

fomenting the worst instincts of certain Russian factions. Any possible U.S. intervention to stop the genocidalists, the foundation leaders said (starting with the original sponsor of Maggie Thatcher, Sir Alfred Sherman), is a direct attack on Russia. Russia has to react (see box).

In normal conditions, such propaganda would be dismissed as delirious; but under the destructive conditions imposed by economic shock therapy, irrationality can flourish. The British have been actively flirting with a scenario for World War III.

In fact, one of the reasons for the long non-intervention of the Clinton administration—and one of the reasons for the unjust Dayton agreement—has been the fear that Russia might be drawn into the war. The British, in the middle of the game, kept the genocide going, preventing any possible positive U.S. intervention through direct sabotage (see the story of Gen. Sir Michael Rose, p. 26).

LaRouche's 'Productive Triangle'

What prompted the British decision to launch the Greater Serbians around 1989, was the perception of an immediate and overwhelming danger, just as London's man Laffan warned of before World War I. The end of communism and fall of the Berlin Wall had opened, *mutatis mutandis*, a perspective of development comparable to that in the years preceding World War I. In particular, as readers of *EIR* know, the end of the geopolitical division of Europe and the world coincided with the elaboration by Lyndon LaRouche of his conception of the Productive Triangle: an area of great development centered in the Berlin-Paris-Vienna triangle, which could become the engine for the modernization and reconstruction of the countries of the former Soviet bloc, but also the rest of Europe, the Middle East, and so on.

According to LaRouche's elaboration, the Triangle was

British propaganda for a new Triple Entente

The following statements by British policymakers document their visceral hatred of Germany, and their effort to manipulate Russia into an alliance with Britain against the United States.

Margaret Thatcher, former British prime minister, in a speech in September 1995, in Colorado Springs, Colorado, at a meeting of the Forum for International Policy: Germany's "national character is to dominate. There is something in the character of the German people that led to things that never should have happened. Why was it that the German people let Hitler do the things he did? This is something I still fear. Even to this day."

Kenneth DeCourcy, editor of *Intelligence Digest*, Aug. 11, 1995: "American generals trained and advised the recently triumphant Croatian Army, and German pilots have been training the Croatian Air Force (U.N. sources at Zagreb airport say air traffic control frequencies 'resound to the voices of German pilots'). Yet the recent events in the former Yugoslavia, important (and dangerous) as they are, form only a small part of an overall U.S.-German plan for Europe. . . . America's solution is to encourage and support German hegemony in both East and West Europe.

"Washington urgently needs to think again before it is too late; its policy for Europe is not a policy for future

stability; it is the reverse."

Michael Martin Stenton, representative of the Lord Byron Foundation for Balkan Studies, in a press conference in Moscow on Oct. 9, 1995, sought to turn the Russians against Germany and the United States: "The new Germany has been tested, the attitude of the United States has been made clear, the weakness of Britain and the weakness of Russia have been proven. The solution to the question of the autonomous rights of the Serbs in Croatia has now been revealed: the military destruction of the Serbian community by an army trained by the United States, politically encouraged by Germany and tolerated by the new Yugoslav authorities in Belgrade.

"Another experiment was made, and that experiment was to give NATO military authority. NATO was introduced into the former Yugoslavia as an air power to police the air exclusion zone on behalf of the United Nations. . . .

"What we must now conclude is that the experiment is finished. We have absolute evidence that NATO is not prepared to behave in a neutral fashion, that it wishes to move towards a solution in a unilateral and extremely violent fashion."

The NATO bombing of Serbian forces at Sarajevo, Stenton continued, "is one of the first uses of military force that has had positive approval by the pope of Rome. . . . The question is, will this political intimidation, which forces Britain to bomb people when Britain does not want to go to war and which forces Russia to remain silent when it knows what is happening, will this political intimidation continue?"

Stenton then discussed the proposal that there be a NATO military force in Bosnia, to which Russia and

to be linked, through railroad and other transportation and communication infrastructure, to the main areas of reconstruction. One of the main branches, of course, was to run through the Balkans. No national leadership in its right mind would have failed to jump at the opportunity. The British had to move fast.

Through Slobodan Milosevic, already the principle of racist irrationality—Greater Serbia—had been revived. Milosevic, a banker trained in the United States, was a product of the Henry Kissinger grouping. Frantic meetings took place in Britain and elsewhere with Serbian envoys. The green light was given.

From then on, as this magazine has regularly documented, the “Invisible Empire,” either directly or through its U.N. incarnation, made sure that nobody would interfere with the war “experiment.”

The treason of General Rose, when he and his Special

Islamic countries could contribute. Stenton warned: “Every Russian should have no doubt that this is a poisoned offer, and I recommend you strongly not to accept it. Russia will buy no influence for herself, nor buy any advantage for the Serbs, by sending forces to Bosnia under NATO command. If there is a NATO force in Bosnia, it will be the dominant force. . . .

“If NATO is allowed to send a very powerful American force to Bosnia it will in all probability behave in exactly the same way. Except that this time . . . it will be American Special Forces seizing control in Pale, Banja Luka, Brcko, and ultimately on the River Drina itself. And if there are Russian troops present, they will be helpless to do anything about this. Which is why I recommend Russia to avoid the poisoned gift, to not send your troops and to not vote in favor of a new United Nations resolution to give NATO permission to send a military force into Bosnia. . . .

“The question that Russia ought to ask itself is whether the presence of a NATO contingent in Bosnia will make a NATO air base in Tallinn [Estonia] in 10 years time more or less likely. Russia is facing a new Cold War look-alike situation whether it wants to admit that or not. By acting now to assert its legitimate national interests and its geopolitical concerns, Russia, in fact, may prevent this situation from blossoming into a fully blown Cold War. . . .

“NATO has changed for the worse. NATO has become a giant without any checks, balances, and controls. . . . NATO now, as has been proven in Bosnia, is not only a threat to Russia, it is a threat to its own members because NATO is behaving in a way which may push many reluctant members into a sort of confrontation nobody wants, but a small group of adventurers in Bonn and Washington.”

Air Services (SAS) sabotaged NATO strikes against the Karadzic gangs assaulting the U.N. “safe area” of Bihac, is one of the examples that came out publicly. The war among the victims, the British intelligence authorship of the confrontation, in 1993 in Central Bosnia, between Muslims and Catholics, is another of these sickening examples (see *Documentation*, p. 32).

Unleash the power of the American economy

But that treason is only the tip of the iceberg. There are few U.S. observers and military personnel who have been in Bosnia, who have not been sickened by the British modus operandi. It is reasonable to believe that much more evidence of London’s perfidy is ready to pop up. The NATO air strikes that freed Croatia and put the genocidalists on the defensive in Bosnia, took place, after innumerable British actions of sabotage, because of a decision made in Washington. It showed that the British game was psychological warfare, and a courageous decision could have broken the “game” at any moment. Of course, London agitated the scarecrow of a Russian intervention in defense of the Serbians, and the operation against Karadzic’s new Nazis did not go as far as it could have. And then there was Dayton.

The ideologues of the Empire are progressively showing signs of paranoia vis-à-vis the role of the United States in Bosnia. This is what Hollinger Corporation operative Ambrose Evans-Pritchard wrote after the air strikes, in the London *Sunday Telegraph*: “Gone is the automatic trust that once tied the British and American armed forces. President Clinton ordered a secret policy that undercut the British army. . . . Now he expects London to provide . . . loyal Gurkhas for his plan.”

The current policy fight over the economic reconstruction of Bosnia does not concern only the Balkans; it concerns the economic reconstruction of the United States as well.

On April 3, for causes still under investigation, the plane carrying U.S. Commerce Secretary Ron Brown and 31 other people, including executives of several of the most important U.S. industrial firms, crashed near Dubrovnik, Croatia, en route from Tuzla, Bosnia. Brown was involved in channelling huge investments that, according to observers, do not seem to fit the agenda of the World Bank and IMF. A source told *EIR*: “There was a potential of investment exceeding \$40 billion on that plane.” In his last speech in Tuzla, Brown said: “I think we shouldn’t just look at aid. Aid is kind of a one-shot deal. We’d better look at long-term economic development, and it can only come through investment.”

Speaking of Brown at the Commerce Department on the day of the fatal crash, President Clinton recalled: “When we met earlier this week, right before he left for the Balkans, he was so excited, because he thought he would be able to use *the power of the American economy to help the peace take hold in the Balkans.*”