

Continued from page 15

state status, but is openly driving for a new global empire, under various guises, such as the British Commonwealth of States and the so-called “Blair Doctrine.”

In addition to the Maastricht Treaty treachery, which has caused the continental European system of sovereign currencies and credit instruments to evaporate, the pivotal nations of Germany, France, and Italy have been hit by “political corruption” scandals—aimed, not at reforming the political institutions, but at decimating them.

The same thing is true in the United States. It was, as *EIR* has documented, the London-based Hollinger Corp. media cartel that played the pivotal role in the six-year assault on the Clinton Presidency, which ultimately led to Clinton’s impeachment by the House of Representatives and his trial (and acquittal) in the Senate.

With President Clinton distracted by grand jury appearances before special prosecutor Kenneth Starr, and the House and Senate partisan impeachment wars, Vice President Gore, Secretary of State Albright, and others in the Principals’ Committee of senior Cabinet officials, delivered the United States as a willing ally of London’s war and chaos efforts, first against Sudan, next against Iraq, and, finally, against Yugoslavia.

Vice President Gore flaunted his own role in the drive against the nation-state by convening a two-day “anti-corruption” event at the U.S. State Department in February 1999, with the noteworthy participation of Transparency International (TI) and the World Bank. TI was launched as a World Bank project, to dismantle the governing political institutions of targeted countries, from Africa, to Southeast Asia, to continental Europe. Indeed, it was a group of jacobin magistrates allied with TI that launched the so-called “Clean Hands” campaign against both the major political parties of Italy, the Christian Democracy and the Socialist Party.

Following the same script, the TI-linked network, with strong backing from London, is now conducting the same kind of assault against the political and industrial institutions of Germany and France.

In summary

Lyndon LaRouche commissioned this special report in order to provide an overview of the process of disintegration already under way. Even those readers who may be familiar with some of the details presented in the pages that follow, lack the necessary comprehensive overview of the scale of assault on the nation-state system that is under way.

In the history of mankind, the nation-state has proven to be the only system by which individual human beings have had the opportunity to realize their God-given capacity for creative discovery. Disintegrate the nation-state system, through the kind of multi-faceted assault documented in this report, and mankind is certain to plunge into a New Dark Age, lasting for several generations, at best. Destroy the nation-

state system, and the oligarchs in London—typified by Prince Philip, who has expressed his desire to be reincarnated as a deadly virus that would decimate populations—will drive this planet into a living Hell, as they plunder all of the raw materials and industrial assets left to grab.

As LaRouche has emphasized, the United States was founded as the most perfect expression of the republican nation-state principle in history, to date. Despite the erosion of its institutions and principles, and despite the treachery of Wall Street, the Al Gores, the Bushes, and so on, the United States remains a bulwark of the nation-state system to this day. It is all but impossible to conceive of the nation-state system surviving this present onslaught, without the United States taking a leading role in defeating the London-centered oligarchy’s present efforts. This, in turn, places a tremendous responsibility on the shoulders of the American people, as well as the elected institutions of government.

The assassins of the nation-state

by Michele Steinberg

In the last decade, the international oligarchy concocted various “theories” of the “dysfunctional nation-state,” identifying it as the cause of wars and the impediment to progress, in order to justify globalism and free trade, the very tools the oligarchy uses to implement genocide.

A network of institutions, most of them incorporated as private or semi-private organizations, such as the “Project Democracy” apparatus built up during the regime of former U.S. President Sir George H.W. Bush, runs coordinated, but secret campaigns of attack against nation-states, as indicated in the accompanying articles. The report below constitutes a “Who’s Who” of some of the key individuals and institutions running this assault.

The current attack on the nation-state had precursors grounded in the neo-Malthusian movement launched in 1963 by Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, and consort to Queen Elizabeth II, who has said he wishes to “be reincarnated as a deadly virus” to reduce the human population. Philip created the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) to promote genocide, and to reassert in a new form Britain’s stranglehold over Africa and other former colonial areas. In Philip’s view, *no former colony was ever to develop*.

But Philip’s WWF empire scheme required allies:

- In the early 1970s, the **Club of Rome**, a Malthusian outfit headed by Aurelio Peccei, became the launching-pad for the “popular” version of the environmentalist, zero-

growth movement. Peccei explicitly attacked the nation-state as the enemy of Malthusianism.

- In 1973, the **Trilateral Commission**, co-founded by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Henry Kissinger with David Rockefeller's money, became an effective means to attack the United States from within. In December 1974, Kissinger, a self-confessed operative for the British Foreign Office and Secretary of State to President Gerald Ford, joined Prince Philip's plan for genocide. Kissinger oversaw the writing of National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM) 200, which said that the United States, the UN, and "other international bodies" would have to employ "vigorous efforts" against countries with high population growth, to reduce their population. NSSM 200 singled out "India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nigeria, Mexico, Indonesia, Brazil, the Philippines, Thailand, Egypt, Turkey, Ethiopia, and Colombia." On this list are the targets of the current wars and chaos (e.g., India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Colombia); other countries on the list, such as Ethiopia, barely exist today.



Aurelio Peccei

The assassins in their own words

In 1993-94, key theoreticians, including Samuel Huntington, of the New York Council on Foreign Relations; Gerald Segal, of the International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS) in London; and Zbigniew Brzezinski, Trilateral Commission founder, now at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, D.C., were unleashed against the nation-state, especially targetting Russia and China for dismemberment.

These hired guns for the oligarchy are backed by a network of propagandists who explicitly call for establishing a zone of prosperity, surrounded by a modern version of the old Roman Empire *limes*, the wall of fortification, outside which lay a *terra incognita* of chaos, disease, famine, and death. In books such as *The Empire and the New Barbarians (L'Empire et Les Nouveaux Barbares: Rupture Nord-Sud* [Paris: Hachette-Pluriel, 1992]), by Jean-Christophe Rufin, the *limes* idea is graphically depicted (though not endorsed by the author). Another book, *The Real World Order: Zones of Peace; Zones of Turmoil* (Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House, 1993), by Max Singer and Aaron Wildovsky, proposes that the nation-state be ended and replaced by a "wall of fortification."

Here are some statements of the anti-nation-state theoreticians:

Samuel Huntington: Author of "The Clash of Civilizations" in the Summer 1993 *Foreign Affairs*, the magazine of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, writes:

"World politics is entering a new phase . . . the end of history, the return of traditional rivalries between nation-states, and the decline of the nation-state from the conflicting pulls of tribalism and globalism. . . . It is my hypothesis [that] . . . the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. . . . The *clash of civilizations will dominate global politics.*" Huntington says that the economic cohesion of the nation-state will break down, and wars between any combination of Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Slavic-Orthodoxy, and various tribes in Africa, will dominate the globe and will result in "torn countries." He says, "The Soviet Union and Yugoslavia are candidates for dismemberment. . . . These are torn countries. . . . The most obvious and prototypical torn country is Turkey. . . . For the U.S., Mexico is the most immediate torn country."

Huntington, a co-founder of the Trilateral Commission, accompanied Brzezinski into the Jimmy Carter administration, where they promoted the "Arc of Crisis" policy, to engulf in war a swath of territory from Egypt to the Transcaucasus. He also wrote the *Crisis of Democracy*, published in 1976, which put forward the doctrine that "human rights" overrides national sovereignty.

Gerald Segal: The May/June 1994 *Foreign Affairs* featured an article by Segal entitled "China's Changing Shape." He wrote "Never in China's history has such a push for decentralization been accompanied by the pull of so many outside forces. In an age when empires disintegrate . . . can China be immune to revolutionary change?" Illustrating his point with a map that divides China into the "Inner Empire" and the "Outer Empire," Segal adds, "Unlike Hong Kong, Taiwan is not necessarily on an inexorable road to unity with China."

Zbigniew Brzezinski: In his book *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* (New York: Basic Books, 1997), he argues for the rule of empire: "Hegemony is as old as mankind. But America's current global supremacy is distinctive in the rapidity of its emergence. . . . [After World War II] the next fifty years were dominated by the bipolar American-Soviet context for power. In some respects, the contest between the U.S. and the Soviet Union represented



Samuel Huntington



Zbigniew Brzezinski

the fulfillment of the geopoliticians' fondest theories. It pitted the world's leading maritime power . . . against the world's leading land power. . . . And each used its ideology to reinforce its hold over its respective vassals and tributaries, reminiscent of the age of religious warfare. . . . The collapse of its rival left the U.S. in a unique position. It became simultaneously the first and the only truly global power. . . . Rome comes to mind . . . [but] the Roman empire was not truly a global power."

Martin van Creveld, a military history lecturer at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, writes on "the future of warfare." The content of his "future" has made him a hero of the "New Dark Age" faction internationally, as he insists that the era of the sovereign nation-state and the principles underlying the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia (by which peace came to a Europe ravaged by the Thirty Years' War) have come to an end, and there will be an increasing trend toward the establishment of "private armies" and other manifestations of feudalism. In a recent interview, he stressed: "The state as a kind of organization has outlived itself. The future lies in one of either two directions, either there are larger and more sophisticated supranational organizations, like the European Union, or there will be Chechnyas. Many places will become new Chechnyas. States can no longer make it. In many places, we will see things heading in more primitive directions, as we see now in large parts of Africa and Asia, where there are pre-state conditions. . . . The best candidate for break-up now, is Indonesia. I have been saying for the last couple of years . . . it is a prime candidate for a major civil war."

Juan Enriquez Cabot, who teaches at Harvard and descends from the American opium-trading Cabot Lodge family, in an article entitled "Too Many Flags" in the Fall 1997 *Foreign Policy*, says that "the stereotype that only weak and underdeveloped countries produce new states . . . is wrong." The Western Hemisphere "has seemed to be immune from secessionist impulses. But boundaries . . . are [not] as stable as they appear." In a Sept. 21, 1999 interview, he explained: "One of the consequences [of globalization], is that all of a sudden the people who are generating most of the wealth in your country, are not focussed on the internal markets of the country. . . . And, the size of the country itself matters much less. . . . Some of the richest and fastest-growing countries in Latin America are actually small countries. You start getting Costa Rica and Uruguay developing on a par or faster than the large countries. . . ."

"The Soviet Union is now back to the borders it had, or Russia is back to the borders that it had, in the 1740s. And, I suspect that they are going to continue cleaving new states until there is a clear value added to the central government. . . . [Chechnya and Dagestan are] symbols of what will happen unless that country is able to generate a common sense of purpose, and start delivering something. . . . [But,] that isn't the critical issue for the Soviet Union [sic]. It's whether the Soviet Union—Russia—splits east-west."

The globalizers

Under the banner of "globalization," a handful of key institutions are running the destabilizations of countries on a day-by-day, even an hour-by-hour basis. Many of these operate as non-governmental organizations (NGOs) through the United Nations.

Leading the globalist charge are the international financial institutions (IFIs): the **International Monetary Fund (IMF)** and the **World Bank**, which, together with their allies among the blood-sucking international hedge funds (of which George Soros's Quantum Fund S.A. is the best known), can cut a nation's access to credit, and destroy its currency and credit rating in a matter of days.

IMF Managing Director **Michel Camdessus** kicked off a new era of assault on the nation-states in 1997, when he appeared at an international conference of **Transparency International (TI, an NGO)** and called for a "new French Revolution" by the Third World's *sans culottes* (financed and backed by the IMF and other globalizers), to bring down selected government leaders, beginning with Indonesia President Suharto. Within the year, Suharto was ousted.



Michel Camdessus

For decades, the IMF has used "conditionalities" to impose genocide. In return for loans, countries are forced to give the IMF control over their currencies and their national budgets, including setting wages, and allocations for food subsidies, health care, and pensions; they are forced to demilitarize and surrender the right of national defense.

Two developments gave even greater power to Camdessus and the IMF. First, in 1993, TI's strategy to "identify and root out corruption" was developed by a special unit of the World Bank. Then, in 1995, **Sir James Wolfensohn**, who had built up TI, became president of the World Bank, on the recommendation of anti-nation-state U.S. Vice President Albert Gore, Jr., a close ally of Prince Philip.



Sir James Wolfensohn

With this combination, in 1997, the IMF announced that it could withdraw a loan already allocated "on account of poor governance." *Governance* is supposed to mean, according to the World Bank, "the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources." According to the new doctrine, if the governance is

“poor,” the IMF has the power to take over the administration of any country.

The power to bring a nation-state to its knees was tested by the IFIs and their allies in the hedge funds in 1997, when Soros mounted an attack against Asian countries. (Soros operates several hedge funds based in the offshore tax haven of the Netherlands Antilles that have several billion dollars of old European *fondi* money under management. Included among Quantum investors is Queen Elizabeth II. Soros uses his profits to fund a powerful NGO devoted to legalizing the drug trade.)

By leveraging assets (at 20 to 100 times the original value) through willing major banks, e.g., Citicorp, Soros mounted a series of economic warfare attacks against the currencies of Thailand, Malaysia, and other Asian nations. In a short time, decades of development were destroyed.

However, the powers of a sovereign nation-state, asserted by Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad in response to Soros and the international financial institutions, once again proved that the oligarchy and its New Dark Age could be stopped. Mahathir fixed Malaysia’s exchange rate, and called in foreign-held currency, successfully defending his country.

The Western Hemisphere

In the Western Hemisphere, the leading institution in the arsenal against nation-states is the **Inter-American Dialogue**. Founded in 1982 to manage British-Wall Street policy toward the Western Hemisphere, the Dialogue has maintained one unified commitment throughout its history: to replace the nations of this region with a supranational, “hemispheric” system of government, based on usury and free trade. The subjects of various special task forces set up by the Dialogue over the years reflect this commitment: In the 1980s, drug legalization, ways to reduce national militaries in size and influence, and the urgency of establishing a hemispheric free trade zone, dominated its agenda. In the 1990s, task forces worked on “redefining sovereignty,” proposals for a system of political and economic “multilateral governance” in the region, a project to foment “ethnic divisions,” and ways to legalize narco-terrorists under the rubric of “democratic governance.”

The IAD and TI are two institutions of the species of NGOs which, in the structure of globalization, have *more power* than governments. In the UN, the NGOs have rights and power *equal to* member-countries, and they can operate across borders, exempt themselves from national laws, and even hold huge tracts of territory that are off-limits to the sovereign nation’s institutions. NGOs thereby serve as conduits for arms-trafficking, drugs, and money-laundering used to destabilize countries. One of these, Human Rights Watch, backed by Soros, acts as a de facto arm of world government, identifying countries that can be militarily and economically crushed for alleged human rights abuses.

Asia 1997

The case of Indonesia

by Michael Billington

Indonesia has always been a prime target for empire-builders: Not only is it huge geographically, spread out over 3,400 miles, spanning strategically critical shipping lanes, but it also contains enormous deposits of some of the world’s most valuable resources. Its most valuable resource—its population, now more than 200 million people, the fourth largest on Earth—is viewed as more of a nuisance than a benefit by the would-be colonialists. Henry Kissinger, for example, in 1974, included Indonesia on his list of 13 developing nations whose population growth represented a “security risk” to the United States.

Indonesia is now being targetted by the full arsenal of British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) subversion capabilities. Even the coverage in the world press, reporting on Indonesia’s ethnic, religious, and separatist violence, escalating hunger and poverty, and bankrupt economy, gives a distorted picture calculated to facilitate the foreign takeover of the wealth and strategic territory of the Republic of Indonesia.

Under the Dutch colonial empire, Indonesia was considered to be Europe’s most lucrative colonial possession. Today, the country stands second in the world in tin production, fifth in copper, gold, nickel, and natural gas, and 14th in oil. But the stakes go beyond the natural resources available for looting.

The British (and their Dutch colonial subcontractors) never forgave the Indonesians for their successful military defense against the attempted re-colonization of the islands after the World War II Japanese occupation. When the father of the nation and the first President, Sukarno, carried the revolutionary spirit forward into the creation of the Non-Aligned Movement, starting with the famous 1955 Bandung Conference of Asian and African Nations, held in Indonesia, the British responded by sponsoring multiple separatist movements in the outer islands—with generous support from the Dulles brothers at the U.S. State Department and the CIA. Their effort failed, when the Indonesian military and the population rallied to defend the nation’s territorial integrity.

Then, soon after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, London and Washington moved to isolate and destabilize Indonesia through a cutoff of credit and other sanctions imposed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), tactics which were to become very familiar in the 1990s. In 1965, as the United States was escalating the war in Vietnam, London and Washington also supported a coup by a faction in