

ARCHIVE

# EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

September 22, 1995 • Vol. 22 No. 38

\$10.00

Jordan prepares for development summit  
Bank of Japan tries a 'backdoor bailout'  
Expose Bush-drug cartel pact against Noriega

**Sir Henry's lifelong service  
to the British monarchy**





# British agent Kissinger sets up U.S.-China conflict

by Jeffrey Steinberg

On July 26, Katherine Graham's *Washington Post* turned over two-thirds of its op-ed page to Henry A. Kissinger. The recently knighted Sir Henry spun out one of his typical pieces of amoral geopolitical drivel, on U.S. policy in Asia, particularly U.S.-Chinese relations, titled "Heading for a Collision in Asia."

Kissinger's piece was a carefully worded attack against the Clinton administration—one of a string of recent public and private assaults on the Clinton Presidency to come out of Dr. Kissinger's mouth. From beginning to end, the Kissinger piece was consumer fraud. He began by lying that "the United States and China are on a collision course. Twenty-five years of U.S. bipartisan policy pursued by six administrations is coming unglued. Chinese leaders fear that America, afraid of growing Chinese economic power, is embracing a two-China policy as part of a strategy designed to contain China. . . . Sino-American relations are becoming vulnerable to accidents beyond the control of either side."

Ever since March 29 of this year, when Kissinger appeared as a keynote speaker at the London Chatham House, headquarters of the Royal Institute for International Affairs (RIIA), the former U.S. secretary of state has been a leading spokesman for the House of Windsor Club of the Isles drive to break up China and plunge all of the Asia-Pacific Rim into chaos. This is at the heart of British policy in the Far East—not American policy.

Six days after Kissinger's article appeared, on Aug. 1, the *Washington Post* published an abbreviated rebuttal to the Kissinger piece titled "China: What Kissinger Leaves Out." The author was Harvey J. Feldman, who was the State Department country director for Taiwan from 1977-78. Reportedly, Feldman's piece was drafted in consultation with current State Department officials, and was intended to be a put-down. The mere fact that the *Post* published a reply to the high-flying Dr. Kissinger by a lowly ex-State Department functionary must have sent Sir K into orbit.

It is a healthy sign that the Clinton administration is apparently making even a



*Henry Kissinger (left) and David Rockefeller in Washington, D.C., April 1992. Now that President Clinton is defying British policy in crucial areas, Sir Henry is shuttling around the world to try to undermine White House initiatives.*

veiled effort at showing its disdain for Kissinger. This is a measure of Kissinger's diminished influence over American policymaking; but it is insufficient. In many world capitals, among powerful but poorly informed officials, Kissinger's name is still synonymous with American foreign policy, with the Republican Party legacy of Richard M. Nixon—in short, with a segment of the American policymaking establishment. When Kissinger showed up recently in Beijing to confer with the Chinese leadership, his confident forecast that the Republican Party would sweep into the White House in November 1996, and his sober pronouncement that President Clinton is already a "lame duck," was reportedly taken as the well-informed word of a legitimate American political insider.

But nothing could be further from the truth! Kissinger is, after all, a publicly confessed British agent. On May 10, 1982, speaking at Chatham House, Kissinger confessed his lifelong loyalty to the British Crown and to the British Foreign Office, whose 200th anniversary he had come to London to commemorate. Years earlier, this news magazine had published extensive evidence that Kissinger was a British agent throughout his career in U.S. government service. But, as of May 10, 1982, that evidence was corroborated by Kissinger—in his own written and spoken words. Kissinger is no different than confessed Soviet spy Aldrich Ames, or confessed Israeli double agent Jonathan Pollard—a traitor to all things genuinely American.

Between the death of President John F. Kennedy in November 1963, and the inauguration of William Clinton in

January 1993, no American President has dared to defy the City of London and the British Crown on any significant policy matter. Before the Kennedy assassination, the last American President to systematically challenge London was Franklin Roosevelt, despite Dwight Eisenhower's brief challenge to London during the Suez crisis of 1956. British agent Henry Kissinger's emergence as a powerful force within American policymaking in the period 1969-92 was the clearest evidence of London's domination over Washington since the Kennedy murder.

Now, for the first time since JFK, the Clinton White House, with the backing of some until-recently slumbering American institutions, is defying British authority on a range of fronts. The Anglo-American conflict is most evident in the Balkans and in Northern Ireland.

But, in Asia as well, American and British policies are as different as night and day. American policy is to attempt to encourage stability and to ensure that British efforts to break up China into a string of petty warring principalities are blocked. The American policy may be severely limited in scope and flawed in its execution, but it nevertheless stands in sharp contrast to that of the British Crown.

The repeated failure of many important world policymakers, as well as the overwhelming majority of too-often-British-controlled American news media, to treat Kissinger as the pathetic British pawn that he is, has made it necessary for this news service to once again expose the sordid career of one of London's most significant propaganda assets.

# Henry Kissinger on the move

*This has been a busy year for British agent Henry Kissinger. Never one to let the queen down, Henry has been globe-hopping on behalf of the Windsor/Club of the Isles apparatus, spreading the poison of British disinformation wherever he goes. Here are a few pages from Dr. K's itinerary this year:*

**Jan. 17:** In Beijing for meetings with Chinese President Jiang Zemin. The tab for Kissinger's trip is picked up by Kissinger Associates client GTE Corp.

**Feb. 2:** Back in Washington, Kissinger delivers a lecture to the Senate Armed Services Committee on "the foundations of American national security strategy."

**Feb. 9:** It's off to Boston for a brief visit at the State House with Gov. William Weld, whom Dr. K cites as "one of the ablest leaders in our country. I am very impressed with his leadership in this state."

**March 2-3:** In Washington to address a conference of the Richard Nixon Center for Peace and Freedom, Kissinger introduces Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, who fawns all over him.

**March 21:** In Bombay, India to deliver a lecture, Kissinger drives a wedge between India and China, warning that China is about to emerge as "an extraordinary superpower" with aggressive impulses toward its neighbors. India's best course of action, says Kissinger: Follow the guidelines laid down by the International Monetary Fund.

**March 29:** In London to speak at a Chatham House conference at the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Center. The event, co-sponsored by the British Crown and Royal Institute for International Affairs, is on the theme of "Britain in the World."

**April 1:** In São Paulo, Brazil to deliver a lecture before the Brazilian chapter of the Council of Latin American Businessmen (CEAL). According to participants, Kissinger delivered an attack against the Clinton administration, and made a "confident" prediction that Clinton was already a lame duck.

**April 2-6:** Kissinger is in Buenos Aires to speak before a local front of the Mont Pelerin Society, the Institute for Contemporary Studies.

Kissinger's arrival coincides with the 13th anniversary of Argentina's re-seizing of the Malvinas Islands from the British. Kissinger arrives in the Argentine capital arm in arm with former President George Bush. Both men

meet with President Carlos Menem, and Kissinger also meets with a large number of Argentine industrialists and bankers.

**April 21-24:** In Copenhagen, Denmark to attend a meeting of the Trilateral Commission.

**April 26:** In Munich, Kissinger gives an interview to Bavaria-3 TV, in which he assails the Clinton administration and warns that any effort to follow through on the U.S.-German "strategic partnership" will have disastrous consequences for Germany. Kissinger's trip to Germany was prepared by Otto von Hapsburg, who, on April 1, penned an article in the Austrian newspaper *Vorarlberger Nachrichten* titled "The Hour of Kissinger," demanding that the Clinton administration place Sir Henry in charge of foreign policy. "It is the great tragedy of the U.S.A. that this man remains more an observer on the sidelines, and is not listened to by below-average people in the administration," lamented the former claimant to the Hapsburg throne.

**May 9:** In Mexico City, Kissinger holds a two-hour meeting with President Zedillo, calling for expansion of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

**June 8-11:** In Burgenstock, Switzerland. Kissinger participates in the annual meeting of the once-important Bilderberg Society. Kissinger is a steering committee member of the group, now headed by his former business partner Lord Peter Carrington.

**June 12:** In Hanover, Germany speaking before the Norddeutsche Landesbank (NLB), at an event commemorating the bank's 20th anniversary. Kissinger says that Bosnia is "a construct without its own language" and assails the U.S. and German governments for granting Bosnia recognition as a nation.

**June 20:** Back home in London. Kissinger is awarded the title of Honorary Knight Commander of the order of St. Michael and St. George, personally, by Queen Elizabeth II. This order is generally only given to members of the British foreign service. Kissinger attends the Royal Ascot Races with Prince Philip and the queen. That night, Kissinger dines with former British Foreign Secretary Douglas "Hider" Hurd.

**July 5:** Back in Beijing. Kissinger meets with China's Prime Minister Li Peng. Kissinger is in China (his 25th visit) as part of a delegation sponsored by the U.S.-China Association. Other participants are Alexander Haig and Carla Hills.

**July 13:** In Washington, D.C., testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Kissinger pronounces U.S.-China relations "on a collision course." His solution: America must adopt his balance-of-power formulas.

## A British agent since his youth

by Scott Thompson

In 1976, Lyndon LaRouche commissioned a special report, published by *Campaigner* magazine, entitled "Expel Britain's Kissinger for Treason." It created a furor, because it unearthed axiomatic features of the Kissinger profile that had been all but totally ignored by even the most ardent Kissinger-haters among American patriotic circles and foreign nationalists. Prior to this exposé, the opponents of Kissinger had been duped by the late CIA Counterintelligence director, James Jesus Angleton—himself a British "mole"—into viewing Kissinger simplistically as a KGB agent, probably compromised at the close of World War II. While many of Kissinger's secret diplomatic efforts "objectively" benefitted Soviet interests at the expense of the United States, LaRouche understood from the outset that there was something much more fundamental to the Kissinger case than Soviet control.

LaRouche upped the ante by likening Kissinger to H.A.R. "Kim" Philby, the British triple agent, who had similarly been mis-read as a genuine KGB "defector," but who remained an asset of the British Crown until his death in Moscow several years ago.

Kissinger didn't miss the significance of the LaRouche-commissioned exposé of his British agency. He launched a personal vendetta against LaRouche that, at times, became a point of obsession, as when, in 1982, he told a press conference in Paris that LaRouche had duped the family of slain former Italian Premier Aldo Moro into publicly accusing Kissinger of being behind Moro's 1978 kidnapping-assassination. Ironically, according to several recent biographies of Angleton, toward the end of his life, the ex-CIA man entered into collaboration with Kissinger against LaRouche.

### LaRouche was right

In a May 10, 1982 speech at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) in commemoration of the bicentenary of the Office of Foreign Secretary, titled "Reflections on a Partnership: British and American Attitudes to Postwar Foreign Policy," Kissinger came out of the Queen's closet and admitted that LaRouche was right all along. Groveling before an audience of English lords, Kissinger boasted of at least three decades of treason on behalf of the British. He stated: "In my White House incarnation then, I kept the British Foreign Office better informed and more closely en-

gaged than I did the American State Department." Moreover, Kissinger admitted that almost every major policy decision he helped implement in the United States had been "Made in Britain":

"In my period in office, the British played a seminal part in certain American bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union—indeed, they helped draft the key document. . . . In my negotiations over Rhodesia I worked from a British draft, with British spelling, even when I did not fully grasp the distinction between a working paper and a Cabinet-approved document."

Among those policies that bear the "Made in Britain" label which Kissinger enacted during his "White House incarnation," and later also as secretary of state, are the following:

- The 1972 SALT-ABM Treaty, which locked the United States into the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD), while shutting down work parallel to that ongoing in the U.S.S.R. to develop technologies for ballistic-missile defense;

- The 1973 Yom Kippur War and ensuing "shuttle diplomacy," which not only kept the Middle East at dagger point, but effectively partitioned Lebanon between Israel and Syria;

- National Security Study Memorandum 200, which made global population reduction a national security priority.

Moreover, Kissinger planted British moles throughout the U.S. State Department, and many, like Luigi Einaudi, are still active there to this day.

Asked by *EIR* after the Chatham House speech whether Kissinger were truly a British agent, Lord Home of the Hirsell, the former foreign secretary of Great Britain, responded: "I worked with him for many years in my official capacity, and only on minor tactical details did we ever disagree. . . . Surely by instruction and experience he finds himself on the same side as us, yes."

### The early years: Fritz Kraemer

Heinz Alfred Kissinger was born in 1923 in Furth, Germany. Having escaped Nazi Germany with the help of his mother's relatives in the Oppenheim family, both in Germany and Britain, Kissinger ended up in Manhattan where he worked in a pig bristle factory in the morning and attended high school at night. He planned to attend City College of New York, and had the intention of becoming a certified public accountant. Certainly, the world would have been better off had this occurred.

In 1943, Kissinger's plans to become an accountant were interrupted by the draft, and he was assigned, due to his German-language skills, to the Army Specialized Training Program that was designed to create a core of military personnel for occupied Germany. Eventually, the program was disbanded, and he was transferred to the 84th Infantry Division at Camp Claiborne, Louisiana, where he met the first of several mentors: Fritz Kraemer.

# JORNAL DO BRASIL

C. JORNAL DO BRASIL - 1971 Rio de Janeiro - Sexta-feira, 13 de novembro de 1992 Ano CII - Nº 219 Preço para o País: Cr\$ 5.000,00



*Kissinger's disgusting personality is not exactly a well-kept secret. Here, he drew the attention of a photographer from a Brazilian newspaper in 1992, creating an international scandal when Henry threatened to sue. (Jornal do Brasil's photographers recently caught him in the act again, and the proof appears in the paper's Sept. 6, 1995 issue.)*

Kraemer was in the Counterintelligence Corps (CIC) at Camp Claiborne, and although of low rank, he was actually in an important position to recruit future intelligence operatives. He could get Kissinger safe jobs, all the while lecturing him in history, particularly that of the Holy Alliance. Kraemer himself had studied at the London School of Economics, and, upon his return to Germany, he had joined the same German National Party out of which came Hjalmar Schacht, Hitler's economics minister, the man who designed the concentration camps as a slave labor system. Kraemer referred to Henry affectionately as "my little Jew."

By outlook and training, Kraemer was an Anglophile to the core. Thus was Kissinger drawn into the orbit of British

intelligence, via Kraemer, before the end of World War II.

When the demobilization came, Kissinger received a lucrative post running a town for the occupation forces. Next, he became a civilian instructor, working under Kraemer, at the European Command Intelligence School at Oberammergau, teaching German history. The Oberammergau school was set up as an offshoot of the British Wilton Park "re-education" project, out of which the British recruited a host of agents who were put in leading positions in postwar Germany. After a stint at EUCOM G-2, Kissinger returned to the United States with the admonition from Kraemer that "a gentleman doesn't go to City," a reference to Kissinger's earlier plans to attend New York's City College.

On Kraemer's insistence, Kissinger applied to Harvard and was accepted. There he met his second mentor, William Yandell Elliott, the head of Harvard's Government Department and a deep-dyed British agent. Elliott tutored him, Pierre Trudeau, and McGeorge Bundy as "adopted sons." For Kissinger, Elliott set up the International Summer Seminars to which aspiring leaders from around the world were brought for recruitment and training.

## William Yandell Elliott and the Round Table

Elliott was born in Murfreesboro, Tennessee on May 13, 1896, the son of William Yandell and Annie Mary Bullock Elliott. He got his B.A. and M.A. from Vanderbilt University in 1917 and 1919, respectively, while getting a certificate from the Sorbonne in Paris. He was briefly one of the first directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, whose policies reflected the efforts of the Morgan-Warburg British interests to undermine the American financial and monetary system.

In 1923, Elliott received a Rhodes scholarship to attend Balliol College, Oxford, which was then the central recruiting ground for the British Round Table, as documented by Carroll Quigley in his book *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*. At Balliol, Elliott was recruited to the Round Table, and became one of its leading organizers in American academia.

The Round Table was founded by Cecil Rhodes and Lord Alfred Milner in 1910. The idea behind it, as expressed in Rhodes's will, was to forge an "English-speaking Commonwealth," which would draw the United States back into the British Empire. While Rhodes was linked to the British royal family's retainers, the Rothschilds, in South African mining ventures for gold and diamonds, Lord Milner was managing director of the raw materials bonanza Rio Tinto Zinc, in which both the British royal family and the Rothschilds held large stakes. It was Lord Milner who headed the Round Table's so-called "Kindergarten" for future leaders of the empire. The "Kindergartners" were almost all trained by T.H. Green or John Ruskin, also of Balliol College. The Round Table members set up Institutes of International Affairs in most British Commonwealth countries; this was the

origin of the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London and the Council on Foreign Relations in New York.

At Balliol, Elliott's tutor was A.D. Lindsay, the protégé of and heir to T.H. Green as master of Balliol College. Green, Lindsay, and especially John Ruskin were seminal influences in the development of the Round Table conspiracy. Quigley notes that Ruskin "hit Oxford like an earthquake," giving anti-Renaissance lectures that launched the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. Quigley writes that Ruskin "talked also about the empire and England's downtrodden masses, and above all because he talked about all three of these things as moral issues. . . . His inaugural lecture was copied out in longhand by one undergraduate, Cecil Rhodes, who kept it with him for 30 years." Rhodes used Ruskin's lectures to form the kernel of the Round Table conspiracy.

As for T.H. Green, he was the founder of what is sometimes called the Idealist Movement in England. The son of an evangelical preacher, Green polemicized against the complacency of the City of London aristocracy and its allied gentry. He called for the creation of a movement to develop "a high moral purpose": defending the British Empire. This elite would have to create a long-range social policy and social institutions through which the masses could be manipulated into accepting monetarist looting and colonial subjugation—always under the guise of high-sounding ethical objectives.

Green, along with Arnold Toynbee, who was one of Ruskin's protégés, created the Settlement House Movement in London's East End, and the Christian Social Movement within the British labor movement. It was these agencies that set up the Russell Sage Foundation in the United States, to spearhead the Settlement House and similar "charities," as centers of Round Table subversion.

### **Elliott promotes the British System**

On his return to the United States, Elliott became a lecturer and tutor in the Harvard Government Department in 1925, and became its chairman by 1934. While at Harvard, Elliott wrote unabashed British Round Table propaganda, including *The New British Empire* and *The Public Service in Great Britain*. He maintained that a civil service, a permanent bureaucracy, should weigh the most difficult decisions. In the introduction to the latter book, John Buchan (Lord Tweedsmuir) extolled the British civil service as a paradigm of self-sacrifice for the entire world. Elliott himself praises "the superiority of the British Service as an instrument of State."

In 1935, Elliott continued this theme in a vitriolic attack upon President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, titled *The Need for Constitutional Reform*. Apart from putting an end to political appointments to high office, Elliott proposed: 1) eliminating state and local governments with their replacement by Federal Reserve district "commonwealths"; 2) dissolving the House of Representatives for at least one term; and 3) establishing a method for coordination of the administrative

branches of government. Elliott concluded: "The essential point on which these reforms are based is that the United States has now become a world power and the type of government control needed to secure the ends of government already set forth can not be achieved under the rigid machinery of 1787. It is now time to modernize the machinery, not by scrapping it piecemeal, but by a thorough overhauling and rebuilding of constitutional fundamentals." Three years later, Elliott wrote *The Crisis of the American Constitution*.

In 1938, at the urging of John Wheeler-Bennett, who was director of intelligence at Chatham House, Elliott began work on a book to propagandize on behalf of the British war effort, to be titled, *The British Commonwealth at War*. Elliott was hampered in completing the collection of essays, because he had already been brought into the Office of Production Management. Still, in 1943, his defense of the British Empire emerged, and he made perfectly clear who ran it: "The Crown is the keystone of the constitutional structure of the British Commonwealth of Nations—as of that of each of its constituent parts (with the partial exception of Eire), including the Indian Empire and the colonies. Each executive authority, whether the Cabinet in the United Kingdom, or a dominion cabinet, or the executive council in the colony, exercises its power directly or indirectly in the name of the Crown. A cabinet minister anywhere in the Empire is a 'Minister of the Crown.' Executive acts are performed in the name of the King-in-Council, or on behalf of the King by the governor-general-in-council or the colonial governor-in-council. In each part of the Commonwealth the legislative power is more than Parliament; it is the King-in-Parliament. A law is enacted by the King, or his representative, 'by and with the advice and consent' of the Houses of Parliament."

Elliott, who wishes to tear up the U.S. Constitution, has no objections to this system.

From 1953-57, while still a professor at Harvard, Elliott operated on the National Planning Board of the National Security Council. In the 1968 edition of his republished doctoral dissertation, *The Pragmatic Revolt in Politics*, Elliott added a new appendix, which ends with a chapter entitled "A Round Table for the Republic." This section registers Henry Kissinger's recent appointment as presidential national security adviser as something over which the British would gloat:

"In conclusion may I make a special plea for a type of group that I do not think we have today— . . . the Round Table. . . . We must find ways to produce some high purpose groups like a . . . Round Table for the Republic, chosen on a coopted basis, selecting those people who best represent the best principles. . . . We must find funds which our thousands of foundations could amply provide, privately, and ways to supply them with a staff of young men who would themselves be potential members of this highly honored and motivated group. They would be particularly fit for the honor if, after being tried out and given missions to perform, they really succeeded . . . with honor and dignity, with self-effac-



ing service and heroic willingness to undertake missions no matter how dangerous or difficult. This is what the Round Table of the Arthurian legend suggests. . . . I would hope the Round Tables could be spread on an international basis by a parent Round Table for Freedom. . . . We had the makings of something like this on a lower-level model in the well-chosen representation of the Harvard International Summer Seminars set up during the ten years which I ran the Summer School, and with Henry Kissinger as the prime guide for it through most of his life."

## Rockefellers fund the Round Tables

Among those who financed the Round Tables for Freedom, which gave a central involvement to Kissinger, were Nelson and David Rockefeller. Kissinger's first major job for then-New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller was to take a partial leave from Harvard to advise the governor on foreign policy, during Rockefeller's campaign for the Republican presidential nomination in 1968. Henry had first met Nelson Rockefeller at an arms control conference at the Quantico

Marine Base near Washington in 1955, for which Kissinger was selected as a panelist, on the recommendation of Elliott and Gen. Theodore Parker, White House aide to President Eisenhower. The inspiration for the conference had come from Nelson Rockefeller, who was then President Eisenhower's special assistant for international affairs. Nelson Rockefeller said of his meeting with Kissinger: "I was tremendously impressed. He had the capacity to mobilize all the facts and arguments and to give both sides. And he was a conceptual thinker—he thought in broad terms."

Kissinger was thus singled out as a member of the "brain trust" around Nelson and David Rockefeller. When, in 1956, Nelson decided to set up a special studies project, established under the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, to make projections as to the nation's major domestic and international problems over the next decade, Nelson asked Kissinger to be the director of the project. This overlapped a Round Table at the New York Council on Foreign Relations, of which David Rockefeller was president, called "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," for which Henry Kissinger was the rapporteur (see below).

John D. Rockefeller II also has a British pedigree, having been trained at the London School of Economics. He established the General Education Board, which bankrolled the invasion of the American educational system by British Fabianism and pragmatism.

These deep ties between Kissinger and Nelson and David Rockefeller have been lifelong ones. When Nelson Rockefeller lost the 1968 race for the Presidency, it was at his home that Kissinger got the call from President Nixon, asking him to become presidential assistant for national security affairs, and Nelson gave his blessings. When David Rockefeller founded the Trilateral Commission, acting as North American chairman, he frequently sought advice from Kissinger, who became a member of the steering committee upon leaving office.

## LaRouche on Kissinger and Bertrand Russell

*Lyndon LaRouche, during his 1984 campaign for the Democratic Party presidential nomination, delivered a nationally televised broadcast on March 26, titled "Henry A. Kissinger, Soviet Agent of Influence." Here is an excerpt:*

For nearly 40 years, from late 1946 until March 23, 1983, the strategic and foreign policies of the United States were steered by the influence of the most evil man of the 20th century, the late Bertrand Russell. This may seem unbelievable to those many of you who think of Russell as a leading pacifist. I am not exaggerating in the slightest degree. . . .

Russell's proposal of a scheme of world-government and his back-channel "New Yalta" agreements with Moscow were, for Russell, H.G. Wells, and their co-thinkers of the Liberal Establishment, a way of bringing Russell's design for a feudalist Anglo-Saxon world-empire into being. Russell found among the hardened racials within the ruling caste of the Soviet dictatorship a partner who had similar, if conflicting, goals to match Russell's own. Russell, and avowed feudalists such as Henry Kissinger, allied with the Soviet dictatorship not because they like Russia, but because they hate what the United States represents.

## The MAD doctrine

According to MIT professor Bruce Mazlish in his biography *Kissinger: The European Mind in American Policy*, sometime between 1952 and 1955, Henry Kissinger took part in group therapy sessions at the Tavistock Institute in London. It was apparently under the influence of these brainwashing sessions that Kissinger began to avow the doctrine of "credible irrationality" or *Shrecklichkeit*. This was the foundation of the military doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction, which originated with British psychological warfare studies conducted by Tavistock Institute psychiatrist H.V. Dicks, for the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces. Another leading proponent of the MADness doctrine was the evil Lord Bertrand Russell, whose Pugwash Conference was frequently attended by Kissinger in the 1950s and 1960s, laying the foundations for the Cold War assault on the nation-state and the notion of scientific and



technological progress.

In 1955, McGeorge Bundy, with support from William Yandell Elliott, had Kissinger brought in to the Council on Foreign Relations' "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy" study group as rapporteur. The group undermined traditional military doctrine by propounding MAD, theater limited nuclear warfare, and an array of other cabinet warfare scenarios that depended upon the "credible irrationality" doctrine to seek to terrify the Soviet Union into accepting Bertrand Russell's rules of the game. But despite Kissinger's claims to the contrary, the Soviets never did accept this arrangement; their military doctrine remained one of total war, which included seeking the means, through technological attrition, for a surprise attack. Nonetheless, the publication of *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* catapulted Kissinger's career.

### Anti-republicanism: 'A World Restored'

The nearly simultaneous publication of Kissinger's doctoral thesis, *A World Restored: Metternich, Castlereagh and the Problems of Peace 1812-1822*, although it was a vicious attack, from a British standpoint, upon the American System, added to Kissinger's "aura of power."

Examples of Kissinger's anti-republican world view can be found on virtually every page of this nearly unreadable diatribe. Consider the following quotes from *A World Restored*:

"It was clear [from the time of the American Revolution] that there were new forces loose in the world clamoring for popular attention and participation in government. But it seemed equally evident that these forces had been responsible for a quarter-century of turmoil. The French Revolution had dealt a perhaps mortal blow to the divine right of kings; yet representatives of this very doctrine were called upon to end the generation of bloodshed. . . . It may not have fulfilled all the hopes of an idealistic generation, but it gave this generation something perhaps more precious: a period of stability which permitted their hopes to be realized without a major war or a permanent revolution. . . . That Europe rescued stability from seeming chaos was primarily the result of the work of two great men: of Castlereagh, the British Foreign Secretary, who negotiated the international settlement, and of Austria's minister, Metternich, who legitimized it. . . . Because Britain was threatened only if Europe fell under the domination of a single power, Castlereagh was primarily concerned with constructing a balance of forces. Because the balance of power only limits the scope of aggression but does not prevent it, Metternich sought to buttress the equilibrium by developing a doctrine of legitimacy and establishing himself as its custodian."

Of course, Kissinger makes no mention of the fact that the Jacobins of the French Revolution were a British Crown and British East India Company deployment, whose first victims for the guillotine were the republican collaborators closest to America's Founding Fathers, who also happened

to be France's leading scientists. The British pulled off the Jacobin tragedy through sub-agents such as the Duke of Orléans (Philippe Egalité).

Or again, from *A World Restored*:

"It was therefore not mere deviousness which accounted for Metternich's measures—although he dearly loved finesse—but a deliberate choice of weapons. The more intricate the maneuvers, the more surely the contest would be shifted from the plane of patriotic fervor to that of cabinet diplomacy."

And elsewhere:

"In its altered form the Holy Alliance substituted a patriarchal association of monarchs for the community of peoples, and its preamble . . . read: 'The Allied Sovereigns have become convinced that the course which the relations of powers had assumed, must be replaced by an order of things founded on the exalted truths of eternal religion.' . . . Its new version could rather be read, and more logically, as an attack on the transformations wrought by Revolution, as a promise to return to order. . . ."

### Lord Carrington and Kissinger Associates

In 1982, the same year that he delivered his Chatham House "confession" of his British agency, Kissinger launched his own private intelligence agency, Kissinger Associates, Inc. Founded with loans from the investment banks S.G. Warburg, Pincus, and Goldman Sachs, Kissinger Associates, Inc. has developed into a "miniature State Department," charging clients fees that start at \$150,000 a year for "consulting." Actually, there is a question about precisely what Kissinger Associates does to earn such fees, and it has been alleged that the main attraction of the firm is not its geopolitical briefings, so much as the doors that it opens for its clients.

Lord Peter Rupert Carrington was a founding board member of Kissinger Associates, Inc. Lord Carrington had just left the post of British secretary of state for foreign and Commonwealth affairs, and became the chairman of British General Electric, which was a major funding conduit to the Tories in Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's camp. Earlier, Lord Carrington had been on the board of Hambros Bank, whose chairman, Jocelyn Hambro, had served as head of the British Special Operations Executive in Switzerland during World War II. Lord Carrington joined Hambros in 1967, just after he finished a watch as First Lord of the Admiralty. He left Hambros in 1970, not out of disagreement with its involvement in a "strategy of tension" against NATO members such as Italy, but to become British secretary of state for defense and one of the chief advisers to Prime Minister Edward Heath.

Although Lord Carrington was only on the board of Kissinger Associates for three years, he had considerable influence over Kissinger, both before and after Lord Carrington went on to become NATO secretary general in 1984.

Another founding board member of Kissinger Associates,



One of Kissinger's controllers is Britain's Lord Carrington, a founding board member of Kissinger Associates, Inc. Carrington has served as British foreign secretary and NATO secretary general, as well as in various corporate posts.

Inc. was Lord Roll of Ipsden (Baron Eric Roll, created Life Peer in 1977), who had worked with William Yandell Elliott to produce *The British Commonwealth at War*, writing a section on "Britain's Overseas Trade." Lord Roll had been the chairman of S.G. Warburg since 1973, and he has also been the past chairman of Mercury Securities. Lord Roll was elevated to the peerage for having been director of the Bank of England from 1968 to 1977. The S.G. Warburg investment bank put up the loan money to launch Kissinger Associates.

In 1989, Kissinger Associates Vice Chairman Brent Scowcroft and President Lawrence Eagleburger were brought into the Bush administration, becoming national security adviser and secretary of state, respectively. Although Kissinger had had to sit on the sidelines throughout much of the Reagan administration—except for his chairmanship of the Bipartisan Presidential Commission on Central America—he had enormous influence in the Bush administration, including being on the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board until he was forced to resign for conflict of interest with his position in Kissinger Associates. Kissinger had two birds in the Bush administration, and Eagleburger was in an especially important position. For example, together with Lord Carrington, Lord David Owen, and other members of the British oligarchy, Eagleburger directly helped ignite the Balkan tinderbox, in an example of Kissinger's dictum that "morality has no place in foreign policy."

### The 'dump Clinton' operation

Lord Carrington, KG, GCMG, who had been secretary general of NATO from 1984 to 1988, showed up again with Kissinger as one of two senior advisers on the International

Advisory Board of the Hollinger, Inc. press conglomerate. The head of the board (honorary senior international adviser) is Baroness Thatcher of Kesteven, who was created a Life Peer after leaving the post of prime minister of Great Britain in which she served during 1979-91.

Hollinger, Inc. was founded by Conrad Black out of the Argus Corp. in Toronto, Canada, and was part of a British Special Operations Executive postwar network established with Edward Plunkett Taylor heading Argus. Hollinger, Inc. has been in the forefront of British propaganda efforts to topple President Bill Clinton through the Whitewater scandal and every other kind of sleaze.

Hollinger's main subsidiary is The Telegraph PLC, particularly the *Sunday Telegraph* of London. Lord Carrington, who until recently chaired Christie's International PLC, has also been on the board of The Telegraph PLC, of which Hollinger owns 68%. He holds that position with Henry N.L. Keswick, who is chairman of Matheson & Co. Ltd. and Jardine Matheson Holdings Ltd.; the latter is one of the biggest "Dope, Inc." banks driving the Golden Triangle opium/heroin trade.

In addition, major Hollinger, Inc. holdings include 99% of Jerusalem Post Publications Ltd. and 90% of American Publishing Company. The latter, which owns 240 papers led by the *Chicago Sun-Times*, had 10% purchased by Dwayne Andreas's Archer Daniels Midland grain cartel. Andreas has been on the International Advisory Board for years, while ADM board member Robert Strauss, who had just completed a stint as Bush's ambassador to Russia, is on the main board of Hollinger, Inc. Combined in effect, Hollinger, Inc. has been beating the drums for President Clinton to be shot, jailed, or thrown out of office after one term, because, as its journalists like Ambrose Evans-Pritchard have unabashedly said, Clinton broke the "special relationship" between the United Kingdom and the United States.

Some others on the Hollinger International Advisory Board, with Kissinger and Carrington, include: Dr. Giovanni Agnelli, chairman, Fiat SpA in Italy; William F. Buckley, Jr., editor-at-large, *National Review*, a British Fabian Conservative; and Sir James Goldsmith, cousin of the Rothschilds, environmentalist, and junk bond buyout specialist; Lord Jacob Rothschild, chairman, J. Rothschild Holdings PLC.

### The Queen's queen

On June 20, 1995, Queen Elizabeth II dubbed Henry Kissinger Honorary Knight Commander in the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George. A week before Kissinger was beknighted, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in London put out a press release, under the title, "Dr. Henry Kissinger Honored by H.M. Queen Elizabeth II." The release read:

"Spokesmen announced that The Queen had been pleased to approve a recommendation by the Secretary of State for

Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs [Douglas Hurd] that Dr. Henry Kissinger should be appointed an Honorary Knight Commander in the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George (KCMG). This honor was in recognition of Dr. Kissinger's contribution towards Anglo-American relations."

Although this was the official formulation, a spokesman at Buckingham Palace told *EIR* that the appointment had been made by H.M. Queen Elizabeth II herself. Moreover, it is very rare for an "American" to be invested into the Order of Saint Michael and Saint George. Most have been given Honorary Knighthood in the Order of the British Empire, which is lower in the pecking order.

On the evening before he received his knighthood, Henry Kissinger had dinner with Foreign Secretary Hurd. On the same day that he received his knighthood, Kissinger, dressed in top hat and tails, had the singular honor of riding to the Ascot races in the carriage with H.M. Queen Elizabeth II and H.R.H. Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh. Wags noted that Kissinger was the Queen's foremost queen.

## Confessions of a British agent

by Scott Thompson

Henry Kissinger has not only openly boasted that he has been a loyal agent of the British Crown, working against vital American interests throughout his career. Over the years, he has demonstrated a world-outlook that is pure British geopolitics, as shown in the following excerpts from his speeches and writings.

### Chatham House, 1982

*"Reflections on a Partnership: British and American Attitudes to Postwar Foreign Policy. Address in Commemoration of the Bicentenary of the Office of Foreign Secretary," May 10, 1982, Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House), London. In this speech, Kissinger endorses British Prime Minister Winston Churchill's campaign against President Franklin Roosevelt.*

All accounts of the Anglo-American alliance during the Second World War and in the early postwar period draw attention to the significant differences in philosophy between Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill reflecting our different national histories. America, which had never experienced a foreign threat to its survival, considered wars an historical aberration caused by evil men or institutions; we were pre-occupied with victory defined as the unconditional surrender of the Axis. Britain had seen aggression take too

many forms to risk so personal a view of history; she had her eyes on the postwar world and sought to gear wartime strategy toward forestalling Soviet domination of Central Europe. Many American leaders condemned Churchill as needlessly obsessed with power politics, too rigidly anti-Soviet, too colonialist in his attitude to what is now called the Third World, and too little interested in building the fundamentally new international order towards which American idealism has always tended. The British undoubtedly saw the Americans as naive, moralistic, and evading responsibility for helping secure the global equilibrium. The dispute was resolved according to American preferences—in my view, to the detriment of postwar security. . . .

The disputes between Britain and America during the Second World War and after were, of course, not an accident. British policy drew upon two centuries of experience with the European balance of power, America on two centuries of rejecting it.

Where America had always imagined itself isolated from world affairs, Britain for centuries was keenly alert to the potential danger that any country's domination of the European continent—whatever its domestic structure or method of dominance—placed British survival at risk. . . . Britain rarely proclaimed moral absolutes or rested her faith in the ultimate efficacy of technology, despite her achievements in this field. Philosophically she remains Hobbesian: She expects the worst and is rarely disappointed. In moral matters Britain has traditionally practiced a convenient form of ethical egoism, believing that what was good for Britain was best for the rest. . . . In the nineteenth century, British policy was a—perhaps *the*—principal factor in a European system that kept the peace for 99 years without a major war. . . .

Franklin Roosevelt, on his return from the Crimean Conference in 1945, told the Congress of his hope that the postwar era would "spell the end of the system of unilateral action, the exclusive alliances, the spheres of influence, the balances of power, and all the other expedients that have been tried for centuries—and have failed." . . . Roosevelt toyed with the idea of nonalignment between a balance-of-power oriented colonialist Britain and an ideologically obstreperous Soviet Union. Even Truman took care not to meet with Churchill in advance of the Potsdam Conference. . . .

Disillusionment was inevitable. America fluctuated between moral crusading and frustrated isolationism, between overextension and escapism, between extremes of intransigence and conciliation. . . . It was therefore a rude awakening when in the 1960s and '70s the United States became conscious of the limits of even its resources. Now with a little over a fifth of the world's GNP, America was powerful but no longer dominant. Vietnam was the trauma and the catharsis but the recognition was bound to come in any event. . . .

The First World War was a temporary exertion, after which we withdrew into isolationism; during the '20s the U.S. Navy Department still maintained a "Red Plan" to deal



with the contingency of conflict with the British Fleet. It was not until the war with Hitler that the gap closed permanently. In the immediate postwar period we were held together by strategic circumstances which imposed the same necessities, whatever the different philosophical premises. American resources and experience and understanding of the European balance of power, were both needed to resist the sudden threat from the Soviet Union. . . .

American leaders no longer thought of consultations with London as a special favor but as an inherent component of our own decision-making. The wartime habit of intimate, informal collaboration thus became a permanent practice, obviously because it was valuable to both sides. The ease and informality of the Anglo-American partnership has been a source of wonder—and no little resentment—to third countries. Our postwar diplomatic history is littered with Anglo-American “arrangements” and “understandings,” sometimes on crucial issues, never put into formal documents. . . .

The British were so matter-of-factly helpful that they became a participant in internal American deliberations, to a degree probably never before practiced between sovereign nations. In my period in office, the British played a seminal part in certain American bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union—indeed, they helped draft the key document. *In my White House incarnation then, I kept the British Foreign Office better informed and more closely engaged than I did the American State Department . . .* [emphasis added]. In my negotiations over Rhodesia I worked from a British draft with British spelling even when I did not fully grasp the distinction between a working paper and a Cabinet-approved document. The practice of collaboration thrives to our day, with occasional ups and downs but even in the recent Falkland crisis, an inevitable return to the main theme of the relationship.

## Return to Chatham House, 1995

*On March 29, 1995, Kissinger returned to Chatham House to deliver a keynote speech at a one-day conference in association with Her Majesty's Government, among whose participants was Prince Charles. The speech was titled “How Do People Outside Britain View Our Role in the World? The View from the United States.”*

I grew up intellectually in the age of the special relationship. I believe it was vital for the creation of the postwar international system. It was not a favor that the United States granted to Britain; it was earned first in the conduct during the war and secondly in the enormous contribution in the construction of the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and what generally was identified with the Cold War pattern of international relations. The special qualities that Britain brought to that relationship have been discussed by previous speakers, experience in a multipolar world, a global character of mind, an experienced leadership, a commitment to security, overseas ties of not insignificant

proportions, and the English language which you can hear today practiced on American television by those who are genuine and by those who engage in wishful thinking. . . . I would argue that the qualities that made the special relationship work, broadened now to a European/American relationship, may be even more essential than before. . . .

The American perception of its foreign policy has always been as one of almost unlimited choice and above all of the ability to participate or to withdraw at its own discretion. . . . This is why almost all American foreign policy has been presented alternately in psychiatric or theological terms, either as a means by which relations among nations could be conducted like relations among people, or as a crusade to destroy or, even better, to convert antagonists to the American perception of international affairs. . . .

America is now going through what I believe is only the beginning of a national debate. And I really have no right to speak here of an American point of view, because the American point of view is still in the process of being formed. The seminal debates have not taken place. For the first time in its history, America has to conduct a global foreign policy without an ideological enemy, without a clear-cut strategic plan in a world which it can neither dominate nor from which it can withdraw. And therefore the classic maxims of American foreign policy are impossible to apply. . . . What is necessary to understand is that we are living now in a world of six or seven major global players. It is said that the United States is the only superpower left. That is a simplistic description of the problem. We may be the only military superpower left, but the issues susceptible to solution by military action are declining. . . .

In such a world, the United States faces a more or less traditional foreign policy problem, which is that in a world of players of operationally more or less equal strength, there are only two roads to stability. One is hegemony and the other is equilibrium. Hegemony may not be possible and is in any case against the convictions and the public morale of the American people, but equilibrium, or balance of power, is a concept passionately rejected in the American intellectual community as a contribution to endless tensions and is an attitude that Americans have fortunately transcended through much of their history. . . . Nevertheless, the future of the world will have to be based on some notion of equilibrium, some balance between the various regions of the world. . . . It can perhaps be achieved that the major regions of the world are not so dissatisfied that they will seek to overthrow the international system by violence, by terrorism, by economic warfare or some of the other methods so well elaborated in our century.

In conducting such a policy, I would define the American interest both negatively and positively. Negatively it is against the American interest that any major region of the world, any continental region, either Europe or Asia, and surely both of them together, be dominated by a country or a

group of countries that can dominate it and then organize it to pursue inimical objectives. And secondly, it is necessary for the United States to participate in a world community that takes into account the global nature of our societies in economics, communications and technology. Theoretically, the United States could pursue this on a global basis as in the manner in which Britain conducted itself towards Europe through most of the nineteenth century, from a posture of splendid isolation, maintaining good relations with everybody, and throwing its weight to the side that seemed most advantageous at the moment. . . . I do not believe we have the philosophy, the personnel, or the resources to do this on any consistent basis, or even to elaborate it as a philosophy. . . .

Therefore, I conclude that the United States and Europe at this moment, just as at the end of World War II, have the need for a special kind of relationship with each other. It is not in the sense that we have necessarily a common enemy but that we have comparable problems that need to be dealt with by parallel approaches. . . .

I do not agree with those who believe that America should now shift this special relationship to Germany. It is not helpful to Germany and it is not meaningful for the United States, because we should not have a special continental partner and I do not know of any German leader who aspires to such a position. It is not meaningful either, because what is needed is help to America and cooperation with Europe in transition that I have described to the conduct of a global policy without enemies, without a security danger geared to potential threats and geared to global opportunities. . . .

A succession of American leaders of both political parties, many of them not known for excessive sentimentality, which is anyway not a trait which enables one to rise easily to the Presidency, have over a period of more than a generation considered it natural that on major issues Britain and the United States would seek to cooperate. And would have a level of consultation that was never formalized but was central to the formation of policy in both parties in both countries. Now, the challenge is whether this can be done on European/American relations, and this is where Britain's experience can make a seminal contribution. Europe does not need to wrest its identity any longer from the United States—we are back to 1947 in that respect.

## São Paulo

*Just a few days after that Chatham House speech, on April 1, 1995, Kissinger turned up in São Paulo, Brazil, for a private speech before the Council of Latin American Businessmen (CEAL). EIR was able to obtain a copy of his address, which included a more explicit attack against the Clinton Presidency than he normally makes in public forums.*

. . . The [U.S.] government is still divided between a Congress that more or less reflects its tendencies, and an Executive branch which more or less reflects tendencies of

the seventies. And, when you have a President that acts as leader of the opposition, it is very hard for a parliament to come through with a coherent program. Still, with all of this, I believe that this year will be marked as one of a major reversal in American economic policy.

The United States is itself going through an intellectual crisis. And, this administration has not been distinguished by great reflectiveness about where it is going. So, it is not so easy for Brazil to have a discussion, because . . . somebody once said about the former Senator Humphrey that he had more answers than there were questions. And, that is true of some of the younger people in the White House right now.

I am not the best witness on this administration, because President Clinton was my second choice as President. So, I'm not one of his unqualified admirers. But, I did support him on NAFTA, I did support him on the Mexican loan, I did support him on China. And many of us who would certainly work against his reelection would be absolutely delighted if he followed what we are discussing here in Brazil. And, I would point out that what he did at the Latin American Summit in Miami has my full support, and has the full support of a lot of people, and there will be no partisan issue if he actually moves in this direction. The danger is that they will always look for some political benefit, some specific trade issue and make a lot of fuss over that.