

British public opinion, and consequently on the freedom of action of the British government and on world opinion in general. Hitler would, with one blow, disarm his bitterest enemies abroad, restore confidence in Europe, and thereby lend to the British desire for understanding. . . . If Germany led but did not dominate Central and Eastern Europe, the Western European nations could then feel reassured about their political independence. England-America [which Lothian naturally likes to regard as one—ed.] and Germany, as the only real Great Powers, could then jointly shape and guarantee the future of world politics. This picture of the future had occupied his mind after his conversations with the Führer, and he still could not believe it was finally impossible.”

Subverting U.S. technological optimism

In the postwar period, the British continued to look for world domination. To do this, they had, of course, to recapture the United States *de facto*, if not *de jure*. In 1959, Russell laid out his prolegomena for a postwar new world order, entitled *The Future of Science*. “Science has increased man’s control over nature,” Russell wrote, “and might therefore be supposed likely to increase his happiness and well-being. This would be the case if men were rational, but in fact they are bundles of passions and instincts. . . .

“Modern industrialism is a struggle between nations for two things, markets and raw materials, as well as for the sheer pleasure of dominion. The labor which is set free from providing the necessaries of life tends to be more and more absorbed by national rivalry. . . .

“The world becomes more and more of an economic unity. Before very long the technical conditions will exist from organizing the whole world as one producing and consuming unit. If when that time comes, two rival groups contend for mastery, the victor may be able to introduce that single worldwide organization that is needed to prevent the mutual extermination of civilized nations. . . . There would be at first economic and political tyranny of the victors, a dread of renewed upheavals, and therefore a drastic suppression of liberty. But if the first half-dozen revolts were successfully repressed, the vanquished would give up hope, and accept the subordination assigned to them by the victor in the great world-trust. . . . Life at first might be unpleasant, but it at least would be possible, which would be enough to recommend the system after a long period of warfare.”

Russell wrote that in 1959, just one year before America’s great advocate of the promise of science, John F. Kennedy, was elected President. Not only was Kennedy assassinated, but the conspirators who were responsible, had protection at the highest level. It was the death of Kennedy and the policies for which he stood—encapsulated in the landing of an American on the Moon—which allowed Henry A. Kissinger to become the evil genius of the American political scene.

Dr. Strangelove and the Pugwash story

by Carol White and Jeffrey Steinberg

Starting in 1982, Lyndon LaRouche and the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF) conducted an international campaign to urge that the Atlantic Alliance begin a crash program to develop an alternative to the insane doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD) most prominently then associated with the name of Henry A. Kissinger. Not only was MAD an incompetent strategy for war avoidance, but worse yet, the documentation existed to prove that the Soviet Union was moving unilaterally and secretly to develop its own “strategic defense initiative” based on the most advanced physical principles.

In a seminar on beam weapons held by the FEF in Paris, France on March 24, 1984, LaRouche laid out his program for the alliance. To elucidate the situation then faced by NATO, of the threatened Soviet superiority in anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense systems, it was necessary for LaRouche to explain the role of Bertrand Russell’s Pugwash Conferences movement, which was the inspiration for Kissinger’s policy of MAD and its twin brother, *détente*.

LaRouche explained the British-inspired policies which had already led to two world wars in the century, and which were creating the conditions in which we might be forced to fight in a third one. He said: “Let me go back to what the problem is, at least as the United States is concerned. During the last period of the last war, the United States had a policy for the postwar period. The moment that President Roosevelt was dead, within 24 hours of his death, every scrap of his postwar policy had been destroyed by the U.S. State Department. . . .

“The problem has been that we, in the postwar period, and particularly in the so-called Atlanticist, or Anglo-American alliance, have followed a modified form of the same policies that caused two world wars in this century. A form that is far worse than the policies of the early part of this century or the policy of the 1920s and 1930s. . . . Every foreign policy and particularly every military strategic policy of the Anglo-American allies in NATO, has been dictated by a group of people working with and led by the most evil man of the twentieth century, the late Lord Bertrand Russell.

“Bertrand Russell and his crowd authored two phases of postwar military policy, in particular. First, in 1946, Bertrand Russell and his people, as Russell reported in the October 1946 issue of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, declared that there must be a world government agency, to have

a monopoly on the use and possession of military arsenals, including nuclear arsenals. All governments must give up their sovereignty in these matters and surrender them to a world government agency. He said if the Soviet Union did not accept this world government agency policy, then the United States and Britain must launch a preventive war against the Soviet Union.

"This policy continued until the middle of the 1950s." By the mid-1950s it became clear that the Soviets had themselves become a nuclear power, and the plan was modified to allow the Soviets a share in Anglo-American imperial designs. The following is an excerpt from Russell's article—cited by LaRouche—which appeared in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. It laid out precisely the use now being made of the United Nations, as a cover for Anglo-American gunboat diplomacy, deployed under the guise of keeping the peace. Russell wrote over 40 years ago:

"There is only one way in which great wars can be permanently prevented, and that is the establishment of an international government, and I mean one that really governs, not the fraud of the League of Nations or the United Nations, but one with power to govern.

"There is one other method by which in theory the peace of the world could be secured, and that is the supremacy of one nation or one closely allied group of nations. By this method, Rome secured the peace of the Mediterranean area for several centuries. America at this moment, if it were bellicose and imperialistic could compel the rest of the world to disarm, and establish a worldwide monopoly of American armed forces. But the country has no wish for such enterprises. And in a few years, the opportunity will be gone. In the near future a world war, however terrible, would probably end in American victory without the destruction of civilization in the Western Hemisphere. An American victory would no doubt lead to a world government under the hegemony of the United States, a result which for my part I should welcome with enthusiasm."

Bertrand Russell's new order was based upon the kind of radical environmentalism today represented by Britain's Prince Philip who is on record preferring paganism to Christianity, and who has expressed the desire to be reincarnated as a virus rather than a man. In one book, Russell said of man's role in God's Universe: "What is life? Life is a brief, small, and transitory phenomenon in an obscure corner, not at all the sort of thing that one would make a fuss about if one were not personally concerned." Both Russell and Philip undertook as their life's work, the destruction of Western Christian civilization. Russell's aim was to a return to a kind of feudalism—in other words fascism—in which technology would be severely restricted to serve the interests of a ruling elite.

Under no circumstances would the developing sector be allowed to use advanced technological capabilities. This, of course, is the underlying cause of the present war in the

Middle East. Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi people could not be tolerated, because they represented the potential and will for development which could have transformed the region from being a pawn in the service of Anglo-American geopolitical interests (emphatically including resource control), into a new Eden. In his book *The Impact of Science on Society*, written in 1951, Bertrand Russell openly laid out this malthusian anti-science perspective:

"Science can abolish poverty and excessive hours of labor. In the earliest human communities, before agriculture, subsistence was precarious, and death from starvation must have been frequent. At that stage, man had the same mixture of misery and carefree enjoyment as still makes up the lives of other animals.

"Agriculture was a technical advance. The way it was used should be an awful warning to our age. It introduced slavery and serfdom, human sacrifice, absolute monarchy and large wars. Both industry and agriculture, to a continually increasing degree, are carried on in ways that waste the world's capital of material resources. The indisputable fact is that industry and agriculture, insofar as it is used to make artificial fertilizers, depend upon irreplaceable materials and sources of energy. If bad times come, it must be inferred that industrialization characteristic of the last 150 years will be rudely checked. . . .

"The atom bomb and still more the hydrogen bomb have caused new fears involving new doubts as to the effects of science on human life. If, however, the human race decides to let itself go on living, it will have to make a very drastic change in its way of thinking, feeling and behaving. We must learn to not say 'Better death than dishonor.' "

Who is Dr. Strangelove?

Despite the manifest similarities between Henry Kissinger and the classic creation in Stanley Kubrick's film "How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb," a closer contender for the strange doctor was, in fact, Dr. Leo Szilard. Szilard was Lord Russell's chief collaborator in the United States from 1938 until his death in 1964. A Hungarian emigré, he taught at the University of Chicago, where he used his eminence as an atomic scientist to give credibility to the thesis that the development of scientific capability is the cause of war. In the late 1930s Szilard worked with John Foster Dulles to create a peace movement which urged the appeasement of Adolf Hitler. He was also a member of the fascist Pan-European Movement, which opposed Hitler's *national* socialism, but wanted a one-world empire.

Szilard, along with Russell, founded the "nuclear freeze" movement. In 1957 they set up a parallel institution within the scientific community, and held the first of what became known as Pugwash Conferences. At the second of these, in 1958, Szilard gave a speech entitled, "How To Live with the Bomb and Survive: The Possibility of a Pax Russo-Americana in the Long-range Rocket Stage of the So-Called Atomic

Stalemate,” which would seem almost laughable, were it not for the fact that its underlying assumptions are the basis for Anglo-American policy today, both in the Gulf war, and also in the conceit that all wars can be fought by Marquess of Queensbury rules. One of Saddam Hussein’s *crimes* is that he does not play by the rules! Clearly the Soviets would be a far more deadly enemy than the Iraqis.

In the postwar period, before the Soviets developed atomic and then thermonuclear explosive devices, the Russell-Szilard gang acted as a universal fascist tendency whose aim was to establish world government and rigidly suppress the application of nuclear technology in the civilian economy. In 1947, in the April-May issue of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, Szilard wrote: “As matters stand at the moment, Russia has no atomic bombs. . . . But can we predict how we shall react if the day approaches in which Russia has a stockpile. . . . The most ardent advocates of international cooperation might then turn into the most ardent advocates of a preventive war.”

Furthermore he was a convinced malthusian like Russell, who anticipated and endorsed the emergence of depopulation wars. Szilard advocated how wars should be fought in his 1958 Pugwash speech:

“Let us now assume for the sake of argument that in the long-range rocket stage there may occur some major disturbance affecting the Arabian peninsula, which threatens to cut off Western Europe from its Mideast oil supply. Let us further assume that America is on the verge of sending troops into the area. Russia would have to decide whether she wants to fight an atomic war on her southern border and take the risk that such a war might not remain limited; she might decide to proclaim that she would not resist an American intervention locally in the Middle East but would, if need be, exact a price from America, not in human life but in property.

“She might proceed to name some 20 American cities, and make it clear that in case of American troop landings in the Middle East she would single out one of these cities; giving it four weeks’ warning to permit its orderly evacuation. In order to make this threat believable, Russia would have to make it clear that she . . . would tolerate, without threatening any reprisals America’s demolishing Russian cities having the same aggregate population. The political state of things today, the long-range rocket stage, is going to make America and Russia become increasingly indifferent to changes that might take place on the continent of Europe. Therefore America will have no interest really in defending the oil supply of Europe. On the other hand, the Soviets won’t have an interest in attacking the Middle East. In that stage, there will be no important reason why the United States should wish to maintain any military bases on foreign soil. And a military alliance with the nations of Western Europe would no longer add anything much to the security of America even if America should continue to maintain an

alliance with the nations of Western Europe. She would be bound to regard these allies as more and more expendable. . . .

“Right now, the nations of Europe are tired of war. Clearly the people of Western Germany are more interested in increasing their prosperity than in the problem of unifying Germany. Yet the time may come, when unifying Germany may become an overriding political issue on which all Germans may unite. And similarly, once Germany has been united, the issue of recovering for Germany some or all of the territories lost to Poland may become an overriding issue on which Germans may unite. Then Russia and America might be willing to guarantee jointly or separately the agreed-upon status of Europe against changes brought about forcibly by either Poland or Germany. They could do this effectively without any risk or appreciable cost to themselves, by relying on the threat of demolishing if need be a few cities either in Germany or Poland, perhaps giving each city several weeks of warning to permit its orderly evacuation.”

The misbegotten Mr. Kissinger

Henry Kissinger was the misbegotten manchild of Szilard and Russell. By 1953-56, when this “preventative war” scheme had irreversibly failed and it was clear that the Soviets had developed thermonuclear bombs, the great men of peace around Russell stopped threatening Russia and instead decided to accommodate, at least temporarily, with Russian imperial aims, by splitting the world along the lines laid out at Yalta. This decision marks the start of Henry Kissinger’s public celebrity as arch-manipulator, trained in the British school of balance-of-power politics. Kissinger has styled himself as an agent of onetime Foreign Secretary and NATO Secretary General Peter Lord Carrington.

In May 10, 1982, at a speech delivered in London, Henry Kissinger laid out the Anglo-American strategy of out-of-area deployment for the Atlantic Alliance. This speech, given before the Royal Institute of International Affairs—also known as Chatham House—laid out the perspective for a period of malthusian North-South wars, which would be made possible by a deadlock in the East-West conflict. Not incidentally, Kissinger admitted in the speech that, during his term as secretary of state and as national security adviser, he considered his first loyalty was to the British Foreign Office. He explained how the British impose their policies even against U.S. national interest. Just this past August, we saw this process acted out before our eyes, as Margaret Thatcher literally dictated George Bush’s march to war, step by step, even against his own, stated intention directly following Iraq’s Aug. 2, occupation of Kuwait.

Kissinger’s speech bore the title, “Reflections on a Partnership: British and American Attitudes to Postwar Foreign Policy.” The section on “The Nature of the Special Relationship” is worth excerpting here, out of order:

“To the outside world it may have seemed that Britain

clung far too long to the illusion of Empire; in her relations with Washington, she proved that an old country was beyond self-deception on fundamentals. Bevin, the unlikely originator of this revolution in British diplomacy, shrewdly calculated that Britain was not powerful enough to influence American policy by conventional methods of pressure or balancing of risks. But by discreet advice, the wisdom of experience, and the presupposition of common aims, she could make herself indispensable, so that American leaders no longer thought of consultations with London as a special favor but as an inherent component of our own decision-making. The wartime habit of intimate, informal collaboration thus became a permanent practice, obviously because it was valuable to both sides. . . .

“The British were so matter-of-factly helpful that they became a participant in internal American deliberations, to a degree probably never before practiced between sovereign nations. In my period in office, the British played a seminal part in certain American bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union—indeed, they helped draft the key document. In my White House incarnation, then, I kept the British Foreign Office better informed and more closely engaged than I did the American State Department—a practice which, with all affection for things British, I would not recommend be made permanent. But it was symptomatic.”

LaRouche commented on Kissinger’s admitted treachery, in *EIR*’s June 1, 1982 issue: “Kissinger insists that since no later than the term of office of Secretary Jimmy Byrne [June 1945-January 1947], the foreign policy of the United States has been dictated from London by means of secret, unwritten agreements between certain U.S. officials and the royal government. . . . Therefore, it is our proper duty to account for the process by which we began to uncover the treasonous role of Henry Kissinger, beginning January 1974.” LaRouche attacks the workings of the secret government in the United States, which consciously represents the interest of an anti-republican, Anglo-American grouping, under the direction primarily of British oligarchs and the royal family. Kissinger plays a key role as their agent. LaRouche was writing in 1982, during the Malvinas War, when all of the seeds of the present debacle were planted. LaRouche continued:

“So, under U.S. law today, the President of the United States is not only empowered but obliged, without need to consult Congress or his secretary of state, to kick the British out of the South Atlantic more forcefully than President Eisenhower kicked the British [out of Suez] in 1956. That is the obligatory law and action of the entire Executive Branch of government until such time as the Senate shall explicitly repeal the Monroe Doctrine and all of the numerous treaty-laws attached to that doctrine since its first promulgation.”

The overriding of treaty law in the case of the Malvinas War created the disrespect for constitutional law that we have most recently witnessed in President Bush’s brutal threats to



Stuart Lewis

Henry Kissinger: key agent for British imperial policy and its Soviet allies inside the U.S. government.

go to war against Iraq with or without the concurrence of the Congress of the United States of America.

The Kissinger Chatham House speech has other policy implications, directly relevant to present U.S. policy. Indeed, if we fail in our mission to defeat Henry Kissinger and his Anglo-American sponsors, historians in the future will refer to this speech (libraries remaining intact) to explain how mankind was led within one century to fight three world wars, the last of them presenting the greatest threat to the continuity of Western Christian civilization.

In 1982, Kissinger wrote approvingly that “Britain has rarely proclaimed moral absolutes or rested her faith in the ultimate efficacy of technology, despite her achievements in this field. Philosophically, she remains Hobbesian: She expects the worst and is rarely disappointed. In moral matters Britain has traditionally practiced a convenient form of ethical egoism believing that what was good for Britain was best for the rest.”

With regard to the modern phase of the Anglo-American special relationship, he provides the following account:

“All accounts of the Anglo-American alliance during the Second World War and in the early postwar period draw attention to the significant differences in philosophy between Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, reflecting our different national histories. . . . Many American leaders condemned Churchill as needlessly obsessed with power poli-

tics, too rigidly anti-Soviet, too colonialist in his attitude to what is now called the Third World. . . . Fortunately, Britain had a decisive influence over America's rapid awakening to maturity in the years following."

At Chatham House, Kissinger endorsed the Russell-Churchill policy—in the period before the Russians became an effective nuclear power—to establish a new Roman Empire based upon Anglo-American dominance. He attacked the failure of American nerve, which caused the United States to hold back from brandishing the threat of nuclear extermination on the Soviets if they did not subordinate themselves to a one-world government. Not for him a LaRouchian policy of offering the Soviets a path to assimilation in Western Christian civilization, through the road of high-technology investment, and a place within the community of nations. Instead, Kissinger believes that the West should have acted in the tradition of the just-defeated Adolf Hitler, brandishing raw power and threatening naked aggression—in fact, the policy being followed by the so-called "coalition" in the Persian Gulf today, against a far more defenseless opponent than the Soviets presented Russell and Churchill.

Kissinger said, "The flaw in containment was not only, as the cliché has it today, that it was overly preoccupied with military counterforce, but that it misunderstood that the West in the immediate postwar period was precisely at the apex of its relative strength. Containment thus deferred the moment for a diplomatic encounter with the Soviet Union to a later time by which Soviet power could only have grown. In 1945 the United States had an atomic monopoly and the Soviet Union was devastated by 20 million casualties. Our policy paradoxically gave the Kremlin time to consolidate its conquests and to redress the nuclear imbalance. The West's military and diplomatic position relative to the U.S.S.R. was never more favorable than at the very beginning of the containment policy in the late forties. That was the time to attempt a serious discussion on the future of Europe and a peaceful world.

"As so often, Winston Churchill understood it best. In a much neglected speech at Llandudno [Wales] in October 1948, out of office, he said:

"The question is asked: What will happen when they get the atomic bomb themselves and have accumulated a large store? You can judge yourselves what will happen then by what is happening now. If these things are done in the green wood, what will be done in the dry? If they can continue month after month disturbing and tormenting the world, trusting to our Christian and altruistic inhibitions against using this strange new power against them, what will they do when they themselves have huge quantities of atomic bombs? . . . No one in his senses can believe that we have a limitless period of time before us. We ought to bring matters to a head and make a final settlement. We ought not to go jogging along improvident, incompetent, waiting for something to turn up, by which I mean waiting for something bad

for us to turn up. The Western nations will be far more likely to reach a lasting settlement, without bloodshed, if they formulate their just demands while they have the atomic power and before the Russian Communists have got it too.' "

Kissinger on the Suez Crisis

Kissinger wrote: "The experience of Suez [in 1956] is instructive. Our prolonged and never-reconciled clash had lasting consequences not only for the Middle East and the Third World but also for the long-term evolution of Western policies." Kissinger was sharply critical of President Eisenhower's intervention to stop the British-French-Israeli invasion. For him, the shift of the Atlantic Alliance toward making war against the developing sector can reverse the "mistake" made by America in not fully implementing the Russell-Churchill policy at the end of the Second World War.

"It is the Communist world, not the West," he continued, "that faces a profound systemic crisis. Ours are problems of coordination and policy, theirs are of structure. And therefore it is not beyond the realm of hope that a coherent, unified Western policy could at long last bring into view the prospect of a negotiated global settlement that Churchill foresaw at Llandudno."

In the section on "Third World Perspectives: What Is the Limit of Inter-Allied Conflict," he presented the perspective for NATO out-of-area deployment now being implemented:

"In a period of nuclear stalemate, ironically, conflict became more likely at the level of local, non-nuclear crisis. In an age of decolonization, many of these clashes were bound to occur in the Third World. This was another area in which, in the immediate postwar period, American and European attitudes diverged sharply. . . . On Third World issues especially, many in Europe have ended up adopting the attitude embodied in Roosevelt's anti-colonialism and Eisenhower's conduct over Suez. Now Europe would seek to identify with Third World aspirations, economic and political, intensifying its efforts at conciliation the more insistent, peremptory, and radical that Third World demands become." In speaking of "Europe," he, of course, exempted the United Kingdom, which is a power unto itself.

Sadly, European opposition to the Gulf war has been undercut by the unwillingness of the Germans, French, and Italians to make a sharp break with Anglo-American policy. Now, along with the Japanese, these three are bankrolling the war and also being drawn into the military adventure. This is particularly disastrous, because continental Europe as a whole—and Germany most poignantly—offered the hope for a peaceful resolution to the East-West conflict, through the kind of development policies presented by LaRouche's proposal for a Paris-Berlin-Vienna Productive Triangle. Instead, as a result of Henry Kissinger's policies, which are literally stripping Europe of defensive capabilities, we are now facing the very real danger of a Europe newly vulnerable to Soviet aggression.