

LaRouche's record on Moscow, the Third Rome

This chronology traces the origins of Lyndon LaRouche's analysis of the Russian "Third Rome" cultural matrix. Soviet General Secretary Yuri Andropov's 1983 rejection of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)—the program which LaRouche devised and President Reagan adopted—convinced LaRouche that Russia was on the way toward a post-communist form of Third Rome imperialism. A full timeline on this and related events was published in New Federalist newspaper on Oct. 25, 1993.

June 1983: In a series of published documents, LaRouche warns the West of the "Third Rome" threat from Moscow. If Moscow rejects the SDI, then Moscow is headed toward economic collapse and reemergence of a violently anti-western, imperial military doctrine. Under conditions of collapse, the Russian leadership reverts to the blood-and-soil myth of Moscow as the Third and Final capital of a world empire. Therefore, a post-communist

economic collapse of Russia is a grave danger to the West; the West must aggressively offer rapid scientific and technological progress and economic reconstruction to the Soviet empire, to break up the empire peacefully. LaRouche's 1984 presidential campaign platform, published in 1983, includes a chapter titled "The Roots of the Third Rome."

Aug. 10, Oct. 6, Oct. 26, 1983: Attacks on LaRouche and on the SDI by senior KGB official Fyodor Burlatsky in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*. Burlatsky calls the SDI "a *casus belli* for nuclear war."

Sept. 1, 1983: Moscow orders shooting down of Korean Airlines passenger plane KAL 007.

Sept. 6, 1983: LaRouche comments on the KAL shootdown in an article in *New Solidarity* newspaper: "What do the Soviets think of leading figures who deny the Soviets' 'Third Rome' strategy? They think of them as fools."

Sept. 18, 1984: An *EIR* article by LaRouche emphasizes: "The key to understanding the domestic, foreign, and strategic policies of the Soviet government today is a doctrine famously promulgated in 1510 A.D. by a mad but influential Russian Orthodox monk, Philotheos of Pskov. The same doctrine was defended savagely by the influen-

ed. I can only call this a kind of election rally for the Gaidar election slate, the so-called Russia's Choice. This was held at the Aganbegyan Institute for National Economy in the southwest corner of Moscow. If you looked up on the podium, the lineup was: Christopher, Aganbegyan, Gaidar, U.S. roving ambassador Strobe Talbott, and Ambassador to Moscow Thomas Pickering. There was very little time spent on the events at the White House just a few days before. Rather, Christopher's argument was, synthetically, that Yeltsin equals democracy equals the free market, and all of the combinations of that. I think this is the wrong policy, and some people have learned nothing from their previous support of Gorbachov.

Assault on the intelligentsia

I would like to focus with special emphasis on one of the groups in Russian society which has been hardest hit by these measures, which I think is absolutely critical for the future, and that is the intelligentsia. You often hear analyses of Russian society, saying that it is an imperial two-class system with a tiny elite and a large mass. There is something to that; but there is, indeed, a middle class in Russia, between the old communist *nomenklatura* on the one hand, and the masses of workers and peasants on the other. Recent Soviet and Russian history emphatically displays a middle class, or intelligentsia, based especially in state-sponsored professional, educa-

tional, science, and research activity.

The stratum of the intelligentsia is absolutely decisive. These are cultured people, in most cases superior to their counterparts in the United States, certainly. They are interested in science and technology, and they have tended, up to now, to be pro-western. Anti-communist dissidents of the type of Andrei Sakharov typify this layer.

The policy of the United States and the other western nations ought clearly to be to cultivate the friendship of the intelligentsia, for many reasons—if only because they are opinion-shaping leaders, who can potentially incline Russian government and society in a pro-western direction. At the same time, the future technological and economic viability depends directly on the contributions of the scientific intelligentsia, among whom are some of the most advanced scientists to be found anywhere in the world. One of the big problems with the economic policies associated with Yegor Gaidar, Jeffrey Sachs, and the International Monetary Fund, is that these policies have virtually wiped out the intelligentsia.

It now appears that forces around Gaidar and Yeltsin are preparing to dismantle the Russian Academy of Sciences itself. Let me take a minute to explain why this is so dangerous for Russia and for the peace of the world.

The Russian Academy of Sciences is, of course, the current successor of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, an

tial Russian fascist, Fyodor Dostoevsky. Today the revival of this doctrine is defended by the Soviet KGB's publication, *Literaturnaya Gazeta*. Today, mad Philotheos' dogma saturates a powerful, overtly Dostoevskian faction within the leadership of the Soviet military. Today, it is not only the ruling ideology of the Soviet rulership; it is the key to every feature of Soviet practice in foreign policy . . . and in its deployment of the military . . . principally to the purpose of early degradation of the United States to the status of a virtual Soviet imperial satrapy."

Sept. 30, 1984: Presidential candidate LaRouche on nationwide TV says that "Russia's real face is its Third Rome doctrine. Most Americans assume Russia is 'communist,' but it is communism welded onto Russian mystical imperialism."

June 1985: *EIR* publishes a Special Report, "Global Showdown: The Russian Imperial War Plan for 1988," with a preface by LaRouche. It identifies the Soviet war mobilization as the basis of Gorbachov's perestroika, and explains the driving ideology of the Soviet leadership as the "Third Rome" myth. LaRouche pinpoints 1988 as the limit this Gorbachov war mobilization could be sustained until world war, or the collapse of the Soviet empire, ensues.

institution which traces its lineage back to that great Russian National Academy which Peter the Great created around 1700, with the help of the great German philosopher and economist Leibniz. The apparatus of the Russian Academy comprises about 800 full members, perhaps—Sakharov was one of these; Arbatov is one today, along with Velikhov, to name some academicians that people have heard of. There are about 1,000 corresponding members and several thousand institute directors and other important officials. When you put the roster of the Russian Academy of Sciences together, it adds up to approximately 200,000 scientists, researchers, scholars, professors, and so forth—some of them located in Moscow, some of them in regional centers like the Siberian Academy in Novosibirsk, various science cities, and so forth.

According to well-informed sources, the Yeltsin group has hatched a plan to abolish and break up the Russian Academy, through the expedient of inducing the full members and corresponding members to vote their own organization out of existence. The bait being offered to the academicians is a pension windfall of perhaps 1 million rubles a month—momentarily serious money, but maybe in a few months, not. It appears that the motivation of the Yeltsin group includes the desire to profit from the process of privatizing or junking the Russian Academy, plus the urge to wipe out a center of democratic resistance to authoritarianism.

One of the signs of this is something you can already find

in the *New York Times*, and if it's in the *New York Times*, you know that it has got to be a very gross phenomenon indeed: A couple of Sundays ago, they did an article from Akademgorodok, the academic city outside Novosibirsk, and one of the facts they point to is an estimate coming from the OECD that the budget of the Russian Academy has been cut by 60%—almost two-thirds—in real terms, between 1990 and 1992.

Let's take the plan to destroy the Russian Academy of Sciences. I would submit that if this plan were to be carried out, the chances of nuclear war, including nuclear war involving the United States, will increase markedly in the years ahead. Without the scientific and engineering capabilities of the Russian Academy and its subsections, Russia will utterly lack the wherewithal to maintain itself as a modern, productive economy. Should the Russian Academy actually disappear, the Russian economy will enter an irreversible thermodynamic implosion that will guarantee emergency dictatorship and the attempt to compensate politically and economically for the collapse, through outward aggression, conquest, and rapine.

There might be some, here in the United States especially, or in Britain, who might tend to gloat over the destruction of Russian science and engineering. If Russian science is destroyed, they might argue, there is no Russian threat to the West. I would say that is short-sighted *in the extreme*. It is clear that most Red Army infantry and tank formations are today of only limited effectiveness, but many sources confirm that the strategic rocket troops and the ballistic missile submarines, especially those big ones of the Typhoon class, have maintained the highest levels of combat readiness and are prepared to strike virtually without warning.

We would therefore conclude that it is extremely unwise to support a plan to destroy Russia's scientific and engineering potential. The United States and other western nations ought rather to be exploring the forms of international cooperation which could make possible the preservation and development of an asset that is of vital importance for all mankind.

To sum up this analysis: Russia is indeed lost, momentarily. The phase of pro-western curiosity that was observable at the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, has now been supplanted by a climate of rage and despair. A great deal of this rage is directed against the United States, because of the obvious role of the United States in supporting the IMF, because of the role of people like George Soros, and above all because of the contribution of Bush and Thatcher to the present situation. When this debate gets under way, just like in 1949 and 1950, the congressional committees were investigating "Who Lost China?"—I'm afraid we're going to have to have repeats of those in the coming months—the answer is going to be: George Bush, Margaret Thatcher, and their policies are responsible for this looming catastrophe in regard to Russia. Perhaps I shouldn't say