

Tacoma, Washington

In this small industrial city of 100,000, U.S. Labor Party school board candidate Brian Lantz scored 32.5 percent of the vote in a two-way runoff for a school board seat. In a private poll taken by his opponent David Tuell's staff, Lantz was said to be expected to gain 38 percent of the vote, with 18 percent of the voters undecided.

Virginia

The best publicized candidate in the Virginia gubernatorial race received the lowest vote total in his political career. Alan Ogden, the U.S. Labor Party candidate, scored a higher absolute total of votes in his 1975 bid for the Virginia House of Delegates than the 6,000 votes he supposedly earned in this race. In that race Ogden received 14 percent of the vote, a tally he repeated in his 1976 effort for Congress. Ogden's official total of 1 percent statewide is particularly dubious when compared to Labor Party House of Delegates candidate John Ascher's total of more than 11,000 votes from Richmond alone.

Washington D.C.

U.S. Labor Party school board candidate Stuart Rosenblatt polled 9,252 votes to place third in a four-way race for two school board positions. Rosenblatt's 19.3 percent of the vote can be identified as voter rejection of liberalization of marijuana laws and an endorsement of quality education. Rosenblatt, who strongly condemned local efforts to decriminalize marijuana, had been endorsed by two high-school principals.

Westchester County, N.Y.

Michael Billington, U.S. Labor Party candidate for Westchester County Executive, had met his opponents, incumbent Albert DelBello and Republican Gordon Burrows, in more than 40 public debates, and his impact on the race had gained him front-page news coverage in the final weeks of the campaign.

A poll taken by Rep. Richard Ottinger (D,N.Y.) in behalf of DelBello's staff a month before the election showed Billington to be the preferred candidate of 8 percent of the voters. But in the official returns, Billington was credited with less than 1 percent.

Everyone's "After Carter"

Administration circles allied to Vice President Walter Mondale, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, and the City of London-linked *New York Post* converged on a common political target this week: the James Carter White House.

The set-up of Carter was highlighted by the reception of his energy address, scripted by energy czar James Schlesinger. The *New York Post* opened a ridicule campaign complete with editorial page cartoons, following the speech, even though for months the *Post* has fervently supported Carter's no-energy conservation program, and the efforts of Department of Energy Chief James Schlesinger to implement it. While the *Post* took advantage of the public's no doubt disgusted response to Carter's renewed demands for energy sacrifice, Schlesinger, the author of the Administration package

and the prompter of Carter's Nov. 8 diatribe, remained comfortably behind the scenes.

Henry Kissinger's part in this nasty scheme to knock Carter off balance is being played against the Administration's persistent efforts to cool down the Middle East dispute and bring its principles to the peace table at Geneva. On Nov 3, Kissinger delivered an actionably treasonable speech against Carter's Mideast diplomacy to the World Jewish Congress (see below).

And as if to publicly advertise the intentions of these efforts, the Democratic Agenda, an umbrella group of the Mondale-linked Social Democratic Organizing Committee, this week announced a December conference to be held under their auspices — called "After Carter." As yet, the brochures advertising the conference do not announce when it is intended that Carter is to be ousted from office.

Elephants And Nebbishes

The following statement was released on Nov. 10, 1977, by Lyndon H. LaRouche, chairman of the U.S. Labor Party.

Yiddish culture has contributed several not unimportant pragmatic conceptions to political science and sociology. Unfortunately, according to the best philological authorities in the matter, the Yiddish terms attached to these conceptions are reputed to be untranslatable. Thus, without mastery of certain key Yiddish loan-words, the contemporary political analyst is most poorly equipped to understand such phenomena as the conduct of certain "moderate" Republican spokesmen.

The most famous of these Yiddish concepts is identified by the term chutzpah. If an individual enters a

revolving door behind you, and comes out first — that is chutzpah.

The most relevant of the Yiddish concepts to be employed for the case under consideration here involves political behavior of the following exemplary form. Some of you may have had the experience of watching a neighbor spend his entire Saturday afternoon sweating, huffing, cursing, and pushing, trying to fit a full grown African bull elephant into a one-horse horse-trailer. The Yiddish term for such a person is a nebbish. For those of you so culturally under-privileged as to lack such a neighbor, your understanding of the term nebbish must rely upon observing the conduct of such modern Republicans as Senator Baker, trying to push forward Henry Kissinger's current delusions as a credible

alternative to an early Middle East Geneva summit conference.

To see the problem involved more exactly, one must see Henry Kissinger himself as a nebbish among nebbishes. Despite the misleading indication arising from Henry's notorious manic-depressive fits of temper, the use of the term nebbish for Kissinger does not arise as a diminutive for the analogy to grass-eating King Nebuchadnezzar. A nebbish is a nebbish, and that, among Yiddish scholars, is the long and short of the matter.

Like the oaf attempting to fit the bull elephant into the horsetrailer, Henry Kissinger is attempting to push his hopelessly misconceived and downright dangerous worship of Metternich and Bismarck as a workable approach to current world strategic realities.

Specifically, Kissinger and his nebbical admirers obsessively repeat the claim that that great genius, Kissinger, edged the Soviet Union, step-by-step, out of a significant position in the Middle East. Such claims by Kissinger's press agents amount to the moral equivalent of an outright, bald-faced consumer fraud, which ought to come under investigation by the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission on that account.

So, when the Carter Administration, convinced by Israel and the Arabs that the Soviet Union is a major factor in the Middle East, negotiates a package SALT-Geneva effort with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, the great chorus of wild-eyed nebbishes bellows out, "Carter brought the Soviets back into the Middle East." The fact of the matter is that Henry never got them out, but it is not the quality of a nebbish to face facts contrary to his obsessive delusions.

Kissinger's Delusion

The key to the essential fallacy of the Kissinger step-by-step narcissism is that the influence of a great strategic power in the world, and in regions of the world, is not to be measured in the number of governments and parties which are the evident clients of that power.

It is the British imperialist delusion, which has infected Fabian and kindred quarters in the United States, that the United States and Britain have established a dollar-denominated Pax Britannica over the capitalist sector as a whole. Consistent with that same deluded view, they see the Soviet Union as representing a Pax Sovietica empire, and Peking as the nucleus of yet a third empire. In this fantasy-ridden image of global actualities, the Kissingers and their kind count the nations within each orbit as mere satrapies of the respective great imperial powers, to the effect that such satrapies are essentially the political property of the great power to which the present government is nominally oriented.

The Kissingerian delusion to such effect is periodically driven to imbecilic rages by such phenomena as French Gaullism or the quasi-Gaullist impulses manifest in and around Israel's Begin government. The cause of such Kissingerian imbecilic rages is not that Gaullism or Menachim Begin represent in themselves a dangerous threat to the massive correlation of power at the disposal of the Anglo-Americans. The cause of the rage is that the occurrence of Gaullism or a Menachim Begin government

is crucial empirical evidence that Kissinger's imperial doctrine is a delusion, that the world does not operate in the way Kissinger obsessively prefers it to operate.

The fact that continental Western Europe or Israel are under the thumb of Anglo-American NATO hegemony does not prevent those regions and nations from possessing vital national interests which come increasingly into conflict with Anglo-American policies of the present time. Such nations, whenever faced by a sharp conflict between Anglo-American policies and their own vital interests, will attempt to find some way in which to extricate themselves from the dictates of Anglo-American policy.

In reality, as President DeGaulle understood and emphasized, such national independence in matters of policy compels those nations to play between the two principal strategic powers. If France or Israel wishes to resist a current policy-dictate from Washington and London, it is obliged to exploit fissures in the great power relationships as a way of securing itself elbow-room for a semblance of independent policy. Hence, in the current Middle East situation, Prime Minister Menachim Begin's visit to Romania, and the crucial role of France's Prime Minister Barre in the emergence of the Carter-Gromyko Geneva proposal.

A better understanding of these realities appears to be present among circles associated with former Governor Averell Harriman, and in the Vance-Brzezinski circles within the Administration itself. We do not propose that this represents a correct understanding, but only a probing for practice in productive directions.

Contrary to Kissinger's imperial delusions, a workable United States foreign policy is not a private affair between the Executive and the Senate. The mere fact that the Executive has proposed and the Senate concurred does not mean that the adopted policy is a practicable reality. Allies are alienated by bad U.S. policies profoundly contrary to their vital interests. The constellation of political power—the so-called "Atlantic concert"—at the disposal of the United States is eroded by such a bad U.S. policy, and hence the possibility of ordering U.S. foreign policy along such lines is eroded to the point that the policy can not succeed.

A workable U.S. great-power foreign policy depends upon the hegemony of that policy in global affairs, a hegemony which in turn depends upon a favorable correlation of global political and economic forces. Hence, a leading world power must shape its policies not merely according to a monetarily prevailing perception of its domestically determined self interests, but according to an understanding of a commonality of self-interests among those nations to which it proposes to give great-power leadership.

We can not succeed if we act on the presumption that because we are a great power, therefore, our putative allies must behave as dutiful satraps under any imperative we choose to present to them.

Some recent cases in point are most relevant.

The London Attack on the Dollar

The recent fight within the Administration, between those concurring with Bert Lance and those aligned around Blumenthal, Mondale, et al., resulted in the

tactical defeat of the same forces around Lance in favor of the Blumenthal policy. It was not a clear-cut victory for the Fabian faction, but it was a defeat for the forces of fiscal sanity. In consequence of Blumenthal's wrecking of the U.S. dollar's position, a fraction of merchant bankers in the City of London cut the pound free of the dollar and proceeded to gobble up significant portions of petrodollar and Eurodollar deposits. This produced the recent pound bubble and the correlated effort of London, with complicity by the Lazard-centered Fabian-oriented U.S. financial interests, to break with the dollar in favor of world monetary hegemony by the City of London.

In assessing this development, one must distinguish between the circumstances prompting the London insurgency and the insane policy which London pursued in that temporary breakaway.

The London action was the cumulative result of the fact that since 1971, in particular, U.S. economic and monetary policies have been savagely incompetent on balance.

The refusal of the nebbishes leading New York banks and the nebbishes in Washington to face the crises of the dollar at root has been the primary consideration. Because those intellectual cowards refused to face the fact that their perceptions and policies were the principal cause of the mess, they attempted to postpone the consequences of the problem rather than making the corrections which would have solved the problem.

So, we have had the phenomenon of endemic dollar collapse without collapse. By building up offshore financial bubbles in a cancerously inflationary Eurodollar market, and by the short-lived and ultimately disastrous "remedy" of petrodollar recycling, the bloated overhang of Manhattan banking has been refinanced past each point of imminent collapse.

Out of this post-1971 experience, key U.S. and other policy-formulators have developed the wishful doctrine of the permanently postponed financial collapse of the dollar. "See," they point to their charts, "we should have gone into bankruptcy-collapse here, and then here, and then here. Each time, we managed to get through, by these refinancing innovations. Therefore, the collapse will never come. We merely have to keep on adding new innovations of the same sort, and we can postpone the bankruptcy indefinitely."

The essential fault with such Pollyanna self-delusions is that the policy-formulators involved are incompetent in the ABCs of economics.

The monetary form of the post-1967 perpetual crisis has been the accelerating growth of the overall debt-equity ratio in the capitalist sector as a whole. The mass of debt-service payments and implicit debt-service payments required on capital account has run ahead of the real gross profit on combined industrial and agricultural production. The refinancing of this debt at each point of imminent bankruptcy takes consistently the form of increasing the rate of forward debt-service. This necessarily increases payments for debt-service and imputed debt-service taken out of circulating capital of industry, agriculture and household consumption, bleeding both through direct indebtedness of production

and incomes and through looting of public consumption of industry, agriculture and households.

This consequence first reduces the rate of economic growth, and then proceeds to contract industrial and agricultural output absolutely. The result of this process is to increase the gross-debt service secularly while reducing the scale of real economic output, raising the breakeven point of individual firms and farms while driving levels of output below the breakeven point. So, the secular tendency set into motion is an exponential growth in the debt-equity ratio relative to real productive output throughout the capitalist sector as a whole, proceeding toward the point at which the rise in interest rates and the shortening of debt-maturities under inflationary pressures generates a hyperinflationary explosion.

The immediate consequence of this folly is to strike a deadly blow at the most vital economic interests of firms, agriculture, and the populations, which takes the form of a threat to the most vital interests of the affected nations. This sets into motion inevitably centrifugal political tendencies within the Anglo-American monetary system.

These centrifugal tendencies will tend to take one of two alternate general forms. In the positive variants, European nations, Japan and parts of the developing sector revolt against U.S.-dictated policies and influence in the interest of maintaining productive output rates, in favor of real economic growth. In the ugly variants, as was the case with the London caper, one group of bankers seeks to gain a relative advantage by looting the U.S. financial community, with aid—in the case of the London caper—from a Lazard-centered "fifth column" within the U.S. financial community itself.

Consequently, we have had the ludicrous spectacle of the most bankrupt, worst-managed, most economically devastated of the OECD nations, Britain, temporarily enjoying the largest rate of growth of financial reserve at the expense of nations whose currencies are relatively miracles of buying-power and economic growth potential, relative to the fictitiously valued pound.

The Schlesinger Doctrine

The paradox of the White House itself is that on the one side President Jimmy Carter is receptive to "fiscal conservatism"—his Bert Lance side—but on the other side, he is, up to this point, obsessively attached to the wildest fiscal maniac in his Administration, Energy Czar James R. Schlesinger. Carter's glazed-eyed, obsessive clinging to the Schlesinger energy doctrine is the feature of the Administration which can wreck every aspect of U.S. foreign policy potentials, generate political chaos within the nation, and even put the nation on the track toward an otherwise avoidable general thermonuclear war.

From any competent standpoint, the Schlesinger energy policy is pure economic insanity, reducing the United States to a condition of relative pastoral imbecility, in which the basic commodity at the local supermarket will become marijuana with PCP additive, transforming the nation into one hideous emulation of the Manson Family.

This is understood by the leading political forces of Western Europe and Japan, and also well understood by the Soviet Union. Leading Soviet think-tanks see the success of Schlesinger's energy policy as weakening the United States to the point that it is a third or fourth quality power in comparison with the Soviet Union first and Western Europe and Japan second.

Carter's foolish veto of the Clinch River breeder project makes the Soviet Union and France presently the world's only significant powers in nuclear technology. Other features of the Carter energy program ensure that the United States will be a pathetically backward nation as Soviet fusion energy production begins to come on line during the early 1980s.

France and West Germany do not wish to follow the United States into that morass of pastoral imbecility. The Carter energy policy, especially its foreign policy aspects, are correctly seen in continental Europe as a profound threat to the most vital national interests of those states.

Unfortunately, the pastoral imbecility of the United States is not the only consequence of the Schlesinger doctrine. The political consequences of such a doctrine upon the geometry of U.S. internal and foreign policies virtually ensures general thermonuclear war's eruption in the near future, triggered by the escalation of a Middle East war or some outbreak of military conflicts in Africa or Asia.

The problem of the United States' foreign policy at the moment is that the Carter Administration has moved in the direction of vital national interests in seeking a Geneva negotiation of the Middle East situation, but that Carter's obsessive clinging to the pastoral imbecilities of Schlesinger et al. comes into direct conflict with the foreign policy efforts of Vance and Brzezinski, under conditions in which the London-oriented Mondale faction has a preponderant control of cabinet positions.

The Truth About Kissinger

Henry Kissinger has always been a failure in politics, if one judges the matter not by the ups and downs of Kissinger's career, but from the standpoint of the effect of his policies on the most vital U.S. interests.

Kissinger's consistent outlook since 1957 has been the long-term perspective of subjugating the Soviet Union through a kind of Mutt-and-Jeff policy of sustained containment pressures centered on the aura of a credible thermonuclear ultimate threat. Kissinger's style, his acrobatics and so forth, involve the complementary feature of his approach. In matters of detail, Kissinger's practice is to probe for weakpoints in the Soviet influence, weak points fostered by containment, and to negotiate inch-by-inch advances in what Kissinger defines as the long-term U.S. position.

Kissinger's practice has been to avoid coming to any conclusive settlement of any issue of strategic importance. His method is to negotiate only temporary partial settlements, preparing the way for a new negotiation of the same issues at a later date, capitalizing, in between, on marginal advantages secured through each temporary agreement.

In general, the 20 years of Kissinger have been a net, major failure.

The sabotage of President Eisenhower's efforts, a sabotage consistent with the Kissinger doctrine of avoiding conclusive resolution of problems, was followed by the perfervid version of the Kissinger Doctrine practiced by the John F. Kennedy Administration. This venture committed the Soviet Union to a war-winning long-term strategic military perspective in force today.

The Anglo-American foul-up of Indochina, launched under the Kennedy Administration, and the mire of the Johnson Administration, became a hideous, massive ulcer, which did savage damage to U.S. foreign policy capabilities as well as nearly wrecking the nation's institutions internally. This was Kissinger's doctrine carried to the extremes of its potential insanity for that period.

Kissinger himself has been associated publicly with a more cautious application of his own policy. Unlike the Kennedy Administration, and unlike the follies of the first half-year of the Carter Administration, Kissinger avoided pushing matters so far as to directly catch the United States in a major set-back to his policies from the Soviet side. However, the policy of all Administrations since 1960 has been essentially Kissinger's. However significant for the short-run the "stylistic" differences have been, it is various stylistic interpretations of the Kissinger doctrine which have dominated U.S. policy since the "U-2 Incident."

It is not accidental that the London-oriented Fabian liberal faction within the Democratic Party's "Eastern Establishment" have repeatedly carried Kissinger's doctrine in practice to lunatic extremes.

The appearance of Kissinger's success during the 1968-1976 period was not the result of any inherent competence in his policies, but the fact that his relative moderation of public style combined with the continued credibility of the world power of the U.S. dollar enabled Kissinger to enjoy certain short-term gains made larger-than-life by his admirers in the major press and the Congress. What worked was not Kissinger's policies, but the continued hegemony of the U.S. dollar and economy.

For example, the case of Egypt. Kissinger did not win Sadat to his camp, Kissinger took over Sadat's rental contract, and staged the 1973 war in such a way as to enable Sadat to make the corresponding shift. It was the U.S. dollar that bought Sadat together with certain other arrangements involving the 1973 OPEC and petrodollar recycling constellation.

This reporter had the opportunity to study Kissinger's operation at very close range beginning in the fall of 1975. Kissinger and this writer were working opposite lines of economic policy during that period, and Kissinger was personally, directly involved in operations against key world figures who he had detected as sympathetic to the Labor Party's International Development Bank proposal. Many of these talked—if discreetly—adding up to a catalogue of outright economic blackmail and bribery of industries, parties, governments and so forth. Kissinger's diplomacy is all Mutt-and-Jeff, Kissinger's goons on the one hand and a check-book on the other.

As the time came, as it had to come, that the U.S. dollar itself was monstrously weakened through the policies Kissinger represented, the consumer fraud involved in Kissinger's reputation came to the surface. The

U.S. dollar lacked the resources to buy up factions and nations, and the most vital interests of European and other nations forced them to come out in bolder resistance to threats, and terrorist and environmentalist goonery.

Now Kissinger and his duped admirers, all howling like the band of nebbishes they are, insist that since Kissinger's policies worked in the past, they are the policies which must be applied to the present. One is reminded the nebbishes canoeing eastward across Lake Erie, reaching Niagra Falls, at which point, the nebbishes reject warnings from the river bank, yelling to one another "keep paddling forward." Kissinger's policies have reached their lawful destination, and are thus exposed for their intrinsic incompetence which they have, in fact always represented.

Metternich and Bismarck

It is well known among those Kissinger associates who are gullible to listen to such nonsense that Kissinger pridefully models himself on study of the roles of Metternich and Bismarck. To anyone who knows the real history of Metternich and Bismarck, Kissinger's recitals in themselves give away the secret of his essential incompetence.

Both Metternich and Bismarck were essentially tools of London financial interests. In either case, the diplomatic and military successes attributed to those "statesmen" were arranged for them by, principally, the House of Rothschild.

The case of Bismarck is sufficient to illustrate the principle involved.

In the aftermath of 1848-1849, the House of Rothschild recognized that inevitable doom of the political obscurity known as the Austro-Hungarian Empire and played alternately with Napoleon III and Bismarck as the new, alternative instruments of British continental policy. Bismarck himself was an adopted protege of the House of Rothschild, which used its influence in Britain and on the continent to bring Bismarck from relative obscurity to power in Prussia.

In each case of Bismarck's famous successes, it was the role of the Rothschilds in manipulating the credit of the states involved, and the politics of Napoleon III's armaments industry, which rigged the military and diplomatic games of Europe to the effect that Bismarck's success was prearranged.

Thus, to adduce from the case of Metternich and Bismarck a doctrine of diplomacy and strategy is to presume that the British-centered power of a force like the Rothschilds enjoys political and financial hegemony over the states involved behind the scenes. Without that latter consideration, a Metternich or Bismarck would have been nothing but discredited public jokes in world affairs.

A Bismarck or a Metternich without the House of Rothschild arranging history behind the scenes is nothing but a pathetic nebbish, like the nebbish trying to put the African bull elephant into a one-horse trailer.

Kissinger: Disregard Carter's Mideast Peace Efforts

In an intimate closed-door session with the World Jewish Congress Nov. 3, former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger urged the American Jewish community to defend Israel at all costs, regardless of U.S. policy. Kissinger's diplomatically worded statement, delivered in an atmosphere that one participant described as "almost like a family affair," was an unmistakable cut at President Jimmy Carter's overtures for peace in the Middle East and, in fact, followed the President's own remarks to the Congress.

Nahum Goldmann, a leading WJC member, made the point obvious to all by telling the participants to "read between the lines" and remember that Kissinger was of necessity speaking only in very general terms.

The Congress meeting was closed to the press, but NSIPS has obtained a paraphrase of Kissinger's speech from which the following excerpts are taken.

The present situation must fill all Jews with a sense of responsibility and concern. All Jews must be for peace, and peace does not rest only on statements — because Jews have seen too much of the transitoriness of human intentions. Jews know that they must not be seen as the cause of international difficulties. Peace must reflect an equilibrium of strength. No nation can entrust its security simply to trusting in another state....

I believe, and have always stated, that a separate Arab state on the West Bank — whatever the declaration or intention — inevitably must have objectives that are not compatible with the tranquility of the Middle East; it has nothing to do with professions, guarantees, assurances, promises....

To understand the real concerns of both sides (i.e., the U.S. and Israel): the U.S. is a superpower — but for the Jews and Israelis, the margins of safety are very narrow. The U.S. can afford certain experiments because if we are wrong, our worst penalty is to redouble our efforts. For Israel, certain experiments cannot be tried because Israeli leaders get only one guess — if they are wrong, it may involve the survival of their people.

Jews in America and around the world can best assure their interests by understanding the interests of the countries in which they live, but similarly, the U.S. and other countries have to understand the insecurity and the traumas of a people that has barely survived the holocaust and never known a day of peace in its existence, and knows that, in the final analysis, it is no good to any country unless it is meaningful to itself.

And therefore, it must maintain its faith in itself and its confidence that it is a master of its own destiny, and not just the protectorate of some other country, however well-intentioned that country may be.