

An open letter to President Brezhnev

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editor's Note: We are publishing the following letter from Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., in hope that this route will bring the matter to the attention of immediate circles of Leonid Brezhnev.

Dear Secretary Brezhnev:

Some leading circles in the Soviet Union are playing a very foolish and dangerous game, lining up with the Socialist International and Church of England against figures such as Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, Helmut Schmidt, and Ronald Reagan.

Since you do not regard the recent destabilization of Poland as precisely a contribution to world peace, you ought to view the leading role of the London Tavistock Institute and Socialist International in orchestrating that turbulence as an indication of the true character of the recurrent allies of the anglophile institution called IMEMO.

If no one informed you that both "Experience and the Future" and "KOR" were joint operations of the London Tavistock Institute and the Socialist International, then you ought to have certain officials of IMEMO and the KGB tried and sentenced for being de facto British intelligence agents. As for the Solidarity movement as such, although this was created by the same forces which funded and directed Ferdinand Lassalle, and although the Free University of Lublin operation is coordinated by way of Vienna, it is the friends of the late Herbert Waddams of the Church of England who coordinate its operation today.

These are exactly the same forces directing the "peace movement" so much praised of late in Soviet publications.

Is there some idiot in Moscow who seriously believes that the Church of England's efforts to destabilize the Reagan administration will contribute to peace? Directly the contrary. It will enrage the indignant citizens of the United States, as well as the President, especially when the Primate of Canterbury parades with highly visible encouragement from the Soviet press.

The trap in visible Soviet policy is the obsessive repetition of the assertion that such clown-shows as

"peace movements" deter war, or that "arms treaties" ensure détente. The period between two world wars was a succession of détente-treaties. The 1930s was a heyday of peace movements. Meanwhile, the world moved toward war, making a mockery of all treaties and peace movements. In more recent experience, you personally negotiated numerous agreements with Presidents Nixon and Ford; what happened to those agreements once David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission took office in January 1977?

As the case of Nazi Germany illustrates, once a state comes under the control of an irrationalist movement, and under the impulsion of Schachtian forms of economic self-cannibalization of its economy, only the overthrow of such a government can prevent that nation's irrepressible, Hobbesian impulse toward war.

Then, if you are for avoiding war, why do you permit the Soviet KGB to put massive pressure in Italy, in support of Haig's efforts to put the avowed "New Mussolini" of Italy, Bettino Craxi, into power?

You believe that nuclear deterrence, or even a marginal superiority of Soviet military capabilities would deter governments from plunging into war? If so, you underestimate the capacity for delusion in governments gone mad.

Consider the case of the first of two world wars organized by the British. As you may recall, the principal cause of the war was the geopolitical policy of the Milner group, whose principal feature was the intended mutual destruction of Germany and Russia. (A blunder the British repeated during World War II, putting and maintaining Hitler in power for this purpose through 1938).

The Schlieffen Plan was well known prior to the outbreak of the war. But for the Kaiser's holding back the final phase of assault, for purposes of aiding a ceremonial touch, Paris would have been captured during the initial assault of that war. This was calculable before the war. Had Hitler not held back Guderian, and had he not shifted the Luftwaffe attack to the British anti-aircraft shooting-gallery over London, Britain might have been conquered during the Second World War.

Any command which assumes knowledgeable rationality by opposing forces is committing a dangerous error of estimation. Nations driven mad or desperate will stumble into war despite all rational evidence available foretelling the consequences. In this circumstance, no silly "peace movement" or scrap of treaty-paper will deter them.

Nations avoid war to the extent they perceive a powerful positive advantage in doing so. The principal such perceived advantages are enhancement of sovereignty and gains in terms of benefits of prosperity and security. It may be sometimes difficult to achieve a condition of perception to such effect, but no other course of action can succeed.

It may be agreeable to the ideological stubbornness of M. Suslov, but it is nonetheless a delusion, to believe that the turmoil in the capitalist sector of the world is the reflection of any inevitable or final fundamental contradictions within industrial capitalism as such. The fact of the matter, as available statistics ought to convince you, is that a feudalistic relic, rentier-finance, has superimposed itself more or less successfully on the principal capitalist states as well as the debts of the developing nations. If the industrial-capitalist modes of finance, made famous initially by Alexander Hamilton, were to reassert themselves, the present threat of general monetary collapse would vanish, and a massive expansion of world trade, based largely on development of the developing sector, would emerge.

As even M. Suslov ought to have perceived from the experience of the 1920s and 1930s, it was the collapse of industrial-capitalist impulses under the weight of the Versailles rentier-financial structures, which created the conditions leading into the second general war. If M. Suslov wishes to discern the "objective forces" of history in the current situation, let him learn the lesson of the last general war, that the social and political consequences of a new general monetary collapse are to be avoided by all possible means.

I will grant you that it is not entirely within the means of the Soviet government to determine whether or not a new general war occurs. It is within the means of that government to develop and adhere to a sound war-avoidance policy. Playing with the Church of England and the Socialist International, in the manner manifest from sources such as the Moscow press, is the most efficient way in which the Soviet government might seek to ensure the preconditions leading toward war.

I assure you that permitting a Soviet official, such as Djerman Gvishiani, to climb into bed with the genocidalist Club of Rome is equivalent to embracing creatures such as Pol Pot. Gvishiani's embrace of the evil Aurelio Peccei, a man resolved to be one hundred times more of a criminal than Adolf Hitler succeeded in becoming, is an act of unfathomable immorality, the act of an element

within Soviet leading circles which has joined our own Western genocidalists in exhibiting a lack of the moral fitness to survive.

Unfortunately, Gvishiani's evil behavior is approximated by policy statements given by Boris Ponomarev at the 1980 Berlin conference. To propose that developing nations ought to rely on their own available resources, rather than seeking economic aid from industrialized nations, is to propose that many of such nations condemn themselves to precisely the genocidal effects of famine, epidemic, and homicidal chaos which Peccei has proposed more explicitly.

Unless evils such as Pol Pot and Khomeini are ruthlessly crushed, and unless we of the industrialized nations begin quickly the mobilization of economic growth of the developing nations, the world must almost certainly stumble by successive strategic miscalculations towards the verge of a new general war they do not believe they will actually be obliged to fight. They will then plunge into general war, not because they intend to do so, but because no one appears able to stop the plunge. If we are impelled to such a state of affairs, probably civilization will vanish. It will deserve to die, because it tolerated not only Pol Pot and Khomeini, but the policies of Peccei and Ponomarev. It will die because it lost the moral fitness to survive.

This is not speculation. This is the sensuous reality looming rather immediately before us. You know what total nuclear war means, how the beginning of such an affair proceeds to its ultimate outcome. The series of strategic miscalculations leading to such trigger-point is already well under way.

Poland once more

Who is pushing the world toward war? It is the forces behind the World Wildlife Fund, the Club of Rome, and the heritage of H. G. Wells and the evil Bertrand Russell. Their reasoning is consciously as follows, as some of that faction have outlined the matter explicitly.

The destruction of the capitalist industrialized sector by the effort to establish a neo-Malthusian postindustrial order, means that the logistical capabilities for supporting military parity of the NATO and allied forces evaporates with the loss of vital sections of basic industry. Even for the British-led Futurologists, this creates the prospect of an intolerable state of strategic balance between the NATO and Warsaw Pact powers.

They, the leading Futurologists, are well aware of the implications: either they abandon their neo-Malthusian world-federalist utopia or they succeed in destabilizing the Soviet Union from within. That is precisely why the destabilization of Poland occurred, and for no other reason. That is why the Church of England and the Socialist International coordinated the destabiliza-

tion of Poland, and aim to do more in the same direction in other parts of the Warsaw Pact.

This is complicated by the fact that there is a faction within your own country which is as fanatically neo-Malthusian as Gvishiani's crony Peccei. To crush the Soviet Union's own impulses toward advanced technologies, that Soviet faction allies with the Church of England and Socialist International against you, Leonid Illich. In turn, it supports the Church of England and Socialist International in efforts to destabilize the nations of the NATO and allied nations, as well as promoting genocide in the developing sector.

If war occurs it will be because you, for your part, tolerated too long that nest of snakes in your bed, and because we, for too long, tolerated Socialist International and Church of England snakes in ours.

Why decent people die too soon

I assure you that President Ronald Reagan has shown signs of becoming the best President of the United States in at least a generation. I also assure you that approximately three-quarters of the citizens of my country are essentially good, moral people who deserve the best.

"Let them behave rationally, then," you say.

It is not so simple. Perhaps by seeing the follies of your own nation's policies you can be more understanding of our President's difficulties.

Perhaps two-thirds of the adult populations of industrialized nations, excepting Britain, are essentially decent, moral persons. Yet, in all but a handful of cases in each nation, they usually lack the developed capacity to be effectively rational on matters of even national domestic policies, to say nothing of global policies.

The problem is that their minds are so narrowly occupied with what they perceive as their immediate experience and limited interests, that their minds are made too small to assimilate facts so large as matters of national domestic or foreign policy. They are Kantians, even though they have never read Kant. They are what Plato's Socrates termed "silver souls," or persons of the limitations Dante Alighieri portrayed in the Purgatory canticle of his *Commedia*. They are Sancho Panzas from Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, not sufficiently developed to rule themselves effectively.

Their minds refuse to consider the connections between policies and consequences on a scale so broad as the nation itself, or international affairs. In such matters, they rely on a lying press, gossip, prejudices, and sheer superstition.

Hans Fallada in the 1930s published the book *Little Man, What Now?* How was it possible that a nation so cultured as the Germany of Leibniz, Humboldt, Schiller, Beethoven, Heine, and Riemann could tolerate the Nazi regime imposed upon it by Britain? It was not that

Germans were not predominantly moral, but that they suffered in the main the Kantian affliction of *littleness*. They each sought to take care of their own needs for job security and retirement benefits *within whatever circumstances they found imposed upon them*.

There is no nation's people which would have behaved better under similar circumstances. A nation which tolerates the "beggar's-opera socialism" of a Bertold Brecht is a nation of pathetically little people at best.

A nation well governed is a nation led by a Charles de Gaulle, who lifts a people for a time out of cow-like soddenness of intellect, to grasp for a moment the grandeur of a great and good national purpose. Without such leadership, the governments and citizens of nations behave like mean, frightened sheep, herded by their littleness into whatever course circumstances impel them.

Lacking a de Gaulle, the best a nation can enjoy is a figure such as a Valéry Giscard d'Estaing or a Helmut Schmidt. A political figure, formerly of a thoroughly Kantian quality of littleness, thrust into the lonely responsibilities of chief of state or government, may sometimes acquire a sense of world-historical responsibility, and may thus grow considerably in moral dimensions through incumbency in high office. I am confident that our new President, Ronald Reagan, possesses the moral qualifications to accomplish the same sort of growth, and he shall not want for what aid I can muster for him on that account.

Yet, even in such cases, a Giscard, a Schmidt or a Reagan governs with aid of a combination of forces, some well-meaning, some downright wicked, and at the same time is contained in scope of initiative by the great weight of littleness among the citizens generally. So, with aid of the wicked folly of Boris Ponomarev, Giscard was pulled down, and Schmidt's government placed in jeopardy.

This curse of Kantian littleness among peoples and political leaders is the great weight around the legs of any political figure seeking to combat a great evil such as the Church of England, the Club of Rome, and Socialist International today.

For that reason, those who govern with good intentions become accountable not only for the decisions, but their omissions of decisions that should have been made. A nation entering a period of grave crisis under the leadership of pragmatic "political realists" is a nation virtually doomed, a nation doomed by the failure of leaders to grasp the significance of such points as that I have made to you here.

Sincerely yours,

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.