

Neo-Cons: The View From Russia

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

October 8, 2005

A set of dispatches from Russia viewed by *EIR* today, point to the importance of developing a shared, common-interest strategic outlook on the so-called “neo-conservative” phenomenon today. For Russians today, this requires a rapid and accurate general review of the role of the notorious Alexander Helphand (“Parvus”) during the period from his visit as a guest of British intelligence services in London, through his role as a British agent in London’s “Young Turk” operation, through his role in two Russian revolutions, his role as an arms-trafficker, and his interventions into Germany before and after World War I, including his supporting role in the circles of Hitler predecessor Coudenhove-Kalergi.

It is past time to put aside the conventional fairy-tales about such matters, and to recognize the continuous, leading role of the neo-Venetian, imperialist motivation of the relevant Anglo-Dutch Liberal circles formerly associated with Lord Shelburne’s imperial British East India Company, through the French Revolution, Napoleonic wars, two so-called World Wars, and the long threat of nuclear “Armageddon” launched by Winston Churchill, Bertrand Russell, and their successors over the 1945-1989 interval.

Since the famous “Seven Years War” by which the East India Company established its imperial power in the Paris Treaty of February 1763, there has been a perpetual conflict between imperial financier interests and the struggle for the security of an emerging system of sovereign nation-states, a struggle typified by the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence and the imperial adventures of the neo-Venetian British East Company and its successors.

The two “world wars” of the last century were a product of British King Edward VII’s efforts to put all continental Europe in flames, in a London-orchestrated war between the King’s two nephews, the German Kaiser and the Russian Czar. Such wars have come and gone, but the essential intent remains. That imperialist enterprise is what is expressed typically by the drive toward so-called “globalization” today. The Anglo-American neo-conservatives associated with Michael Ledeen are a typical expression of that imperial intention today.

The self-styled Trotskyists of sundry pedigrees who have

come into a prominent role on behalf of the imperial adventurism of U.S. Vice-President Cheney, are a logical expression of the quality of an “interchangeable,” right-left part which has existed since Lord Shelburne’s launching and orchestration of both the French Revolution of 1789 and the ensuing repetition of the “Seven Years War” as the Napoleonic Wars.

The leading idiots of my own republic, the U.S.A., have so far distinguished themselves as fools by their persisting delusion that the U.S. alliance with London in two world wars and the U.S.-Soviet conflict of the post-Franklin Roosevelt interval, were not of a piece with Edward VII’s successful manipulation of his two foolish nephews, the German Kaiser and Russian Czar. The continuing objective has been the ruin of the threat of strong and independent nation-states on the continent of Eurasia, in favor of that same parasitical slime-mold known as the London-centered, neo-Venetian, *ultra-montane* system of global financier tyranny which is behind the drive toward “globalization” still today.

These “neo-conservative” Trotskyists associated with Cheney’s war-making efforts today, are each and all tools of the relevant neo-Venetian style in that mass of family-centered financier associations which are combined in the fashion of the individual member of a common slime-mold. They are typical of the petty fanatics who dream wet dreams, in the fashion of lackeys behind the curtains, of orchestrating the history of the world, the naughty children following the whistle of the rat-catcher of Hamelin.

As we approach the onrushing greatest crisis in modern history, let us not be played for fools, once again, this time.

Documentation

Oct. 8 (EIRNS)—Writers in Russia have begun to point up “neo-Bolshevik” qualities in current U.S. policies. Columnist Igor Torbakov, in an overview published by Eurasianet.org on Sept. 28, cited recent articles by political scientist Boris Mezhujev and by a former advisor to Mikhail Gorbachov named Alexander Tsipko (both of whom Torbakov oddly dubbed “arch-conservatives”). “The leader of the biggest world power has actually turned himself into a champion of world revolution,” wrote Mezhujev about George W. Bush, in an APN.ru commentary. Tsipko titled a recent article, “The Colored Revolutions, or the Revival of Bolshevism.” He compared Bush with Lenin, with respect to “exporting revolution.”

None of the commentaries cited by Torbakov touched on how today’s “right-Synarchist” doctrines of permanent war, espoused by the neo-cons, are rooted in the “left-Synarchist” campaigns by Leon Trotsky and Alexander Helphand Parvus for “permanent revolution,” 100 years ago. *EIR* of Sept. 23 presented that historical continuity in depth.