

# Britain's century-old geopolitical obsession revived at Ditchley

by Mark Burdman

In a July 9 speech to the Anglo-American establishment's elitist Ditchley Foundation in Britain, which has recently been made available to a wider public, a senior British establishment figure provided valuable confirmation of *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche's contention that Great Britain's policies over the past 150 years have been determined by a geopolitical obsession to halt economic development on the Eurasian continent. Delivering the annual Foundation Lecture at the Ditchley Park estate near Oxford, historian Sir Michael Howard asserted that it was the development of railways and the resultant emergence of Germany as a European power which were responsible for unleashing this century's two world wars in Europe. According to Howard, this process of industrial and infrastructural development upset the British-backed balance-of-power arrangements for Europe that had been worked out at the Congress of Vienna in 1815.

Sir Michael Howard represents the higher echelons of the Anglo-American establishment. From 1980 through 1989, he was the Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford University, and then, from 1989 until the middle of this year, was Lovett Professor of Military and Naval History at Yale University in the United States. He is also a governor of the Ditchley Foundation, a chief policy institution of the transatlantic establishment which includes among its leaders former British Ambassador to the United States Sir Anthony Acland and former U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance.

Despite Howard's status at the top of the British historical profession, the absurd assertions in his lecture reveal him as an incompetent about recent world history. His "railroads=Germany=wars" construct simply inverts cause and effect. But this makes his comments all the more useful from a clinical standpoint. As LaRouche has repeatedly stressed, it is the *British* who must be held responsible for the two world wars in this century, precisely because their insane insistence on preventing a German-French-Russian "Eurasian" alliance for infrastructure development committed them to a destabilization of continental Europe, playing one country off against another in classic "balance of power" fashion.

LaRouche has further insisted that the current war in former Yugoslavia results from a post-1989 revival of British or British-French "Entente Cordiale" geopolitics: Elites in London and Paris first created a hysteria that the newly united

Germany would become the "Fourth Reich." These elites then encouraged their Serbian friends to launch a war of aggression that would destabilize Germany from the "soft underbelly" of Europe. LaRouche has stressed that those political leaders concerned with stopping the chaos in the Balkans must publicly identify *British geopolitics* as the ultimate cause of the problem, and must break with the big lie of the 20th century—the "victors' history" which holds Germany uniquely responsible for the two world wars and for the present conflict in the Balkans.

These are hardly academic issues, as the current conjuncture in Europe clearly demonstrates. One of the singular aspects of politics in Europe during the summer of 1993 has been the growing number of publications and political figures who have followed *EIR*'s lead to one extent or another, by singling out British geopolitics as being ultimately responsible for the carnage in the former Yugoslavia. While the Croatian daily *Danas*, for example, has exposed the role of Britain's MI-6 intelligence service in fomenting Croatian versus Muslim fighting (see *EIR*, Aug. 27), several leading figures in Bosnia, most outspokenly Vice President Ejup Ganic, have attacked British "tricks" and the British diplomacy of Lord Owen in Geneva, as being to blame for the carnage there. Moreover, Owen's erstwhile partner in crime Cyrus Vance is the chairman of the American branch of the Ditchley Foundation.

Ganic's charges are echoed in the German, Austrian, and Italian press and even by senior officials of the United Nations and a small minority of commentators in Britain and France. Austria's *Die Presse*, charged on Aug. 23 that British and French diplomacy were using Bosnia as an instrument of their respective power interests in Europe, in an attempt to revitalize "old natural alliances in the Balkans war." Quoting the former Swedish commander of the U.N. troops in the Balkans, Gen. Lars Wahlgren, as saying that day-to-day U.N. policy decisions were actually made in Paris and London, *Die Presse* charged that Britain and France were involved in a "struggle for power in Europe."

## Sir Nigel doth protest too much

It is clear that the British are becoming very upset by the attacks on their actions in the Balkans. On Aug. 24, British Ambassador to Germany Sir Nigel Broomfield wrote an article in *Die Welt*, saying that he was "amazed" by the commen-



A scene along the Trans-Siberian Railroad. "The railroad is like a leaven, which creates a cultural fermentation among the population. Even if it passed through an absolutely wild people along its way, it would raise them in a short time to the level prerequisite for its operation," commented Count Sergei Witte.

taries in that newspaper and in the other leading German conservative daily, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, that have attacked the British for their actions in the Balkans. Protested Sir Nigel: "Those commentaries that claim we intend to support the aggressor in the conflict are not remotely in tune with Britain's real policies or its real intentions." The Aug. 25 London *Times* commented that this sentence is "as close to a thundering conclusion as any senior diplomat *in situ* can manage. His article was clearly authorized by the Foreign Office."

In fact, on both Aug. 24 and 25, Roger Boyes, *Times* correspondent in Bonn, profiled Germany's growing anger at Britain over the Balkans and other issues. Boyes wrote that students at German universities are now studying the much-publicized summer 1990 interview by *Spectator* magazine with the late Nicholas Ridley, then British minister of trade, warning of the new "Fourth Reich" danger from the united Germany. Beyond this, continued Boyes, "certainly an influential part of the German press is convinced that Britain is stirring up things with a view to forging an Anglo-French axis. The Balkan experts of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* and *Die Welt* dailies regularly accuse Britain and France (but especially Britain) of perfidy in Bosnia. Other commentaries frame their arguments in almost 19th-century terms: Britain and France are being drawn together, they say, because they want to stop Germany's expansion toward the East."

The same circles that originally launched the "Fourth Reich" hysteria are now attempting a crude counterattack. On Aug. 22, the London *Sunday Telegraph* dragged out Patrick Glynn to pontificate that the First World War was caused, pure and simple, by "premeditated German aggression," and was not the result of an "accident" or of the "arms race" of that time. According to Glynn, the war was the product of "a deliberate attempt by the German leadership to secure and improve Germany's position in Europe. The Germans under Kaiser Wilhelm went into the Sarajevo quarrel (of 1914) with open eyes, goading their Austrian allies

into a confrontation with Serbia, provoking France and Russia, and deliberately deflecting British attempts at mediation. When war broke out, the leaders of Britain, France and Russia were glum, but the mood among the German leadership, according to contemporary memoirs, was one of 'happiness.' "

The article almost read like a response to LaRouche. A leading *Sunday Telegraph* editor is Sir Peregrine Worsthorne, whose late stepfather, Bank of England chairman Montagu Norman, was instrumental in installing Adolf Hitler into power. Worsthorne is an intellectual author of the recent years' "Germany is the Fourth Reich" hysteria. The same edition ran a letter from former Thatcher adviser Sir Alfred Sherman, insisting that the war in the Balkans today results from a deliberate German design to break up Yugoslavia, "to initiate Germany's fourth *Drang nach Osten*" (drive to the East). Sherman, a nominal Thatcherite conservative with a well-deserved reputation for being mentally unbalanced, has thereby allied himself with the left-radical publication *Searchlight*, the mouthpiece of the allies of the Anti-Defamation League within Britain, which repeatedly spews out "*Drang nach Osten* in the Balkans" black propaganda.

### The Ditchley view

But it is Howard's Ditchley lecture which stands as the definitive expression of the "geopolitical" world view. In his speech, "Cold War, Cold Peace," Howard warmed up to his attack on Germany by inviting his audience to imagine themselves as being in the same position as the statesmen congregated for the Treaty of Vienna in 1815. It was that conclave, it should be recalled, which conspired to establish a "European order" that, under the pretext of preventing any new Napoleon Bonapartes from arising in Europe, would act to crush any *republican* movements on the European continent modelled on the American Revolution of 1776. Specifically, the Vienna Congress participants, from Britain, Austria, and Russia primarily, conspired to crush the German "Wars of Liberation" of the 1809-13 period, and to deny

Germany effective nationhood.

Said Howard: "It would be legitimate, indeed, to extend [the troubled period of the Cold War] backward for a generation, to 1914, for the two world wars had a basic continuity: So far as Europe was concerned, they can be regarded almost as a single Thirty Years' War. So in broader historical perspective the years between 1914 and 1989 may come to be seen as ones of continuous armed confrontation and conflict, broken by periods of uneasy truce, not unlike the wars of the French Revolution and Napoleonic conquest between 1793 and 1815; except that in our own time we had to endure not one but two prolonged conflicts with two different major adversaries; and those conflicts shaped the minds, not of one generation, but of three.

"Now, like the statesmen gathered at Vienna at the conclusion of the Napoleonic Wars, we have to adjust ourselves to an entirely new situation. . . .

"If we take the Napoleonic analogy seriously, the good news is that after 1815, nearly half a century was to pass before Europe saw another international war, and a century before there was a conflict on anything like so considerable a scale. The bad news is that during those years developments were under way that made the European system increasingly unstable; unstable internally, as industrialization transformed the economies of western Europe, bringing in its wake growing class-conflict and fear of revolution; externally, *as the growth of railways (in particular) created a new major political and economic power in the center of Europe which was to shatter the international system with a new series of wars* — wars that began with the Prussian challenge to the Austrian Empire in 1866 and *did not really conclude until the defeat and destruction of Nazi Germany in 1945*" (emphasis added).

### The civilizing mission of railroads

With these words, Howard is striking at the heart of those "Hamiltonian" economic policies which have brought about whatever development there has been in western economies over the past 200 years, policies which have always driven the British "free trade" fanatics apoplectic.

It is worth recalling, that the drive for the development of railways in Germany came from Friedrich List, who was close to Mathew Carey and Henry Carey in the United States, and who was a rigorous Hamiltonian in economic policy outlook. Later in the 19th century, Russia's Count Sergei Witte was strongly influenced by List's ideas, in motivating his own projects for railway development in Russia; it was common for Witte to write, in poetical terms, about the railway as the greatest factor in humanizing and upgrading backward rural peoples. On one occasion, he stated, "The railroad is like a leaven, which creates a cultural fermentation among the population. Even if it passed through an absolutely wild people along its way, it would raise them in a short time to the level prerequisite for its operation."

## U.S. makes NPT the issue in S. Asia

by Ramtanu Maitra

With the arrival of the Indian Foreign Secretary J.N. Dixit in Washington, there are expectations that India-U.S. relations may get beyond contentious non-proliferation and security issues. Expectations, however, can hardly be justified considering the one-dimensional South Asia policy of the Clinton administration so far.

Irritated by Washington's continuous sermonizing on non-proliferation and the American perception of India's security concerns, and embittered by U.S. criticism of India's "poor" human rights record, New Delhi initially welcomed the changing of the guard in the White House. Even the grating visit of Acting Undersecretary of State John Malott to South Asia in the spring did not quite dampen hope. Later, the selection of Mrs. Robin Raphel as assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs raised hopes, since Raphel was serving as political counselor at the U.S. embassy in New Delhi at the time of her appointment. It was hoped that since she was aware of the political situation of both India and Pakistan from her first-hand experiences, she might be able to bring a multidimensional policy in tune with the sensitivities of the subcontinent and enrich U.S. policy toward South Asia.

But Raphel, testifying before a U.S. Senate panel recently, emphasized that her main objective in her new post is to pressure India and Pakistan to take down their nuclear capabilities.

Starting her career as a CIA economic analyst, before opting for the foreign office, Raphel reportedly attended Oxford with President Clinton, and hence, has the President's ear. She was earlier married to the U.S. ambassador to Pakistan, Arnold Raphel, who, along with the Pakistani President Mohammed Zia ul-Haq, was killed in a mysterious air crash in 1988. Since then, Mrs. Raphel has married a South African and was posted at Pretoria prior to her arrival in Delhi. Her two postings in Pakistan — one in the 1970s when Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was prime minister, and later as Ambassador Raphel's wife — make her a Pakistan expert, she claims.

### Echoing the Carnegie Endowment

Mrs. Raphel's testimony to the Senate, however, indicates that she is more likely to enhance conflict and friction between the two largest democracies in the world. Her state-