

Lord Bethell moves to blow up Yugoslavia

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The British Secret Intelligence Service, under direction of Lord Nicholas Bethell's masters, has detonated the first phase of a long-prepared scenario for the dismemberment of post-Tito Yugoslavia. The Albanian government has deployed forces in support of an Albanian insurrection against the Serbian-dominated Yugoslav regime, with the heavily armed Croatian fascists waiting to be deployed as the next step.

According to some of the most highly placed circles in governments and intelligence agencies of several nations, British intelligence's launching of the dismemberment of Yugoslavia is the pivot-point for a "new Yalta" agreement presently being negotiated between London and Moscow.

Reports of a "new Yalta" deal between London and Moscow have been pouring into our files for about three months. In addition to reports confided by high-level governmental and intelligence sources of the Western alliance, we have received corroborating intelligence from our contacts in the Arab world and from underground sources in Iran. These are not merely high-level documents and rumors. Anyone who has been following closely both the British and Soviet press, and who has noticed the escalation of the Albanian operation aimed at the dismemberment of Yugoslavia, has ample evidence that the "new Yalta" is an ongoing operation—at least, from the British side.

The putative authorship of the "new Yalta" scheme

is a transatlantic network of influentials usually known to insiders as "the Circle." This network was consolidated after the public disgrace of the former Nazi SS officer Prince Bernhard (of the Netherlands and World Wildlife Fund), as the putative replacement for the outdated Bilderbergers. Among the active features of the new coalition of influentials is the prominent role of the Bavarian crowd around Franz-Josef Strauss and Otto von Hapsburg. The Circle is the crowd which brought down President Giscard and put Mitterrand into power in France.

Nominally, the Circle is presently directed by such British figures as the same Julian Amery who codeployed with Willy Brandt to set President-elect Reagan up for a fall during meetings held in Washington, D.C. at the beginning of December 1980. For those who know the inside of the Circle, the controlling interest is the ancient Byzantine family funds of Venice—to which most readers are paying rent or debt-service, directly or indirectly at the present time. However, since the Circle's transactions must be conducted in large part through the instruments of nation-states, it is the British monarchy which is presently the chief acting representative for the Circle's involvement in the "new Yalta" project.

A significant number of the members of the Circle are known personally by either this writer or his immediate collaborators. With many of those, we have discussed crucial aspects of the current policy outlook of the Cir-

cle's constituents. What we report here is, in the main, a summary restatement of the objections we have presented to such persons in earlier private discussions.

Imagine that you were a British oligarch, closely connected to the inner circles of that British aristocracy assembled under the roof of the British monarch's private household. Imagine you were Julian Amery. How would you attempt to solve Britain's devastating problems on terms agreeable to British aristocrats? You might very well come up with some evil scenario such as the "new Yalta" scheme for which Circle-puppet Alexander Haig is currently deployed.

It is true that some leading protégés of the Circle, such as some among those around Georgetown's Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), are not exactly pleased with Haig's present style of performance. Haig has no subtlety. He insists on making a bungling ass of himself on every mission—as we witnessed the day President Reagan was shot. They do not object to the policy Haig is attempting to implement. They object merely to his propensity for bungling bombast and other crudities in the execution of the efforts.

Britain itself is a disaster. The adoption of the von Hayek-Friedman variety of monetarism has transformed the decaying British economy into a mass of rotting wreckage. If Britain is to maintain its power over most of the world, it must do something quickly, before the reality of economic rot overtakes the artificially and monstrously inflated international exchange-value of the pound.

Britain knows that the looming world depression could be prevented. The discussions of Hamilton's economics among beginning-of-the-century Round Table circles preparing for World War I leave us no doubt that the British know that "free trade" is the death of industrial-capitalist economy. Putting the U.S.A. back on a gold-reserve basis (at approximately \$500 an ounce) would stop the depression and monetary inflation cold. The British know that quite well. However, if the world were to adopt Hamilton's approach to economic growth, the British oligarchs would lose the greater part of their relative financial and political power over other nations, especially the United States.

Meanwhile, the British and their Venetian patrons have nearly succeeded in bringing the entire Western world into that neo-Malthusian, world-federalist sort of "postindustrial society" they have desired ever since the 15th century's Golden Renaissance nearly destroyed the old feudal order. To resume industrial-capitalist growth now would mean abandoning all of the institutions of "environmentalism" and irrationalist cultisms which the British have been building up so obsessively since the days of Lord Palmerston and John Ruskin.

How can a Julian Amery find a solution satisfactory to the British monarchy and the Venetian family funds? How can a Julian Amery solve the strategic problem of relative growth of Soviet power without giving up the Club of Rome's genocidal policies?

The drive toward a "postindustrial society," set into motion in U.S. policy during 1965-1967 under the Joseph Califanos, Ramsey Clarks, and Cyrus Vances of the Johnson administration, has been accelerated on the working assumption that Anglo-Venetian penetration of high-ranking Soviet circles would enable the Anglo-Venetian crowd to collapse the industrial economies of the West without giving strategic preponderance to the Soviet Union. The case of Dzhermen Gvishiani, the late A. Kosygin's son-in-law, and the case of British "triple," KGB Gen. Harold "Kim" Philby, are exemplary of the reasons that Anglo-Venetians believed they could destabilize the Soviet bloc at the same rate they collapsed the industrial power of the West.

As a result of this policy, the West is now at the brink of the worst monetary collapse in modern history, while the "Soviet Empire" is by no means at the point of crumbling. It is true that there are important weak points in the Soviet strategic complex, but these are weak points readily controlled by deployment of a relative superiority of present Soviet strategic capabilities. The will of the Soviet leadership to act in defense of the integrity of the "Soviet Fatherland" is relatively strengthened, and the past 15 years' rotting-away of Western strategic-industrial capabilities provides the Soviets with a growing margin of Soviet material capability, even with an attenuated rate of net Soviet economic growth.

Therefore, the British instinct is to "buy time." The "new Yalta" scheme is the expression of that instinct.

The Yugoslav caper

The idea of drawing the Soviet bloc into occupation of eastern portions of Yugoslavia, and of giving Moscow both Iran and strategic hegemony over a weakened Arab region, is the direct expression of the "new Yalta" thinking among Lord Bethell's masters.

To understand the Yugoslav scenario, it is necessary to emphasize that the thinking is Venetian, not British. Venice is not morally a part of Saint Augustine's Western Europe; it is the capital of the Byzantine Empire, the center of the concentric circles of old Byzantine aristocratic families spread throughout Europe (and into Latin America) at the point that Venice and Patriarch Gennadios directed the 1453 conquest of Greece by the Turk Muhammed the Conqueror. Gennadios's letter to Muhammed the Conqueror still exists, as do the details of the actions by which the Greek patriarchate and Venice and Genoa accomplished the

destruction of Paleologue Constantinople. In return, Venice ran the Ottoman Empire from the inside, especially through the dragoman and janissary system.

From Byzantine times, especially from the 12th century onward, Venice controlled the Adriatic region now identified by Greece, Albania, and Yugoslavia. Most of the Bulgarian, Romanian, and Austro-Hungarian aristocracy were either Byzantine families or Venetian families, as well as the "black hundred families" of the Russian aristocracy. Switzerland has been nothing but a colony of Venetian family funds since Venice wrote Switzerland's present constitution at the close of the Napoleonic wars. The British monarchy itself was a creation of Venetian family funds, and British financial power to date is nothing but an extension of the Venetian family funds which took over the City of London in 1603. Britain is Venice's (Saint George's) principal agent-of-influence in the world.

From that standpoint, one can describe the present effort to destabilize the Balkans as a British operation. It is a Venetian operation conducted under the British flag.

During the period the Venetians ran the Ottoman Empire from the inside, the Albanians were the principal body of armed thugs deployed against the South Serbs and Macedonians of the adjoining region—this is the reason there is a significant Albanian population in South Serbia today. During and following World War II, Albania, like Montenegro and Croatia have been assets of British intelligence throughout, including British intelligence asset Enver Hoxha. Granted, the Croatian operations were run from Austria, Bavaria, Latin America, and Canada, but the formal responsibility for controlling the Croatian nationalist movement—and arming it in Bavaria—has been British.

Although the Albania operation is directed from the University at Palermo (Sicily), the strategic control of Albanian intelligence operations is maintained from London.

Britain's control over Enver Hoxha (as well as the family of exiled King Zog) was used to launder British "triple agent" Harold "Kim" Philby to Moscow shortly after World War II. The British set up a dummy coup against Hoxha, duped the U.S. intelligence services into adopting the project, and then shipped advance details of the American plan into Moscow, giving Philby credit. The backers of Gvishiani in Soviet circles always knew that Philby was a British "triple," but it was necessary to fool the Soviet leaders within the state-apparatus (Soviet nationalist) faction.

Now, the British intelligence's Albanian caper is operational, under the direction of Fitzroy Maclean, Lord Bethell, et al. The latest reports show that the Albanian government itself is already directly involved

in the small war now ongoing within the South Serbian region. The question is: when will the British (and Venetians) unleash the second phase of the operation, the deploying of the Croatian armed insurrection (from Bavaria, et al.)? In case of the second, Croatian, element, the Serbians will howl for help from the East, at about the same time that the echoing insurrections of Macedonians involve Bulgaria, Turkey, and Greece directly into the fragmentation of the Yugoslav nation.

This is precalculated. Will the Soviets honor the proposed terms of the "new Yalta" agreement, and limit themselves to occupying Yugoslavia only up to the "Dalmation Line"?

The Middle East

Thanks to Henry Kissinger, Carter's Zbigniew Brzezinski, and misinformed President Reagan's Alexander Haig, the Soviets now control Iran from within. The mullahs are merely the surface of power: Philby's Tudeh party has seized power from beneath, aided by Israeli and British intelligence, and by Princeton University's Bernard Lewis, Richard Falk, and by Ramsey Clark and Warren Christopher. The next-to-final step of turning Iran over to Moscow was arranged in Washington among Henry Kissinger, Olof Palme, and Georgii Arbatov during the period Palme was attending the Dec. 5-7 meeting of Willy Brandt's Socialist International and "Wimpy" Winpisinger in that city. Julian Amery was also in town for the negotiations. With the dumping of Bani-Sadr, Soviet control is now virtually completed.

By actions of the U.S. State Department under Haig and Philip Habib, Menachem Begin was encouraged to launch a bombing attack on Baghdad. The Reagan administration's capitulation to pressures of Haig and Israeli-sponsored Richard Allen (among others) had the effect of pushing a reluctant Iraq to make fresh approaches to Moscow. Reagan had slapped a friendly Iraq in the face. The entire Middle East is going into the Soviet camp, courtesy of the Benedict Arnold-like roles of Kissinger, Haig, et al.

This, is consistent with the "new Yalta" deal being offered to Moscow by London. London orders President Reagan: "Go get them thar Commies." Reagan obeys. London assures Moscow, "We British are your true friends."

General object

London's object in these and relations operations is twofold. Immediately, London imagines that sucking a Poland-plus-Afghanistan-occupied Moscow into the Balkans and the Middle East will "bog Moscow down" in these undertakings. Otherwise, London is aiming to save and strengthen its assets in the Soviet command, and to buy time until the Soviet Union itself is ripe for



Lord Bethell

destabilizations spread into such regions as the Ukraine and Kazakhstan.

Now, let us assume that Moscow chooses not to become bogged down. If there are General Douglas MacArthurs in Moscow, where would they strike to neutralize the whole game? Where would a MacArthur bogged down in the "North Korea" of Afghanistan choose to strike? How would a von Schlieffen assess this strategic situation? Afghanistan need but formalize the state of war between itself and Pakistan—before London delivers nuclear weapons now en route to Pakistan. The deployment of Soviet forces as allies of Afghanistan to neutralize bases of operation "across the Yalu" means the immediate destabilization of not only Pakistan, but a chain-like reaction of coups within Peking. From a military standpoint, Pakistan is the counter-target of least effort and maximum opportunity for Soviet action. Furthermore, this action is mandatory (pending a coup within Pakistan) prior to the establishment of British-delivered nuclear-weapons capabilities to Pakistan.

The Soviets have other options besides hot pursuit attacks on bases within Pakistan. Since the British have

obligingly developed the Baluchistan operation (under the Bernard Lewis Plan), that potential can be judoed. The option of cutting the China-Pakistan highway also exists. As a high-level official of the subcontinent observed after learning of idiotic James Buckley's proffering of new U.S. military aircraft to Pakistan, "This means the dismemberment of Pakistan."

The objection to such speculation is, "World opinion would not tolerate such a Soviet move." Precisely so. Such moves occur at exactly the point the Soviets no longer give much of a damn about "world opinion." That condition was approached by the successive actions of Menachem Begin's bombing of Baghdad, the arming of Pakistan, and Haig's big mouth in Peking, Hong Kong, and Manila. The Soviets are in the ugliest mood since November 1962, and, this time, perceive themselves to have a relative preponderance of strategic capability.

In brief, Moscow will exploit the negotiations of the "new Yalta" agreement without actually agreeing to such an arrangement.

Continental European views

Leading insider families of continental Europe are tolerating the "new Yalta" tactic, but without much confidence. Never has so much flight-capital run from Europe into the Western Hemisphere since the Battle at Stalingrad. The Venetian colony known as Uruguay is quite occupied with conducting such financial transactions currently.

Nonetheless, most of the members of the Circle are playing out the game.

If the Soviets "buy" (or appear to buy) the "new Yalta" package, the outbreak of monetary collapse will be the signal for establishing fascist governments approximating the 1920s Mussolini regime, and, in most cases (France, Germany, Italy, et al.) under socialist prime ministers or presidents. This includes the United States—as Jack Kemp's sponsorship of the socialist New York City "free enterprise zone" scheme illustrates.

New York City under Felix Rohatyn's Ed Koch and Roy M. Cohn is already a fascist economy. Cleveland and Detroit are high on the list of other cities which Rohatyn is currently assigned to transform into fascist entities. The fostering of chaos—as Koch has done in New York City—is the precondition for a subsequent "reaction."

The London crowd has no intention of making President Ronald Reagan a fascist ruler. Reagan is intended to be gone soon after the new depression hits. Roy Cohn's cronies in the New York East Side Conservative Club are already committed to lining up with Katharine Graham and the IPS crowd to accomplish a

fast "Reagagate." Reagan, because of his presently neglected social base among moderate Republican and Democratic constituencies, is seen as potentially a "wild card," who might rebel against fascism by instinct, and might use the power of the Presidency to upset the project in view. This crowd wishes Reagan out and Pope John Paul II dead—as what it views as the leading two potential institutional threats to the fascist scheme.

Best estimate

When push comes to shove, the Soviet leadership will react on the basis of deeply embedded memories of World War II. They will not react in the adventurous manner of fascists such as Adolf Hitler or Menachem Begin, will not indulge in wild, reckless gambles on emotional impulse. Rather, they will act ruthlessly, at points of time and places of their own choosing. They will act as Marshal Zhukov exemplified for their memories in developing the Stalingrad counteroffensive. They will insulate themselves against "outside world opinion," and view every provocation with suspicion as a calculated attempt to force them to react. They will tend to react to provocations by strategic surprises on other flanks of action.

The controlling feature of their response—the proverbial bottom-line—will be "Soviet nationalism." The question of risk is the balancing of risk of action against the risk of destruction of the Soviet state. At the point that the prospective dismemberment of the Soviet state is perceived to be a threat, or an intolerable strategic threat is developed, all thresholds of deterrence cease operation.

The Soviets will not launch preventive nuclear war. Faced with the imminent monetary collapse of the West, they will adjust their position to maintain assured preponderance of strategic advantage for every foreseen contingency, convinced that the political-psychological effect of a new world depression will be a quantum-leap in Soviet moral hegemony both within and outside the Soviet bloc.

This intrinsic impulse of Soviet policy will make the London crowd all the more desperate and reckless. It is in this aspect of the matter that the danger of plunging into thermonuclear war by strategic miscalculation lies.

The Yugoslav caper is the bloody line which must not be crossed. Unless such a caper is offset by a coup within Peking, Moscow will be strategically impelled to offset the bogging-down implications of the Balkan situation by neutralizing the threat within Asia. Pakistan is the key point of action uniquely indicated for this purpose.

The added problem here is the British mentality. As Wellington's "meat wall" and Montgomery's set-piece tactics illustrate, the British have never accepted the principles of warfare established by the Carnot and

Scharnhorst reforms at the turn into the 19th century. Like our own U.S.A. "utopians" of Rand Corporation varieties, the British are deeply committed to revivals of principles of 18th-century cabinet warfare, as the case of the lunatic "Rapid Deployment Force" proposal illustrates. The fact that the Pentagon transformed by the moonstruck Robert S. McNamara has assimilated that British view—that we no longer honor the traditions honored by MacArthur—means that our military and intelligence command is infected by the same hysterical disposition for strategic miscalculation as the British.

Therefore, if a British or U.S. strategic planner attempts to play Schlieffen-type strategic war-games in attempted evaluation of Soviet responses, the loss of traditionalist military-science viewpoints among Americans will usually prompt them to misestimate Soviet strategic thinking. The Soviet military is unhampered by the lunacies of "cost-benefit analysis." IASA's (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis) influence has not yet reached that far into Soviet command.

The solution to the strategic problems underlined here ought to be clear. If the United States acts now to establish a gold-reserve basis for international marketing of U.S. currency-notes (e.g., \$500 an ounce), and regulates its domestic and foreign banking relations accordingly, monetary inflation can be halted immediately. Through issuance for "hard-commodity" lending of gold-reserve-denominated currency-notes, and by crushing the resistance of the "environmentalists," a general revival of the industrial power of the West can be set into motion.

This requires an abandonment of the follies of Keynes, Friedman, and Adam Smith; in favor of the American System of Hamilton, Carey, List, and Lincoln. The stability and power imparted to nations participating in such high-technology-vectored economic growth provides the means and premises for solving all of the detectable strategic problems.

If we continue to refuse the "Hamiltonian" solution, then only two options exist. Either we stumble into general nuclear war by successive strategic miscalculations, or the Soviets will come to rule the world over the course of the 1980s and 1990s.

There are those, of course, who proceed through life with the delusion that all must turn out well in the end for them. Such fools ignore the fact that a nation or culture which loses the moral fitness to survive seldom survives a crisis as acute as that which confronts us now. Either we implement a Hamiltonian solution now, or, failing to do so, we illustrate in that war, as well as by the New Sodom New York City has become, that we, like the Cities of the Plain, have lost the moral fitness to survive.