
Interview: Lyndon LaRouche

Defeat for Nazi wing of British Tory Party

British Prime Minister John Major won the leadership contest in his Conservative Party on July 4, with 218 votes by Tory parliamentarians, compared to 89 votes for challenger John Redwood, and some 20 abstentions. The London Times, in an editorial the next day, characterized the vote as a triumph, not for Major, but for Labour Party leader Tony Blair. "Conservative MPs threw away their last best opportunity to win the next general election," the paper wrote. "Accordingly the happiest-looking man on television after the result was not John Major but Tony Blair. He has the outcome he wanted. He can confidently expect the government to stumble on now until it is forced out of office."

In an interview with Mel Klenetsky on the weekly radio program "EIR Talks" on July 5, Lyndon LaRouche had a quite different perspective:

EIR: I wanted to begin with a discussion of the recent Conservative Party vote in England. Prime Minister John Major, in a great deal of political difficulty, put it to his party to vote on whether he should remain the head of the party or not, and he did win that vote. But a lot of people, including the *London Times*, are saying that that's not the real issue at this point. Regardless of the vote that he got, the real issue is that Tony Blair of the Labour Party is the real winner. What do you think?

LaRouche: First of all, take the easiest part about it. Tony Blair or the Labour Party probably are the real winners. Major has won, but that means he's merely transitional, on the same track—the defeat of the Conservative Party as a whole—as he was before.

Now, let's look at another part of the thing, to see the thing in full perspective.

It was obvious, I think, to people who followed the relevant press, that both President Clinton and [Chancellor Helmut] Kohl in Germany and [President Jacques] Chirac in France, were among those trans-Atlantic leaders who are visibly moving to strengthen Major against the forces within the Conservative Party which Lord William Rees-Mogg (Clinton's enemy, by the way), represents. Rees-Mogg is a real nasty fascist. He makes Hitler look almost like a country gentleman, and that's not really an exaggeration.

Now, on the European side, however, there's a differ-

ence between some of the Americans and the Europeans. The President of the United States obviously is not *for* the Labour Party operation on the continent of Europe. His top allies are Kohl, in a sense; at least, he has a special relationship with Germany, and Kohl is the chancellor; and he's done things to try to strengthen Kohl as a figure of international significance. He also has an understanding now with Jacques Chirac, the new President of France, who, on a number of issues, is probably closer to the President than Kohl is.

The Europeans tend to think that the Labour Party option in Britain, is to be desired. In Germany, there are those who are not supporters of Kohl, who are behind the Red-Green coalition, as it's called currently in North Rhine-Westphalia now, who want a Labour Party because of Social Democratic considerations on the continent.

So, it's a mess. What, in that context, is the motivation of Clinton together with Chirac, for example, and possibly also Kohl?

What Redwood represented was very little. He's a figure of no charm, shall we say. But he does represent a stalking-horse for Lord Rees-Mogg and what Rees-Mogg represents. In other words, he represents the real cave-man Nazi types within the Conservative Party, who are, among other things, anti-European. But they're the real troglodytes, the real Nazi Party of Britain in that wing of the Conservative Party.

Therefore, the concern on the part of Washington, Paris, and Bonn-Berlin, is: We don't want this bunch of Nazis to carry the Conservative Party down to what is going to be its inevitable defeat anyway; we want to *minimize* in the world the influence of this bunch of Nazis typified by Lord Rees-Mogg, by Peregrine Worsthorne, or by the *American Spectator* and Conrad Black crowd, also behind Ambrose Evans-Pritchard and so forth in the United States, behind our Newt Gingriches; Newt Gingrich is an asset of these British fascists, as is, of course, the senator from Texas, Sen. [Phil] Gramm.

So the point is, we don't want these people getting any power, credibility. We want to get rid of this Gingrich-Gramm crowd in the Republican Party. If Dole takes the leadership of the Republican Party, I think I'd be a little bit more happy than to have these other guys in there. But essentially, we want to defeat these extreme right-wingers in the coming 1996 election. Here, we don't want them coming up even as an influential force from Britain into the United States, or into continental Europe.

So in a sense, the Major victory, while it presages a defeat for Major and the Conservative Party in the not-too-distant future, was nonetheless, for many of us, a relatively happy event, in the sense that the extreme right wing, the Nazi wing of the British Conservative Party, was put back into a corner and is not going to be as influential as it would have been, had Major gone down to defeat in this contest.