

Editorial

Eurasian development or British swinishness

The latest wave of terrorism comes at a time when the financial markets are teetering on the brink of collapse, but also when there is the prospect for an alternative path to oligarchical rule and social collapse. Surely the historic May 7-9 conference in Beijing, on creating a Eurasian land-bridge, was on President William Clinton's mind when he coupled the reemergence of China and Russia as great powers, to the terrorist incidents of the past weeks.

For the British, rebuilding the historic Silk Road, through construction of a major railroad linking Asia to Europe through Russia, is more than a threat to their wished-for hegemony. To them it is an outrage. This was confided to *EIR* by a top-ranking British military person on July 26, who, not surprisingly, wished to remain anonymous. Such a land-bridge, he said, would be a threat to British imperial designs, equivalent to the threat posed by Adolf Hitler. The land-bridge "would not be accessible to the Anglo-American maritime powers," and the effect of building these railways "would have an enormous multiplier effect, in terms of materials and logistical infrastructure."

Global development on this scale would end the reign of the British-controlled International Monetary Fund's attempt to impose a dictatorship over the world economy, and re-create the conditions for viable national economies. Not only in Asia, but globally.

Such a situation, in which China and Russia would realize their status as superpowers, along with the United States, is intolerable to British geopolitical thinkers today, just as it was to the pre-World War II geographer Halford Mackinder, and to Franklin Roosevelt's enemy, Winston Churchill.

Clinton understands that the British Empire still exists, and he knows that it is evil. It is not just an aspiration of the Chinese which the British fear, but the attraction of Clinton to the politics of Franklin Roosevelt, who created the historic World War II alliance among the Soviet Union, China, and the United States—an alliance intended to defeat British imperialism once and for all, as soon as a military victory over Germany and Japan had been achieved.

On July 29, in the wake of two major British-inspired terrorist incidents on U.S. territory, the *New York Times* reviewed Clinton's foreign policy. On the same day, of the whole article, the British wire service Reuters singled out Clinton's remarks on how the "unfinished business of leaving the Cold War behind" has been a major part of his foreign policy framework since taking office in 1993. This, for Clinton, has meant creating the conditions in which China and Russia would, in his words, "define their greatness."

"Will they define their greatness in terms of their internal achievements," he asked, "and what kind of values and character they have, what kind of economic achievements they can have . . . how they can solve their problems?" While he did not explicitly reference plans to revitalize the Silk Road, Clinton asserted: "It seems to me that if America is at the center of these emerging [trade] networks, it dramatically increases our leverage to work with people for peace, for human rights and for stability in the world." Such a policy orientation is precisely what Reuters' masters fear.

At the Beijing conference, British representative and Vice President of the European Commission Sir Leon Brittan attacked plans for such a continental link, and said that the Chinese must instead bow to the dictates of "the market," i.e., that China would not be allowed to buck the plans of the British monarchy.

This Grand Design for peace through development is central to the economic program of Lyndon LaRouche, and it was an important element in the discussion in Beijing, where Helga Zepp LaRouche spoke on how building a Eurasian land-bridge would be the basis of a new Renaissance. She closed her remarks with a call to humanity, saying that if this were realized, then the conference would be remembered generations far into the future, who would say of those at the conference, "Yes, they were like the people of the Italian Renaissance and the Sung dynasty. Yes,' perhaps they will even say, 'they even were a little better.'"

It is this promise which the British fear, and which they seek to defeat with a new terror wave. They cannot be allowed to succeed.