Soviet culture in its present form is not capable of applying this lesson." LaRouche comments, that "after 20 years of post-industrial ideology, the new generations of top industrialists and bankers seem to have forgotten those ABCs."

"The key to my Poland proposal," he said, "is that if we junk the so-called 'post-industrial' ideology in the West, and go back to sound economic policies, we in Western Europe and North America know how to make an economy succeed, where the Soviet leadership does not."

LaRouche's argument is, that the crisis in the Soviet economy is now becoming so acute, that Moscow would have to consider his offer seriously, as probably the only workable way of finding a solution. He smiled as he added, "This is exactly what Leibniz offered to the Russian government nearly 300 years ago. As long as Russia followed Leibniz's plan, the Russian economy improved spectacularly. When they began to scrap Leibniz's plan for development, and reinstated serfdom, Russia slid from a growing industrial power, into backwardness. Russia has always admired German science and industry since, if sometimes with bitter envy and resentment. If Western Europe and the United States work

together on this, we could do the job for Poland's economy. It could be a step toward winning Moscow over, perhaps over two generations or so, but what of it? Building the foundations of future peace is worth working to achieve over time.

"Of course, Moscow is our adversary, and only wishful dreamers can overlook that fact and what it means today; but the people of the Soviet bloc are people. If the object of war is a successful peace, so also, the avoidance of war ought to have similar peace-objectives. We never desire to make any people our enemy forever. Moscow is our enemy today, but its grandchildren and great-grandchildren should not be so.

"That was Machiavelli's wisdom: Always give an adversary a safe route of escape to survival. If the adversary accepts that as our real intention, and is not utterly evil, it is possible to win those conflicts which are the cause of wars.

"Otherwise, I would be happy if something I could do, would turn out to help the people of Poland, and I believe that Germany would be happy to accept such a mission as part of the mission on which its own reunification is founded."

A page from French history

Later, LaRouche emphasized, "What I have done is not as original as it might appear to some. The idea behind my statement is my own, but the thing which contributed the most to giving me the confidence to make this as a public proposal was my memory of France's King Louis XI. Louis XI created modern France out of a collection of parts that were to a large degree dominated by foreign powers; he did it by the kind of policy I outlined in the statement I released in Berlin. There are examples of this approach from Germany history, too."

The presidential candidate identified Prussia's King Frederick II as one of these models. "The image of Frederick the Great as a military genius often causes us to overlook the fact, that his greater genius was that of a statesman, who fought wars only when there was no other solution for the dangers to Prussia's future existence. All real statesmen of today, should prefer France's Lazare Carnot very much to Napoleon Bonaparte. The clearest example of statecraft is Germany's Liberation Wars, where Schiller's genius in statecraft shown in the work of the circles of Humboldt, Scharnhorst, and vom Stein. However, we should never forget Louis XI, to whom I am certain Machiavelli referred in writing of a certain 'great king.' "

"Therefore, if I emphasized de Gaulle in my statement, I was also thinking of other great French statesmen before him, such as Louis XI, Richelieu, Mazarin, Colbert, Carnot, and Hanotaux, too. Reunification is primarily a German matter, but we should approach this with the best taken from that great European tradition which the United States shares.

"I am certain, that from their graves, such statesmen would wish to join with me in the kind of proposal I featured in that statement to the Berlin press conference."