

London in Flight Forward for ‘Regime Change’ in Russia

by Jeffrey Steinberg and Nancy Spannaus

Nov. 25—Lyndon LaRouche, in his opening statement to the LaRouchePAC Policy Committee discussion Nov. 24, said that the world is on the edge of frightening developments, with one international force seeking a global war confrontation, and another mobilizing to defend itself against this threat. The decisive factor in determining which way this confrontation goes, is the United States—whose Presidency is now under the control of the war party.

From the British Empire, and its de facto puppets in Brussels and Washington, are coming escalating provocations, which are bringing the world to what LaRouche described as the very “edge of a general state of thermonuclear warfare.” These include the increasingly open statement of intent by London and its lackeys to extend the “regime change” policy, otherwise reflected in the “color revolutions” that London and the West have bought, paid for, and armed in Georgia, Ukraine, Libya, and other smaller nations, and in two of the world’s nuclear superpowers, Russia and China.

LaRouche cautioned against any tendency to sit and wait for a provocation to occur; the urgency of the situation demands preventive action before a single provocation triggers extermination warfare. Crucial among those actions is to force a political change in the United States which removes Barack Obama and the fascist war-mongering Republican Party leadership from power, and brings the nation in alignment with the

BRICS countries. These are the *sine qua non* for both preventing war, and establishing the long-term basis for peaceful cooperation among nations.

London Threatens

This week’s cover of *The Economist*, mouthpiece of the City of London, depicts a bear bleeding in the snow, headlined “Russia’s Wounded Economy.” Backed up by three pages of in-depth profiling of Russia’s economic weak points, the lead editorial serves to confirm Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov’s charge, that the purpose of the West’s economic sanctions against Russia is “regime change.” Speaking for a trans-Atlantic financial sector that is itself bankrupt, *The Economist* declares that Russia “is closer to crisis than the West or Vladimir Putin realize.”

It lists Russia’s vulnerabilities as dependence on oil exports, when oil prices are now \$10-20/barrel below what Moscow had counted on; a 23% collapse in the ruble, bringing potential consumer price inflation despite efforts to substitute domestically produced goods for imports; and the Russian corporate foreign debt, of both state-owned and private companies, which is now over \$500 billion, with \$130 billion due before the end of 2015.

The Economist suggests ways for “international finance” to exploit each of these, to breach “Russia’s defenses.” Continuing its propaganda campaign of recent weeks about vulnerabilities within the BRICS, *The*

Economist suggests that if Russian companies default, then Brazil will be the next to suffer. “When economies are on an unsustainable course,” the editorial intones, “international finance often acts as a fast-forward button, pushing countries over the edge more quickly than politicians or investors expect. . . .”

One of the back-up articles purports to find a Russian “weakness” in the fact that \$170 billion of its reserves and “rainy day” assets are in the National Welfare Fund (NWF) and the Reserve Fund, and the NWF has been partially committed to infrastructure investment, so it won’t be available for bailouts!

The Economist’s international editor, Ed Lucas, is a notorious Putin-basher and author of books on the need to bring down Putin, and also famous for the utterance in 2008, “I hate the Westphalian system” of sovereign nation-states. Lucas personally used his Twitter feed last December to fan the Maidan coup process in Ukraine, by putting out a false report that President Victor Yanukovych had pledged to join the Eurasian Customs Union as a full member.

The Russians Know the Score

Among the top Russian leadership there has never been any confusion over the fact that the U.S. necons, and their British big brothers, have been aiming at the subjugation of Russia. Exemplary of this understanding was the book published by Putin advisor, economist Sergei Glazyev, in 1998-99, entitled *Genocide, Russia and the New World Order*, in which Glazyev documents the way the IMF shock therapy of the ’90s deliberately ravaged his country through de-industrialization, privatization, and political manipulations.

The Russian governments of Vladimir Putin, as either President or Prime Minister (beginning in 2000), have acted with this understanding, but consistently attempted to outflank Western assaults, including through offers of economic and security cooperation. Increasingly, however, the Russian leadership has found it nec-



Presidential Press and Information Office

Russian President Putin and Foreign Minister Lavrov have made it clear that they understand the U.S./NATO efforts to bring about “regime change” in Russia; but, declared Putin, “No one has ever managed to achieve this aim, . . . or ever will. . . .”

essary to speak more bluntly.

Asked by a journalist at a meeting of his All-Russia People’s Front on Nov. 18, whether the U.S. is trying to “humiliate Russia,” Putin responded: “This is not so. The United States is not trying to humiliate us; it wants to subdue us, to settle its own problems at our expense. No one has ever managed to achieve this aim in relations with Russia, or ever will. . . .” (Itar-Tass).

Putin also took up the issue at a Nov. 20 expanded Security Council meeting in the Kremlin called to discuss a draft document for a “Strategy for Countering Extremism in the Russian Federation through 2025.”

“In the modern world,” said Putin, “extremism is often used as a geopolitical instrument to rearrange spheres of influence. We see the tragic consequences of the wave of so-called color revolutions, the turmoil in the countries that have undergone the irresponsible experiments of covert and sometimes blatant interference in their lives. We take this as a lesson and a warning, and we must do everything necessary to ensure this never happens in Russia.”

He distinguished legitimate protest from the “regime change” operations run from the outside: “As we assert our freedom of choice, the right to hold meetings, marches, and rallies, we should not forget

that we are responsible for our words and deeds. We must know and bear in mind that breeding conflict between people of different ethnicity and religion, propaganda of nationalist ideology, mass violations of public order on these grounds, and particularly, calls for a violent overthrow of the existing regime are direct manifestations of anti-national thinking and extremism.”

On Nov. 22, Foreign Minister Lavrov told a meeting of the advisory Foreign and Defense Policy Council in Moscow, that the actual intent of Western sanctions against Russia was to bring about “regime change.” “As for the concept behind the use of coercive measures,” Tass reports Lavrov saying, “the West is making clear it does not want to force Russia to change policy, but wants to secure regime change.” He added, “Now public figures in Western countries say there is a need to impose sanctions that will destroy the economy and cause public protests.”

An Alliance with China

On Nov. 18, following his talks with Chinese Defense Minister General Chang Wanquan in Beijing, Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu said Russia and China should jointly stand against color revolutions which both countries are facing. Russian Deputy Defense Minister Anatoly Antonov told the Tass news agency, “We focused on those events which have recently taken place in Hong Kong, and both ministers acknowledged that no country is immune from color revolutions.”

“It only seems that these color revolutions and these experiments by Western spin doctors, including those from the United States, are being implemented somewhere far from China or the Russian Federation,” Antonov said. “All this is in fact near us, and we believe that Russia and China should work together to withstand this new security challenge to our countries.”

Antonov also referred to this year’s events in Ukraine as a “coup d’état.” Russia and China, in his words, know about the problem of “color revolutions” on the example of Ukraine, “where a coup d’état took place, and we now see the trials this fraternal country is living through, and we see how much effort is to be exerted by all to establish peace, tranquility, and order in that country.”

Just as Russia is confronted by the Big Lie that it

was responsible for the destabilization and bloodshed in Ukraine, China faces charges that its defensive measures—and even its offers of broad economic cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond—are simply expressions of some kind of imperialist aims.

Chinese President Xi laid out in detail at both the APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) summit and his address to the Australian Parliament, that China is operating on the basis of a policy of mutual benefit, a “win-win” policy of cooperation among nations. This policy has been attacked in the West as aggressive.

Chinese Defense Minister Gen. Chang answered those charges in his keynote address to the 5th Xiangshan Forum in Beijing Nov. 21. He stressed that China was also undertaking military modernization in order to defend its sovereignty, which, he noted, has been under attack for most of modern history. The conference had the participation of some 300 defense and military officials from 47 countries.

“China has learned a bitter lesson from its wretched modern history,” Gen. Chang said. “The Chinese civilization is one of the oldest in the world. As we entered the modern era, however, the Chinese people suffered grievously in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society because of the corruption and incompetence of their feudal rulers, coupled with unrelenting aggressions of foreign powers. Our people did not become masters of their own destiny until a century later, after a protracted struggle.”

“When it comes to national sovereignty and security, the Chinese give great credence to the adage, ‘We should not rely on the likelihood of the enemy’s not coming, but on our own readiness to receive him.’ Therefore, China is firmly determined to promote the modernization of its national defense and armed forces and effectively safeguard its national sovereignty, security and development interests.”

New War Cries and Deployments

Anyone who doubts the threats being issued against Russian and Chinese sovereignty need only open their eyes and ears.

NATO’s redeployment to the East is continuing, with official announcements now that there will be permanent rotating troop deployments in Poland and the Baltic states.

Both the European Union and the U.S. government are considering expanded sanctions against Russia. And the U.S. Congress has decided to take up legislation demanding that China implement American ideas of “human rights” in Hong Kong, regardless of what the Constitution there says.

In Germany, where the Western sanctions against Russia are crippling industry, and a dialogue has up until now been maintained with the Russian government, Chancellor Angela Merkel has gone into a new phase of confrontation against President Putin, as expressed in her speech in Australia recently. In Germany itself, the government is doing its best to create an atmosphere of terror against anyone who speaks out against vilification of Putin and Russia. There are even indications that the government plans to purge itself, and private business associations, of those who dare to speak against the official confrontation line.

A perusal of the Nov. 23 *New York Times* and *Washington Post* gives evidence of the war propaganda drive at a fever pitch. Under the title “How Washington can

counter the rise of Russia and China,” the *Washington Post* called for escalating economic warfare against Russia, and for the preemptive positioning of NATO and American military forces in the Baltic states, Ukraine, and Vietnam. The *New York Times* warned that Xi Jinping’s recent successful diplomatic and economic forays to Australia and New Zealand revealed a devious scheme by the “Big Boy” to displace the United States as the strategic economic and security partner for China’s neighbors.

The reason for the insane drive for war is that half of humanity—led by China, Russia, India, and the other BRICS countries, and allies like Egypt and Argentina—is that the British financial empire is fighting for its life. It’s outnumbered and bankrupt; the balance of power has, in fact, shifted.

Whither the United States?

Can a thermonuclear confrontation be avoided? That will depend upon a dramatic change in the U.S. situation.

At present, the Obama Administration is, like the British, in a flight-forward mode. That state of mind is widely considered to have been reflected in the President’s firing of Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel, who had been at odds with the White House inner circle, such as Susan Rice, Valerie Jarrett, and Denis McDonough.

Respected retired military commentator Patrick Lang presented his view of the matter in his blog *Sic Semper Tyrannis* on Nov. 24, beginning this way:

“So, Hagel is out. He is evidently the loser in a struggle between the military leadership and the Children’s Crusaders at the White House and State Department. The military want more clearly defined goals across the Islamic culture continent and ‘the kids’ want to run foreign affairs on the basis of the crap they write in magic marker on white boards in their seminars.”

Hagel, despite his opposition to the Vietnam War years ago, was no hero in opposing the regime-change adventures and confrontation policies of the Obama Administration. The fact that Obama and his controllers thought they had to get rid of him tells you a lot about how fragile they feel their situation is.

Thus, we are indeed, in a situation of extreme danger, as LaRouche indicated. A change of leadership in the United States, toward collaboration with the BRICS, is a matter of life or death.

GENOCIDE

RUSSIA AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

Russia in the 1990s: “The rate of annual population loss has been more than double the rate of loss during the period of Stalinist repression and mass famine in the first half of the 1930s . . . There has been nothing like this in the thousand-year history of Russia.”
—Sergei Glazeyev

Paperback, with a preface by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Economist Dr. Sergei Glazeyev was Minister of Foreign Economic Relations in Boris Yeltsin’s first cabinet, and was the only member of the government to resign in protest of the abolition of Parliament in 1993.

Now available in PDF format from the
LaRouche Publications [Store](http://www.larouchepub.com). \$20

Order by phone: **800-278-3135**
Online: www.larouchepub.com