

Ending 'Versailles System' in vital interest of U.S.

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following is a memorandum defining the current world situation in light of the strategic interests of the United States, issued by LaRouche, a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, on Jan. 18.

First, I have observed the post-1988-89 attempts at reorientation of mission and capability of the United States intelligence, military, and related institutions. What I see is, in effect, a strategic box, which will do nobody any good, especially the United States, and especially those institutions which are engaged in this, not reorientation, but re-disorientation. The purpose of this communication is to outline some considerations which will point in a correct direction.

The world situation at present is essentially characterized by the disintegration of what is usefully termed the Versailles System; that is, agreements reached in the context of the Versailles Conference by the Anglo-Americans, in particular, with some French participation, as these agreements were modified during and at the close of the Second World War.

The collapse of the Soviet empire, at least in its old form (the *Soviet* empire, as distinct from something that might come through under Russian leadership), and the now-accelerating disintegration of the Anglo-American/British Commonwealth economy and, therefore, system, defines the essence of the disintegration of the Versailles System in all essential respects which define it as a system.

Nonetheless, the Versailles System is not giving up so easily and, even while doomed, like the last dinosaur, is nonetheless thrashing around and doing as much damage as it can, as if in a desperate effort to deny the imminence of the inevitable.

We must understand, to define a strategic orientation for

today, the issues which led to World War I and which, under the Versailles System, have dominated this century since World War I. And only when we find the nature of the sickness affecting our nation and the world embedded in the Versailles System, and understand the need for a replacement for the Versailles System—not its perpetuation—do we see clearly what the proper strategic orientations and missions of U.S. intelligence and military and related institutions ought to be.

The causes of World War I

Now let's look at the Versailles System on the surface. What were the causes of World War I, when the Americans and the French made a fatal strategic blunder in entering into a war, or planning for a war, in concert with England—the war known as World War I?

What was the effect? What was the issue of that fateful folly of Teddy Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson et al., together with France, entering into this stupid coalition with Britain against Germany, the thing that has ruined civilization, and imperiled our civilization, in the course of this century?

Go back a century to 1862. At that time, on the North American continent, a British puppet entity called the Confederacy, directed by the British state—that is, through Rothschild channels such as August Belmont in New York, and Judah Benjamin, the secretary of state of the Confederacy, in the South—was deployed in an effort to break up the United States and effectively divide the North American continent into four or five quarreling baronies which could easily be controlled as a Balkanized entity from London. The Belmont letters and other original documents from the period *leave no doubt of that reality. There was no virtue in the*

Confederacy. The Confederacy and what it represented, was a degeneracy, a horror, a disgusting thing, which can in no way be justified, nor should it be decked with chivalric honor, as many fools have done.

At that point, since the Union forces were enjoying an unexpected vitality (from the standpoint of the Anglo-French quarters of Lords Palmerston, Russell, and the Emperor Napoleon III), the British and French forces were on the verge of intervening with naval and other forces—as they intervened in Mexico—on the side of the Confederacy, to assure the crushing of the Union, or at least to ensure that the Confederacy would force upon Washington a negotiated peace which would establish the Balkanization of the North American continent as a settled arrangement.

At that point, among the other things intervening, the Czar of All the Russias, Alexander II, intervened in two forms, replicating his ancestor's, Catherine the Great's, action in supporting Denmark in launching the League of Armed Neutrality against British operations against North America, ensuring the American victory in the 1780s.

The Czar warned Paris and London that his government, his state, was prepared to make war throughout Europe should the British and French forces intervene on behalf of the Confederacy in the North American conflict. Secondly, as a gesture of armed neutrality, the Czar sent the Russian fleet, which was then being built, the Pacific fleet to San Francisco, the other fleet to New York, in a gesture of friendship and demonstration to the British and French of the Russian resolve to prevent the Anglo-French intervention on behalf of the Confederacy.

Russia's impulse toward economic development

That is the actual beginning point, the wellspring, of World War I.

Why? First of all, it is the usual belief, a mistaken one, that the initiative at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, for economic development and cooperation among France, Germany, and St. Petersburg, originated from either France or from Germany. The contrary is true, as the record shows. There were impulses in that direction, natural historic ones from Germany; there were impulses from France. But the essential impulse came from St. Petersburg, from the Czar, from people like Mendeleyev, their influence on policy and, most explicitly, Count Sergei Witte, the useful minister who dominates the entire period up until about 1905, particularly after the death by assassination of Alexander II.

And the threat was, based on the key role of the technological, scientific, and economic growth of Germany, that St. Petersburg's alliance with Germany and France in such cooperation would define a zone of technologically driven economic development in northern Eurasia from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and also from this baseline in northern Eurasia,

southward into the southern Americas, Africa, and southern Asia. It was an anti-British operation.

As opposed to this, the British developed a mystical dogma called geopolitics, which belongs with hobgoblins in the fairy books of historiography and strategy, which talks about the physiocratic essence of the "heartland" rising to challenge the rightful supremacy of the "rim." Real garbage. Only morons could really take seriously such a physiocratic bit of fairy tale. The reality was that if the economic development of northern Eurasia occurred in that form, the system of economy associated with British imperial domination of the world, or so much of it, would be threatened and come to an end; that the British themselves could survive under those circumstances *only* by adapting to, and becoming integrated into, the kind of economic cooperation which the Witte initiatives, for example, presupposed.

To prevent that, the British did a number of things. They played, of course, the pan-Slavism card for all it was worth, to influence Russia. But that would not have worked without several other things.

The assassination of William McKinley and the bringing in of Teddy Roosevelt cleared the decks for a sweeping Anglophile disease affecting the minds of the Americans, who had previously been more pro-Prussian and pro-Russian, than pro-British, based on experience.

Secondly, at the same time, the corruption of France through such channels as sodomite Lord Grey's relationship to strategic catamite Théophile Delcassé in establishing the Entente Cordiale locked up Europe, and set the stage for World War I.

So, by involving Japan and the United States on the side of Britain, and combining this with the British Empire and playing the game with France, the Balkans, and Russia, the British created a combination of "rim" forces, as they would call it, and balance of power operations in Europe, which became the devastating World War I.

Britain created World War II

On the question of World War II: Yes, Hitler was a menace that had to be removed at all costs. However, Hitler was not a German creation, essentially, but rather a Versailles creation, particularly of that Anglo-American faction which is associated with Harriman, Morgan, and the relevant circles in London around the Bank of England—Schacht's backers. There's no question of this.

This was created as Bolshevism was tolerated as an institution, because Bolshevism was the adversary of Witte, the adversary of everything that the British feared as the heartland, and as long as Russia under Bolshevism did not try to become a heartland power, with a heartland policy as the British defined it, then Russia could be tolerated uneasily, as a Bolshevik power.

Hitler was created to destroy a heartland policy, as the British would define it, in Europe. For example, a fact of

history: When the Wehrmacht moved into Russia, they moved along the southern flank, into Ukraine. The Wehrmacht itself had the initial policy and took the initial actions to establish an independent Ukraine, with its own government, its own military force, and so forth, and brought people forth from the cracks of Ukrainian society to do that. The Gestapo under Hitler had a different policy, and moved in their crack units, pushed the Wehrmacht out, and began slaughtering the very policy that the Wehrmacht had pulled up to form the core of a new Ukrainian government.

Is it not in the interests of the United States to establish a world order consistent with Christian principles, with respect for the sovereignty of the individual, the sovereignty of the nation-state republic in such matters as economic cooperation to the benefit of each and all?

So one sees in this shoot-out, so to speak, between Wehrmacht policy, which makes historical-strategic military sense, and Hitler's lunatic butchery, how valuable and important and useful Adolf Hitler was to his Anglo-American sponsors in that respect. One sees the motive of putting Hitler in from the beginning. Hitler's work, *Mein Kampf*, was written under the direction of a geopolitician, Haushofer, and from the beginning, before Hitler came to power, he was assuredly an instrument of British policy, that is, an asset of British influence, if not himself a British agent. So that's understood.

But World War II is an outgrowth of the Versailles System; and thus the horrors and the outcome of that war must be placed within the continuation of World War I, from that standpoint. Only then is history coherently represented.

Pugwash and the world condominium

The other aspect of this policy, which became most clear after the death of Roosevelt and the prevalence of Churchill through the Harriman crowd's takeover of the Truman administration, was the policy of London established in 1955-58 with the Pugwash evolution around Bertrand Russell, that the Anglo-Americans and Russia would form a world condominium which would agree upon the non-development of the former colonial or semi-colonial southern regions of the world. That was policy. What was being worked out was how the condominium itself could be rearranged; and what we see, now, is in effect a realization in part of the Pugwash objective as set forth by Bertrand Russell and others at the

end of World War II—except at the time that Russell's dream is being realized on that account, not only was the Soviet empire disintegrating, but also the Anglo-American economic system.

That has implications which could be further discussed, but it's clear enough from this point.

The strategic interests of the U.S.

Now, what is the interest of the United States? What is the intelligence/military-strategic interest of the United States? Is it anything which keeps a budget for the intelligence and military services? Or is it the defense of something which is in the vital historic interests of the United States as a sovereign republic, and as a people—in terms of our children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren, and so forth, in terms of the kind of world in which we wish the nation, the republic of our children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren to live, the kind of world which that is? Is that the strategic interest?

Is not the strategic interest that for which Lincoln fought against the British puppet, the Confederacy? Is not the strategic interest of the United States represented by what Alexander II and Witte attempted to bring into being, in cooperation with the United States?

Is not a community of principle associated with the principles upon which the United States itself was founded as an extension of the same impulse in European civilization—is that not our strategic interest?

Is it our strategic interest to go shooting down little brown- and black-skinned and yellow-skinned people, and prove how much we can do as sort of a reply on a horrible scale of what was going on in Southeast Asia some years ago? Is that our strategic interest—to be bloody-handed machos like these crazy Israelis all over the world? Is that our interest?

Do you want to look to the world like the Israelis look to the Arabs, as inhuman butchers, worse than Nazis? Do you want to look like that? Do you want our institutions to look like that? Do you want to be influenced by that kind of mentality? Or does the United States and its people have a true interest, which is ill-served by the policy of post-industrialization, the collapse of our industry, the collapse of our infrastructure, the collapse of our agriculture, all for some kind of utopian dream, utopian fantasy? Is that what you wish? Is that the interest of the United States?

This free trade delusion—is that the interest of the United States? Is it not in the interests of the United States to establish a world order consistent with Christian principles, with respect for the sovereignty of the individual, the sovereignty of the nation-state republic in such matters as economic cooperation to the benefit of each and all? Peace based on development of that sort? Peace based on a community of principle, based on those conceptions, and the willingness and ability to fight to ensure that that is achieved and defended?