

London's Strategy:

Regional Conflicts In The Third World

Over the last few weeks, a series of border conflicts, territorial disputes, and similar conflicts, mostly in the Third World, have been either provoked or escalated such that the number of potential "hot spots" which could flare into superpower confrontation has dramatically increased. The British government and the heavily British-penetrated Carter Administration have been the major protagonists in all of them.

On one level, this development reflects the classical British manipulation of "hot spots" in order to provoke confrontations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. London's Cold War technique pummels unwilling proindustrial factions in Western Europe and the U.S. into following along with British monetarist control over the world. This time around, however, advocates of the British System who have one foot in the coffin, have designed a "final solution" to assure the survival of their interests.

Close reading of the journals of the British-dominated U.S. foreign policy makers, with Zbigniew Brzezinski and Henry Kissinger in the lead, shows that the second major aspect of these conflicts is London's intent to use them to carry out a systematic genocidal depopulation of the Third World.

London's rigged U.S.-USSR confrontation is designed to force the Soviets to back down from intervening in the regional conflicts. But if the Soviets follow this path, the oligarchical British grouping will follow through to a full thermonuclear war with the Soviet Union. This will come as soon as London feels that its first families can emigrate to the Third World, leaving behind the radioactive rubble of Western Europe and North America, without being threatened by the "inferior" races of South America, Africa, and Asia. However, the British intent and the actual results of their plan, are, of course, two different matters.

The Scenarios

Having one foot in the grave themselves, the Trilateral Commission, the New York Council on Foreign Relations, and the Bilderberg Society (i.e., the London tendency) view the wiping away of the modern state and national sovereignty as their primary task. The recurring impulse of leaders of the United States, Western Europe, and large chunks of the Third World to act in the interest of their respective national states, is seen as the biggest threat to the nexus of City of London, New York, and some commercial banks. Therefore, what London and its allies propose is either a "new world order," or a new form of "cooperation" because of the "interdependence" of the world, designed to shatter national sovereignty.

The David Rockefeller, Kissinger, Brzezinski,

Trilateral Commission call for such a new order is especially blunt: "A realistic strategy of action must take into account the major obstacles to cooperative management of interdependence," a recent commission document reads. "Obstacles of particular importance are the desire for national autonomy... the traditional concept of sovereignty aggravate(s) the tension between national policies and transnational interaction."

Samuel Huntington, a Trilateral Commission "theoretician" and high-level Defense Department official, calls the problem the "ungovernability of democracies," while Brzezinski and Huntington buddy Daniel Bell states "the national state has become too small for the big problems in life, and too big for the small problems... the national state is an ineffective instrument for dealing with the scale of major economic problems... The problem, then, is to design effective international instruments..."

What policy is to be implemented by these "international instruments?" Massive energy conservation and the resultant deindustrialization. "...The pressures of domestic politics encourage a short-term view of problems," Huntington writes. "The fact that politicians must present themselves to the voters every few years has the unfortunate effect of concentrating their attention on immediate issues... The failure of American and European politics to respond adequately to the necessity to reduce oil consumption provides a telling example." Huntington's Trilateral Commission document proposes slave labor for the Third World, a Kissingerian International Resources Bank to oversee London's looting of Third World raw materials, and the scrapping of the U.S. dollar in favor of Special Drawing Rights with the International Monetary Fund evolving into a world central bank. In short, this is the policy now being carried out by Messrs. Blumenthal, Schlesinger, Brzezinski, Kissinger, British Chancellor of the Exchequer Denis Healey, and EEC Chairman Roy Jenkins.

However, the problem still remains of how to implement these policies with the resultant removal of national sovereignty fast enough to allow the political-financial interests of these agents' patrons to survive. All of these think tankers recognize that it is impossible under present circumstances to carry out London's program. Yet they point out that the seed for creating this "world order" exists. Naturally, they see themselves as the harbingers of the new order, an idea that goes back to the 19th century founding of the Roundtable by the British oligarchical families.

The Trilateral Commission reports this view: "Many issues can be handled through a series of circles of consultation and discussion, and moving inward toward closer cooperation until, in the innermost rings, close

collaboration and coordination of policies occur among the key group."

William P. Bundy of the Council on Foreign Relations characterizes the Round Table ideal this way: "Something beyond nationalism is slowly taking root in the world. With all the discouraging developments of the last five years, the signs of a developing sense of common human destiny are present." Stanley Hoffman of Harvard calls it the "...fragile flickerings of 'universal consciousness'."

The gap between the fragile existence of London's new Round Table and its ruling over the world is to be bridged by provoked "global fragmentation," upheavals and engineered "localized conflicts." A sinister formulation of this is given by Henry Kissinger in *The Washington Review* (Vol. II, No. 1). Kissinger points out, from an explicitly British imperial view, that the nation-state emerged in the 18th and 19th centuries because the "concept of a legitimate political unit had changed." Putting forward the idea of the "world order" as the new legitimate unit, Kissinger then states: "If there is a change in the idea of a legitimate unit, you will automatically have a transformation of the international system and a period of *upheaval*; *this is one of the problems of the contemporary period.*" (emphasis added)

Even blunter than Kissinger's pseudo-intellectual babblings is think tanker Daniel Bell in *Foreign Policy* (Summer, 1977). Bell points out that unless new international institutions are formed, "global fragmentation" will result. Bell asserts that similar circumstances to today's in the 1930s brought about fascism, although Bell knows well that in fact it was the British who brought fascism and Nazism to power. Today, Bell points out, "It is highly unlikely that any of the European countries will go fascist... These movements are too discredited politically and would lack any historical legitimacy. What is more likely to happen in Europe, as well as in many other countries, is *fragmentation*..." Bell points to Basque, Catalanian, Breton, etc. terrorism and to Quebec separatism as signs of such fragmentation. He argues that Eastern Europe will suffer the same fate via the dissidents movement. More to the point, he compares the fascist gangs of the 1930s to the terrorists of today.

Could it be clearer, that the Trilateral Commission and its London masters are the sponsors of terrorism, fragmentation, and conflicts today in order to assure their "world order?"

The journals are full of material like this. The Trilateral Commission document "Towards a Renovated International System" points out that "...local conflicts could well occur with greater frequency in the next quarter century than they have in the comparable period just past." Ralf Dahrendorf, an Anglicized German who sits on the Trilateral Commission and heads the London School of Economics, points out that "...local or localized wars, and 'direct diplomacy' of a limited character" are probable. (*Foreign Affairs*, October, 1977). Remarkably, Dahrendorf says that "since we are no longer concerned with one overriding military conflict between two superpowers, the repetition of the painful and useless experiences of Europe's history in other parts of the world is by no means unlikely." Yet, Dahrendorf knows that the

European conflicts he refers to were all caused and used by the British to destroy continental unity against the British Empire! Like Bell, Dahrendorf is clearly stating who will be responsible for bringing about localized conflicts, upheaval, and fragmentation.

Finally, the Rand Corporation, a British think tank implanted in the U.S., has released yet another scenario for conflicts in Latin America and elsewhere. During Kissinger's tenure at the National Security Council and the State Department, Rand authored the conflict "scenario" which presently keeps most of the Southern Cone of Latin America in a permanent state of military mobilization over the question of a Bolivian access to the sea. Now Rand has published a document titled "U.S. Arms Transfers, Diplomacy, and Security in Latin America and Beyond." Its message is simple. Regardless of whether U.S. transfers of arms take place or not, there will be countless border conflicts in the area and "beyond." Therefore, sales of arms is encouraged.

Genocide: The Case Of Mexico

Besides the object of establishing a British-dominated "world order" by marking the globe with regional conflicts, London's object is genocide. Simple economic collapse, austerity, and starvation will not occur rapidly enough for these modern Malthusians. Lest anyone doubt this, the case of Mexico is clear enough. Daniel Bell, in the above-cited article, points out that one of the major problems for the remainder of the century is the "population tidal wave" in the Third World. Using racist terminology, Bell spins off subsidiary scenarios involving Mexico.

It is Mexico's population growth that makes Bell most hysterical. His scenarios are all centered on the necessity of sealing the U.S.-Mexico border, a move that would cause major disruption within Mexico since the Mexican workers who cross into the U.S. for work could not be absorbed into the Mexican labor force. Disruption within Mexico would, of course, lead to a military government there, Bell continues, all but saying that *genocide* is the only answer.

William Paddock of the Rockefeller Foundation has already said that depopulation of Mexico is the intent of the border-sealing policy. Paddock in 1975 stated that Mexico's population had to be reduced by half from 60 million to 30 million. Lest anyone think that Bell is merely a scenario-monger, it should be noted that he served as special emissary to Europe from President-elect Carter in December of 1976. His message to the Europeans was that they must pick up the major responsibility for the defense of Western Europe since "an explosion could occur on our southern border which would force Mr. Carter to pull back certain military units from Europe."

The Bell-Paddock scenario is now in activation. Ford Foundation, Institute for Policy Studies, and Rockefeller Foundation-controlled agents within the Chicano movement have been activated to "oppose" Carter's program for dealing with illegal Mexican workers in the U.S. by calling for Chicago separatism in the U.S. Southwest, replete with terrorism and environmentalism. This, of course, is going on while the Carter Administration begins to propose legislation and otherwise put into motion that apparatus which will lead to the sealing of the border under the Paddock and Bell plan.

The Conflicts

A close look at the other conflicts will show that *genocide* is indeed an inherent part of the scenarios. The Ethiopia-Somalia conflict on the Horn of Africa is exemplary. Former British colony Somalia's British-manipulated invasion of Ethiopia, against all international law, and other equally outlaw operations to dismember Ethiopia, if successful, would mean genocide not only for the Horn of Africa but for the entire African continent. As the Organization of African Unity has let it be known, and any African diplomat will tell you, if the principle of territorial integrity is destroyed in Ethiopia by the British-Trilateral Commission-Brzezinski combination, all of Africa will become a free-fire zone for the dismembering of the nation-states currently in existence. The continent would be set aflame with tribal genocidal warfare, with Biafra serving as the model for this modern way of dealing with the "white man's burden." Therefore, to the extent the Soviets, Cubans, and the German Democratic Republic guarantee the existence of Ethiopia, they guarantee the principles of African territorial integrity and sovereignty and minimal human rights. To that extent the Soviet role in the Horn should be supported.

In summary fashion, other local conflicts are:

South America: In March, 1976, the British monarchy gave Chile the Beagle Islands, on the Atlantic side of the tip of South America, thereby breaking the established balance that had existed between Chile and Argentina for over 70 years. Under the old arrangement, Argentina had rights to the Atlantic, with Chile retaining rights to the Pacific. Among other things, this put Britain in a better position to ward off Argentina from the oil-rich Malvinas (the Falkland Islands) which Britain took by force from Argentina in the 1830s in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. The only British claim to the islands are that the few hundred shepherders who inhabit the area want to continue being British citizens!

The other aspect of the conflict in South America is the question of Bolivian exit to the sea. This problem dates from 1879, when the British with strong opposition from the U.S. incited the Chileans to steal Peruvian and Bolivian territory in order to shore up the Rothschilds' financial integrity in the area. As pointed out before, the conflict is being run by the Rand Corp, and the Chileans continue to be the leading stooges of the scenario. The Ecuadorians have been added, and are being encouraged to try to take territory back from Peru lost during a short border war in 1941. As in the case of the Horn of Africa, an explosion of these conflicts would open up the whole of South America (including Colombia and Venezuela) to border wars which would end in Thirty Years War style chaos and genocide for the continent.

Central America: The most immediate British input into this area is around the question of the British colony of Belize. British policy now, as expressed by Foreign Secretary Owen, is to territorially divide Belize instead of guaranteeing its independence and integrity. On the other side, the unstable and puppet regime of Guatemala is being manipulated into a frenzied pitch against Belize. Before British Prime Minister Callaghan was wholeheartedly playing the hand of the City of London banks, as he is now, he had prevented a Guatemalan invasion of

Belize in 1977 by sending British troops to defend it. Callaghan took this action over the hysterical objections of Foreign Secretary Owen, who presumably cared little if Guatemala took Belize by force.

Off the Belize scenario Guatemala is also being whipped up to attack Mexico, because of Mexico's insistence on full independence with territorial integrity for Belize. Guatemala's presumed target would be Mexico's oil fields in the south.

The other Central American instabilities are well known, and have been lately escalated on the basis of Brzezinski's attempts to overthrow Nicaraguan dictator Somoza with the object of setting off chaos in the area.

This scenario is nothing but the southern aspect of the Bell-Paddock plan to destroy Mexico and its population. Only in this light can the political debacle of the Panama Canal debates be viewed. This has been made clear by Canal Treaty "supporter" Kissinger, who, even though he says that the treaty is needed to maintain stability in the area, nevertheless proposes limited sovereignty for the region and spins off visions of guerrilla warfare, Vietnams, and tens of thousands of U.S. troops in Panama.

Furthermore, Kissinger has always proposed and carried out policies of *instability* in every area of the world. The Panama Canal issue than essentially boils down to the manipulation of a situation in order to get the U.S. and especially U.S. conservative layers embroiled in a conflict scenario. So far, this manipulation is proceeding apace, without any major Republican or Democratic political force identifying the actual issue involved.

All the other major conflicts in the Third World follow the same pattern: gross violations of borders or of the principles of territorial integrity which lay the groundwork for the destruction of national sovereignty.

Besides the well known Mideast scenarios, such is the case with China's client-state Cambodia and its insane campaign of aggression against Vietnam, with the Chinese now serving as major allies of NATO. Similarly in the Southern African situation, the British are manipulating events to defend their financial interests against both African nation-builders such as A. Neto of Angola, as well as proindustrial and anti-British tendencies within the South African Afrikaner groupings.

Not accidentally, George Ball of the same Council on Foreign Relations crowd as Bell and friends, has proposed the official partition of South Africa into a white state and a black state. Ball's proposal carried to the extreme the insane racist view that is inherent in the bantustan policies of the worst of the British manipulated Afrikaners. More importantly, Ball knows that any attempt to impose on South Africa such a radical division would result in genocidal racial warfare and the destruction of the anti-British industrial potential of South Africa, along with probable war between the black frontline states and South Africa. But then, George Ball is no stranger to genocide since he's one of the leading advocates of ultra-Malthusian policies for the Third World.

Haig: War General

The military machinery for the implementation of these scenarios is rapidly being readied for actual deployment. Most notable is the new defense posture of Secretary of Defense Brown in the U.S. which heretofore

had been the exclusive warcry of Kissinger ally and NATO commander, General Haig. As put forward in the U.S. defense budget, Brown proposes a strategy of preparing U.S. forces to fight "one and a half wars." The first war is general thermonuclear war; the half war is conventional war (possibly including the use of tactical nuclear weapons) in the Third World. Brown explicitly cited the Middle East as the most likely location of such a conflict. Haig has been campaigning for years to prepare NATO to fight on its "southern" flank in the Third World. Generally, everyone has correctly seen this as a return to the MacNamara and Maxwell Taylor "flexible response" strategy which was responsible for the disaster in Vietnam.

This strategy must be understood as identical to the tactical nuclear warfare doctrine devised for the European theatre. It is designed to create a conflict in the Third World, proceeding toward U.S. intervention even to the level of Vietnam, and then to force the Soviets to "blink" and withdraw from all challenges by NATO in the Third World. In this schema, Brown, Haig, et al. hope to quickly gain the strategic advantage by controlling and destroying the Third World. Then the stage will be

set for thermonuclear war with the Soviets on NATO's terms.

Of course, the Soviets will treat this type of warfare in a similar fashion to the way they are prepared to face tactical nuclear warfare. Should they be confronted with a series of conflicts or with one large regional war (such as an explosion in the Mideast), the Soviets will not "blink." Rather they will fight a total nuclear war rather than be put in the position of waiting to be surrounded entirely through NATO hegemony in the Third World.

In short, the plans of Kissinger, Bell and their London masters to carry out genocide will result in early thermonuclear war. This war, although horrifyingly costly to the Soviets, will be lost by NATO. Anyone endorsing any of the regional conflict scenarios and using the rationalization of "Soviet expansionism" or other cover stories about any of these conflicts to justify their support is either suffering from a suicidal mania or is simply a racist British agent.

—Fernando Quijano
Director of Third World Affairs,
U.S. Labor Party