

nuclear forces, warnings systems, anti-missiles defenses, satellites, weapons stockpiles, and key industrial facilities. Among the internal dangers, are the activation of extremist and separatist groups, the planning and preparation of actions to disrupt the infrastructure for the functioning of the state, organized crime, unregulated trade in explosives and weapons, and so forth.

In recent weeks, top military officers like Gen. Leonid Ivashov, head of the Russian Defense Ministry's international department, have voiced their acute sensitivity to the strategic articulation of such threats. General Ivashov spoke on Qatari television in early October, about Zbigniew Brzezinski's designation of Central Asia as "the Eurasian Balkans," and suggested that it was "the old dream of the West," at least since Henry Kissinger's time, "to pit Russia against the Islamic world."

The Military Doctrine draft mandates a traditional Russian, elaborate check-list for the timely identification, classification, and response to military threats to the country.

The use of nuclear weapons

It was under the late Soviet President and Communist Party General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, that Moscow publicly renounced the first use of nuclear weapons, although Soviet military planners never stopped their study and development of "first strike" options in modern warfare. In 1993, the passages made public from the Russian Federation's Military Doctrine allowed that nuclear weapons could be used first, "in the event of a full-scale aggression by a nuclear power against Russia," or, if Russia were attacked "by an ally of a nuclear power," even if the attacking country lacked a nuclear arsenal of its own.

Gen. Valeri Manilov, First Deputy Chief of the General Staff, said back then (November 1993), "The Russian Armed Forces will use all means at their disposal, to repulse an attack on Russia or its allies, and defeat the aggressor."

The new draft Military Doctrine broadens this language in several respects. The main relevant paragraph is: "The Russian Federation reserves the right to use nuclear weapons in response to the use, against itself and its allies, of nuclear and other weapons of mass attack, as well as in response to large-scale aggression employing conventional weapons, in situations that are critical for the national security of the Russian Federation and its allies."

With the release of the new draft, General Colonel Manilov was much in evidence, once again, as one of its lead authors. He told *Krasnaya Zvezda*, that "recent events, including in the Balkans and the North Caucasus, meant that we had to complete the work on the draft started more than two years ago."

Advanced technologies

Under the "military-economic" heading, the draft Military Doctrine outlines a number of requirements, which allude

to the Russian push for "energy-dense," new weapons development, under conditions of very austere financing. These are the development areas, discussed in *EIR* several times this year: July 16, R. Douglas, "Russians Seek 'Asymmetric' Advantages in Military Technology"; Oct. 15, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., "Science Versus 'New Math' Witchcraft"; and L. Hecht, "Nuclear Nightmare of the Information Age."

In the new Russian draft, the identified priority tasks include:

- development of the scientific, technological, and production base of the state's military organization and military infrastructure;
- creation and development of weapons systems and special military equipment;
- initial scientific and design work "for the creation of a highly effective new-generation weapons system," and preparations to supply it to the Armed Forces;
- "development and production of highly effective command systems for troops and weapons, communications, intelligence, strategic warning, radioelectronic warfare, and highly accurate, mobile non-nuclear means of attack, as well as their informational support systems."

"The Russians are doing very significant work on EMP-based [electromagnetic pulse] weapons and directed energy weapons, LaRouche is definitely pointing in the right direction," a knowledgeable European expert on the Russian military told *EIR* in early October. "These area-destruction weapons immobilize the communications and information of an entire area. At the same time, watch the newest series of Russian ground-to-air missiles, the S-400 series, they have directed-energy weapons components as well, I understand. . . . The General Staff is very committed to developing new weapons, new technologies, new types of weapons systems. The General Staff wants to upgrade Russian tactical nuclear weapons capabilities, as well as develop EMP and directed-energy weapons."

If war-avoidance policies were to be adopted at the political and economic strategic level, by U.S. and other national leaderships turned competent, then these types of energy-dense military R&D endeavors in Russia have a different sort of potential for the future — as the means for the reengagement of Russia in its own economic development, and the world's.

Russians briefed on LaRouche Webcast

Prof. Stanislav Menshikov, who took part in Lyndon LaRouche's Oct. 13 press conference over the Internet, published an article, headlined "Plato Among the Bulls in the China Shop," in the Oct. 20-21 issue of the Russian weekly

Slovo. A translation by EIR follows. (Bracketed passages are translation of quotations, where the Russian slightly diverged from the transcript.)

The Russian question in U.S. electoral battles

Although the U.S. Presidential elections are more than a year away, the candidates are beginning to define their positions on the main domestic and foreign policy issues. The “Russian question” occupies a prominent place in these preliminary battles. A growing number of analysts have come to the conclusion, that the Clinton-Gore administration has failed, with respect to Russia. On the one hand, attempts to weaken Russia as much as possible, economically and militarily, have provoked a reaction—an intensification of anti-American and anti-Western attitudes in general, which bodes nothing good for America under Yeltsin’s successors. On the other hand, the so-called market reforms, carried out by pro-American figures inside Russia, promoted the growth of crime and scared away foreign capital from investing in this newly opened domain of neo-colonial exploitation. The disintegration of the Soviet Union and the overthrow of Communism are considered the only achievement of U.S. foreign policy, but it took place before Clinton and Gore took office, so they cannot even boast about that.

Russia can look forward to nothing good, in the event Gore is elected. His constant references to Communism’s being responsible for all of Russia’s ills, demonstrate his extremely primitive notions about our country. His close ties with corrupt circles of the Russian elite also define the current Vice-President’s personal interest in the continuation of the failed policy.

The chief contender from the Republic Party is Gov. George W. Bush of Texas, son of Clinton’s predecessor in the White House. He has not yet said anything intelligible about Russia and its relations with the United States. His chief adviser on Russian affairs, however, Ms. Condoleezza Rice—who is said to be destined for a prominent role in Washington—speaks out actively and, to put it bluntly, with considerable ill will. She is convinced that Russia will continue to disintegrate. Therefore, she thinks, the United States should prepare to bring order to that part of Eurasia. The other possibility, which is less welcome from her point of view, is that a strong leader will appear in Russia and save the country from collapse, but this leader’s policy would likely run counter to U.S. global interests.

It is well known, that Ms. Rice studied Russian affairs from the father of the current U.S. Secretary of State, who, after emigration from Czechoslovakia, turned into a fervent opponent of Russia and instilled his hatred for Russia into his daughter, as well as some of his students. Thus, exchanging Madeleine Albright for Condoleezza Rice will hardly bring any change in American foreign policy.

Against this gloomy backdrop, Lyndon LaRouche, one of the candidates for the Democratic nomination, stands out for the better. This original politician is known for his out-of-the-ordinary analysis of the current geopolitical situation and the state of the world economy. He is convinced that the Western world will experience a financial crash in the near future, which Western leaders of the Gore and Blair type are attempting to avert, aiding and abetting wars against Yugoslavia, Iraq, and other countries that have refused to submit to NATO dictates. Last year’s world financial crisis and the recent panic on Wall Street, show that LaRouche’s forecasts are not without some basis. As for the NATO military threat, LaRouche believes that it may confront Russia, India, and China. The Western bloc’s subjugation of these countries, one at a time, he calls “creeping Third World War.” It will lead to the latest catastrophe for all mankind. In order to prevent this, LaRouche thinks that U.S. global policy must be fundamentally changed, returning to the traditions of a “great President,” Franklin Roosevelt.

A few days ago, LaRouche gave a press conference over the Internet, in which I took part. Answering my question about his position with respect to Russia, LaRouche said the following: “What Roosevelt *intended* to do, [but was unable to do] . . . as the postwar reconstruction, is the model of reference. I wouldn’t necessarily copy it in detail, but the model of reference. . . . What I’m specifically for, is to use the crisis, with the United States President taking the lead, bringing together people from western Europe, with Russia, with China, with India, with other relevant countries, . . . and set into motion a ‘New Bretton Woods,’ . . . a new monetary system, [to replace the current, bankrupt one]. Under those conditions, then, Russia would have to revive and play a more significant role, . . . together with western Europe, Japan, and the United States, in particular, [in] the development of the countries of Asia, which have a [scientific and industrial] technology shortage.” The economic cooperation among our countries will create a firm foundation for the improvement of international relations, and for peace.

LaRouche recalled that, back in 1988-89, he had publicly proposed creation of “a new form of cooperation, under which the [scientific and] technological capabilities of the Soviet Union and eastern Europe will be mobilized, [together with the capabilities of reunified Germany], in order to build cooperation in great infrastructure projects, throughout Eurasia.” This idea was supported by a number of leading German bankers at that time. Its implementation was resisted, however, by the United States and Great Britain, which, together with the IMF [International Monetary Fund], “imposed . . . on Russia [conditions of aid], which almost destroyed the economy of Russia, and has had genocidal effects on some parts of its population. . . . The only way we’re going to stop the problem that now exists, is by recognizing, this policy has been a terrible mistake. And getting into cooperation,



Dr. Stanislav Menshikov (right) with Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., during a seminar in Bonn, April 21, 1999.

cooperative relations, to reverse it, and go on to the kind of policy I proposed [ten years ago].”

During the press conference (a lively exchange, conducted by telephone from two-dozen locations simultaneously), I said quite frankly to LaRouche that his views were little known in the U.S. and abroad, and that it would be desirable for him to have direct discussions with other candidates, in order for those views to be more widely circulated. He responded with his regret, that most of the mass media ignore his campaign. He does not give up, however, and is holding press conferences with the participation of local political leaders from American states, trade union officials, etc. As for the other candidates, they refuse to enter into direct confrontation. “We were told directly: Your candidate (i.e., LaRouche) is so effective, that nobody wants to get into a direct discussion with him. That’s how things are in the U.S. today.”

LaRouche’s well-wishers acknowledge that he is on too high a level for the political standards of America today. He does not want to resemble the other candidates, who emphasize memorized formulas or advertising gimmicks, for purposes of attracting the public or winning financial support from big-money contributors, and so forth. LaRouche, by contrast, relies on the minimal government financing, extended to all candidates who have collected at least 1 million petition signatures [sic]. “The function of a President is [to put forward new ideas], to inspire people. And the President

should be, at least a President of the United States, should be in the model of what Plato referred to as the philosopher-king. An old man, who’s concerned with wisdom and knowledge, with what’s needed by the nation, [faced with a crisis].” Day-to-day questions can be delegated to aides.

Washington’s White House has not had a person on that level residing within its walls for a long time. The military and economically most powerful country in the world has been led, as a rule, by quite mediocre persons. While claiming “world leadership,” they sometimes behave dangerously, acting like bulls in a china shop. Such are the wonders of American democracy. Or, is it just American? Philosopher-kings are a great rarity in the world today. The power of money erases such lone figures down to the role of speechwriters for the representatives of big capital.

But that doesn’t stop LaRouche. He hopes that a deep financial crisis will wake up the American people, since an extraordinary level of leader is needed for salvation from the crisis. He compares this scenario with the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, which made America finally enter the war against fascism.

According to this logic, Russia—if it hopes for changes for the better in Washington—should pin those hopes on either a stock market crash, or some other big jolt. But even that does not give a total guarantee. In short, don’t await favors from America. We must live by our own interests and our wits.