

pursuing their course after the clear warning given, the end will be, I regret to foretell, a very bloody one.

The possibility of saving the French franc and all the European Economic Community currencies as well, depends absolutely upon France's key role in a joint European program of massive nuclear-energy and electricity-grid exports into the developing sector. With such a program, and only with a package which includes such a program, the franc and other European currencies can be quickly put on a gold-reserve basis for export. To attempt to interfere with that program at this critical juncture of dollar-collapse is to make war upon the European and other nations involved.

West Germany might conceivably vacillate briefly on this issue, but "fundamentals" prescribe that West Germany, Benelux and Italy have no real choice but to swing over decisively. If the Carter-Mondale forces attempt to sabotage this process by various monetary tricks, Europe will either resist that in the most forceful way with existing governments, or produce new governments quickly which do. Cute tricks and covert operations are now of greatly reduced effectiveness since Carter's Libyan caper. The fundamentals have begun to operate, and now real politics will assert itself.

Any effort by the Carter-Mondale-Humphrey to counter this development will only worsen the situation of the dollar, as long as the present Carter-Mondale policy continues. If Europe is shifting toward a hard-commodity policy, while Carter-Mondale-Humphrey continue the deindustrialization-funny money policy, with or without suprausterity in the USA, the "fundamentals" referred to by the Bank of England yesterday mean that Europe must win at the expense of the dollar.

Since the Carter-Mondale crew is faced with that reality, the risk that they will attempt to provoke a general thermonuclear confrontation with the Soviets, as a "last gamble" for saving the Manhattan banks is the gravest problem of this period.

Otherwise, the best solution is to get me into the White House very quickly. The only alternative is someone in the White House who accepts my authority as the administration's "grey eminence." There is no problem facing the United States which Carter, Mondale or Humphrey would not make worse, and no problem which I can not solve.

Goodbye, Humphrey-Dumphrey. All the king's horses and all the king's men couldn't put your world together again.

Carter's Puppet Attacks Libya

The following statement was released on July 25, by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., U.S. Labor Party chairman.

Contrary to all lies being conduited through press and other "authoritative sources," the Egyptian invasion of Libya is the activation of one-half of a plan of the Carter U.S. National Security Council, which has been planned to be put into operation for at least three months to date. The other half of the plan is an Israeli strike into Lebanon and Syria, triggered through destabilization of the delicate balance in Lebanon.

Highest-level European circles have been duped into accepting the version of the operation put out from Washington and NATO Brussels headquarters. The insiders' "cover story" for this operation is the explanation that this is a Brzezinski move to clean out all Soviet bases and influence from the Middle East.

The truth is that it is an operation whose objective is the destruction of the French, West German and Italian economies through a violent disruption of OPEC and Middle East petroleum supplies. It is, in short, an action taken in behalf of the policy being pushed by Senators Jake Javits and Frank Church, and Javits' and Church's backers, of course.

Although the primary objective of the actions by David Rockefeller's puppet Anwar Sadat is to break up OPEC and break the back of the European economies, there is a dangerous element of confrontation with the Warsaw Pact in this operation. However, the issue of the confrontation has nothing to do with the story being put out from Washington and Brussels. The pattern of confrontation is that of which I warned in my nationwide

U.S. half-hour television address of Nov. 1, 1976.

Essential Elements of Information

The essential elements of information to be considered in arriving at an evaluation are as follows.

Anwar Sadat and his minister-president are currently functioning under the terms of a rental contract held by David Rockefeller of Chase Manhattan Bank. The reported rental fee paid for Sadat's services during the present period is in the vicinity of \$900 millions. There are also indirect influences to the same effect on Sadat, through pro-Rockefeller or pro-London factional elements within Saudi Arabia. For all practical purposes connected with the current operation, Sadat is at the moment a mere puppet of Zbigniew Brzezinski, and each of Sadat's actions, until further notice, are being finetuned by the corresponding Washington, D.C. and Brussels coordinating agencies.

Any report to the effect that Libya's government is in any way a Soviet influence-conduit is nonsensical, and if from high-level sources a deliberate lie. Historically, to date, the Libyan government's closest political ties are with a certain department of the intelligence services of a certain Western European country, not Italy. All high-level intelligence and informed political sources in the world are adequately informed of this arrangement. Although the details are complex — as all political intelligence connections involving states are — the essentials of the arrangement are quite clear.

Libya is not a Soviet political influence in the Mediterranean or Africa. Libya in no sense "belongs" to the Soviet orbit. Rather, Soviet relations to Libya con-

form to a Comecon policy of attempting to stabilize the Mediterranean and Middle East in concert with those Western European political forces to which Libya is in fact historically closest. Soviet technical assistance to Libya, of which military assistance is a part, is a combination of a Soviet policy of developing friendly relations with devoutly anti-Communist Arab governments and also of strengthening detente cooperation with certain Western European governments.

These facts are known to every European government. Up to that point those governments have the proper facts, but do not yet go one essential step further.

It is also known to European governments that the three-month project for an Egyptian invasion of Libya is complementary to a plan under which Israel attacks Lebanon and Syria.

The triggers for the second operation are chiefly U.S. National Security Council-controlled elements within Israel's military and the Chamoun-Falange element in Lebanon. Since the Israelis have been induced to adopt the Falange as part of Israel's overall strategic interest in the region, certain Lebanese configurations, when coordinated with direct pressures into certain circles in Israel, will automatically activate an Israeli invasion of Lebanon and Syria despite the political controls to the contrary established by the Begin government.

These two attacks combined set into motion the general Middle East conflagration which points toward destruction of OPEC oil fields. However, the real purpose of the operation has been kept "covert" in effect by strenuous efforts to impress Western European governments with the argument that the objective is Soviet Mediterranean and Middle East influences and military bases. Typically, Washington and Brussels are using the old bloody shirt of anti-Communism to lull West Europeans and key USA forces into passively watching David Rockefeller et al. cut the vital interests of West European, USA and other nations to ribbons in favor of one Lower Manhattan's idiotic but nonetheless obsessive conception of a "dollar bail-out."

The Soviet Confrontation

By pumping out the smokescreen explanation of the Carter administration's invasion of Libya, the Carter administration has located the confrontation with the Soviet command on an issue of actually tertiary importance, thus distracting attention away from the real nature of the confrontation involved.

First, the strong intimation of a direct confrontation with the Soviets pouring out of Washington and NATO circles creates an atmosphere mid-way between the effects of the Bay of Pigs operation and the 1962 Missiles Crisis. This posture changes the internal political configuration within the Warsaw Pact command from one of attempting to save detente toward that of preparations for fighting World War III. This operation convinces the Soviet leadership that Carter-Brzezinski is committed to general war **in fact**, and that the London-Mondale-Carter alternative inside the administration and US Congress is merely a cosmetic posture either by intent or otherwise by fact of its ineffectualness.

The Soviet command, which does not think in the "line-by-line cost-benefit analysis" terms popular around

Washington and NATO headquarters, will not respond quidproquo under such circumstances, but will choose a pattern of posture and supporting actions as they envisage their overall two-layer counteroffensive. They will now shift fully into operations along the Soviet version of Clausewitzian postures.

The Soviet Clausewitzian posture operates on two levels. Level one is a Clausewitzian war-avoidance phase, which continues as long as war-avoidance does not mean reduction of their potential thermonuclear war-winning capabilities. The other level, which is concurrent with the first, is preparations for winning a general thermonuclear war. The passing-over from the first level to the second is triggered either by a sharp confrontation, or by the cumulative effects of an attempted chewing-away of Soviet strategic deployments.

The exemplary flash-points include: (1) A general Middle East crisis. (2) Escalated operations in the Horn of Africa against Ethiopia. (3) Eliminating the resistance of Eastern Europe to fully-committed NATO "forward defense" postures. In general, any combination of developments which the Soviets view as irreversible preconditions leading into general war represent the configuration in which they will react at a point of their choosing.

The Soviet reaction will not be determined by specific issues, but by an overall estimate of the strategic situation. This discrepancy between the way of thinking in Washington, Brussels and that in Moscow is a prominent feature of the consistent pattern of aggravated miscalculation in Washington, Manhattan, London and Brussels circles.

Brzezinski and others profile Soviet responses in terms of Soviet individuals and currents. In a crisis-situation, the Soviet command operates collectively, not individually, and reverts to the cathexes of World War II to group all individuals and currents into a process of collective thinking centered around the military-strategic outlook of the overall command.

The overall pattern of the Carter administration to date has been to act upon the Warsaw Pact nations to the effect of driving them out of the mode of political interactions and judgments characteristic of the 1963-1976 period into the aversive circumstances in which the dominance of the collective mode of judgment is crystallized. On performance, barring the observations from Governor Harriman's circles, and some insights by U.S. conservative Republicans and others, the administration and Congress ostensibly lack the capability of comprehending the way in which the Soviet command thinks under the collective-thinking circumstances of a pronounced aversive environment. In such circumstances all Soviet leaders become "Stalinists."

The form of "Stalinist" Soviet thinking in the present period cannot be compared for strategic effects with that of earlier periods. First, the Soviet command is more sophisticated than during any past "Stalinist" period, and this distinction is qualitative rather than quantitative. Second, the Soviets have a slight strategic war-fighting margin — but only under conditions of total war — which the Soviet Union has not commanded in past periods. If pressed sufficiently, a "Stalinist" CPSU will be guided by only one fundamental consideration: at

what point do they enjoy the relatively greatest war-winning advantage by launching total war?

Apart from certain flash-points at which a total-war threat posture is highly probable (if not certain), the pattern of which I warned during my Nov. 1, 1976 nationwide address is the fundamental consideration to be watched. It is not a process of isolation of the Soviet Union which itself leads toward war, but a process of aggressive efforts to isolate the USSR conducted by a USA administration visibly committed to 1962 Missile Crisis-echoing postures of strategic confrontation.

The Carter administration's operations in Libya are deadly, but even more deadly is the pattern of hints being insinuated into leading Western European circles by NATO Brussels. These hints have been interpreted by some very sophisticated recipients as indicating that a Soviet intervention into the Libyan affair might probably result in a selective strategic launch against East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and so forth. That pattern of hints, which cannot fail to gush into reports hastened to Moscow, will shape Soviet thinking in the most dan-

gerous way. Faced with reflections of such thinking in NATO-Brussels, the Soviets' inclination will be a qualitatively-increased disposition for launching total war.

One of the most dangerous elements in the current situation is the Carter administration's hysterical effort to consolidate its political position with aid of a hard-line "anti-Communist" posture, thus attempting to neutralize its trade-union and conservative critics in the USA and elsewhere. That thrust will convince the Soviets that the Carter administration's strategic confrontation thrust is not offset by internal controls within NATO. The trade-unionists and conservatives who allow themselves to be manipulated by this gimmick ought to be accompanied by the act of kissing cherished parts of their anatomy a fond, final goodbye. Their gullibility in falling for that trick means that one not-so-fine early morning, the United States will probably cease to exist.

The way key Congressmen and others react to Carter's current insane escapade will inform us all whether these Congressmen and others have sufficient combined brains and guts to enable our nation to survive.

A Soviet Lesson

In April of this year the Soviet Union made a dramatic show of strength in the Atlantic Ocean which left NATO shocked. A *Reuter* release citing NATO intelligence sources has made known that the Soviets deployed 89 submarines, a fleet of surface warships — including the new aircraft carrier Kiev — and long-range aircraft in the unannounced maneuvers. The sources admitted that the show of strength was more than NATO tracking procedures could handle.

In May, the USSR moved 120,888 troops into Eastern Europe by air in the space of one week.

Alert readers will recall that around this time, Secretary of State Vance returned from his mission to Moscow, and the full brunt of Soviet anger at the Carter Administration's provocative SALT package was first felt. Foreign Minister Gromyko, in a Moscow press conference, and *Pravda*, in a 5000 word editorial, charged that the package was designed to be unacceptable. With the deployment of Admiral Gorshkov's fleet, Moscow flexed the muscles behind its verbal warnings that Carter was heading for war.

The *Reuter* wire did not conceal the import of the Soviet move: "The North Atlantic Treaty Organization views the deployment of the Soviet submarine fleet to sea as one of its most important warning signs that a conflict is about to begin. Intelligence experts expect the submarines to begin moving out to operational areas between seven and 14 days before the start of war."

The news story sheds light on reports emerging in the intervening period to the effect that NATO's monitoring ability at the Iceland entrance to the North Atlantic waters, through which the Soviet fleet passes on the way from its base at Murmansk, should be revamped.

Also in April, it will be recalled, the conflict in Zaire with the involvement of NATO-directed French forces was escalating. The massive transport of foreign troops to aid Zairean President Mobutu was audibly con-

templated. During and after the Zairean war, the Soviet press portrayed it as a Wall Street-run operation that could lead to global conflict.

In light of events to date, readers might also return with interest to an April 24 article in the Soviet Military daily *Red Star*, which reported tension mounting at that time between Egypt and Libya. "The possibility of an attack by Egypt on Libya," commented the newspaper, "is linked with the recent visit of President Sadat to Washington, where he received positive statements of American support for such an action. Such support results from Egypt's pro-American policy in Africa and the Middle East, as demonstrated in Egypt's interference in the Zairean crisis."

Just last weekend, in the feature excerpted here, *Red Star* situated the several African "hot spots" as focal points in a single U.S. "local war" strategy which will cause global war.

Experienced observers in the United States greeted the *Reuter* report with a query: if the Soviets did *that* in April, what did they do last week?

General Haig Plays The Hypocrite

This article by Major Yu. Gavrillov and V. Vinogradov appeared in the Soviet military daily Red Star, July 24.

A few days ago Supreme Commander of the Allied Armed Forces of NATO in Europe General A. Haig gave an interview to the paper *France Soir* in which he said that he fears the beginning of a war in "the Third World." This war, in the opinion of A. Haig, "could break out as the result of an evolution of the situation in the Third World, without even any encouragement from the so-called superpowers.