

SPECIAL REPORT

Lyndon LaRouche on the 'kooks'
and 'realists' of strategic policymaking

Dracula had blue blood

The great organ groaned sepulchrally as the figures, faces obscured by hooded capes, scuttled into their appointed positions for the ceremony. Then, when the eerie ceremony was nearly completed, from beneath each hood of the throng there rumbled the responsive echoing of the solemn oath recited by the figure at the front.

An American International horror film? A scene from "The Phantom of the Opera?" A convention of the Ku Klux Klan?—Not exactly: an investiture ceremony at New York's Anglican Cathedral of St. John the Divine. The hooded figures are not exactly Ku Klux Klaners, but members of the same Order of Malta on which the Ku Klux Klan was modeled by its creators back in 1867.

Led by the British monarchy's own branch of the Maltese Order, all branches of the order participating at the recent New York ceremony swore an oath of fealty to Britain's Queen Elizabeth II. These included U.S. citizens, committing the crime which has always been the basis for loss of U.S. citizenship even by native-born Americans—an oath of fealty to a foreign monarch.

Two days ago, a connected incident occurred on the premises of Yale University at New Haven. According to officials of Yale University, who apologized for the business the following day, the behavior of many persons in that incident is not representative of the University community as a whole, and represented, in face, a violation of the university's rules. We are inclined to accept the Yale official's view of the matter; the regrettable features of the incident occurred at the prompting of outside forces, such as the B'nai Brith's Anti-Defamation League.

In fairness to Yale as a whole, the highlights of the event should be reported.

What now seems a long time ago, this presidential candidate received an invitation to address the Yale

Political Union on the evening of Nov. 6, 1979. Suddenly, during the forty-eight hours immediately preceding the scheduled event, various off-campus forces, led by the local ADL office, deployed extensive harassment in the effort to prevent the event from occurring. That failing, they resorted to a fall-back option, of deploying various forces into the event for a centrally coordinated program of attempted heckling and slander, in an effort to disrupt the proceedings.

However, most of the groupings clearly hostile to the speaker settled into a calm and more or less reasonable sort of discussion over the course of the question period. One participant popped the question concerning the New York Times' libellous charge of "anti-Semitism." After the speaker's reporting on the 1975-1977 history of his policy and efforts for seeking Middle East peace, there was no repetition of that question—apparently that student and others of similar concerns were satisfied with the response. Toward the close of the discussion period, the ostensible chief spokesmen for the antinuclear faction was engaged in what any onlooker must have judged an eminently rational, point-by-point dialogue on the important technical issues.

It was only at the conclusion of the affair that a formerly silent youth wearing a "Kennedy '80" button led a nasty effort at disruption and, according to witnesses, incited persons to rush out into an assault on the departing presidential candidate's party. Not more than two dozen, and perhaps fewer of the audience of between one hundred and one hundred fifty persons consistently heckled throughout the affair. Only a handful, led by the youth wearing the "Kennedy '80" button, showed any hooligan impulses.

That clarified, we may now focus our attention on the feature which connects events at Yale to the behavior of the caped kooks at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine.

From early during the question period, there was a

persisting effort to ridicule the speaker for tracing key elements of U.S. policymaking to London-centered influences. The gist of the critics' point was that any figure who suggested powerful British political influences over influential U.S. institutions must be so silly as to be deemed incredible on virtually all points. Yet, once the presidential candidate's party had departed, these same persons burst out into a chorus of "God Save The Queen"—not stumbling over a single word of that musical oath of fealty to a foreign monarch.

I do not propose that we summarily revoke the citizenship of each and every member of all branches of the Order of Malta. If these folk were confronted with a choice between labeling their oath to the British Queen as a "silly prank," and surrendering their citizenships, many could be brought quickly back to their senses. There is, after all, a stink of sheer childishness in the entire Maltese mumbo-jumbo. Many persons sucked into that display of infantilism need only to be instructed to grow up, to return to the twentieth century and out of such distorted fantasies concerning the Middle Ages. It is proper to give the misguided dupes the opportunity to separate themselves from the hard-core treasonous lot.

However, there must be no more wishy-washiness on this business of swearing oaths of fealty to foreign monarchs. The attitude of United States constitutional law toward such treasonous oaths is beyond disrupting. If representatives of Queen Elizabeth II accept such oaths, the Queen has created a *casus belli* between Britain and the United States, in which circumstance

the treasonous oath-taking becomes pure and simple treason. To swear an oath to the Queen of England is to place one's loyalty to a foreign monarch above one's loyalty to the United States. Such an oath is a repudiation of the American Revolution, and of the U.S. Constitution.

Who's selling the U.S. down the river?

During the recent years, a growing number of patriots have been grumbling to their confidants: "The United States is being sold down the river." In these circles, the predominating view is that the past two decades stand out as a span of aggravated subversion. Others among those same circles correctly trace the problem back decades earlier, to the establishment of the Federal Reserve System by Warburg-influenced circles during the 1907-1913 period.

The agents of this process of subversion have been sought in various directions. To some, whatever influences are selling the United States "down the river" must be, axiomatically, "the Commies"; to others, "the Rockefellers"; to a few, regrettably, "the Jews." Among those generically termed "right wingers," conspiracy schemas proliferate, many with some semblance of truth, many of about the quality of Madame Blavatsky's fantasies. Except for a small, well-informed handful, the blame for the problem is wrongly placed. There is a real conspiracy, but most of the "conspiracy theories"

The 'kooks'...

Kissinger: arm for 'limited war'

The following are selections from Henry Kissinger's speech to the Center for Strategic and International Studies conference in Brussels in the first week of September, 1979.

If we think back to the Cuban Missile

Crisis of 1962, which all the policymakers of the time were viewing with a consciousness of an approaching Armageddon, one is almost seized with nostalgia for the ease of their decisions....

No one disputes any longer that in the 1980s—and perhaps even today, but surely in the 1980s—the U.S. will no longer be in a strategic position to reduce a Soviet counterblow against the United States to tolerable levels. ... The growth of the Soviet strategic forces has been massive...

Be that as it may, the fact is that the strategic imbalance that I have predicted for the '80s will also be accompanied by a theatre imbalance in the '80s. How is it possible to

survive with these imbalances in the face of the already demonstrated inferiority in conventional forces?...

Just as I believe it is necessary that we develop a military purpose for our strategic forces and move away from the senseless and demoralizing strategy of massive civilian destruction for our strategic forces, so it is imperative that we finally try to develop some credible military purposes for the tactical and theatre nuclear forces that we are building.

Haig threatens Europe

The following is selected from General Alexander Haig's speech to the Center for Strategic and International

offered are either simply wrong or downright absurd.

The United States has been rather systematically sold down the river over the decades, especially during the past two decades. Not by a handful of domestic authentic "Commies," and certainly not under the direction of Moscow, or by "little green men under the floorboards." Be sensible! We have been sold down the river through our adoption of foolish policies. The source of decline must be located within the policymaking process. One must, in short, follow the principle which Edgar Allan Poe underlined in his tale of "The Purloined Letter." The source of the problem is not hidden in impenetrable shadows; it is right out in the open.

Who, a sensible patriot should ask, has been shaping our nation's policies? Since the election of President Jimmy Carter, David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission has become increasingly notorious. However, the Trilateral Commission was constituted little more than a year before it adopted Jimmy Carter as its 1976 presidential candidate—at the 1975 Tokyo conference of that body. The Trilateral Commission could not, therefore, explain developments stretching back more than two decades. The point to be made is that the Trilateral Commission is a subcommittee of the New York Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the entity which did create every policy the Carter administration has adopted so far, and which has shaped most of the important policies of the federal government since the CFR's founding in 1919.

True, there is also the Brookings Institution. There

is the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania. There is the Aspen Institute, the Russell Sage Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Rand Corporation, CSIS at Georgetown University, and, since 1963, the networks of the Institute for Policy Studies. CFR and these identified institutions intersect various university-attached and other "think-tanks." Every policy which has contributed to the undermining of the United States has been mediated into federal government action through chiefly those and interconnected institutions.

What is the common denominator—the common link? What is the content of the "purloined letter" standing right out in plain sight?

CFR was created in 1919 as a subsidiary institution of the London Royal Institute for International Affairs (RIIA). The RIIA is the conduit for British foreign policy determination, including the policies governing conduct of the British foreign secret intelligence services. Consistent with that 1919 connection, the key controlling members of CFR are predominantly either members of the U.S. financial and intelligence community with long track-records as self-professed "anglophile" collaborators of British intelligence services, or as outright British secret-intelligence agents.

The CFR and RIIA were created in 1919 as part of an internal reorganization of the British Round Table organization. The Milner Round Table organization itself was put somewhat into the background, although by no means dissolved. The RIIA became the up-front voice of the British ruling financial and aristocratic circles. In the United States itself, the old National

Studies in Brussels the first week of September.

The emerging international environment is loosely clustered around three influential actors—the Soviet Union, the Peoples Republic of China, and the United States....

Despite its growing influence, the Federal Republic of Germany confronts something of a dilemma. It remains difficult for the alliance to accept German leadership, especially when the FRG remains the most vulnerable and highly exposed member of NATO ... For this reason, the Schmidt government has been reluctant to maximize the influence it might enjoy. Rather it has sought to work in concert with other European

nations to resolve their common problems. The most active vehicle for these efforts has been a new "entente cordiale" with France ... But it has also prodded the Germans to discuss their options. If these options were to be seriously pursued in the future, the alliance could find the Federal Republic following an independent course that, in the worst case from NATO's perspective, would take it out of the alliance. Such a course would be extremely detrimental to the interests of the alliance and the Federal Republic....

If NATO as an organization is unable to respond to external changes (in the balance of power), there is every reason to expect that the more influential members of the

alliance will combine to see some resolution of important issues. Moreover, they are also likely to address European questions if they conclude that existing organizations are incapable of dealing with them effectively ... The prospect of the creation of these "Great Power Directorships" is of fundamental concern not only to the smaller members of the Atlantic alliance, but also to the smaller nations throughout the globe. Clearly, a development of this kind would shake the structure of the alliance.

While permanent directorships are clearly detrimental, one should not adhere to the purist view that they should never be forged, at least for temporary crises....

Civic Federation made way for the hegemony of CFR, while the Russell Sage Foundation, controller of U.S. intelligence during and following World War I, was tucked back under the cover of sponsoring pilot sorts of social work projects including such projects as the Fund for Investigative Journalism more recently.

The Brookings Institution was a British policy conduit from its creation, as were the Rockefeller Foundation and, since Robert M. Hutchins' reign, the Ford Foundation. The Aspen Institute is virtually undetachable from the Atlantic-Richfield interests, de facto a part of the same complex of British Petroleum multinationals as British Petroleum and Royal Dutch Shell. The Wharton School is currently the base of operations for one Eric Trist, a senior member of the British secret intelligence's psychological warfare division.

The Rand Corporation's pedigree is that of a subdivision of British secret intelligence's psychological warfare division, the Tavistock Institute (Sussex). Tavistock created the Strategic Bombing Survey of Churchill and Cherwell during World War II. The U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, like the U.S. Operations Research organization, was created as a clone of the Tavistock operation during that war. The U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey was given a corporate existence as the Rand Corporation, a corporation which was developed under the guidance of such top Tavistock executives of British intelligence as H. V. Dicks.

Georgetown University is a more complicated case. It was founded by Bishop John Carroll, a close collaborator of Benjamin Franklin and the Marquis de Lafayette. Through combined British and Hapsburg

blackmail against the Vatican, following the 1815 Treaty of Vienna, the Brazil-based, Hapsburg secret intelligence organization known as the St. Leopold Foundation was imported into the United States, and the U.S. Catholic hierarchy placed under the direct supervision of an Archbishop who was a member of the Hapsburg imperial family. In this arrangement, Prince Metternich took control of Georgetown University, transforming it into the center of Hapsburg covert operations against the United States.

Later during the nineteenth century, the Catholic Church succeeded in retaking control of Vatican policy from the dictatorial control of British and Hapsburg forces. Pope Leo XIII was the nineteenth-century high-water mark of this renaissance of the spiritual independence of the Vatican from secular dictate. However, as Leo XIII's 1899 letter denouncing the Georgetown-centered "American heresy" shows, the Vatican failed in its efforts to root the treasonous, heretical element from all of the institutions penetrated by Metternich's secret-intelligence networks.

Although the Hapsburgs were nominally an ally of the City of London, in reality both the Italian "black nobility" (e.g., the Pallavicinis) and the Hapsburg Order of the Golden Fleece have been subordinate to British leadership from 1815 down to the present day. The British monarch has been the principal among nominal peers in the ranks of the aristocratic forces continuing their ancient enmity against technological progress and industrial-capitalist forms of generalized global economic development. Hence, Georgetown and its CSIS attachment have been that sort of special case of a

...and 'realists'

Bundy: a small risk is too large

The Sept. 11 editorial of the Italian newspaper La Stampa, by Arrigo Levi, quoted McGeorge Bundy's refutation of Kissinger at the conference of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in Villars, Switzerland, in September.

It's true, that no one can claim to be sure that a largescale conflict in Europe would reach the strategic nuclear level. But the essential point is the opposite: no one can know absolutely that this escalation would *not* occur. Even a small risk of a largescale nuclear conflict is decisively too large. My conclusion is that marginal changes in the strategic figures do not in fact represent a threat to the U.S. strategic umbrella over NATO. This guarantee does not rest on numbers of warheads, but on a commitment that offers to the opposing party risks that are completely unacceptable and by their nature unforeseeable. Nor do I think that the real effectiveness of this deterrent is responsive to the highs and lows of

European faith in any particular American president. The shield of Europe is the American nuclear "Triad", credibly upheld by 300,000 Americans in Europe...

The Soviet Union is not going to launch a first strike against the Minutemen: the Soviet leaders know that it is unlikely that America would passively accept the simultaneous destruction of eight nations.

Mountbatten: tactical nuclear war is insane

In a speech delivered May 11, 1979 in Strasbourg, West Germany, the late Lord Mountbatten of Burma, a member of Britain's royal family and one

British intelligence asset down to the present date.

These and related facts point directly to the true source of the past twenty years' subversion of the United States. As Britain has dwindled to third-rate potency among nations over the course of this century, the penetration of U.S. major financial and policymaking circles has increased even more rapidly.

In short, the "Eastern Establishment," centered in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and the Washington, D.C. area. Thus, for every ounce of power Britain itself has lost through the economic and moral decay of Great Britain to its present state of industrial bankruptcy, the British financial oligarchy has gained two or more ounces of power.

If we study more closely the moral and economic decay of Great Britain, and compare that with the pattern of our own decay over recent decades, a rather conclusive case emerges immediately. The British are inducing us to do to the United States what they have done to themselves. If we trouble ourselves to follow closely the London press, including the London *Economist*, we observe that the policies introduced to the White House, New York press, and the mouths of leading presidential candidates today have usually appeared as demanded changes in U.S. policy about forty-eight hours earlier in the British press.

In sum, one is compelled to the judgment that Benjamin Franklin, George Washington and others acted with excellent foresight in making a difficult American Revolution to free us as a nation from British morals and policies.

It is no foreign power which has ruined us; rather

it is British influences which have succeeded so far in inducing us to ruin ourselves.

Strategy, for example

During August of this year, according to high-level Soviet sources quoting their spies, the Carter administration reaffirmed once more the same general, stupid strategic policy outlined in the late 1950s book which Gordon Dean wrote for the semi-literate Henry Kissinger. Although we have not had the opportunity to check the reports of the Soviet spies to Moscow, the Moscow spokesmen's report, published in West Germany, is highly credible. The reported shifts in Carter administration postures and global deployments coincides exactly with what Soviet spies presumably relayed to their Moscow employers.

On the one side, the United States is being hurtled toward the brink of thermonuclear war with the Soviet Union, especially in Southeast Asia and the Middle East. On the other side, if these developments trigger war, the United States is currently well-prepared to lose such a war. The gist of the policy and strategic practice is: "Since we would currently lose a thermonuclear war against the Soviet Union, let us bluff Moscow into backing down in face of NATO efforts to administer the Soviets a decisive strategic defeat globally." Soviet representatives have underlined Moscow's detailed awareness of such a configuration of events, and yet in face of evidence the game won't work, Washington and NATO continue the unworkable policy.

This Kissingerian bit of lunacy by Cyrus Vance et

of the monarchy's closest policy-advisors for half a century, revealed his opposition to the "limited nuclear war" doctrines.

Smaller nuclear weapons of various designs were produced and deployed for use in what was assumed to be a tactical or theatre war. The belief was that were hostilities ever to break out in Western Europe, such weapons could be used in field warfare without triggering an all-out nuclear exchange leading to the final holocaust.

I have never found this idea credible. I have never been able to accept the reason for the belief that any class of nuclear weapons can be categorized in terms of their tactical or

strategic purposes.

Next month I enter my eightieth year. I am one of the few survivors of the First World War who rose to high command in the Second and I know how impossible it is to pursue military operations in accordance with fixed plans and agreements. In warfare the unexpected is the rule and no one can anticipate what an opponent's reaction will be to the unexpected....

I am not asserting this without having deeply thought about the matter. When I was chief of the British Defence Staff I made my views known. I have heard the arguments against this view, but I have never found them convincing. So, I repeat in all sincerity as a military man, I

can see no use for any nuclear weapons which would not end in escalation, with consequences that no one can conceive....

I regret enormously the delays which the Americans and Russians have experienced in reaching a SALT II agreement. ...I regret even more the fact that opposition to reaching any agreement which will bring about a restraint in the production and deployment of nuclear weapons is becoming so powerful in the United States. What can their motives be?

There are powerful voices around the world who still give credence to the old Roman precept—if you desire peace, prepare for war. This is absolute nuclear nonsense. ...

al. obliges us to note that certain leading circles in London are not as lunatic as the British dupes in Washington and Manhattan. Examining this matter will bring our attention back to Georgetown University.

For purposes of broad political-intelligence analysis, we can rightly say that there are two distinguishable factional currents within the topmost British oligarchical circles. These can respectively be labeled, most usefully, as the "realists" and the "kooks." The former is typified by the recently assassinated Lord Louis "Dickie" Mountbatten, the father-in-law of Queen Elizabeth II. The second, the kook-faction, is typified by the man who plays Svengali to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's Trilby (or, "Shrilby"), Industry Minister Keith Joseph. In the United States, the center of kookdom is Georgetown University.

Exemplary of Lord Mountbatten's realism is an attack on the Kissinger policies he publicized shortly before his assassination. This denunciation of Kissinger (and, of course, Kissinger's dummy, Haig) was subsequently put into the mouth of McGeorge Bundy on the occasion of the recent Switzerland conference of the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). The principal theme of the "realists" is that the "China card" should be scrapped immediately, lest the Carter administration's secret agreements with Peking lead to an early thermonuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union. The secondary theme is that the Camp David "secret agreements" also be scrapped, in favor of an immediate push for a comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace settlement around the keystone of the creation of an Arab Palestinian state in the Israeli-occupied territories outside Israel's 1967 borders.

Obviously, as President of the United States, I would hear the arguments of the Mountbatten faction of "realists," and would cooperate with them if at all possible. I would not make a "community of principles" sort of alliance with them—I would make such alliances with France and the Federal Republic of Germany—but I would cooperate with them in the interest of finding sensible alternatives to losing a thermonuclear war.

The opponents of Mountbatten among the "black nobility" circles are the kooks. Although all policy-outlooks of the British oligarchy and City of London crowd are predominantly evil, the "realists" will usually attempt to get on board with winning forces, and will tolerate sensible policies as long as they perceive it relatively advantageous to their factional interest to do so. The kooks are ideological fanatics, who are incapable of responding to reason, and who can be persuaded to cease evil ventures, even suicidal ventures, only by applying the proper amount of clout to their sort.

The case of nuclear energy development is exemplary. Most of the leading British realists know that all of the arguments against nuclear-energy development

are nonsense. It happens that they themselves desire a world without continued technological progress, and are therefore opposed to nuclear energy on purely ideological grounds of that sort. If you inform such a British "realist" that he believes the nonsense published by James R. Schlesinger, the British realist will rightly despise you for a very stupid sort of fool. If you point out to this fellow that his crowd cannot succeed in stopping technological progress, except at risk of thermonuclear war, this time around, the fellow will shrug and reply, "Then, the realist voices of the British press would make the appropriate 180-degree about-face, to support nuclear energy development."

The kook will not respond so sensibly. The kook actually believes the "antinuclear" nonsense—at least in a certain sense. He may despise the fraudulent arguments of a Barry Commoner or Ralph Nader, but he is a Khomeini-like fanatic in his opposition to technological progress. Only clout will deter him, not reason.

Henry Kissinger's patrons, the hard-core kooks, are fanatically dedicated to the delusion that the Soviet command will accept "theater-limited" regional conflicts as a substitute for global conflict.

Granted, in the case of Vietnam, the Soviets did appear to accept that substitution doctrine, as long as the U.S. did not attempt an absolute victory over the northern republic. As long as U.S. involvement stayed within the bounds of the "sub-strategic" doctrine which the British had brainwashed General Maxwell Taylor into regurgitating, Soviet policy of thermonuclear-war-avoidance predominated. However, this sort of substitution does not operate above such "thresholds." If a substantial geopolitical threat is attempted against the global defense capabilities of Soviet power, the Soviets will respond totally—for reasons elaborated adequately enough by Niccolò Machiavelli. The fundamental principles of military science dictate this to be the case, as Mountbatten and IISS reflected that set of military-science ABC's.

The kooks refuse to face the facts in the matter. Rather than give up delusions discredited in two world wars and during the Napoleonic wars earlier, Kissinger's kooky patron will stumble blindly ahead, insisting that their deluded rearming of the discredited "cabinet warfare" doctrines of the eighteenth century represents an unshakeable truth, insisting that the Soviet command shares their own delusion on the matter.

What kind of a kook believes such suicidal nonsense? Precisely the sort of kook one finds wearing a hooded cape at a cult ceremony in the crypt of the New York Cathedral of St. John the Divine, or the sort of kook who joins in a fanatical singing of "God Save The Queen" out of pure hysteria, in the wake of a session of the Yale Political Union.