

# LaRouche: British geopolitics is behind Yeltsin's attacks on U.S.

*The following is an excerpt from Lyndon LaRouche's Nov. 16 radio interview with Mel Klenetsky of "EIR Talks." Klenetsky asked LaRouche to comment on a recent speech by Russian President Boris Yeltsin, which suggested that the U.S. position on Bosnia and NATO could make for a future hostile environment for Russia.*

This is kind of interesting. And if you know history (unfortunately, most Americans do *not*, especially since the socialists like Charles Beard and John Dewey and Walter Lippmann got hold of the history books, or the people who wrote them), this is *very* interesting.

From the time of the 1850s, especially from 1862-63 until the assassination of President McKinley, the United States had three leading allies in the world: Germany, Russia, and Meiji Japan. After the assassination of McKinley by some admirers of Teddy Roosevelt (and that's a fact), it shifted. Teddy Roosevelt broke our alliance with Germany, with Russia, and with Japan, which had something to do with the wars and the Cold War and so forth that we had in this century. They're the gift of Teddy Roosevelt and his friends, and Woodrow Wilson, too.

## The British gameplan

In the 1890s, a foreign minister of Russia by the name of Count Sergei Witte, who was overthrown by the 1905 Revolution, had struck an agreement with a French foreign minister by the name of Gabriel Hanotaux. This involved large-scale railway system development across Eurasia, from Brest in France to Vladivostok and into Japan in Asia, and down into India, and at the German branch of this effort, there was the so-called Berlin to Baghdad railway effort.

The British reacted to that about 1896-98, and, over that period, they moved to set up what became World War I. What they did, is the following:

The British first secured France, at a famous incident called Fashoda. A young French captain and Lord Kitchener were involved there. A fellow called Théophile Delcassé, who was a catamite for Britain's Lord Grey, influenced the French government or his faction, the so-called *revanchistes*, to capitulate to Britain on the question of East-West, North-South railway development through Sudan, in the interests of a common warfare front against Germany. Out of this, by

1904, the so-called Entente Cordiale was established between Grey and Delcassé. And this organization, during that 1898-1904 period, intervened in Russia to turn the Russians against Germany (which was supposed to be one of their cooperating partners, along with France), over the issue of the Balkans.

The British, using a British freemasonic organization based in Salonika, Greece, organized, out of a B'nai B'rith Lodge run from London, a government called the Young Turk regime. The operation which organized the Young Turk regime was also the agency which, through Serbia and other channels, organized the Balkan wars, which led into World War I.

The Russians were drawn in, through a pan-Slavic faction in the political establishment and military in Russia, and in the pan-Slavic opposition in the Balkans, where the French and the British were stirring up the Balkan crisis, leading to a conflict between Russia and Austro-Hungary. The Russians declared a general mobilization, and that led to World War I.

## Background to the current situation

What's happening today, is a similar thing.

I had developed a concept back in the 1970s, which was used by the Reagan administration prior to March 1983. I was asked to run this back-channel for the U.S. government with high levels of the Soviet government, and, as a talking point, it was agreed from the U.S. government side, that my prior proposal on what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI], would be one of the levers by which this exploratory back-channel discussion would occur.

For various reasons, there was a change of horses in the Soviet Union during that period, in which it was agreed, during the late spring and early summer of 1982, that Yuri Andropov would replace Leonid Brezhnev, on whom they were going to pull the plug very soon. Andropov and his crowd were very much against the SDI; but nonetheless, the Reagan administration, President Reagan himself, went ahead with the SDI, despite the signals from Moscow that the Soviets were going to reject it.

During that period, in February 1983, I told my Soviet interlocutor, my connection to Moscow, that if they took the policy of opposition, which he signalled they would take,

that the Russian economy would collapse within five years from the strain on the satellite countries and other countries' economies, which would not take one more half-cycle of de-capitalization with that kind of strain.

It did collapse in 1988-89, and when that occurred, I set into motion what I'd already announced earlier, when I'd said this thing is coming up and soon: a proposal to proceed with an economic development policy which *paralleled* what Hanotaux and Witte had proposed back in the 1890s. That is, that France and Germany, with U.S. sponsorship, should move ahead toward opening up the collapsed communist

---

---

*Thatcher succeeded in dragging France into a revival of the Entente Cordiale, in opposition to the kind of proposal I put forward, in the same way that Britain had seduced France into the suicidal policy, as World War I showed, of opposition to the agreements between Hanotaux and Witte back in the 1890s, leading into World War I.*

---

---

regimes in eastern Europe and then the Soviet Union, for cooperative infrastructure-building projects *throughout* Eurasia. This is called the Productive Triangle proposal, which was widely circulated first at the end of 1989, and through 1990 and so on.

What happened is that Margaret Thatcher, at the same time I was launching this proposal, went the other way, and she dragged George Bush into that proposal. She also succeeded in dragging France into a revival of the Entente Cordiale, in opposition to this kind of proposal, in the same way that Britain had seduced France into the suicidal policy, as World War I showed, of opposition to the agreements between Hanotaux and Witte back in the 1890s, leading into World War I.

At the same time, Margaret Thatcher, with the cooperation of George Bush's regime (which was sort of her puppy dog, as she claims in her memoirs), started the Balkan war by unleashing Serbian fascist aggression against, first, Croatia and Slovenia, and then directly against Bosnia-Herzegovina and also, implicitly, against Macedonia, with the help of the Greek regime there, and, of course, against the Albanians in Kosova, threatening to set off a general Balkan war, *just as they had done between 1898 and 1904 and on into the World War I period.*

This Anglo-French Entente Cordiale, initially with the full backing of George Bush and his regime, set an economic policy which, on the one hand, has succeeded in collapsing the economies of the states of eastern Europe and the Soviet Union to *below 30% of what they were in 1989*. It's produced a situation of desperation and rage throughout eastern Europe (except in the Czech part of former Czechoslovakia), and in Russia.

### **Yeltsin is doomed**

Yeltsin was made the instrument of a policy of destroying his own country, as Gorbachov before him was already doing. Yeltsin was backed by the Franco-Anglo-American powers on this policy, and by the International Monetary Fund. This policy has *driven all of Russia into a state of rage*. At the same time, the Anglo-French influences on Moscow *have revived the same kind of pan-Slavic attachment to the Serbian fascist murderers in the Balkans, which engaged Russia in the assault, the war on Austro-Hungary, which started World War I.*

There is a solution, of course. Sergei Glazyev, chairman of the Committee on Economic Affairs in Russia's State Duma, in an interview which is published in this week's *EIR* [No. 46, Nov. 18] addresses some of these issues. But without the kind of development program which I announced years ago, and have continued to announce, which I'm working for now, and without the kind of policy orientation which President Clinton has announced, that is, Germany as the preferred partner of the United States in Eurasian policy—without those kinds of policies, this thing is going to go to Hell, and we are going to get a *powerful reaction* in Russia of some form.

It can be the kind of reaction which leads to a new adversarial relationship between Russia and the United States, organized by Britain and France, against us and against Germany, *unless* we get the kind of development program going in Russia, which I proposed in the tradition of the Hanotaux-Witte agreements of many years ago.

In any case, I think Yeltsin is doomed. What you have, is a doomed regime which has made itself the complete captive of the ideas of that little idiot from Boston, Jeffrey Sachs, who deserves a Nobel Prize for Idiocy in Economics. He's a good competitor of Nash on that question.

Therefore, Yeltsin is going down. But in the death agony of his regime, Yeltsin is lashing out, trying to appease and control some of the military, by threatening an adversarial posture against the United States, on the pretext of the Bosnia question, and trying to blame the United States for the policy which is ruining Russia. In a sense, yes, it was the policy of Bush; but it was a policy created by the British. And what you have, is a situation in which, in Moscow, the potential enemies of the United States in Moscow today, are the *friends of London*.

That's the lesson to be learned.