

the IPPNW, because I have the impression the IPPNW has ideas very different from ours.”

EIR: What did these two French organizations represent numerically?

Dr. X: This was a foul game from the beginning. At the very beginning, the other group had a file containing a lot of names, about 200 physicians; this file obviously came from somewhere, it had not been created like that from one day to another. At the time, we were about 80, so obviously, had we accepted the fusion, we would have been wiped out right at the first General Assembly, and they would have taken control of the board. Furthermore, to make the figure of their membership more impressive, they accepted in their association all kinds of people who were not physicians, although from the standpoint of IPPNW, only the number of actual

Right at the beginning of the association, even before the first general assembly that was to decide its statutes, the association was contacted by physicians mostly linked to the “Appeal of the Hundred” against U.S. missile basing, and to the Appeal of Stockholm against nuclear war—i.e., an emanation of the Communist Party.

medical doctors is considered. Recently, they said they had about 300 members, but we don’t know if this takes into account only physicians or not.

EIR: Who are the people who, in the Budapest congress, have decided to accept only the communist created association?

Dr. X: Well, IPPNW has a European board, situated in London, and an international headquarters in Boston, Mass. I don’t know in detail who are those who took the position for the other association. I know that Dr. Richard (who had joined the other organization) was in contact with Dr. Nugent Conn, who was Executive Director of IPPNW. I would like to add a few names of the people belonging to the support committee of the other association. There are Dr. Schwartzberg, Dr. Milliez, Dr. Jasmin, Dr. Bousquet and Dr. Georges Mathé [most of them signed the Appeal of the Hundred]. Looking back at the matter, I am very happy that our association was not recognized. It leaves us free to act the way we want, without being forced to adopt positions of IPPNW.

Obituary

C. Douglas-Home, Editor of *The Times*

by Laurent Murawiec and Michael Liebig

On October 29, Charles Douglas-Home died of cancer at age 48. The young editor of *The Times* of London, in the three years of his tenure, had revived the sagging fortunes of the newspaper. But more importantly, his commitment to fight through thick and thin on behalf of President Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative, had made him one of the most important political allies of the United States in Europe.

For the last three years, a long series of articles in his newspaper relentlessly pressed the case not only for SDI, but for its moral and strategic underpinning, the concept of Mutually Assured Survival. Douglas-Home’s editorials explored the avenues of British and European participation in the SDI and of a European Defense Initiative. When the British foreign secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, threw a violent anti-SDI fit last March, the *Times* chief sent him a shell against which no defense was found, “Mr. Howe’s Unilateral Declaration of Independence from SDI.”

Mr. Douglas-Home was execrated—the word is not too strong—by the numerous and powerful appeasement elements in Whitehall, who blamed his courageous stance upon his supposed “eccentricities,” against the conventional wisdom shared at the moment by the vast majority of the mandarins, the peers, the experts, and the legion of London-based worshippers of Neville Chamberlain. As he jokingly told the authors a few months ago, “There is no lack of people in Whitehall that want my scalp. Let them dance!” The authors clearly remember some of his enemies, in high places in government and elsewhere, repeatedly predicting his demise. What they could not stand or fathom was a commitment to truth that was most unusual in today’s press world.

Over the years, the authors had the chance of meeting Mr. Douglas-Home a number of times, and had been impressed by a quality of personal courage—the courage of standing firm for one’s own ideas. They were impressed by his patriotism as well as by his ability to look at the future, and the interests, of the Western world as a whole. In their last, recent meeting with Mr. Douglas-Home, his acute interest in Peruvian President Alan García’s war on drugs had stood equal to his commitment to convincing Mrs. Thatcher of the urgent necessity of Britain joining in the SDI.

A tribute should be paid to a brave fighter who died far too early. His loss is not only that of *The Times* and of Britain, it is that of a precarious Western civilization.

The Trilateral Conspiracy Against The U.S. Constitution: Fact Or Fiction?



EIR
Executive Intelligence Review
Price: \$250

Order from:
EIR News Service,
P.O. Box 17390,
Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
Order #85019

David Rockefeller: To some, the Trilateral Commission is a sinister plot by Eastern Establishment businessmen who will do almost anything—including going into cahoots with the Kremlin—for the sake of financial gain. The fact that many former members, including President Carter, are now members of the Administration is hailed as proof of how devilishly well the conspiracy works.

—Letter to the editor, of the *New York Times*, Aug. 25, 1980.

Moscow: The Trilateral Commission has opposed some of the military programs adopted by Washington which threaten to upset the strategic balance.

—Yu. Fedorov, in *International Affairs*, July 1985

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.: The general object from the side of the Liberal Establishments was to establish a global *Pax Romana*, a thousand-year empire of shared global rule between the Trilaterals and the Soviet empire. . . . It happens, however, that the Soviets intend to cheat. They will maintain their partnership with the Liberal Establishments no longer than the Trilaterals and similar types continue to be "useful fools" working to advantage of Soviet imperial interests. Once the usefulness of those fools has been exhausted, the Soviets will variously assimilate or obliterate them.

—Foreword to *The Trilateral Conspiracy Against the U.S. Constitution: Fact or Fiction?*

To destroy the evil influence of the Trilateral Commission in American political life, one must expose the delusions in which the Trilaterals obsessively believe. *EIR's* Special Report provides a comprehensive textual analysis and refutation of key Trilateral writings, including: Zbigniew Brzezinski's delphic attacks on the Strategic Defense Initiative; George Shultz's argument for the decline of American power and influence; David Rockefeller's "socialism." Foreword by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.