

Editorial

An urgent strategic deal with China

Whenever the *Washington Post*, the *Washington Times*, **and** the *New York Times*—along with a host of outright British agents—are so hysterical about an event, you might guess that something worthwhile is going on. Such is definitely the case in the matter of the recent diplomacy of the Clinton administration toward the People's Republic of China.

As *EIR* founding editor Lyndon LaRouche put it in an interview on March 26, "it is urgent strategically for the United States, to maintain a constructive engagement with the present government of China." With the world on the edge of total financial disintegration, the potential for creating an economic renaissance—and indeed, maintaining civilization—depends upon two focal points, that of the government of the United States, and the government of China. If these two capitals do not have a working agreement on the creation of a new monetary system, and the reconstruction of the world economy, along the lines of the Eurasian Land-Bridge policy, there is little hope for humanity's survival through the next 100 years.

EIR does not speak about this matter as an "outsider;" in fact, Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp LaRouche and *EIR* have played a critical role over the past several years in putting together the conception of a Eurasian Land-Bridge, starting with Lyndon LaRouche's idea of the European Productive Triangle, back in 1990, and culminating, so far, in the participation of Mrs. LaRouche and two associates, in Beijing's International Symposium on Economic Development of the Regions Along the Euro-Asia Continental Bridge," in May 1996.

It is transparent, as *EIR*'s recent feature stories have shown, why the British would like to prevent such a U.S.-Chinese strategic deal. We refer you to our feature story of Nov. 22, 1996, "Ring Around China: Britain Seeks War," which outlined the role of British spokesmen like Gerald Segal, as well as U.S. Congressmen on the British leash, in seeking provocations. In our last issue, we updated this story, with reference to both the on-the-ground activations in China, and the burgeoning anti-China propaganda campaign in the United States.

British policy is Commonwealth imperial policy, and calls for the breakup of China. Only a fool, or historical illiterate, could overlook this fact, in light of British hysteria over having to give up their Crown Colony of Hongkong, a colony which they stole "fair and square," through the notorious Opium Wars of the nineteenth century. British geopolitics proceeds from the axiomatic assumption that nation-states, particularly major ones, must always be at each other's throats, especially because such conflicts enhance the role of the British-dominated financier oligarchy.

But what about the objections of others? Is developing China, and landlocked Asia, a threat? To the contrary, it is economic disintegration that would lead to wars and instability. Is concern about China's human rights violations a reason to avoid collaboration? Who are Americans to talk about human rights? Look at the atrocities being committed by the U.S. Department of Justice. Look at the genocide we're permitting to be carried out in Africa, some of which is clearly by "off-the-reservation" U.S. assets, and the bulk by our "dear ally" Great Britain.

Reality must be faced. If the policy of Eurasian development, also known as the "New Silk Road," is not adopted by the world's leading governments—led by the United States and China—the world is headed for hell. This should be obvious everywhere, from western Europe, to the countries of the Third World, to Russia. The policy of establishing corridors of development through Russia, as well as the southern route through Iran and India, is already on the table for the Russian government, and it is just about the only hope to prevent the disintegration of that imploding, nuclear-armed superpower.

So far, it seems as though the Clinton administration, including through Vice-President Gore, has been pursuing a rational policy of engagement. It has not yet quite reached the level former Commerce Secretary Ron Brown had chosen, by putting billions of dollars of large construction projects on the table. But it is in the right direction. Ultimately, it's the Eurasian Land-Bridge which must be adopted, for the sake of all mankind.