

Before Gaza Disappears: Can American Subjugation to British Imperial Policy Be Reversed?

by Dennis Speed

Dec. 15—During his [annual](#) “Results of the Year with Vladimir Putin” live televised four-hour Question & Answer session with media and the public yesterday, Russian President Vladimir Putin offered the following assessment of the state of the leadership of Europe, and implicitly, of the United States.

Outwardly, many European politicians may look like General de Gaulle, who took up arms to fight for his country’s interests, who rallied whatever resources France could muster to resist the occupiers. But in reality, they are more like Marshal Pétain—although he was a WWI hero, he became a collaborator and succumbed to the invaders during World War II.

Almost everyone [in Europe] behaves this way, except for a few people. Robert Fico became a new leader [in Slovakia] after the election, and Viktor Orbán in Hungary. ... [T]hey are not pro-Russia politicians; they are pro-national—they are defending their countries’ interests. But there are too few politicians like this. ... Maybe this has to do with Europe’s excessive dependence on the Big Brother—the United States. But we are ready to build relations with them.

In fact, we are ready to build relations with the United States as well. We believe that America is an important country on the world stage. But this absolutely imperial policy the country pursues is bad for them. ... Why? Because the public expects them to act like an empire. If they agree to compromise on something or concede something to someone, their voters will see this

as a failure or a flaw. That may partly be the reason the elites have to act in this way.

As soon as they change on a deeper level, and begin to respect other people, other countries, start searching for compromises instead of addressing their problems by using sanctions and military force, which would create the underlying conditions for restoring full-fledged relations. So far, there are no such conditions. But we are ready for this.

EDITORIAL

Do not merely agree or disagree with what Putin has said: consider it. With this assessment in mind, then

consider this question:

Americans Knighted by the British Crown

Why Is “Perfidious Albion”—the British Empire—more responsible than the U.S. itself for the failure of American foreign policy? Make a list of those American military officials who have recently been knighted by the British Crown. Generals Brent Scowcroft, Colin Powell, Tommy Franks, Martin Dempsey, Joseph Dunford, Norman Schwarzkopf. Then, look at the wars they fought: the costs, human and material, and the outcomes. Compare the fate of the nations involved to the fate of nations in World War II. What did post-war Germany, Italy, and Japan, all adversary nations, experience? What have post-war Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Libya experienced? Is it perhaps the case that the generals were knighted, precisely because the wars they fought systematically undermined the national interests of the United States, and advanced the interests of Empire, and not the American people or government?

Think for a moment—but perhaps not too deeply—about the rotting corpus of “geo-strategic” ideas represented by Henry Kissinger, which are distilled, in terms of their real-life implications, in the policy memorandum “National Security Study Memorandum 200—Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and Overseas Interests.” The document’s unstated, but clearly implied position was that the inferior peoples of the world, particularly those that lived in the Global South, do not make history, and therefore are to be divested of the possession as well as the use of the material resources required to do so. Kissinger’s [confession](#) at Chatham House, on May 10, 1982, of his preference for British Imperial attitudes rather than FDR’s vision of the world, including the Roosevelt Four Freedoms, means that he would have had no real disagreement with Winston Churchill’s well-known 1937 statement to the British Royal Peel Commission on a Jewish Homeland in Palestine:

I do not agree that the dog in a manger has the final right to the manger even though he may have lain there for a very long time. I do not admit that right. I do not admit for instance, that a great wrong has been done to the Red Indians of America or the black people of Australia. I do not admit that a wrong has been done to these people by the fact that a stronger race, a higher-grade race, a more worldly-wise race to put it that way, has come in and taken their place.

Kissinger’s October 18 remarks—“I believe the West Bank should be put under Jordanian control rather than aim for a two-state solution which leaves one of the two territories determined to overthrow Israel”—originate from the same geostrategic cesspool that Churchill’s “frank discussion” of the rightness of imperialism expresses. Zbigniew Brzezinski’s 40-year (1973-2017) desecration of American foreign policy was plagiarized from British intelligence master agent and “Arabist” Bernard Lewis, whose “Islamic Fundamentalism Card” policy, otherwise known as the Bernard Lewis Plan, would be made *Readers’ Digest* friendly and re-packaged by Brzezinski as “the Arc of Crisis,” and later, more crudely as *The Grand Chessboard* and even more crudely by Brzezinski’s Sancho Panza, Samuel P. Huntington, as *The Clash of Civilizations*.

Money for Whom? For What?

Consider the following anomaly, reported today, regarding the non-disbursement of over \$53 billion of already appropriated money over the past 17 months, authorized under the Schumer-Young “CHIPS and Science Act,” which was passed by Congress in July 2022. Only \$35 million of this has been disbursed, and that went to the British weapons company, BAE Systems. Why isn’t the money being spent? And why, actually, was the money spent on BAE contracts? BAE Systems, let us remember, is at the center of the 1980s “Al-Yamamah” oil-for-weapons deal between Great Britain and Saudi Arabia.

Recall a Nov. 29, 2010 [story](#) from London’s *The Guardian*:

During the two-hour engagement in 2008 at a hotel in the capital, Bishkek (Kyrgyzstan), [Prince] Andrew, who travels the globe as a special U.K. trade representative, attacked Britain’s corruption investigators in the Serious Fraud Office for what he called “idiocy.” ... In the cable from the U.S. embassy to Washington in October 2008, (American ambassador to Kyrgyzstan Tatiana) Gfoeller wrote: “Rude language à la British ... [Andrew] turned to the general issue of promoting British economic interests abroad. He railed at British anti-corruption investigators, who had had the ‘idiocy’ of almost scuttling the Al-Yamamah deal with Saudi Arabia.”

While Gfoeller expressed shock at Andrew’s crude conduct during the two-hour dialogue, she highlighted two topics: the Prince’s boasting about Britain’s revival of the 19th-Century “Great Game”, and his candid assault on snooping British journalists and investigators, who dared to interfere in Britain’s Al-Yamamah deal.

The U.S. ambassador, a veteran career diplomat who speaks six languages, did not appear to have great regard for Andrew’s intellect.

Nothing for Technology for Peace

The original title of the “CHIPS and Science Act” was the “Endless Frontier Act of 2019,” which was supposed to usher in an “Apollo Project-style” explosion in the expansion of American science

centers, space research outposts, communications technologies, etc. But there is no forward motion on this, because scientific and technological optimism must be de-prioritized in America. Science enthusiasm must not be allowed to grip American youth, the way it once did in the Kennedy Administration. In this issue of *EIR* we are releasing preliminary reports for a detailed Fact Sheet on the nature and character of American military expenditures, exposing not only the intrinsic wastefulness of bloated military disbursements, such as Pentagon planes with price tags of “\$900 million,” but the fact that, under certain circumstances, money will be wildly spent, but withheld, if its deployment actually means an advancement of the human potential of the American workforce and electorate.

That will not be allowed by the British in any administration, Republican or Democratic. And this is why the United States votes the way it does in the UN on the matter of the ceasefire; why the United States seeks to still deploy tens of billions of dollars to Ukraine, when Ukraine is a militarily

lost cause; and how the United States can spend \$2 trillion on an Afghanistan war, and still lose. We must free the mind of the United States, to halt the self-destruction of which Vladimir Putin spoke in his press conference.

Time for FDR-Eisenhower-JFK Americans

Against this outlook, the recent series of votes and debates that have occurred at the United Nations, particularly the actions of United Nations Secretary General António Guterres, have moralized the world’s governments, to dispose themselves to consider adopting solutions to wars, such as those in Gaza and Ukraine, with ideas such as the Zepp-LaRouche [Ten Principles Conferences](#), such as that held in Nicaragua this past weekend, especially where connected to the campaign of independent American candidates for high office such as Diane Sare, can explode the deliberative process, a process fed by a new appearance of actual morality, as expressed in the United Nations process which must be fully supported everywhere, and particularly in the United States.