

The danger of a new Thirty Years' War

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Lyndon LaRouche, who first elaborated the program for a "Productive Triangle" on Jan. 3, 1990, directed the following remarks to the March 1-3 Berlin conference of the Schiller Institute on "Peace Through Development: Infrastructure Program for a New Europe."

Particularly during the recent period, I have emphasized, perhaps more intensely than I had in earlier years, the fact that the period from 1912 to 1945, the period of the so-called two world wars, was a crisis in civilization created virtually entirely by a British geopolitical plot, a plot initially directed against France's statesman Gabriel Hanotaux. I would like to, at this moment, assess the current global situation in light of the significance of a force which crushed the collaboration centered upon such figures as France's Hanotaux and Russia's Sergei Count Witte, and others in Germany, Japan, and elsewhere.

On the surface, it was very simple—apparently. Hanotaux and others were tired of the ruinous condition of Europe and Asia brought about by the combination of British imperialism, and the British policy of playing off the balance of power on the continent of Europe. So a network of cooperation emerged around the leading figure of France's Gabriel Hanotaux. And there were movements for the industrial development of Russia based on high technology, a move which reached to anti-British circles and factions in Japan, and to anti-British factions among those struggling for the independence of China, for example.

Britain viewed this cooperation from a twofold standpoint.

First, it recognized, that if Hanotaux and Witte had their way, all of Eurasia would emerge as a sphere of cooperation for mutual benefit among sovereign states of Eurasia, and

that under those conditions, the British domination of the world could not continue.

The British reacted to this on two levels. First, as a threat to British imperial power. But secondly, the British reaction was not simply a national interest reaction against the threat of cooperation in Eurasia; the British reaction was determined by the character of the ruling strata in Britain, a strata in Britain which have been more or less continuously ruling since the time of the first Duke of Marlborough, and since particularly the accession of George I to the throne of England. That is, with the establishment of British liberalism.

The issues, thus, in the conflict between Britain on the one side and Hanotaux, Witte, and so forth, on the other side, was, to a large degree, the same issue, which prompted the Americans around Benjamin Franklin to recognize the unavoidable conflict which became known as the American Revolution—or the American War with Britain—over the period from 1775 through at least 1863, 1864, the period of the American Civil War, which had been created by Britain, with the collaboration of, naturally, Napoleon III, most notably.

The second motive of the British, was the British opposition to what we consider today the most fundamental rights and interests of nations.

The rights and interests of the modern nation-state

Modern civilization has come to define the interests of nations, first of all, in the right of a nation to national sovereignty, to a perfect national sovereignty, at least prior to 1945, to the right of persons to certain conditions merely by virtue of being individual sovereign persons. The right, therefore, to economic development, to access to scientific

and technological progress; to freedom from imperialists and colonial or neo-colonial designs; freedom from mass murder, from atrocities such as those that Britain perpetrated so many times in British-occupied India, in the form of famines, the control of population and politics by virtue of mass-murderous famines, a form of genocide well-installed as a tradition in British India, before the appearance of Hitler in Germany. So essentially, British liberalism is opposed, philosophically and every other way, to what we call European Christian civilization and ecumenical standards consistent with Christian European civilization.

So, the British, and others, launched a twofold attack. One was simply the balance-of-power methods, of playing off potential national collaborators among France, Germany, Russia, Japan, and so forth against each other, as a development of the Entente Cordiale between Britain and France expresses this, and similar developments which I need not go over here.

Nietzsche's satanic, existentialist movement

But the second aspect upon which I wish to place emphasis, was that there emerged from Britain—but not only from Britain—a literally satanic movement against civilization, as part of the reaction against what Hanotaux represented potentially, and Witte.

That was an existentialist movement against, for example, what Friedrich Schiller represented in Germany, typified by Friedrich Nietzsche, typified by the Oxford-Cambridge group around people like Benjamin Jowett and John Ruskin, the Theosophical movement in Britain and in Europe, associated with certain kinds of Freemasonic currents, a movement which later came to be associated with people like Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler, and such Hitler admirers as Martin Heidegger, Karl Jaspers, and so forth and so on. As well, those who deserve to be Hitler supporters, but who, for minor technical reasons, went the other way, such as leaders of the Frankfurt School, such as Theodor Adorno.

This was a movement which later took the form of the rock-drug-sex counterculture movement, a movement which the authors described by the turn of the present century, as the introduction of the Age of Aquarius, that is, of Dionysos, Lucifer, and Satan, to destroy, crush, and push to one side what they call the Age of Pisces, that is, the age of Socrates and Christ in their own terms, which are the terms of Friedrich Nietzsche.

That is what we face today.

That is what we faced in the years 1912-45. That is what we faced in the person of a Bertrand Russell, who probably contends for the position of the most evil man of the 20th century. What we face now, as then, back in 1912-45, is an attempt not only to prevent economic cooperation among Western continental Europe with sympathetic forces in Russia, that is, forces sympathetic to technological progress and cooperation, and Japan and China and so forth. What we face



Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. speaks at a press conference in Berlin in October 1988, laying out his now-famous proposal for an economic development program that would make possible the reunification of Germany.

is a force presently centered among certain Anglo-American factions which share this neo-malthusian countercultural view, who are determined to crush forever, for once and for all, that kind of rationality in human politics and human populations, which allows to come forth the aspiration of the average individual for conditions of life which are human; to crush, as in the cradle, the aspiration for national sovereignty, the aspiration for a culture based on reason expressed in terms of a literate form of national language, the right of individuals to scientific and technological progress. That is what these liberals did, from the beginning of World War I (1912, the Balkan Wars), through 1945.

It was they and their ideological fellow-travelers, such as the Friedrich Nietzsches and Nietzsche's successors, and the Heideggers, and the Jaspers, who attacked European Christian civilization, who sought to destroy it.

When, in the early 1920s, they saw that the virus of Bolshevism had not been able to destroy the culture of Western Europe, they resorted to new methods; the methods of the Frankfurt School, and so forth, and the bringing of Hitler to power, which was largely done by the Anglo-American powers. *Let us never more allow that fact to be hidden.* Without Montagu Norman, without the racist Averell Harriman, without Prescott Bush, the father of President George Bush and the chief executive officer for Harriman, *Hitler would not have come to power in the 1932-33 period. They brought him to power*, and they knew, to a large degree, what they were doing. They may not have known all the consequences of what they were doing, but they knew what they were doing. And, together with Churchill, they supported Benito Mussolini's power in Italy until 1938. And they

were somewhat sympathetic to Hitler's rule over Germany, against German opposition, through the Kristallnacht events of 1938.

These fellows, at the end of the war, as Bertrand Russell expressed it in his October 1946 paper in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, proposed a condominium between Stalin's Moscow as a junior partner and the Anglo-Americans as the

The Bush administration represents, in the person of the President and his close associates, one of the biggest drug-pushers in the world. . . . The criminals are in power. The plague of drugs runs on the streets. The United States is being destroyed from within, by this rock-drug-sex counterculture.

major partner: a global condominium. The United Nations was supposed to become the vehicle whereby the Anglo-Americans, with Soviet seconding as a junior partner, would rule the world.

This is, of course, the frequently expressed philosophy of Henry Kissinger, who identifies himself as a follower, and a faithful follower, of Winston Churchill. Policy is made from London, to New York and Washington, to Moscow; and the rest of the world has naught to do, but to obey.

Kissinger revived the condominium

Because of the falling-out between Stalin and Churchill on the conditions of the postwar world, the plan did not work out as Russell and others intended. The United Nations did not become the imperialist agency that its founders intended immediately. After Stalin's death, there were movements toward a rapprochement, toward condominium, under Khrushchov, with Bertrand Russell at the center of these negotiations. This became the Pugwash movement. That didn't fully work out; it was revived after the assassination of Kennedy; President Johnson was one of those who abortively attempted to revive this; it was revived as soon as Henry Kissinger became acting President with the inauguration of Richard Nixon and his successor, Gerald Ford. We have now, of course, this condominium, established over the 1986 to 1989 period.

But, the condominium has blown up again, because the agreements, and vital interests, cannot necessarily suppress reality; and, reality puts Russia into resistance against the junior partner role, and what that portends to be the Anglo-American side of the condominium. So, we are headed, in effect, toward a Third World War—not necessarily like the first two of this

century, but continuing the same causal principles.

We are headed toward, as I have said, and others have said, a Thirty Years' War, that is, a Thirty Years' War in the sense that the Peloponnesian War in ancient classical Greece was a Thirty Years' War. The Thirty Years' War in Central Europe was an echo of the Peloponnesian War, and the period from 1912-45 in Europe, is effectively another Thirty Years' War.

We're talking about a conflict in every dimension, in every level, spreading, intensifying, and ultimately reaching the point that weapons are used in conflicts among major powers—a general devastation of this planet deep into the early decades of the coming century, unless we stop this.

Up to now, from at least 1986 on, from 1982 in part, and earlier, it seems that the British liberals—the same fellows who caused the Thirty Years' War of 1912 to 1945, are predominant: They're winning. They're winning, because France acquiesced to them, as earlier it was key to causing wars, and because the world is generally acquiescent to this power, to this liberalism, to IMF conditionalities.

Unless that trend is reversed, it is *certain* that the new Thirty Years' War period now in progress, will be the rule of this planet deep into the early decades of the next century.

What must be addressed, therefore, is not the issues as they are normally defined by the press, or day-to-day gossip; we have to recognize that there is a pattern, like an infectious cancer, in the history of European civilization, a cancer not limited to, but typified by, the rise of British liberalism in Britain, particularly in its 18th-century form for purposes of immediate reference, as this was expressed by the role of Britain at and following the Vienna Congress of 1815, and during this century. There is no hope for civilization, there is no hope for this planet, as long as that cancer exists—the cancer of not merely the British desire to play the balance of power on the planet, but the purpose from which that desire is executed, the intent to suppress Christian civilization, and to bring back a modern utopian form of pagan Roman civilization, ruled by American brawn in turn directed by British brains, and to play movements and forces like the communist forces in Moscow, and so forth, as the complement and sometime associate of these efforts to crush out of existence, everything that Christian civilization deems precious.

There is no hope for civilization, there is no hope for this planet, that it escape this new Thirty Years' War, except we change that now. What we must address, is not merely local issues, or immediate short-term issues, or medium-term issues; what we must address, is the fact that in British liberalism, in particular—not exclusively, but in particular—there is a form of purely satanic evil.

What is evil about Britain

The evil is not the fact that Britain as a national power or an imperial power, or with its United States running dog, has tried to prevent the development of rational collaboration

among the sovereign states of Eurasia, or that it has promoted brutish oppression of the nations of Ibero-America (Central and South America), Africa, and so forth; that is not the *primary* issue. The primary issue is that British liberalism, and its American complements, are the center of a radiation of power, of a commitment to crushing out of existence what they call the Age of Pisces—of Socrates and Christ—in order to bring into ascendancy globally, the age of Dionysus, Satan, and Lucifer.

This expresses itself in such things as IMF conditionalities, in what are called free trade policies; it expresses itself in the liberal doctrine, that there is only opinion, not right or wrong, not truth or falsehood, not justice; it expresses itself in the common feature of Nazi law and the present U.S. federal courts and Executive Branch, in what is called in philosophy radical positivism.

Whereas Christian civilization bases itself on the existence of certain principles (as the U.S. Declaration of Independence points in that direction), and that nations and their lawmaking must be subject to natural law, which is above the whims of any nation, or any national majority, or any institution of nations; these fellows say, "There is no truth, there is no natural law, there is only what the responsible institutions of government, which we control, have decided."

For example, in the United States, beginning with the Teddy Roosevelt, shall we say, Internal Revenue Service, there has been a shift in the practice of prosecutorial law.

In former times, criminal prosecution started with the existence of the body of a crime. Somebody had committed a crime, or it had to be (probably) some human agency. The job of the government was to determine who might have perpetrated that crime, and to bring the person responsible to justice, and deal with that justly and for the interests of society as a whole—according to natural law, not according to the caprices or whims of judges or parties in power in government.

Today, that's reversed. The United States government is no longer concerned with crime. *The Bush administration represents, in the person of the President and his close associates, one of the biggest drug-pushers in the world.* It is they, through such subordinates as Gen. Richard Secord, or Col. Oliver North, and their Israeli accomplices, who ran the great cocaine-running from Central and South America into most of the world. It is they who are at the center of international drug and weapons-trafficking. Other powers are involved, but they were at the center. *The criminal occupies the White House, in effect.* It was George Bush, as head of the Special Situations Group, who was responsible for these people. It was he who was presumably administering the war on drugs to defend the shores of the United States against importation. It was his subordinates—including Colonel North, and so forth, who are engaged in this drug traffic and bringing these drugs into the United States, or arranging to have them brought in. That's on the court records. The

criminals are in power. The plague of drugs runs on the streets. The United States is being destroyed from within, by this rock-drug-sex counterculture.

So what do they do? Now, they've eliminated the prosecution of crime. Satanism is protected by even the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which intervenes to head off investigations into crimes, even mass, horrible, grisly mass murders by Satanist groups.

But any group which is seen to be a potential source of political resistance to the British liberal policies of the Bush administration marks those responsible, or believed to be incidental to it, as targets for prosecution. These persons are targeted for prosecution, these groups are targeted for prosecution, and then the agencies of government go out to invent a crime with which to charge them, often a conspiracy charge, which is considered a felony, with no criminal act at all perpetrated by any of the accused, not even claimed to be so by the prosecution itself.

We have gone full tilt to this kind of radical positivism—which is really another name for totally arbitrary rule, and total destruction of the rule of law, to the worst kind of rule by men.

Some legal experts say, and I think justly so, that in respect of theory of law, the United States today is already worse than Karl Schmit's Nazi Germany.

We must defeat this evil

So, the time has come that we must all be much more serious. We can no longer content ourselves with trying to play pragmatic, opportunist games, trying to nibble here and nibble there and get a little of the fundamentals to people here and there.

The time has come that we must begin at least to neutralize the agency which was Hanotaux's adversary, Witte's adversary, which has been consistently the adversary of everyone who tried to create a Eurasian bloc of cooperation and economic development, which is trying to prevent the developing nations, so-called, from having the most elementary rights as nations, which has crushed their aspirations and plotted genocide in the order aggregating to billions of victims against those persons, because some in the North consider some in the developing nations to be overpopulated.

We must address that evil, directly; name it, remove it from power. As long as we allow that evil—the evil typified by the enemies of Hanotaux at the end of the last century—to dominate Europe, in the manner the friends of Henry Kissinger dominate Europe and the United States, then this planet as a whole is doomed to a Thirty Years' War, which may be the worst of them yet to be experienced by the human race. We must stop being children; we must grow up. We must stop trying simply to fix a little thing here and there. It is now the time to call evil by its name, because if we allow evil to predominate, as it predominates today, our nations, and civilization as a whole, are doomed.