

desire to loot, to get more of the natural resources out?

LaRouche: No, not exactly. The answer is this. Before 1988, many of us knew that the Soviet system was going to collapse. We had two policies on this. My policy and the policy of some other people was the following. On Oct. 12, 1988, I made a speech in Berlin, which was then broadcast on U.S. TV nationally. In that, I said: yes, the industries of the Comecon sector are obsolete generally. But they must not be shut down. They must be used for infrastructure projects. Let's use up the old machine tools and introduce new machine tools which we pay for out of the use of the old.

Margaret Thatcher said: "No!" She raised the geopolitical argument, in which she was supported by George Bush. They said, "We are now going to destroy Russia for once and for all. We will do it with reform." And that's what has happened. That's not the interests of governments, that's the interests of certain international financier circles. We still have some of those scoundrels in the United States. I think we'll send them into retirement in the next election next year.

The success of Russia in the way I indicated, *is in the vital historic interest of the United States*. Anyone who tries to prevent that development, I will treat as an enemy of the vital interests of the United States.

Q: What's your personal view: if the left forces come to power here, who all maintain that they're for a diverse economy, not for a return to the communist system, do you think there could be an intervention by force in response from the West?

LaRouche: If George Bush were President of the United States, and people like Margaret Thatcher were in power in Britain, I would not exclude that possibility; and I do not doubt that there are certain people in high places in Russia, who thought the same thing, who have the same estimation as I.

Q: It's really a matter of indifference whether the United States or Russia would go out of existence as a state first. Insofar as the anti-ballistic missile system of Russia is more developed than that of the United States, it would prevent forcible interference by the United States anyway.

LaRouche: On the question of defense systems, I happen to be an expert in that area.

Let me say that the conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States in the postwar period, was a British creation. *There is no fundamental national conflict of interest between America and Russia*.

However, these systems are still useful, because there are dangers in the world still.

Q: I've been a student and a graduate student here, and I'm now a philosophy teacher, and I would like to say that this is the best lecture I have ever heard, including the speech of your President here.

Book Reviews

Satan's children declare war on the nation-state

by Mark Burdman

Saturn's Children: How the State Devours Liberty, Prosperity and Virtue

by Alan Duncan and Dominic Hobson
Sinclair-Stevenson, London, 1995
448 pages, hardbound, £16.99

In a case of great art being coopted for purely evil purposes, this book takes its title from the famous painting by Francisco Goya, "Saturn Devouring One of His Children." A reproduction of that painting appears on the book's cover. Whatever Goya might have been seeking to convey with this powerful visual metaphor, and this remains an enigma to the present day, the great Spanish painter must be turning in his grave to see his genius so abused. The image is utilized, by authors Duncan and Hobson, to convey the image of "the State" as "Saturn," voraciously devouring everything in sight.

On reading this book, one is tempted to pray that some deity would come along and swallow up our two authors, before they have their next chance to inflict their writings on the public.

Saturn's Children is an eruption from that pit in Hell which is reserved for what has come to be known as "Thatcherism," or, more properly, the Conservative Revolution. Duncan and Hobson are the self-avowed followers of the British philosophical-radical evil of David Hume and John Stuart Mill, as well as of American pseudo-Catholic gnostic Michael Novak, and of the late Friedrich von Hayek of Austria. The last was the founder and guru of the chief organ of the Conservative Revolution, the Mont Pelerin Society. The book is now being touted by spokesmen for the Mont Pelerin Society in Britain, and is billed in such circles, in conjunction with the ramblings of Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) and his ilk, as a significant contribution to the Mont Pelerin Society's ideological offensive for the mid-1990s. Duncan is himself a Conservative Party member of the British Parliament, and is known in

certain London circles as a “cheerleader of the New Right.”

The book is a mindless diatribe against the state, albeit dressed up in much pseudo-academic mumbo-jumbo and professedly moralistic and religious (for example, the word “virtue” in the title) sophistries. The polemic of Duncan and Hobson is identical, in substance, to the arguments of Lord William Rees-Mogg, a commentator for, and former editor of, the London *Times*. Like his lordship, they want the “welfare state” to be dismantled. They denounce “old-age pensions, school meals, education, and unemployment and health insurance,” wanting these to be phased out, supposedly in the name of “the individual” and “liberty.”

They undoubtedly share his lordship’s hidden agenda, which they are wary of announcing too explicitly, but which is now openly discussed by the British friends of Rees-Mogg and by leading Mont Pelerin spokesmen: The welfare state cannot be dismantled in a democracy, but only with a dictatorship. The authors’ repeated attacks on democracy should be seen in this light. As the London *Guardian* put it, in a May 20 feature on the book, “the libertarian remedy suddenly turns out to have an authoritarian logic.”

In tone, the book often reads like an anarchist tract of the type that one might expect from the 19th century’s Mikhail Bakunin. This is not surprising. Anarchism and “liberalism” were both promoted by the British Empire, as a means of undermining the institution of the sovereign nation-state, which was seen, understandably, as an impediment to the achievement of imperial aims. It was a British-run anarchist network, recall, which assassinated nationalist U.S. President William McKinley, and which brought imperialist Teddy Roosevelt to power.

Duncan and Hobson are very much fans of the British Empire, to the point of concluding their book with a ghoulish defense of British imperial drug-trafficking policies. Truly, the authors are Satan’s children.

A disease called Hume

One caution must be exercised in reading *Saturn’s Children*. Much of what they attack is worth attacking, including Fabian social-engineering and “collectivism.” They are hoping, after all, to appeal to many more or less honest average individuals, particularly in Britain, who are completely fed up with the ongoing process of disintegration of society, and who have been subjected to Fabian social-engineering policies that are, indeed, heinous.

But to denounce every evil as resulting from “the State,” is worse than absurd, especially in Britain. Britain is, indeed, disintegrating, economically, politically, and morally. But the immediate cause is the rampant destruction caused by the authors’ beloved “Thatcherism.” The deeper cause is that Britain is controlled by a rotten oligarchical system of more than three centuries duration, headed by a monarchy which thinks of human beings as apes, and by oligarchs who see “the United Kingdom” as their playground. And that system

itself is disintegrating, as the historical era exemplified by the power of the House of Windsor, draws to a conclusion.

Even were one to take the main strand of their ostensible argument at face value, it leads to entirely different conclusions than they intend. In trying to document the massive rise of state functions and power in the past 100 years, they repeatedly affirm that this was a consequence of the two world wars in this century. These wars: 1) self-evidently, led to a massive increase in state functions to conduct the war; 2) required urgent postwar measures of reconstruction of destroyed physical infrastructure; and 3) caused such widespread cultural pessimism and demoralization, that people turned to the state for dependency. But if they are angry about world wars, Duncan and Hobson should have written a different book, one in which they should advise Great Britain’s geopoliticians to stop unleashing world wars.

“The State” is their scapegoat, much as “the Jews” were for Adolf Hitler.

Beyond this, their counterposition of “individualism” and “liberty” to “collectivism” is absurd. In Britain, both come out of the same oligarchical brew. They praise David Hume, for having “rightly observed” that “a nation is nothing but a collection of individuals,” and that “the rules of morality are not the conclusions of our reason.” Hume was one of the more lunatic exponents of the disease known as British radical liberalism, a belief-structure correctly classifiable as pagan. At the same time, they attack Jeremy Bentham, because his “utilitarianism” and “pleasure-pain principle” has been used by Fabian social engineers. But Bentham was used just as often by radical “individualists,” as he was an advocate of the most perverse forms of hedonistic “self-expression,” typified by his *In Defense of Pederasty* tract. Humean “liberals” and Benthamite “utilitarians” would assuredly congregate, for various orgiastic purposes, in the British elites’ Hell-Fire Clubs of the 18th and 19th centuries.

If there are a few words which might describe what the great figures of American statecraft would have found philosophically repugnant in Great Britain, it is the cited paranoid-schizophrenic statement by Hume that “a nation is nothing but a collection of individuals.” Whether it be the American Declaration of Independence, or the Constitution with its general welfare clause, or Abraham Lincoln’s notion of “government of the people, by the people, and for the people,” American statesmen saw in the nation-state, the main promoter of individual dignity and welfare, and thereby overcame, in statecraft, Plato’s problem of “the one and the many.”

Abusing Christianity

The most obscene fraud, is that Duncan and Hobson, admirers of Hume, von Hayek, and other pagans, repeatedly cloak themselves in the mantle of “Christianity,” glibly throwing out phrases about “man being made in the image of God” and the like. It reaches its high point, when they portray Jesus Christ Himself as the hero of Mont Pelerinite “individu-

alism.” They write: “It is not surprising that He died alone, on a Cross, at the hand of a State.”

For all their posturing about Christian doctrine, they never once refer to the current pope, nor to any of his encyclicals, nor to any of the earlier encyclicals such as *Rerum Novarum*, which certainly saw the state as playing a role in protecting the citizen against what Pope John Paul II denounces as “savage capitalism.” Well, what can one expect from savages?

In fact, the development of the modern nation-state, and the highest forms of Christian humanism, developed during

For all their posturing about Christian doctrine, they never once refer to the current pope, nor to any of his encyclicals, nor to any of the earlier encyclicals such as Rerum Novarum, which certainly saw the state as playing a role in protecting the citizen against what Pope John Paul II denounces as “savage capitalism.”

the Golden Renaissance, are one and the same. The first nation-state was the France of Louis XI, who based his conceptions, in significant part, on those of Cardinal Nicolaus of Cusa. In this conjuncture, Christian culture, through the nation-state, fostered science, technology, and the development of reason. But like every true Conservative Revolutionary, of the sort that helped bring Adolf Hitler into power in Germany, Duncan and Hobson repeatedly attack “science and reason,” as instruments or bastions of “Saturn.”

Propagandists for Dope, Inc.

Whatever their demagogic invocation of Christ dying on the Cross “at the hand of a State,” Duncan and Hobson are, in fact, very much apologists for Imperial Rome, in its modern incarnation as the British Empire.

They write that “it was once the chief glory of the English political genius” to have figured out a way to combine “security and freedom. . . . During the two centuries which separate the Glorious Revolution [of 1688] and the Third Reform Act [of 1884-85], it delivered unparalleled prosperity and, through its example, inspired most of the states of modern Europe and America.”

What drive! The “unparalleled prosperity” was that gained by the worst forms of imperial looting known in history. The period they glorify, is the heyday of the British Empire, which really began to take off with the Glorious

Revolution and its aftermath, and which was achieved through endless wars, primarily against France. That “unparalleled prosperity” was never experienced by the populations of India, Ireland, or any other people under its yoke, and only came to the shores of America when a Revolution was fought and won against that empire. That “unparalleled prosperity” was, certainly, never experienced by the vast majority of wretched, oppressed Britons.

For Duncan and Hobson, the “State” suddenly becomes quite fine, when it is the *imperial state*, carrying out imperial functions. The 1982 “Falklands War,” as they call the British seizure of Argentina’s Malvinas Islands, “was a victory for great principles and a just cause.”

But the real giveaway is a section, toward the end, entitled “The Legalization of Drugs”—a measure which our authors, of course, support. In the name of “freedom from the State” to take narcotics, they are perfectly happy, when the imperial state acts to defend drug-traffickers against attempts by sovereign nations to stop such trafficking! To quote:

“Draconian laws against drug-trafficking and consumption are anyway of relatively recent origin. Thomas de Quincey published his *Confessions of an English Opium Eater* in London in 1821, after consuming the drug for nearly twenty years, without interference from the State. In the 1830s, and again in the 1850s, *the Royal Navy effectively supported opium traders against the efforts of the Chinese authorities to stamp out an illicit trade in the drug*” (emphasis added).

Duncan and Hobson go on, later in the same passage: “The Opium Department of the Indian Civil Service . . . supervised a state monopoly of opium production for export to China, a trade which at one time accounted for a sixth of the total government revenues of British India. There was no legislation against the consumption of the drug in England until the passage of the Dangerous Drugs Act in 1920. Legislation against the opium trade was not introduced in South East Asia until after the Second World War.”

A fugitive fraudster’s faithful servant

Duncan’s pedigree says it all. The book-jacket identifies him as a Tory parliamentarian, Oxford graduate, and so forth. What it *doesn’t* say, is that during 1982-88, he made significant amounts of money as an oil trader with the Marc Rich and Co. commodities trading group.

Marc Rich is a chief figure in the present-day international “underworld” of predators, swindlers, and fraudsters, who make millions by looting resources from sovereign nations. And Rich has a *particular* vested interest in destroying nation-states. For more than a decade, he has been a fugitive from American justice, living in Zug, Switzerland. He was indicted in 1983 for violating the oil embargo against Iran and for tax fraud. Almost the entire period of Duncan’s employment, would have coincided with Rich’s fugitive status. With *Saturn’s Children*, Duncan shows that he learned a lot from his former boss.