

# Confusion among the European-American elites

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Recently, there has been a scattering of published "think-pieces" from some leading publications in Europe and the United States, each arguing that there exists presently a grave and ominous moral crisis among the established leaderships of Europe and North America. The common point of these various published pieces is "confusion and disarray among the elites."

The writings on this theme include: Stanley Hoffman, "To Reduce European Anxiety," *New York Times*, Feb. 6, 1984; Marshall D. Shulman, "A and B Discuss the Soviet Union," *New York Times*, Feb. 7, 1984; Seweryn Bialer, "Kremlin, Insecure, Might Increase Risks," *New York Times*, Feb. 5, 1984; and Gregory Flynn, "Public Opinion and Atlantic Defence," in *NATO Review*, December, 1983, which is based on the book, *The Public and Atlantic Defense*, edited by Gregory Flynn and Hans Rattinger, a study sponsored by the Atlantic Institute for International Affairs in Paris scheduled for early-1984 publication.

The bellwether of the moral crisis to which these think-pieces allude is the recent transformation of Britain's putative "Iron Lady," Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, into a new "Neville Chamberlain." It is generally understood that this shift in Mrs. Thatcher's policy has been imposed upon her by forces identified within the United Kingdom as "the Establishment," by forces typified by Henry A. Kissinger's business-partner and mentor, Peter Lord Carrington, the recently appointed secretary-general of NATO. In the United States itself, and not accidentally, the confusion is traced to circles associated with Henry A. Kissinger's reentry into the federal government, and Kissinger's "Neville Chamberlain" role as associate of an Aspen Institute working to "decouple" the United States strategically from its Western European allies.

The immediate center of the weakness of vacillation among the elites of Europe and North America is the military

coup d'état now being consolidated in the Soviet Union. As Lord Carrington stated to a caller during April 1983, the subsequently deceased Soviet general secretary, Yuri Andropov, was considered by the British Establishment to be a "strategic asset" of the circles which include Carrington, Kissinger, et al. The close connection between Andropov and KGB General Harold "Kim" Philby illustrates the grounds upon which Lord Carrington viewed Andropov as a British strategic asset. Andropov is now no more, but the Carrington-Kissinger crowd are still desperately attempting to bring off a counter-coup against the "Russian Party" which has seized power in Moscow.

There is an analogy to the present situation in the British Establishment's policies into 1938. Let there be no side-stepping simple, incontestable facts of history on the latter account. The Morgans and Harrimans of New York City actively and openly supported both Mussolini and Hitler into about 1938, and did so in part for reason of stated admiration of Hitler's "racial hygiene" policies. The emergence of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, in negotiations under way during 1938, combined with the disgusting pragmatism of Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain in the matter of Hitler's invasion of Czechoslovakia, induced a state of alarm among some British circles known as the "Churchillian Reflex." For about a quarter-century to date, the Anglo-American Establishments have repeated their earlier, pre-1938 accommodation to Hitler and Mussolini, in the form of back-channel negotiations with Moscow through such conduits as Bertrand Russell's Pugwash Conference series. The doctrines of Nuclear Deterrence, Flexible Response, and Arms Control were imposed upon the United States and NATO as a consequence of earlier agreements between the Anglo-American Establishment and Moscow, agreements reached beginning in the 1955-58 period.

Now, with Moscow, as earlier with Hitler, long-standing

Anglo-American strategic policies have backfired, and there is confusion among the elites.

The Anglo-American elites have assumed, for about a quarter-century to date, that by adhering to the strategic policies negotiated with Moscow—Nuclear Deterrence, Flexible Response, and Arms Control—the Soviet policy-makers would be induced to keep their side of the bargain, and adhere to the same policies from their side. Yet, beginning the publication of Marshal V. D. Sokolovskii's *Soviet Military Strategy*, during 1962, the Soviet Union has consistently used Nuclear Deterrence's *adoption by the West* as the means of deception through which to build up Soviet strength to the point that Moscow could survive and win a thermonuclear war against the United States. To the degree the Sokolovskii Doctrine has been acknowledged to exist by leading Western

---

---

*These monstrous strategic errors of our foreign policy toward the nations of Ibero-America, Africa, and Asia, errors which contribute to the economic downfall and political erosion of export-hungry nations of Western continental Europe, are the root of our strategic crisis today.*

---

---

strategic planners, the spokesmen for the Anglo-American Establishments have insisted: "Yes, the Sokolovskii Doctrine exists, but the political command in Moscow will keep their military under control."

Now, the military has seized control through a coup d'état launched during August 1983. The sudden disappearance [perhaps death] of General Secretary Yuri Andropov at that time, and the ensuing assertion of military control by Marshals Ustinov and Ogarkov in connection with the shooting-down of KAL 007, are the signal events of that coup d'état. Now, instead of the Pugwashers controlling the wielders of the Sokolovskii Doctrine, the proponents of the Sokolovskii Doctrine have the Pugwashers running errands for the Soviet military.

The time for a new "Churchillian Reflex" has come. However, to accept that fact means to scrap entirely the "post-

industrial society" doctrine which has been almost successfully imposed upon the United States and Western Europe as a by-product of Pugwash Conference strategic doctrines. It means scrapping everything dearest to Bertrand Russell's (Robert M. Hutchins's) Aspen Institute, to (Russell's), Hutchins's, and McGeorge Bundy's Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, RAND Corporation, Stanford Research Institute, and most of the New York Council on Foreign Relations. Naturally, these circles seek desperately some solution to the strategic crisis, but desire only a solution which does not upset and scrap the "post-industrial society" doctrine.

Among the Anglo-American Establishment circles, it might be said that they are awaiting the emergence of a new Winston Churchill. As Churchill's postwar policies attest, he never rejected the long-range utopian policies of H.G. Wells, Bertrand Russell, et al. He was truly a spokesman for the prevailing long-range policies of the Anglo-American Establishments, and was thus, with some reluctance, entrusted with the duty of temporarily shelving those long-range policies in face of the unexpected turn of the Hitler developments about 1938 onward. This is to emphasize that those Establishments will not gladly tolerate a leader for the West who does not come from their own ranks.

The Establishment's wish to overlook the fact that the guiding hand of World War II was not Churchill, but President Franklin D. Roosevelt. True, Roosevelt was a "patrician" of the U.S. Establishment, as Churchill was an aristocrat of the British Establishment. On that account, the Anglo-American Establishments restively tolerated Roosevelt's leadership. Nonetheless, it was Roosevelt who won the war, by unleashing the U.S. military tradition exemplified best by General Douglas MacArthur, as otherwise echoed by the best U.S. commanders in the European theater, such as General Patton. Elliot Roosevelt's *As He Saw It* underlines the crucial policy-differences between Roosevelt and Churchill, just as Henry A. Kissinger endorsed Churchill against Roosevelt, in Kissinger's May 10, 1982 address to a public audience at London's Chatham House.

The root of our strategic, and most domestic, problems today is the fact, as Kissinger stated in his May 10, 1982 Chatham House address, that since the untimely death of President Roosevelt, on April 12, 1945, U.S. foreign-policy has been dictated by the British Establishment. Kissinger insisted, in that address, that every postwar U.S. Secretary of State, himself emphatically included, had been a servant of the British Establishment first, and the United States only when U.S. interests did not conflict with policies of the British Establishment. Thus, because of gentlemen of Kissinger's inclinations, the United States, which had won the war, lost the peace.

The issue posed by foreign-controlled U.S. secretaries of state—as Kissinger publicly professed himself to have been—is most readily illustrated by the conduct and outcome of

U.S. policy toward Latin America, better named "Ibero-America." That region of the world, today representing about 350 million persons, shares with the United States the same political philosophical origins as our own republic: The republican movement of Ibero-America has always been an outgrowth of the same 1766-1789 trans-Atlantic conspiracy, then extended from Leibniz's Petersburg Academy in Russia, through the court of Spain's Charles III, into the republicans of Spanish America. Together, Ibero-America and the United States represent about 600 million people. If U.S. capital-goods-producing potential were unleashed to foster the economic development of our neighbors to the south, the economic collaboration would produce quickly an economic superpower beyond the wildest dreams of all but a few today: an immense bastion of republican power in the world as a whole. Yet, our policy over the postwar period to date has been chiefly a commitment to the ruin of our neighbors to the south. The past and present policies of Henry A. Kissinger toward that region exemplify the manner vital U.S. strategic interests have been vastly undermined, almost destroyed by the post-April 12, 1945 overthrow of the policies of President Roosevelt.

In Africa, we are presently following a policy of literal genocide against the black African population. Of the approximately 400 million total population of that vastly underpopulated continent (of which Nigeria alone represents about one-quarter of the total), today approximately 120 million black Africans are threatened with genocide through famine, epidemic, and correlated civil strife, and an estimated 60,000 a day are currently reported dying of these causes. Only the kind of economic development which President Roosevelt projected for postwar Africa could stop this genocide, but we support those policies of the Swiss and Anglo-American Establishments which demand "red-lining" of black Africa, policies which can have no outcome but the genocidal death of tens of millions of black Africans. Yet, Kissinger professes to be foremost in his fear that Moscow will subvert black Africa before his policies might succeed in destroying that continent.

In the Middle East, we count Israel as our leading ally, and yet our State Department is demanding that Israel collapse its economy, through the same kinds of policies we have dictated, in concert with the Swiss bankers and IMF, to Ibero-America.

During the 1950s, President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace policies fostered positive relations with Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's India. India today is a nation of about 700 million people, the fourth-largest industrial power in the world, and the leading strategic power in the Indian Ocean region. For nearly two decades, the U.S. State Department has excelled even itself in attempting to turn India into our adversary.

In continental Southeast Asia, the United States ceased to be a credible force since about 1972, chiefly due to the

work of Henry A. Kissinger and his teams. Through policies espoused by Kissinger, we are ruining our relationship with the second power (after India) of the South-Asia region, Indonesia.

Our relations to Japan are obscene in large. Again, the worsening of these relations date from Kissinger's reign at National Security Council and State Department. While we have been destroying our steel, auto, and other industries at home, Japan has "unfairly" continued policies of high-technology investments which we abandoned. Under Kissinger and others, we demand of Japan that it be "fair" by destroying its economy as we have destroyed our own. For example, Toyota's studies report that during the early 1950s the efficiency of U.S. capital-investment in auto-production was eight times that of Japan's auto industry; today, Japan's is

---

---

*The time for a new "Churchillian Reflex" has come. However, to accept that fact means to scrap entirely the "post-industrial society" doctrine which has been almost successfully imposed upon the United States and Western Europe as a by-product of Pugwash Conference strategic doctrines.*

---

---

eight times as efficient as our own. We demand, in effect, that Japan subsidize the mismanagement of the United States' auto industry, the mismanagement of our steel industry, and our willful ruin of U.S. agriculture.

We ought to be cooperating with Japan in programs for economic development of the Indian Ocean and Pacific Ocean basins. Instead of working together to create capital-goods markets in Asia and Ibero-America, we are squabbling over the price at which our two economies "take in one another's laundry."

These monstrous strategic errors of our foreign policy toward the nations of Ibero-America, Africa, and Asia, errors which contribute to the economic downfall and political erosion of export-hungry nations of Western continental Europe, are the root of our strategic crisis today. If we were to take seriously the plans of the Soviet military dictatorship to es-

tablish its imperial rule in the world during the months and years immediately ahead, these are the policies which must be changed to provide the indispensable political and logistical strategic bases for our security.

These are the facts which bear most directly upon the "confusion among the elites." Their policies have failed miserably, as the Soviet military coup d'état informs them most precisely of this fact. Yet, they desire to consider only those solutions to the crisis which do not return the alliance to the policies associated with President Roosevelt's projected postwar designs. For lack of any solution acceptable to their "post-industrial society" designs, they propose to send Henry Kissinger and his Brent Scowcroft to Moscow for "back-channel" negotiations, to negotiate the unnegotiable, *to attempt to shift Moscow back to a pre-military coup d'état policy*. In short, out of hatred against the memory of President Franklin Roosevelt, the Anglo-American Establishments are devoutly dedicated to solutions which assuredly will fail, just as was Neville Chamberlain's faction during the pre-June 1940 period.

However, the picture is more complicated—fortunately. The "Western elites" are not limited to the ranks of the Anglo-American Establishments. Partly opposed to those Establishments, but also partly overlapping them, the nations of Western Europe and the United States each have leading strata whose political philosophical outlook is predominantly nationalist and republican. Typical are leading military professionals whose political thinking tends toward the tradition of Lazare Carnot and General Scharnhorst; these strata also include elements of the entrepreneurial ranks, leading professionals, especially in the physical sciences, high-technology farmers, and leaders of some trade-union and other popular organizations. From such latter strata, in Western Europe (Britain, Spain, France, Germany, Italy, and so forth), and in the United States, there is a restiveness at present. As the political self-confidence of the Establishments is undermined by a real crisis, and their own lack of a real solution to the worsening crisis, the relative influence of the republican patriots tends to increase.

This is the key to the massive, multi-million-dollar deployment against the LaRouche campaign, for which the January 30, five-minute editorial statement on NBC-TV's "Nightly News" is but the tip of the iceberg. "The LaRouche Phenomenon," to describe the matter as the Establishments view it, is the growing success of economist, editor, and Democratic presidential candidate LaRouche in promoting the emergence of a loosely coordinated, but increasingly potent international upsurge among patriotic republican elite-forces not only inside the United States and nations of Western Europe, but also Asia, Africa and Ibero-America.

For example, since October 1982, the principal efforts of Henry Kissinger's Kissinger Associates, Inc., AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland's AIFLD, and such State Department officials as Schlaudeman in Argentina have been directed chiefly against LaRouche's influence throughout Ibe-

ro-America, and very little else. The fight by Kissinger himself, his crony William D. Rogers, and others, has been directed against the influence of a book-length economic-policy document, *Operation Juárez* issued by LaRouche during early August 1982. *Operation Juárez's* policies have since appeared as adopted policies of continental agencies of Ibero-America, as well as governmental figures and other leading circles in most of the nations of Ibero-America. Kissinger's assignment, from his employers in London, Switzerland, and New York City, has been to "stop LaRouche's influence" in Ibero-America.

Similarly, a massive operation involving Kissinger, Irving Brown, Lane Kirkland, the FBI, and rotten elements of the State Department, has been deployed to attempt to neutralize LaRouche's influence in Western Europe, in Africa, and in Asia. In all these cases, Kissinger's and Kirkland's efforts overlap anti-LaRouche efforts by the Soviet KGB and GRU, and are sometimes done in collaboration with KGB-GRU channels.

The issue is not LaRouche as an individual. The issue is the tendency of LaRouche's influence to catalyze a more effective insurgency from patriotic republican circles of influence in those nations, to supply such circles with a strategic policy-matrix through which to coordinate strategies to be adopted among the various nations involved to a common purpose for a common interest. The thought by the forces behind NBC-TV's multi-million-dollar operations against LaRouche is that if LaRouche can be isolated and destroyed, the threat of the forces he represents can be neutralized. Their view is that LaRouche is the only visible personality who might unify such forces into effectively coordinated policy-action at this juncture. For that reason, as former Allen Dulles chief of staff Tom Braden said at the conclusion of a Cable News Network "Crossfire" broadcast on January 31, LaRouche is considered "dangerous" by the Swiss and Anglo-American Establishments.

What frightens them is not LaRouche himself. What frightens them is their own confusion in face of the worst strategic crisis in modern history. They fear LaRouche more or less as much as they fear the military dictators in Moscow. LaRouche's efforts might save them from Moscow's strategic threats, but they fear that if LaRouche is permitted to assume leadership of the United States during this crisis, LaRouche would use that position of leadership to reshape the world more or less as President Franklin Roosevelt projected for the postwar period. That latter outcome the Establishments hate more or less as much as they fear the prospects of becoming slaves of Moscow.

Thus, the tendency among the Establishments is to borrow some of LaRouche's proposed strategic policies, in a slightly modified form, but to also destroy LaRouche himself. This tendency is growing among the Establishment's ranks, although not yet predominant. That, as briefly as possible, is the reason some Establishment press-outlets are reporting disarray among the elites.