

Instead of doing that, the Anglo-Americans insisted on applying to Eastern Europe, and to Soviet reforms, the radical monetarist austerities which had brought about the collapse of the Anglo-American world monetary system itself, or is bringing it about.

The result was, that the opportunity in the East was lost, in consequence of the visible effects of the so-called Jeffrey "Hjalmar Schacht" Sachs austerity program in Poland. The attempt to apply that to the Soviet Union, as a reform condition, blew up the possibility of any future reform process in the Soviet Union, particularly under conditions that the United States was eager to reach a combination with Moscow upon any conditions, out of U.S. and Anglo-American zeal to begin the war against Arab and other nationalities to the south.

As a result of all this, what we now have is a resurgence of Soviet power, albeit in civil war-pregnant conditions, an explosion of the Balkans along the lines which I indicated back in 1988, to such effect that the growing war of the United States against the world Islamic populations, which is what the war in the Persian Gulf is becoming, is an appendage of a revived East-West conflict.

We now see that the United States and Britain have stripped defenses in Western Europe, to beef up the assault force in the Gulf region. The result is that Europe is weakened as the Soviet forces reconsolidate themselves. One would say of this, that we are seeing the enactment again of Lenin's famous slogan, "two steps backward, one step forward." The Soviets took two steps backward to consolidate their position under difficult conditions, and are now exploiting the follies of the United States and Britain in launching war in the Middle East, to create the opportunity to build up their strength again in Moscow. And, as the United States and Britain collapse, the prospect is, that Moscow will come to dominate by overweening force, continental Western Europe, and also Japan. In that reconfiguration of the globe, while the United States is stuck in a race and religious war with the Islamic population of the world, and others, we see the makings of a prospective World War III.

Of all of this, one can say that a nation which exhibits a total loss of elementary morality in its leading institutions, as was demonstrated, for example, in the prosecution against me and my friends by a totally corrupted judicial and executive system, and a nation which prides itself on imposing austerity upon the homeless and hungry and underprivileged in its own nation, that nation lacks the moral fitness to survive. And that lack of moral fitness so exhibited in its domestic affairs, cannot but impose itself upon the foreign relations of the same state.

If the United States does not change its ways very soon, in a direction which the late Rev. Martin Luther King would admire much more than the present circumstances, the United States is not going to survive—in point of fact, unless we change, we're headed right now toward World War III.

## Bertrand Russell's 'final solution'

by Carol White and Jeffrey Steinberg

While Adolf Hitler is generally accepted to be the most evil man of this century, it is arguably true that Bertrand Russell and the men around him were evil beyond Hitler's wildest dreams.

These were the people who created the phenomena of Hitler and of creatures like Pol Pot of Cambodia. It was the Russellites who undertook to transform Western Christian civilization by systematically attacking every aspect of classical culture, whether in the fields of art, philosophy, science, or the interpretation of history. Russell and his friends Aldous and Julian Huxley deliberately created the rock-drug-sex counterculture. They argued for the *right* of children to use drugs and to be sexually exploited; they denied that every child, or even most, should be educated to the point of functional literacy.

These men were the policy shapers and ideologues for the British ruling elite, an oligarchy centered on the British crown, and including leading representatives of the aristocratic families of England, who had been actively involved with the British East India Company and international drug trafficking, as well as the civil service and colonial management, over more than a century.

So when President Bush, in a Jan. 17 address, described the U.S. attack on Iraq as a historic moment, which was ushering in "a new world order," he was reflecting the imperial aims of these men. What he said precisely was: "This is an historic moment. We have in this past year made great progress in ending the long era of conflict and cold war. We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order, a world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, governs the conduct of nations.

"When we are successful—and we will be—we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.S.'s founders."

The role which Bush envisages for a supranational police force, operating under Anglo-American imperialist control, is not to establish peace, but to act as a battering ram against any nation, such as Iraq or Brazil, which is not willing to accept colonial status. It is the fantastic hope of Bush, and of the British elite whom he serves—typified by Prince

Philip—to destroy, once and for all, the republican hopes of the Third World.

### The ‘Persian model’

The “new” order is at least as old as the Persian, Babylonian, and successor empires, such as the Roman and British empires. It is based upon the most vicious racism imaginable, according to which whole sections of the human race are deemed expendable, to be killed or enslaved. Russell’s credo was expressed by Charles Dilke, a liberal member of the British Parliament in the 1880s, who wrote the book *Greater Britain*, which was a bestseller in its day. Dilke stated clearly the basis for the new world order:

“In America we have seen the struggle of the dear races against the cheap—the endeavors of the English to hold their own against the Irish and Chinese. In New Zealand, we found the stronger and more energetic race pushing from the earth the shrewd and laborious descendants of the Asian Malays; in Australia, the English triumphant, and the cheaper races excluded from the soil not by distance merely, but by arbitrary legislation; in India, we saw the solution of the problem by the officering of the cheaper by the dear race. Everywhere, we have found that the difficulties which impede the progress to universal dominion of the English people lie in the conflict with the cheaper races.”

Another member of this grouping, Halford Mackinder, identified what he called the “Heartland,” as a region which the British must control at all costs. He wrote: “The Heartland, for the purposes of strategical thinking, includes the Baltic Sea, the navigable Middle and Lower Danube, the Black Sea, Asia Minor, Armenia, Persia, Tibet, and Mongolia.”

To control this it was necessary to ensure that neither Germany, nor Japan, nor Russia develop the capability to threaten British hegemony. They must be prevented from exploiting the cultural potentials embodied in Christianity—the capability of achieving a technological surge by tapping the creative potential of each man and woman best accomplished through a republican form of government. The British used two strategies to achieve their aims. One was cultural and political subversion by covertly sponsoring anarchist, terrorist movements which were used to murder actual or political opponents of the monarchy, and to overturn republican governments. The other was to maintain the “balance of power” by fomenting wars, so that the perceived enemies of the British would destroy each other.

### Why Russell wanted the bomb dropped

It was from this perspective that Bertrand Russell called for the deployment, preemptively, of the atomic bomb against the Soviet population at the close of the Second World War. In his 1951 book *The Impact of Science on Society*, he expressed his racism. Accusing those who promoted development and uncontrolled population growth for the developing sector—and ostensibly accusing them of responsibility

for poverty in these countries—his underlying racist assumptions are nonetheless clear. He wrote sarcastically: “At present the population of the world is increasing at about 58,000 per diem. War, so far, has had no very great effect on this increase, which continued throughout each of the world wars. . . . War has hitherto been disappointing in this respect . . . but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could spread throughout the world once in every generation, survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. The state of affairs might be unpleasant, but what of it?”

As is well known, Adolf Hitler had many British supporters, such as King Edward VIII, although it is not common knowledge that for a time, Winston Churchill was among them. According to Oswald Mosley’s autobiography, *A Life of Contrasts*, Churchill stated in 1935: “It is not possible to form a just judgment of a public figure who has attained the enormous dimensions of Adolf Hitler until his life work as a whole is before us. . . . History is replete with examples of men who have risen to power by employing stern, grim and even frightful methods. . . . He has succeeded in restoring Germany to the most powerful position in Europe.”

In 1935 the British still hoped to engineer a well-contained war between Germany and the Soviet Union, which would allow the British to sit on the sidelines, while their two potential rivals destroyed each other. This plan was scotched by the Hitler-Stalin Pact, which forced the British to enter the war directly, backed by U.S. military might. There is no contradiction in Britain’s ultimate opposition to the Nazis and their predilection for a fascist state. The issue, for them, was never democracy; rather, it was the strictly Hobbesian issue of who would rule the world.

Lord Lothian, Great Britain’s ambassador to the United States at the start of the Second World War, was a confirmed enthusiast of Hitler’s methods. He had several private meetings with Hitler, in which he tried to work out a power-sharing agreement, in which Britain and Nazi Germany would jointly police the world.

As late as June 1939, a German account of a private meeting which took place at Lord Astor’s home at Cliveden with Viscount Halifax, the British foreign secretary, and Adam von Trott zu Solz, for the Nazis, reports on how Lothian fought to put a British-Nazi condominium in place. His plans for a new order are, not so strangely, reminiscent of the aspirations of President Bush and Margaret Thatcher for a condominium deal with Mikhail Gorbachov.

The minutes of the meeting, as reproduced in a biography of Lord Lothian by J.R.M. Butler, state that “Lothian—asking that he should not be mentioned as the originator of the idea—had suggested that if it were even now possible for the Führer to give Bohemia their full national independence back again on condition of an effectual limitation of their armaments and economic cooperation with Germany, such an action would, in his view, have a revolutionary effect on

British public opinion, and consequently on the freedom of action of the British government and on world opinion in general. Hitler would, with one blow, disarm his bitterest enemies abroad, restore confidence in Europe, and thereby lend to the British desire for understanding. . . . If Germany led but did not dominate Central and Eastern Europe, the Western European nations could then feel reassured about their political independence. England-America [which Lothian naturally likes to regard as one—ed.] and Germany, as the only real Great Powers, could then jointly shape and guarantee the future of world politics. This picture of the future had occupied his mind after his conversations with the Führer, and he still could not believe it was finally impossible.”

### Subverting U.S. technological optimism

In the postwar period, the British continued to look for world domination. To do this, they had, of course, to recapture the United States *de facto*, if not *de jure*. In 1959, Russell laid out his prolegomena for a postwar new world order, entitled *The Future of Science*. “Science has increased man’s control over nature,” Russell wrote, “and might therefore be supposed likely to increase his happiness and well-being. This would be the case if men were rational, but in fact they are bundles of passions and instincts. . . .

“Modern industrialism is a struggle between nations for two things, markets and raw materials, as well as for the sheer pleasure of dominion. The labor which is set free from providing the necessaries of life tends to be more and more absorbed by national rivalry. . . .

“The world becomes more and more of an economic unity. Before very long the technical conditions will exist from organizing the whole world as one producing and consuming unit. If when that time comes, two rival groups contend for mastery, the victor may be able to introduce that single worldwide organization that is needed to prevent the mutual extermination of civilized nations. . . . There would be at first economic and political tyranny of the victors, a dread of renewed upheavals, and therefore a drastic suppression of liberty. But if the first half-dozen revolts were successfully repressed, the vanquished would give up hope, and accept the subordination assigned to them by the victor in the great world-trust. . . . Life at first might be unpleasant, but it at least would be possible, which would be enough to recommend the system after a long period of warfare.”

Russell wrote that in 1959, just one year before America’s great advocate of the promise of science, John F. Kennedy, was elected President. Not only was Kennedy assassinated, but the conspirators who were responsible, had protection at the highest level. It was the death of Kennedy and the policies for which he stood—encapsulated in the landing of an American on the Moon—which allowed Henry A. Kissinger to become the evil genius of the American political scene.

# Dr. Strangelove and the Pugwash story

by Carol White and Jeffrey Steinberg

Starting in 1982, Lyndon LaRouche and the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF) conducted an international campaign to urge that the Atlantic Alliance begin a crash program to develop an alternative to the insane doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD) most prominently then associated with the name of Henry A. Kissinger. Not only was MAD an incompetent strategy for war avoidance, but worse yet, the documentation existed to prove that the Soviet Union was moving unilaterally and secretly to develop its own “strategic defense initiative” based on the most advanced physical principles.

In a seminar on beam weapons held by the FEF in Paris, France on March 24, 1984, LaRouche laid out his program for the alliance. To elucidate the situation then faced by NATO, of the threatened Soviet superiority in anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense systems, it was necessary for LaRouche to explain the role of Bertrand Russell’s Pugwash Conferences movement, which was the inspiration for Kissinger’s policy of MAD and its twin brother, *détente*.

LaRouche explained the British-inspired policies which had already led to two world wars in the century, and which were creating the conditions in which we might be forced to fight in a third one. He said: “Let me go back to what the problem is, at least as the United States is concerned. During the last period of the last war, the United States had a policy for the postwar period. The moment that President Roosevelt was dead, within 24 hours of his death, every scrap of his postwar policy had been destroyed by the U. S. State Department. . . .

“The problem has been that we, in the postwar period, and particularly in the so-called Atlanticist, or Anglo-American alliance, have followed a modified form of the same policies that caused two world wars in this century. A form that is far worse than the policies of the early part of this century or the policy of the 1920s and 1930s. . . . Every foreign policy and particularly every military strategic policy of the Anglo-American allies in NATO, has been dictated by a group of people working with and led by the most evil man of the twentieth century, the late Lord Bertrand Russell.

“Bertrand Russell and his crowd authored two phases of postwar military policy, in particular. First, in 1946, Bertrand Russell and his people, as Russell reported in the October 1946 issue of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, declared that there must be a world government agency, to have