

EIR Strategic Studies

How to catch a British agent

From the Editors

The editors of *EIR* are pleased to publish the third in a series of book reviews by Stu Rosenblatt, cataloguing the perfidious careers of some of the 20th century's leading British agents-of-influence within the U.S. political establishment. In our Oct. 23, 1998 issue, we published Rosenblatt's review ("How Mr. Fixit Nearly Wrecked the World") of Kai Bird's biography of John J. McCloy, *The Chairman*, with an introduction by Lyndon LaRouche ("How Our World Was Nearly Destroyed"). On March 12, 1999, we published Rosenblatt's second installment ("How Henry Stimson Bombed Hiroshima, and Nagasaki Too"), reviewing Godfrey Hodgson's book *The Colonel: The Life and Wars of Henry Stimson 1867-1950*.

It is most fitting that the third in the series of Rosenblatt reviews should take up the careers of McGeorge and William Bundy. The Bundy brothers were both sponsored into the preeminent positions they occupied in the Wall Street-centered "Eastern Liberal Establishment" by McCloy and Stimson; and, as you will read here, they were responsible for many of the wretched, British-steered turns in American foreign policy and national outlook, during the period between the end of World War II and the beginning of the Reagan Presidency. Their legacy lives on in the persons of Henry A. Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Samuel Huntington, to name just three of their most immediate protégés who remain active today.

The LaRouche-Bundy wars

The Bundy case is of special significance for another reason. McGeorge Bundy was the first leader of the City of

London/Wall Street faction to engage in political "hand-to-hand combat" with Lyndon LaRouche and the political movement that LaRouche founded during the mid-1960s. The first such confrontation took place at the time of the Columbia University student strike in the spring of 1968, when Bundy, through the Ford Foundation, was bankrolling the Weathermen terrorist group, and LaRouche was educating a group of student strike leaders on the need to broaden the strike to take up issues of concern to all New Yorkers: the collapse of education, the "red-lining" of whole areas of the city by real estate speculators, slave-labor wages in the garment center, and so on.

The following year, LaRouche and his followers clashed with Bundy and the entire Ford Foundation-bankrolled New Left, by supporting the New York City Teachers Federation in its strike against Bundy's "community control" wrecking campaign against the New York City school system. LaRouche penned a devastating exposé of the Bundy policies at that time, in a widely circulated pamphlet titled "The New Left, Local Control, and Fascism." LaRouche identified the policies of Bundy's Ford Foundation, the International Monetary Fund, and the nascent environmentalist movement as being no different than those of Adolf Hitler's Economics Minister, Hjalmar Schacht.

LaRouche's arrival on the political scene provoked a strong, personal reaction from Bundy. The reason is clear, and it dates back to a debate on economic policy at New York's Queens College in 1971, between LaRouche and Prof. Abba Lerner. As LaRouche describes it in his autobiography, he forced Lerner, a Keynesian social democrat, to



“Eastern Liberal Establishment” representatives McGeorge (left) and William Bundy played key roles in ushering the technology-proud, culturally optimistic U.S. population through a paradigm-shift into a post-industrial New Dark Age. As head of the Ford Foundation, McGeorge Bundy clashed with Lyndon LaRouche during the late 1960s and 1970s.

admit that his own economic philosophy would lead to the kind of austerity that Hjalmar Schacht had imposed on pre-Hitler and Hitler Germany. Cornered, Lerner snarled that if Weimar Germany had only adopted the measures which Schacht introduced under the Nazi regime, Hitler might have been avoided. After that debate, Lerner’s crony Prof. Sidney Hook declared: “LaRouche defeated Lerner in the debate, but he lost the war.”

The “establishment” had determined that LaRouche was a “potential dangerous adversary” who would be blocked, at every turn, from changing the direction of American policy.

At the time of the debate, LaRouche had already sized up the implications of President Richard Nixon’s disastrous, politically and economically fatal decision to take the dollar off the gold-backed, fixed-exchange-rate monetary system that had been formed in 1944 at the Bretton Woods conference convened by President Franklin Roosevelt. LaRouche foresaw that the Nixon decision would bring on an epoch of financial instability, speculation, and, ultimately, the crash of the system itself.

It was the Bundy gang that assessed that LaRouche represented a revival of the traditional American System outlook, which they had all but eradicated from the national conscience. Years later, as LaRouche’s political impact broke through the walls of containment erected by Bundy et al.—by years of FBI “Cointelpro” harassment (and at least one officially acknowledged assassination plot, in 1973-74), and by a systematic smear campaign through the establishment media—Bundy acolyte Kissinger personally solicited an ille-

gal FBI “national security” program to shut down the LaRouche movement altogether. During this period, McGeorge Bundy’s son, Steven Bundy, provided *pro bono* legal representation to one of the leading “Get LaRouche” poison-pens, Dennis King.

London’s Wall Street

There is a deeper significance to the Bundy case, as well as to the profiles of McCloy and Stimson, which goes to the issue of the real history of the United States. During the Second World War, individuals such as McCloy, Stimson, Harvey Bundy (father of McGeorge and William), and Dean Acheson, were part of a British-steered factor in American life that was formally referred to by its major participants as the “British-American-Canadian” group. Kissinger described this group, in his May 10, 1982 speech before his superiors at the Royal Institute for International Affairs’ Chatham House in London, as more devoted to the outlook and policies of Winston Churchill than to those of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whom Kissinger derided as a “moralistic American.”

Although Britain has shed the outward trappings of empire, the fact is that, today, what is now referred to as the “British-American-Commonwealth” (BAC) apparatus, is more powerful, in financial, economic, and political terms, than at any point since the era of Queen Victoria and her son, “The Prince of the Isles,” Edward Albert (King Edward VII).

One important component of that BAC power is Wall Street, which has been a hub of British treason against the

American Revolution and the American System since the founding of the Republic. Aaron Burr, the assassin of the first Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton, embodied the British treason on Wall Street.

Burr, who fell one vote short of becoming President of the United States, was an agent of Jeremy Bentham and Lord Shelburne, America's leading British adversaries in the American Revolution. Shelburne ran the "Secret Committee" of the British East India Company and pioneered Britain's opium war policy. He nearly succeeded in wrecking the nascent United States by Anglo-American free-trade subversion, before the nation was saved at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia.

During the 19th century, City of London-Wall Street figure Martin Van Buren did become President of the United States, after running the Presidency of Andrew Jackson. August Belmont, the formal representative of the British Rothschild family interests on Wall Street, was, for decades, the head of the Democratic Party, from which position he played a pivotal role in launching the Southern secessionist drive to break up America's noble experiment.

In other words, Wall Street, throughout American history, has been an epicenter of British treason. In the World War II and postwar periods, the names Stimson, McCloy, and Bundy deserve the same "Made in the City of London" label as Burr, Van Buren, Belmont, et al. did earlier.

Real power centers

The power of the Wall Street crowd today is still widely misunderstood. From key positions in banking, academia, the media, and, especially, the legal profession, the leaders of "the liberal establishment" exert extraordinary power over our elected officials. Their real centers of power inside the government are not, however, as most people foolishly believe, in the CIA. Look instead at the Department of Justice, particularly the permanent bureaucracy, which is run, from outside the government, by Wall Street lawyers. Look at the "white shoe" bureaucrats of the State Department, whom FDR labeled as "more British than the British." Years ago, LaRouche referred to this Wall Street apparatus as "the real CIA."

This Wall Street component of the BAC complex is far from invincible. Just consider that it is the Wall Street establishment which has produced two generations of George Bushes who have stumbled and blundered their way across the American political stage.

To the extent that more and more citizens of this Republic, and nations around the world, come to understand this BAC phenomenon, and the idea that much of Wall Street serves at the beck and call of London, this leviathan can be soundly defeated, particularly as *their* post-Bretton Woods, would-be one-world system moves ever closer to the point of evaporation. Hence, *EIR's* continuing commitment to provide you with the necessary historical ammunition to help defeat this alien virus.

Book Review

How the Bundy family ruined America

by Stu Rosenblatt

The Color of Truth

by Kai Bird

New York, Simon & Schuster, 1998

496 pages, hardbound

Gray is the color of truth.

—McGeorge Bundy, May 1967 speech about Vietnam at the Cosmos Club, Washington, D.C.

Despite President Bill Clinton's generally good intentions, U.S. foreign policy, as steered by his so-called Principals Committee, is drifting in the direction of war. Following disastrous and senseless military operations against Iraq and Serbia, U.S. relations with Russia and China—two countries with which the President has sought a partnership—have run aground. Secessionist wars are raging in Russia's Northern Caucasus, in the volatile India-Pakistan border region of Kashmir, and in the Pacific archipelago. The British drive to extend NATO to the borders of Russia, coincident with an ambitious raw-materials grab by London-centered cartels in the Caspian Sea basin and Central Asia, are driving Russia to contemplate a new military doctrine based on the limited use of nuclear weapons.

The warning signs are all there. If current trends are not soon reversed, the United States and the world may be on an unstoppable path toward a nuclear war.

We are dangerously close to repeating, step by step, the mistakes made four decades ago, when we blundered into the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Vietnam War, this time with potentially more catastrophic consequences. Then, as now, we had a President, John F. Kennedy, who was personally opposed to such a war-vectored policy, but who was continuously undercut and betrayed by a crew of formal and informal "advisers" more loyal to Britain and to British geopolitical thinking than to their Commander in Chief.

If we are to avoid a repeat of the disasters and blunders of the past, we must break the vise-grip on American policymaking enjoyed by what Lyndon LaRouche has labelled the British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) cabal.