

Kissinger Boasts of Three Decades of Treason

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 9, Number 21, June 1, 1982. [View PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

We have included in this *Special Report* excerpts of Henry A. Kissinger's treasonous bragging before a British audience at London's Royal Institute for International Affairs (RIIA) on May 10.¹ The excerpts should bring a surge of angry blood to the face of every patriot of the United States.

We have but to add two indispensable comments. First, we summarize, to the extent of our own knowledge, the process by which we have come to know Kissinger's treasonous remarks to be true. Second, we employ the principles of constitutional law which must guide every President of the United States in judging whether Kissinger's admissions are treasonous in fact under the clear intent of the U.S. Constitution.

Kissinger insists that since no later than the term of office of Secretary of State Jimmy Byrne [June 1945–January 1947], the foreign policy of the United States has been dictated from London by means of secret, unwritten agreements between certain U.S. officials and the Royal government. It is the documentable knowledge of myself and my associates that there are many important instances corroborating Kissinger's claims on this point. Equally important, we are well informed, if certainly not completely knowledgeable, concerning the special, unofficial channels of "secret government" through which successive presidencies have been manipulated into submitting to such unlawful forms of foreign-policy dictates by Britain.

Any good attorney would not be satisfied with our documentary proof of what we report, although for every claim we submit we have massive proof. A good attorney would demand to know at least the essentials of the process by which we were guided to discover such evidence. In a good practice of law, no evidence, however massive, is conclusive until adequate evidence has been added respecting the way in which submitted proofs were developed.

Therefore, it is our proper duty to account for the process by which we began to uncover the treasonous role of Henry Kissinger, beginning January 1974.

¹ [See "Documentation: 'I Kept Britons Better Informed Than Americans,'" *EIR*, Vol. 9, No. 21, June 1, 1982.]

Although this reporter is most immediately identified as an economist and a probable contender for the 1984 U.S. presidential nomination of the Democratic Party, his entry into political life as such has developed more recently, as an earlier unforeseen outgrowth of a philosophical commitment to republican principles originating in a family tradition of honoring the memory of its earlier allegiance to the Whig faction of Henry Clay. To serve that philosophical commitment, this writer has followed assorted pathways and developed a range of capabilities, some of each of a very special character.

Who Are 'We'?

This philosophy is most simply and most accurately name *Augustinian Neoplatonic republicanism*, the form of Judeo-Christian republican commitments mediated into the founding of our republic chiefly by channels of the Commonwealth Party of John Milton and, later, of Benjamin Franklin. This philosophy agrees with St. Augustine and Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa on the adoption of the scientific method of Plato both as to science so-called and the foundations of the science of statecraft. However, Platonism became Neoplatonic republicanism chiefly through the subordination of Platonic knowledge to the leading principles of the Judeo-Christian impulse.

The first, historically, of these Judeo-Christian principles is the kind of commitment to technological progress recently emphasized as the kernel of Pope John Paul II's *Laborem exercens*, the injunction of the *Book of Genesis* that man must "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it." The second is the Christian doctrine of the consubstantial Trinity, that the Logos or Holy Spirit, the lawful ordering of universal creation, is equally consubstantial with the Godhead and Jesus Christ, as set forth at the opening of the Gospel of St. John. These directly interact as man, through fulfilling his command to technological progress, obliges himself to master more perfectly the lawful composition of the universe, and so brings his knowledge and will for earthly practice into greater agreement with the Logos. On this rests the potential divinity of the human individual, the sacredness of the human personality.

It is to be acknowledged that only a relative minority of Judeo-Christian republicans actually exert themselves to understand adequately the readily available knowledge of this sort. Through the influence of the kind of Judaism represented by Philo of Alexandria and Christianity, the Judeo-Christian republican values have been embedded more efficiently, if somewhat unconsciously, in our culture. This is so to the degree that approximately three-quarters of our adult citizenry remains essentially moral today, by means of deep-rooted commitment to moral policies derived from the direct or indirect influence of Judeo-Christian republicanism.

What is so far lacking among nearly the entirety of even those moral citizens is direct knowledge of the way in which Judeo-Christian republicanism has been in combat with an opposing, anti-republican current in European civilization over the past 2,000 years. The ordinary moral person is so preoccupied with the trials and labors of immediate personal and family concerns, that the problems of society as a whole, the problems of effects of policies over the span of successive generations, seem to the average sort of moral individual a matter of little immediate practical sort of importance to him.

For such reasons, the perpetuation of republics continues to depend upon the reproduction of a certain special sort of republican elite. This is not an elite of powerful, wealthy families. It is an elite of knowledge and special dedication to service, reflected by those American patriotic families which, over two centuries, have committed themselves to a policy of developing their children in moral qualifications and knowledge to serve alternately our diplomatic service or military officer-corps.

Such an elite is of a modest disposition respecting pursuit of hedonistic goals of earthly paradise; it locates the personal identity and self-interest of its members in the function of service to the nation and civilization, to the future its works leave after it for generations yet unborn. The individual's greatest reward is that true happiness which can be achieved only by one whose life is committed to accomplishments which survive the passing of his mortal life.

Such elites have the duty of focusing their attention on the important matters of policy of practice usually overlooked by the average moral citizen. Their education to this purpose is a mastery of 2,500 years or more of history from the standpoint of the classical Greek conceptions of the process of history and scientific progress. The principal concern for acquiring personal wealth among such elites is to achieve a standard of material culture adequate to provide such a classical education and outlook to their children.

In modern European culture, Groote's great teaching-order, the Brothers of the Common Life, typifies this concern, as did later, the Oratorian teaching-order of Italy and France. Indeed, from the founding of the Brothers of the Common Life, through the mid-19th-century influence of France's Ecole Polytechnique in Germany, such teaching and scientific institutions sprung from the classical Greek republican tradition, have produced, directly or indirectly, nearly all of the great scientists, philosophers, creative artists, and statesmen upon whose influential role the rise of European civilization from the ashes of the 14-century Dark Age has chiefly depended for leadership.

This writer's commitment to such service began to develop in the wake of his return from India at the close of the last World War. Although the disposition for the idea of a life devoted to service was earlier imbued by the influence of Christian ministry within his

family, the immediate cause for his choice of direction was the recognition that the post-war period in the United States was dominated by moral degeneration into philosophically thoughtless pursuit of the hedonistic pleasures of an emerging middle-class suburbia. In the monetary and other policies emerging during the first post-war years, the United States was already blindly drifting then toward a repetition of the kinds of follies which had produced the Great Depression and the two World Wars of the century to date.

Although this writer had learned to despise the British from meeting them and seeing their works in India, he did not initially associate the disorientation of the post-war United States with a principally British influence. That connection first became clear during January 1974, as the writer and his associates first uncovered facts proving British secret-intelligence service's guiding role in deploying both the Kissinger-Haig inside, and the Institute for Policy Studies outside of the Watergate operations.

This writer's initial concern, especially from 1952 onwards, was to prevent a new general economic depression and a correlated drift into resurgence of fascist forms as a result of the prevailing monetarist policies associated with the Bretton Woods system.

The institutions of policy and influence responsible for their suicidal drift, he judged, must simply be either reformed or, if not reformable, replaced. Although that commitment has not been altered in direction from its beginning, the knowledge of the implications of this commitment among the writer and his immediate collaborators has been successively transformed to higher levels, especially beginning the autumn 1971 establishment of an international political-intelligence news service.

Out of the work associated with that continuing root-commitment, there has developed an international association of close collaborators among persons who are both patriots and world-citizens of their respective nations. This philosophical association, somewhat paralleling the Society of Cincinnatus established jointly by George Washington and Lafayette, is premised upon two governing commitments.

First, we are committed to a secular world order constituting a community of principle among nations committed to policies coherent with Augustinian Neoplatonic republicanism, and to the development of individual nations according to those principles.

Second, we are committed to the principle of the absolute sovereignty of each and every sovereign nation-state republic, following the principles exemplified by Dante Alighieri's proposals and the principles of international law elaborated by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa during the 15th century.

We function like an international Freemasonry of patriots who are also world-citizens, as the two, cited principles define such a policy.

Our principled function is not to seek positions in government or to acquire wealth. Such desires we know to be potentially dangerous, as too great an attachment to either goal corrupts morals and the powers of judgment. We prefer to promote scientific progress, to help in promoting classical culture, and in fostering institutions which spread republican knowledge to new generations. In respect to government, we would prefer to inform and otherwise assist governments in discovering right policies, than to be part of government ourselves.

Unfortunately, because of the pluralist and related decay into pragmatism among the major political parties of most nations, these parties as a whole are not constituted in such a way that they are presently morally or intellectually capable of understanding or implementing even those kinds of policies urgently required for the continued survival of civilization. Therefore, contrary to our underlying impulse, we have been obliged to participate directly and vigorously, and very factionally, in the partisan political process. There are presently, no effectively functioning bodies of republican elites ruling the governments and leading political parties of nations, except as we act to catalyze the development of such formations by intersecting ourselves those fragmented circles which are potentially elements of such an elite.

It is this character of our work which has caused us to be rated as “potentially very dangerous” by powerful forces intersecting the ruling British oligarchy. It is for that reason that oligarchical institutions, including the British-controlled major news media of the United States, have spent so many tens of millions of dollars launching coordinated lying vilification of this writer and his associates. It is for that reason that this writer has been repeatedly a prospective target of assassination beginning an aborted effort of late 1973, and repeatedly a target of assassination-plots deployed internationally beginning the Summer of 1977, plots concocted now by the same circles otherwise mooted new assassination-attempts against Pope John Paul II, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany, and President Ronald Reagan.

Henry Kissinger, who is documented as having abused governmental authorities in a personal vendetta against this writer since 1975, is politically allied to the circles behind both the international press-vilification and the projected assassinations.

What Is the Leading Issue?

We first acquired a rating of “potentially dangerous” during 1973, during the period the Institute for Policy Studies deployed Communist, Trotskyist, and other hooligans in an unsuccessful effort to physically destroy our organization in the United States. The principal cause for this sort of escalated harassment was our publication that year of a series of strategic policy-studies we found it appropriate to label as the “New Constantinople” thesis.

It was made clear to us, with aid of the clinching facts concerning the Club of Rome, that certain powerful European oligarchical interests intersecting the British monarchy itself, were actively deploying a coordinated effort intended to eliminate all sovereign nation-states, and to replace those states with a global Malthusian world-federalist order. One of the options we discovered those forces to be exploring was the use of what may be described as the “Thuringian geopolitical” proposal, aided by Willy Brandt’s version of détente, to make central Europe (i.e., Germany) the possible center for such a world order.

The most famous historical precedent for such a scheme, since the old Roman Empire, was the role of Constantinople from Constantine through the period up to the [tenth-century] Paleologue insurrection. One might have said “New Venice,” rather than “New Constantinople,” since, following the rise of the Paleologues until Napoleon destroyed the Republic of Venice [1797], Venice was the coordinating-center for the same rentier-financier geopolitical policy which the Malthusian world-federalists continue to deploy today.

What made us dangerous in the eyes of backers of the Malthusian world-federalist project was not only the evidence that we had stumbled across the nature of their true policies, but that we were publishing this assessment internationally. If influential patriotic circles of favored nations were to take seriously our analysis, the success of the Malthusian world-federalist project might be jeopardized by “premature” exposure.

At the close of 1973, two of the best-known operatives of Britain’s MI-5, Mr. Paul Walsh and Mrs. Schroeder, were caught red-handed in an elaborate covert operation against us internationally, an operation including elaborate arrangements with New Caledonia Airlines, and coordinated through channels of Britain’s psychological-warfare center, where Henry Kissinger was indoctrinated, the London Tavistock Institute, into such U.S. assets of British secret intelligence as the Institute for Policy Studies.

The uncovering of leading aspects of this particular transatlantic covert operation, in late December 1973 and the first weeks of January 1974, led us to recognize that the forces deployed against us were identical with leading elements, including the Institute for Policy Studies, setting up Watergate as an attempted destabilization of the United States. Shortly, through aid of some Republicans in the Congress and some honest elements of the Nixon administration, we pieced together proof that Henry Kissinger and his errand-boy Alexander Haig had set up the Nixon administration from the inside for the *Washington Post’s* and Institute for Policy Studies’ operations from the outside.

For months, through 1974 and into 1975, we struggled to sort out such questions as the indicated role of the Rockefeller interests in many more features of the subversion than were subsumed under Henry Kissinger himself. Although we had massive evidence of British guilt, it was initially not credible to us that a ruined former imperial nation, such as Britain, could

be the master of wealthy American families such as the Rockefellers. What we blamed the Rockefellers for doing during those two years was accurately based on fact, but, later, with aid of a better estimate of the limits of David Rockefeller's mental powers, we were obliged to face the conclusive evidence that the British side of the connection was the controlling feature.

The fuller truth dawned on us beginning the day in 1975 Rupert Hambro telephoned our New York office, asking for an appointment. The interests of the Hambros were focused upon my proposal to establish a gold-reserve-based international rediscount facility as replacement for the decaying remnants of the Bretton Woods System. The concern of the London bankers, as they later explained their policy in the matter, was to study the reasons for the influence of our proposal during that year, in order the better to defeat it—with aid of their agent Henry A. Kissinger.

So, during 1975, on orders from London, began Henry A. Kissinger's massive use of the resources of U.S. governmental agencies and of NATO intelligence, for massive news-media libels, financial warfare, and other evil deployed against not only ourselves but every leading figure of the United States, Europe, and the developing sector sharing conceptions of monetary reform similar to our own.

Nowadays, we have regular chats with officials of the forces behind the Malthusian world-federalist projects. We are curious to know what they are thinking, and they are curious to know what we are thinking. We chat like leaders of two opposing forces preparing for all-out warfare. With aid of our international political-intelligence capabilities, we presently know more of the relevant fine detail of British policy-making than any official patriotic agency of the United States.

The reason for our superior political intelligence in this connection is not located so much in the amount of fact at our command. The important thing is to know what to look for, as any homicide or burglary detective might inform you.

The key thing is to see the United States (in particular) as our nation is seen through the eyes of the leading British oligarchy, and to understand so why and how the British intend to destroy our nation (among others). At the same time, and in the same general way, one must understand who are the Tory traitors among policy-influencing circles inside the United States, and what motivates those persons to be the Tory traitors they are. The trick of intelligence, and also science generally, is to know what constitutes an adequate body of relevant fact, and to determine so where to look for the kinds of facts which are both available and important.

How Most U.S. Patriots Are Distracted

Beginning 1917–22, and again from 1946 to the present, it is prevailing doctrine of the United States that our primary adversary is the Soviet Union and “international Communism.” The reality of the military-adversary relationship to the Soviet Union is so much a thermonuclear preoccupation of most policy-influentials, that most among them see this strategic fact in the wrong practical terms of larger reference.

It would be silly to suggest that the Soviet Union is not arming at as much as twice the rate projected by early CIA “Team B” estimates, and that this Soviet arms-race is not in preparation for the prospect of a probable thermonuclear confrontation with the United States. It would also be silly to overlook the fact that a certain influential “international Communist” faction within Communist nations and among Communist parties elsewhere is committed to seeing the United States “buried” by one means or another, preferably our own internal self-destruction, as early as possible.

These are monstrously big and very ugly strategic facts. The Sun is also a very big fact of our Solar System. Yet, as the galaxy dwarfs our Sun to pitiful tininess, so there are larger facts in our strategic galaxy than the Soviet adversary-situation.

Essentially, the modern radicalism out of which the Bolshevik faction split-off was established under the titular leadership of Giuseppe Mazzini, and under the joint direction of Venice and Britain’s Lord Palmerston, as the “Young Europe,” and Concord “Young America” transcendentalism, of the 1830s and 1840s. From the beginning, the radical movement of Europe, and its socialist outgrowths, was created by the rentier-financier oligarchical interests of Europe for the specific purpose of mobilizing a “proletariat” as a destructive social-battering-ram against the influence of the kind of industrial-capitalist institutions then represented more perfectly by the United States under George Washington, James Monroe, and John Quincy Adams. It was a representation of an oligarchical trick familiar from ancient history, the creation and deployment of wild-eyed dionysiac mobs as forces of chaos and confusion, to destroy the republican institutions of urban-centered republics.

To a certain degree, both Karl Marx and V.I. Lenin, represented contradictory impulses within the oligarchy-directed radical movements. Although Marx accepted the destruction of industrial capitalism, he and his follower Lenin projected the establishment of a socialist form of industrial state, a form of society not much less or more abhorrent to the oligarchists than the capitalist form of industrialized nation-state. Consequently, as the Soviet Union emerged as a consolidated nation-state power, and later as a world power, the oligarchs retained control over most of the international socialist movement, through the anarchist and socialist internationals, while attempting to play the United States (especially) and the

Soviet Union off against one another, aiming thus to facilitate the mutual destruction of both.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt plainly had a grasp of this strategic reality, as the published reminiscences of his son Elliot help us to understand more exactly. Roosevelt's clear commitment to an "American Century" coming out of World War II, was to eliminate British "18th-century methods" from international relations, and to deploy "American methods" of high-technology development of the world's agriculture, industry, and basic economic infrastructure. To the extent that the Soviet Union was willing to accept a place as a sovereign nation-state within such an "American Century" world-order, war-avoidance between the two post-war super-powers could be effected.

Unfortunately, beginning Walter Lippmann's lying policy-interventions during the period of the 1944 Roosevelt re-election effort, the U.S. government was repeatedly hornswoggled by a combination of Britain and American Tories. With Roosevelt's death, the Tories, including Secretary of State Jimmy Byrne, led President Truman around by the nose. Instead of imposing an "American Century" on the post-war order of international relations, we accepted the degradation of the United States to becoming a "dumb American giant on a British leash," barring such glorious moments as President Eisenhower's slapping of the British in 1956.

In brief, we must situate strategic issues respecting the Soviet Union within the larger, determining context of the conflicts between U.S. and British interests. No matter how bloody and dangerous the facts of the U.S.-Soviet conflict become, we must never permit that to cause us to lose sight of the larger reality in which the shape of that U.S.-Soviet adversary relationship is situated. When we forget, the British betray us with their dirty, behind-the-doors operations using the Soviet Union to manipulate the strategic situation and perceptions of the United States.

When we were embroiled with a war against China in Korea, at the same time Britain was keeping up appearances with a few Tommies dying on Korean battlefields, Britain was providing the most vital strategic assistance to Peking through Hong Kong. Britain plays up to the present day, the same sort of behind-the-doors games with Moscow against the United States it played with Peking against the United States at the beginning of the 1950s. Indeed, the British are playing similar games with Moscow in connection with the present British war against Argentina. Certain Soviet officials have been caught plotting with British military commanders, both chortling over the humiliation and isolation of the United States if Washington is foolish enough to permit Haig's policies to continue.

The Philby case is exemplary. Harold "Kim" Philby, presently an influential General of the Soviet KGB, is to the present moment one of the most prized assets in Moscow of the British

monarchy's private household. Philby, who was sold to Moscow through aid of providing Moscow with details on the British-directed U.S.A. Albania operation, was sitting in Washington directly on top of innermost secrets of U.S. intelligence—some of which he was transmitting to Moscow—including his knowledge of every unwritten secret British-American agreement of the sort to which Kissinger refers broadly in his recent public address in Britain.

Secret But Unlawful Agreements

The foreign policy of the United States, under law, flows primarily from the declaration of national purpose explicitly and implicitly embedded historically in the 1787 draft of the Federal Constitution of the United States, and as typified by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams's arguments of principle and constitutional law in formulating the Monroe Doctrine of 1823. Additional law can be added to foreign policy only with the consent of acts of the United States Senate, which are law insofar as those acts do not contradict the implications of our Federal Constitution.

The President of the United States, who is the only constitutional authority for making and conduct of foreign policy of the United States, may of course make secret agreements, provided these agreements do not contravene the Constitution and existing law, or that his proposed alterations of treaty-law are duly submitted for the consent by vote of a majority of the U.S. Senate.

So, under U.S. law today, the President of the United States is not only empowered but obliged, without need to consult Congress or his Secretary of State, to kick the British out of the South Atlantic more forcefully than President Eisenhower kicked the British in 1956. That is the obligatory law and action of the entire Executive Branch of government until such time as the Senate shall explicitly repeal the Monroe Doctrine and all of the numerous treaty-laws attached to that doctrine since its first promulgation.

However, no President has the authority to make secret agreements which contravene or subvert existing law, unless authority for the interest of those secret agreements is submitted to the Congress in written form for deliberation and vote by a majority of the Senate. Any secret agreement otherwise conflicting with a law such as the Monroe Doctrine is null and void, especially if it is an unwritten secret agreement of the sort which the treasonous Henry A. Kissinger has insisted on to enable the British to govern secretly the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States.

Since such secret agreements have the cumulative object of destroying the constitutional sovereignty of the United States, and, in the most recent issue, to prompt Secretary Haig to aid what is under law a British act of war against the United States, we make not the slightest

exaggeration in denouncing such secret agreements as both unlawful and implicitly treasonous.

Under the 1947 Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, which is one of the treaty-laws subsumed under the Monroe Doctrine, any British military action against a sovereign state of the Western Hemisphere, for whatever cause, is by law an act of warfare against the United States. Whatever elected or appointed public official gives aid and comfort to those actions of Britain under such circumstances, is *ipso facto* guilty of treason against the United States.

Haig, whose ignorance of U.S. history, the Constitution, and literate language generally is well established, may be behaving treasonously under the influence of his own defective mental powers. His actions are *ipso facto* treasonous, only his degree of legal mental responsibility for such acts is to be deliberated. Kissinger, although probably a moral imbecile, has made it clear through his remarks that he, Kissinger, is adequately witting of the treasonous intent in his own support of Haig's treasonally unlawful actions.