The strategic issues behind the Kennedy assassination

by Lyndon LaRouche

LaRouche, a political prisoner and Democratic presidential candidate, has commented upon several occasions on the assassination of President John Kennedy since the release of Oliver Stone's movie "JFK." The following comments were made on Jan. 19.

As most people by now know, the Oliver Stone film "JFK" is a truthful account of the fraud known as the Warren Commission coverup of the Kennedy assassination. The film also contains some lines of potential speculation as to what the motive might have been for the assassination. I'm not pleased with the military-industrial complex line, I don't think that that is accurate—of course that's not original to Stone, others have it. I know a bit of the truth because I was involved at a later stage in the investigation of aspects of the Kennedy assassination myself, working with some very high-level people in the United States and in Europe on this question. And I can say plainly that the same combination of forces, together with George Bush, which killed Kennedy, put me in prison, and essentially for the same motive behind the Kennedy assassination.

The lesson to be learned is this. In the time of President Kennedy, the reigning approach toward Russia, or toward the Soviet Union, was that of Henry Kissinger's bankers, an approach which was associated then with Bertrand Russell's front operation called the Pugwash Conference, with people like Leo Szilard, a Russell crony, key in this. What Kennedy did in going for a peace through superior strength policy, toward seeking peace with Russia on that basis, was to threaten to overthrow the entire strategic approach represented by Bertrand Russell and other backers of the policy which Henry Kissinger was pushing. Now Henry at that time was a fairly low-level but becoming-conspicuous figure temporarily around the Kennedy administration, until Kennedy ordered him fired. He was a contract employee, so to speak, of the government, and Kennedy ordered him kicked out. And so I don't think that Kissinger was at a high-enough level to have been involved in the Kennedy assassination, though he, like Bertrand Russell, would have been sympathetic to its purposes.

The international picture

To understand the Kennedy assassination you have to take your eyes away from the United States as such and look more broadly around the world at some other assassinations and attempted assassinations which were going on in that period, along with a few other events. For example, the same year we have the Profumo scandal which toppled the Macmillan government and led to the bringing forth of the Harold Wilson government in England, which was a part of this pattern orchestrated by the same people who killed Kennedy—they brought Wilson to power in England. Another thing was a couple of assassination attempts against President Charles de Gaulle of France. This is more obvious because de Gaulle was following a line quite similar to that being pushed by Kennedy. Konrad Adenauer was kicked upstairs in Germany, to weaken the French-German alliance by introducing new elements of economic policy in Germany, which were, shall we say, not quite as Gaullist as those of Adenauer himself. There were destabilizations in Italy, and elsewhere at the same time. The objective was to preserve a policy of ongoing Pugwash negotiations with Moscow, deals already struck with Khrushchov, which Kennedy implicitly threatened, by taking an approach which dovetailed with that of de Gaulle and Adenauer in Europe.

That is the reason for killing Kennedy: that he threatened the architecture of strategic policy of those forces in the world which are most easily recognized by the man in the street as the evil forces which employ and deploy creatures such as Henry A. Kissinger.

Strategic defense and monetary reform

That lesson is important for today. Back in 1982 and early 1983, I had an association with the Reagan administration in connection with what became known publicly after March 1983 as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). This involves my negotiation, on behalf of the Reagan administration, with a back-channel with the Soviet government, and what I was proposing to the Soviets is parallel to what Kennedy was pushing in 1962 and 1963, particularly in 1963. At that point, once it became obvious in 1983, that the President had adopt-

The opening of the headquarters of Permindex-Centro Mondiale Commerciale in Rome, May 29, 1959. The firm was forced to leave Italy. French officials also suspected Permindex as behind the assassination attempts against President Charles de Gaulle. Inset: (left to right) From the film "JFK": Clay Shaw (Tommy Lee Jones), Assistant D.A. Bill Broussard (Michael Rooker), and Jim Garrison (Kevin Costner) after Garrison confronted Shaw with charges about his ties to the Italian fascist front.

ed this kind of policy, at least temporarily, Henry Kissinger and others moved to have me thrown into prison and have the movement associated with me destroyed.

That's not speculation. That's a matter of official documented record, that Kissinger moved against me on two issues for his masters: on the issue of my negotiations for international monetary reform—and Kennedy had angered them by his Federal Reserve actions—and by my strategic operations in which I was negotiating with the Soviets through a back-channel for the Reagan administration on a package which included the SDI. And those are the reasons that this special operation was run against me to try to destroy the movement associated with me, and either to kill me or to put me in prison. The issues were the same which prompted the same group of people, I wouldn't say the same personalities, but the same forces, to kill Kennedy back in 1963.

Kennedy was going for superiority

In response to a suggestion that President Kennedy was assassinated primarily because he was pulling out of Vietnam, LaRouche made the following comments on Jan. 6.

. . . Kennedy was looking for peace. He was trying to get Cuba out of the Soviet orbit, with bribes and what-not. He was also at the same time, as the speech he was going to deliver at Dallas the day he was assassinated indicates, moving to scrap the so-called balance of terror, the policy of Mutually Assured Destruction, for one of technological, military, and other, superiority.

From a quite different standpoint, I was doing the same thing in 1982-83, when I was negotiating for the U.S. government in this back-channel with the Soviets, on what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Look at the opposition to Kennedy and who killed Kennedy. It was the same people who were out to kill Charles de Gaulle, it was the same people who were responsible for bringing the Harold Wilson government to power in Britain, and so forth.

The issue was the Pugwash agreement, the Bertrand Russell line. Russell, if he was not one of the people who planned the assassination of Kennedy, was certainly entirely sympathetic to it, and to its objectives in particular.

You had in the postwar period a Versailles System modified by the Yalta agreements, which established what had been implicitly established prior to World War II, the Soviet Union as a strategic factor, together with the Anglo-Americans, in running the world. That is, a co-dominion, a condominium if you please, between the Anglo-Americans and the Soviet power. Yalta essentially established that formally.

Now within the Yalta system, Russell and Churchill—there was no difference between Russell and Churchill on the main lines of strategic policy or their hatred and contempt for the United States—came up with what became known as the Pugwash agreement, to which Henry Kissinger, McGeorge Bundy, and so forth, were all committed. And that was exemplified by the attempt to bring in this "new world order," which is what Bush was trying to do at the beginning of 1991.

So, there you had Kennedy trying to negotiate a solution to the strategic conflict on *his* basis, which was pro-Third World in many respects, like de Gaulle's policy, pro-Third World; that is, pro-development of the Third World. It was essentially a Catholic position, that is, in line with what we recognize in 1967 as *Populorum Progressio,* and in line with the Catholic Solidarist position, particularly when you consider that Africa and Central and South America represent a good deal of the composition of the Catholic Church, their parishes.

Now comes 1982-83 and the freak-out against me, when I'm negotiating with Moscow—it's over the same issue. It's called the Great Game, the establishment of an Anglo-American/Moscow oligarchical empire, with Anglo-American domination, which is what the original objectives of World War II were, for a new Versailles System. And the other objective is to keep the southern part of the planet in complete subjugation.

The sacredness of human life

Kennedy was going against that, in his own way; I was going against it in another way. But we both were hit by the same people over the same issue. The issue of the Vietnam War does not stand out by itself. . . .

Whenever you talked about justice for the planet as a whole, against the oligarchical system, you came up against it. It's in all the leftists and all the rightists and so forth, who were all a bunch of fascists on this question. Then Martin Luther King was killed for the same reason. Not the war in Vietnam per se, but the idea of the dignity and the sacredness of individual human life, and that rights under natural law coincide with that. That has been the underlying issue.

But the center was Kennedy's approach to dealing with the communist world, how to resolve this conflict with military strength but at the same time with development alternatives: the same thing I did, exactly in that sense, with what became known as the SDI—which is what Reagan offered, of course, initially, in March and continuing into part of April 1983. And that's why Kennedy was killed. That is the gut issue, the immediate strategic gut issue, why the backers of Henry Kissinger killed John F. Kennedy in the same way that Kissinger's backers put me in prison.

Beware 'authoritarian personality' kookery

Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche made the following comments on "JFK" on Jan. 20.

The general line of attack recently has been to charge that Oliver Stone is playing into what is described as the paranoid style of American politics, that is, Americans as a bunch of screwed-up conspiracy seekers. The attack on the movie from this standpoint, as from the *Los Angeles Times,* the *Washington Post,* and other quarters, references Richard Hofstadter's book called *The Paranoid Style in American Politics.* This book is based on lectures which he delivered in England in November 1963, the month during which President Kennedy was assassinated by an international cartel associated with a group called Permindex.

The thing that people should bear in mind before taking Hofstadter too seriously, is to recognize that Professor Hofstadter was a genuine kook. He was, specifically by his own attribution, under the influence of a group called the Frankfurt School, which was founded on the initiative of the Communist International in 1922 and 1923 under the influence of a Communist International cultural war figure, Georg Lukacs, former cultural minister in the short-lived Bela Kun communist dictatorship in Hungary.

The group that was pulled together was associated with a bunch of Adam Smith worshipers around Max Weber, the sociologist in Germany, which was dedicated, at Lukacs's proposal, to destroying western Christian civilization. That was their objective. One of the leading features of this group's work is best known among Americans as the theory of the "authoritarian personality." This is a theory which denies that there is any truth; there are only absurd opinions and each person has an equal right to his own absurdity and truth be damned, or be ignored.

These people are real kooks. For example, one of the people who pushes this theory is a fellow named Chip Berlet, who came through the National Student Association—for those of you who remember the CIA running this student group and the big scandal around that. Well, Chip Berlet was in there; and he was a lobbyist for the homosexual and drug-using faction within the NSA back in the 1970s. He went on to become a key figure of *High Times,* that is, the drug-pushers' magazine, and he now works for the Anti-Defamation League and some of the government officials in running nasty things against me most of the time.

Chip Berlet is one of the people who believes, most assiduously, in Hofstadter's book and in the Hannah Arendt "authoritarian personality" doctrine of the communist kooks to whom I referred.

So, in looking at the attacks on the "JFK" movie, any time you see somebody attacking the movie as playing into the paranoid style of American politics, the so-called Hofstadter thesis, you know you're dealing with a genuine follower of a kook, who may have borrowed some of the kookishness themselves.