

'The LaRouche Doctrine' on the Balkans crisis

The following statement was released by Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche's Committee for a New Bretton Woods, on April 7:

1. Recent developments make it urgent that I summarize my personal knowledge of the principal causes and implications of the present tragic folly of the U.S.A. in supporting the British Blair government's orchestration and direction of the presently ongoing war against the rump state of Yugoslavia.

2. This war

This war, like the still-ongoing war against Iraq, is entirely a creation of the Blair government, as "Desert Storm" was adopted by the government of former President George Bush at the behest of the former Thatcher government of Britain, as the same Thatcher government had earlier duped the U.S. government into violating U.S. treaty law by support for the provocation and conduct of Britain's 1982 Malvinas War against its victim, Argentina.

3. Not a war in U.S.A. interest

Any contrary view of these events, whether as individual events, or as a series of events, is either an outright lie, or a case of inexcusable ignorance.

This war, like typical British-orchestrated Balkan wars of earlier during this century, is not a war against atrocities by the Milosevic government; it is a war launched on the pretext of atrocities by that government, atrocities which, themselves, have been orchestrated in a knowing and willful manner by agents and assets of Her Majesty's Blair government.

4. Corruption in Washington, D.C.

The U.S.A. and NATO involvement in this series of wars, was made possible through corrupt U.S. accomplices of the British monarchy's respective Thatcher and Blair governments. These accomplices are the U.S. component of what was created under U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt, as a British-controlled faction inside U.S. official and other powerful institutions.

5. The BAC's crucial role

This entity within influential U.S. official and other strata, was originally known as the faction assembled, through British monarch Edward VII's assets Cassel and Schiff, to become the Wall Street-centered Federal Reserve System. During World War I, this Wall Street-centered set of pro-treasonous British assets became known as the U.S. component of a "British-American-Canadian" (BAC) formation.

Since the détente process, consolidated step-wise follow-

ing the 1962 Cuba Missiles Crisis, and since the British monarchy's recent decades reorganization of its Commonwealth, the BAC has been enlarged, to become recognized today as the "British-American-Commonwealth" Cabal.

The U.S. component of this Cabal may be identified with certain former U.S. officials of the Nixon, Ford, Reagan, and Bush administrations who have gained so-called honorary titles of British gentry and nobility, conferred by HM Elizabeth II for "outstanding services to the British Empire." (Such titles may be honorable for Britons, but, honorary or otherwise, are utterly dishonorable for U.S. citizens, especially when granted for services performed on behalf of actions in furtherance of British imperialism, while high-ranking U.S. officials.)

The roles of outright BAC lackeys, including such members of the Principals Committee as Vice-President Al Gore, Secretaries William Cohen and Madeleine Albright, and also of certain anglophile assets of Israel as Leon Fuerth, are notable in respect to the way in which the currently ongoing war against Iraq was launched, and in which British intervention, as abetted by Albright, avoided a successful negotiation of a peaceful solution for Kosovo.

6. BAC strategy

The 1989-1999 policies of the British monarchy were first set forth publicly by Thatcher government Minister Nicholas Ridley, during Autumn 1989, in the Thatcher government's declaration that the collapse of the Warsaw Pact shifted British strategic interest to an effort to ruin the economy of a united Germany, if that reunification could not be prevented altogether. This became known as the "Fourth Reich" policy of the Thatcher, French, Yugoslav, and Israel governments. This policy, of ruining Germany, was the basis for the assassination of leading German banker Alfred Herrhausen by a certain European intelligence service, the imposition of the "Maastricht" agreements around the euro, the launching of "Desert Storm" against Iraq (as part of this British "Fourth Reich" policy), and the intentionally ruinous so-called IMF "reform" and "conditionalities" policies which the G-7 governments, and, later, U.S. Vice-President Al Gore, imposed upon the member-nations of the former Warsaw Pact alliance.

This "Fourth Reich" policy coincided with the BAC's shared commitment, to using the elimination of the only capable opposing military superpower, the Soviet Union, as the opportunity for fragmenting the existing nations of continental Asia, especially China and the former Soviet Union, and

for eliminating the sovereignties of all nation-states to the effect of creating a new world-wide British Empire, an empire constituted by assimilating the U.S.A. components of BAC into de facto integration within a new world empire based upon the Commonwealth as such, rather than an empire of the previously quasi-autonomous member-nations of the Commonwealth. This thrust for world-empire was conducted under the deceptive terminology of “globalization.”

Just as the British monarchy’s provocation and conduct of its Malvinas War against Argentina was deployed as a precedent for establishing what was known, in 1982, as “NATO out-of-area deployment” (aggressive warfare conducted by NATO outside the area designated for NATO defense), “Desert Storm,” “Desert Fox,” and the currently ongoing war against Yugoslavia, have been selected as pretexts for establishing a “new NATO”—presently intended to be introduced officially later this month—which will award total control over deployment of NATO forces to the BAC, that is, to the British Commonwealth of Tony Blair’s Elizabeth II and its BAC stooges within the U.S.A.’s Wall Street BAC establishment.

For that reason, each of these latter wars—“Desert Storm,” “Desert Fox,” and the current war against Yugoslavia—are to be recognized as nothing but the intended detonator for a form of World War III evolving out of the combined doctrines of “globalization” and the “new NATO” doctrine already being practiced in the current war against Yugoslavia. This policy is therefore to be regarded as sheer strategic lunacy.

7. The present danger of global war

Global wars do not necessarily start out with the intent of becoming actually global wars. Like Britain’s design and launching of World War I, and Britain’s putting Adolf Hitler into power in Germany in 1932, global wars usually begin with the intent of conducting wars in a limited area, but to a global purpose. Madmen, typified by those of Britain’s Blair government, and the majority of the U.S. Principals Committee, do not intend to fight a global war; they are lunatic utopians, who intend to fight “only one war at a time,” since their faction’s pro-ecology and globalization policies have destroyed the economic basis needed to support wars on the scales of World War I or World War II. They intend to gain global objectives piece-meal, by fighting not more than one limited war—or, perhaps a war-and-a-quarter—at a time; worse for all of us, they are idiots who believe they are fighting only one war at a time—presently against Yugoslavia (not counting Iraq).

This foolishness of Blair et al. is not the general opinion of high-ranking circles in the U.S.A. or the United Kingdom, for example. Clearheaded thinkers know that these so-called limited wars are nothing but idiocies adopted by hare-brained incompetents such as Prime Minister Blair or Vice-President Gore themselves. Most of these wiser heads, who are already beginning to distance themselves publicly from the military lunacies of Blair, Gore, Cohen, Albright, and company, are



Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche. “This war, like typical British-orchestrated Balkan wars, is not a war against atrocities by the Milosevic government; it is a war launched on the pretext of atrocities by that government, atrocities which, themselves, have been orchestrated in a knowing and willful manner by agents and assets of Her Majesty’s Blair government.”

slyly positioning themselves, like many leading U.S. Republican Party figures, for the incumbents to bring discredit upon their policies and themselves, thus creating the situation for a new government of the U.K., a Republican victory in year 2000 in the U.S.A., and so on. Nonetheless, all of them are dallying with the rapidly increasing risk of global warfare.

8. Clinton dangles by a thread

President Clinton is presently attempting to balance between two absolutely irreconcilable policies. On the good side, he is defending strategic partnership with Russia and China (and with others); on the other hand, his present policies on “free trade,” “globalization,” Iraq, and NATO deployments, combined with the detonator of the war against Yugoslavia, threaten to doom Clinton’s Presidency to an early consignment to eternal ignominy. The rapidly deteriorating strategic situation, which has been set into motion by the successive recent actions against Iraq, in fostering a “new NATO” policy, and the manner in which he permitted the British government to use its asset, Madeleine Albright, to manipulate NATO into war in the Balkans, will, if continued, ensure that no partnership potentials exist, and, then, the world is headed toward global, prolonged warfare of the sort central Europe experienced during 1618-1648.

The responsibility, but not the blame, lies with President Clinton: it happened on his watch. The guilt lies with the Blair government and its accomplices in both the U.S. Republican (and some other) members of the U.S. Congress, with the BAC-controlled mass media, and others who pounded and hounded this President into a battered state in which he could be manipulated into his presently precarious policy situation. The blame lies with those who do not join with me in working to extricate the President from this monstrous situation.

9. Why it happens now!

To understand how and why the Blair government was able to lead the world to the present brink of global war, go back to the events of mid-August through mid-October 1998.

Until mid-August 1998, Vice-President Al Gore had succeeded in playing a key role in looting Russia, in partnership with the so-called "Russian mafia," while lining his own pockets with what are fairly regarded bribes taken by a monstrosity corrupt elected public official, Al Gore himself. In this way, Al Gore was enjoying hand-outs for his future election-campaign from persons involved in a massive swindle known as "derivatives" speculation on Russian GKO's. Gore's cronies in an entity known as Long-Term Capital Management were a key part of this "John Law Bubble"-style financial swindle. On August 17, 1998, the bubble burst.

Gore acted immediately, behind the back of President Clinton, to attempt to bail out Gore's Wall Street financial angels, by putting Gore's crony Viktor Chernomyrdin back into the position of Russia's Prime Minister—to bail out the LTCM betters. By mid-September, Gore's Chernomyrdin stunt was collapsing; LTCM's situation was hopeless. So, as during the first weeks of October 1998, a series of decisions were made, all leading in the direction of risking global warfare at some early time.

This was the time that Gore exposed his malicious policies toward both Russia and China (nations to which President Clinton had misguidedly entrusted Gore's special relations). During the first half of October, two general developments erupted, in reaction to the looming meltdown of the world's present financial system. The financial blowout of Brazil was the detonator. It was the combination of the threat of Russian default, Brazil collapse, and the ultra-explosive yen bubble, which threatened the immediate doom of the world's present financial system—exactly as I have warned would be the crisis-point reached, as it was reached, during October 1998. The G-7 and their associated central banking systems reacted to the mid-October situation, by: a) unleashing the most lunatic, wildest hyperinflationary monetary and financial expansion in the history of the human species; b) driving toward war, unleashing the Principals Committee's initial efforts to swindle President Clinton into the bombing of Iraq while the President was on a later visit to the Middle East. Every step toward war, including the attempt to break Clinton from strategic partnership with Russia and China, has been a step-by-step—quick-step—movement toward global war since then.

Such combinations of financial-economy crisis and the timing of incidents leading to outbreaks of warfare, are not unfamiliar to the historian.

From their visible public performances, fellows such as NATO's General Wesley Clark, Secretary Cohen, and Chairman Shelton, are silly, if nasty tin soldiers fighting wars designed in a RAND Corporation-style sand box. Political and economic illiterates in history, such as they exhibit themselves to be, should never be entrusted with command responsibilities of so important a nature.

How global war would unfold is not clear, and could not be clear at this time. How it would unfold would depend upon choices yet to be made by (especially) some of the leading powers being arrayed against one another by the "new NATO" policy. A Primakov-led Russia, or a Jiang Zemin-led China will not respond in ways as foolish as those of lunatics such as Blair and Gore.

Nonetheless, these nations presently being targetted by Blair et al., notably Russia and China, have been put on notice that no offering of peace will be made to them with which they could live. Russia, already raped by George Bush's and Al Gore's Russian Mafia cronies, has reached the extreme state that it is ready to explode if provoked more along present lines. In the last ditch, there are major nuclear arsenals which no Russian dare give up to negotiations with Blair et al. China's tough resolve has a different quality, but it is equally decided, if on a longer fuse than the short-fused Russia situation.

Meanwhile, the global financial system is ever closer to meltdown. Under present G-7 policies, that financial meltdown is inevitable for the near future, and will be of such a character that entire nations, including some nations of western Europe, such as Spain, will simply disintegrate under such conditions. We are not looking at the likelihood of a World War II reenacted, but, rather something from early Fourteenth-Century Europe, or the 1618-1648 Thirty Years War, the kind of war novelist H.G. Wells would have adored.

10. The remedy

There will be no successful avoidance of a continued and accelerating degeneration of the global strategic situation, unless two measures are placed foremost on the agenda for immediate action by President Clinton at this moment. Otherwise, the march toward the kind of global warfare which would plunge the entire planet into a new dark age, is more or less inevitable.

a. There must be immediate emergency action to establish a virtually global New Bretton Woods agreement, as I have defined the principled features of such a new system of strategic partnership among perfectly sovereign nation-states.

b. The U.S.A., together with at least one leading continental western European strategic partner (e.g., France, Germany, Italy), must take emergency action to establish a general partnership of economic and other cooperation with the group of states now developing a system of partnership among China, Russia, India, et al. The objectives should be those anti-British policies which U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt intended to be the basis for a just, imperialism-free form of a new world economic order among perfectly sovereign nation-states enjoying free access to the most advanced discoveries in science and technology.

If you wish security, that, as of now, is the only possible way it can be reasonably assured. If you will not join me to that purpose, you are not serious about either your own personal interests, or those of the U.S.A.