

London ‘Adjusts’ to Collapse Of Obama Presidency

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Sept. 17—Two flagship publications of the City of London financial oligarchy—the *Financial Times* and the *Economist*—have printed calls for an expansion of nuclear power. These two pieces signal a potential shift in policy outlook, away from the radical Malthusian and quack environmentalist policies associated with former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, and with two rabid fascist voices of the British Monarchy, the Royal Consort Prince Philip, and his son and the presumed successor to the throne, Prince Charles.

Lyndon LaRouche has identified this emerging policy shift as an indication of a growing recognition, by some leading London circles, that their dreams of engineering the final self-destruction of the United States through the Obama Presidency, has failed miserably, and that their “Obama agenda” cannot be salvaged. This London-centered faction, in LaRouche’s view, has taken note of the mass strike process underway in the United States, and the danger of a return to the American System policies, last seen in the Presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In another sign of the sea change in thinking among some factions of the British oligarchy, another City flagship publication, *The Times*, on Sept. 11, published previously classified details of a September 1989 Moscow meeting between then-British Prime Minister

Margaret Thatcher, and then-Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachov, in which the two plotted against the expected German reunification.

These revelations came on the same day that the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office released a 600-page volume of FCO documents from 1989-90, exposing the collusion among Thatcher, U.S. President George H.W. Bush, French President François Mitterrand, and Gorbachov, to block the reunification of Germany and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The FCO documents were not due to be declassified and released for another decade.

LaRouche’s Strategic Assessment

In a Sept. 15 discussion with colleagues about these extraordinary developments, LaRouche expressed his preliminary thoughts on the emerging policy shift in London: “Now, only what we are doing, and only what I have specified to that effect, could possibly prevent a general disintegration of world civilization during the period immediately ahead. There may be certain factors which might tend to slow this down. There may even be some interesting interventions from the enemy’s side, because not all Brits, for example, believe that the current British administration, which is running the United States, presently, is actually capable of dealing success-

fully with this situation, even from the standpoint of their own interests. So they might intervene, as you saw in the *Economist* this week, where there was an article in there of some weight, which made the case for nuclear power, as against other alternatives, rather strongly. So obviously, there are people in the system on that side, who recognize that since our defeat of the Obama cause—we haven't defeated Obama, but we've defeated his cause; his cause will never get through. His cause will never be successful. Unless he surrenders to my conditions, there's no possible way that he can be successful. Only if he surrenders to me, and that puts him into protective custody within the White House.

"So therefore, there are other forces, who recognize that the British and related interests, which are supporting Obama up to now, may be getting ready to dump Obama, because he's worse than useless. In that case, there are some people who will try to stick to the cause, in some term or other—to find a substitute for Obama to pursue the same direction of policy. But I think there are also—there are signs of this—much more serious elements, behind the curtain on the British side, shall we say, who are looking at alternatives to the end of the Obama trend. It's not that they oppose the idea of Obama having tried to do what he did, but they now realize, that because of the chain-reaction my intervention set off, that Obama's case is hopeless. And therefore, whatever regret they wish to express, they are prepared to replace and dump the Obama option, where some people among them are not."

LaRouche later addressed the *Times'* Gorbachov revelations: "You had a very peculiar development, of relevance to this: When somebody on the British side, ten years before the release of this information was scheduled, previously, released reports, including an extremely significant leak, on a meeting in Russia, between Margaret Thatcher, and that treasonous British agent of influence, Gorbachov. Now, this Gorbachov element, this leak, tends to suggest something very interesting on the British side, which goes along with this item inside the current edition of the *Economist* boosting nuclear power, against the so-called alternatives. There is a counter-view, coming out of Britain, as typified by this article on nuclear power in the *Economist*, and typified more emphatically, by this advance leak of a recapitulation of the negotiations among Mitterrand, and his mistress Thatcher, and George Bush, together with Gorbachov, in the consequence of the collapse of the Berlin Wall.

"There is somebody on the other side, who is playing a different game than the British have been playing up to now. And this has implications in all kinds of directions: What's the effect of this crowd's opposition, alternative to Tony Blair operation? What is it? What do they intend to do? This is obviously against the Anglo-Russian entente, now. It's something else. They're pro-Russian, in one sense. They are for nuclear power, they are for a different approach. They also represent people who have blown the whistle on Gorbachov.

"Remember," LaRouche continued, "Gorbachov was a British agent. Thus, he was actually a treasonous figure, from the Russian standpoint, not only the Soviet standpoint, but the Russian standpoint. He's a traitor. And so, you have a British-controlled traitor, and he's not the only high-ranking traitor in this old Soviet system, of relevance to this case. But he's a traitor! And that little leak, of the conversation between Thatcher and Gorbachov, in Russia, which just leaked as part of the whole leaking process, has very, very, interesting implications from our standpoint."

LaRouche next drew an important distinction: "What you're dealing with—see, the intelligent type, within the power structure in Britain, or the British system, are not friends of ours. What the significance is, they have made a great gamble, that is, the whole British crowd has made a great gamble, together with other factors in the world, like the Russians and so forth; the gamble is open. The gamble was: 'Let the system collapse, we'll control that. But the United States will be destroyed, and that's good.' That's the game. That's the game in Russia, that we're up against. That's the game with Britain.

"Now, the point is, that game, if played, would be the end of the existence of Russia! And would be a catastrophe beyond belief for the British, as well as the Chinese. As for all continental Europe, and for South America and Central America! So, there's some characters on the British side, who have the intelligence to recognize that fact. They're not interested in lining up with us. They're not attracted to us. They hate us! They hate us all the more, because we defeated their buddies. What they're saying is, 'Okay, call off the war for the time being—until we're ready to take you on again!'

"So, what they're doing, is they're walking away from a war, which has turned inconvenient for their purposes, and they've often done that. And waiting for the time to start the war, on new terms, again, which

will take some preparation on their side. That's what we're looking at."

The U.S. Mass Strike

LaRouche then turned to the situation inside the United States: "There is a process in motion, inside the United States, which represents a recognition that the Obama cause is, in principle, defeated. They can still do a lot of damage, and the side-effects which can be ruthlessly damaging. But, at this point, Obama is on the way *down*. In this circumstance, other forces are beginning to emerge. They're moving into preparation to take over. The key factor will be the rate at which the popular movement, or the mass strike movement, moves. And generally, the forces that are going to try to move things, in a direction different than Obama, who is considered already a failure, but they will move to replace him with something.

"But the impetus for that will come in, and be regulated by the tempo of the mass strike movement. Because anybody who's going to come into a position of power is going to require a power-base: They're not going to go out there and organize it by themselves. They're going to try to take over leadership of something that's already in motion. And the thing that's in motion, is the mass movement, the mass strike movement. And so, anybody who's going to replace Obama now, is unlikely to be successful, unless they do it that way. But it will be other forces in the Democratic Party and also the Republican Party, who will tend to coagulate, in trying to assume an adaptation to the mass strike movement. That's the only way that the kind of change that's likely could be brought into being.

"I think, anybody in the British circles, for example, and their friends on the continent, anyone who's looking at this situation is going to readily recognize what we've said, if they hadn't recognized it earlier, the minute I said it, they began to recognize it: that the phenomenon inside the United States, now, which frightens and astonishes a lot of people, is properly to be seen, as having the precedent of the mass strike in '89, in East Germany. That's not going to be ignored. They're going to recognize that that's the character of the situation, the character of the *breakdown* crisis of the economy, makes that the only possible basis for doing something—so they're going to adapt to it."

LaRouche concluded: "So the British are not going to be quiet, the British faction, the oligarchical faction. They're not going to love the United States, but they're

going to say, 'This option, which came out of Tony Blair & Co., with Obama and the British monarchy, has failed! So, let's not gamble our existence any more on trying to bail out that failure. We're going to have to move and take an adjusted position, for a little bit longer-haul view of things. Now, that means that we don't want to have an immediate breakdown of the entire society, worldwide. That means we want to postpone that. We want to find a period of interim stability, while setting up new lines of controversy at the same time.'

"And there are signs that some people will be moving in the direction of the obvious thing: First of all, an elimination of this green policy, wherever it's feasible to do so. All we have available for reviving economies in Europe and the United States, generally is infrastructure. We have means, for example, in the United States, to do that. We could take the auto-industry sector, which has been totally collapsed, but it's fresh dead, shall we say—fresh killed. And therefore, it still can be revived with government support, which would require credit.... And the driver for that would be—nuclear power! Because that would give you all the options you want, for this kind of project....

"So, my bets, are that anybody's going to play a game, for presumably a survival of civilization beyond the coming months, is going to think in that direction. You have some hard-nosed characters, who're going to stick to this crazy green policy, and similar kinds of idiocy, and they will be a nuisance. But what's going to happen within the context of adopting a policy which means a prolonged period of survival of civilization, because of such reasons; you're going to have the essential warfare, which has existed, for example, between the two English-speaking powers of relevance, the United States and United Kingdom; you're going to have that warfare still there—not as a short-term conflict, but as a longer-term conflict, played on a different field of battle, than presently.

"That's what I think is the situation, potentially, as of now. And we've seen signs that that is recognized on the other side of the fence, by some people there, as you see the Obama phenomenon and the people associated with it, *going down*. We see the imminence of the British faction, British royal family faction, going down. And there would be some inclination in the British Isles, to lessen the role of the British royal family—which has become a 'bloody nuisance,' as the British would say, these days."