The British faction in the Soviet leadership

It would be technically correct to describe Assistant Secretary of State Warren Christopher as a Soviet "mole" within the U.S. State Department. He, together with another Arthur Goldberg-linked figure, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, has acted on behalf of a stated Soviet policy for overthrowing the Bakhtiar government of Iran, and replacing it with a Khomeini-centered insurgent regime. Moreover, we are in possession of evidence which shows that Christopher's actions are coordinated with the Soviet circles pushing that insurgency project.

In an earlier report on the conduct of Goldberg-linked elements within the State Department, we cautiously avoided indicating that Christopher was Soviet-linked. At that point, evidence in hand merely proved that he was linked to political-intelligence operatives of Western Communist parties (e.g., the CPUSA and the Pajetta faction of the Communist Party of Italy). Since that earlier report, evidence has developed which shows Christopher to be Soviet-linked as well as linked to political-intelligence operations of Western Communist parties.

Our knowledge of such connections was developed through clumsiness on the part of Christopher, his aide, John Trattner, and State Department Soviet desk official Jim Huff. They committed the blunder of circulating in "I.D. format" a lying slander against the U.S. Labor Party which was initially circulated into high level diplomatic channels by political-intelligence operatives of Western Communist parties. Any spy committing such a blunder must expect to be caught; we caught Trattner and Huff, and subsequently secured reliable information that Christopher himself was implicated in this unlawful activity.

If one knows both the common, Arthur Goldberg-linked pedigrees of Warren Christopher, Huff and Ramsey Clark, and also knows the pedigree of the Soviet faction pushing the pro-Khomeini line, one also knows the nature of the pipelines which have historically connected Christopher's circles to the indicated elements of the Soviet leadership. The pipeline connection, via such channels as G. Arbatov of the Moscow USA-Canada Institute, also includes the same networks as Christopher's circles' connections to both the so-called KGB unit in the Communist Party USA and the Pajetta-centered faction of the Communist Party of Italy. The connection of Warren Christopher's circles to this element of the Soviet leadership is long established.

Therefore, there is nothing new in Christopher's links to the Soviet leadership. What is new is Christopher's clumsy self-exposure of his use of office in collaboration with that Soviet faction.

We know in advance what Christopher's defense would be to relevant U.S. security agencies. Indeed, if one of the contaminated elements within the FBI's Counterintelligence unit, or a contaminated element of Naval Intelligence were involved, Christopher would not even be obliged to make a clarification. Christopher would argue, if need be, that the Soviet elements to which he is connected are British agents, and hence, in a manner of speaking, Mr. Christopher's and Mr. Brzezinski's agents, as well as the agents of any relatives of British intelligence's Barbara Tuchman around the precincts of the National Security Council.

The fact that British "triple" Kim Philby's friends in the Soviet Union are technically agents of Mr. Christopher may tend to clear him of the charge of espionage. That fact does not lessen the enormity of Mr. Christopher's activities. The effect of the actions of Mr. Christopher and his putative agents in the Soviet leadership is to set up conditions for a thermonuclear-tinged confrontation between the United States and Soviet Union over Iran.

The Danger

The Bakhtiar government, whatever its included imperfections, is the only present basis for restoring stability in Iran. This stability would probably prevent the development of conditions for a U.S.-Soviet confrontation in Iran, and provide valuable flanking support to Saudi Arabia against the destabilization

In this section

U.S. foreign policy in the recent period is quickly bringing the United States face-to-face with the Soviet Union in an all-out confrontation. On Iran, on China, on the European Monetary System, the State Department has not made policy in the interest of the nation, but in the interest of those who profess to be the heirs of Lord Bertrand Russell, this century's leading proponent of a "New Dark Ages" for the globe.

Our report begins with an analysis by LaRouche that starts with Assistant Secretary of State Warren Christopher, a "mole" inside the department with links to a British faction in the Soviet leadership that is pushing a pro-Khomeini line for Iran and links to British nests in Western Communist parties. Next, Konstantin George and Ann-Marie Sawicky present a who's who of State Department foreign policy wreckers whose credentials include being board members of the Aspen Institute and/or the United Nations Association.

which Sir John Glubb Pasha and his wretched accomplices — such as Joseph Malone and some gentleman around Duke University — have projected for that latter nation. The simultaneous destabilization of Iran and the Saudi peninsula means general chaos, and who knows what else besides, for both the industrialized-capitalist and developing economies of the world.

James R. Schlesinger may be obscenely wishing for such developments, but no sane person in North America, Western Europe, or Japan does.

Apart from the consequences of chaos in the industrialized-capitalist nations, Mr. Schlesinger, like the Henry Kissinger whom Fritz Kraemer now regrets to have "invented," is a six-legged, purple fool in matters of military strategy. Obsessed with his delusions of "limited nuclear war," or perhaps obsessed with the delusion of a "Pacific-centered-only" thermonuclear war, Mr. Schlesinger has emulated British conduct on the eve of each of the two preceding World Wars of this century: he has grossly miscalculated. Like the late Winston Churchill, Messrs. Schlesinger and Kissinger are ostensibly determined to have their "Gallipoli." There can be little doubt that Mr. Christopher, if he thinks at all about the military implications of policy, must suffer delusions akin to those of Schlesinger and Kissinger.

None of these gentlemen appear aware that they are playing with total thermonuclear war. What will happen, in the course of any direct confrontation between major elements of the NATO and Soviet forces, is a total strategic ABC lift-off by one side. Any lift-off of ABC strategic weapons by the U.S. side means a total lift-off by the Soviet side. A total lift-off by the Soviet side means that any commander in the Pentagon not on LSD-25, or marijuana, or an overdose of Rand Corporation print-outs, will order a total U.S.-NATO strategic lift-off. Only imbecilic commanders will target "missile-silos"; all missile launching sites will have been emptied before a "counter-missile" could arrive. Between 150 and 180 million U.S. citizens will be dead in consequence of the first hour's launches, and the survivors on both sides will emerge from the radioactive, bacteriological and chemical contamination and destruction to continue warfighting as well as they can manage.

This is what Mr. Christopher and his accomplices are risking with their folly and evil.

The point, which certain gentlemen around Washington have so far failed to grasp, is that when an event in strategic deployments at the borders of the Soviet Union threatens to weaken substantially the Soviet strategic defense posture, and this event occurs under a U.S. administration which appears recklessly dedicated to Messrs. Kissinger's and Brzezinski's outlooks, the threshold represented by "deterrence" drops to the vicinity of "zero."

There are certain things no U.S. Administration will tolerate unless it either desires a thermonuclear war or it is simply incompetent or insane. The combination of the "China policy," the London-orchestrated deployment of London's Israeli puppet, and a general destabilization throughout Mr. Brzezinski's "Arc of Crisis" brings the world pretty close to the threshold value of "zero deterrence." Any bold shoving toward the "brink" and the world goes over the "brink."

On this point, some members of the U.S. Administration ought to shape their perceptions of the Soviet leadership not on the model of G. Arbatov, but that of commanding Soviet generals. It is those generals, plus the ex-generals of World War II in the Soviet political command, who will make the crucial strategic decisions, not the types like Mr. Arbatov. These command layers, like several governments of NATO and other non-Communist nations, have been fully persuaded that Brzezinski is clinically insane. If Mr. Carter continues to tolerate Brzezinski, Schlesinger and other like influences, then the judgment is formed that the Carter Administration itself is, as a whole, clinically insane.

This perception of insanity among key elements of the Carter Administration is coordinated with a shrewd estimate of current U.S. thermonuclear war-losing potentialities. The USA-NATO capabilities profile overall has been guided, since the days of the unfortunate Mr. "Slickum" McNamara, by a wholly mistaken conception of the order of general warfare, and by the associated, Kissinger-colored lunacy of "Mutually Assured Destruction." This trend, combined with an "environmentalism" aggravated erosion of U.S. scientific and high-technology industrial capabilities, has given the U.S. the capabilities for losing a general thermonuclear war. This general profile of capabilities is aggravated in many ways, including the drug problem, including the "all-volunteer army" lunacy, and also including the misindoctrination of the officers corps and units.

Although the current strategic capability of the USA does represent a horrifying "deterrent," it is not a war-winning capability. When this potential war-losing capability is employed in support of bluffs, and those bluffs involve matters which the Soviet strategic self-interest cannot compromise, the "deterrent" is reduced to a zero-threshold. The "deterrent" works only up to the point that decisive strategic issues are not involved. The use of "brinksmanship" to attempt to gain decisive strategic gains at Soviet expense does not function.

In general, it can be fairly stated that in a new thermonuclear eyeballing with the USSR, the U.S. position would be exactly the reverse, at best, of what it was during the 1962 missiles-crisis affair. The British and their Anglophile elements in the U.S. command have duped the Soviet leadership on many things, many times, especially since Nikita Khrushchev's days, but the one point on which the Soviet command cannot be deceived is strategic-military and immediately related matters of the sort I have emphasized here. Hence, in a "brinksmanship" crisis over vital strategic issues, such as the "Arc of Crisis" business, either the U.S. faces a backdown before a margin of Soviet war-winning advantage, or some lunatic persuades President Carter "not to be bluffed." If so, within the next hour, between 150 and 180 million citizens can stop worrying about their insurance-policy premiums.

The combination of Mr. Christopher's antics with the lunatic antics of Brzezinski and the absurdities of Kissinger and Schlesinger adds up to a threat of the most tragic miscalculation in human history. Mr. Christopher and other advocates of "Rube" Goldberg diplomacy may imagine themselves very clever; they are effectively both immoral and insane.

We shall return once again to the subject of Messrs. Christopher and Goldberg. Next, we should consider the lunacy exhibited on the Soviet side of this present mess.

What Every Congressman Must Know About The Soviets

The Soviet leadership is represented by two distinct political-philosophical currents. One current, typified by the May 1978 Schmidt-Brezhnev agreements, is dedicated to the same Grand Design strategic outlook as Leibniz and Count Sergei Witte: an entente of industrial-development cooperation across the Eurasian continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast of Japan. The opposite current, ideologically traceable to Rousseau and Bentham, is perfervidly anti-industrialist in its philosophical bias. The first, like the pro-American V.I. Lenin earlier and Brezhnev today, seeks global detente based on economic-development cooperation among both industrialized and developing nations. The second, in the tradition of Bukharin, Radek et al. is bent toward the perspective of massive chaos and destabilization throughout the capitalist sector, with outlooks which converge on those of the late, evil Bertrand Russell.

The second current, the current to which Christopher is connected with the Iranian situation, is historically linked to British intelligence in the manner exemplified by Alexander Helphand (Parvus's patronage of L.D. Trotsky (1905) and coordination of his sub-agents such as Karl Radek, N. Bukharin, and G. Ryazanov. British "triples" from the 1920s faggot-generation of Oxford University, Maclean and Philby, intersected this Bukharinite-Trotskyist element in the Soviet leadership, building up Imemo and spinning-off the USA-Canada Institute as concentrations of British intelligence penetration of the Soviet party's command. **If this bunch ever succeeds in getting firmly into the saddle in Moscow, war between the United States and USSR becomes virtually inevitable.**

The anti-Giscard, anti-EMS policies of Brzezinski, Kissinger, Christopher et al., plus the "Arc of Crisis" and China-policy operations, have had the effect of enabling the Bukharinite faction, earlier reduced in influence, to significantly recover its position within Soviet policy-making. The destabilization of Iran, led by British and Israeli intelligence services, aided by Chinese Communist foreign intelligence and Brzezinski, has been crucial in this deterioration of the situation in Moscow.

As I have emphasized earlier, it is correct for the United States to pursue a policy of normalization of relations with Peking. This should be a policy of aiding China's successful industrial development, with the long-range goals of bringing China out of the "idiocy of rural life" on the communes, and into a modernized, urban-centered culture, in which the ratio of the labor force employed in rural production is reduced over a pair of decades to the order of five percent of the Chinese population. China cannot continue to feed its growing population without replacement of backward methods of intensive agriculture, with high-technology programs which increase per hectare yields and sharply decrease per hectare labor requirements. China will remain backward as long as the social cost of rural production is in the state of hideous economic backwardness represented by more than two-thirds of the population required to meet agricultural and related rural requirements of the population as a whole.

This, however, means a break with the British, Hong Kong connection to Peking, and an emphasis on industrialized development of China in cooperation with Japan. To follow a British, Hong Kong-centered China policy, and to tolerate the Peking Chinese Communist (Ch'ao Chou) intelligence service's opium traffic and other evils abroad, is to create conditions leading in the direction of war.

For an extended period, the Soviet Union had maintained correct relations with the government of the Shah of Iran, cooling the activities of the British intelligence-permeated Tudeh Party, and maintaining a policy of stability for Iran. As the British-orchestrated destabilization of the Shah's government proceeded, the Soviets correctly evaluated a crucial aspect of the Iranian situation. Under the influence of certain elements which were in turn influential with the Shah's wife, the Shah had failed to develop political parties in Iran, parties which were developed around his generally correct policies of modernization of that nation. In this way, badly advised, he left the matter of political influence over his people to foreign intelligence agencies which did not fail to exploit that opportunity.

Ayatollah Khomeini is the exemplar of this problem. Khomeini, a sub-agent of Sir John Glubb Pasha, had long practiced the standard British intelligence policy of maintaining certain connections with Communist and Communist-linked elements inside and outside Iran. Khomeini's British-intelligence patrons and advisors did not overlook the matter of using Khomeini's friendly connections to Communists to more thoroughly penetrate those Communist parties. Thus, when the continued deterioration of the Iranian situation approached the point of a possible "Chilean solution" during the early future, and the Soviets sought to develop new options by activating the Tudeh Party, Moscow found itself attached to a British intelligence-controlled Tudeh entity, and subject to British intelligence playback simultaneously from both British agents inside the Tudeh and British intelligence influences inside Soviet party circles. This problem was aggravated by the British intelligence-controlled circles in the Communist Party of Italy (e.g., Pajetta) and by a British Rothschild-controlled penetration of the leadership of the Communist Party of France.

(It can be fairly stated, for purposes of thumbnail description, that the French Rothschild interests control the payroll of the French Communist Party bureaucracy. The key elements in France, most intimately associated with the Khomeini staff there, are from the Emma Rothschild Institute of Paris.)

Under this circumstance Maclean-Philby-connected types within the Soviet party circles managed to shift Soviet policy toward the presently trumpeted, anti-Bakhtiar, pro-Khomeini posture.

Look for a moment at the predicament of Prime Minister Bakhtiar. The gentleman is engaged, unavoidably, in a balancing act. In hope of succor from the U.S. influences, Bakhtiar made a foolish anti-Soviet declaration. This fact was fed promptly and eagerly into Moscow by corrupt persons, and was used as part of the leverage for tilting the Soviets into the pro-Khomeini posture.

I can only imagine how such a piece of folly was sold to the non-agent sorts of the Soviet leadership. The objective circumstances of the situation nonetheless afford us excellent clues as to what had to have been argued to persuade some of the Soviet command into adopting the present pro-Khomeini posture.

The Soviets know that any efforts to build either a CENTO resurrection or a long-term destabilization in Iran means a probable direct military eyeballing with the United States — at least while Brzezinski is at NSC and Kissinger leading the Republican National Committee around on a leash. They desire a quick thrust which establishes either a neutral or friendly regime stably in power in Iran.

Frankly, it is clear that the Soviet command truly does not know what to do with the Iran mess. They know they wish to avoid (a) a CENTO revival on their Islamic borders, and (b) a military confrontation with U.S. forces in that region. Muddled and confused by the situation, they grope. Their uncertainty makes them more readily susceptible to influence, to careless probes and postures.

The threat of a military coup instantly suggests a page from 1917 history, the Kornilov revolt. Khomeini appears to them a suitable rallying-point for a "united front" against such a Kornilov outbreak in Iran. Bakhtiar's gesture of anti-Sovietism feeds into this, especially in view of their blindness as to the nature and authorship of Khomeini's maintenance of his own Communist options.

Under these circumstances, the London-orchestrated collusion between the Moscow Bukharinites and the Arthur Goldberg gang goes into operation, in concert with the Brzezinski-Kissinger effort to destabilize both Andreotti and Berlinguer in Italy.

The overall result is that the Soviets, who were formerly often accused, but never guilty of, fostering the Iranian destabilization, have now stepped, at least up to their ankles, into complicity with a continuing destabilization. This shift in Soviet policy now lends credibility to Brzezinski's, Robert Moss's and other earlier lies: "See," Robert Moss's admirers gloat to credulous congressmen, "we told you the Soviets were responsible all along."

Thus, Moscow's stupidities, fostered by Moscow's perplexities, contribute to an escalation of the potential for an early strategic eyeballing between Soviet and U.S.-British forces. Thus, with aid of Moscow's stupidities, we are that much closer to a Saudi peninsula destabilization, and to the scenario leading into almost virtually certain thermonuclear war.

The slander

There is another aspect to the Goldberg gang's operations which enables us to probe more deeply into the mess. The most extraordinary idiosyncrasy of the concocted lies circulated by the State Department's Huff and Trattner to journalists, business executives and so forth was the included allegation that my associates were collaborating with Trotskyists in the Federal Republic of Germany. The other elements of the lies circulated by Christopher, Trattner and Huff were simply silly assertions of characterization; the allegation of "cooperation with Trotskyists in West Germany" was an allegation of fact, readily verifiable one way or the other. Told within the circles of the leadership of the SPD, CDU or FDP in West Germany, that silly lie in respect to simple fact would cause the teller to be ridiculed as a public fool.

Similarly, that lie has no function in the United States. The idea that the U.S. Labor Party is cooperating with Trotskyists in any part of the world makes a public fool of the teller. Why, then, did Messrs. Huff and Trattner include this particular lie within the slander they were playing, like a phonograph record, all the extended weekend they were so busily working to wreck my Washington press conference and evening meeting? There is no purpose to including such a lie in slanders retailed to U.S. citizens.

The answer is simple: the lie concerning Trotskyists was intended for Soviet and Italian consumption, predominantly, and also for Arab consumption.

The facts are these. About a fortnight before Trattner and Huff were caught red-handed telling such lies, we picked up the same lie, down to the last included detail, being introduced to Arab and other diplomatic circles by political-intelligence operatives of Western Communist parties. A fortnight after this activity was discovered, the same lie, down to the last details, was pouring, like a tape-recording, out of the mouths of Trattner and Huff.

The reasons are obvious. Everyone who follows matters closely knows that the publications of the U.S. Labor Party are exhaustively studied by elements of many governments and related circles around the world, including the Soviet government, Arab governments, and both leading Christian Democratic and Communist circles in Italy. In all these various circles we have a known, high level of credibility. Our reports and recommendations are not always accepted at face value, but they are taken seriously into account.

The purpose of the "collaboration with Trotskyists in West Germany" aspect of Mr. Trattner's and Mr. Huff's "tape-recorded" lies was to discredit U.S. Labor Party evaluations in the eyes of Soviet, Arab, and the two Italian party circles memtioned.

For example, with aid of undercover collaborators, my associates in Italy traced a lie being widely circulated against me in that country, from the U.S. consulate and U.S. Information Service in Milan to the Israeli embassy in Rome. The U.S. consulate in Milan was citing the Israeli embassy in Rome as the highest authority for its slanders against the Chairman of the U.S. Labor Party! The added explanation was that the U.S. Ambassador to Italy, Mr. Gardner, was extremely angered by my Italian co-thinkers' interference in Mr. Gardner's efforts to topple the Andreotti government. This latter effort is primarily British in origin, but Mr. Zaccagnini of the leadership of the Christian Democratic Party knows, after his meeting with the lunatic Mr. Brzezinski, that the Carter Administration is fully behind the British destabilization of the Andreotti government.

The accompanying, more immediate purpose of the lies circulated by Messrs. Christopher, Trattner and Huff was to simply sabotage my press conference and evening address. On that account, their motive was simple. The Carter Administration is currently committed to wrecking the European Monetary System, and I am the most qualified person in the U.S. to accurately represent the EMS, as distinct from the lying on that matter which has predominated in the U.S. press and official statements since July 1978. When Messrs. Christopher, Trattner, Huff and others assert that I am incompetent to speak on the character and implications of the EMS, those gentlemen are not offering mistaken judgments; they are lying. All the leading officials of the State Department have known since June-July 1978 that I am better informed on the EMS than the Carter Ad-

ministration's so-called experts. The British-loving Carter Administration was afraid that my explanation of the EMS would find receptive minds among most U.S. business and trade union officials, as well as numerous leading political figures.

What Is Warren Christopher?

The subject of the Jones Peoples Temple cult ought to be very, very embarrassing to Mr. Warren Christopher.

The Jones Peoples Temple cult is an outgrowth of the overall drug-and-cult projects typified by the notorious MK-Ultra pilot project of the 1950s. At about 1963, with aid of substantial funding run through the IOS financial conduits of Israeli intelligence (Mossad), the combined drug-cult efforts were unleashed on a relatively mass scale, at about the same time Timothy Leary transferred from the Harvard to the Mossad payroll.

This evil activity was associated with Gregory Bateson and Bateson's former wife, the late Dame Margaret Mead. Margaret Mead, no mean cult-sympathizer herself, was active in promoting "radical" networks among anthropology, sociology and psychology students in the USA — and abroad, most actively intersecting entities deployed by the branch of British intelligence known as the London Tavistock Institute. (Henry A. Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and the Trotskyist "Fourth International" are all examples of the patronage of the London Tavistock Institute's "Russian Studies" network. The Rand Corporation is chiefly a clone of the Tavistock Clinic in the USA, like the ISR at Columbia.)

The most significant center for the networks engaged in this combined drug-and-cult building activity of the 1950s and 1960s was the Robert Hutchins gang at the University of Chicago, and a West Coast gang euphemistically known as the "Palo Alto Mafia." Bateson was associated with the latter, and is also a leading figure of the cult-building center in the United States, the Lindisfarne kook-designing center on Long Island. Bateson is also the principal advisor to the Zen-Buddhist Governor of California (or, has it already become the state of Kookifornication?)

Now, follow this closely, if you desire a peek at real dirt on Warren Christopher and Arthur Goldberg.

It should be well known that after the Jones Peoples Temple departed from the kindly aid of ADL-linked Rabbi Maurice Davis in Indianapolis, and the Indianapolis funding-environment of the Lilly Endowment, it moved to California, to join the ranks of the kooky back-to-rural communes cults developed in Ukiah, California. From Ukiah, Jones moved into becoming a part of the Democratic Party political machine in the San Francisco area, picking up numerous recruits from a project created by one Dr. Joel Fort of that city. It remained an element in high-standing with the Brown machine in California, and was a significant part of the 1976 "Operation Big Vote" — as well as, earlier, a leading element of the local Mondale nomination-campaign forces of that area.

You should know that there is a nasty scandal in the State of California, involving the financing of the Pertamina interests of the Brown family, interests acquired not without regard for the existence of Arthur Goldberg.

Warren Christopher was prominent in the campaign of the high-placed Zen Buddhist kook, of that confidant of kook-maker Gregory Bateson, "Jerry" Brown.

In Washington, Warren Christopher is not of indifferent significance in State Department blocking of investigation of the Jones cult. I shall not burden you with the details of what elements of British intelligence, tied to Sussex (Tavistock), were coordinators of the bringing of the Reverend Jones rural marijuana-growers' commune to Guyana. You are, or should be, aware that nine hundred members of the cult were murdered, some by deception-poisoning and others by aid of more forceful means, to cover up the evidence of the activities in which Jonestown figured. You should be aware that highly placed elements of the Administration are ostensibly engaged in massive cover-up in connection with this affair to this date, with the finger pointing to Brzezinski, among others, in this affair. The truth, if aired, would bring great embarrassment to Henry Kissinger and to Warren Christopher, as well as to Brzezinski.

The Warren Christopher, Ramsey Clark, Arthur Goldberg connections are, to put the matter quietly, not nice. Mr. Christopher should therefore take his "not nice" connections to some other location than the State Department.