

Lord Rees-Mogg kicks the dragon

Kathy Wolfe analyzes the ongoing attempts by the British to destabilize China and hand President Clinton a foreign policy disaster.

In the last two months, Britain's leading propaganda units, from the London *Times* to the London *Economist*, have escalated their campaign to carve up the nation of China, with a series of mad "predictions" that China, if confronted harshly by "the West," will fall apart, as did the former Soviet Union.

It was these threats from London and its assets in Washington, which *provoked* the alarming March and April military maneuvers by China in the Taiwan Strait, and by North Korea in the Korean Demilitarized Zone (DMZ), *EIR* has learned. Britain also seeks to provoke confrontation between President William Clinton and Beijing, to create a foreign policy disaster for the President.

Lord William Rees-Mogg, a spokesman for British intelligence, stated the policy in an April 8 editorial in the *Times*, entitled "The Encircled Dragon Lashes Out." Rees-Mogg, former *Times* editor, wrote that China first threatened Taiwan with missile exercises on March 9-21, and then encouraged North Korea to "pressure" the United States by trucking troops into the DMZ on April 5-7, as a "dangerous geopolitical game."

China, however, will soon collapse, Rees-Mogg claims. Beijing's game is "played from weakness," he stated, because "China exists inside a large box," surrounded by hostile powers, and could end up as Germany did after World War I: defeated and subject to humiliating foreign treaty demands. Beijing's "lashing out" shows the "typical signs of the end of a regime, the traditional disorder which has appeared at the end of every Chinese dynasty," he concluded.

The *Economist*, a mouthpiece of the Lazard Bank, the Rothschilds, and the City of London, chimed in on April 20 with a cover story entitled "Will China Disintegrate?" "There are persistent signs," the story said, "that certain provinces and regions—many with languages or Chinese dialects of their own—perceive their interests as quite separate from those" of Beijing. The article cited "huge economic disparities between regions," trade barriers set up between provinces, and a "general loss of central political authority." It concluded: "Some believe such differences will continue to tug the regions away from the center, and some could one day break away."

A new opium war

The *Economist Intelligence Unit*, a spinoff of the *Economist*, published an extensive prediction on April 22 that China will break up after the death of leader Deng Xiaoping. "This

will make China an unpleasant place to do business," they wrote, inciting a run out of investment in China. The *Economist* has had no fewer than four such cover stories this year alone.

EIR Contributing Editor and Democratic Party Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche pointed out recently, that the Chinese leadership is by no means blind to the current British machinations.

"The Beijing government understands one thing very clearly, and they understand it from the history of [19th-century British Prime Minister] Lord Palmerston and the China Opium Wars," LaRouche said in an interview. "They trace carefully, in their study of history, those British families which have the same policy toward China, as did Palmerston's crowd. They recognize the British are out to destroy China, to carve it up into several pieces. And they react.

"Rees-Mogg is one of those who's out to destroy China," LaRouche continued, "by a destabilization of the Far East, which would result in China's being carved up into several pieces. His function is as a senior public relations spokesman for the inner core of the British financial oligarchy . . . very close to the Privy Council, which is the actual government of Britain."

Britain has proposed to carve up China since London's Institute for Strategic and International Studies (IISS) published a plan in March 1994 to cut China's area in half, by creating independent entities of Xinjiang, Tibet, Yunnan, Guangdong and other southern provinces, and Manchuria. IISS officials such as Gerald Segal encourage Taiwan to declare its independence from China. Beijing has long stated that this would result in war.

Rees-Mogg, the IISS, and the *Economist* are pushing Britain's Conservative Party and its dupes in the U.S. Republican Party into confrontation with Beijing, Peter Ferdinand, former Asia Director for the London Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), told *EIR* on April 9. "The idea of China being an 'evil Empire' which may be made to collapse, may well be in their minds," he said. "They are especially upset about the aggressive noises which China is making about Hongkong."

Provocations and reactions

It is such threats from London, and British assets in Washington, which have *provoked* the recent military scares in the

Far East, informed Asian diplomats tell *EIR*. They dismiss as “nonsense,” the Western media spin that China and North Korea were simply trying to influence the March 23 Taiwan elections and April 11 South Korean elections. “Both Beijing and Pyongyang have a deeper, strategic worry,” one source said. “They are making a strategic statement on their national existence.”

It is London loonies such as Rees-Mogg, LaRouche explained, who are kicking the Chinese dragon, thus creating a dangerous military situation. “This is not something coming out of North Korea as such, out of Pyongyang,” he said of the April 5-7 North Korean troop movements in the DMZ. “It’s coming out of China, or some factions in China, which are recommending to the North Korean capital that it play some of the pressure tactics” which China played in the Taiwan Straits.

The “real problem,” one Asian negotiator told *EIR*, is the British idea, now popular with Republicans such as Sen. Jesse Helms (N.C.), that North Korea and China will soon “go away,” fall apart like East Germany or the Soviet Union. “They are treating the Pyongyang regime as something to be confronted, and forced to crack. But North Korea won’t ‘go away,’ ” the diplomat said. It “could open up and in 15-20 years become a different place. But it won’t collapse, as they think. . . .

“This is part of a much broader miscalculation in London and Washington about *China*, he said. “The opinion on Capitol Hill right now is that China, fairly soon, will ‘go away,’ like the U.S.S.R., so there is no point dealing with Beijing. This is crazy. China is not ‘going away.’ They can’t kill 1.3 billion people.”

British think-tankers admit openly that Beijing and Pyongyang are reacting to pressure from London and Washington. “People in London and Washington are pushing” to confront North Korea and China, believing they will collapse as did East Germany and the Soviet Union, says Dr. E.R. Kang of the University of London School of Oriental Studies (formerly the British East India Company). “Take the sudden pressure on the Chinese over human rights. That’s what the Chinese complain of, in disputes with the British over Hongkong. Beijing says Britain didn’t introduce democracy for 150 years, and now they’re doing it only to foment internal dissent in China. . . .

“There are NATO people who treat Russia as a defeated state, and there is a tendency to treat China the same way,” said Kang, identifying a military network dominated by the British in NATO which is then played back into the U.S. Pentagon. “The Pentagon perceives China as a strategic threat,” he asserted, blaming the Americans for London’s sins as usual, “which needs to be contained.”

Kang also added that “academics associated with the Pentagon such as Samuel Huntington, with his ‘Clash of Civilizations,’ and Francis Fukuyama, are very much on this line. Huntington says that we must inevitably clash with

Islam, clash with China; let’s do it! Fukuyama can’t tolerate the survival of Marxist states.”

Hit Clinton foreign policy

The British would also like to have a military crisis in the Far East to create a major disaster for President Clinton, LaRouche pointed out. “These are the enemies of Clinton,” he said. The British oppose Clinton’s programs to bring peace settlements and economic growth to Korea, the Middle East, Ireland, Bosnia, and other areas, and have vowed to run him out of office.

“There are those in the United States, on the Republican side, who are trying to do everything possible, with London’s cooperation,” to destroy Clinton’s foreign policy, LaRouche added. “In Korea, with respect to China, in dealing with Japan, the Middle East, Ireland, in dealing with Russia, and so forth, they’re trying, as we say in the vernacular, to ‘screw up’ Clinton. It’s Republicans going to bed with Margaret Thatcher’s crowd in London and Rees-Mogg’s crowd, which is playing the susceptibilities of Beijing . . . and Pyongyang.”

Britain’s International Monetary Fund (IMF)-type free trade policy especially creates tremendous pressure on Beijing and Pyongyang, Dr. Kang noted. Recent military actions “demonstrate the feeling of vulnerability of the Communist leaders, that while their system is still Marxist, everything around them, the economy, the culture, is becoming liberalized. So China and North Korea sense the Western powers pushing against them, and they sense internal vulnerability.”

China is not falling apart as quickly as the IISS projected in its March 1994 plan, Peter Ferdinand of the RIIA said, but the IISS and RIIA believe the “world environment” of IMF free trade will destroy China. “Our conclusion at a recent conference was that to talk about the rapid collapse of China was overdone, since the South, especially Guangdong, doesn’t have a tradition of being fully independent of Beijing,” he said.

“Now there could, however, be other parts of China, such as the periphery, the far north or Tibet, which may press for autonomy,” he said, “and there is, however, still some mileage, in the idea of a parting of the ways between a Northern China and a Southern China. Not just Guangdong, but other Southern provinces, might come to feel that Beijing was . . . living off the backs of the people doing the actual work in the South.”

Eventually, Ferdinand concluded, the leadership in Beijing will “fall out amongst themselves,” arguing over “fundamental issues” such as “how to carry out the [IMF] reforms, the strategy for reform of loss-making state enterprises, the layoffs which are potentially explosive, the privatization of enterprises. . . . None of their plans are going to work, and there’s the possibility of a significant downturn, with a very large number of people being put out of work. The leadership’s problems have been patched over, but by no means solved.”