

## Clinton rebuffs Kissingerian world government ploys

by Jeffrey Steinberg

During the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the D-Day landing at Normandy, President Bill Clinton took the opportunity to voice his disdain for British one-world government schemes. First, Clinton pointedly chose not to join the majority of world dignitaries aboard Queen Elizabeth II's yacht, the *Britannia*, instead opting to cross the English Channel on June 5 aboard the *U.S.S. George Washington*. Then, he gave a shipboard interview to Cable News Network's Wolf Blitzer, in which he told the reporter: "Roosevelt and Churchill, when they thought of the United Nations, were cold-eyed realists. They never had any idea that there could be some utopian world government, where all the problems would go away."

Throughout the interview, Blitzer had attempted to badger the President over the North Korea nuclear bomb crisis. Clinton insisted that he was leaving the door open for a practical diplomatic resolution of the conflict.

Then, in a June 21, 1994 White House press conference, President Clinton was able to announce that, as the result of a "private" diplomatic initiative by former President Jimmy Carter, the Korean crisis had been, at least for the time being, cooled out.

The President's handling of the Korean crisis, whether he fully realized it or not, put him once again at loggerheads with the heirs to Lord Bertrand Russell and Winston Churchill, the manipulators of the nuclear weapons race during and immediately after World War II, who thought they could terrify world leaders into caving into their utopian one-world government schemes out of fear of thermonuclear holocaust.

For some among the British Royal Institute for International Affairs (RIIA) crowd, the Korean crisis was seen as an opportunity to manipulate a regional crisis to the point that the United States might be compelled to resort to the use of nuclear weapons, either to preemptively destroy North

Korea's nuclear reactor or in retaliation for a North Korean invasion of the South.

In his June 22 radio interview with "EIR Talks," Lyndon LaRouche explained: "The idea was to play the Korea situation . . . to get a nuclear conflict. The British, in the traditions of that evil clown Bertrand Russell, the most evil man of the 20th century, want to have another nuclear exhibition, bigger than Hiroshima and Nagasaki, to terrify the world into accepting United Nations dictatorship: blue helmets everywhere."

Bill Clinton, the student-protégé of Georgetown University's Prof. Carroll Quigley, author of one of the most astute exposés of the British one-world game, *Tragedy and Hope*, has shown an instinct on several occasions as President to go against the Anglo-American one-worlders. Hence the British, led by the Hollinger Corp. media syndicate, have been out to sink his presidency since his inauguration.

### Kissinger's Chatham House confessions

To better understand what he is up against, President Clinton would do well to read Henry Kissinger's infamous May 10, 1982 speech at Chatham House, London, the headquarters of the RIIA.

The occasion was the bicentennial of the 1782 founding of the Office of the British Foreign Secretary by Lord Shelburne and his intelligence chief Jeremy Bentham, within months of the British defeat at Yorktown. The driving purpose of Shelburne and Bentham in founding the Foreign Office was to weaken and recapture the United States.

Dr. Kissinger, who served as secretary of state and national security adviser under Presidents Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford, brazenly admitted that he had been a British agent all the while: "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."

But far more damning in Kissinger's remarks before RIIA was his scathing attack on President Franklin Roosevelt and his lurid embrace of the balance of power and nuclear blackmail dogmas of Sir Winston Churchill.

Kissinger started out by distinguishing between American and British policy: "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 politics, too rigidly anti-Soviet, too colonialist in his attitude to what is now called the Third World, and too little interested in building the fundamentally new international order towards which American idealism has always tended. The British undoubtedly saw the Americans as naive, moralistic, and evading responsibility for helping secure the global equilibrium. The dispute was resolved according to American preferences—in my view, to the detriment of postwar security."

Kissinger would return again and again to the theme of the philosophical differences between America and Britain, always taking the British "Hobbesian," "worst case" side. In a brief discussion of the Third World, Kissinger observed: "Americans from Franklin Roosevelt onward believed that the United States, with its 'revolutionary' heritage, was the natural ally of peoples struggling against colonialism; we could win the allegiance of these new nations by opposing and occasionally undermining our European allies in the areas of their colonial dominance. Churchill, of course, resisted these American pressures, as did the French and some other European powers."

### **Thermonuclear balance of terror**

But the most relevant sections of the Kissinger diatribe at Chatham House dealt with the issues once again on the table in the Korea nuclear conflict.

Kissinger lamented: "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 '40s. 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," Kissinger went on. "In a much-neglected speech at Llandudno 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? . . . 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? . . . We ought to bring matters to a head and make a final settlement. . . . 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.'

"So," Kissinger concluded, "the postwar world came into being. A precarious peace was maintained, based on a nuclear equilibrium, with occasional negotiations to ease tensions temporarily, but ultimately dependent on a balance of terror."

Lord Bertrand Russell, Churchill's senior within the hierarchy of British secret intelligence, had written a year before Churchill's Llandudno speech in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, an identical call for preemptive atomic bomb attack against the Soviet Union to force all nations of the world to surrender their sovereignty to a world government body that would have a monopoly on the weapons of mass-destruction. When the Americans balked at such a preemptive attack, Russell and his allies and successors, including Henry Kissinger and Dr. Leo Szilard, activated their fallback option: a deal with Moscow to strike a nuclear "balance of terror" to impose the identical world-government goal. When filmmaker Stanley Kubrick made his nuclear Armageddon film "Dr. Strangelove," he modeled the title character on Szilard and Kissinger.

### **British Tories hate all things American**

In his June 22 interview, Lyndon LaRouche summed up why the Kissinger-linked Hollinger Corp. crowd have been so set on destroying the Clinton presidency through transparent black-propaganda methods:

"Here you have [in President Clinton] a patriotic American . . . who says that the United States has an interest in the way the world is organized, not to have chaos, to have some kind of stability in the world. . . . He knows what the British are, he studied over there.

"The British have got a completely different agenda, which involves this U.N. world dictatorship under British philosophy, which is Bertrand Russell's way of thinking, Kissinger's way of thinking. . . .

"It's the conflict between this faction, which some might call the Thatcher-Bush animals, and a President and others who are trying to grope their way to what they perceive as a patriotic self-interested American position for stability in the world around us, a world which is very much threatened."

Since his outburst of Anglophilia at Chatham House, Henry Kissinger has elaborated his love of all things British and geopolitical. His new book, *Diplomacy*, was reviewed in the July 1994 issue of the *American Spectator*, the neo-conservative monthly run by Hollinger Corp. which has been the number-one U.S. propaganda organ for London's scandal war against the Clinton presidency. Needless to say, the *Spectator* review was full of fawning praise for Hollinger Corp. advisory board co-chair, Henry Kissinger.