

Moles seek to wreck U.S.A.-China 'summit'

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

October 10, 1997

The British monarchy is waging economic and diplomatic warfare, aimed at isolating and crushing the United States, and the strategic planners at the Defense Department do not appear to be paying attention to their duty to plan the strategic defense of our republic.

London, in its capacity as command-center for the world's most powerful political force, the British Commonwealth, is conducting its not-so-silent warfare against the U.S. on the following fronts:

1. During the recent three years, *EIR* has documented this extensively: In **Africa, South America, and Central Asia**: London-coordinated British Commonwealth interests are continuing a move to grab control of the majority of the world's strategically significant raw-materials resources. In **Africa**, the British monarchy's mercenary operations (run under the direction of Queen Elizabeth II's Corps of Commissioners and Crown Agents), the genocide in progress is coordinated through Uganda's marcher overlord and mass-murderer Yoweri Museveni and his key cronies, the current dictators of Eritrea, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Burundi, Zaire, and John Garang. In Central and South America, British interests have taken control of the top financial institutions and raw materials, freezing out the U.S. government and U.S. interests.

2. On the economic front: The British government's openly and repeatedly stated policy, is to use a common European currency, under British direction, as a base of operations for economic and political warfare against the United States. As during the Nineteenth-Century period of Britain's Lord


Palmerston and his puppet, Napoleon III, France under President Jacques Chirac and François Mitterrand heir Prime Minister Jospin, has presently resumed the part of a British lackey for economic and political warfare against the U.S.A.

3. The U.S.A.'s greatest single potential for beating back this British aggression, is the possibility which has been opened up by China, for new U.S. strategic relations in the Pacific and Indian Ocean regions, new relations centered around China, Japan, and, hopefully, also the Indian sub-continent. The October "summit" between the Presidents of the U.S.A. and China is the opportunity. Naturally, London, an openly declared enemy of China, is using virtually every mole and dupe it has, inside the Congress, and inside British-controlled "high" and "low" church sects inside the U.S., to prevent a successful outcome of that "summit."

With that "summit" little more than days ahead, it is urgent that we identify, and act to correct some of the subversive operations which London is running through the U.S. Congress, within corrupt, but influential Pentagon voices, and under the cover of some London-controlled, mass-based religious cults. Before turning to my principal topic here, I must clear the decks by summary reference to the matter of London's top-down control over certain mass-based politically active sects.

State-controlled religion

To understand the way in which London deploys certain among the U.S.A.'s leading television-based and kindred, wild-eyed religious cults, we must identify the reasons why so large a part of the U.S. population is susceptible to being manipulated by the current crop of such profit-minded "Elmer



Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va.) gives a press conference on Aug. 20, about his trip to Tibet and his efforts to derail the U.S.A.-China summit.

Gantrys.” With the 1962 “missile crisis,” and several other terrifying shocks of the early to middle 1960s, the popular culture of the U.S. underwent a rapid, and profound change, a change which had its most radical impact upon the generation which is now approaching, or has passed its fiftieth birthdays.

The result, was what Britain’s leading psychological-warfare agency, the London Tavistock Clinic and Institute, termed a “cultural paradigm-shift,” “a shift away from rationality, whose most colorful expression was the “rock-drug-sex” youth-counterculture, which erupted during the 1964-1970 interval. However, the dayglo colors of that youth-counterculture must not distract our attention from the fact, that the overwhelming majority of the adolescent U.S. population underwent kindred, sudden, and radical changes in their mental habits. The general term for all of this, is “flight from reality.”

Sometimes, this flight from reality assumed the form of some seemingly outrageous change in personal behavior. More generally, it took the form to be expected of any group of people subjected to an effect like war-time “shell shock:” increasing instability, suggestibility, paranoia. This was to be seen, on campus and elsewhere, during the 1966-1973 interval, as an increasing tendency toward irrationality, as the upsurge among adolescents and young adults, of a tendency to wander from one utopian fad to another.

This produced the “Me Generation” of the 1970s, better

described as the “Look-at-me generation.” The custom of paying a higher price for a personal-use product, such as a garment, because it has a conspicuously displayed brand-name, expresses this irrationality. The subsuming syndrome was “flight from reality,” into fantasy, into “virtual reality.” The TV screen, and, more recently, the Internet, have become the conspicuous playgrounds for such masturbational qualities of escapism.

In the domain of religious behavior, the same epidemic of irrationality is expressed by “Millennium” cults, and kindred, gnostic pathologies. A kind of Manicheanism has taken over its glassy-eyed victims, and that in increasing numbers. The habit of flight from reality, over the recent thirty-odd years, has had a cumulative effect, reflected in strange new patterns of lability in so-called religious belief, whether as blind faith in mutual funds and derivatives, or in cults of a frankly religious guise. Initially, the flight-from-reality was prompted by the awesomeness of the prospect of thermonuclear attack. Thirty years of flight from reality, have made any form of reality terrifying. We see, thus, not only in the U.S.A., but globally, beginning the middle of the 1960s, an increasing insanity in the expression of novel developments in the field of mass religious behavior.

Actual Christianity is epitomized by the *I Corinthians 13* read at the recent state funeral for murdered Princess Diana. We are here on a mission, to do good for humanity as a whole,

leaving life to dwell thereafter in the Creator's own dwelling-place, the simultaneity of eternity. The gnostic, such as the Manichean or Bogomil, rejects this. For him, or her, in the material world, Satan is absolute monarch; only through a "spiritual world" can we escape from Satan's absolute rule, to find a better dwelling-place in death or, perhaps, Rapture. Thus, as *I Corinthians 13* reminds us, in exemplary fashion, the Gnostic is no Christian, but is, with all his spiritual and other personal rituals, as "nothing;" he has abandoned his mission: his responsibility for the condition of all mankind, to the limit of his or her powers to affect this.

The characteristic of the mass religious cults, is a flight from reality, into the hopes of health, wealth, and family, which might be magically provided by financial donations to an "Elmer Gantry," through the mail, or as price of admission to some "Feel Good" orgy, some retreat from rational responsibility for the condition of humanity in this nation, this world. These are no Christians, loudly as they might claim to be; Jesus Christ would tell us to shake the dust from our shoes when we depart the company of such cultists. They are not their brother's keeper; they are of the "Look-at-me generation." They are the "welfare cheats" of spirituality—all for me, my family, my "feel good" needs; wanting everything, but unwilling to work for it. Like today's Ayn Rand followers and other neo-conservatives, they will do nothing for the mission which one has been made to perform, but, they expect to be paid, and, that strictly on time.

The danger, as expressed more luridly in satanic cults, is that one, like a shooter in a crowded restaurant, post office, or as a serial killer, will commit hideous crimes of commission, or omission, on real people, in the real world, for the sake of some fanciful scenario in the virtual reality of one's religious or analogous delusion.

The truthfulness, and the true effect, of one's acts, or omissions, is of no concern to such escapist "true believers." It is the ecstasy of shared belief in mere words, and the virtual sexual release of symbolic acts, especially symbolic acts in propitiation of those mere words, which governs. Such were the Flagellants and kindred sorts of the escapists' mass lunatic cults, during the so-called "New Dark Age" decades of Europe's terrifying mid-Fourteenth Century.

To understand that form of mass-insanity in the name of religion, is already half-way toward neutralizing it. The crisis of our military and related institutions, is of a somewhat related, but distinctly different form.

Pentagon or Pentagram?

The kinds of efforts to sabotage the U.S.A.-China "summit," being deployed into the Congress from Pentagon-related circles, center around two points.

The first, is the assertion that since we can not trust China to keep its present policies and leadership in power, China *could become* a military threat in the future. Therefore, that

argument continues, we must keep open an option for a future military confrontation with China.

The second, is the assertion, that the interpretation of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty favored by the devotees of self-avowed British Foreign Service asset Sir Henry A. Kissinger, and Moonie-funded Sir George Bush, requires us to construe as Japan's, a collection of rocks associated geologically with Taiwan, and historically with China (except for period of Japan's aggression against China, during the Sino-Japanese wars launched of 1894 and the 1930s). Japan, in its negotiations with China, postponed discussion of those claims, until some distant future time, when relations between the two states might be warmer. In any case, the notion that these islands are part of Japan's security requirements, is a highly dubious bit of sophistry. Nonetheless, the wild-eyed Kissinger-Bush freaks from our Pentagon offices insist, that the U.S. is obliged to demand that China accept their "interpretation."

This is not a blanket criticism of our military professionals. We have, in fact, two branches in our defense policy. This situation is fairly described as "Pentagon versus Pentagram," the first, the traditionalist view we might associate with General Douglas MacArthur's role as organizer of victory, in what seemed to most observers, at the beginning of 1942, a hopeless short-term situation in the Pacific. The second, the devotees of the "Pentagram," has been known, since the late 1940s, as the "utopian" tradition, the tradition associated today with characters such as former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and those men in uniform who sold their souls to Sir Henry "Mephistopheles" Kissinger, James R. Schlesinger, et al., during, and following the period of the Vietnam conflict.

I have some direct knowledge, based in experience, on this matter; the Pentagon types responsible for the outlook I have just described, are clowns who should receive instant promotions to the post of tortoise protection, in the Galapagos Islands. There are other military currents, which, unfortunately, President Clinton has done too little to reach out to, thus far. My experience in these matters, back during the late 1970s and early 1980s, is of crucial bearing on the China-related issues rampant within the Pentagon, the Congress, and our ever-British-loving mass media, today. I reference that experience here, to indicate the real-world possibilities for developing an effective U.S. strategic doctrine under the conditions of the approaching turn of the century.

At the close of 1981, I was approached by representatives of the U.S. government, with the proposal that I, in my private capacity as a recent candidate for the Democratic U.S. Presidential nomination, establish a new back-channel for discussions with the Soviet government. It was accepted, that I include my personal recommendation on a new U.S.-Soviet agreement on ballistic-missile defense, as part of that series of meetings, meetings actually held by me, during the approx-

imate lapse of twelve months, between February 1982 and February 1983. During the latter eight months of that period, I reported to the highest level of the U.S. National Security Council, while my Soviet interlocutor conducted his part in a similar way.

The net result was the closing segment of President Ronald Reagan's March 23, 1983 televised broadcast, announcing the "Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)," and proposing to Moscow exactly what I had suggested to my Soviet counterpart, as what I would recommend that President Reagan offer publicly to Moscow. During 1982, and into the middle of the 1980s, my personal efforts on this were massively supported among senior military retired and active ranks, not only inside the U.S.A., but also in Germany, France, Italy, and elsewhere. There were also adversaries, such as Lt.-Gen. (ret.) Daniel P. Graham, who campaigned loudly and widely against me and against Dr. Edward Teller, on this issue.

During the late Spring and Summer of 1983, the White House approach to SDI was significantly modified. This began, at the close of March 1983, when the most prominent public opponent of SDI, the British-directed Heritage Foundation's General Graham, was deployed to claim authorship of the policy, but, insisted that the defense be limited to a useless program of "kinetic energy" interception-weapons. Despite some sympathy for SDI within some British circles, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, like her Washington-based Heritage Foundation agents, was stubbornly opposed to SDI. By August of that year, the policy had been greatly changed from the original, March 23, announcement. During those years, I came to know the internal factional divisions within the military and intelligence community, here, and abroad, rather intimately.

Had Moscow accepted President Reagan's March 23, 1983 offer, the world would not be the mess it is today. Instead of accepting that initial SDI offer, which would have prevented Russia—and, also, the ordinary citizens of the U.S.A.—from collapsing into the kind of murderous economic degeneration Russia is suffering today, Armand Hammer's Soviet protégés, notably Soviet General Secretaries Yuri Andropov and Mikhail Gorbachev, joined the British government in putting me "number one on the hit parade." As a result, my associates and I suffered the well-known legal problems suffered during the 1984-1989 interval. There was a massive, international news-media attack upon me personally, during the March-October 1986 preparations for the Reagan-Gorbachev "summit," attacks which featured a Soviet operation around the Feb. 28 assassination of Sweden's Prime Minister Olof Palme, attacks, coordinated between certain Western and Soviet bloc agencies, which saturated the U.S.A. and Soviet leading media. These attacks culminated in an attempt, under the Justice Department's George Bush-allied William Weld, to have me assassinated during the night of October 6-7, 1986, on the eve of the Reykjavik "summit"

between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev.¹ The impetus for the legal and mass-media attacks upon me during that period, came as direction issued to official U.S. agencies from London.

These London-orchestrated legal and other attacks upon me and my associates, had the effect of virtually shutting down my high-level connections into the military and other relevant circles in the U.S.A. and western Europe. Nonetheless, these active connections of the 1977-1986 interval continue to provide me an advantageous view of the kinds of problems surfacing around "China policy" within the U.S. military and Congress today.

This is an area in which Admiral Bobby Inman would have been a great asset to the Clinton Administration. It is an area of policy shaping which I believe I understand much better than my sometimes perplexed, and politically out-flanked President. It is fair to say, that I came to understand some of the most commonly overlooked features of functioning of institutions of government, an understanding which, in large part, I learned the proverbial "hard way."

Strategy

The problem is, that the patriotic elements within the U.S. military and related institutions have presently no clear mandate on which to base sane strategic planning. Under such circumstances, the corrosive, frictional influence of bureaucratic, chiefly Anglophile, over-stuffed moral mediocrities, in key offices, tends to take over policy-shaping, to such effects as we see in the Defense Department's continuing the lunatic, September 1995 "United States Security Strategy for the Americas," or putting forth the disgusting excuse for a "China policy" rattling around some Pentagon offices and the U.S. Congress today. Disgusting "sensitivity" cults, such as the notorious "Inter-American Dialogue," tend to replace competent strategic professionalism in the design of what, too often, becomes U.S. strategic policy, by default.

To illustrate what the term "strategic planning" ought to signify, look at the October 1997 China "summit" against the relevant background of the present global threat, that the sovereignty of the U.S.A. will be liquidated by approximately the end of this century, a mere three years ahead. What must we think of the pompous mannequins who currently testify on the "strategic issues of U.S.-China relations" before the Congress? What impotent, bloated asses these fellows are!

Briefly, examine the continued, near-term threat to the existence of the U.S.A.

The threat, in its present form, originates in the aftermath of London's unsuccessful effort to use its creation, the Con-

1. Following a telegram I sent to President Reagan, in the early evening of October 6, the forces deployed for the attack were pulled back for the night, and the continuing of that phase of Leesburg operation shut down the following morning.

federate States of America (CSA), to break up the U.S.A. and Canada, into a "Balkanized" array of feudalistic baronies constantly at one another's throat over boundary and related "interests." At that time, there was no nation on this planet, except the U.S.A., which was potentially capable of threatening the world power of the imperial financial oligarchy centered in London. The U.S. victory, against Britain, in defeating the Confederacy, and in building the U.S.A. into the world's most advanced and most powerful nation-state economy, during the 1861- 1876 interval, unleashed a wave of national-economy building in Japan, in post-Napoleon III France, in Germany, in Italy, and in Russia.

From the close of the U.S. Civil War, until today, the ideological assault against the 1861-1876 U.S.A. model of democratic republic and national economy, has been centered in the kookish ideological circles of Oxford University's John Ruskin, his Cecil Rhodes, the Fabian Society, and the Fabian Society's expression as the "World Federalist" movement and ideology.

During on-again, off-again relations between plebian H.G. Wells and aristocratic Mephistopheles Bertrand Russell, during the opening three decades of this century, Wells read the work of Rutherford associate Frederick Soddy, and adopted Soddy's view on the potentiality of nuclear fission as both a power source and the means for devising the most terrible weapons. On or about the time of Wells' official position in British foreign intelligence, during World War I, Wells conceived the promotion of development of nuclear-fission weapons, as creating devices so terrifying as to impel nations to surrender to arbitration by world government, rather than fight war in defense of national sovereignty. With Bertrand Russell's public declaration of solidarity with Wells' published *The Open Conspiracy*, Russell quickly assumed the leading role in pushing for the development of nuclear-fission arsenals. It was Russell, who exploited Otto Hahn's 1938 chain-reaction experiment, as a pretext for luring Albert Einstein into writing the letter which launched the U.S. Manhattan Project.

During the period since the untimely death of President Franklin Roosevelt, nuclear arsenals, and threat of nuclear war, have been used, as Russell stated this policy in the September 1946 edition of that *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* which he, Russell, personally controlled through his agent Leo Szilard. When N.S. Khrushchev, in 1955, sent four representatives to praise Russell's policies, at the London Conference of Russell's World Parliamentarians for World Government, the process which became known as "détente" was set into motion, a process, which in the stated intent of Russell, Szilard, et al., was intended to bring about "world government," and, in that process, eliminate the existence of nations such as that United States which Russell, according to his own writings, so passionately wished to eliminate.

The 1989-1991 disintegration of the Soviet bloc created opportunity for that for which Russell had worked so long, and

so devilishly. The cabal of Thatcher, British asset François Mitterrand, and British asset George Bush, sought not only to destroy the economies of the former Soviet bloc, but to eliminate quickly all vestiges of national sovereignty and national economy world-wide.

If, as is inevitable, the present international financial and monetary system disintegrates during the months ahead of us now, and if there is no effective replacement for those failed international agencies, the entire world will go through a chain-reaction process of dissolution of all significant semblance of sovereign national existence, a crisis of the sort implicit in the precedent of Europe's Fourteenth-Century "New Dark Age." That would mean the dissolution of the U.S.A., and the outbreak of rates of death from starvation and illness comparable to, but possibly exceeding what has been seen in post-1991 Russia.

These facts constitute some among the essential features for defining the strategic issues facing the U.S.A. today. To speak of "strategic issues," without explicitly addressing these matters I have just summarily described, is to make oneself a disgusting object in the eyes of such citizens as might still be living beyond the upcoming turn of this century.

The vital strategic challenge for the U.S.A. today, is to secure the continuation of the principles of national sovereignty and matching principles of national economy, deep into the coming century. Our allies, and potential allies, for this purpose, are those who will share our concerns in these matters, who will fight to secure our sovereignty, because that is necessary to secure their own.

The only powerful nation on this planet, besides our own, which is jealously dedicated to its own sovereignty, more jealously than most U.S. citizens guard their own nation's independence, is China. Other nations may aspire to the same policy, but, isolated, are unable, by themselves, or in blocs of small nations, to resist the imperial insolence of today's supranational institutions. Thus, a partnership between the U.S.A. and China, becomes the only visible means for rallying a large number of nations around us, in order to defeat those opposing global forces pushing for a neo-feudalist world of "world government" and "globalization." If one opposes that view of the matter, he or she must be judged either astonishingly stupid, or no patriot in any sense of the term.

Then, why do we permit misguided factitious blocs within the bureaucracy and the Congress, to play geopolitical tiddlywinks with the future existence of the United States? It is past time, to send such non-patriots of the Pentagon faction to harmless assignments in places such as the Galapagos, and to put serious professionals to work in refining the kinds of strategic plans which accord with the vital, sovereign interests of a U.S.A. now rapidly approaching the greatest global crises in all of modern history. For that, the President must call forth the patriots in the Pentagon, and activate them to their proper mission, by the kind of mission-assignment I have indicated here.