

London Clearly States Its Intention To Wipe Out Sovereign Russia

March 6—On Feb. 29, four days before the Russia Presidential elections, Lord Robert Cecil's Chatham House, the mother of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, and the headquarters of the post-World War I British imperialism of the Round Table, issued a highly publicized report on Russia, following Vladimir Putin's March 4 election as President. What that 70-page report makes clear in black and white is what Lyndon LaRouche and this magazine have been warning of for several months now: London is determined to destroy a sovereign Russia, and therefore has made Putin a major target for the immediate period ahead.

By the time the report was released, of course, it was already clear that the popular Putin was going to win the Presidential election on the first round, and he did, with over 63% of the votes cast. But London has made clear, with this report and other measures, that what they deem "Putinism" must be destroyed, either by assassinating him, creating chaos through London-spawned terror and so-called democracy movements, or by a thermonuclear war confrontation straight out.

The Chatham House Report

In the Chatham House report, British Imperialism makes the Marxist argument that the system of "Putinism" will inevitably, and quickly be laid low by its own internal contradictions—especially that between the social-class superstructure of "personalist" rule, and the need to develop what the authors consider the productive forces.

Advanced technology requires liberal democracy in order to function, the authors claim. They echo the argument of certain liberal Russian oppositionists who locate an insoluble contradiction in the fact that opposition to Putin is centered in a supposed "new creative class" of Internet-savvy Gen-Xers—the class respon-

sible for the latest economic breakthroughs—such as Facebook.

All five authors are Chatham House Fellows or Associate Fellows. The most rabid is Lilia Shevtsova, who doubles as a senior associate of the Carnegie Moscow Center, formerly the bailiwick of now-U.S. Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul. In an earlier incarnation, she had received a PhD in political science from the Academy of Social Sciences of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (the highest educational establishment of the CPSU, which prepared theoretical workers for Party institutions) in 1976. Shevtsova classes "Putinism" as "autocracy," and writes that Russia has suffered under it for centuries—i.e., it is the old Tsarist system. If that is true, then London's wild threats against Putin today reveal an intention to replay the assassination in 1881, of the reformer Tsar Alexander II, who freed the serfs. It is Shevtsova who asks whether Putin will be able to escape the fate of Muammar Qaddafi, who was murdered after surrendering to the Obama-British-French forces last year.

Chatham House repeats almost verbatim the lines set forth in the London *Economist* articles last December (which we described in the first of the three articles in the Brits vs. Putin dossier, in *EIR* of Dec. 16. "City of London mouthpiece *The Economist* magazine spelled out the intention in two articles and an editorial in its Dec. 10 issue, writing that unrest after the Dec. 4 State Duma elections 'may not be the beginning of a revolution, but it is the end of Vladimir Putin's era of alleged stability.'"

Like all the British strategists who hate Putin, the authors are liberal imperialists. They insist that the strategic objective of the West should be "integrating Russia into a liberal world system." Expressing the insanity of the bankrupt British globalist empire, they insist that Russia (a country with a formidable strategic

nuclear arsenal) is “punching above its weight” in world affairs. It is telling that the author of the chapter titled “Russia’s Geopolitical Compass: Losing Direction” is James Nixey, a specialist in the Caucasus, Britain’s traditional stomping ground for destabilizing Russia.

The Democracy Movements

Not surprisingly, the aftermath of the Presidential elections has proceeded according to the Chatham House/*Economist* script. A report was immediately released by European election observers claiming that the election results were fraudulent, because of the pattern of media coverage of the candidates prior to the voting. A rally of protest was held the day after the election.

In Moscow’s Pushkin Square, Left Front leader Sergei Udaltsov, who, during the campaign was a spokesman for Communist Party candidate Zyuganov, was one of the extraparliamentary protestors who turned the authorized March 5 rally into a provocation, ending in his arrest along with blogger Alexei Navalny, and others. Some 15-20,000 people demonstrated in the evening under the now-customary “Honest Elections” banner. Navalny revved up the crowd by shouting “We here are the power!” Gorbachov ally Vladimir Ryzhkov of the unregistered Parnas party led chants of “Russia without Putin,” proclaimed “Their elections are a farce, their power is illegitimate,” and announced a larger rally to be organized for Saturday, March 10.

When the rally ended, Udaltsov urged people to stay. Around 1,000 did. After an hour, according to Russian media reports, the OMON police special forces started demanding that the crowd disperse. They then enforced the order, linking arms to push the protesters out of the square. Udaltsov, Navalny, and other resisters were arrested—an act the demonstrators undoubtedly wanted, in order to try to build the March 10 demonstration.

How successful these forces will be is unpredictable, but they are not the only line of attack by London.

Assassination Threat

On Feb. 7, Russia’s state-owned First Channel TV, followed by state television Rossiya-1 and other channels, revealed that Ukrainian and Russian security services last month foiled an attempt on the life of Prime

Minister Putin. According to the testimony of the young men involved in the attack plans, the assassination attempt on Putin was to have been activated immediately after the March 4 Presidential election. The detailed reports given by Russian TV about the background to this particular foiled plot, gives insight to what are likely ongoing operations against the Russian President-elect.

One arrested participant in the plot, Adam Osmayev, quite recently had been an economics student at the University of Buckingham in the U.K. It was in London, according to his televised interview with First Channel, that he “became interested in explosives.” Osmayev had been sought by security forces since 2007 for plotting a bomb attack against Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov. According to another participant in the operation, Ilya Pyanzin, the group was flown into Ukraine via the U.A.E. and Turkey, and was headed for Moscow, where they were to undertake attacks on economic facilities, and assassinate Putin. Osmayev told interviewers that his group was experimenting with explosives that could penetrate heavy armor.

Orchestration of the operation is being attributed to Chechen separatist leader Doku Umarov, a key figure in British-linked schemes for a North Caucasus emirate, to secede from Russia.

According to First Channel’s report, the scheme was only one of several attempts on Putin’s life over recent years. Cited in the broadcast were foiled attempts in Azerbaijan in 2001, Kislovodsk (Stavropol Territory, near the North Caucasus) in 2008, and Novgorod in 2009. The First Channel report summarized, “The terrorist war against Russia, which began in the 1990s, continues, despite some successes of our security services, and the extremists openly name their main targets: Vladimir Putin has been number one for them for a long time.”

One of the major funders of the Chechen separatist/terrorist movement is none other than zillionaire Boris Berezovsky, currently a fugitive from Russia in London. Berezovsky, who has previously called for using “force” against Putin, made headlines with an interview in the Israeli paper *Ha’aretz* at the end of February, in which he warned that Putin would end up like Qaddafi.

London is also the home to support networks for the North Caucasus insurgency, some of whom the Queen’s government has refused to extradite to Russia to face charges for their crimes.