
Book Review

'Anti-Kissinger' Book Arouses Suspensions

by Mark Burdman

The Trial of Henry Kissinger

by Christopher Hitchens

New York: Verso Publishers, 2001

159 pages, hardbound, \$22

In February 2000, this reviewer was a participant on "Talking Point," a weekly talk show of the British Broadcasting Corp. (BBC). The subject of the show, was the state of democracy in the United States, in light of that year's Presidential elections. During my brief contribution, I mentioned that American democratic processes were being seriously called into question, by the farcical way in which the 2000 American Presidential campaign was being conducted. I briefly cited, as an example, the way in which the Lyndon LaRouche Presidential campaign was being excluded, by the Democratic Party leadership, from rightful participation in the primary process in Michigan.

At the bare mention of the name LaRouche, the Washington-based guest on the show, (British-born) journalist Christopher Hitchens, went ballistic, denouncing LaRouche as a "neo-Nazi," and thereby attempting to dismiss the entirety of what I had said. Washington observers noted, that this was only the latest, in a series of wild outbursts, by this odd creature, against LaRouche and his movement.

The BBC anecdote must be kept in mind, in evaluating Hitchens' book. His violent hostility to LaRouche, helps to explain the strange phenomenon, that in enumerating the "crimes of Henry Kissinger," Hitchens would never once refer to the fact, that the most notorious case of Kissinger utilizing extra-legal facilities of the U.S. government, was in his 1982-83 initiation of the persecution, conviction, and incarceration of LaRouche, the man whom he regarded as his chief adversary, inside the United States, throughout the 1970s and 1980s.

This omission by Hitchens is all the more notable now, at a time when Kissinger's role in putting LaRouche behind bars, became a *cause célèbre*, among Russian political figures and newspaper commentators who are sympathetic to

LaRouche, during and since LaRouche's late-June visit to Moscow.

It is also strange, that Hitchens never once refers to any document published by the LaRouche-founded *Executive Intelligence Review (EIR)* magazine, even though his book is extensively researched, and even though *EIR* is recognized as the authoritative source on Henry A. Kissinger, and the latter's crimes. *EIR* has published explosive exposés on Kissinger, for nearly three decades.

So, Christopher Hitchens is somewhat of a latecomer, who might find it problematic to explain, why he and his despised Kissinger, share a similar view about Lyndon LaRouche.

Advice From Friedrich Schiller

Such points are necessary to make at the outset, because Hitchens' book has been causing quite a flurry, worldwide. It was recently the subject of a short news-feature on the "Aspekte" show of Germany's second television station, ZDF. The book is soon to appear in a German edition. This occurs in a time frame when, in France and Chile, there are ongoing efforts to bring Kissinger to court, for his role in the 1973 overthrow of the Salvador Allende regime, and his backing for the brutal Augusto Pinochet dictatorship there.

Elements of the Chile matter are documented in *The Trial of Henry Kissinger*, as are other high crimes and misdemeanors of "Fat Henry," in Bangladesh, Cyprus, Vietnam, and elsewhere. Respecting Vietnam, for example, Hitchens documents criminal acts that Kissinger undoubtedly committed. One, was the extension of the war into Cambodia and Laos. He otherwise charges, that Kissinger was key to an effort to prolong the war, in 1968, in order to get Nixon elected President, by discrediting the peace-negotiation efforts of President Lyndon Johnson, and to thereby sabotage the campaign of Democratic Presidential candidate Hubert Humphrey, Johnson's Vice-President.

But the question quickly arises: Why such a legalistic approach to the Kissinger criminality? If these crimes are reduced to a strictly legal issue, it is hardly difficult for Kissinger's well-paid lawyers to come up with legalistic refutations. A law court, these days, is not the best venue for dealing with *political crimes*.

In such moments, it is always best to remember Friedrich Schiller's injunction, "World history is the world court." From the standpoint of that great dramatist and poet, Kissinger is already guilty.

The second problematic element, is that, since it is clear to Hitchens and others that Kissinger would not be tried in the United States, as would be just, since he abused U.S. official power, then it must be done through the mechanism of an "international criminal court." This is an extremely dangerous mechanism, overriding vital institutions of national sovereignty, and establishing preconditions for world government. It puts into question the entire complex of nation-state

institutions that were developed during the Italy-centered Golden Renaissance, and that were greatly strengthened by that 1648 Treaty of Westphalia—ending the 1618-1648 Thirty Years' War—that Kissinger himself so violently abhors.

Ultimately, that raises the question, whether the Hitchens enterprise against Kissinger is an attempt to legitimize the notion of “universal jurisdiction,” the which notion should be avoided like the plague, when powerful oligarchical forces want to exploit the massive financial, economic, and strategic crises of the current conjuncture, to establish a neo-feudal, imperial system.

The Ghost of Bertie Russell

Suspicion of Hitchens' motives, is reinforced by a couple of curious facts. First, is that Hitchens is one of a select few so-called “Honorary Associates,” of an entity known, variously, as the Rationalist International, or the Rationalist Press Association. The self-professed “Rationalists” are a collection of militant anti-religious atheists, euthanasia advocates, and Darwinist fundamentalists.

One such “Honorary Associate,” Dr. Pieter Admiraal, is the godfather of the pro-euthanasia movement in Holland. Two others, Oxford Prof. Richard Dawkins and London School of Economics Prof. Helena Cronin, are the two most prominent neo-Darwinists in Britain. Dawkins issued a notorious statement, in 1992, that belief in God is equivalent to a virus, in response to which, LaRouche wrote the devastating refutation, “On the Subject of God.” Another of the group, U.S. Prof. Paul Kurtz, has been a bitter and nasty opponent of LaRouche for some three decades. All in all, it is not surprising to learn, that “Rationalists,” and their allies, have recently been active in efforts against LaRouche associates in France, Sweden, and Germany.

The most revealing thing about the “Irrationalists,” is that, in the 20th Century, one of their chief associates and collaborators, was Lord Bertrand Russell. The Rationalist Press Association published several of Russell's works. Russell was a fanatical proponent of ending nation-states, and bringing about a world government, and was, frankly, more than willing even to unleash nuclear war to achieve these aims. He was a close ally of the degenerate writer H.G. Wells, and has justifiably been called by LaRouche, “the most evil man of the past century.”

So, “Kissinger-hater” Hitchens keeps some very bad company. The Russell-Wells conception of the world, was shared, in crucial respects, by Henry Kissinger!

Who Is Henry Kissinger, Really?

That latter point, forces us, in conclusion, to demolish the ultimately fictional view of Henry Kissinger presented by Christopher Hitchens.

In Hitchens' depiction, Kissinger is some sort of *deus ex machina* on the American scene, inflicting his evil, as if out

of nowhere. But Kissinger, in and of himself, is a pathetic nothing. So the story goes, he was a Jewish escapee from Nazi Germany, who was then picked up by the U.S. Army, and “moved through the ranks” of Army Intelligence. Then, he was seconded to the prestigious Harvard University where, like his alter ego Zbigniew Brzezinski, he was patronized by a certain William Yandell Elliott, head of the Harvard Department of Government.

William Yandell Elliott is an obscure name, both to most Americans and certainly to almost all Europeans, yet he did more evil than his protégé Kissinger. Elliott, a fanatical Anglophile, was a chief ideologue and propagandist of a group called the “Nashville Agrarians.” Founded in the 1930s, the Agrarians sought to revive the anti-industrial (and ultimately, anti-American) *Weltanschauung* of the 1861-65 slaveholders' “Confederacy” of Southern U.S.A. states. Their extraordinary and baneful influence over 20th-Century America, is ably documented, in the Aug. 3 edition of *EIR* by Stanley Ezrol.

The Agrarians may have some curious direct links to Hitchens, since one of their leading lights, the aging degenerate writer Gore Vidal, has designated Hitchens as his “dauphin,” his heir apparent.

It was apparent to Elliott and his collaborators, that Kissinger was a malleable non-entity, who would, eagerly and with no questions, carry out the oligarchy's wishes, and publish all sorts of abominable ideas. So, “Fat Henry” was soon sent into the New York Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the American branch of the London Royal Institute of International Affairs (“Chatham House”), to promote a doctrine on nuclear weapons deployment, that fit 100% into the one-world, anti-nation-state doctrines of Lord Russell! At the CFR, Kissinger worked under the tutelage of Anglo-American establishment bigshot McGeorge Bundy. In ensuing years, as Kissinger himself boasted during an infamous May 10, 1982 Chatham House speech, he had served the British Foreign Office more faithfully, than he did the American government that he was part of.

It is more than strange, that “Kissinger-hater” Hitchens covers none of this. Strangest of all, is that Hitchens never mentions Kissinger's sponsorship, in the early to mid-1970s, of the U.S. government's “National Security Study Memorandum-200: Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security Overseas Interests,” the which defined reducing population in numerous developing sector nations, as the highest priority for the United States. This policy, fully in line with the Agrarians' idea of a “post-industrial society,” has been the driving factor in the genocides worse than Vietnam, most drastic in Central Africa, for which the Anglo-American oligarchy has been responsible.

For such actions, Kissinger is already deeply ensconced in the lowest levels of the Inferno described by the great Italian poet Dante Alighieri. That is clear. But what final verdict will be reserved for Christopher Hitchens?