Britain's foreign secretary and the KGB's Mary Kaldor Robinson

by Mark Burdman

A Jan. 27 speech by British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe is causing much animated discussion within the British Establishment these days. The fact that Howe blasted the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative, and issued veiled threats against those American strategists who support early deployment of the SDI, surprised no one, since Howe had made a much-publicized, controversial speech two years ago, declaring war against the SDI. What was new, was that Howe openly endorsed a position-paper drawn up by a KGB-front unit at the University of Sussex, and co-authored by British "peace movement" leader Mary Kaldor.

Howe was speaking before the London International Institute for Strategic Studies, delivering an address with the title, "The Foundations and Future of British Security." After several minutes of apparently enunciating traditional British defense doctrine vis-à-vis the Soviet threat, Howe launched into the following diatribe:

"In theory, East or West could build twice as many tanks, three times as many planes, put four times as many men into uniform, and all the while go on pushing back the outer limits of technology. But neither side has limitless resources. Somewhere the spending has to stop. Military men may assure us that new weapons systems will work on the battlefield just as well as they seem to do on the drawing board. But the God of War must bow eventually to the God of Mammon. Economic realities are just as relevant to the battlefield as they are to the market-place. And balance matters too. An over-concentration on military technology to the detriment of civilian R&D is unhealthy for the economy as a whole."

The last formulation has, increasingly, gained fashion in London these days. On the one hand, it comes from those "free market" true-believers, who think Britain need not have a manufacturing base in any case, since the Oct. 27, 1986 "Big Bang" deregulation of the City of London will transform that financial center into the focus of "economic growth" in the U.K. A variant of the formulation was released in November 1986, in a report by a House of Lords Select Committee on Civil Defense and Technology, which, while admitting that Britain needed a manufacturing base, nonetheless insisted that the plague undermining Britain's economy is "over-concentration" on military R&D investment. Lyndon LaRouche's critique of that report, was the feature story in *EIR* last week (Feb. 6, 1987, "How Much Should the Allies Spend on Military R&D?").

Of greatest interest, however, is that, in October 1986, *Lloyds Bank Review* released a 20-page report, filled with charts and graphs, which argued that Britain's economy was being wrecked by "heavy commitment to the development and production of military equipment," which was "contributing to her relative economic decline." The report was entitled *Industrial Competitiveness and Britain's Defence*, and was authored by three senior fellows at the Science Policy Research Unit (SPRU) of the University of Sussex. This unit is notorious as a nest of the "counterculture" in Britain, with close ties to the London Tavistock Institute, and to the East bloc's intelligence services.

In terms of content, the report is absurd. It claims that, in per capita military R&D spending, Britain is highest among industrialized nations, while Japan is lowest. At the same time, Britain is lowest in "industrial competitiveness," while Japan is highest. Conclusion: "Among the Western industrialized nations, there is a striking inverse association between the share of GDP devoted to military research and development and international competitiveness in manufacture." Or, read the last sentence in the cited portion of Howe's speech.

The report fraudulently argues against the efficacy of "technological spin-offs" from advanced-technology weapons systems like the SDI, without pointing out that Britain's foremost problem, is that its economy is so wrecked, that there is almost nothing for the technology to "spin off" into! The wreckage is, in significant part, due to various governments, especially that of left-Labourite Harold Wilson in the 1960s and 1970s, which followed the kind of advice on economics that emanates from Sussex SPRU!

Since *Lloyds Bank Review* is distributed freely in London, and widely read by the Whitehall bureaucracy, the report received more attention than its content would merit.

Further, the Sussex SPRU writing team has set up contact networks within the British defense ministry, within the group in Mrs. Thatcher's Cabinet office responsible for R&D review, and within the Policy-Planning Staff of the British Foreign Office. Their defense ministry contacts are, in large part, carry-overs from the days, beginning in mid-1982, when (now Sir) John Nott was British defense minister. Nott is presently a banker at Lazards-London, and was trained in economics at the Fabian nest of Cambridge University.

The latter point, brings us to the heart of the story.

The 'pervasive' Mary Kaldor

One of the three co-authors, Mary Kaldor, who works at the "Arms and Disarmament" group at Sussex SPRU, is the chief editor of the leading mouthpiece of the European peace movement, *The European Nuclear Disarmament (END) Journal,* published in London. She is one of the four daughters of the late Lord Nicholas Kaldor, a Hungarian-born Fabian-Socialist Cambridge University economist, who was an intimate not only of the 1930s-40s Cambridge pro-Soviet, homosexual nests (alternatively called the "Cambridge Comintern," or the "Cambridge Homintern") associated with Lord Bertrand Russell and Lord John Maynard Keynes, but also of top-level Soviet-intelligence influentials, such as Eugen Varga, the founder of today's IMEMO Institute in Moscow.

Mary Kaldor's husband, SPRU's Julian Perry Robinson, is the leading biological and chemical warfare expert for such Lord Russell-disciple organizations as the Pugwash Group and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). Robinson has been central, for over a decade, in coordinating back-channel East-West discussions on biological and chemical warfare, which have had the effect of unilaterally dismantling key American capabilities in these military domains. For well over a year, at least, he has been circulating attacks on Lyndon LaRouche, as responsible for a "U.S.-Soviet cold war on AIDS." Through SIPRI, Julian Perry Robinson is an intimate of another well-traveled British left-radical daughter, Emma Rothschild, the U.K. Governing Board member for SIPRI. The circumstances of Emma Rothschild's intimacy with assassinated Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, have been totally hushed up by Swedish police investigating the Palme assassination.

In the words of one British military source familiar with Kaldor's activities over the past years, "She has one passion: to destroy the defense capabilities of Britain, and of the West. The problem is, she is both persuasive and pervasive. She is well-listened-to in the Whitehall Establishment, as one of the big-mouthed leftie-trendie types."

Pervasive, indeed. From Jan. 26 through Feb. 6, 1987, Kaldor traveled through North America, stopping in Washington, D.C., for, among other things, a Pentagon tour of U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative Organization facilities; in Canada, for a lecture series at Toronto's McMaster University; and in Boston and Amherst, Massachusetts, for lectures at Hampshire College, sponsored by Michael Klare, the leading "disarmament and arms-control" expert for the left-radical Institute for Policy Studies.

Experts suspect Mary Kaldor of playing a behind-the-scenes role in the "defense procurement fraud" witchhunt being carried out by U.S. Department of Justice Criminal Division head William Weld, himself a supporter of the Boston left-radical set. According to Sussex sources, she is one of the leading experts on "U.S. defense procurement," and the "structural problems of the defense industry," having authored a book, in 1982, *Baroque Arsenal,* which profiled the post-World War II American defense industry, in comparison to that of late 19th-century Great Britain.

On Feb. 14, she will be the chief British representative at a confidential meeting in Amsterdam, of an organization called "The East-West Dialogue Network," which is headed by West Berlin Green Party politician Dieter Esche. Esche's group and Mary Kaldor's END, have considerable co-responsibility, for planning the next European-wide "peace-movement" extravaganza, the Seventh Annual END Convention, in Coventry, England, from July 14-16. They have an extensive array of Soviet and East bloc contacts, in building for that event.

The decoupling of Europe

Not surprisingly, Mary Kaldor is also prominent in the organizing drive for splitting the United States from Europe, and breaking apart the NATO Alliance. She has just released a new book, *European De-Alignment,* co-authored with Princeton University's Richard Falk, who had been one of the earliest and most vocal supporters of Ayatollah Khomeini in the months leading up to the overthrow of the Shah of Iran. The material for the book, was based on the findings of a New Delhi-based "Program on Peace and Global Transformation," operating under the auspices of the United Nations University.

According to an associate of Kaldor, "The idea of European de-alignment is very much like the concept of decoupling that we hear so much about. But, whereas the impulse behind decoupling would be a decision by the United States, to remove its strategic commitment to Europe, the idea of European de-alignment is the reverse, it is Europe deciding that it can live without the United States. . . . What Mary and her collaborators want to do, is to return to the 19th-century 'Concert of Europe' idea for European unity. It means going back to the 1815 Congress of Vienna, and then working out from the period from then, to the present, in all its broad historical sweep."

And, since the 1815 Congress of Vienna, admired so much by Henry Kissinger, negotiated handing hegemony over Europe to the Holy Alliance of Western and Russian oligarchs, it is no surprise, that the ideas of Kaldor, and those expressed by Howe on Jan. 27, would have the same effect today.