

## Editorial

### *Nations are being murdered*

Hitler in his wildest fantasies of world domination did not imagine a plan so hideous as that which guides the thinking of leading world strategists today. We face today a resurgence of the plan for world empire that has characterized oligarchical strategy from its beginnings. But even the very term empire may be misleading for those accustomed to life in a saner period of world history. For today's empire builders, the goal is not merely to place the populations of the darker-skinned nations of the world under their sway. They do not intend to capture Africa, the Middle East, the nations of Asia. They intend, rather, to destroy them.

It is not the Soviet Union versus the United States, nor any other clash of national interest that is guiding world history today. It is the battle of those committed to the policy of empire, versus the forces of the nation-state. That is what guides the behavior of the Libyan madman in the employ of Swiss and Venetian oligarchical interests. Qaddafi is not stealing land. He is destroying. That is what is determining the battle in Central America. It's not Soviet expansionism we have to fear there; it's religious cults. The same is true in the Middle East. No one is out to rule the Middle East. Some evil forces are out to destroy it.

Where is the proof? Unfortunately, if you are willing to look, it is almost everywhere:

- "Keeping Lebanon stitched together is a desirable American diplomatic interest, but it is not a vital national interest," editorializes the *New York Times* of Sept. 15, 1983. The problem, you see, is that this nation was "a precarious creation to begin with."

- Or, listen to Alexander King, co-founder with Aurelio Peccei of the Club of Rome International, on the subject of India: "India's population should not be beyond two-thirds of what it is now. Mrs. Gandhi has been very unsuccessful in her approach. There is too much romanticism, sentimentality." How to eliminate the 200 million excess eaters? "More regional autonomy" could "help a lot. . . there would be more of a sense of self-management in controlling the population."

How did it start? The problem, in its current form, goes back to the 1920s and Bertrand Russell. Russell then envisioned a one-world empire, a rule by the Anglo-Saxon races over the benighted darker skinned peoples, who were to be left in their "natural state" of technological backwardness, their unfortunate tendency to overpopulate to be cured by periodic famine and war. After the Second World War, Russell tried to implement it as an Anglo-American empire. It was to be called a one-world government, and would possess a monopoly over science, technology, and the world's nuclear arsenals. To achieve it, Russell, the pacifist, called for a preventive nuclear strike against the Soviet Union. But the Soviets got the bomb, so Russell changed his plan to call for two empires, and went back to his former advocacy of pacifism, promoting the talks with the Soviet Union that led to the Pugwash conferences on arms control.

By 1958, Khrushchev had accepted the Russell plan by way of the Pugwash negotiations. The Soviets agreed to accept the doctrine of MAD (mutually assured destruction) as put forward to the Soviet delegations at the Pugwash II conference by the deranged Dr. Leo Szilard. This was the Dr. Strangelove who called for the superpowers to periodically agree to conduct limited nuclear wars against each other's urban population centers to "relieve tensions." The Soviet leadership, for their own reasons, bought MAD, and made the decision to work with the racist, imperialist Russell against forces in the West committed to the development of nations through technological progress.

That was the beginning. The two empires began to become one. Not conflicts of nations over national interests, but Malthusian maniacs, supranational interests dedicated to world rule, have come to determine world strategy. We are now near the endgame. Either we return to the principle of national sovereignty, based on a community of principle among nation-states devoted to the material and technological progress of their populations, or Russell's plan will come into being.