

Carter's economic war against the U.S.

How Kissinger took control of the President

With last night's televised address, President Jimmy Carter has put himself into the role of the amateur surgeon who proposes to remove most of a patient's innards on the presumption that he doesn't know which organ is causing the patient's complaint. Such luridly psychedelic policy-making from a President prompts the query: why doesn't someone in a position of power act to stop Carter before the value of the dollar is totally wrecked and the economy plunged into a depression worse than that of the 1930s?

The answer is that most of the nation's behind-the-scenes policy makers wish to wreck the dollar and plunge the nation into a depression. The answer to the question posed by Carter's address is: *If one wishes to kill the patient in surgery, it is quite sufficient to give a reckless, untrained amateur the scalpel.*

This state of affairs in the nation represents a qualitative change in policy outlook since mid-July. During July, there remained a significant plurality among policy makers and leading policy-influencers, in both governmental and private circles, which was considering the adoption of the European Monetary System (EMS) perspective. *On the surface*, today there are virtually none supporting the EMS. Those who entertain pro-EMS outlooks are, for the moment, maintaining a very low profile. Kissinger's policies are rampant.

At this moment, Henry A. Kissinger is determining Carter Administration policies for:

- (1) Monetary and economic policy;
 - (2) Middle East and Islamic policy;
 - (3) Africa policy;
 - (4) Latin American policy;
 - (5) Far East policy;
 - (6) Policy vis à vis NATO and the Soviet Union.
- In the Washington pecking order, Zbigniew Brzezinski is essentially a mere errand-boy for Kissinger.

The policies for these areas are summarily as follows:

(1) Monetary and economic policy

The end of the U.S. dollar's role as a principal

international reserve currency, thus aiding the attempted deviation of the world into "regional currency blocs." This British policy of Kissinger's (and Carter's) is directly counterposed to the European Monetary System, and is shaped by an intent to wreck the new monetary system at birth. Wrecking of the U.S. dollar and U.S. economy are viewed by British circles as a key, integral feature of the effort to wreck the EMS, Arab Monetary Fund, and Tokyo capital market.

The current Carter Administration policy is to drive the value of the dollar down to the vicinity of 1.60 deutschemarks, and to bring the U.S. economy into a

In this section

On the evening of Oct. 24, President Carter went on national television to present his Administration's new anti-inflation program. The response the next day from the public, the press, and the international currency markets was unanimously negative. Yet both the explanations offered for Carter's behavior and the alternative proposals presented in most public forums have been in general no improvement over the President's call to virtual national suicide.

In contrast, we are pleased to reprint here an analysis of Carter's speech and the U.S. policy debacle by U.S. Labor Party chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., that was written the day after Carter's address and appeared in the Oct. 27 issue of his party's newspaper, *New Solidarity*. LaRouche's survey of America's political choices and policy options is must reading particularly now, as U.S. citizens prepare to go to the polls on Nov. 7, to cut through the psychosis being passed off as political debate.

depression during November and December of this year.

The foreign monetary and economic policies of the Carter Administration center around the IMF "floating rate system" proposal. In addition to the creation of "regional currency blocs," Carter policy is the imposition of *fascist* monetary and economic policies on all developing nations, including a sabotage of high-technology development programs and an insistence on "appropriate" technologies (labor-intensive servitude) in agriculture. These policies for the developing sector are explicitly fascist in the perception of their authors, are modeled wittingly on the economics of the Nazi-occupation policies.

As is shown by examination of Middle East, Africa, Latin America and general-strategic policies, *the current Carter Administration foreign policy under Kissinger's influence is a genocidal policy*: the aim is to launch biological holocaust and war throughout the developing sector, to the purpose of enhancing the relative position of the Anglo-Saxon race, as otherwise proposed by Otto von Hapsburg. The British architects of Kissinger's policies place great emphasis on Hitler's failure to exploit Slavic and other minorities as temporary allies for the destruction of the Soviet Union: British policy is to incite the non-Anglo-Saxons to destroy one another in aid of long-term Anglo-Saxon world rule.

(2) Middle East and Islamic policy

On the surface, Kissinger, the Aspen Institute, and Johns Hopkins CSIS are leading among U.S.-based, British intelligence-controlled agencies proposing a general destabilization of all Islamic nations, with Kissinger's project for an Israel-Egypt (Coptic) military alliance and Kissinger's butchery of Lebanon the launching points for this general project. Kissinger aims (on behalf of his masters) at a disruption of Middle East petroleum supplies, as a way of wrecking the European and Japanese economies.

(3) Africa policy

Carter Administration policy has currently flipped back to the Africa policy which Congress outlawed under the Ford Administration. In place of the Ponto Plan (named after its principal proponent, Baader-Meinhof-murdered Jürgen Ponto of Germany's Dresdner Bank), for economic cooperation agreements among white and black populations of Africa, Carter Administration policy has adopted the wretched British agent Ian Smith, and is now committed to a combination of racial and intraracial bloodbath throughout all of southern Africa. This is a part of London's (and Kissinger's) genocide policy for entire regions of the developing sector.

Discarding the 'China card' for a U.S. war buildup

Kissinger's turn from the "China card" to the "American card" and the subsequent shift in White House policy was first signaled in an article by Kissinger's close associate Edward Luttwak in the October issue of Commentary Magazine, the official publication of the American Jewish Committee. Luttwak, a British subject, discredits the China card option in favor of consolidating conservatives behind a military buildup policy here at home. In his article, titled "Against the China Card," Luttwak, who works at Kissinger's Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies, declares:

"It seems that after all the years of our troubles with the Soviet Union a transference of purposes has taken place, from the positive of preserving Western security to the negative of opposing the Soviet Union. It is, of course, true that the Soviet Union remains by far the most powerful of our adversaries, and there is every reason to believe that this will be true in the future also. Nor can one disagree with the contention that it is now a matter of high urgency to muster additional strength to oppose the steady course of power-accumulation which the Soviet Union has followed for fifteen years and more. Finally, one may agree also that the West is in fact losing the military competition and that a strategic remedy is now needed. But the China card is the most unstrategic of remedies, being rather a

tactical quickfix writ large. Only its unpremeditated consequences will be strategic in import — and exceedingly unfavorable.

"There can be no reliable prediction of what the Chinese might do with an enhancement of their military power....As for Peking's willingness to cooperate on a purely diplomatic level, we have now only the promise that after normalization much can be expected.

"The problems then arise from the consequences of the move, not from its feasibility.

"If the Russians were to decide that the threat of a Sino-American alliance was not merely ominous in its long-term consequences but also dangerous in the short-term, they might be driven to use force against China....The Peking

(4) Latin American policy

The Carter Administration policy of this moment is a reversion to the joint policies of Kissinger and Luigi Einaudi (under the Kissinger State Department during the Nixon and Ford administrations). Economically, this is a Chile-model policy for all Latin America, combined with the Einaudi "Second War of the Pacific" policy, for a general bloodbath throughout all of Latin America. This is also part of London's (and Kissinger's) genocide policy for the developing sector.

(5) Far East policy

Just as London has adjusted its own China policy, so London's puppet, Kissinger, has adjusted his own policy. So, Carter Administration policy has followed Kissinger's turn on this matter. The "China Card" is now being deemphasized in preference for the "U.S. Card." Current Kissinger "China policy" as such is an anti-Japan policy, or, to be exact, an anti-Fukuda, anti-Mitsubishi policy. Kissinger (like London) is determined to wreck Japan's industrialization policy, breaking the Japanese leg of the new world monetary system.

The fraudulent "Koreagate" operation in the Congress targeted the rapid-industrialization domestic and foreign policies of the Republic of Korea as a parallel thrust for the anti-Japan policy.

The Kissinger (London) policy for the Asian subcontinent is a by-product of the Islamic and Far East policies. India is scheduled to be destroyed, plunged into massive genocide, through aid of the alliance between Brandt's Socialist International (George Fernandes et al.), the Maoists, and the fascist RSS. Senator Patrick Moynihan has adopted the RSS as his own publicly during recent weeks.

(6) NATO-Soviet policy

London and Kissinger are the visible sources of the current Carter Administration policy of breaking off the SALT II negotiations — at the point "95 percent agreement" is reported by Warnke and other prominent circles associated with those negotiations. This is the "U.S. Card" policy of London.

By linking the U.S. more closely to Israel and to Ian Smith, London has created two deadly triggers for a thermonuclear confrontation between the U.S. and Soviet Union. This general reorientation of the Carter Administration brings the issue of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to the fore in the most practical and relevant manner. It is also directly related to London's strategic approach to attempting to wreck the EMS.

Kennedy was assassinated on orders from London, with the assassination controlled by networks of drug-linked organized crime and Cuban "right wingers" most intimately linked to the Bronfmans and other

regime would be undermined internally by the exposure of its military inadequacy, and the American alliance would be shown to be hollow.

"...far from being a substitute for American strength, the 'China card' would require a prior augmentation of American military power as the essential precondition of so risky a move. Otherwise a violent Soviet reaction could not be reliably deterred, nor defeated. This of course makes nonsense out of the whole scheme....the relative strength of the United States can scarcely be expected to increase through an alliance with a China that is altogether more vulnerable to Soviet attack than the United States could ever be.

"By all means achieve diplomatic relations with Peking....Even the supply of military-industrial technology

from Europe must be seriously considered. Beyond that, however, the 'China card' should not be played. Instead we should play the American card, mustering more of our own strength for our own purposes.

"In this particular case the attempt to derive a free benefit from Chinese strength in order to spare ourselves efforts which we are very well equipped to make, would fatally compromise not only our strategic position, but also our most fundamental political purposes."

"We should confront the Soviet Union...."

That the "American card" means a military buildup policy was stated bluntly by a source close to Kissinger commenting on Luttwak's views in an interview last week with the

Executive Intelligence Review.

"Brzezinski has been defeated at the National Security Council. He no longer runs policy. The China card is out.

"I too favor not provoking the Soviet Union over China, especially over China. We should confront the Soviet Union, but we can only do that if we are strong militarily. We must build up our military strength in order to do that. Brzezinski has been pursuing the China card as a way of cutting our defense budget, thus having us lean on the Chinese.

"My military buildup policy is exactly consistent with the policy goals stipulated by the NATO summit. If we try to use China against the Soviet Union we lose all possibilities of influencing the Soviet situation the way we want to ... aiding the growth of the wrong factions in the Soviet Union."

elements of control of the so-called Zionist Lobby. Every key fact concerning the conspiracy behind the assassination is now known to a degree adequate to the appropriate political conclusion. The motive for the assassination was Kennedy's turn away from London's confrontationist policies during 1963, a turn symptomized by Kennedy's ordering the firing of "that lunatic" Henry A. Kissinger from McGeorge Bundy's staff. It was the London-controlled Zionist Lobby which effected the "hit." It was the Zionist Lobby's responsibility for the "hit" which motivated the frauds associated with the Warren Commission coverup operation.

What has occurred is largely a return to pre-1963 Kennedy Administration confrontationist policy, the policies with which McGeorge Bundy staffer Henry A. Kissinger was associated during that period.

Interestingly, London is informed that the marginal war-winning advantage the Soviets have consistently worked to develop since 1962 means that the U.S. would be the loser in an actual thermonuclear war. The British are nonetheless prepared to risk that, for sake of their determination to wreck the EMS at birth.

Kissinger's control over the Carter Administration thus presents us with two specific risks of general thermonuclear war. One is short term; the other medium term. There are, at this moment, two short-term triggers for general thermonuclear war. The first, a short fuse, is the Israel-Egypt "separate peace." The second, somewhat slower fuse on the verge of being lit, is Kissinger's Africa policy. If those and similar short-term risks of war are avoided, the arms-race policy of Kissinger's Carter Administration is aimed, in effect, at causing the U.S. to lose a general thermonuclear war during the medium term.

The war-losing perspective must be clearly understood. The Carter Administration's science and economic policies for the U.S. mean that the U.S. must lose any arms race conducted against the USSR *under those policy-conditions*. Expanding U.S. military capabilities in terms of preexisting scientific and technological capabilities places the USA at a growing disadvantage to a Soviet build-up premised on breaking through new frontiers in science and technology. In the realities of thermonuclear war, development of the "neutron bomb," B-1, MX missile fix the U.S. capabilities into a *decisive margin of strategic disadvantage*, since the deployment of such weapons rests upon assumptions concerning the order and character of warfare which have no correspondence to the reality of such warfare.

Interpolation: the Nazi precedent

The combined present military and economic policies of the Carter Administration are a direct parody of the policies of Nazi Germany. "Fiscal austerity" constricts the scale of capital formation in industrial production to a narrow, cartelized sector

which constitutes the war-industry sector. The "triaged" other sections of industry, agriculture, and labor force are "absorbed" in labor-intensive programs modeled upon the Humphrey-Hawkins legislation policy.

As in Nazi Germany, the social composition of the Carter Administration policy is a perverted Republican National Committee (analogous at the moment to the German conservatives aligned around Schroeder's bank), and a broader, "environmentalist" base. One need only know how the *Wandervogel* ferment in Germany produced the Nazi movement's rank-and-file to see the connection to the present-day Kennedy machine base, the rock-and-roll drug "counterculture."

The only, ironic difference of note is that Nazism was anti-Semitic, whereas Carter's Nazi-like policies are associated principally with the Zionist Lobby. Otherwise, the same Jewish-name banking families behind the Zionist Lobby were principals in the creation of the Hitler regime.

Under conditions of Nazi economy, Nazi military policy was necessarily a *Blitzkrieg* policy. *Blitzkrieg* is not a 1930s-1940s innovation in warfare policies, but rather a special expression of an ancient, oligarchical military policy which was also the "cabinet warfare" doctrine of the eighteenth century British and Russian commands. Hence, *Blitzkrieg* policy is a doctrine which was discredited in battle by Napoleon's forces by 1807. This French force was defeated only by those Russians who directly applied the historical studies of Friedrich Schiller, to lure Napoleon into a position at which Russian in-depth capabilities would defeat him.

If a military force faces a prospective adversary whose in-depth forces could defeat him, the problem admits of an hypothetical solution if some means can be devised such that the first-line adversary forces are crushed before in-depth capabilities can be brought effectively into play. To accomplish this, a *Blitzkrieg* policy dictates the concentration of the bulk of one's own forces into a highly mobile first-line assault force of the greatest relative concentration of firepower and closest coordination of both arms and logistical capabilities. The 1940 Nazi assault against France is exemplary of this point. The principles of Scharnhorst and Schlieffen were perverted into a concentrated, *Blitzkrieg* expression. Thus, although first-line French forces outgunned the Nazis in tank quality and so forth, the coordinated deployment of aggregately inferior Nazi potentialities shattered the more thinly deployed, more poorly coordinated, less mobile French forces, such that France was defeated before in-depth war fighting — a new Battle of the Marne — could begin.

Blitzkrieg, like all other forms of "cabinet warfare," depends upon winning a set of decisive battles before the adversary's advantage of in-depth capabilities can be mobilized. If that initial shock-assault objective fails, the *Blitzkrieg* force is defeated.

The Soviet defeat of the Nazis is the exemplar of this, and Zhukov's counteroffensive at Stalingrad the epitome of Soviet policy to this date.

Thermonuclear war has added one feature to Soviet strategic policy: the use of intercontinental and related ABC weapons to obliterate the in-depth war-making capability of a principal adversary as the first act of war.

Soviet capabilities are otherwise centered around two interconnected points of policy: civil defense and the dirigist promotion of the highest rate of general scientific advancement. Only high rates of capital formation permit deployment of industrial and population capabilities to take advantage of geographic and other potentialities of civil defense.

Under the Nazi-modeled combined economic and arms-building policies of the Carter Administration, U.S. development is channeled into a *Blitzkrieg* profile, such that the antiscientific bias of the Carter Administration increases the war-winning margin of Soviet forces faster than U.S. arms build-ups occur.

If leading military professional ranks in the U.S. were thinking competently, they would demand that U.S. monetary and economic policies be subordinated to the requirements of in-depth war-fighting capabilities. They would demand, as the first line of U.S. defense capabilities, (1) Dirigist policies of broadly based scientific and technological advancement, through high rates of capital-intensive capital formation in industry, agriculture and infrastructure, (2) The most intensive and broadest-based scientific research and education, (3) The elimination of the "all-volunteer Army" policy, in favor of a universal-militia reserves policy, and (4) The promotion of scientific and technological development of an *active* (antimissile) civil defense capability for neutralizing ABC missiles in flight. The proposal of an arms buildup policy under Carter monetary and economic policies — under Kissinger and Schlesinger antisience policies — is sheer strategic lunacy.

It happens to be the historic, strategic irony of the situation, that if the USA had such a competent military policy, the danger of thermonuclear confrontation would evaporate. The correct military policy presupposes a correct monetary and economic policy. Under a correct monetary and economic policy, durable economic cooperation and subsumed political cooperation agreements with the Soviet leadership are readily available at this moment.

Carter's paranoia

The current, Kissinger takeover of the Carter Administration's policies centers around that grave personality defect in President Jimmy Carter against which this writer warned during the 1976 presidential campaign. This personality flaw — *paranoia* — was heavily underlined in last night's TV address: "Don't

listen to anyone who says the Carter program won't work."

This is a further plunge into paranoia along the lines first underscored in the "Shaba II" affair and in the aftermath of the recent Camp David fiasco. In the "Shaba II" affair, Carter regurgitated the lies put forward by Brzezinski, Kissinger, and CIA Director Turner. Carter insisted that he had made up his mind and was impervious to any contradictory facts. In the Camp David case, the same lunacy was paramount: "It is a success," the Administration insisted, "and we will refuse to listen to any evidence which might suggest the contrary." Last night, Carter insisted that his Administration pay no attention to anyone who indicated that Carter's policy was the lunacy it is in fact.

Carter's paranoia is key to the process by which the Administration's policy has been taken over (nominally at least) by Kissinger. Without that grave flaw in President Carter's mental processes, the recent operation could not have been pulled off.

The reader must demystify paranoia. All adult psychosis, like neurosis, is summarily, inclusively accounted for as a kind of "reaction formation" in which the victim regresses toward the world outlook of a superstitious condition like that of a child between one and two years of age.

The world outlook of the child obsessed with Warner Communications' "super hero" comics is exemplary of the point, especially in respect to President Carter's current deepened strategic disorientation.

The mature adult sees the world as a whole in, at worst, logical terms of lawful cause-and-effect connections. Such an adult proceeds, in each given instant of policy-making, on informed logical judgments, but is constantly open to new information and more sophisticated evaluations, to alter and improve a decision, or to drastically correct a faulty initial decision. An informed electorate selects officials not merely for their present qualifications for making mature, logical judgments, but more for the manifest capacity for intellectual growth, to correct faulty decisions quickly and openly, and to constantly increase the depth and breadth of judgment.

The infantile mind, like President Carter's, does not see the world in such mature-adult, logical terms. The infantile mind clings, oedipally, to its mother's skirts, and has no logical comprehension of the world beyond a narrow range of immediate personal associations. The infantile mind views the larger world with superstition, myths.

Carter makes policy, in effect, by posing before a mirror. The mirror is a close set of cronies, including Brzezinski and Schlesinger, who have been appointed to their present positions, chiefly by the New York Council on Foreign Relations, because those appointees have demonstrated their special influence over Carter, their ability to act as his "mirror." Hence, Carter's policy-making is that of an empty-

headed method actor, who has not the slightest conception of world reality, but only a concern for the pose he strikes on stage. As to what his pose should be, he depends upon his "close advisors" to assure him that this or that posture will best serve to make him "look like a real President."

Carter does not see world reality. He is merely an infantile actor upon a stage. It is the script writers, the directors, the producers, the prompters, who determine the content and enunciation of his assigned lines, and the watching world is not a world of reality, but merely a theater audience. The "outside" critics are viewed merely as theater critics, to be variously denounced or appreciated as they are "nice to" or "ungrateful to" their President.

The manipulation of the increasingly paranoid Carter is accomplished by manipulating those elements of Carter's rigged psycho-political environment to the common ends of inflating his general manic-paranoid delusions of grandeur, and the suggestive conditioning of Carter toward the kinds of policy postures his controllers impose upon him.

Reality makes little impression upon him. The collapse of the dollar makes little impression on him; he simply refuses to see a connection between his August 1978 policies and that collapse. The collapse of the U.S. economy makes no impression upon him. The fact that his policies are crushing the labor and minorities on which he presumed to base his popular constituency makes no impression upon him. The fact that France, West Germany, Japan and other nations warn that his policies are unworkable, that he is wrecking the NATO alliance, and so forth, makes no impression on him. "I am President of the USA, and the world must obey me — or else" is his world outlook of the moment.

Whatever is planted into his head by manipulative suggestion becomes for Carter *his own judgment*, his own "difficult decision." "But, Mr. President, these people have forgotten that you said clearly that..." is sufficient to drive him into a rage against those who have ignored a "clear presidential decision." The poor man has no sense of the fact that he is almost entirely manipulated.

That susceptibility of the paranoid President Jimmy Carter to manipulation is key to the way in which U.S. policy has been driven insane.

RNC: Key to the recent turn

The key to the most recent, post-July turn in the Carter Administration's policy profile is the Republican National Committee. In effect, Kissinger took over the White House by delivering the RNC to Carter.

That has been the trend of the pattern around the White House and Congress since Kissinger emerged

from semi-retirement in 1977. We ourselves can date this efficiently in effect from June-July 1977, centering around the Kissinger-Schlesinger-Zionist Lobby disruption of a Fusion Energy Foundation conference in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The role of Nazi-industrialist self-modeled Speer of U.S. Steel surfaced in those circumstances, together with an exacerbated first assault against the Labor Party by Senator Jacob Javits's Anti-Defamation League — the Javits political link to organized crime is relevant in understanding that.

Since approximately that point in time, there has been a trend of moral degeneration within U.S. conservative and Republican leading circles, as first the Republican National Committee's newsletter, and then the Birchers's publications became shamelessly tools of the Zionist Lobby. It was at about the indicated point in time that Kissinger first delivered the RNC conditionally to the Carter White House, the point at which Kissinger's regular collaboration with the Carter White House began.

Nonetheless, there was only so much Kissinger-bending which the social base of the RNC would tolerate. Until May-July 1978, there were precise limits beyond which Kissinger could not manipulate the Republican Party leadership in Congress.

What has happened was most plainly reflected in the last weeks' sessions of the Congress, with the RNC support of the Carter veto of the Public Works bill the tip-off as to how far the degeneration of the RNC has gone since the May-July period. The absolute lunacy of the closing 30 hours of the congressional session, the logical aftermath of the successful Carter veto of the Public Works bill, attests to the basis for the manic-paranoid delusions of grandeur put before the television screens last night.

It was Kissinger's delivery of the RNC to Carter for the present set of Carter Administration policies which represents the decisive factor, the decisive marginal element in transforming Carter from a Democrat into a Zionist Lobby version of a Republican conservative. If this facet of the process is more closely examined, the manner in which the policy turn was effected becomes clear, and the implications of the turn also become clear.

What happened, beginning May 1978, was a large-scale, multibillion dollar British intelligence campaign in behalf of "free enterprise." This campaign was coordinated by a British intelligence black-propaganda conduit, the Heritage Foundation, with an intensive direct deployment by Henry A. Kissinger in support of this. This British covert operation against financial, industrialist and other conservative circles, beginning May 1978, was directed by British intelligence against the European Monetary System proposals of France's Giscard d'Estaing and Germany's Chancellor Helmut Schmidt.

This resurrection of the United States' ancient enemy, British intelligence hoaxster Adam Smith, as

the apostle of "free enterprise" and "antidirigism," was dovetailed with a cooption of anti-SALT postures among military-professional and conservative ranks, and nested within conservative support of Israel and Ian Smith as leading "anti-Soviet" heroes who must therefore be fully backed by the USA.

It was this operation which enabled Kissinger to turn the RNC into a collection of babbling fools, and Kissinger's delivery of such a lunatic RNC to Carter which enabled Kissinger's masters to turn Carter into his present policy profile beginning in approximately mid-August of this year.

The May 1978 caper

To this date, outside the publications associated with the U.S. Labor Party, no national news media have yet informed business leaders, let alone the general public, of the contents of the agreements reached either at the Bremen EEC summit of July, the Aachen Schmidt-Giscard summit, the October meeting of Schmidt and Fukuda, or the May 1978 summit of Schmidt and Brezhnev in Bonn and Hamburg. Except for a handful of leading figures in the U.S. who have been directly in contact with appropriate leading continental European circles, only readers of media associated with the U.S. Labor Party have even a semblance of competent knowledge respecting the new world monetary system to go into operation on a \$100 billion base of reserves on Jan. 1, 1979.

To put the matter bluntly, and without the slightest exaggeration, all of the national news media in the U.S. have either suppressed all reports of these indicated developments or have simply issued the wildest sorts of lies on those topics.

The reason for this massive lying by the news media is not properly astonishing. Just as President Carter invoked Winston Churchill to premise his own lunatic policies presented last evening, so the British monarchy and intelligence service are running the U.S. government today. Those same foreign agencies, aided by the so-called Zionist Lobby, control or powerfully influence every national news medium but those of the U.S. Labor Party and a handful of other exceptions in the USA today.

If the U.S. reader were to have been familiar with the London leading press during the past two weeks, he could have absolutely no objection in point of fact to what we have said. The British government and leading press loudly complain that the British government badly miscalculated and bungled in its spring-summer-fall efforts to wreck the European Monetary System proposals of Giscard and Schmidt. What Lords Palmerston, Russell, and Benjamin Disraeli, Lord Milner and Major-General Professor Karl Haushofer and his protégé Rudolf Hess have always feared has now come into reality.

From the eastern shores of Japan to the Atlantic,

across all industrialized Eurasia, a common bloc of economic cooperation will be operational as of Jan. 1, 1979. This is the most powerful bloc of economic cooperation in the world today, the most powerful economic force the world has ever seen. This bloc of industrialized nations is in intimate cooperation with the overwhelming majority of Arab and other Islamic nations, and also with key forces throughout the developing sector. This is what the British fought the Napoleonic wars to prevent, what the British organized two world wars during this century to prevent. It is the reality against which the whole Rothschild-created geopolitical doctrine of the Nazi Haushofer was designed by the British monarchy to prevent. It is now becoming a reality.

It is in the interest of the United States to be a leading part of that new economic reality; it is in the desperate interest of the British monarchy that the United States should be deployed in an effort to wreck that economic reality.

The May 1978 Bonn-Hamburg summit meetings between Germany's Chancellor Schmidt and Leonid Brezhnev are the key to this emerging reality. No one in the United States but the U.S. Labor Party understood this at that time, but leading British circles did. Therefore, the British reacted immediately to the May 1978 events, deploying simultaneously against Schmidt and the U.S. Labor Party beginning May 1978, in the immediate wake of the Schmidt-Brezhnev summit. This deployment had the purpose of wrecking what the British knew to be coming next: the July Bremen EC summit at which Schmidt and Giscard launched the new world monetary system — the system to replace the IMF, the World Bank, and the London-controlled portions of the Eurodollar market.

The point is this, as the U.S. Labor Party has insisted publicly since spring 1974. Economic cooperation between Western continental Europe and the Soviet-led Comecon, based on a new, gold-based monetary system, is the only alternative to a new general depression, and represents the form of economic cooperation indispensable for preventing World War III. The political stability in the world secured by such continental European East-West economic cooperation provides the indispensable basis for a high-technology development of the developing sector as a self-expanding new market for industrial, high-technology exports. So, economic agreements between East and West are the linchpin of the creation of a new monetary order within the capitalist sector of the world.

Chancellor Schmidt was brought to play a leading position in launching such a new global monetary system in consequence of his study of NATO strategic outlines for the order of warfare between the NATO and Warsaw Pact forces. Although he is determined to make the new monetary system effective, this determination among himself and his collaborators would not be possible but for their shared concern to prevent

general thermonuclear war. They would not, in short, have the guts to buck both London and Washington on this issue if any less power motive than preserving the existence of their nations were clearly at stake.

The same perception operates significantly on the side of the Soviet leadership.

The British, whose leading circles understand this sort of connection, understood immediately that the May 1978 Schmidt-Brezhnev agreements meant imminent creation of a new monetary system, a new system which would end the approximate two centuries of City of London rule over the world's debt-financing. The British also knew, as their leading spokesmen have stated, that the U.S. Labor Party and its chairman had been the best-known source for the policy-conceptions the new world monetary system will embody in practice. Hence, they reacted immediately, in May 1978, launching simultaneous operations against Schmidt in Germany and the U.S. Labor Party in the USA.

The British view of the U.S. Labor Party is that it is an exceptional sort of *potential* danger to the British interest. The wide, cumulative contact of the U.S. Labor Party with various leading industrial, financial, political, trade-union, minority, farmer circles in the USA has produced an awareness of Labor Party International Development Bank policies. Thus, the instant a broad section of leading U.S. circles knew the facts concerning the new monetary system, the Labor Party must automatically emerge as a leading intellectual force in policy-shaping within the USA.

Notable in this is that exactly the same forces deployed against Schmidt in Germany were deployed against the U.S. Labor Party in the USA.

Germany: Otto von Hapsburg

The immediate reaction to the Schmidt-Brezhnev summit was a massive British deployment around Queen Elizabeth II's extended visit to Germany. The Springer press, juridically and otherwise closely allied to the British intelligence service, groveled in headlines of obscene adulation before the visiting Guelph monarch. This obscenity was capped with disgusting headlines, asserting such things as "Germany, too, needs a Queen," and "Ten Million Germans Prefer a Queen."

The centerpiece of this operation was Otto von Hapsburg, who had just recently added Bavarian citizenship to his preexisting (and continuing) citizenships in Austria and in the Sovereign Order of Malta. The Hapsburg family is closely linked to the British monarchy and to the City of London, and Otto von Hapsburg himself is a central figure behind the German substitute for the USA's movie-star-fan

magazines, what is termed the "Rainbow press," which features the social life of Grace Kelly Grimaldi and other elements of the European "black nobility." These magazines are more widely circulated among the most ignorant and backward sectors of the population in Germany, and in some Bavarian rural communities are avidly read and discussed in place of ordinary newspapers. It is the addicts of such profederal fare who represent the hard-core supporters of Hapsburg crony Franz-Josef Strauss.

The significance of the Queen Elizabeth II caper was an attempted rallying of the backward and ignorant admirers of the "Rainbow press" in support of Strauss's, Dregger's and Kohl's efforts to topple the Schmidt government with aid of the lunatic "greenies" (German "environmentalists"). This destabilization has been administered heavy defeats in the successive Hamburg, Hessen, and Bavarian state elections, but the effort was nonetheless made, and most vigorously.

The profederalist faction in Germany is tied together by the German, Bavarian, and Austrian divisions of the Order of Malta. Excepting some anti-British forces in the French priory and the Rome-based division of the Order of Malta, the Order of St. John of Jerusalem is a profederalist organization of the "black nobility" factions of the European and Mediterranean royalty and aristocracy, with Queen Elizabeth II and the Dutch monarchy serving as the dominant titular leaders and centers of political power for Maltese Order forces generally.

The semi-secret international intelligence organizations of the Maltese Order include the Swiss-based Mont Pelerin Society, which is most closely attached to the Hapsburg family.

It is the British factions of the Maltese Order, together with their Zionist associates, who have controlled the international illegal-drug traffic for two centuries to date, and who control organized crime in the U.S., the Caribbean, Italy, France and most other nations. Not accidentally, the key allies of Queen Elizabeth II in the effort to destabilize the Schmidt government were the Mont Pelerin Society and the Zionist Lobby forces in Germany.

The British press is now howling in agony, arguing that Prime Minister Callaghan, together with Denis Healy and Roy Jenkins, badly bungled in their efforts to wreck the EMS, a bungling based on a sad miscalculation of the determination of Giscard, Schmidt and others to succeed at all costs. Now, the British monarchy's last card is the Carter Administration; only a Carter Administration thermonuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union proffers a credible means for destabilizing the European Monetary System between now and Jan. 1, 1979.

New anti-inflation czar admires the Nazis' economy

Alfred E. Kahn, the man who is taking over the job of Carter's "anti-inflation" czar recently resigned by Ambassador Robert Strauss, is well-prepared to carry out the dismantling of the U.S. economy through the "free enterprise" route of "increased competition." Most recently, Kahn held the post of Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, where he carried out the operational end of Sen. Edward Kennedy's propaganda and legislative blitz to deregulate the airlines as well as the trucking industry. As head of the CAB, the agency created to establish stability in an industry where price-cutting and cheating on capital investment can be lethal, Kahn unilaterally imposed deregulation measures

and began to phase his own regulatory agency out of existence.

Kahn, a close Kennedy family confidant, is living proof of the fact that free enterprise is anti-capitalist. In a recent interview on National Educational Television, Kahn put himself forward as a modern-day Lincoln Steffens, vehemently attacking Big Business "price fixers" and liberally slinging around anticapitalist rhetoric.

To see the sort of economic policies that Kahn and those like him actually endorse, one only has to turn to his 1946 book *Great Britain and the World Economy*, written first as a dissertation for his Ph.D. in economics at Yale University in 1942. The book presents a glowing account of

the German economy *from 1933 on*: "Payment of German reparations was never physically impossible. The abundant energy and capacity for belt-tightening and for vigorous economic reorganization and rehabilitation which Germany has demonstrated since 1933 to make possible an orgy of unproductive investment might easily have made reparations transfer possible if directed to that end instead."

Translated out of academese, this is an open endorsement of the Nazis' economic policies, in the middle of World War II—and an endorsement of the viability of the British-imposed debt reparations, from the Versailles treaty, which opened the path to the war.

In the USA: Heritage Foundation

The campaign against the EMS was launched in the U.S. under the coordination of the Mont Pelerin-controlled Heritage Foundation. The opening action in this campaign was a slander of the U.S. Labor Party written by British intelligence and laundered through the Heritage Foundation as a conduit. This slander was composed in May 1978, and widely issued in June 1978, through such conduits as Congressman Jake Garn's office. At the same time, an escalation of Zionist Lobby-coordinated libels, slanders, physical harassments and assassination projects was launched against the U.S. Labor Party and this writer. The *Business Week* hoax is among the more recent of the Zionist Lobby frauds produced as part of that slander-assassination project.

During May-June-July, a massive deployment by the Heritage Foundation, Henry Kissinger, the Aspen Institute, and the Zionist Lobby occurred. In this the frauds and blackmail against Labor Party contacts and the promotion of the Mont Pelerin Society's "free enterprise" campaign were inseparable.

This slander and harassment operation has two interconnected objectives. More narrowly, it is part of an approximately six-months operation dedicated to the assassination of this writer by the forces coordinated around Senator Jacob Javits, Henry Kissinger, Max Jacobs, Max Fisher, the Bronfmans,

Resorts International, et al. (Ironically, Senator Edward Kennedy's circles are cooperating in this operation, cooperating with the same Bronfman-linked circles which assassinated President John F. Kennedy.) The purpose of the slander and libel operation — including Kissinger's and Sargent Shriver's operations, in cooperation with *Business Week*, against the Islam Foundation — is to discredit and isolate the Labor Party and its chairman to the point that the assassination can be deployed with a minimal political penalty to the Zionist Lobby, Kissinger, et al. Knowing that the new monetary system will probably go into effect Jan. 1, 1979, the British and their Zionist puppets, such as Senator Jacob Javits, are determined to eliminate *potential danger* LaRouche before leading U.S. circles awaken to the fact that LaRouche's proposals and judgment are being so massively vindicated.

The broader purpose of the attack on the U.S. Labor Party is to prevent the Labor Party from wrecking the Zionist Lobby's "black propaganda" hoax through the principal U.S. news media. It was essential to the British that the leading U.S. industrial, banking, trade-union and other relevant circles be prevented from discovering the facts about the new monetary system. To make the press hoax succeed, it was necessary to take massive measures to the purpose of cutting off those circles from the U.S. Labor Party. Hence, there is no possible separation in operational fact between the libels, slanders and assassination-

projects against the U.S. Labor Party and the Mont Pelerin Society "free enterprise" swindle.

Because most leading U.S. circles are represented variously by cowards and fools, the massive British-Zionist operation has temporarily significantly succeeded. The campaign against *dirigism*, as antagonistic to the Mont Pelerin Society's version of "free enterprise," has intimidated, duped and blackmailed the majority of leading industrialist, banking and political circles into avoiding any open association with support of the European Monetary System.

The Nazi parallel

This is identical with the operation which the Seligmann-connected (and Dulles brothers-connected) Schroeders' Bank and Hjalmar Schacht used to put Hitler into power in Germany.

Up to November 1932, the majority of German industry, together with the Catholic Centre Party and SPD, was anti-Nazi. The only industrialists which had backed Hitler consistently over the preceding period were firms such as I.G. Farben which were controlled largely by Jewish-name financial houses such as Warburg through cartels in New York City and London. Morgan interests were involved, but as traditionally British conduits of influence in the USA. The *New York Times* issues for the period of Hitler's installation accurately reflect the Zionist support for Hitler at that point. (No amount of Zionist screams of denial can eradicate the fact of those *New York Times* leading articles, or the Warburg and related connections to the Hitler project. These are facts. Without the Zionist organization's support, Hitler could not have gained power in Germany.)

The German industrialists were predominantly committed to the candidacy of General von Schleicher, who had neutralized Hitler by coming to an agreement with Gregor Strasser, following Hitler's downslide in preceding elections. Von Schleicher's approach to the German economic crisis was a "Rapallo" approach, full-scale economic-development cooperation with Russia, and to hell with the Versailles agreements.

Unfortunately, not only did German industrialists permit themselves to be blackmailed into abandoning

von Schleicher for Hitler, but, like many military-professionals in the USA today, General von Blomberg and others supported the Hitler project — as U.S. military professions are brought into support of the Carter policy turn around the abandonment of SALT II.

If that had not occurred, if von Schleicher had prevailed, there would have been no Hitler and no World War II, and the changes effected in world monetary arrangements would have led quickly to an end to the general depression.

New York, London and leading Germans acted to support Hitler to save the Versailles monetary system, just as foolish Manhattan bankers today are acting to save the bankrupt "floating rate system" of the IMF and London-centered Eurodollar market. Since Manhattan bankers, U.S. Steel's Speer, Dupont's Shapiro and others are so obviously repeating the follies of Hitler today, these Americans are historically less forgivable than the Germans who went along with Hjalmar Schacht's previous version of the same "free enterprise" project — the Heritage Foundation has launched these recent months.

In those days, it was said of the senile President Hindenburg: "Don't put any piece of paper in front of him; he'll sign it." So, with Carter; by playing upon his paranoia, any sort of lunatic policy can be embedded in his mouth.

Most recently, a leading Paris newspaper, *Le Figaro*, most appropriately summarized current U.S. policy. Commenting upon C. Fred Bergsten's tantrums in Paris, that newspaper wrote: the Carter Administration is threatening Europe — with the suicide of the USA.

This is not a matter for the reader to contemplate. Either the reader supports or cooperates with the U.S. Labor Party, or that reader is inviting his own, his family's, his nation's early radioactive death. There is no one but the U.S. Labor Party holding out publicly a policy of sanity nationwide in the USA today. Either you cooperate with the U.S. Labor Party, or you otherwise profess yourself a person who does not morally deserve to survive. Most of you will probably do nothing, if past performance is a measure of your morality and intelligence; perhaps, our nation no longer deserves to survive, because you, typically, lack the brains and guts to act to save the very lives of your family and their posterity.

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.