

Der Spiegel Circulates Fraud

The following analysis was released on April 11, 1978 by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., U.S. Labor Party candidate for President, 1976.

The hideously fraudulent and slanderous attack on the U.S. Carter Administration in this week's issue of the British-sympathizer, Hamburg *Der Spiegel* typifies the broader range of kindred, wicked efforts to drive a wedge between Washington and the capitals of Western Europe. This problem is complicated by the fact that, while many European leaders have some good knowledge of important aspects of U.S. policy, especially President Giscard of France and probably Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany, no European capital (barring the special case of the Vatican) has a truly competent insight into the important internal characteristics of U.S. political processes at this time.

As a U.S. public figure better informed than most on the European situation, it is my duty to contribute my knowledge to counteract the fraudulent and insulting sort of British propaganda issued against President Jimmy Carter by conduits such as *Der Spiegel*. I shall not, of course, encroach upon the authority of Mr. Cyrus Vance's State Department. Nor shall I violate the confidences which I and my close associates have from certain highly placed U.S. and other quarters. Within those noted restrictions on what I may say publicly, I am qualified to report the essential profile most European political leaders do not yet comprehend, and to aid them in seeing the reality of U.S. political processes through American eyes.

The Neutron Bomb Issue

Since the facts concerning the "neutron bomb" issue have now been placed in the public domain, I am plainly at liberty to summarize these facts, and to dispel the nonsensical discussion of this issue which has come recently to dominate the European press. I refer my remarks most emphatically to the attention of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung's* Adalbert Weinstein, who would not have embarrassed himself publicly on this issue had he heeded my earlier, now fully validated advice to him.

Before — long before — the recent propaganda campaign around the "neutron bomb" erupted (during the early 1970s), the U.S. military establishment had projected the upgrading of the aging nuclear arsenal in NATO to include, possibly, an improved nuclear warhead bearing the unspectacular name of "enhanced radiation" device. The public relations agent's name of "neutron bomb" was not being wildly bruted about in press channels until recently. There was nothing secret about the matter: the matter was candidly discussed in 1973 Soviet publications.

The problem with the "enhanced radiation" (ER) device is that it has virtually no advantage except as an

offensive weapon of nuclear warfare. It is absolutely not a defensive weapon against "Warsaw Pact tanks." Its distinctive primary use is as a bombardment weapon used in place of conventional artillery-bombardment cover for one's own mechanized forces advancing into adversary territory. Its distinctive advantage over "dirtier" nuclear weapons is that its use exposes one's own forces to reduced radioactive contamination in the line of advancing march.

The difficulty with the deployment of the ER device is that the Warsaw Pact not has an equal capability for deploying its own ER device, but the deployment of ER devices in Europe gives the Warsaw Pact forces a marginal advantage because of Warsaw Pact assault capabilities for the present and in-sight period.

This would ordinarily have been the policy issue quietly mooted behind closed doors if the refurbishing of NATO nuclear arsenals had been deliberated in an ordinary way. Instead, circles in Europe and the United States linked to the British Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), such as the British Secret Intelligence Service's (SIS) International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) division, chose to create a major publicity campaign around the "neutron bomb."

During recent months, various European circles of influence have been subjected to an orchestrated, intensive indoctrination in behalf of the "neutron bomb." The center of this indoctrination campaign has been not Washington, but London. Excepting Republican and other circles subjected to Henry Kissinger's influence, and Zbigniew Brzezinski and James R. Schlesinger within the Carter Administration itself, no section of the Carter Administration has been pushing consistently for deployment of the "neutron bomb" into Europe. Notably, Secretary Harold Brown's Department of Defense has been cautiously ambivalent on the "neutron bomb" — for good military-strategic reasons. Beginning with British-linked General Alexander Haig at Brussels, every force strongly pushing the "neutron bomb" deployment has been either British or British-linked.

The "neutron bomb" has been pushed by British circles on two pretexts.

First, the British have pushed through IISS and allied conduits the argument that the "neutron bomb" is an essential enhancement of NATO forces for a theater-limited nuclear conflict within Central Europe. This is doubly nonsensical. For the existing and in-sight balance of forces in Central Europe, neutron bomb deployment would result in a significant margin of increased disadvantage for NATO forces. Second, a theater-limited nuclear war in Central Europe is pure fantasy. Any nuclear confrontation between NATO and Warsaw Pact forces is the trip-wire for full-scale, intercontinental thermonuclear warfare.

Second, the fall-back argument of British circles has been that the "neutron bomb" can be traded off against such Warsaw Pact weapons systems as the SS-20. This is utter nonsense. The Soviets will trade for a NATO "neutron bomb" a Soviet "neutron bomb." The N-bomb is not some weapon which NATO has but the Soviets do not: it is a weapon the Soviets have been prepared to produce and deploy since no later than 1973.

Both of those popularized arguments for the neutron bomb are therefore absurd. Nor can the presumed military expertise of General Alexander Haig be invoked to create some mysterious authority for the popularized arguments. The principal facts of Haig's career ought to be noted to dispel illusions concerning his competence.

In 1968, Colonel Alexander Haig, a protégé of present U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Joseph Califano, was transferred to the staff of Henry Kissinger, at the Hotel Pierre in New York City, together with Morton Halperin and Daniel Ellsberg. On K

was promoted, out of line of promotion, to two-star general (major-general) and promoted to four-star general in 1972. Haig's 1972 promotion bypassed 240 top-ranking U.S. general officers! Haig's military history is principally as a stooge of Califano and Kissinger, an individual of whom well-informed close observer William Safire said: "Al Haig wouldn't go to the bathroom without first raising his hand and asking Henry Kissinger's permission."

It is most relevant to know that Kissinger was originally a protégé of a top British secret-intelligence agent, William Yandell Elliott of Oxford's Balliol College and Harvard University, and that Kissinger was trained for British Secret Intelligence Services during the mid-1950s at the London Tavistock Institute of the British Secret Intelligence Service.

Contrary to popular misconception, NATO is not a U.S.-directed institution, but is a British-administered institution traditionally featuring a U.S. military figurehead. Notably, the nuclear planning group within NATO was a British-designed element of NATO and is currently administered under British control. Haig's significance is that he is not only Kissinger's stooge, but a figure wholly in agreement with the covey of British flag-officers who actually administer NATO.

From a military-strategic standpoint, all of Haig's utterances on policy are pathetic nonsense. There are doubts that the man is qualified for higher rank than company commander. He is purely a political bureaucrat disguised by a military uniform.

N-Bomb Not The Real Issue

The second argument for the N-bomb — "only for trading purposes" — ought to forewarn the intelligent observer that the entire "N-bomb" issue is a British hoax.

Basic British strategy throughout the present century was laid down at the beginning of this century under the direction of Lord Milner. The first version of British "geopolitical doctrine" was developed by a Milner-led task force including the Fabian Society's Sidney Webb and the noted later exponent of geopolitics, Halford Mackinder. The doctrine was also made famous by

Major-General and Professor Haushofer and Haushofer's protégé Rudolf Hess. The doctrine in its original form was embodied in the "Parvus Plan" of the World War I period, and implanted under direct influence of Haushofer and Hess in Hitler's *Mein Kampf*.

The original versions of the British geopolitical strategy proposed deploying Germany's military forces eastward against Russia. Both versions (World War I and World War II) backfired, because in both wars Germany broke through the "prohibited western barrier" into France, rather than limiting itself to a march eastward as the British had prescribed.

Despite the efforts to resurrect the march eastward from central Europe during the post-war period — since the mid-1950s Suez Crisis — the British have moved toward an alternate version of the Mackinder-Haushofer policy concerning control of the "world-island" Eurasian landmass: an alliance among the United States, Japan, and China for total war against the Soviet Union in the Pacific. This is presently the operational commitment of leading British strategists. issinger

British policy presently centers around the intermediate-term objectives of: (A) extracting Western Europe, step-by-step, from close alliance with the United States — taking Britain out of the projected coming world war; and (B) developing a total thermonuclear war in the Pacific (rather than the Atlantic) between the United States and Soviet Union, with China and Japan the key allies (and victims) of the Pacific anti-Soviet alliance in this Pacific-centered total war. Simultaneously eliminating the Soviet Union, the United States, China, and Japan in the Pacific war is viewed as affording London the basis for establishing its global hegemony.

To realize that intermediate-term geopolitical objective, the British deploy a variety of preparatory maneuvers in the United States, Western Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. These include: (A) forcing both the resignation of President Jimmy Carter and a series of humiliations of the United States; (B) using these humiliations of the United States to (1) establish a step-by-step break between Washington and Western Europe and (2) to turn the United States under Mondale into a fascist armed camp modeled on the Nazi machine; (C) using British treaty agreements to force the United States to deliver to Britain the technology for an independent Western European nuclear-armed force; and (D) impelling the United States toward an alternative, Pacific military alliance with China and Japan.

The British effort to push the Healey-Jenkins "Europa" currency bloc, and the creation of the flap between Europeans and Washington over U.S. strategic policies are integral parts of the preparatory, step-by-step conditioning of the strategic situation for the Pacific war scenario.

That is the key to the game being played by the management of *Der Spiegel* during the recent period.

European Blind Spots

Among European capitals — both in Western Europe and in Eastern Europe — the principal reason why none of these governments (excepting certain top French government circles) understands the internal situation

in the United States is the refusal of European political leaders to confront the reality of the British problem, firstly, and, secondly, widespread European delusions concerning the significance of Henry A. Kissinger. The effort to arrive at an understanding of the United States among European leaders generally, represents an effort to explain developments in such a way as to avoid confronting the prevailing European delusions concerning the British and Kissinger problems.

Despite the recent babbling of former President Gerald Ford and such Republican self-esteeming 1980 presidential candidates as Brock and Baker, important innermost policy circles inside the United States know and are acting upon the fact that the key United States problem is the British problem, and that Brzezinski and Schlesinger are Kissinger pawns of British circles of influence. The most important problem confronting these leading U.S. policy circles is that the anti-British coalition of forces inside the United States is barely able to balance off the pro-British forces. Consequently, the internal situation in the Carter Administration and U.S. policy circles generally represents an approximate impasse. The loyal Americans so far have barely sufficient strength to prevent the pro-British forces from pushing through hideous policies wholesale, but do not view themselves as situated yet in the position to launch a broad counterattack.

The centers of British influence inside the United States are as follows. In the major political parties, the Kennedy faction and the faction of the late Senator Hubert Humphrey (e.g. Vice-President Mondale) are totally British agents-of-influence at the top-most levels. The section of the Republican Party adhering to the influence of Henry Kissinger is also under British influence. The leadership of the AFL-CIO, notably Clayman of the industrial union division, is saturated with British agents-of-influence, as is also the case with the leadership of the United Auto workers union. The so-called Jewish Lobby, including Senator Henry Jackson of the British Columbia-influenced division of the Senate, is in effect nothing but a joint arm of the British Secret Intelligence Service and its Israeli intelligence branch-division. The neo-Fabian section of the U.S. policy and intelligence establishment, the networks of the League for Industrial Democracy, the Americans for Democratic Action, and the terrorist-linked Institute for Policy Studies, are British intelligence-controlled at the top.

This configuration is key to this writer's critical preference for President Gerald Ford in the Nov. 2, 1976 general election and the subsequent work concerning the massive vote fraud of the Nov. 2 election.

Until the developing nations capitulated to London-Kissinger pressures during the month of September 1976 in abandoning their August 1976 Colombo Resolution, this writer's U.S. Labor Party candidacy for the presidency was a serious tangible faction in the national situation. Although this writer received in fact more than 3 million of the votes cast in the Nov. 2 general election, it was clear by late September that the U.S. Labor Party's campaign had been reduced to a marginal factor by the display of cowardice and foolish cupidities among most developing-nations' governments.

The problem this writer and his party confronted during and following the last quarter of 1976 was that both leading prospective candidates for the U.S. presidency were disastrously "underqualified" for the position. However, the constellation around a Ford presidency meant a probable avoidance of the worst consequences for the upcoming economic and other strategic problems. Jimmy Carter's personal profile, the menace represented by a Vice-President Walter Mondale a heart-beat behind Carter, and the massive concentration of British agents-of-influence in the Carter campaign machine, meant that a Carter presidency placed the United States — and the world — in a most precarious situation for the months ahead.

For this reason, the writer and his party made a major successful effort to raise over \$125,000 in last-minute funds for two nationwide TV broadcasts, the first, a five-minute political message broadcast during October, the second, a half-hour address to the nation delivered on Nov. 1, 1976 next to the half-hour nationwide addresses by Ford and Carter. The Nov. 1 address had two purposes. The first, nullified by what has been proven by legal evidence to have been the most massive electoral fraud in U.S. history, was to draw sufficient votes away from Carter among trade unionists and others to ensure a Ford victory. The second was to pull together a new combination of forces in the United States around agreement on the most vital strategic issues of the months ahead.

The second objective of that broadcast was immediately realized in part and has been increasingly fruitful over the subsequent months to date. Key policy forces in the United States, representing Republicans, Democrats, trade union leaders, minorities' leaders, industrialists, financial groups, farmers, and intelligence and military professionals are building a policy alliance of growing strength, in which the U.S. Labor Party performs special roles as a principal "strategic thinktank" and a political catalyst in organizing efforts. The Nov. 1 1976 nationwide broadcast has been integral to this process, in that it established the U.S. Labor Party's leadership as being of major political stature in the shaping of U.S. policy perceptions and options.

Although the U.S. Labor Party, like its cothinkers abroad, operates under such massive, London-coordinated containment that even wealthy sympathizers of the party's work have been intimidated against making financial contributions, the threadbare, harassed forces of the writer and his associates are collaborators of a broad array of forces, and thus exceptionally qualified to report as "insiders" on the state of affairs at the highest levels within the U.S.

The general problem all of the U.S. Labor Party's collaborators confront inside the United States is the Carter problem. With the evil presence of Vice-President Walter Mondale looming in the background, the only responsible policy of all key forces in the United States is to aid in developing the incumbent President as an effective instrument in behalf of vital interests of the nation and its allies. The U.S. Labor Party and its allies are keenly, painfully aware of the limitations of President Carter, but we have no choice but to work to

make the incumbent President effective between now and 1981.

If President Carter is to be helped in his efforts to fill out the dimensions of his office, the responsible forces inside the United States must be aided to that effect by responsible leaders of other nations, especially those of continental Western Europe and Japan, and also, one would hope, the Soviet Union.

President Giscard and Chancellor Schmidt, as well as Swiss central banker Fritz Leutwiller, and the Saudi and Iranian governments, have good reasons to be distressed by President Carter's toleration of the influence of Blumenthal, Schlesinger, and Brzezinski on matters of both international economic policies and strategic political issues. Nonetheless, no responsible leader in France, the German Federal Republic, Italy, and Japan wishes to stamp his feet and run away from the United States merely because of such painful frustrations. We in the United States and honest and responsible leading forces in Europe have a common interest and a common problem of making President Carter more adequately aware of the realities, and of mobilizing the support President Carter will require to resist the pressures of the British agents-of-influence inside his Administration and the Congress.

The filthy, slanderous, and falsified attacks on President Carter by *Der Spiegel* are most unhelpful, to say the least.

The most painful problem we Americans face in our efforts to aid the incumbent President is the refusal of honest Europeans to recognize and act upon the essential feature of President Carter's difficulties. European leaders fail to openly acknowledge that the problem side of the Carter Administration is entirely a British problem.

The Soviet leadership is to be criticized most sharply on this point. Moscow knows that Kissinger is a British agent, and that Brzezinski and Schlesinger are essentially pawns of Kissinger and London. Yet, Moscow persists to the present moment in playing into attacks on the United States over issues Moscow knows to emanate not from U.S. interests but British interests and British agents-of-influence within the U.S. Moscow has but to read the latest British line in the *London Times*, the *Economist*, the *Financial Times*, the *Observer*, and the

Guardian to know what certain continental European publications and mouths will be babbling out the next day, and what Kissinger and Brzezinski will be babbling not less than two days later.

Naturally, since this writer is sufficiently informed of British secret intelligence and related control among the parties of continental Western Europe, and British secret intelligence influence in such places as Moscow and the foreign office of the German Democratic Republic, he is aware of the nature of the difficulties in each European continental nation in openly denouncing the British for their current "geopolitical" policies, their monetary frauds, and their international environmentalism and international terrorism. Nonetheless, the price of failing to defeat the British influence in Washington and other capitals is a deepening world depression, an upsurge of police states in Western Europe itself, as well as other locations, and almost certain thermonuclear war.

Based on the record of Europe's two world wars in this century, in consequence of Britain's geopolitical designs, one can not be childishly optimistic that the United States will not play once again the role of a "dumb giant" led around by a British chain attached to its nose, and that Europe will not once again go into the Third World War as British influence set up the two preceding world wars. One can not be naively optimistic, but must act with determination against Britain, knowing that that course of action, whatever the risks, is the only chance the human race has to secure its survival over the intermediate term.

The U.S.-directed effort should be launched on two levels. First, I encourage official bodies to deepen their collaboration with the U.S. State Department. Second, leading circles of various nations should enlarge the informal links to the proper circles of opposite numbers inside the United States. Apart from the important, direct negotiation this involves, the environment favorable to closer collaboration should be enriched, and responsible Europeans must quickly develop a correct understanding of internal U.S. policy-dynamics, an understanding contrary to that offered by Kissinger accomplices and dupes such as the *Washington Post*.

It would also be helpful to look at *Der Spiegel* with a more precise recognition of the nationality of the image reflected there.

The Fantastic Lies of Der Spiegel

Reprinted below are portions of a 15-page-long diatribe against the United States Administration appearing in the April 10 issue of Der Spiegel magazine.

Relations between Bonn and Washington have reached an all-time low point following U.S. President Carter's neutron bomb decision. Chancellor Schmidt, who is deeply distraught along with other Europeans and Carter's own administration, is organizing the resistance: If Europe cannot go its own way militarily, then at least it will do so in its monetary policy.

The American-voyager Genscher has almost never been as dejected as when he summarized his impressions: The President has made impossible any

rational calculation within Alliance politics; his decisions are no longer comprehensible. Genscher's pithy remark: "He's a religious Schwärmer."...

Carter's confusing game strengthened once again Helmut Schmidt in his estimation of the American President: He considers him to be an erratic dilettante who attempts to recast his private morality into world policy-making, but who in reality is incapable of taking up the role of leader in the West....

The President's current term in office runs out in two-and-a-half years. Bonn is in the meantime setting all its hopes on that point in time: Perhaps then the American electorate will get rid of the problem of the erratic Jimmy Carter.