
A Strategic Assessment by Lyndon LaRouche

To understand Bush's policy, look at how Britain set up World War I

The following is excerpted from a campaign statement issued by presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche on Dec. 1.

If you look at the way George Bush has been flip-flopping on the question of recognition of Ukraine, you may wonder why. I shall explain to you exactly what's going on.

You have to go back to the beginning of this century, about the time that the British had planned to start a general war in Europe, because they feared, at that time, that Germany, together with France and with Russia, would develop railway networks, such as from Paris to Vladivostok, and from Berlin to Baghdad, which would make the entire Eurasian continent as area of high-technology development—that is, large-scale infrastructure projects leading to modern technology spreading all over the place, in agriculture, in industry. And that, the British did not want. So they organized World War I to prevent that from happening. By aid of President Teddy Roosevelt coming into power, through the shooting of McKinley and other things, the United States was brought in on Britain's side.

The first thing the British did in the 1890s was to target France, to get rid of the patriotic, pro-development types in France, and push them to one side; and bring together a group of people who came out of the radical republican tradition, who were, as the French say, *revanchistes* [intent upon revenge]—they wanted war against Germany to get back Alsace-Lorraine, and they didn't care what happened to the rest of the world, as long as that objective was realized. This included a fellow by the name of Théophile Delcassé, who was in the Foreign Service at that time, and he was a patsy for a British fellow by the name of Lord Grey.

Now, what the French did, over the period 1898-1904, is enter into a pact of submission to London which became known as the Entente Cordiale. Once, by 1904, the Entente Cordiale had been cemented in place in the relationship between London and Paris, London and Paris together were able to proceed to bring Russia onto the side of the Entente Cordiale, as well as Italy, eventually; but the process was started then, for a war against Germany and also Hungary.

They started the war from Italy, and they started it in the Balkans—the place where we're having a new Balkan war—and they used the same forces then, as they're using now to get this Balkan war going. They played the Serbian card; and

they're playing the Serbian card now. They used the breakup of the Ottoman Empire as the occasion for this kind of process.

Now, admittedly, the German government didn't behave entirely too well in this process—they fell somewhat into the trap—but they were the least guilty of all parties. The Austro-Hungarian emperor did fall into the trap, and actually double-crossed his German allies, who wanted to *avoid* the war, by setting up a situation in which the war became inevitable. There were people on the Russian side who wished to avoid war, but they were outflanked and outmanipulated.

So, that's how World War I started and that's how it was organized.

Now, at the end of the war, obviously, the Anglo-Americans imposed conditions of peace which were consistent with their war objectives. These conditions of peace are known generically as the Versailles institutions: not just the Versailles Treaty as such, but also the Sykes-Picot treaty affecting the Middle East and so forth—the whole package of arrangements redrawing the map of Europe, defining borders, defining governments, and all these sorts of things; and deciding what they thought should not be allowed to happen in the future.

Essentially the purpose of the Versailles system was to ensure that the British forces, the Entente Cordiale—Paris, dominated by London, and an American giant, American muscle, controlled by British brains—that this combination would control the world forever. That was essentially the direction they intended to move.

It didn't work, and blew up in World War II.

The philosophy of the Versailles system

But at the end of World War II, in Bretton Woods and elsewhere, new arrangements were made which *affirmed* essentially the philosophy of the Versailles system. The philosophy of the Versailles system is essentially what we call geopolitics: a kind of quasi-religious kookery—pagan religious kookery, that is—dreamed up by Halford Mackinder and others in London, to say that the rim must control the heartland, the heartland being Eurasia, and the rim being the British Empire and its cohorts.

So that's where we are today. Now, look at the lineup. With some degree of exception, but generally true, the gov-

ernment of François Mitterrand of France is playing the Entente Cordiale role of pre-World War I France with Britain. Italy has been pulled into the same alignment against Germany—particularly the presidency, Foreign Minister DeMichele and the President, have moved into a position of support of the British pro-Serbian line, despite the fact that the Serbians are butchering Croats left and right.

The argument that's made in policymaking for this apology for the Serbian butchers is that we must preserve Yugoslavia at all costs. So, here we have what the Serbs are doing to the Croats, in particular. What Saddam Hussein was *accused* of doing to the Kuwaitis was absolutely small-time stuff compared to what the Serbs have been doing, week after week, to the Croats—week after week after week.

The United States does not protest.

The Soviet Union no longer exists

Now, look at the Russian side. Now we come to the real idiocy. *The Soviet Union no longer exists*. It has not existed for months! In fact, it really went out of business right after the summer coup, when it liquidated. Nonetheless, the Anglo-Americans, backed by the stupid U.S. media—radio, television, and print—keep telling you about this and that agreement that the United States or somebody else has negotiated with the Soviet government. But the Soviet government does not exist! Gorbachov is a stateless President. There is no Soviet Union. There are only the relics of a Soviet Union. What exists is, primarily, the Russian Federation, the Russian republic. What remains of the Soviet government is now on the payroll of the Russian republic under Yeltsin—including Gorbachov. Most of these fellows are under investigation; the Politburo people are under investigation, or criminal prosecution, including Gorbachov. Gorbachov doesn't function unless he gets a paycheck from Yeltsin! The great bank of Russia that everybody thinks they're negotiating with, doesn't function, unless the Russians and others put deposits in there. It has no power over Russia, it has no power over Ukraine, over Belorussia, over Kazakhstan.

There is no Soviet government! There is an attempt to create some kind of cooperative confederation from among the remains of what was once the Soviet Union, but there is no Soviet government. So why does George Bush, why do the U.S. press, why do the British press, keep talking about these negotiations with the Soviet government? Because the Soviet government is part of the Versailles system, that is, as amended by World War II. Just as the Versailles system wishes to maintain Yugoslavia as a unit, at all costs and all pretenses, so they want to maintain the Soviet government as a unit, even when the Soviet government no longer exists. That will change.

What London fears

The fear was, with the British in the case of World War I, not merely that France and Germany and Russia would

hook up for infrastructural development, say from Brest to Vladivostok and so forth, but that that would destroy the British Empire, the British colonial world. That would destroy, for example, the colonies, the colonial status of the Central and South America, of Africa, southern Asia, and so forth, and that, the British did not want.

Now, what are these fellows afraid of, and why are they afraid of me, still, in Washington, the way they are? Here I am; they stuck me in prison, but they're *terrified* of me. What are they afraid of? Well, the reason they stuck me in prison is that I moved to upset their little colonial arrangement in Central and South America, and a few other places, by demanding a new monetary system. And we came close in 1982 to actually pushing that through. That's why they moved—Kissinger and company, on behalf of the British and other banks—to have me thrown into prison, back then. It took them time to do it, but they did it, with George Bush's help.

The issue was this banking and colonialism business: like the North American Free Trade Agreement, for example; NAFTA's an expression of that policy—genocide against the peoples of Central and South America. That is U.S. policy. Kissinger said so in a number of places, including in official National Security Study Memorandum 200 in 1974. Brent Scowcroft said the same thing, in a memorandum, when he succeeded Kissinger back in 1975, following up Kissinger.

The policy of the United States is genocide against Central and South America, and Africa, and the people of Asia, especially the peoples of Southeast Asia, India, and so forth. That's their policy. You may not know it, but that's your government's policy.

What comes in now? The Soviet Union is dismembered, disintegrated. The Warsaw Pact has disintegrated. What is the greatest fear of the Anglo-Americans behind the Halford Mackinder geopolitical policy? The fear is that the nations of eastern Europe, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, in particular, together with places like Ukraine or the Russian Federation, or Belorussia, would line up on the side of the patriots of Central and South America, Africa, and Asia, and say: No, there has to be an equitable, new world monetary and economic system, under which every nation has a right to participate in investing in scientific and technological progress to improve the conditions of their people; that is a sovereign right.

What the United States hoped, was that because of Mrs. Thatcher and Bush's close relationship with Gorbachov, they could get Gorbachov and the newly weakened remains of the Soviet Union to throw their weight on the side of British imperialism—to put it bluntly—and thus keep this kind of Anglo-American Roman Empire ruling the world forever, crushing anybody who wanted to develop their country.

Now the danger they see is that if the Soviet Union crumbles, Ukraine, the Russian republic, and others will begin to move together and put themselves politically on the side of those who want monetary reform. . . .