

# How President Reagan is being played by London

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Whoever designed President Ronald Reagan's address projecting "nuclear war in the European Theater" was manipulating the President into the hands of the "Malthusian" faction in Moscow.

First, let it be absolutely clear, that a nuclear exchange limited to the European theater is an impossibility. Any nuclear attack on Soviet territory brings an immediate total nuclear bombardment on the United States' homeland. Soviet policy is to move into occupation of Western Europe *after* destroying the very existence of the United States.

The so-called theory of theater-limited nuclear war is that: (A) the Soviets would accept "limited" nuclear warfare in Europe, in order to avoid the massive penalties of total deployment of U.S. strategic thermonuclear capabilities; and, (B) that the mutual destruction of Eastern and Western Europe would leave the Soviet Union virtually helpless in face of the virtually-intact capabilities of the U.S. homeland and British Commonwealth forces. That "theory" would have exactly such a strategic outcome, if Moscow would only play by James R. Schlesinger's proposed rules of the game.

For that very reason, Moscow would never follow that course of action. It would respond by knocking out the United States first, before occupying Western Europe. "But, that's insane!" the "limited-war" kooks, such as Schlesinger object. "The Soviets would never risk total war! No one would be so insane as that!" On the contrary, gentlemen kooks, a nation faced with imminent extinction will risk destruction of everybody, rather than passively accepting the kind of defeat that Soviet adoption of a European theater-limited nuclear option implies.

The problem which the gentlemen kooks refuse to face is that a doctrine of forward-based nuclear posture is in itself a trigger for thermonuclear intercontinental war. When some madman slips the policy of "European-limited war" into a speech of the President of the United

States, such a madman is pushing the United States to the brink of nuclear armageddon.

Most probably, happily, the immediate effect of President Reagan's unfortunate remarks will not be nuclear war. When Reagan's remarks hit the front pages of the Western European news-media, every influential political party in Western Europe will panic, and will telephone London, asking to speak directly and immediately to Britain's Foreign Minister Lord Carrington. They will propose immediate action on Britain's proposal to split Western Europe strategically out of submission to the Transatlantic Alliance, to create a third force, a "third way" based on a separate alliance among the Western European nations. Carrington, receiving such telephone-calls, will reply with sympathetic noises concerning "our distressingly simple-minded American friends." The British proposal for a "third way" will be no longer merely a floated option.

Yet, it was the same London, America's ever-loving "special ally," which designed the strategic policies which Carrington will now pretend to find so distressingly crude and incompetent.

To understand this curious state of affairs, one must ignore the silly babbling among American policy-influentials and look closely at our ever-loving "special ally" in London. What infernal schemes is the crowd in London concocting?

## Britain's policy

Britain's policy toward the United States and Moscow today is a replay of Britain's earlier policies toward the relations between Berlin and Moscow, in both 1914 and in connection with Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's pact with Adolf Hitler in 1938. London is determined that the United States and the Soviet Union should destroy one another without either adversary actually winning.

Britain's special difficulty at present is the unpleas-

ant reality of thermonuclear strategic arsenals. Britain's problem is that of causing the United States and Soviet Union to destroy one another without destroying absolutely everyone else, including the British aristocracy's Commonwealth hiding-holes, in the process. (Intercontinental thermonuclear exchanges are dreadfully complicating affairs, don't you know.)

Therefore, London does not intend that there should actually be an all-out intercontinental war. Rather, Britain intends that a condition of controlled conflict between the two super-powers should be orchestrated in such a fashion as to catalyze a process of internal dissolution of both the United States and the "Soviet Empire." The sticky point for London at the moment, is that while it has sufficient control over U.S. banking, political parties and the federal government to proceed now to destroy the United States from within, Britain can not proceed to complete the wrecking of the United States until Britain is equally assured of its ability to simultaneously break up the "Soviet Empire."

Therefore, until the internal situation inside the "Soviet Empire" can be caused to deteriorate considerably more than it already has, Britain is obliged to keep the United States stumbling around the world, putting on a ferocious appearance—at least to the extent that internal collapse of U.S. defense capabilities provides some credibility to such a show of nastiness.

The end-result toward which London is working is the establishment of a Malthusian, World-Federalist sort of world-order. The world is to be broken up into petty autonomies, each significantly smaller than any of the corresponding nation-states. These petty, communal fiefdoms are to be coordinated by one or another sort of regional semi-government. Each of these regions of the world is to be ruled by supra-national institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Bank for International Settlements, and an assortment of United Nations arrangements.

The only considerable obstacle which remains in the pathway of such a Malthusian World-Federalist order is the power of the United States and Soviet Union, and Britain cannot proceed to fully destroy the United States from within until the Soviet Union reaches the point of ripeness for dissolution. Once those two super-powers are broken up, the consolidated power of the British Commonwealth is intended to become the real power-base controlling the supranational institutions of Malthusian World-Federalism.

There is nothing properly incredible in this report. The British have been proposing such a world-order openly ever since the hey-day of John Ruskin at Oxford University; not only the world's principal Malthusian think-tanks propose such things openly, as have the World-Federalists since World War II. The Trilateral Commission and Mrs. Averell Harriman are openly

committed to such objectives.

Since we began chatting frequently with leading U.S. policy-making circles, back in 1974, each time we have ridiculed the present trends in U.S. defense-policy, the supporters of such defense-policies have retorted to us: "You are forgetting that we have influence with powerful friends in Moscow." These leading U.S. policy-makers are not completely insane. They may, and do overestimate the potential represented by their friends in Moscow, but they do have such friends, and those friends have been a powerful and growing minority within Moscow's leading circles. They are, not properly surprising, the pro-Malthusian circles in Moscow, the crowd rallied around a project known in Moscow precincts as "global systems analysts."

### **The Soviet Malthusians**

This is the crowd in Moscow on which Britain is chiefly relying to destroy the "Soviet Empire" from within, in much the same fashion that the Malthusians of the liberal Eastern Establishment have been destroying the United States from within since approximately 1966-1969.

Britain's problem is chiefly that among many of Moscow's Malthusians there is a deeply-engrained Soviet nationalism. If this nationalist impulse prevails over the Malthusian impulses, then what Britain is concocting is not a Malthusian World-Federalist empire under Commonwealth hegemony, but an enraged Soviet Union prepared to fight thermonuclear war to win.

That is the pivotal point on which the risk of thermonuclear war by British strategic miscalculation hangs.

The exemplar of the Anglo-Americans' high-level penetration of Moscow's leading circles is the case of Dzhermen Gvishiani, the son-in-law of the late A. Kosygin and Soviet head of the Vienna-based International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). IIASA is a subsidiary of NATO, created under the direction of British intelligence's Dr. Alexander King, and the chief NATO (British) conduit directly into both the "global systems analysis" Malthusians of Moscow and high-level circles of IMEMO, the foreign intelligence arm of the Soviet Communist Party leadership.

IIASA and Gvishiani are integrated with another NATO creation—also by Dr. Alexander King—the Club of Rome.

This Gvishiani-linked NATO intelligence channel intersects various interesting things in Moscow. IMEMO is a revival of the former Communist International intelligence-apparatus, whose most celebrated adviser (since 1963) has been former British Secret Intelligence Service (SIS) officer Donald Maclean. Maclean's Malthusian faction in IMEMO operates world-wide in close cooperation with the Soviet KGB's leading official for

Islamic affairs, Gen. Harold "Kim" Philby, also formerly a top official of SIS and the son of the creator of the terrorist Muslim Brotherhood, the SIS Arab Bureau's St. John Philby. Maclean and Philby are to this day still "triple agents" of SIS.

These SIS-NATO-linked conduits into Moscow's policy-making intersect a "Bukharinite" collection of political relics concentrated in the intelligence service of the party, the KGB and the professional foreign service itself. The "Bukharinite" network, historically a product of the Venice-Switzerland-Vienna complex behind Alexander Helphand (Parvus), intersects the oldest and deepest British SIS-linked intelligence asset in Russia, the hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church.

It was chiefly through London and Vienna, in collaboration with these networks that the two-pronged (KOR and Jesuit-Orthodox-Anthroposoph) coordination of the Polish destabilization was run. (The silly, megalomaniacal fanatic, Zbigniew Brzezinski, deluded himself he was coordinating the operation. We talked directly to high-level circles which, none of U.S. pedigrees, actually ran the operation via Stockholm and Vienna. And we were able to prove that they did run it: not to imply that so obvious a figure as this writer could have run under double-cover into Poland.)

It is the Malthusians and the hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church on which British SIS is relying to effect the desired dissolution of the "Soviet Empire" from within.

Britain's policy is not to cause direct fighting between the strategic forces of Washington and Moscow. Britain's policy is to orchestrate U.S. strategic policies in such a way as to bring the Malthusians and their friends to the top in the process of determining the Soviet leadership-succession.

The purpose of Britain's "balance of power" game is not nuclear war between the super-powers themselves. The purpose of the British game is a Malthusian World-Federalist order before the end of this present century. It is not only an evil scheme, more evil than anything actually proposed by Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. It is an evil scheme pregnant with probable risk of thermo-nuclear strategic miscalculation.

### **If Britain wished Reagan to defeat Moscow**

From discussions directly with leading British strategic specialists, we have determined that the British command has good knowledge of the kind of preparations the United States would require to achieve strategic parity with the Soviet forces. Since the British do not insist on the United States' adopting such a defense-policy, it is to be considered proven that Britain does not wish the United States to achieve strategic parity with Moscow.

Such a policy would have to include prominently:

1. Universal military training.
2. Enlargement and technical and literacy upgrading of officer and enlisted forces.
3. Developing in-depth expanded engineering and logistical capabilities for air, naval and ground-forces arms.
4. A policy of crushing the "environmentalist" influence in the nation.
5. A flood of low-interest credit to all civilian categories of agricultural, industrial, and infrastructural classes of goods-producing logistical production and transportation capabilities.
6. An acceleration by a factor of at least two of civilian space and fusion-energy programs.
7. A crash mobilization for development of deployable particle-beam anti-missile systems.

Without particle-beam anti-missile systems, and without in-depth military personnel and logistical capabilities, no potentially nuclear war can be won. Britain knows this. Therefore, Britain demonstrates that it does not intend that either Moscow or Washington should prevail in a showdown implying military confrontation.

### **The Venetian secret behind London's policy**

Up through World War I, the world's most powerful center of rentier-finance, Venice, ran three operations which are paradigmatic for understanding the mentality behind Britain's "balance of power" manipulations of the present time. These are Venice's mobilization and direction of the Fourth Crusade against Constantinople, Venice's direction of the Ottoman subjugation of Greece in 1453, and Venice's orchestration of the attempted mutual destruction of the Ottoman and Russian empires over the period from the rise of Venice's asset, Potemkin, during the 18th century, through February 1917.

Britain, whose monarchy was created under Venetian-Genoese direction over the course of the bloody coup d'état of 1589-1603, participated in a capacity as an accomplice of Venice in the project for simultaneous destruction of the Ottoman and Russian empires, with British penetration of the Russian Orthodox hierarchy a continuing feature of that connection into Russia from the 18th century to the present day.

Britain learned its business at the feet of its master, Venice. This is the Venice which has been the true owner of the British and Dutch East India Company. And the controlling force behind the nest of interlocking directors, controlling both the Seven Sisters petroleum-marketing complex and the dominant elements of international insurance-finance today. It was this same Venice, through such spokesmen as Gianmaria Orte, which invented the genocide dogma promptly conduct-

ed through the British East India Company to become known as the mass-murder policy of Reverend Thomas Malthus. To understand Britain, one must understand Britain's master: Venice, or the same thing, Venice's personal piggy-bank, the pseudo-nation Switzerland.

At the December 1981 New York City conference of the National Caucus of Labor Committees, *EIR* Editor-in-Chief Criton Zoakos will report those features of the Venetian operations against the Ottoman and Russian empires which ought to be in the possession of every strategic policy-maker and intelligence-analyst today. Therefore, it is sufficient here to state the basic conception.

In repayment for delivering the people of Greece to Ottoman rule in 1453, Venice's chief Greek agent, Gennadios, was made Patriarch of the entire Eastern Orthodox Church by the Sultan of Turkey, with direct authority over non-Islamic people of the Ottoman Empire. Venice was given more substantial rewards. Venice was given a large chunk of conquered Greece for its own looting-purposes, and the families of Constantinople which had aided Venice and Gennadios in betraying Constantinople achieved great power under the Ottomans. Venice and these treasonous Greek families ruled the administrative apparatus of the Ottoman Empire from the inside, and spread out from Greece to become a power faction of the aristocracy in Russia, Austro-Hungary and elsewhere.

During the 18th century, Venice, which controlled both the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires (despite resistance from Maria Theresa and Joseph II), decided that a controlled disintegration of the Ottoman Empire was in order. Venetian agents in Russia were advanced to controlling influence over the policies of Catherine the Great, and Russia was launched on a campaign for access to the Mediterranean. Russia was never intended to succeed in this, as it was not intended to succeed in another project conduited into Petrograd from Venice—the Pan-Slavist assimilation of the Balkans. Russia was intended to conduct the fruitless labors of Sisyphus in these matters, to the ends of facilitating the dissolution of both the Russian and Ottoman empires—and, at a later point, the Venetians' Austro-Hungarian obscenity.

At the close of the Napoleonic Wars, when Venice's formal political independence had ceased, several new arrangements were put into place, with a leading role played by a Venetian, Capodistria, who Venice had appointed the Foreign Minister of the Russian Czar. As a Venetian-appointed Russian Foreign Minister, Capodistria dictated the present constitution of Switzerland, establishing that pseudo-nation as a Venetian piggy-bank. The same Capodistria dictated the terms of the 1815 Treaty of Vienna, which established Britain as the chief instrument of Venice's policy and power

world-wide, and established the Holy Alliance under administrative direction of Prince Metternich and the Venetian secret police, the Jesuit order.

So, Britain played Venice's policy throughout the 19th century under the rubric of "balance of power."

At the beginning of this century, the term "balance of power" gave way to a new term produced by the political faction of neo-feudalist fanatic John Ruskin, "geopolitics."

As Lord Alfred Milner, the founder of the London Round Table and the New York Council on Foreign Relations, emphasized, "geopolitics" has the principal purpose of realizing the objectives set forth in the testament of that genocidal racist swine, Cecil Rhodes, founder of the Rhodes Scholarship. Britain was to conquer the world by subverting the United States and sending Germany and Russia into a war of mutual destruction.

The object of "geopolitics" then and now is the establishment of a variety of Malthusian World-Federalism under which world-order the ruling forces of the British Commonwealth will establish a world empire, through aid of mass-murder of most of the indigenous non-Anglo-Saxon populations living in the southern portion of the globe.

Through two world wars organized by Britain and Venice during this century to date, Germany has been destroyed as a nation-state power.

That most ungrateful V. I. Lenin! After the Venetians and British arranged the Germans to put 3 million Reichsmarks into Karl Radek's pocket, and conduit Lenin by the British-controlled northern Scandinavian route into Petrograd, Lenin, instead of helping to destroy the Russian state, established a new one as dedicated to sovereignty and technological progress as old Count Sergei Witte and Czar Alexander II had been. In short, Germany has been destroyed, but Russia remains as stubborn an obstacle as ever. So, the United States must play "Ottoman Empire" to "Russian Empire" in Britain's determination to effect the simultaneous elimination of both principal remaining obstacles to Malthusian World-Federalism.

Unless both the Americans and Soviets crush the Malthusian World-Federalists in each of their nations, either the British version of the old Venetian game will succeed, or typically British strategic miscalculation will lead the world into nuclear war; in the latter case, under present monetary, economic and defense policy, either the Soviets will win that war or we shall all be simply destroyed.

A nation which tolerates such Malthusians as our liberal, ever-British-loving Eastern Establishment is a nation which has lost the moral fitness to survive.

One wonders if President Ronald Reagan is able, at last, to understand that fact.