

Germany as tragedy revisited

by Lyndon LaRouche

November 21, 1999

Germany's military is repeating today the same tragic blunder it committed, respecting its betrayal of Kurt von Schleicher, first, in January 1933, and, fatally, on June 30, 1934. Its support of the London-directed NATO command's present targeting of the Balkans, and the Middle East, Transcaucasus, and Central Asia flanks of Russia and China, is leading in the same direction as the military officer corps' failures of 1933-34 led it into the slaughter of Germany's military leadership, in the failed coup of July 20, 1944.

This is not only a German tragedy; rather, it is the irony of the German command's present commitment to back London's NATO policy, that those German circles are repeating today, the same tragic folly of "*raison d'état*," which led the Germany military to its own doom earlier. It is the same tragic folly, on the Germany side, which has led Germany repeatedly to terrible times, ever since the betrayal of the German patriots of 1812-13 by the Prussian monarchy of the post-Vienna Congress period. Again, the tragedy, overall, is not German, but also the tragedy of the present U.S.A., and of Europe in general. The German aspect of the present tragic folly is merely the clearest and simplest illustration of that wider situation.

That said on background, now view the current Russia situation, and the follies of the U.S.A. and U.K. governments, among others, in pushing the world presently down an accelerating pathway toward something like a World War III.

Like the response to the Barbarossa attack of 1941, more and more of the otherwise diverse, patriotically inclined currents of Russia are converging upon unity for the common defense of Russia, provoked by a Brzezinski-style, London-directed attack, which is aimed at the break-up of existing Russia, into fragments. Thus, a "line has been drawn in the sand" of the North Caucasus.

The silly babbling of the diplomats at the recent Istanbul

gathering, shows what "ships of fools" the governments of the U.S.A. and western Europe have become. Those fools have refused to grasp the essential fact of the situation: Chechnya is neither a nation, nor a human rights issue; it is a strategic line which the British-led NATO powers and their auxiliaries, themselves, have "drawn in the sand."

The "dialogue of the deaf" staged between President Clinton and President Yeltsin, in the context of the Istanbul farce, typifies the way World Wars begin. I am reminded of the silly Habsburg Emperor, ruler of an Austro-Hungary already overdue for the undertaker, who insisted on pushing the Russian Slavophiles into launching the general mobilization which made World War I immediately inevitable. The comic-opera Caligula, Tony "with my last breath" Blair, echoed by his foolish U.S. and other partners in strategic folly, must remind us, collectively, of the pure silliness of the mind of the self-doomed Habsburg Kaiser of 1914. The self-righteous posturing of the NATO and auxiliary fools, at Istanbul, echoes the 1914 folly of the self-doomed Habsburg Kaiser, repeated as low-grade operetta today.

The dirty game proceeds

Since no later than the end of the past Winter, the London-led NATO command has been committed to establishing a military-style ("Pinochet"-style), post-Yeltsin dictatorship in Russia. Lebed has often been mentioned as one among the London-preferred candidates for that role. Such a dictator would accept turning over Central Asia and the Transcaucasus to British financial and strategic interests, in return for London support in the role of being the broker of delivery of Russia's Siberia-centered raw materials assets, at British prices and British pleasure. The pipeline from Baku, celebrated at the recent Istanbul affair, typifies the future role of a Russian "Pinochet" in London's intended, globalized imperium-emporium.

The bombing of Yugoslavia, arranged through Robin Cook and his flunky Madeleine Albright, was intended as a stepping-stone to London-directed NATO operations in the Transcaucasus and Central Asia. The recently announced, London-directed jihad against Russia, is integral to that same policy.

Thus, now, in Russia, there are three polarities: the patriots, London's "Russian Pinochet" option, and the four-man cartel operating within President Yeltsin's orbit. From the side of Russia as a nation, it is the interplay among these three polarities, which defines what appears to be Russia's moment-to-moment policy. However, the patriotic interest of Russia has been made painfully clear to those sundry forces which are tending to converge upon broad terms of agreement respecting Russia's desperate strategic situation. Thus, the situation is extremely confused, but nonetheless quite clear. In other words, the situation is highly turbulent, and increasingly so; but, that very fact of increasing turbulence defines its own kind of clarity about the current direction of policy-shaping.

Russia's policy for the North Caucasus is to seek to win the battle decisively, as quickly as possible. For Russia now, "moderation" means promoting a military and strategic quagmire. The very weaknesses in the Russia military forces, merely push the situation all the more in that direction. The issue is not whether or how Russia wins the war in Chechnya; like the Soviet Union's "Finnish war" of the pre-Barbarossa period, the issue today is the role of the Chechnya war in recementing, and restoring the élan of the recently fragmented Russian military and intelligence organizations around a political conception of national defense.

Thus, two Presidents—Clinton and Yeltsin—neither of whom is actually in control of his own policy-making institutions, conducted what was inevitably a pathetic dialogue of the deaf.

In short, never let the *New York Times*' harem grammarian shape the way you define your morality, or define a strategic interest.

Russians protest British terror

by Jeffrey Steinberg

As reported in last week's *EIR* ("British Declare Terrorist 'Jihad' Against Russia"), on Nov. 12-13, a collection of ostensibly Islamic organizations, including the International Islamic Front, Al Muhajiroun, and Ansar as-Shariah, met in London under the banner of the "Fourth Conference of Islamic Revival Movement." The conference produced a declaration of war against Russia, because of the Russian military's

actions in Chechnya. The conference was sanctioned by the government of Prime Minister Tony Blair and the British Crown. Indeed, the *jihad* declaration against Russia was thoroughly in line with the British Foreign Office's policy of supporting terrorist insurrections and other destabilizations against all "rival empires." Russia heads the list of "rival empires" slated for early extinction, if the British have their way.

But, in the wake of that flagrant provocation, it appears that the Russian government may be in the process of joining a growing list of nations that have labelled Britain as the terror capital of the world. According to a report in the Nov. 16 *Kommersant Daily*, during the second day of the London Islamist conference some of the attendees physically attacked two Russian television newsmen, from ORT and NTV, beating them and destroying their cameras. The two cameramen had captured two days of footage, of non-stop calls for holy war against Moscow.

On Nov. 14, Russia's Foreign Ministry filed an official protest to Andrew Wood, Britain's Ambassador in Moscow. According to *Kommersant*, "The organizers of the event apologized to Russia's mass media, while the British government reported that the case is under investigation by the Home Ministry, and asked Russia not to inflate a scandal."

Scotland Yard 'does not react'

ORT's cameraman Alexandr Panov, who suffered a concussion in the beating, told *Kommersant* that he is "very surprised at the indifference of the British government. Some of the participants at the 'charity' event were people wanted by Interpol, but Scotland Yard, although evidently aware of their residence [in Britain], does not react. Meanwhile, even English journalists have to be cautious in their coverage of the 'Islamism' issue. A correspondent of the *Sunday Times*, who had published two sensational articles on [training] bases of terrorists in Britain, refused to be featured on Russian TV," for fear of being targeted for retribution, Panov emphasized.

"Most of the organizations represented at the meeting in London are familiar only to a narrow circle of specialists, and often emerge ad hoc, for the occasion of a certain event," commented *Kommersant*'s foreign policy department. "Still, they represent only the tip of the iceberg of the radical Islamist network widespread in Britain. Exactly there, the Islamists train mercenaries for warfare in Yemen, Egypt, Algeria, Kosovo, Tajikistan, and Chechnya. Most similar organizations, based in western Europe and the U.S., act quite legally. In particular, British courts actually ignore requests for extradition of their members, exposed as terrorists."

Russian television had launched the exposé of Britain's role in harboring anti-Russian terrorist networks several days before the meeting in London. On Nov. 10, both NTV and ORT aired stories profiling Osama bin Laden's political organization in Britain, charging that the groups were receiving paramilitary training from British officers.