

# Why does Kennedy parrot a Moscow line on Iran?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The *New York Post* reports that Senator Edward Kennedy's recent remarks on Iran have made the senator the instant darling of the lunatic mobs of Teheran. It appears that everyone and his brother, especially political candidates, is rushing to the nearest news media to comment on the senator's unfortunate remarks.

Although many of the senator's critics are honest, patriotic, concerned citizens, too many of the candidates with the biggest mouths in the press are, to my knowledge, a gang of hypocrites. Granted, the senator's statement was a hideous piece of unpatriotic lying about Iran; some of the published criticisms of the senator's statement are approximately as bad as the senator's remarks themselves.

However, I do have some things of importance to disclose on the significance of the senator's lying description of the so-called "Iranian revolution." I focus your attention on the remarkable similarities between the senator's statement and a line now being prominently circulated by numerous significant Moscow spokesmen.

I happen to know, from my expertise as founder of a private international political-intelligence news agency, that Senator Kennedy is neither an agent nor a sympathizer of Moscow. I know who controls the senator and what those controllers represent; it is not Moscow.

Nonetheless, that Kennedy's statement echoes the current Moscow line is the key fact about the senator's statement itself.

I explain the significance of that similarity. First, I clear away several preliminary issues and questions.

## **The fraud of national unanimity**

The argument that no candidate ought to speak publicly on the current Iran crisis I denounce as a down-right fraud.

The truth is this. The White House leaked to the *Boston Globe* and other news media the fact that Henry A. Kissinger and David Rockefeller had pressured the U.S. government to admit the exiled Shah of Iran for medical treatment in the United States. That leak to the *Boston Globe* I happen to know to be the truth.

Then Congressman Hansen (R-Id) announced to a Teheran press conference that he had seen documentary proof that the U.S. State Department had known in advance that admitting the Shah to the United States would produce something like the present hostage situation.

At that point, according to press reports, Kissinger and Secretary Cyrus Vance met and agreed to cooperate in covering up each other's dirty role in the Iran affair. That swindle was the basis for the Executive Branch appeal for "national unanimity" on the present Iran situation.

President Carter is being very foolish, politically, in going along with that "national unanimity" nonsense.



Those who keep silent on the Iran situation are supporting President Carter in exactly the same way a rope supports a hanging man. If the hostages are murdered, as seems almost certain, it will be Carter who will be blamed. If a mistaken course of military action leads to a shut-off of petroleum supplies from many OPEC nations, it is President Carter who will be blamed.

If there were a legitimate basis for requesting "national unanimity," there is a definite procedure which the Carter administration, or any presidency, follows in case of a national emergency during a major election campaign. The White House has but to invite all of the candidates to Washington for a private discussion of the problem; then, an agreement is worked out on what points will not be raised, an agreement whose legitimate purpose is to protect some current, short-term enterprise in the vital national interest. I am a registered Democratic Party candidate, one of the three leading Democratic candidates in the New Hampshire primary. I have offered to go to Washington on this issue. Neither I nor to the best of my knowledge any other major-party presidential candidate has been asked to go to Washington on this matter. In the absence of such an appropriate procedure, this chatter about "national unanimity" is a fraud.

Moreover, it is my knowledge that President Carter is being totally misadvised on Iran and related matters. The *Boston Globe* leak was factually accurate; so was Representative Hansen's leak. In addition, White House

spokesman Jody Powell, among others, has stated that Zbigniew Brzezinski is committed to support of the Muslim Brotherhood, and that the White House is going along with Brzezinski's policy. It is the Muslim Brotherhood which not only rules Iran, but which organized the attacks on the U.S. embassies in Pakistan and Libya.

It is therefore in the most vital national interest that Mr. Carter find better advice than that being offered by such discredited advisors as Vance, Brzezinski, and Kissinger. Some responsible voices must speak out publicly, to help create the situation in which advice such as that of Vance, Brzezinski, and Kissinger is replaced.

Senator Kennedy's offense is not that he spoke publicly on the Iranian situation. The senator's offense is solely that he lied to the effect of giving comfort to a Muslim Brotherhood which is presently in a virtual state of war with the United States.

### The Iran issue as such

By every accepted standard of international law, a virtual state of war exists between the United States and the Khomeinac dictatorship of Iran. Insofar as U.S. military action against Iran were to serve a useful purpose in net effect, the United States would be justified in using that force.

The Khomeinac regime has invaded U.S. territory (the U.S. embassy in Teheran) by force of arms. It has taken U.S. nationals within that embassy hostage in a shameless act of international terrorism. It has avowed the intent of its actions which have the effect of economic warfare against the United States, and has conspired to bring forces influenced by the Muslim Brotherhood into aid of both acts of violence against the United States and economic warfare against the United States.

These actions not only constitute clear *casus belli*, but also define the Khomeinac dictatorship and its parent organization, the international Muslim Brotherhood, as indictable outlaw organizations under the body of international law reflected in the so-called Nuremberg Code.

### The issue of U.S. military operations

If the United States were able to occupy Iran by force, to bring down the Khomeinac dictatorship, and to foster the creation of a new, responsible government by the Iranian people, I would fully recommend and support such military action.

The problem is that recommended forms of military action would not only be ineffective for the kind of problem Iran presently represents, but the probable secondary consequences of such military action would involve greater damage to the interests of the United States

than the current status quo in Iran and in de facto Iran-U.S. relations.

For a major military operation, Iran would be a logistical nightmare without massive Soviet support of such U.S. actions. A so-called punitive, exemplary operation against critical economic and military targets within Iran would merely contribute to a general destabilization of the Middle East situation as a whole.

The primary interest of the United States, together with its transatlantic and Japan allies, is to create a total containment of the Muslim Brotherhood problem in the Islamic world, to keep the chaos and confusion from spreading to destabilize Saudi Arabia (principally) or to create epidemic chaos in the Middle East nations proximate to Iran. All deployment of U.S. means, including military force, should be taken in cooperation and consultation with our French and Arab-nation allies, to create an effective cordon sanitaire around the Muslim Brotherhood problem.

The Iranian policy of the United States government must be to anticipate a "Ninth Thermidor" against the "Jacobinesque" lunacy of terror now rampant in that nation. This policy must be tempered by recognition of the de facto status of the Khomeiniac regime, and shaped by concern to secure the safety of U.S. nationals presently held in jeopardy in Iran.

### **The character of the Khomeiniac dictatorship**

There are two most-relevant historical precedents for characterization of the present Muslim Brotherhood dictatorship in Iran. More broadly, that regime is a parody of the French Jacobin Terrorist regime of the 1790s. More immediately, the regime has crucial points of similarity to the genocidal Peking client-regime of Pol Pot in Cambodia (Kampuchea).

The ruling stratum leading the mobs is an evil, feudal caste of land-owning mullahs, a social stratum analogous to the Fronde in French history. It is these mullahs who forced the father of the exiled Shah to become a monarch, whereas the Shah's father had preferred to develop Iran as a republic on the model of Kemal Ataturk's efforts in Turkey. It is this corrupt, feudalistic caste of mullahs which has kept the Iranian peasant in wretched poverty, illiteracy, and almost bestial superstition over the decades. It was this caste of mullahs which resisted, with considerable success, every effort by the Shah's government to conduct a modernizing land reform in Iran of the sort which would have uplifted the masses of the people and brought Iran into the orbit of developing, modern capitalist nations.

In the case of the Jacobin Terror, the Paris mob which provided the social basis for the Robespierre dictatorship and the bloody terror of Danton and Marat was a horde of illiterate, half-crazed peasants brought into Paris by

promises of welfare handouts. It is the same with the Teheran mobs. The latent insanity and violent, irrational superstition of the mass of Iranian peasantry has been deployed as a social battering ram by the Iranian equivalent of the Fronde, the feudalistic, land-owning caste of mullahs.

The Shah's government did, indeed, conduct systematic political repression in Iran. This repression was directed most significantly against the pro-industrial, pro-land-reform forces typified by the deposed prime minister, Bakhtiar. Otherwise, the Shah's grandiose expenditures on armaments, combined with his compromises with the feudalistic, land-owning mullahs, restricted the actual economic development of Iran under his rule to a mere facade, a facade which did not reach down into the gut of the economy. Without a real economic development program, and without political parties to mobi-

---

*"...recommended forms of military action would not only be ineffective against Iran presently, but the probable secondary consequences would involve greater damage to the interests of the United States than the current status quo in Iran."*

---

lize a democratic force of the urban population (especially) as a constituency force for economic development, the Shah, in effect, prepared the doom not only for his regime, but for Iran as a nation.

Under the lunatic leadership of the Khomeiniac regime, the gross economic output of Iran is best estimated to be no better than one-quarter of the level of production under the Shah. Agricultural production is a disaster. Without massive and growing imports of food to feed the lunatic mobs of Teheran and other cities, famine and epidemic would begin to create genocidal effects on the population of Iran as a whole. If the Iranians were to be marched out of the cities into the countryside, a genocide similar to that which occurred under Pol Pot in Cambodia (Kampuchea) would immediately ensue.

### **The Khomeiniac ideology**

Khomeini and his revolutionary council represent the Iranian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood. Another branch in Pakistan is known as the Jaamat-al-Islami. There is another, self-styled Sunni branch historically based in Cairo and Beirut, and other subbranches in

nearly every branch of Islamic doctrine and culture throughout the Islamic world. The Iranian Student Association, for example, is a branch of the Muslim Brotherhood, as is most of the top leadership of the Muslim Student Association, an umbrella organization linked to the Iranian Student Association. There are also various other front organizations of the Brotherhood, including one established under British secret intelligence patronage in Aden.

Not only does Carter's national security advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, support the Muslim Brotherhood as, supposedly, a "bulwark against communism in the Middle East," but the Muslim Brotherhood is the principal instrument of Brzezinski's "arc of crisis" policy. In addition to supporting the Brotherhood as such an instrument of his personal policy, Brzezinski has prompted President Carter and others into believing that the Brotherhood represents "Islamic fundamentalism," and is therefore somehow analogous to the Baptist fundamentalism which the President espouses.

The implication of the misleading label "Islamic fundamentalism" is the argument that if we were to declare the Muslim Brotherhood an outlaw organization, we would be guilty of fostering religious persecution. That argument is not only false, but a hoax. Islamic fundamentalism, so-called, has nothing to do with the Koranic Islam of the Prophet Muhammad. It is a cult based on the doctrine of the cult of Apollo and of the successor cult to Apollo's, the Ptolemaic version of the cult of Isis. Since Saint Peter collaborated in Rome with Rabbi Philo Judaeus to suppress the cult of pseudo-Christianity of Simon Magus all the great religions—Christianity, Judaism, and Islam—have been repeatedly penetrated by Isis cults which profess to adopt the outer nominal features of Christianity, or Judaism, or Islam. Manichaeism and Donatism are the prototypes of this in Christian history; cabalism is the root form of cultism introduced into Judaic circles; Asharism is the prototype of cults introduced under the guise of Islam. The Muslim Brotherhood is a cult of assassins whose theological doctrine is a parody of the most extreme version of Asharite cultism.

It is of historical relevance to report that the model statement of the Asharite doctrine employed by the creators of the Muslim Brotherhood cult is a manifesto, entitled "The Destruction," attributed to an eleventh-century inquisitionist and book-burner, al-Ghazali. It was this manifesto which organized the destruction of Islamic civilization from within, creating the decay which led into the total destruction of Islam's civilization during the final phase, the Mongol rule of the thirteenth century.

Exemplary of the effects of al-Ghazali's doctrine upon Islamic civilization is Iraq. During the reign of

## Documentation

### Pravda: extradite the Shah

*In an authoritative Pravda commentary Dec. 5 by "A. Petrov," the Soviet Communist Party called for the extradition of the former Shah from the United States to Iran—a turn in Soviet policy. "Petrov" expressed sympathy for the "Iranian revolution" and cited Sen. Edward Kennedy's condemnation of the Shah's regime. Excerpts of the Pravda article follow:*

The tension in Iranian-American relations is growing. The latest actions taken by the United States indicate that Washington has decided to raise tension and to turn this into one of the most serious international conflicts of the post-war period...

Instead of being an example of restraint, responsibility and calm in the current situation ... certain circles of the U.S.A. are counting more and more on the use of force.

They assert that this is in response to the holding of U.S. embassy personnel as hostages in Tehran, which is a violation of the norms of international law. The seizure of the U.S. embassy undoubtedly is not in keeping with the international convention on respect of diplomatic privileges and diplomatic immunity. But this act cannot be taken out of the overall context of U.S.-Iranian relations. The activities of the U.S.A. in respect to Iran which do not at all agree with the norms of law and morality cannot be forgotten.

Did the activities of the U.S. special services, which organized the overthrow of the legitimate government of Iran in 1953 and imposed on the Iranian people for a quarter century the arbitrariness and lawlessness of the Shah not contradict international law? Does the stand of those in Washington who reject the demand of the Iranian people for the extradition of the Shah and the return to Iran of his plundered wealth have much in common with international law? ... (Petrov quotes condemnation of the Shah by Kennedy).

The U.S. has made not extraditing the Shah virtually "a question of national honor." However, hiding a criminal does not at all raise the honor and authority of a country....

Caliph Haroun al-Rashid, the region known today as Iraq supported about 35 million persons in relative prosperity, whereas modern Iraq has less than ten million citizens. A traveller through Iraq can see with his own eyes the irrigation systems, not fully restored to this day, which represented a greater rural prosperity than is yet established in the modern, developing Iraq of today.

In a strict application of Muslim Brotherhood cult-theology, the following argument exists. If a Brother is holding a loaded pistol to the head of a victim, the Brother argues that his pulling the trigger will not injure the victim unless "Allah wills" that the bullet should kill the victim. Similarly, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini encouraged the production, traffic in, and use of opium and heroin on the grounds that these substances were not specifically prohibited by the Koran. This sort of doctrine is identical with such pseudo-Christian cults as a radical monophysite doctrine among a branch of the Copts, and otherwise with such cults as Manichaeism and Donatism. In Judaic cults, cabalism subsumes identical lunatic reasoning.

Khomeini is to Islam as the Rev. Jones was to Christianity.

### **Dealing with the Khomeiniacs**

It should be clear from examination of the Muslim Brotherhood's cult-doctrines that punitive military action against Iran will not accomplish any useful result. Destruction of industrial wealth (petroleum refineries and fields) is not a credible penalty against a force dedicated to destruction of modern technology. Starving millions of Iranians to death—through economic penalties such as cutting off food supplies—will not deter a maniac bent on the suicide of most of the designated "martyrs" of his population.

Looking into the paranoid minds of the Khomeiniacs, there is only one sort of penalty which would work as an efficient deterrent: the imminent destruction of the Muslim Brotherhood internationally. To control a child, control its mother. To all Brothers, the Brotherhood is the "mother." Threaten to destroy the mother and the child can be controlled in that way.

At this point of the Iranian crisis, it is possible that no action exists by which the hostage's lives could be saved. However, the only means which might have saved the hostages, and which might still succeed, is action against the Muslim Brotherhood, declaring it an outlaw organization to be hunted down and brought to justice in the way the Nazi party was hunted down as an outlaw organization. In addition, that is the only policy which would contribute to stability within the OPEC nations generally, and which would lay the basis for the subse-

quent emergence of a responsible government in Iran itself.

Unfortunately for the hostages, unfortunately for the nations which depend upon Middle East petroleum, Zbigniew Brzezinski represents interests which are dedicated to promoting the power of the Muslim Brotherhood.

The problem in the Iranian crisis is that the Carter administration continues to be dedicated to the policies which place the hostages in jeopardy in the first place, policies which must inevitably cause far worse injury to vital interests of the United States and its allies than the present Iranian crisis itself.

"National unanimity" for such a wretched policy is not patriotism, but is conniving to give aid and comfort to the declared enemies of the United States.

### **The Moscow angle**

Although Moscow continues to denounce emphatically the invasion of the U.S. Teheran embassy and the taking of the hostages, many voices from Moscow's highest circles have adopted the same position as Senator Edward Kennedy on the character of the Iranian revolution itself.

It is remarkable that this Moscow sympathy for the character of the Iranian revolution represents a recent and abrupt about-face. Following the Khomeiniac takeover in Iran, Moscow persistently denounced the Muslim Brotherhood and recognized the character of the Teheran dictatorship as a Muslim Brotherhood obscenity. This policy persisted up to the eve of the hostage situation. Then, Soviet broadcasts into the Middle East signaled a possible change in line. More recently, regular sources of Soviet policy statements have joined in adopting the line of those radio broadcasts.

This occurs in the context of high-level rumors to the effect that Moscow and Washington have reached a secret agreement on Iran, under which the Soviets would be invited by Washington to exercise treaty rights to occupy the northern portion of Iran. These are rumors, but they come from so many authoritative sources in both the United States and Europe that the report cannot be brushed aside. Moreover, if one understands the ABCs of the factional combinations in and around the Politburo in Moscow, Moscow's shift to endorsement of the Iranian revolution's struggle against "American imperialism," although not of the violations of international law by the Khomeiniacs, is consistent with the rumor of such a secret understanding between Washington and Moscow.

There are essentially two main lines within the Soviet leading circles. One current is predominantly oriented to Paris and Bonn; the other is predominantly oriented to

London and to the Council on Foreign Relations crowd in New York City, the latter the crowd behind Vance, Kissinger, Brzezinski, Kennedy, and so forth. From about May 1978 until most recently, Moscow was predominantly oriented away from London toward negotiation with the entire West through the channels led by France's President Giscard d'Estaing and Germany's Chancellor Helmut Schmidt.

Now, Moscow has developed the perception that Giscard and Schmidt—especially Schmidt—are losing ground to the London-Manhattan crowd. Moscow's estimate is that the Paris-Bonn forces are not any longer an effective deterrent against East-West confrontation. The immediate reaction in Moscow, when such an estimate might be adopted, is to seek out a new accommodation with the London-Manhattan axis. The offer of a secret agreement on Iran from Washington would tend to have the effect of tilting Moscow away from Paris and Bonn and toward the national strategic estimate that the London-Manhattan crowd will predominate during the years immediately ahead.

Such a shift in Moscow's strategic estimates would correlate with an abrupt "radicalization" of the Moscow line. This "radicalization" would be effected through the convergence of two principal influences upon Soviet policymaking.

Whenever Moscow sees no deterrent to a confrontational course within the overall Atlantic Alliance, Moscow tends to desire the maximal internal weakening of the economic, political, and military power of the Atlantic Alliance. In such a circumstance, it will officially encourage even movements which it privately abhors, such as the Khomeiniac obscenity, insofar as it views those forces as contributing to weakening the objective correlation of combined political, economic, and military power of the NATO-centered forces.

Secondly, the pro-London currents within the Soviet leadership are of a two-fold composition in political character. The first element of this composition is a radically "Marxist-Leninist" variety of influences, which traces the existence of the Soviet state from origins in the Jacobin Terror of the 1790s. The second element, overlapping the first, radical facet, is predominantly a post-1965 phenomenon, the insertion of a penetration operation into the Soviet leading circles under the umbrella of "systems philosophy." The so-called Kennedy machine is directly linked to both of these interlinked "radical" elements of the Soviet leading circles. The centerpiece of that constellation within the Soviet command is the penetration of the Soviet party intelligence services and Soviet State Security command by British secret agents Philby and Maclean.

These elements of the Soviet command's pro-London

currents are linked through embedded "Bukharinite" ("Parvusite") currents in Soviet life, as augmented by the operations of J.B.S. Haldane and Bertrand Russell since the late 1920s. The center of this penetration of the Soviet command from the British side proper is Cambridge University's Trinity College, the same group of Apostles which produced Bertrand Russell and which coordinated the development of Philby, Burgess, and Maclean and other Soviet-penetration-agents of British secret intelligence since the late 1920s.

In the Western Hemisphere, the primary common link to Cambridge University and to the Philby-linked elements of the Soviet command is that network embedded in the Jesuit order which Pope Leo XIII denounced as the "American heresy" in 1899. The center of this operation in the Western Hemisphere is an axis running from Georgetown University to Cuernavaca in Mexico.

### **The Caribbean angle**

The Western Hemisphere's "American heresy" Jesuits deploy into Mexico through two conduits. These conduits are distinct and apparently directly opposed to one another at the lower levels but are identical at the top levels. The right-wing group is identified with Monterrey and with the Pallavicinis' personal Sodom and Gomorrah, Henry Kissinger's Acapulco. The left-wing center for these particular varieties of Jesuits is Cuernavaca.

The left-wing operation against Mexico is run jointly through elements of the United Nations Organization and French circles linked to Jacques Soustelle and the old French fascist organization, the O.A.S. (The "Secret Army"). These Jesuit elements are historically connected to British intelligence through Julian Huxley's UNO and French operations. They are run by the old William Stephenson Special Operations Executive organization for the Western Hemisphere. Stephenson's aide, Major Louis M. Bloomfield, headed up the "Law of the Sea" UNO project which is a key part of the left-covered Jesuit operations in Mexico itself. Ervin Laszlo of the UNO's UNITAR organization is a key figure both in Mexico and Caribbean operations and in the "systems philosophy" penetration of Soviet circles as such. Complementing Cuernavaca in this operation within Mexico is a group, including Octavio Paz and Fuentes at the Colegio de Mexico. Both are connected not only to UNITAR and "Law of the Sea" operation, but also to French fascist circles linked to Soustelle.

Relevant to this and also directly relevant to the link between the Moscow and Kennedy lines on Iran, is the peculiar role the Cuernavaca Jesuits played in connection with the Nicaraguan revolution. The reader will soon discover not only how these are linked, but the monstrous strategic importance of that linkage.

For example, in February 1978, a year prior to overt Jesuit support for the final phase of the Sandinista insurrection, agents of Cuernavaca made a significant visit to Cuba, at which, according to official reports, they negotiated a Christian-Marxist dialogue policy. At the September 1979 Havana Non-Aligned Summit, one month after the Sandinista victory, Castro pushed the Non-Aligned to switch their former "self-determination" line on Puerto Rico and went over to unambiguous support for Puerto Rican "independence." It was as part of the same operation that incoming Attorney General Benjamin Civiletti secured from President Carter the pardoning of four singularly unrepentant Puerto Rican terrorist assassins; assassins whom a foolish Fidel Castro promptly embraced politically.

In a related action of the most recent period, a meeting was held in Peking under the sponsorship of the Georgetown University-based Kennedy Center for Bio-Ethics, the latter one of the principal promoters of the "right to die" movement in the United States. (Now it is clear why Leo XIII rightly regarded Georgetown University as the center of the "American heresy.") This meeting in Peking was addressed by Hans Kung, among others, and adopted the same Christian-Marxist pro-Jacobin line pushed in the Caribbean region by the Cuernavaca Jesuit "leftists."

This indicates the nature of the connection between the current Moscow and Kennedy lines on the "Iranian revolution."

### **The Muslim Brotherhood: a Jesuit organization**

*Executive Intelligence Review* has already published a partial roster of leaders of both the Iranian revolution and of the Muslim Brotherhood who are Jesuit-trained. The Jesuit training and sponsorship of each is directly traced to either the U.S. ("American heresy") or the allied, Soustelle-linked French cousin. This connection is analogous to the identical Jesuit backing and coordination of such agents as Philip Agee (also recently pardoned in effect by Civiletti) and the notorious Regis Debray.

The Debray angle is not irrelevant. Just as the Muslim Brotherhood or its Aden front controls the most radical terrorist forces in the PLO and its peripheries, so the PLO terrorists are linked not only to the Red Brigades and the Baader-Meinhof gang, as well as the IRA Provos, but all are linked to the Basque terrorist organization, the ETA, a terrorist organization created by the Basque division of the Jesuit order in Spain in 1957, the first of the many international terrorist organizations, all closely interlinked, which were subsequently spawned in close cooperation with the ETA. Debray is an integral part of that terrorist network. Jesuit-trained Philip Agee

was sent into the CIA as an agent, was deployed into Latin America where he cooperated with the Cuernavaca crowd, and left Mexico and the CIA's employ following his involvement in the 1968 bloodbath and attempted destabilization in Mexico City.

Major Louis Mortimer Bloomfield also dovetails with this mess. Bloomfield, nominally a principal agent for the Canadian Bronfman circles, is head of the key Jesuit operation inside Zionist circles, the so-called Jerusalem Foundation. He is, in addition to his interest in Mexico through the UNO's Law of the Sea project, a principal figure in the Bronfman Middle East "METO" project and in the Bronfman-labeled "North American Common Market" project. Bloomfield was also the initiating head of the protofascist assassination organization, Pemindex. This is the organization which worked closely with the OAS and the Spanish Falange in the attempted assassinations of President Charles de Gaulle,

---

*"No powerful nation will accept the probable destruction of its political existence without resort to the maximum means of force available to accomplish the destruction of the threatening adversary."*

---

and was expelled from its base in Geneva, Switzerland, on complaint from the French government. During the same period, French intelligence investigation of Permindex led it to New Orleans, which investigations led to the Louisiana Grand Jury indictment of members of the Permindex organization in connection with the assassination of President J. F. Kennedy. Bloomfield is as nasty and bloody as they come, but also a long-standing, powerful influence within U. S. counterintelligence agencies ... which is why Philby was able to deliver so many U.S. secrets to the Soviets, including blowing a projected Albanian operation, undetected, unprevented by the ONI, the FBI's Division V, or by the counterintelligence units of the CIA.

It would be a mistake to attempt to trace these operations to the Jesuit order as a Catholic religious order. The U.S. secret-intelligence agencies of the first half of the nineteenth century did commit an error in evaluations on this point, in discovering the Georgetown Jesuits to be a principal, Metternichean conspiracy against the United States. The network deployed within the Jesuit order is older than Christianity, most immediately located in the old Roman families descended from the Caesars, who have never been Christians, but who

adhere in world-outlook and objectives to the same Isis-cult doctrine they worshipped in the time of the Caesars. These are the same cultist evil exposed by St. Augustine and other early patristic leaders of Christianity. Popes and others have repeatedly attempted to purge the Christian church of this evil, but the backing of this evil by powerful, monied secular forces has so far prevented each of the popes who attempted the clean-up from succeeding fully.

### **Strategic implications**

No American in his right mind wishes to have the Soviet Union shifted into a London-oriented, Jacobin posture. Unfortunately certain influential Americans, including some military types, are variously either out of their minds, or are permitting themselves to be silly dupes of kooks such as Henry A. Kissinger and four-paper-clip operetta general Alexander Haig.

In a recent address to a blue-ribbon audience in Europe, Kissinger announced his strategy to be a combination of external pressures on the "rim" of the Soviet Union, combined with the unleashing of a wave of internal disruptions of not only the East bloc generally, but the Soviet Union itself most specifically. That combination of actions means virtual certainty of thermonuclear war during the period immediately ahead. Kissinger gave 1985 as the date by which his combined tactics would crush the Soviet Union as a credible strategic force. Kissinger is proposing, in fact, a thermonuclear war before 1985, substantially prior to 1985. This is the danger warned against by the late Lord Louis Mountbatten, and also emphasized at the proceedings of a recent Switzerland conference of the London International Institute for Strategic Studies. It was warned, explicitly echoing the analysis repeatedly advanced earlier by candidate LaRouche, that Kissinger and his crowd were committing once again the same fundamental error the British made prior to both preceding world wars of this century. World wars do not occur in the way geopolitical plotters intend them to unravel as scenarios. Two preceding world wars have demonstrated that principle. The actual course of major wars in this century must be chiefly determined as the fatal consequences of gross strategic miscalculation. The denunciation of Kissinger's policies at the IISS conference reflects a painful concern, a most justified concern among the saner elements of British intelligence and policymaking.

Kissinger and his dupes argue that thermonuclear war is so monstrous that no nation would actually fight it. Therefore, the Kissingerians insist, the Soviet Union will accept "flexible response" and theater-limited wars, as proposed by Kissinger and his patrons.

This is an idiotic argument. No powerful nation will accept the probable destruction of its political existence

without resort to the maximum means of force available to accomplish the conquest or total destruction of the threatening adversary. It is precisely pushing ahead on the assumption that the Soviets would not react thermonuclearly which would cause the thermonuclear war by strategic miscalculation. This is the age of deterrence, pending the development of new classes of weapons capable of neutralizing thermonuclear ICBM missiles. As long as military and related action is kept within the bounds of the thresholds of deterrence, then deterrence works. Once either major power acts on the assumption that the other power's deterrent capability has been made politically inoperative, that lunatic assumption becomes exactly the strategic miscalculation which suddenly plunges the world into the thermonuclear war no one wished to fight.

If the Soviet side is dominated by London-oriented currents of the sort reflected in current Moscow statements on Iran, then the Soviet efforts to exploit Jacobinism in various Western and developing nations pours gasoline, in effect, into the fires which Mr. Kissinger and his friends are stoking. In that case, the danger of early thermonuclear war by miscalculation increases in probability and in nearness.

### **The Kennedys as such**

The Kennedy family is intermarried with the most evil of the ruling oligarchical families of Britain, the Cecils. Although the Kennedy fortune is attributed in large part to cooperation with the London Rothschilds and with the management of Kennedy wealth by Andre Meyer of Lazard Freres, the hard-core political links of the Kennedy family in Britain since Joe Kennedy's days were the Cecils and the formerly pro-Hitler Cliveden Set. Except for President John F. Kennedy's opposition to the lunatic demands of Prime Minister Harold MacMillan during 1963, the Kennedy machine has never opposed or deviated from the policies of the Cecil family in Britain.

It was that fight between President Kennedy and MacMillan which provided the context for the President's assassination. All the Permindex-centered forces known to have been deployed in preparing the Kennedy assassination were politically committed to the policies President Kennedy was opposing, and like Henry A. Kissinger, regarded the death of Kennedy as eliminating what they regarded, in Henry Kissinger's later statement, as a "security risk."

We, the writer and his sources, do not know yet the names of the actual assassins deployed to Deeley Plaza. However, all the principal preparatory features of the operation so far brought to light, including the deployment of Oswald as the prepared "patsy," are directly traced conclusively to the Permindex network. On the



case of Robert Kennedy, we are, unfortunately, poorly informed by comparison with our knowledge of those involved in preparatory features of John F. Kennedy's killing. However, it is clear from Robert Kennedy's profile that any force which had murdered John F. Kennedy could not wish to have a tough Robert Kennedy anywhere near the vicinity of the White House's power. Ted Kennedy is a different kettle of fish than Robert, not to be taken seriously as a political personality in and of himself.

Senator Ted Kennedy is essentially a zero, merely the available "clown prince" for the Kennedy machine. It is the Kennedy machine which produces, directs, and writes the scripts for Senator and presidential candidate Ted Kennedy. He is merely a facade behind which the real Kennedy power, the Kennedy machine of such figures as Arthur J. Goldberg, deploys.

The most conspicuous feature of the Kennedy machine currently is the "radical neo-Fabian" crowd identified with the Institute for Policy Studies. This, the so-called left wing of the Kennedy machine which includes Philip Agee and his crowd, is what Ted Kennedy represents predominantly in the public eye today. It is that element of the Kennedy machine which produces most of the words emitted from the senator's mouth on the character of the Iranian revolution.

Exemplary of the Arthur J. Goldberg connections in the Kennedy machine are expelled Jesuit seminarian and Zen-Buddhist kook, Governor Edmund "Jerry" Brown. Also, the former campaign manager for Brown, present State Department official Warren Christopher. Also Ramsey Clark, former attorney general of the United States and organizer of legal defense for such international terrorist groups as the Baader-Meinhof and the Red Brigades, as well as an official State Department agent sent to Paris and Teheran to support the Khomeiniac overthrow of the government of Prime Minister Bakhtiar.

### **The alternative**

The danger of war is to be prevented by the United States' adoption of a policy directly opposite to that presently operative under acting U.S. President Cyrus Vance and such Vance associates as Brzezinski and Kissinger. As typified by Kissinger's support for disruptions within the East bloc and the Bernard Lewis Plan, and by Brzezinski's "arc of crisis" lunacy, the Carter administration, as well as the producers and directors of such candidates as Haig, Bush, Connally, and Kennedy, are dedicated to instability. What we require is a global stability policy.

My strong recommendation to members of Congress, the intelligence community, and the Carter administration, that it cooperate with the government of France to

aid in stabilizing the government of Prime Minister Bakhtiar, exemplifies a stability policy in action. Instead, the United States government deployed the overthrow of Bakhtiar in favor of the Khomeiniacs, a fact highlighted by the deployment of General Huyser and State Department representative Ramsey Clark.

The key to establishing a global stability strategy is the creation of a new gold-based world monetary system. This new system would function to promote high-technology capital goods exports for the development of the so-called developing nations. This export boom would, at the same time, become the basis for economic recovery and continued, sustained expansion of the economies of the presently industrialized nations.

Respecting East-West relations, these must be premised on combined political and economic agreements between the Western powers and Moscow concerning the ground-rules for economic development of the developing nations.

The present pattern of alternating right-wing (so-called) and Jacobinesque coups and countercoups must come to an end. The combined economic power of the United States and its industrialized partners must be deployed to shape the economic environment for the nations of the world. Production and commerce are the proper principal weapons of foreign policy; military capabilities have the function of ensuring that that ordering of the world's production and commerce is not effectively challenged by any band of lunatics operating out of neo-Malthusian or other medieval utopian ideological delusions.

Nuclear energy development is the principal weapon of peace. Without nuclear energy proliferation, there is no hope to sustain the industrial power of the Western industrialized nations. Without the added margin of nuclear power, over potential hydroelectric sources, one-quarter to one-half of the world's population must be reduced by combined effects of famines, epidemics and social chaos over the coming two decades. Nuclear and related high-technology energy investments will exceed one-quarter of world trade and investment in a proper ordering of the next decades of world affairs. Whoever opposes nuclear energy development is, in effect of that policy, dedicated to the most hideous genocide in the history of mankind, perhaps to the end of civilization as we have known it.

Prosperity is the work of peace; austerity is the root of war.

Thus, West Germany's Chancellor Helmut Schmidt rightly said that "even Carter would be preferable to Kennedy." Thus, representatives of other governments have said: "Carter is the slow way to general war, Haig is the quick way, and Kennedy in the White House is too monstrous to be thought of."