

# Why the military is being destroyed

*Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.'s introduction to the Colombian edition of El Complot, scheduled to be released in November in Bogotá.*

Sept. 7, 1997—The facts, as reported in this book, are clear. Since 1989-1992, there has been a concerted, accelerating effort to liquidate the sovereign military institutions of the states of Central and South America. Similarly, the facts are clear, that this move to liquidate those military forces, is linked directly to plans to carve up existing nations, such as Peru, Colombia, and Venezuela, through supranational take-over of large portions of existing states, through declaring those regions as “extra-territorial,” and placing those territories under the supervision of supranational “environmental” and other agencies.

Since the forces behind these moves are chiefly British, but also include some U.S. figures, such as Sir George Bush and Sir Henry Kissinger, we must not be surprised if we discover that there are wicked motives behind these policies. The question is: precisely what are those motives?

The reader will find an important part of the answer in a Special Feature, “Britain’s ‘Invisible’ Empire Unleashes the Dogs of War,” published in the August 22, 1997 edition of *Executive Intelligence Review*. That documentation shows, that the forces targetting Central and South America’s nations for destruction and looting, are exactly the same, London-coordinated agencies of the British monarchy and its British Commonwealth-based financial oligarchy which are currently conducting their genocidal holocaust against the nations and populations of Central Africa.

The looting should not surprise us, nor the mass-murder. Simón Bolívar exposed the role of the head of the British Foreign Service, Jeremy Bentham, in his time. We may recall the “Latin America” operations of Lord Palmerston’s Paris puppet, Napoleon III. We may recall, from 1982, how Lord Peter Carrington, helped by the U.S. Defense Secretary now called Sir Caspar Weinberger, set up the government of Argentina for what became the Malvinas war. Why do the British not simply loot these continents, as they have done repeatedly in the past? Why go so far as to liquidate the very existence of these nations—in both Africa and the Americas?

The facts are clear. Since the disintegration of the former Warsaw Pact and Comecon, over the 1989-1991 interval, the British monarchy has led a world-wide campaign to replace

national economy through globalization, and to eliminate the political existence of the sovereign nation-state in every part of the world. The continent of Africa was the leading target. The assault on the second target, Central and South America, is already under way. The question is: what is the motive for eliminating the nation-state?

Experience shows, that many people are misled by the misguided belief, that the financial-capital interests centered in such places as the British monarchy, the International Monetary Fund, or the New York Federal Reserve District, are politically “right wing.” Too many accept V.I. Lenin’s self-delusion, that “finance capital” represents the “advanced stage of industrial capital.” Exactly the contrary is true. Queen Elizabeth II is fairly described as a “leftist,” much closer to the British Labour Party of Prime Minister Tony Blair, than to the Conservative (“Tory”) Party of John Major.

For several recent decades, Elizabeth II’s leading asset in France, was nominal Socialist Party figure François Mitterrand, reminding us of the way in which opium-pushing Lord Palmerston brought Napoleon III to power in Paris in 1848. One should recall, that the British monarchy has been “leftist” since the days British Foreign Service chief Jeremy Bentham deployed his London-trained Jacobins George Danton and Jean-Paul Marat into Paris to destroy Britain’s mortal enemy, the Marquis de Lafayette’s France, through the Terror. In South America, one should recall Simón Bolívar’s warnings against Bentham’s operations. Nor, should it be forgotten that it was Bentham’s protégé, Lord Palmerston, who deployed Giuseppe Mazzini and Mazzini’s anarchist and socialist revolutionaries, and also, following 1814, the filibustering family of defeated Napoleon Bonaparte, throughout continental Europe, and, also, the Americas.

## Empire vs. Republic

The fact is: although the British monarchy has sometimes used industrial power to serve its purpose, it has always hated the patriotic political institutions of a modern, technologically progressive form of agro-industrial national economy. That fact is well known to anyone who has studied the characteristics of British domestic and foreign policy since the 1688-1716 takeover of the United Kingdom by the brutish dictator

William of Orange and William's cronies, the Duke of Marlborough (Churchill) and George I. Unfortunately, few among those familiar with those facts, fully understand the underlying motives behind this British imperial hatred of the nation-state institution.

Too few recognize the fact, that, in all known history and pre-history, until the emergence of the modern sovereign nation-state during the late Fifteenth Century in western Europe, in all parts of the world, ninety-five percent, or more of the people of every culture lived in the conditions of serfs, slaves, or worse. In the course of the wars of the Classical Greeks against the Achaemenid dynasty of ancient Babylon, the forms of government, such as Mesopotamia or Sparta, which imposed serfdom, slavery, and worse conditions for the overwhelming majority of the population, were known as "the oligarchical model" of society. It was the modern nation-state which has freed mankind from hopeless submission to those bestial, oligarchical traditions of pre-Fifteenth-Century history.

The struggle for the European nation-state, in both Europe and the Americas, has been a continuing, mortal struggle against the preexisting oligarchy of feudal Europe. During the Fifteenth and following centuries, this oligarchy had two components: the landed aristocracies—the serf-owners, and the financier aristocracies, the latter centered in the financial oligarchy of Byzantium and, then, Venice. Beginning Venice's takeover of England's King Henry VIII, the Venetian oligarchy concentrated on developing England and the Netherlands as centers of the maritime and financial power of what came to be known as "the Venetian Party" of England and the Netherlands. The financier oligarchy associated with William of Orange and his protégés, Churchill and George I, was commonly known, and described as the "Venetian Party" during that time, and into the later Eighteenth Century.

Although the feudalistic "Venetian Party" was often allied with the feudal landed aristocracy, it was also committed to taking power away from that landed aristocracy, as in England's wars against Austria-Hungary, from the time of Prussia's Frederick "The Great," through Lord Palmerston's 1848 deployment of the Mazzini-led "Young Europe" organization to bring down London's sometime ally, Clement Prince Metternich.

Over the centuries between the time of Venice's Paolo Sarpi and the 1962 "missiles crisis," the "Venetian Party" of Britain was always committed to weakening the power of the nation-state's republican partisans. However, since technological progress was a key factor in military power, London could not simply eliminate the factor of economic superiority within any modern national economy which the financier oligarchy controlled, as long as there existed the possibility of wars between that state and other powerful modern nation-states. So, the policies of the Anglo-Dutch financier oligarchy remained a strategic game of "divide and conquer," until such

time as preconditions existed for establishing world-government under the control of the world's financier-oligarchical interest.

That was always the policy of the British Fabian Society and its partners of the Church of England and World Federalist movement. The attempt of the British and their continental and U.S. co-thinkers, to set up the League of Nations, at the end of World War II, expressed this. U.S. refusal to support the League of Nations doomed that wicked League of Nations effort then. On this issue, President Franklin Roosevelt's U.S.A. and Churchill's Britain were at cross-purposes in the original plans for a permanent United Nations Organization. Roosevelt intended to liquidate the British, Dutch, French, and Portuguese empires at the end of the war. Churchill hated Roosevelt and Roosevelt's policies, but Churchill's Britain found Harriman-controlled U.S. President Harry Truman a useful asset for London's policies.

The virtual elimination of the danger of a new world war, through Russell's role in 1962-1963 negotiations between the U.S.A. and Khrushchev's Moscow, brought onto the horizon, the establishment of a world government under the British Commonwealth-dominated UNO. The 1989-1991 disintegration of the Soviet system, at a time that London's asset George Bush was President of the U.S.A., enabled the cabal

For previews and  
information on  
LaRouche publications:

## Visit EIR's Internet Website!

- Highlights of current issues of EIR
- Pieces by Lyndon LaRouche
- Every week: transcript of the latest **EIR Talks** radio interview with LaRouche.

<http://www.larouchepub.com>

e-mail: [larouche@larouchepub.com](mailto:larouche@larouchepub.com)

of Margaret Thatcher, François Mitterrand, and George Bush, to introduce policies, such as the continental European “Maastricht agreements,” which made the doom of the existence of the sovereign nation-state almost inevitable, throughout Europe, Africa, and the Americas.

The former editor-in-chief of the London *Times*, Lord William Rees-Mogg, recently summed the matter up. Rees-Mogg, is a leading figure in directing right-wing assassination threats, and political and legal operations against U.S. President Clinton, inside the United States itself. He has been an enthusiastic supporter of the lunatic “Third Wave” cult, of U.S. House Speaker Newt Gingrich and Alvin Toffler. Rees-Mogg has stated repeatedly, that the “Third Wave” cult’s anti-agro-industrial “information society” policies, mean the early takeover of the entire world by a new globalist order, in which the world’s political affairs and ideas are ruled by less than five percent of the world’s population, while ninety-five percent is degraded to the mental condition of Brazil’s MST cult, a poor pack of “deconstructed,” semi-mindless Yahoos, from the pages of Lemuel Gulliver’s fictional visit to early Eighteenth-Century Britain: Yahoos allowed no education at all. That is why the British Commonwealth has deployed its George Soros and the MST cult into an attempted early takeover of Brazil and the immediately adjoining nations of South America.

The issue is the choice between civilization and a London-coordinated neo-feudalist barbarism of a type visible in the ideology and actions of that MST.

## How it was done

The key to understanding the Twentieth-Century British monarchy is its close relationship to the ideologues of Fabian socialism, such as John Ruskin, Cecil Rhodes, Lord Alfred Milner, George Bernard Shaw, H.G. Wells, and Bertrand Russell.

To understand what is behind the attack on the military in Central and South America today, focus upon the Fabian figures of H.G. Wells, Bertrand Russell, Lord Lothian and his World Federalists, the leadership of the Church of England, that Church’s imperial Anglican Communion, and its World Council of Churches, over the course of this century, especially since the close of World War I. It was this left-wing combination of Fabians and the Church of England which pushed world federalism as the British East India Company had pushed opium, all to the purpose of destroying the existence of the sovereign nation-state republic throughout this planet.

Fact: it was H.G. Wells, basing himself on the scientific opinion of Lord Rutherford’s collaborator, Frederick Soddy, who, since about the time of World War I, presented the idea of promoting nuclear-weapons technology as a means for bringing about world government. This utopian use of nuclear weapons, Wells saw as terrifying enough to force nations to

submit to world government as a way of avoiding war. This utopian vision of nuclear weapons, became the policy of Bertrand Russell, the Huxley brothers, and Russell’s agents among scientists, such as Leo Szilard. Fact: Russell’s call to bring about world government, through preparing to launch a “preventive” nuclear war against the Soviet Union, was published in the September 1946 edition of Leo Szilard’s influential *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. Russell’s “preventive nuclear war” initiative of 1946, is key for understanding the origins of the British monarchy’s presently ongoing efforts to liquidate the sovereign nation-states of Central and South America.

The first successful step in this Russell-led effort to liquidate the nation-state, in favor of a system of supranational agencies, occurred as 1955-1963 collaborations between Russell and Soviet General Secretary N.S. Khrushchev. Fact: this Russell-Khrushchev collaboration began, when Khrushchev sent four representatives to a 1955 London meeting of Russell’s World Parliamentarians for World Government. These representatives announced then and there, Khrushchev’s solidarity with Russell and Russell’s proposals. This agreement, between Russell and Khrushchev, was the basis for the establishment of the Pugwash Conference organization, the organization which supplied the context for the career, in U.S. public life, of the confessed British Foreign Service agent later known as Sir Henry A. Kissinger. The so-called “Dr. Strangelove” proposal, which Russell agent Leo Szilard presented to the 1958 Second Pugwash Conference, at Quebec, became the base for “nuclear détente” policies adopted in the “missile-crisis” negotiations of 1962-63, and the 1972 SALT and ABM agreements.

The period following those missile-crisis negotiations, until today, is divided into two general phases. The first of these two phases, is dated from the assassination of President John F. Kennedy until the crucial Autumn of 1989: call it “the détente phase.” The second, beginning 1989-1991, “the march toward liquidation of both national economy and nation-states.”

In the first of those two phases, the followers of Russell’s nuclear strategy, including such U.S. utopians as Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and National Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy, adopted the view that the post-1962 U.S.-Soviet agreement upon conducting a “détente process” ensured that no world war would occur, only “limited wars,” a Twentieth-Century version of Eighteenth-Century “cabinet warfare.” The kind of emphasis on scientific and technological progress which had dominated the period of World War II and the 1949-1962 nuclear-weapons build-up, would be necessary no longer. On the basis of this strategic assumption, the London-led utopians unleashed the youth-counterculture utopianism of what became known as “post-industrial society,” and, in 1970, launched a mass-movement in support of the World Wildlife cult of Britain’s

Prince Philip, as an outrightly neo-Malthusian population policy, the radical left-wing, anti-science, anti-technology “ecology movement.”

The post-1965 shift of the world economy, from earlier emphasis on investment in scientific and technological progress by national economies, to pro-Malthusian “post-industrial” utopianism, brought about a thirty-year shift, away from improving the productive powers of labor, into building up a great bubble of financial speculation, while the productive basis of society was systematically looted into collapse. That is the general cause for the present waves of international financial and monetary crisis, around the world. At the same time, all of the essential institutions of national sovereignty and national economy, were being weakened, and even destroyed, step by step, around the world.

The second phase of this thirty-year process was unleashed in response to the 1989-1991 collapse of the Soviet system. To the degree the United States did not resist, the British monarchy’s control over the British Commonwealth, and its increasing domination of world finance and raw-materials cartels, enabled it to destroy the institution of the national economy and of sovereignty of nation-states. This has succeeded thus far, and will continue to succeed, to the degree the one remaining, competing world-power, the

United States, did not act to support those nations which wished to resist the destruction of their national sovereignty by the British Commonwealth and such Commonwealth-controlled agencies as the UNO and the UNO’s International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and locust-plague-like hordes of UNO Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs).

Now, the situation in Central and South America has deteriorated to the point that continued submission to the London-directed processes of “privatization” and “globalization,” means the irreversible doom of every nation within the region, unless the presently ongoing process is suddenly reversed, very soon.

If there is to be any future for any of the sovereign nations of Central and South America, the national military arm will be crucial. Those arms are the indispensable keystone institution, on which the patriotic forces of the nation will depend, to assemble themselves as an effective force, hopefully not for war, but simply to reassert the principles of national sovereignty and national economy. Stripped of the political strength which the existence of sovereign military institutions represents, none of these nations could take back the freedom which, at the present moment, they are losing to the foreign supranational agencies.