

London Pushes Toward World War III

The following analysis was released on Feb. 26 by U.S. Labor Party Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.:

Blinded by the British-created myth of German "collective guilt" for World War II, a regrettably large portion of the Federal Republic of Germany's influential strata is following London's directives, in a headlong plunge toward intercontinental thermonuclear war. The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* military columnist, Adalbert Weinstein, once more pushing the London International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS) line of support for the "neutron bomb," typifies those presently confused persons who are blindly impelling that nation toward a third, and worst-imaginable destruction.

In the Federal Republic, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and Herbert Wehner typify that small, harassed group of leaders of the Atlantic Alliance nations whose superior wisdom and efforts are now the principal obstacles to horrors beyond the imagination of even most leaders of parties and finance in those nations. Pending possible but not yet visible correction in the composition of the U.S. Carter Administration, it is for the moment principally Schmidt and France's President Valery Giscard d'Estaing who stand between the world and irreversible plunge toward general thermonuclear war.

War might occur as soon as within weeks. We do not think that probable, but at the moment such things are real possibilities. The situation is best described by saying that the world stands at the brink of a development like that of the Hitler-Mussolini-Chamberlain-Daladier Pact of Munich 1938 — at a point at which war is not yet ready to break out, but has become inevitable. After Munich 1938, it was impossible to stop World War II. One cannot prevent general wars at the point they are about to occur. General wars break out only when war has become unstoppable. One can prevent wars only by preventing those earlier developments which make war non-preventable, developments such as the actions by both Winston Churchill and Neville Chamberlain during 1938.

It is past time for both the politicians and the man-in-the-street throughout the Atlantic Alliance nations to awaken from their myth-ridden fogs of consoling self-delusion, to face and act upon the realities immediately before us. *If you do not, then, you are already as good as radioactively dead. Call us "Cassandras" if you will, but remember — to your radioactively dying moment that you did so, that you chose death in that way.*

Incidentally, the Cassandra of Homer's *Odyssey* was right!

Present Day German Mythology

As an American, I am enraged at what U.S. occupying forces permitted the British to do to occupied Germany. The most evil of all the things London did to Germany was to impose the doctrine of "Germany's collective

guilt" for World War II. That is not merely an issue of propaganda of the past, it is the mythology which has seized the minds of many Germans, and which prevents most of them from acting on the basis of principles of national purpose and national self-interest today.

The poor, British-mythology-ridden German citizen sees on television, or reads in some magazine once again the story of General Paulus and the Sixth Army, and says to himself, "Who am I, a mere blundering German, to decide anything of importance?" I suspect if German citizens do not quickly rid themselves of that myth, and learn once and finally about Nazi Germany, Germany will not be able to perform the role in world affairs — in alliance with Gaullist France — which the fate of humanity requires of Germany today.

It was the British who created Hitler, who ordered his 1933 installation in the Chancellery, who prevented his overthrow (by Canaris and the generals) in 1938, who supported him at Munich in 1938, and who refused to permit the Allies to support the generals' plot during the war. Once the events of 1938 were completed, courtesy of Winston Churchill and Neville Chamberlain, there was no force inside Germany which could have prevented what immediately followed.

The kernel of Nazi doctrine was laid down during the late 19th century and early 20th century by circles associated with key British intelligence figures such as Houston Chamberlain. A complementary feature of Nazism, the Nazi social movement, was developed predominantly by a faction of the British Fabian Society, out of its anarchist and anarchosyndicalist social experimental researches. Goering, linked to British networks in Scandinavia, exemplifies one important aspect of the matter. Rudolf Hess, under the influence of British ideological influence Haushofer — the Hess who flew *too late* to Britain — is another. Hitler, originally one of many similar sorts picked up as errand boys of the Allied Control Commission of the Versailles period, was selected and groomed at each stage of his progress up to 1938 by British (Anglo-Dutch) intelligence circles. In fact, it is fair to report that the Haushofer-linked networks of British intelligence services "ghost wrote" most of the contents of *Mein Kampf*.

It was not the German industrialists such as Krupp who elected to put Hitler into the Chancellery. It was, relatively speaking, the German Liberal Party of Hjalmar Schacht which first pulled down the Mueller Social Democratic Party government. It was Schacht who gained London's agreement to putting a Hitler, already losing support and credibility, into the Chancellery. It was Schacht and the London-based Schroeder's Bank — with support from London-allied circles in New York City — who dragooned the main body of German industrialists into supporting Hitler — or else.

The immediate prompting for London and Schacht's action was a strong impulse of forces associated with

Von Schleicher to coopt the Gregor Strasser wing of the Nazi Sturmabteilungen into support of a "Rapallo" alternative — that Germany make an economic pact with the Soviet Union, centering upon Soviet industrial development, in return for Soviet trade as a means for stabilizing the collapsing German economy. Elements of the army command, in addition to Von Seeckt, as well as industrialists, had all the relevant connections for putting such a plan in effect.

London's purpose in putting Hitler into power was severalfold. Most immediately, London acted to impose upon Germany a Schachtian program of "fiscal austerity" and labor-intensive *Arbeitsbeschaffung* identical in principles to the SDR ("International Mefo Bill") swindle London proposes to impose on the world through the International Monetary Fund and McNamara's World Bank policies today. In the longer term, London aimed to develop fascist rearmed Germany as a battering ram for conquest of the Soviet Union. As long as Hitler went only *East*, Hitler was doing the work London assigned to him. (There was nothing mentally deranged in Rudolf Hess's flight to Britain. Had he arrived some months earlier, he would have been received most hospitably.)

Granted, Nazi Germany went out of London's control to the point that London proposed alliance with the Soviet Union, an alliance after the summer of 1940, against Hitler. Nazi Germany's break with London occurred in two phases, and in ways directly relevant to the war danger currently looming before us.

Point One, *The Dismissal of Schacht*. Schacht, advised by representatives of the Warburg Bank, was considered a "financial wizard" by these fools, but the Nazis soon painfully discovered him to be an abysmal incompetent in economic matters. Schacht's "fiscal austerity" measures since the Young Plan, added to the economic ravages accumulated since 1914, were reducing German industry to the point of collapsing for lack of capital maintenance and were eroding the productive skills of the German population. Either Germany had to dump the whole Nazi system — including Schacht's insane financial pyramids, the *Rentenmark* and *Mefo Bills*, and turn toward a "Rapallo" alternative, or Germany would have to loot its neighbors. This latter required an acceleration of the munitions and the war-economy effort — while German industry could still produce. (It is notable, that into 1941 and possibly later, the indices of German industrial production, including military production itself, were below 1914-1915 levels by a substantial margin.)

Hjalmar Schacht was pushed into semi-official retirement.

Point Two, *The Invasion of Scandinavia and Benelux-France*.

Despite growing hostility to Nazism from popular (and Jewish) circles in London, Winston Churchill managed to keep British policy in line with the policy of sympathy towards an accommodation to the Nazis through 1938. The families which maintained that pro-Nazi policy are among the same families which control the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), the London Inter-

national Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS), BBC, Reuters, the Aspen Institute, and other branches of British Secret Intelligence Services to this present day.

It was those British leading families associated with Churchill and the Astors which forced through the Munich 1938-arrangement, freeing Nazi Germany for its drive eastward. During the same period, Winston Churchill intervened personally, to prevent Canaris and the generals from proceeding with the plan, for which forces were already deployed, to overthrow Hitler.

Churchill admitted such 1938 action during a reply to a parliamentary question at the end of World War II. A Member of Parliament interrogated the government as to why it had not supported the Generals' Plot of the 1938 and 1943-1944 period. In a reply reported drafted by Hugh Trevor-Roper, Churchill admitted the burden of the question and justified British actions in those matters by proposing that His Majesty's government had preferred Hitler to the anti-Nazi forces prepared to overthrow him.

The same Hugh Trevor-Roper was one of the leading proponents of "Germany's collective guilt" for the horrors of World War II.

Although the war which London declared on Germany in September 1939 was at first a "phony war," as it was called generally, increasingly up into the spring of 1940, London did intend to invade the Rhineland at the point that the German forces were weakened in war against the Red Army. This fact, obvious to the German High Command, intersected the fact that Germany lacked the resources for a war against the Soviet Union. The German drive westward accomplished two purposes. It knocked out the forces to the West, first, before launching the drive eastward and provided German industry with a margin of loot from the Benelux countries and France to build up for a drive eastward.

It was that drive westward which broke apart London's earlier policy of viewing Hitler as its expendable puppet.

Nonetheless the British influence within the Nazi command saved Britain. Through militarily senseless orders transmitted from Hitler's office itself, Guderian's tanks were held back from Dunkirk. Goering performed a crucial part in saving Britain from defeat with his militarily insane bombing of London. He drew the Luftwaffe away from militarily relevant targets to London, putting the Luftwaffe into a British shooting gallery. This gave British military build-up indispensable breathing room while depleting the Luftwaffe below the point required for covering a sea-borne invasion. The bombing of London, while causing relatively minimal damage overall to London itself, enabled the British propaganda machine to mobilize a demoralized Britain in support of a continued war effort. Hitler abandoned the strategically essential initial conquest of Britain, and turned eastward, to Germany's doom.

The Russian Front

Given the political situation in France and the quality of the French military command itself, the 1940 fall of France was inevitable. So was the doom of the Wehrmacht in Russia.

Because Stalin himself could not believe Hitler so insane as to attack the Soviet Union before eliminating

The War Danger

Britain, the Red Army was caught unprepared by the Nazi onslaught, giving the Nazi assault a degree of initial success not warranted by forces' capabilities.

Niccolò Machiavelli would have understood this point immediately.

The Nazi blitzkrieg policy was a reflection of German weakness, not German strength. Germany lacked the force-in-depth to sustain a war against a well-matched adversary. Thus, the policy of the German High Command was to secure a decisive knockout blow at first onslaught, to avoid all situations resembling a "Battle of the Marne." Everything effective was put up front into assault, but without strategic depth.

Hannibal's problem in Italy was more favorable than the situation the Wehrmacht faced in the Soviet Union — the closer the Wehrmacht reached in-depth Soviet counterattack potentiality, the more the shallowness and logistical weaknesses of the Wehrmacht and the Luftwaffe strike capabilities became conspicuous in respect to in-depth Soviet force capabilities. The war in the East was not, as simpleminded commentators like to profess, a matter of the Soviets trading distance for advantage. It was the principle understood by *Machiavelli* — that Soviet capabilities were based on collapsing temporarily defeated forces into second and third echelons of in-depth war-fighting capabilities as at Stalingrad. Against the in-depth combinations of Soviet forces and Soviet military doctrine, the Wehrmacht was wholly outmatched.

Germany's Paulus at Stalingrad had in fact no choices. His option was to shoot Hitler before the battle. The post-1938 situation in Germany made overthrow of Hitler impossible until the emergence of the generals' plotting, which began as soon as the defeat of Moscow and Leningrad showed every competent military commander that the Wehrmacht was doomed to defeat. Paulus was not situated to shoot Hitler in advance.

The First World War was also the result of British maneuvering in the Balkans and elsewhere. What predetermined World War I was the 1905 Russian Revolution, sparked by Anglo-Dutch intelligence networks for the purpose of overthrowing Count Witte. Witte represented proindustrializing factions in Russian circles, committed to an alliance of interests with industrialized Germany — foreshadowing the later Rapallo efforts. Through the overthrow of Hitler, Russian alliance to the London-coordinated entente was insured. Anglo-Dutch intelligence operations in the Balkans did the rest.

The proper lesson of two world wars for Germany is: never permit Britain to set up the circumstances of war and always develop and maintain an industrial alliance with France against British-monetarist-Schachtian policies. The forces around Konrad Adenauer showed a good working grasp of this lesson — which is why British intelligence services acted to weaken both Adenauer's forces within the Christian Democratic Union and De Gaulle's. It would be, as we shall demonstrate, a good thing if all influential but too susceptible Germans repudiated their association with IISS.

It is the British whose "collective guilt" for two world wars — and the 19th century — properly obliges *them* to pay everybody reparations for the hell they have brought upon humanity.

The center of London's efforts to bring on World War III is the deployment of its agents in leading U.S. positions. Henry Kissinger, Vice President Mondale, James R. Schlesinger, Admiral Turner, W.M. Blumenthal, and General Alexander Haig, as well as Zbigniew Brzezinski are notable such hard-core British agents-of-influence.

The essence of London's effort is the pushing of the "environmentalist" movement, a movement created and controlled entirely by British intelligence services, including British agents-of-influence (chiefly) inside the United States. With the aid of this assault against nuclear energy-centered high-technology export programs into the developing sector, London has succeeded in wrecking world trade levels. By sabotaging U.S. high-technology exports (most emphatically), and at the same time flooding the world with dollars unsupported either by gold or hard commodity exports, the value of the dollar has been brought down artificially to the vicinity of 2 deutschemarks.

By collapsing world trade levels and the dollar — with the most important aid of the British intelligence "environmentalists" and international terrorists' forces, the United States is being driven toward accepting the neo-Schachtian policies of "fiscal austerity" London demands. If this occurs, unless France, Japan, the Federal Republic, and other saner nations quickly establish a new world, gold reserve-based monetary system around the emerging Luxembourg markets, the whole capitalist sector goes into neo-Schachtian "fiscal austerity," an austerity which the IMF and World Bank demand be pushed to mass genocidal extremes in many nations in the developing sector.

At the same time, London is pushing openly for a U.S.-NATO confrontationist policy toward the Warsaw Pact nations, Vietnam and Cuba, and has won a significant number of credulous fools in and around the U.S. military and intelligence establishment to an arms race based on such a confrontationist perspective.

Soviet Follies

Meanwhile, the Soviet command is behaving with mixed military-strategic brilliance and political stupidity.

Although Brezhnev et al. are issuing an unprecedented flurry of probing offers for revitalizing détente, London influence both direct and through U.S. agents-of-influence such as Kissinger, Schlesinger, Brzezinski et al. tends towards causing each of these probes to be turned aside. While making these probes, Moscow is also preparing for total thermonuclear war at an early date, a period as short as weeks or as long as 18 months or less. To this effect, although Moscow continues policies based on long-range political objectives in some parts of the world, it is deploying in the Arab and contiguous sectors in a way which makes sense only as a short-range mobile political deployment in anticipation of either thermonuclear confrontations or actual general war.

On the military side, Moscow policy is excellent. On the political side, it includes leading elements of outright insanity.

Moscow, not being stupid, recognizes that the antinuclear energy and "fiscal austerity" policies being pushed from London have the effect of savagely weakening the United States to the nominal benefit of the City of London. They also know that the "environmentalist" and deindustrializing policies promoted by London qualitatively weaken the military capabilities of the Atlantic Alliance at a point that Moscow itself is moving towards deployment of qualitatively new kinds of weapons systems of major strategic significance.

Militarily, Moscow's indirect support for London against Washington makes sense in that way. Moscow says, "Let the British flea infect the U.S. dog with neo-Schachtian plague, that way we can more easily dispose of both."

Moscow's political stupidity in this is that by putting its deployments in such a way as to enhance London against the U.S.'s vital interests, it is ensuring that the anti-Atlantic Alliance is driven into the neo-Schachtian insanity which makes general war inevitable. Without being directly informed, I know in advance Moscow's attempted rebuttal to that: "We have no faith in the possibility that Giscard, Schmidt, and other sane forces in the Atlantic Alliance will be able to stop London from taking over the government of the U.S., France, and the Federal Republic. Try to stop war if you can, but we think war is becoming almost inevitable. We are realists, who stake everything on enhancing our marginal advantage for general war."

That being the case, it is almost useless to hope that Moscow will independently correct its tragic political error on this count. Thus, the only possibility of stopping war lies on our side of the Atlantic Alliance — in ridding ourselves of the plague-bearing British fleas.

Our estimates of the possibility of doing that in the United States and elsewhere are far better informed than those of any of our readers, and significantly hopeful. However, although we see clearly ways to stop this horror, as we look into your eyes we see men and women who, because of their myth-ridden follies, may well be as good as radioactively dead. If the Schmidt government falls, I would give very little for the Federal Republic's chances to survive physically over the coming months.

The 'Neutron Bomb'

Once again, let us be clear on the Soviet order of battle. Reality has no resemblance to what is offered as official wisdom by General Alexander Haig or most so-called military experts in the Federal Republic. In particular, under no circumstances will the Warsaw Pact forces engage in a theater-limited war in Central Europe. The first act of war on the Warsaw Pact side will be total, intercontinental ABC warfare (atomic, bacteriological, chemical). The order of war-fighting will proceed as follows:

1. An intercontinental salvo amounting to a full strike of strategic ABC weapons against the United States and all other major military and logistical targets out of short-term reach of Warsaw Pact ground forces. This assault will eliminate between 120 and 180 million lives in the United States, and may or may not include

(probably not) missile-silo targets in the United States. (Any commander must assume that at the instant his missiles are detected in liftoff, adversary's liftoff will begin — so, why hit emptied missile silos? Rather, "kill" the nation which represents an otherwise out-of-reach in-depth war-fighting capability.)

During this initial exchange, the Soviet Union will lose in the order of up to 30 percent of its population and logistical resources in depth, including the cities of Moscow and Leningrad. That, however, my friends, is what occurs at the outset of present-day general war. So, my friend, prepare to fight that kind of a war to win, or do not meddle with war.

2. A simultaneous intermediate and short-range full-scale ABC strike against both frontal adversary deployment positions in depth, plus all key in-depth rear-echelon targets. This bombardment has the same included function as a classical "conventional" artillery and tactical-support air bombardment. It "paves" the entire front of assault to the purpose of exterminating every possible means of opposition within that frontal area.

3. Along a broad front in Central Europe, Warsaw Pact mobile forces follow the "paving" bombardment with rapid penetration in dispersed combat-group formation, featuring armored artillery and personnel carriers equipped to deploy in an ABC-contaminated line of march and battle-terrain. This advance is supported by helicopter and other logistical support and troop transport.

Thus, war does not describe a process of escalation toward the asymptote of "maximum deterrent," but a process of deescalation from total thermonuclear deployment toward "conventional" warfare. That policy, which locates the function of the infantryman in an ABC-contaminated environment as the concluding act of battle and war in each setting, is a *war-winning* approach to general war. That is Soviet doctrine and forces capability. Therefore, that is the kind of war that will be fought if war occurs.

As a United States 1976 presidential candidate, I would not have run for election if I had not considered myself psychologically and otherwise prepared for all the functions of that office, the problem of general war included. I know that the incumbent President has not thought through a number of important such matters, including general war. I know that virtually none of the heads of state and leading politicians of the Atlantic Alliance have faced the responsibility of thinking through what it means to fight general war. What I say on this subject reflects looking general war in the face, and knowing how I would prepare for and direct such warfare were I obliged to assume that responsibility. Most heads of state and other leading political figures have not done this, I know authoritatively. Perhaps Chancellor Schmidt is one of the exceptions. Otherwise, they could not pursue the lunatic policies they publicly mouth, and could not tolerate official or press babbling on such matters as the "cruise missile" and "neutron bomb."

First, the "cruise missile." Without going into confi-

dential matters, the "cruise missile," a parody of the Nazi V-1 or "buzz bomb," is not a weapon of war and was never designed to be an effective weapon of actual war fighting. Its use has an entirely different experimental purpose, to which I shall not refer here, out of respect for sensitive confidences. Nonetheless, every head of state and defense minister of the Atlantic Alliance knows exactly what I mean by this reference — and knows that the British know this, too. Why, then, do they tolerate the idiotic proposal to deploy this wholly ineffectual, merely-provocative weapon?

Second, the "neutron bomb." This weapon is distinguished by its extraordinary compassion for an adversary's real estate, and the reduced residual effects it has on those subsequently moving into affected terrain. In short, as a nuclear tactical-support weapon, the only function of the creature is for uses by advancing armored assault forces making successive penetrations of adversary "home terrain," since if the adversary is not using neutron bombs, one's own terrain is already so contaminated that there is no point in using a neutron bomb for recapturing terrain. Hence, the deployment of the weapon has only one significance, an airing of one's implied determination to *initiate* general war.

Three points follow from that.

First, one understands exactly the Soviet reaction to the chatter about the neutron bomb. In a military sense, they are not intimidated by it, since they can match it with very dirty ordinary nuclear devices or make one of their own if they elect to do so. However, it represents a NATO potential commitment to *first-strike*. Hence, the mere deployment of the weapon is itself close to a *casus belli*. (If one were to seriously deploy it, one would not advertise the fact in the least.)

Second, the NATO forces do not have an existing capability to sustain an armored assault in depth into Warsaw Pact territory and no in-sight capability for doing so against existing Warsaw Pact force capabilities governed by existing Warsaw Pact doctrine. So, the weapon is useless for all in-sight situations in Central Europe.

Third, the weapon with which the Soviets could totally outmatch the neutron bomb is a suitable equivalent *thermonuclear neutron bomb*. Scientifically, on the basis of proven theoretical-research accomplishments by the Soviet Union, they have specific capability to create a "clean" thermonuclear bomb. Indeed, they offered the relevant physics to the United States, but — on the action of James R. Schlesinger, under orders from London — the U.S. refused to accept this technological offer. Otherwise, the Soviet reaction to the neutron bomb is to plaster all suspected areas of deployment with very dirty ordinary A-bombs.

The neutron bomb represents no conceivable advantage for NATO forces in Central Europe.

Adalbert Weinstein

Why, those being facts properly available to the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung's* Adalbert Weinstein, does he yet, once again, boost the foolish neutron bomb in his Feb. 26 column? Why do CDU spokesmen and others fall for this business?

Weinstein's rationalization operates on two levels.

First, he proposes that, after all, such weapons are not for using, but only for bargaining against SS-20s, "Backfire" bombers, and the like. That is merely a subordinate — if incompetent — feature of his more essential argument. His most essential argument is London's argument, the International Institute of Strategic Studies' argument, Sussex University's argument, that the Soviets will back down from general war and "accept" a nuclear-augmented-level theater war in Central Europe. Weinstein himself is sufficiently intelligent and well-informed to know that once that latter bit of British idiocy is chucked out the window, the rest of the argument goes as well.

It all comes down to whether or not you are so disposed to submit to "British wisdom" as to abandon the judgment of your own knowledge and senses.

In principle, I have no objection to Herr Weinstein's participation in IISS proceedings. I and my associates have had a few well-mannered chats with such folk over various strategic and policy matters, and have excellent lists of the names and pedigrees of many prominent persons of many countries associated with those branches of British Intelligence. Excepting the fact that MI-6 would presently use the opportunity to assassinate me at this point of affairs, I would enjoy occasionally passing time with some of the British-intelligence crowd and their invited guests. It is always an informative clinical experience to observe how the British mind works at close range and I am socially a pleasant enough fellow, if all the same too plain-spoken and hubristic for British liking. Gather all the information you can, Herr Weinstein, but do not permit yourself to be deceived by those fellows.

The British, who have admittedly done quite a job in penetrating the Soviet leadership circles over the years, understand only one aspect of the Soviet mind, not the aspect which bears upon dropping a pair of 50 megaton thermonuclear devices upon the United Kingdom. The Soviets will tolerate, within limits, surrogate warfare within the developing sector. Once those limits are passed — as is approximately the case at this moment, or once, for other reasons, conflict between Atlantic and Warsaw Pact forces is engaged, full thermonuclear war erupts.

Where the political fact of the Warsaw Pact nations is at issue, the Soviets will tolerate no forms of "cabinet warfare." They will conclude that the war for the world is on, and they will stake the outcome of that on nothing less than total deployment of maximal capabilities in depth — especially the adversary's depth. They will destroy entire nations with thermonuclear weapons, in North America, Central Europe, or elsewhere, if that act will significantly enhance their certainty of winning.

British imbecility on this point flows not merely from their inability to fully probe the Soviet mind. The typical imbecility of the British ruling strata flows from their obsessive commitment to establishing the "feudal-like" Orwellian utopia which is otherwise the masturbational fantasy-obsession of every family of the Black Guelph oligarchical tradition in Europe.

They are hard-core neo-Aristotelians. Despite the deliberate lying on the subject of Plato, Aristotle et al., which pours out for the edification of the learned credulous from Oxford and Cambridge, they know the truth of

the fundamental antagonism between Plato and the evil Aristotle, and are deeply committed to the neo-Aristotelian "Persian model" policy of Philip of Macedon and the cult of Apollo.

This commitment is uppermost in the minds of the inner circles of British policymaking and intelligence services. Their promotion of the Club of Rome fraud and the Phrygian cults of Maoists, environmentalists and international terrorists reflects their inner *anti-capitalist* commitment. They desire, with obscene passion, a world of a feudal-like utopia in which the oligarchy rides to hounds, attended by servants, while a sturdy, simple minded gentry pauses from tossing manure to tug respectfully at its forelock while the gentry rides by. That evil obsession, which governed the monstrous

Bertrand Russell all his life, is the secret of the British monarchy and British intelligence networks. Any reality which purports to deny them the realization of their paranoid's oligarchical dream is a reality they refuse to admit exists.

with obscene passion, a world of a feudal-like utopia in which the oligarchy rides to hounds, attended by servants, while a sturdy, simpleminded gentry pauses from tossing manure to tug respectfully at its forelock while the gentry rides by. That evil obsession, which governed the monstrous Bertrand Russell all his life, is the secret of the British monarchy and British intelligence networks. Any reality which purports to deny them the realization of their paranoid's oligarchical dream is a reality they refuse to admit exists.