

George Bush's new world order and why LaRouche was imprisoned

Candidate Lyndon LaRouche issued this statement on Jan. 21.

This is Martin Luther King's day. It is appropriate to reflect on the state of humanity.

As is well known, I have been put into prison, and the following facts about that are known. First, the charges, of course, are fraudulent. That is a matter now on the court record. Secondly, it's a matter of legal record that the prosecution and persecution against me and my friends was initiated by the circles of Henry A. Kissinger, former secretary of state, the same Henry Kissinger who played a key role in setting up the present war in the Middle East, and other atrocities.

It is also a fact that Henry Kissinger was, and is, an agent of the British intelligence service. This is a point of fact. Kissinger was brought into British intelligence formally in the Wilton Park unit at Harvard, which was a British intelligence unit, under William Yandell Elliot. In 1982, at Chatham House, in London, the premises of Kissinger's British intelligence immediate master, Mr. Kissinger said publicly that he was and had been an agent of the British intelligence and Foreign Service, and had been so at the time he was President Nixon's and President Ford's national security adviser, and secretary of state. He also said at the time that he has followed the orders of the British Foreign Office, contrary to, and without the knowledge of his own President.

The issue of policy which led to my imprisonment, and which has led into the war, has been what many people call a one-world perspective, a utopian perspective, the perspective which came into operation during and following the assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy. That perspective has been a commitment of the United States and others—without the knowledge necessarily of the American people or even most members of Congress—to setting up a one-world utopia, based on, number one, an agreement between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-American establishments with the government of Beijing, and the use of the settlement of the East-West conflict, to launch a North-South conflict, in which the Anglo-Americans believed that they would be able to dominate a somewhat weakened Muscovite

empire, and China, in terms of world affairs.

So, the United States has now launched itself on wars whose stated purpose is control of populations and of strategic raw materials by military force, with the intent of using food control and other means, to bring about a vast reduction of the peoples of the planet whose skin are of a darker skin hue than the preferred Anglo-American.

The East-West conflict is coming back

In their haste and zeal to realize this insane and evil utopia, this one-world neo-malthusian regime, the Westerners blundered in their relations on the East-West side. As a result, the East-West conflict is now coming back full-blown while the United States is stuck in the sands of the Middle East, in the, shall we say, premature North-South conflict. It would have been possible to bring about a solution to the East-West conflict. In point of fact, the events of 1989 and 1990 showed us the window of opportunity for doing just that.

During that period, particularly following the 1987 U.S. stock market collapse, the two dominant superpower economic systems had proven themselves to be catastrophic failures—that is, the Soviet system, and the Anglo-American radical free trade system. This was an opportunity for solving the East-West conflict, at least bringing it under control, by using the opportunity represented by the freeing of states in Eastern Europe, the so-called glasnost-perestroika phenomena in the Soviet Union, to project the best form of Western Christian civilization's economy, into the reconstruction of Eastern European states, and of the Soviet Union. This would have meant a commitment to use of mobilized state credit, not central banking credit, but state credit—to generate long-term and medium-term capital-intensive investments in the most modern forms of basic economic infrastructure, to sop up a great deal of the idle labor in these infrastructural projects, which would center around water management modern forms of rail, or magnetic levitation, power generation and distribution, sanitation, and so forth. The investment in this basic economic infrastructure, would create the basis for rapid development of the small entrepreneurial high-tech industries, on which successful modern industrial development and agricultural development is based.

Instead of doing that, the Anglo-Americans insisted on applying to Eastern Europe, and to Soviet reforms, the radical monetarist austerities which had brought about the collapse of the Anglo-American world monetary system itself, or is bringing it about.

The result was, that the opportunity in the East was lost, in consequence of the visible effects of the so-called Jeffrey "Hjalmar Schacht" Sachs austerity program in Poland. The attempt to apply that to the Soviet Union, as a reform condition, blew up the possibility of any future reform process in the Soviet Union, particularly under conditions that the United States was eager to reach a combination with Moscow upon any conditions, out of U.S. and Anglo-American zeal to begin the war against Arab and other nationalities to the south.

As a result of all this, what we now have is a resurgence of Soviet power, albeit in civil war-pregnant conditions, an explosion of the Balkans along the lines which I indicated back in 1988, to such effect that the growing war of the United States against the world Islamic populations, which is what the war in the Persian Gulf is becoming, is an appendage of a revived East-West conflict.

We now see that the United States and Britain have stripped defenses in Western Europe, to beef up the assault force in the Gulf region. The result is that Europe is weakened as the Soviet forces reconsolidate themselves. One would say of this, that we are seeing the enactment again of Lenin's famous slogan, "two steps backward, one step forward." The Soviets took two steps backward to consolidate their position under difficult conditions, and are now exploiting the follies of the United States and Britain in launching war in the Middle East, to create the opportunity to build up their strength again in Moscow. And, as the United States and Britain collapse, the prospect is, that Moscow will come to dominate by overweening force, continental Western Europe, and also Japan. In that reconfiguration of the globe, while the United States is stuck in a race and religious war with the Islamic population of the world, and others, we see the makings of a prospective World War III.

Of all of this, one can say that a nation which exhibits a total loss of elementary morality in its leading institutions, as was demonstrated, for example, in the prosecution against me and my friends by a totally corrupted judicial and executive system, and a nation which prides itself on imposing austerity upon the homeless and hungry and underprivileged in its own nation, that nation lacks the moral fitness to survive. And that lack of moral fitness so exhibited in its domestic affairs, cannot but impose itself upon the foreign relations of the same state.

If the United States does not change its ways very soon, in a direction which the late Rev. Martin Luther King would admire much more than the present circumstances, the United States is not going to survive—in point of fact, unless we change, we're headed right now toward World War III.

Bertrand Russell's 'final solution'

by Carol White and Jeffrey Steinberg

While Adolf Hitler is generally accepted to be the most evil man of this century, it is arguably true that Bertrand Russell and the men around him were evil beyond Hitler's wildest dreams.

These were the people who created the phenomena of Hitler and of creatures like Pol Pot of Cambodia. It was the Russellites who undertook to transform Western Christian civilization by systematically attacking every aspect of classical culture, whether in the fields of art, philosophy, science, or the interpretation of history. Russell and his friends Aldous and Julian Huxley deliberately created the rock-drug-sex counterculture. They argued for the *right* of children to use drugs and to be sexually exploited; they denied that every child, or even most, should be educated to the point of functional literacy.

These men were the policy shapers and ideologues for the British ruling elite, an oligarchy centered on the British crown, and including leading representatives of the aristocratic families of England, who had been actively involved with the British East India Company and international drug trafficking, as well as the civil service and colonial management, over more than a century.

So when President Bush, in a Jan. 17 address, described the U.S. attack on Iraq as a historic moment, which was ushering in "a new world order," he was reflecting the imperial aims of these men. What he said precisely was: "This is an historic moment. We have in this past year made great progress in ending the long era of conflict and cold war. We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order, a world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, governs the conduct of nations.

"When we are successful—and we will be—we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.S.'s founders."

The role which Bush envisages for a supranational police force, operating under Anglo-American imperialist control, is not to establish peace, but to act as a battering ram against any nation, such as Iraq or Brazil, which is not willing to accept colonial status. It is the fantastic hope of Bush, and of the British elite whom he serves—typified by Prince