

Britain Aims To Stop U.S.-Russia Partnership

by Michele Steinberg and EIR Staff

For the British Empire, it is an existential issue to prevent a U.S.-Russia partnership, and the Anglo-Dutch oligarchy will go to any lengths to stop that cooperation. Especially after the July 2007 talks that Russian President Vladimir Putin held with President George W. Bush and his father at Kennebunkport, Maine, the Empire faction has been hell-bent on driving a wedge between the two countries. And as the global financial collapse puts the power of the Anglo-Dutch financier oligarchy in jeopardy, they are going all out with a new “Cold War” offensive, with constant references to Putin as a new dictator, running a “KGB State.”

This is not a new strategy of evil intent by the British oligarchy; as far back as November 1999, the Russian Foreign Ministry filed a diplomatic demarché over the recruitment and training of Osama bin Laden-linked terrorists in London, to be sent to Chechnya to fight the Russian Army, and carry out terrorist actions. The British government refused to shut down the operation, and continues to shelter Chechen rebel leaders accused by Moscow of masterminding terrorism.

As the new year begins, destabilizations of nations ringing Russia—Georgia, Belarus, and Ukraine—are in full swing. But the threat that would put a match to the powder keg is promotion of the independence of the Kosovo province of Serbia—which Russia adamantly opposes.

Delayed since early December, when an attempt by the United Kingdom—with U.S. support—to have a Kosovo independence resolution at the UN Security Council, failed for lack of support, the separatist leadership in Kosovo claims that it will unilaterally declare independence, at some point, since it already has assurances from individual countries in the European Union to recognize it. The EU has sent an 1,800-person police and security mission to Kosovo. According to diplomatic sources, Kosovo independence would turn the tensions between Georgia and Russia from a “Cold War” to a hot one.

On Dec. 21, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov put a sharp point on the Kosovo crisis, when he told *Vremya Novostei*, “If NATO and the EU now state, after ignoring all legitimate legal mechanisms that exist in the United Nations, that they will decide on how to divide Serbia, how to bite Kosovo off from it ... they will put themselves above international law.” On Dec. 24, Lavrov warned that Kosovo independence would be taken as a precedent by the administrations of Abkhazia and south Ossetia, autonomous regions within Geor-

gia—though he said, it is not Russia’s policy to promote this.

The Kosovo battle at the UN was occurring at the same time that news media were humming over a provocative “scenario,” for Russia, in a report by the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, released on Dec. 17, called “Alternative Futures for Russia,” by Andrew Kuchins. In a fantasia which mixes Sergei Eisenstein’s *Ivan the Terrible* with *Boris Gudonov* by way of Harry Potter and James Bond, Putin is assassinated on leaving midnight mass at Christ the Savior Cathedral in Moscow on Jan. 7, 2008. He is replaced by Russian Railways CEO Vladimir Yakunin, who shoots down striking miners and kills political opponents. Yakunin’s tyranny uses a highly nationalist and religious secret service, combined with the most advanced technology ... and so on.

Blunt Talk

The global chaos scenario is not unnoticed by the leadership of Russia at the highest levels. On Dec. 31, Lavrov issued a year-end statement, warning that 2008 could see “breakdowns in world affairs ... which might be provoked by unilateral actions of some states or groups of states and their attempts to operate outside international law in violation of the principle of equal security.” In his year-end interview published on Dec. 26 by *Vremya Novostei*, Lavrov advised looking back to Putin’s Feb. 10, 2007 speech at the Munich Conference on Security Policy, which was the opening of a year of “blunt talk.” Speaking to officials from more than 40 countries, Putin said, “The conference format allows me to avoid excessive politeness and the need to speak in roundabout, pleasant, but empty diplomatic terms.” Lavrov said about this speech, “The main purpose of Munich was to put the matter of mutual understanding into focus,” to call for “honest, open dialogue ... without hidden agendas.”

What Putin said at Munich was misrepresented throughout the world as marking a return to the Cold War, but *EIR*’s Feb. 23, 2007 issue documented that Putin was not attacking the United States—indeed it was the first of several occasions in 2007 in which he invoked the policies of Franklin Delano Roosevelt—but rather the perversions of American policy by traitors to the real identity of the U.S.A. Lavrov then noted the follow-up to Munich was the “unprecedented proposal Putin made at Kennebunkport ... a qualitatively new approach, implying mutual trust and complete openness.” He added, however, “We have not lost hope, that this approach will be accepted, though the chances of that are declining.”

As Russia heads into its own presidential elections in March 2008, the Russian media is full of warnings about London’s dirty operations (see box). And three of the most important of Russia’s neighbors are facing new crises—all derivative of the insane, phony “democracy” issue that has been used to assault national sovereignty.

In Georgia, early elections were held on Jan. 5, after mass demonstrations in November against “Rose Revolution” poster boy, President Michael Saakashvili, who attempted to de-

fuse the crisis by calling the early Presidential vote. Now, Saakashvili is getting a taste of his own medicine, with accusations, prominently carried by the likes of the *Financial Times* of London, that the results are rigged in his favor. Ten days before the elections, the Saakashvili government accused one opposition candidate, Badri Patarkatsishvili, of plotting a post-election coup that would take place through protests over vote fraud, by buying the security services for \$100 million. Tapes of Patarkatsishvili in London negotiating this payoff were released by the government on Dec. 26.

In Belarus, the United States imposed draconian sanctions on the small country—which voluntarily signed the treaty giving up its nuclear arsenal at the end of the Soviet Union, in return for good relations with the U.S. and West. In a Treasury Department decision, and a Presidential order in mid-December, Washington banned President Alexander Lukashenka from visiting the U.S., prohibited Americans from doing business with the Belarusian oil refiner Belneftekhim, and froze the assets that the company had under U.S. jurisdiction. On Dec. 30, President Lukashenka threatened to expel the U.S. ambassador to Belarus, and the Administration may impose

even more sanctions. The ostensible issue is Belarus's violations of human rights.

Ukraine, which was described as close to civil war in May 2007, has just experienced the return to power of Yulia Tymoshenko, the "Orange Coalition" demagogue who kept in close touch with Dick Cheney while organizing her comeback. She became Prime Minister on Dec. 18, with a one-seat majority in Parliament, and phoned Cheney first thing.

"Instability and leadership conflict" were forecast immediately by Victor Yanukovych, leader of the Party of Regions (POR) and outgoing Prime Minister. His party was the highest vote-getter in Ukraine's fifth Parliamentary election within three years, but—after another two months of maneuvering—the renewed "Orange" coalition was formed without the POR. Tymoshenko told her Cabinet that Ukraine is facing the highest inflation in seven years, and that the country's energy firm Naftohaz was "bankrupt" due to mismanagement. She tried to blame these problems on Yanukovych's government. Naftohaz is in technical default on a \$500 million Eurobond. Some analysts say that the factionalization is so severe, that the eventual splitting of the country is inevitable.

Russian Media: 'The Empire Comes Out of the Shadows'

Russian political analyst Boris Mezhyuev contributed an article titled "The Empire Comes Out of the Shadows," to the year-end issue of *Smysl* magazine, describing how Great Britain was viewed in Russia during 2007. It includes a discussion of Lyndon LaRouche's writings as a source used by Russians on the historical and current role of the British.

Mezhyuev singles out a series by Mikhail Leontyev on his Channel 1 TV show, under the title "The Great Game." Here, "viewers learned many new things about the Anglo-Russian confrontation of the 19th-20th centuries." The anti-British campaign in the Russian press, Leontyev said, is, in some cases motivated by "the British track in North Caucasus events, discovered by Russian counterintelligence." He added, "The British lion, after the American eagle broke its talons in Iraq, is once again returning to Asia and the Caucasus, step by step trying to push aside not only Russia and China, but also its own NATO allies."

Mezhyuev presents "three versions" of the British story. LaRouche's "version" is excerpted here:

"LaRouche rejected Marxism and became a defender of the so-called American System in economics, meaning

the dirigist model in the spirit of President Roosevelt's New Deal. This state-oriented model is opposed by a different model—the liberal-oligarchical one, rooted in British economic liberalism and the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes, who is held responsible for all the sins of the modern era, colonial slavery above all.

"These quite sympathetic 'left-conservative' views, LaRouche spikes with a good-sized dose of fantastical con-spirology. It turns out that the roots of today's financial globalization go back to Venice, which used Great Britain, which had come under its sway in the late Tudor period, to destroy the ideal model of an interrelationship of state and society, developed by the best minds of the Renaissance. Coming under the influence of the merchants of Venice, Britain began to promote economic liberalism, with which the colonial trade in human beings was closely associated. Continental Europe was unable to resist Britain effectively, leaving Lincoln's America as the main adversary of Britain. But Britain's allies in America itself were the Confederates, whose elite was closely linked with the British aristocracy through the Scottish Rite freemasonic network.

"The formal collapse of the Empire in the 20th century simply withdrew British colonial rule into the shadows: Now, they started ruling the world through the financial institutions they control. LaRouche sees his main objective as being to free the American Republic from domination by the British Empire and its henchmen in both American parties, like both Bushes or, for example, Al Gore."