

tion, in transportation, and in commerce in the product of agriculture and manufacturing. By also fostering high rates of scientific and technological progress, and high standards for compulsory public education, the optimal rate of improvement in the productive powers and productive output of the labor force are achieved, ensuring noninflationary growth, an ever-stronger national currency, and a demand for labor slightly in excess of the total labor-force. That is the American System, as opposed to its enemy, the British System of Adam Smith, et al.

The British System of Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Keynes and Schacht is an anticapitalist system of political-economy. It is the increasing influence of the British System which has caused the accelerating decline of the United States since the 1957-1958 recession, and especially since the wrecking of the U.S. dollar under President Johnson and Federal Reserve Chairman W. McChesney Martin during 1965-1966.

The point is to get back to the American System of Hamilton, the Careys and Friedrich List.

Unfortunately, the forces which control both President Carter and the Republican National Committee, the forces associated with the New York Council on Foreign Relations' Trilateral Commission gang, define Hamilton and List as the chief adversaries of the United States. You find this incredible? I refer you to the current publication by McGraw-Hill of more than 20 books belonging to a collection entitled "Project for the 1980s." These books represent policy-papers written under the supervision of Cyrus Vance, W. Michael Blumenthal, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and others for the Council on Foreign Relations during 1975-1976, and completed just in time for the Carter inauguration. These books outline every policy followed by the Carter administration since then, and also define every policy currently adopted by the Republican National Committee. The entire policy of the Carter administration and of the present, Kissingerian Republican National Committee is based on the presumption that France, Germany and Japan—not the Soviet Union, or Communist China—are the chief enemies of the United States. The pretext for defining France, Germany and Japan as the Carter administration's chief strategic adversaries in these books is the observation that those nations, especially Gaullist France, are dedicated to the "neomercantilist" policies of the George Washington administration, whereas, the Manhattan Tories take the side of King George III!

Worse, rather than give up treasonous, Tory policies, the "blue bloods" who run puppet-President Jimmy Carter are prepared to put the United States under the Nazi economic policies of Adolf Hitler and Hjalmar Schacht. Milton Friedman and the British-intelligence conduit, the Heritage Foundation, are the leading voices for this Nazi doctrine.

Two professors revive the policy of Goering

The following is a critical review by Lyndon H. LaRouche of the work of St. Anselm College professors Dr. Richard Gabriel and Paul Savage, authors of Crisis in Command.

The Nazi side to Gabriel and Savage leaps out at the moment one poses of them the question of developing the civilian-economic basis for an adequate military capability. The answer they give is not only exactly the same answer Nazi Hermann Goering gave in the 1930s; Gabriel and Savage are fully aware that they are resurrecting the Nazi policies of Goering.

Gabriel and Savage have flatly insisted that the United States can build a powerful military economy while allowing the civilian economy to collapse. This is the gist of Goering's 1930s "guns not butter" policy, and the policy of the candidacy of Republican George Bush today.

Both President Jimmy Carter and Republican George Bush are candidates for a Nazi policy for the United States. The differences between the two candidates are identical with the differences between Nazi Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht and Nazi military-economy boss Hermann Goering during the 1930s. Not only are the differences between Carter and Bush identical to those between Schacht and Goering, but the key think-tankers behind the policies of Carter and Bush are fully aware of this connection.

Fundamentally, there was no difference between Schacht and Goering in overall policy. Both started from the Nazi economic doctrine of Schacht. So, today, both Carter and Bush accept Nazi-modelled 'fiscal conservatism' doctrines of Schacht imitator Milton Friedman. Starting from that point of agreement, Carter's and Bush's backers diverge in the way in which they propose to apply the Nazi doctrines of Schacht and Friedman. Carter's backers are now committed to a limited growth of the military budget, while collapsing a great deal of the U.S. civilian economy. Bush's backers, like Goering of the mid-1930s, propose to go all the way to the kind of military economy which the Nuremberg trials identified as the special characteristics of the Nazi regime over the 1936-1945 period.

The military doctrine of Kissinger, Schlesinger, and Brzezinski was aptly described during 1975 by James R. Schlesinger as 'the aura of power.' Challenged on the growing inferiority of the U.S. military capability to

Soviet capabilities, Schlesinger replied to my representative's question that the questioner evidently did not understand the principle of the 'aura of power.'

The notion of a mere appearance of real power, 'the aura of power,' as the instrument of geopolitical bluffing, is the basis for the leading features of Carter administration policy today: 'the China card,' 'the Islamic card,' 'the captive nations card,' and so forth and so on. Brzezinski's policies, and therefore the policies of Brzezinski's and Kissinger's puppet, Carter, is accurately described as a strategy based upon 'a house of cards,' as Brzezinski wrote in a Rand Corporation paper he composed during the middle of the 1960s.

What happens when Moscow puffs gently against the Kissinger-Brzezinski-Carter 'house of cards'?

The result is three U.S. carriers (two ready for retirement) lined up in close order on parade, perfect targets for a single tactical nuke, in the potentially hostile zone of the Indian Ocean. Carter threatens capable Soviet forces in Afghanistan with a gang of drug addicts scraped out of the barracks of U.S. forces stationed in West Germany.

These facts are true. The denunciation of the 'systems analysis' policies/traditions of Kennedyite Robert S. McNamara are also valid, even when those criticisms come from the mouths and pens of such followers of the Nazi Goering as Gabriel and Savage.

Why Gabriel and Savage are kooks

When Lord Milner's Round Table group mobilized Britain for World War I, at the turn of the present century, Milner and company adopted the 'dirigist' economic-development policies of Alexander Hamilton as a policy of reference. It is broad-based technological progress, high rates of capital formation in the civilian economy, which give a modern nation in-depth logistical strength for its required military capabilities.

It was because of Milner's adoption of a policy of technological progress for the civilian economy that kook-cultist Bertrand Russell walked out of the Milner group in a display of infantile pique. As H.G. Wells states, referring to Russell's walkout in his own autobiography, Wells agreed with Russell philosophically, but 'compromised' by proposing that high-technology development be limited to the military side of the economy, while applying zero growth collapse to the civilian side. Nazi Goering was the direct outgrowth of H.G. Wells's 1920s articulation of that policy.

Gabriel, Savage, and their 'Team B' group of Bush backers, are rabid, zero growth kooks, who disagree with the lunatics of the Clamshell Alliance only on the point of military spending, while agreeing with the Clammies on nearly every point concerning the civilian economy.

The report of the Commission: end

by Daniel Sneider

"We believe that certain elements of what might be called international government are already called for to meet both mutual and national interests, and that by the end of this century the world will probably not be able to function without some practicable form of international taxation; and a decision-making process which goes a good deal beyond existing procedures."

This rather incredible and blatant call for the surrender of national sovereignty, including even taxation, to a one-world government is the conclusion of a report issued this past month by the so-called Brandt Commission, otherwise known as the Independent Commission on International Development Issues under the Chairmanship of Willy Brandt. The signers of this report, North-South: A Program for Survival, are a group of bankers, politicians, economists and similar misfits from around the world who were assembled late in 1977 at the behest of the President of the World Bank, former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, a misfit in his own right.

The designated purpose of this group was to carry on the much vaunted "North-South dialogue" through the agency of an "independent" group of prominent persons. After more than two years of work the Commission has managed to produce a series of proposals which are really nothing more than a well-padded and little disguised promotional pamphlet for the well-known prescriptions of zero-growth economics and fascist austerity of the sponsors of the group, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank. While the 300 pages of text of the report are insufferably boring as a result, they contain gems of insight into the world in which these One-Worlders would have the rest of us live, provided we surrender our governments and nations to this self-appointed elite.

The principal conclusions of the report can be briefly summarized as follows (please see selected excerpts below for elaboration):