
Book Review

Churchill, the Beast-Man Architect Of Anglo-American Imperialism

by Stu Rosenblatt

Winston Churchill: A Study in Greatness

by Geoffrey Best

New York: Oxford University Press, 2003

400 pages, paperback, \$18.95

Few Americans understand the imperial drive that has embroiled the United States in the Iraq disaster, because they don't understand the givens behind the sacrosanct policies, such as "spreading democracy," the "Anglo-American special relationship," "pre-emptive war," "The Coalition," and other buzzwords in whose defense we send our citizens to die and/or kill in unfathomable brutality. More importantly, what has been kept from Americans is that one of the architects of these givens—either as initiator or promoter—was one of the most evil men of the 20th Century: Winston Churchill. Quite the opposite, many Americans have been taught to look to Churchill as the great man, as Geoffrey Best calls him in this new biography. Churchill's persona is the iron-willed leader for tough times. American political leaders, on both sides of the aisle, regularly invoke Churchill as ensconced in the pantheon with great Americans. But, more bluntly, Briton Niall Ferguson invoked Churchill's brutal suppression of the 1920s' Iraqi uprising against their colonial masters, in an April 18, 2004 *New York Times* op-ed: Here's how we defended the Empire then, said Ferguson. Suck it in, Yanks, and do the right thing now: "The lessons of empire are not the kind of lessons Americans like to learn. It's more comforting to go on denying that America is in the Empire business. But the time has come to get real."

Lyndon LaRouche, in his LaRouche Doctrine for Iraq and Southwest Asia, called for the repudiation of these Utopian, or imperial, military doctrines, which have distorted U.S. military policy increasingly, since the end of World War II. Many of the most nefarious of those doctrines—air power, shock and awe, pre-emptive conventional war and nuclear war, and other madness—are now standard fare in the increasingly

imperial posture of the U.S. military. Most of these policies in the United States have their origin in that most imperial of "democrats," the nasty Mr. Churchill. In the 60 years, since the death of President Franklin Roosevelt, United States strategic policy has shifted away from its foundations in the Republic, in the tradition of Washington and Lincoln, to becoming the muscle for the English-speaking empire, as exemplified by Churchill.

Best's biography is a typical apology for Churchill, "the greatest Englishman of the 20th Century." Best is forced to concede many of Churchill's most egregious errors, but he refuses to identify him for the monster he truly was, hence perpetuating one of the substantial myths at the root of America's current debacle in the desert.

Let us dispense right away with Churchill's one important contribution to mankind, his courageous battle against Nazi tyranny in the Battle of Britain. This is well presented by Best, but he bypasses the fact of Churchill's motivation for resisting the Nazis: Churchill did not oppose fascism in any form; he merely refused to allow his Empire to play second fiddle to that of another second-rate painter, Adolf Hitler. At the same time that Churchill was launching war to save his beloved British Empire, he unabashedly supported other fascist regimes, less threatening to England than Hitler—notably Spain's Francisco Franco.

Origins of the Empire Man

In order to win the Second World War, the United States entered into an alliance with Britain and the Soviet Union, and from that point on, it has become an American article of faith, Britain has been our longstanding, close ally. LaRouche and *EIR* have exploded that myth, proving that United States has been at odds with its Revolutionary War adversary for fully 200 years. Churchill's intention, from no later than the 1920s was to foster an alliance between the U.S. and Britain, within the umbrella of the British Empire, albeit under many guises, not the least of them "spreading the democratic ideal." In the 1930s, Churchill authored the diabolical strategy to create a Union of English-Speaking Peoples, of which the



Churchill officially declared the Cold War against the Soviet Union in his so-called Iron Curtain speech at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri. Ironically, the 1946 speech was titled "The Sinews of Peace." Note President Truman laughing at the podium's right. Truman lied that he never saw the speech, but he and Churchill had gone over it together on the train trip out to Fulton.

post-war America's "special relationship" with the mother country, was the most important adjunct.

His aim, the very soul of his true identity, was to preserve and expand the British Empire, in all of its despicable glory, whereas the very soul of the United States has been bound up with its opposition to the imperial impulse, as was seen in the dedications of Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, and Lyndon LaRouche. All of this is threatened by the past 60 years' post-war history, in which the United States has become increasingly an imperial partner of a Churchillian Anglo-American alliance.

Background of an Imperialist

Churchill was born in 1873. His grandfather was the seventh Duke of Marlborough, and his father, Lord Randolph Churchill, was a Tory leader in the Parliament. (The late Graham Lowry's *How the Nation Was Won* documents the Marlboroughs' hatred for everything American, from the earliest years of the colonies.) Churchill's mother, Jennie Jerome, was the daughter of Wall Street speculator and *New York*

Times publisher Leonard Jerome. Blenheim Palace, the ancestral home of the Marlboroughs, bespeaks Churchill's upbringing—by nannies, naturally—in the bosom of the Victorian "Empah."

Churchill was an enraged, rebellious student, and ended up in the Army. With Victoria's realm at its zenith, Churchill used his mother's social connections (and bedhopping) to secure far-flung deployments to the heart of Her Majesty's imperial wars. In 1895, he fought with the Spanish Army against the rebels in Cuba; in 1897, he fought against the Pathan rebels in the Northwest Frontier of British India. In 1898, he served under Kitchener in Sudan, achieving infamous glory in the bloody suppression of the Khalifa. In 1899 he was in South Africa fighting the Boers.

Though born into money, most of it was squandered by his philandering family, leaving Churchill compelled to write of his exploits for various newspapers, back in the mother country. He made a handsome living this way, and parlayed the efforts into extensive media coverage, all of which got him elected to Parliament in September 1900.

As his books attest, the young Churchill was a hide-bound imperialist adventurer, ambitious, racist, and full of

himself. Fabian Society leader of liberal imperialism Beatrice Webb typed him as "restless, egotistical, bumptious, shallow-minded and reactionary, but with a certain personal magnetism, great pluck and some originality."

Best describes how Churchill was immersed in the mindset of British imperialism, as he made his way up the ladder of power. His racist policy was animated by the desire to maintain the Empire as the white man's stranglehold over indigenous colored populations.

By the turn of the century, Britain's oligarchy grouped around Edward VII took the decision to launch what would become the First World War against the German Empire. The purpose was to both preserve Britain's global supremacy, and to destroy the emerging alliance of industrial nations around the United States. If the immediate target was Britain's chief rival, Germany, the influence of the United States and the American System ideas in the world, was no less a threat.

Churchill was brought into the Admiralty to spearhead the buildup of the Royal Navy, to guarantee victory at sea. Best's report on Churchill's readying the empire for war,

misses the driving force played by this scion of the Marlborough family. Churchill built the modern fleet of Dreadnought battleships, converted the Navy to oil-fire, and seized Middle East oil reserves. Churchill recruited the wild-eyed Jacky Fisher out of retirement to run the Navy, and together they devised all the battle plans and launched the naval buildup in 1911-14, which led directly into the Great War.

In his war memoir *The World Crisis*, Churchill spews out his hatred for Germany and his fantastic view of the Navy and the Empire. "For consider these [Dreadnought] ships, so vast in themselves, yet so small, so easily lost to sight on the surface of the waters. Sufficient at the moment, we trusted, for their task, but yet only a score or so. They were all we had. On them, as we conceived, floated the might, majesty, dominion and power of the British Empire. All our long history built up century after century, all our great affairs in every part of the globe, all the means of livelihood and safety of our faithful, industrious, active population depended upon them. [If they sank], the British Empire would dissolve like a dream; each isolated community struggling forward by itself; the central power of union broken; mighty provinces, whole empires in themselves, drifting hopelessly out of control, and falling a prey to the iron grip and rule of the Teuton and of all that the Teutonic system meant. There would only be left far off across the Atlantic unarmed, unready, and as yet uninstructed America to maintain, singlehanded, law and freedom among men."

Churchill's war leadership was characterized by manic-depressive obsessions and flights of fantasy, and he was ultimately dismissed, after the fiasco he perpetrated in the Dardanelles campaign, which he revisited in World War II as the "soft underbelly" campaign.

Overlord

After the war, Churchill was brought into the Versailles peace conference, and here befriended many those responsible for the decline of civilization over the course of the just-born century. These included Americans inimical to everything American, such as Morgan Bank's Thomas Lamont, and Churchill's life-long friend and financial adviser Bernard Baruch.

Throughout the 1920s Churchill was either in government or Parliament, switching back to the more egregious Conservatives, more for expedience than ideology. Churchill rose to the forefront of all imperial operations: In the 1920s, he was both Secretary of State for War and Air, and later Chancellor of the Exchequer (equivalent to Treasury Minister), under Stanley Baldwin. In the latter capacity, he implemented the "Return to Gold" policy drafted by Bank of England Governor, and Synarchist agent, Montagu Norman. Under this plan the Empire could prepare for the next world war, by consolidating and protecting the imperial domains. The four highlights of the plan were a return to the British gold standard,

Imperial preference (protectionism inside the empire), tariff increases against all outsiders, and high interest rates at home, which further gouged British subjects' already pathetic standard of living. Not everyone was snookered by Norman's scheme, and Churchill's implementing it: John Maynard Keynes penned a diatribe against it, called "The Consequences of Mr. Churchill."

Best describes, that as Secretary of State for War and Air, and then head of the Colonial Office, Churchill was guided by "the place and prestige in the world of Great Britain and its Empire." He presided over the carving up of the Ottoman Empire, and the creation of a Middle East Department to run that area. Churchill also created the Royal Air Force, which he used to police the Empire, including the brutal repression of Iraq and the subjugation of India.

Best grudgingly admits the disgusting racist outlook that permeated Churchill's "handling" of the Empire's problematic subjects. Churchill called the father of India's self-rule movement, Mohandas Gandhi, "a seditious Middle Temple lawyer now posing as a fakir of a type well-known in the Middle East, striding half-naked up the steps of the Vice-regal palace . . . to parley with the representative of the King-Emperor." For five years at the end of the 1920s, Churchill blocked the Government of India Act. He ranted that against any Indian participation in government, was "a crime against civilization," and "a catastrophe which will shake the world."

Best finds Churchill's casual racism—slinging about words such as "blackmoor, nigger, wog, chink, eyeties," with so much abandon—upsetting. He responds similarly to Churchill's notorious campaign against the Indians.

The War To Perpetuate All Wars

If Winston Churchill was unopposed to Fascism, he did nonetheless lead the opposition to the German Nazism in the 1930s. Best writes: "He was an anti-Nazi, not an anti-Fascist until very late in the day. He failed to give serious thought to the issues at stake in the Spanish Civil War and he did his own anti-Hitler campaign no good by appearing at that time to be pro-Franco." Because he would allow nothing to challenge the British Empire, by the early 1930s, he was already sounding the alarms against the rise of Hitler. In 1934, writes Best, Churchill warned, that "The choice for Britain was between preparing to submit to 'a Teutonic domination of Europe' or to prepare to resist, which meant rearmament in collaboration with other nations of like resolve."

Churchill led the fight in Parliament for airplane construction and war preparations of all kinds throughout the 1930s. Unlike the pro-Nazi Synarchists, such as Lord Halifax, Lord Beaverbrook, and Samuel Hoare, who wanted Britain swallowed up as a junior partner in a Nazi Empire, Churchill refused to capitulate.

He condemned the Munich Pact, because, "What I find unendurable is the sense of our country falling into the power,

into the orbit and influence of Nazi Germany, and of our existence becoming dependent upon their good will or pleasure.”

But as Lyndon LaRouche identified, in “Reductionism as Mental Slavery”: “Churchill’s motive [for opposing Hitler] was simple; he needed no one to teach him affection for fascism, but Churchill represented those who would not make a pact with Europe which would lead to the early dissolution of that British Empire established, in fact, by the 1763 Treaty of Paris. Churchill did not object to fascism; he objected to the development of a Germany-based ‘universal fascist’ order, which could make the British a chess-piece of world politics, rather than the intended Anglo-American ‘cousins’ as hegemonic player.”

Several aspects of Churchill’s conduct of the war need to be reported, which Best either merely references or leaves conspicuously absent. First, Churchill’s war aims were always defined by preservation of the empire. Second, the lack of logistics in-depth that characterized Britain’s war-fighting approach, favoring, as Churchill did, what became known as special operations and air power, including the terror bombing of non-military sites, such as German cities. Third, once victory was within sight, Churchill shifted his agenda to launching “pre-emptive war” against one ally: the Soviet Union. Finally, a key feature of Churchill’s strategy was the creation of an Anglo-American alliance during and after the war, to replace the decaying British Empire and become a new Roman Empire.

Britain’s continuing imperial ambitions in the war constantly brought Churchill into conflict with the Allies, extensively documented in *EIR*, and very pointedly by Elliott Roosevelt, FDR’s son, in *As I Saw It* But, Best glosses over this fundamental issue, over which Roosevelt and Churchill locked horns at every turn: At every Big Power summit, FDR spelled out his vision for the post-war, non-colonial world, much to the Prime Minister’s chagrin.

If Best does allude to this conflict regarding the Far East theater war aims, the conflict of Churchill and Montgomery against Eisenhower, is all but avoided.

Best does not avoid Churchill’s enthusiasm for the RAF’s carpet bombing campaign, which *EIR* has extensively covered. He does expose the fact that Churchill was at the center of the decision for the RAF to shift its bombing from nighttime strikes against military targets to daytime area bombing, largely against German civilians, Arthur “Bomber” Harris was a Churchill appointee and close friend. As Best states, “For its first 12 months of operations, Bomber Command carried to Churchill’s satisfaction and indeed in close collaboration with him, to the virtual exclusion of the Chiefs of Staff. He would talk fiercely about bombing Germany to bits.” Even Best is disgusted, but it is also the most honest section of his book, and it establishes Churchill’s dubious place of honor in the history of bestial men. Churchill knew, from studies he

commissioned during the bombing, that the effort was completely ineffective, but admitted he wanted revenge and the obliteration of the German nation. Best writes, how Churchill’s brutality shocked even himself, such that “while watching at Chequers an Air Ministry film of German cities burning under Harris’ assault, [he] once burst out, ‘Are we beasts? Are we taking this too far?’ ”

That question was ultimately answered, with the totally unnecessary nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Launching a New Fascist World Order

Beginning in 1944, Churchill set about launching the initiatives for his Anglo-American empire. After Normandy, the Anglo-American oligarchy determined that Franklin Roosevelt was no longer necessary to galvanize the Allied war effort to victory, and that henceforth all forces were marshaled for the creation of a new global fascist order: This time, English-speaking, controlled by the Synarchist allies of Winston Churchill.

A cold coup d’état was launched inside the U.S. Democratic Party, signalled when Vice-President Henry Wallace, a New Deal supporter, was replaced as FDR’s 1944 running-mate, by KKK-sympathizer Harry S Truman.

For his part, Churchill began his secret plans to attack the Soviet Union, after the cessation of hostilities in Europe. The Anglo-Americans sought to smash their war-time alliance with the Soviet Union, and assimilate the Nazi intelligence service into the ranks of the new imperialists. As *EIR*’s Michael Liebig documented, the Anglo-American Synarchist bankers, merging forces with the remains of the Nazi enemy, started offensive operations against the Soviets. Following orders from Allen Dulles, wartime leader of the Office of Secret Services (OSS), the Allies recruited lock, stock and swastika, entire branches of the Nazi SS: Some of the more notorious names included Klaus Barbie, Gen. Reinhard Gehlen, and Otto Skorzeny.

Meanwhile, Churchill launched actions to destroy the Soviet Union. As *EIR* reported in October 1998, documents recently unearthed showed that Churchill commissioned the British military to prepare a war plan against the Soviet Union named “Operation Unthinkable.” This serious scheme included redeploying British and American troops from the European theater—even before the war against Japan had ended!—to attack the Soviet Union. Churchill knew that the likely war would be long and gruesome. Though ultimately rejected by the British high command, the plan gives a far different sketch of Churchill than the “bulwark of freedom, and rule of law.” Only a vague hint of this appears in Best’s book, in the form of a prescient telegram to the newly installed President Harry S Truman, to whom he wrote on May 12, 1945, “An iron curtain is drawn down upon their front. We do not know what is going on behind . . . surely it is vital now to come to an understanding with Russia, or see where we are

with her, before we weaken our armies mortally or retire to the zones of occupation.”

The doctrine that did emerge beginning with such telegrams, was the insane policy of preventive nuclear war. As Lyndon LaRouche has fully developed this idea, the threat of preventive nuclear war was used to terrorize the post-war world—with nightmare visions of two flattened Japanese cities—into submission to the new Anglo-American fascist order. When the decision to use nuclear weapons on Japanese civilian populations was made at Potsdam in the Summer of 1945, Churchill was at Truman’s side, controlling the all-too labile President.

Churchill, along with his “left wing” cohort Bertrand Russell, promoted pre-emptive use of those nuclear weapons to annihilate the Soviet Union. Best acknowledges Churchill’s support of this horror, though he does not reveal the gory details, as *EIR* has reported them.

Preventive nuclear war as a strategic doctrine would dominate the thinking of the Anglo-American Utopians for the next 60 years, and is today the policy of Churchillian Beast-Men, such as Dick Cheney and Tony Blair. Churchill became a dominant policymaker for the Synarchist establishment, until he was ousted as Prime Minister in 1955. Only strategic miscalculation kept him from establishing a global fascist order during that period, but all the significant, rotten initiatives of that period came from the circles around Churchill.

The Winter of 1946 was murderous, killing tens of thousands in war-torn Europe (synarchist World Bank chief John J. McCloy even denied aid to the Soviet Union), but that Winter was when Churchill traveled to the United States to ignite the Cold War. In January, he stopped first in Miami Beach, for a secret meeting with his financier-confidant Bernard Baruch. He had been invited to speak at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri in March, and with Baruch, the two went over the finishing touches of his now-famous speech. Baruch was the Democratic Party conservative insider, opponent of Franklin Roosevelt, and the deep pockets who was the forerunner of the 1980s Robert Strauss.

Churchill then traveled the country, ending with a train ride to Fulton in the company of Harry Truman, who had extended the original invitation to Fulton. En route, Truman had a chance to review the speech. Later he would claim that he never saw it all, but in fact, Truman put the stamp of his approval to it.

Entitled, ironically, “The Sinews of Peace,” Churchill’s diatribe launched the Cold War. Two components of that speech are critical: First, Churchill throws down the gauntlet against the Soviet Union with his infamous characterization of the Iron Curtain descending to cut Europe in half. The second aspect is his call for the post-war British and American alliance, a crucial feature of Churchill’s strategic thinking for the remainder of his life. Churchill intoned, “Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organiza-

tion will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples. This means a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire, and the United States. This is no time for generalities, and I will venture to be precise. . . . If all British moral and material forces and convictions are joined with your own in fraternal association, the high roads for the future will be clear, not only for us but for all, not only for our time, but for a century to come.”

This idea would take on various euphemisms, the “givens” we cited at the outset, but it all boiled down to British-American imperialism. The speech evoked a storm of opposition in the U.S. press, which Best carefully plays down. But Churchill, quite happy with his attack, restated it in another location. To underscore his declaration of war against the Soviet Union, Churchill repeated his charges in New York on March 20, offering the Soviets a chance to submit to Anglo-American diktat or face the consequences.

Best does acknowledge that it was Churchill’s trip that started the fight inside the United States over whether we should break with our wartime and historic ally, Russia, to ally with our ancient enemy Great Britain—which almost every American in 1946 viewed as a nation not to be at all trusted.

The floodgates opened to drastically shift U.S. policy. In February 1946, George Kennan, State Department chargé d’affaires in Moscow, and key synarchist operative, penned his Long Telegram against Stalin and Russia. On June 14, 1946, Bernard Baruch, whom Truman appointed to head up the U.S. task force on control of nuclear energy, issued the Baruch Plan. In summary, the plan called for UN control over all nuclear materials, immediate punishment of any violations, and the abrogation of the UN veto power over any findings not approved by a nation. Churchill confidant Baruch had been named chair for the sole purpose of issuing a provocative finding. Baruch writings admitted that he knew not the first thing about nuclear energy or its control, but his job was to escalate the Cold War against Russia, which he did with gusto. His June report thoroughly enraged the Soviet government. One week after Baruch himself read the report aloud at Hunter College, Commerce Secretary Henry Wallace, an FDR supporter, believer in sharing nuclear secrets, and promoter of close U.S.-Soviet ties, sent a scathing letter to Truman, in protest.

In the Fall of 1946, Wallace was canned by Truman, for opposing the turn in U.S.-Russia policy. The Truman Doctrine, making the United States a de facto protector of the British Empire, was issued in 1947, and the Berlin Airlift occurred in 1948. Against the backdrop of Churchill, Bertrand Russell, and others agitating for the pre-emptive use of nuclear weapons against the Soviet Union, the unneeded NATO alliance was cemented in 1949.

All of this emanated from the rantings of Winston Church-

ill and his minions.

However, there was an uncalculated consequence of their flight forward: the Korean War. As Lyndon LaRouche has brilliantly developed this point, by forcing the Russians and the Chinese to the wall, they flanked the Anglo-American operations by launching a ground war in Asia. The Russians countered the U.S.-British imperial provocations with asymmetric war, a deliberate campaign that has not been concluded to this day.

The United States failed to learn the lessons of these decades of confrontation with Asian nations, and that stupidity has been repeated most recently in Southwest Asia. Once the U.S. adopted the imperial model of Churchill, our historic, and successful, republican doctrine of strategic defense was lost. This was not merely a mistake, but rather an axiomatic change in U.S. policy, the replacement of traditional U.S. military doctrine, by an oligarchical policy of perpetual and imperial war.

Eisenhower Against British Imperialism

In the 1950s, Churchill continued his anti-Soviet rant both from Parliament and again as Prime Minister in 1953. However, when the Soviets developed their own bombs, including the first deployable thermonuclear devices, Churchill, following the lead of Bertrand Russell, helped initiate the détente with the Soviet Union, which meant ruling the world through the doctrine of Mutual and Assured Destruction.

Little-reported is the battle between Churchill and Eisenhower, and Best shines a light on some only recently reported material. During World War II, as is well known, but equally well-covered up, there was an unbridgeable divide between Churchill's British imperial ambitions and Roosevelt's desire to create a post-war world of sovereign, and prosperous nation-states, on the U.S. model. This battle for the traditional American model, such as John Quincy Adams' community of principle among nations, against the opposing British imperial dogma, continued between Eisenhower and Churchill. In 1953, arch-fixer Bernard Baruch arranged a meeting between the new President and Churchill, in an attempt to win Eisenhower over to a "special relationship." The attempt foundered miserably on the animosity between the American and the imperialist.

Throughout the Eisenhower's first term, strategic conflicts continually erupted. When Eisenhower wanted Churchill to bring together a united Europe, which would eventually take the form of the Common Market and other institutions, Churchill opposed it. When Ike sought to negotiate separately with Germany and France, and end the special relationship, Churchill fought him bitterly.

However, the real test came over British foreign policy, specifically colonial policy. Citing the correspondence brought to light by Peter Boyle (*The Churchill-Eisenhower Correspondence, 1953-55*), Best admits that the confronta-



Churchill inspects a half-naked, but properly respectful British soldier of the Egypt-based Western Desert Force in 1942. His ideal for an expanded British Empire, which he called the "Union of English-Speaking Peoples," is the basis for today's U.S. war policy in Iraq.

tion between the two nations was continuous. Eisenhower wanted to provide both military and economic aid to Egypt in this period, and Churchill moved to block him. In their letters, they interwove discussions of Middle East affairs and China. Their opposition would reach its high point in the Suez Crisis in 1956.

But, in a truly remarkable exchange of letters in 1954, Eisenhower proposed to Churchill a program for the latter to end colonialism, and leave office, in a way that would be "electrifying." Despite Eisenhower's failure to recognize the fallacies behind the Cold War, he did understand that promoting legitimate nationalist struggles was in the interest of the United States and its allies. In a long letter in the Summer of 1954, Ike suggested that Churchill begin the process of stepping down as Prime Minister, with a proposal to bring colonialism to an end over the next 25 years.

The President wrote: "My mind has been turning toward an exploration of other possibilities by which you could still give to the world something inspiring before you lay down your official responsibilities. It should be something that would so well serve the cause in which we believe that it would indeed be considered one of your finest contributions.

Another factor to be considered is that in far too many areas the Kremlin is pre-empting the right to speak for the small nations of the world. We are falsely pictured as the exploiters of people, the Soviets as their champion.

“I suggest to you a thoughtful speech on the subject of the rights to self-government, so vigorously supported in our recent joint communiqué. . . .

“Colonialism is on the way out as a relationship among peoples. The sole question is one of time and method. I think we should handle it so as to win adherents to Western aims.

“We know that there is abroad in the world a fierce and growing spirit of nationalism. Should we try to dam it up completely, it would, like a mighty river, burst through the barriers and could create havoc. . . . We must prove that the obstacles that now prevent self-government in certain regions genuinely concern the free world and engage our earnest purpose to work for their elimination. . . .

“A speech on the matter—and no other could so well do it as you—should deal with the need for education and announce the cooperative purpose of great nations in the Western World to bring educational opportunities to all peoples we are able to reach. . . .

“The talk would not, of course, ignore the economic requirements of independent existence and would certainly dwell at length upon the advantages of free association and voluntary agreements in order to promote the freest and most fruitful kind of commerce . . . and it would discuss self-rule; internal and external security; the promotion of *health* and the *general welfare* (emphasis added. . . . It should announce a certain time limit. . . . Our nations plan to undertake every kind of applicable program to insure that within a space of 25 years (or some other definite date) all peoples will have achieved the necessary political, cultural, and economic standards to permit the attainment of their goals. . . .

“If you could say that 25 years from now, every last one of the colonies should have been offered a right to self-government and determination, you would electrify the world.”

Churchill was less than enthusiastic, even though Eisenhower had suggested that, in all probability, no colony would really grab at the chance for independence. Churchill’s response was quite defensive, with effusive praise of the British handling of India, and the other colonized nations. “The sentiments and ideas which your letter expresses are in full accord with the policy now being pursued in all the Colonies of the British Empire. In this I must admit I am a laggard. I am a bit sceptical about universal suffrage for the Hottentots even if refined by proportional representation. . . . I certainly shall have to choose another topic for my swan song: I think I will stick to the old one ‘The Unity of the English-Speaking Peoples.’ With that all will work out well.”

Churchill’s Outlook—Synarchy in Power

Lyndon LaRouche’s quick summary of the Churchillian mind-set clearly holds true, that Churchill never disagreed

with Nazi policies, but preferred not to salute a German King, simply to have the world bow down to the English one. All of his books personified the British imperial mind-set, from the history of the Marlboroughs to the Second World War volumes. Some of these made an attempt to be true to history, if only to glorify the author. However, his most notorious work, the *History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, was largely fiction, aimed solely at recruiting gullible Americans to save the flagging British Empire from its impending demise. Whole sections of the book were simply written off the top of his head, as even Best admits, although Best never sees the evil intent behind the creation.

Churchill’s close friends and admirers number many of the key players in the growing post-war Synarchist grouping. Several stand out. A key collaborator throughout his life was Max Aitken, the notorious Lord Beaverbrook, press lord and Nazi sympathizer, who both supported Churchill and promoted him in the media.

Bernard Baruch was Churchill’s financial advisor and ally from their first meeting at the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919. Baruch, a Jewish descendant of KKK parentage from South Carolina, ran a continuous inside wrecking operation against the Democratic Party, and against Roosevelt in particular. He promoted fiscal austerity for the masses, and ever increasing power for the most degenerate elements in both the military and Synarchist bankers in the post-war era. It was Baruch’s affiliation with this confrontationist machinery that prompted President Eisenhower to attack the “military-industrial complex” in his final address to the nation. He later said that he was referring to Baruch personally, and his allies.

One of Churchill’s key operators inside the United States, spying on all aspects of American life during World War II, and reporting directly to Churchill, was Isaiah Berlin. Berlin ghostwrote many of Churchill’s books, wrote his own paeans to Churchill, and became a leading spokesman and organizer of the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF), which LaRouche has identified as the most powerful force in destroying the culture of the United States over the past 50 years. Churchill’s articles appeared in the first issues of *Der Monat*, the CCF flagship publication in Berlin.

In his later years, Churchill was supported financially by the entire Synarchist crowd. Trust funds and sinecures were arranged by the likes of Lord Camrose, James Rothschild, J. Arthur Rank, and others. His biggest financial supporter was Synarchist operative Henry Luce, who paid handsome amounts to publish all of Churchill’s works in *Life* magazine. In 1946 he gave Churchill \$1 million for serializing his memoirs.

Contrary to the imperial ideal of Winston Churchill and his U.S. Utopian followers today, the United States does not need to be a “cock-boat in the wake of a British man o’ war.” And to paraphrase Niall Ferguson, it’s time for American citizens to “get real” and dump the imperial legacy of Winston Churchill, once and for all.