

strations had served neither their fellow citizens, nor themselves, but rather that hitherto “invisible” class, which was now visible everywhere with its Mercedes, high-fenced mansions, gangster manners, primitive interests, and no soul. The new class, meanwhile, underwent an amazingly rapid ideological transformation to neo-conservatism. Seeking protection for their property from the new poor, those new rich that originated from among the heralds of liberty, now were interested in “law and order.”

The Oktyabrsky district of Moscow, under Zaslavsky’s rule, and the top-down control of the Russian media by Yeltsin’s crony Mikhail Poltoranin,⁶ are just two models of the “democratic authoritarianism,” which the politicians most favored by British circles and the U.S. “democracy” promoters from the IRI sought to establish throughout Russia. In the second half of 1992, this effort made a dramatic and qualitative advance.

The cost of British support

Inside Russia, the “shock therapy”—the overnight decontrol of prices, even though many suppliers enjoyed monopoly positions in their sector—imposed by the Yegor Gaidar government’s cohort of Mont Pelerin Society-trained radical free marketeers, had devastated the living standards of the Russian population and the functioning of industry, within a matter of months after its implementation in January 1992. In the United States, the defeat of George Bush looked more and more certain. The future “Sir” Bush had taken Margaret Thatcher’s lead on strategic matters, from their shared sour reaction to the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, to the hyper-enthusiastic rampages of the Persian Gulf War in 1990-91. Uncertainty as to whether President Bill Clinton would be as compliant, dictated an escalation of London propaganda, as well as concrete efforts, for a “democratic” dictatorship, in the person of Yeltsin, to be consolidated in Russia.

It is a well-known phenomenon in Russian history, how British strategists appreciate Russian Tsars—especially if they have a clear line of sight to the Achilles’ heel of the latter, and some leverage to keep up a level of instability in his dominions!

Review some items from the record of that period:

April 13, 1992: Lt. Gen. William E. Odom, former director of the U.S. National Security Agency (1985-88), wrote in the *Washington Post*, “If [emerging dictators] are committed to privatization and building a strong and honest state administration, they . . . might be the best hope for a future return to democracy.” In conversation with *EIR* about the Odom article, a London strategist rejoined that the International Monetary Fund would prefer an “authoritarian Presidency”

tee for the Emergency, in August 1991. Yeltsin, as Russian President, resisted. The coup collapsed, and so did the U.S.S.R.

6. Roman Bessonov, “Krieble’s Friends in Yeltsin’s Service,” *EIR*, Oct. 4, 1996.

in Russia, to a “democratic” system.

March 17, 1993: The *Financial Times* of London editorialized, “The West may soon have to choose between an obstructive parliament and a government aiming to introduce the conditions for stable democracy, including a market economy. It would have to choose Mr. Yeltsin. It cannot side with the parliamentarians whose hard core is anti-market, anti-democratic, and anti-western. Democracies must back even authoritarian rulers if the alternatives are worse.”

In November 1992, a week after Clinton defeated Bush in the United States, President Yeltsin hurried to London. The agreements he signed with the British leadership were so detailed and thorough-going, that the London press, joined by *Izvestia* from Moscow, chorused that a Russian-British

The Windsors ‘do’ Russia

Queen Elizabeth II’s state visit to Russia in October 1994 was the first such excursion for a British monarch, since the 1918 execution of Tsar Nicholas II and his family. Nicholas was a close cousin, in the previous generation, of Elizabeth and of her consort, the Duke of Edinburgh (Prince Philip). Alexandra, the wife of Nicholas, was one of Queen Victoria’s many grandchildren.

Preceding his mother, Prince Charles visited St. Petersburg in 1994, at the head of a team of British businessmen.

But Prince Philip led the way, on another track. In a March 14, 1992 article, the London *Spectator* reported that, for “ecological” and other reasons, Philip was “anxious to rediscover his Greek Orthodox roots” (he was born a member of the Greek royal family). “He has personally planned a number of foreign trips that will take him on a pilgrimage to the holy peninsula of Mount Athos and to meetings with Patriarchs of the Eastern Orthodox Church.” In May 1991, Philip had met with the Russian Orthodox bishop in Britain, Metropolitan Anthony Bloom, in preparation for a solo visit to Russia in 1993, “the first time that a senior member of the royal family will have visited the country since the Romanovs were assassinated in 1917 [sic].”

The Queen’s visit was announced in February 1994. As the date drew near, President Yeltsin, on a stopover in Britain on Sept. 26, 1994, en route to the United Nations General Assembly in New York, declared about the pending arrival in Moscow of the British monarch, the leading light of the international oligarchy, “It means Russia has firmly and irrevocably entered on the democratic path.”