

Did Harriman's Role Avert an Early Confrontation Between Carter and the Soviet Union?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

EXCLUSIVE

*New York City
Jan. 6, 1977*

It is the dangerously mistaken, wishful judgment among certain otherwise well-informed circles that Governor Averell Harriman's negotiations between Moscow and the "Carter forces" have contributed to a significant, accomplished reduction in the probability for an early strategic confrontation. Unfortunately, without deprecating the amiable features of Mr. Harriman's concerns, the essential fact is that *the wishful delusions current concerning the outcome of those negotiations have considerably increased the probability of general war during 1977.*

It is properly emphasized in this connection that the cited, mistaken circles have committed the same type of blunder of judgment exhibited during 1938 by credulous observers of the Hitler-Chamberlain Munich Pact. It was still possible, at the time of the Munich Pact, to contain Hitler absolutely. The charade of diplomatic smiles demobilized the atmosphere of containment, and so the wishful delusions of that period transformed a probable general war into a certainty.

The Carter forces of today are governed by an underlying strategic impulsion identical to that determining the policies of the 1938 Hitler regime. The accumulated internal monetary and economic crisis of the Nazi "House That Schacht Built" had reached the stage by late 1937 that only the looting of an expanded economic base, Nazi Germany's neighbors, could stabilize the cancerously expanding mass of *Rentenmark, Mefo* bill and related financial structures. Today, unless most of the developing sector and European and Japanese OECD countries are subjected to the looting policies demanded in the self-interests of Lower Manhattan's debt-overhang holdings, the power of the Rockefeller brothers and their allies is as doomed as Hitler's would have been in 1938 without the Nazi rampaging conquest of continental Europe. It is not accidental that the Carter forces have come to consciously model their present strategic and national policies for the USA upon the monetarist and related conceptions of Hjalmar Schacht et al.

That is the fundamental impulsion leading Carter et al. toward general thermonuclear war even during 1977. All short-term tactical shifts in Carter policies, to the extent they represented actual retreats from such a confrontation perspective, must be overwhelmed by a

countervailing impulsion flowing from the financial desperation of Lower Manhattan Trilateral institutions.

The strategic realities of current Carter policy are Brazilian involvement in Caribex operations. Those operations intersect acceleration of the "Second War of the Pacific" scenario project in South America, a march toward a Chilean "solution" in Colombia, naked confrontation in Mexico, intensified pressure upon Peru, threats of internal destabilization and external interventions into Guyana, and a "terrorist" scenario for Puerto Rico rooted in the 1976 Democratic Party Platform. The Caribex operation also institutionalizes an essential feature of the proposed South Atlantic Treaty Organization, an extension of NATO focused primarily on turning all of southern Africa into Jimmy Carter's "Vietnam."

The strategic realities of the present period include Carter bloodbath operations around the Rhodesia issue. They include the launching of "black operations" within Israel against Prime Minister Rabin's forces, while simultaneously the Carter forces conduct an attempted internal takeover operation in the PLO.

In light of these and related facts, what weight ought to be given to the "cosmetic" concession to Moscow of kicking James Schlesinger "upstairs" to the same old White House position formerly occupied by Henry Kissinger? Must not the "adjustment" in Mr. Schlesinger's career be viewed, more narrowly, in respect of the current fight within the U.S. intelligence community? In the case of Schlesinger's designation and related matters, the Carter forces have made a purported retreat which is in fact a direct advance toward accelerated confrontation! Only children are properly deceived by the ostensible successes of Mr. Harriman's negotiations.

The relevant general principle we are obliged to stress is that *in whatever circumstances an underlying irrepressible conflict is operating among principal forces, all actions which do not directly neutralize those underlying impulsions are inevitably actions contributing to the earlier outbreak of war.*

This principle is richly demonstrated in modern history. What is, indeed, the record of sundry "non-aggression pacts," "disarmament treaties," and similar diplomatic charades? So long as the underlying impulsion toward war was not reduced, each of these diplomatic cretinisms performed an essential,

contributing role in accelerating preparations for war. Any treaty which is not premised in an agreeable intersection of fundamental interests of the parties is a farce. Furthermore, it ought to be common knowledge that avoidance of war is not in itself a principled interest of any nation or combination of nations. Contrary to too-bright-eyed, lispng pacifists, whenever the fundamental interests of a national ruling political force demand goals which cannot be achieved by means other than war, the manifest interest of that nation's ruling faction is to get to a favorable deployment for war-fighting by the quickest means.

It is relevant to this specific point that the Carter forces are not only committed to general war under an estimated favorable correlation of strategic forces; they are so desperate in behalf of their conceived fundamental interest that they are committed to force a casus belli even for those circumstances in which the USA suffers a significantly unfavorable correlation of strategic forces for actual war-fighting! (That latter, of course, is the preponderant issue of the current fight between pro-Carter and anti-Carter forces around the NATO military and intelligence establishments.)

The function of treaty agreements, armaments negotiations, and "cosmetic" gestures of reduced tensions in the current perspective of the Trilateral Commission, New York Council on Foreign Relations, and so forth, is to induce the Warsaw Pact, European OECD nations, and the Non-Aligned nations to make tactical retreats advantageous to the deployment of the monetary, political, and military forces of the Carter-centered cabal. Insofar as opponents are duped into regarding these aspects of Carter operations as aimed at "reducing tensions," etc., the danger of war is directly increased by such foolish credulousness. The weaker the active counter-deployment against the Carter forces, the more aggressively the Carter forces will accelerate their deployment for early strategic confrontation.

The Myth of Communism

The pervasive, most common rationale employed by the credulous in such connections is the thesis that the strategic confrontation between the Trilateral Commission and Warsaw Pact forces is essentially an intensification of the long-standing, institutionalized ideological mobilization of the industrialized capitalist governments and major parties against the Soviet Union. By attributing the primary character of the confrontation to this ideological conflict, the credulous are able to synthesize political models of the present conflict situation in which the "cosmetic" gestures following Mr. Harriman's negotiations are consistently interpreted as an abatement of the tempo of strategic confrontation.

Such credulous observers have learned nothing from the experience of World War II.

During the middle of the 19th century, the then-dominant monetarist faction centered upon the City of London and the British Foreign Office developed the general strategic perspective for the European continent of employing Prussia as simultaneously a "marcher lord" force for containment of France and a battering-ram for London's long-term Eastern European policy.

This project consistently emphasized the "balkanization" of Slavic Europe into an easily manipulated collection of squabbling states. Otherwise, the principal features of that long-standing policy were the splitting of Russia into two principal entities, a nominally autonomous "Great Russian" semi-colonial state in the north, and a separate, puppet-state Ukraine placing the grain and petroleum of the steppes and Caucasus directly under the control of the City of London. The City of London's Balkan policy as such was an extension of this same general strategic perspective.

With the aid of the incredible Alexander Helphand-Parvus, this British policy was introduced to the German command during late 1916 — for the initial down-payment price paid by the German military intelligence of one million marks. Overall, Parvus received over 30 million marks during the war period from German sources, and operating in cooperation with British-controlled northern-route networks — the same British interests Parvus had represented prior to 1916 in Germany, the Balkans, and Turkey — to the purpose of overthrowing the Czar and putting the longstanding British policy into joint British-German practice.

It is one of the howling ironies of history that Parvus, operating in Bolshevik circles through his agents Karl Radek and N. Bukharin, organized and funded the transport of V.I. Lenin to Russia with the consent of a British northern-route network as an intended part of the pot-boiling effort. Lenin, who accepted Radek's disclaimers concerning the origins of the three millions marks, was intended to be not a British or German agent, but a manipulated included element within a "grand scenario" for furthering the Anglo-German Russian project. The "backfiring" of this attempted utilization of "minor figure" Lenin of course shaped subsequently the modern history of the world.

That Eastern European project is properly seen not as an auxiliary feature of World War I, but represents the strategic policy for which that war included, to a certain degree, unexpected results.

The same policy represented the overall strategic setting for World War II. It was that underlying policy concerning the balance of a weakened France against the success of the City of London's old Eastern European perspective which prompted London and allied centers to look favorably upon the Hitler regime during the 1930s. Those forces' hatred of Lenin and Bolshevism — genuine enough in itself — was subsumed within the determining strategic perception of self-interests. It is a fact of history that the Frankenstein-monster creation, Hitler's Germany, developed strategic implications beyond the foresight of Hitler's earlier patrons in the City of London. Hence, the same monetarist factions which had funded Hitler's accession to power, which had prevented French occupation of the Rhineland in 1936, which had given Hitler Austria and Czechoslovakia in 1938, in 1940 reversed their policy drastically, and sought and established an alliance with the Soviet Union against the Hitler menace.

Once Hitler was crushed, London and New York City reactivated the old "Parvus Plan" under the auspices of UNRRA and related arrangements. By this time, the center of global monetarist power had been shifted from

London to New York City. The old City of London monetarist's policies became the foundation for the policy-elaborations of the Lower-Manhattan based monetarist forces.

The joint hegemonies of the City of London and Lower Manhattan during the interwar period and New York City's world-rule of the past 30 years have of course institutionalized the new forms of the old Eastern European policy as "official anti-Communism" of the governments and leading parties of the OECD countries. The ideological doctrine of "anti-Communism" thus serves as the popularized rationalization, the mode of informing the popular will, *for the policy which antedates the 1917 Russian Revolution.*

This institutionalized "anti-Communism" has two interconnected, significant features. Its appropriateness for use *as an instrument of policy* is governed by the conditions favoring the fostering of anti-Communism within the OECD nations and other countries. It is also an instrument for preventing the development of alliances among forces of the political labor movement with industrial-capitalist political forces of opposition to monetarist policies. Since industrial-capitalist political tendencies are impotent to resist monetarist forces without broad support from among working people and farmers, and since the independent political mobilization of the labor movement tends lawfully to occur as a "traditionalist" kind of pro-socialist formation, an ideological climate of "anti-Communism" reenforced by identification with the avowed principal foreign adversary, acts as a most useful instrument of the monetarists in checking both the labor movement and industrial-capitalist political forces within the OECD and other capitalist nations.

Otherwise, the monetarist faction's hatred of socialism may be real enough, but excepting conditions of imminent threats to its interests from the political labor movement, "anti-Communism" does not represent a governing practical impulse of the monetarist forces.

In respect to present issues impelling strategic confrontation, *the issue of Communism is a delusion.*

Anti-Communism has, nonetheless, the psychological advantage of coinciding with the practical impulses of the monetarists' actual war-making interest at this time.

The first is obvious. Although anti-Communism is a delusion, it is an established, hegemonic delusion in the principal institutions of the OECD and other capitalist nations and in the minds of large portions of the population in those states. Thus, as a delusion of this sort, it is the most useful instrument for mobilizing those institutions and populations for war.

The second point is that the essential conflict of interests today is between the monetarists pushing deindustrialization, on the one side, and the combined Soviet and pro-industrial-capitalist political forces on the other. In respect to the developing sector and the revolt of Western Europe against looting by Lower Manhattan, the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact represent the decisive margin of the forces opposed to Lower Manhattan's deindustrialization policy. A vigorous Soviet support of the developing sector and Western Europe means probable defeat of Rockefeller et al.; a weak Soviet support for the developing sector and Western

Europe means Rockefeller's victory. Meanwhile, the strategic economic and military self-interests of the Soviet Union, as a state, depend absolutely upon the defeat of Rockefeller et al.'s current Schachtian schemes.

In this matter, the fact that the Soviet Union is a socialist state determines the character of that state, but does not define the immediate strategic issue. If the Soviet Union were a capitalist state ruled by an industrial capitalist faction, the exact same strategic issues would prevail.

On this point, the principal lesson of World War II is the composition of the anti-Nazi alliance, an alliance of the Soviet Union with the capitalist states of Britain, the USA, et al. Such facts demand that one probe the war to arrive at the motivating issues which were fundamental, motivating issues which cut through the 1930s London and New York City support for Hitler to assert their reality in the form of the 1941-1945 alliance.

The Basic Impulse For War

The essential, intrinsic defect in Mr. Harriman's perceptions and negotiations is that he is in violent contradictions with himself. On the one side, as a monetarist, Mr. Harriman embraces the perception of U.S. monetarist interests which is the ruling compulsion impelling a Carter-headed USA toward thermonuclear war as early as during 1977. On the other side, he rightly deprecates the proposals of Nitze, Schlesinger, et al. as strategically incompetent, and as premised upon included specific insanities concerning the character and policies of the Soviet leadership. Mr. Harriman refuses, at least to the best of our present knowledge, to appreciate the causal connection between the insanity of his own monetarist's outlook and the symptomatic expression of that madness in the ravings of Mr. Schlesinger et al. At best, Mr. Harriman is placed in the position of spreading bubonic plague and aspirins at the same time; he does not object to plague, but merely to symptoms of terminal plague infection. One would, of course, hope that Mr. Harriman, being more rational than Nitze, Vance, Carter, Schlesinger, Linowitz, et al., would act to correct his ambivalence on this point. Pending that, we have aptly characterized the merits of his Moscow-Carter negotiations.

The study of the Hitler regime is here again, as so often generally, the appropriate reference for evaluating the Carter forces. Despite the grip of Hitler on Germany during the 1933-1936 period, if the City of London and allied forces had not prevented a French occupation of the Rhineland, Hitler would have fallen with humiliating ease then. The 1938 Munich pact was more decisive to the same effect. The City of London and its co-thinkers gave Germany to Hitler, first in 1933, again in 1938, and once more in the Anglo-French military policy and deployments of September 1939 into May 1940.

The relevant lesson common to each point of Hitler's consolidation of power was that at each point the relevant forces *failed to intervene into the internal dynamics of Germany's political life.* At each point, excepting the initial London-New York sponsorship and funding of Hitler's rise to power, the form of response to the Hitler menace was at most *passive containment,*

where what was required was the application of crucial pressure to a weak point of the Hitler regime to the purpose of bringing down that regime.

Exactly the same point applies to the Carter forces. Carter has not yet consolidated the economic and social measures being launched by Ted Kennedy et al. to transform the United States internally into a fascist state. In that respect, 1938 and the Munich Pact point have not yet been reached. However, unless aggressive external deployment is applied to the purpose of attacking the Carter forces at their most vulnerable, crucial point, the United States will be consolidated into a force irreversibly committed to war. *The point was passed, by the act of President Ford's being manipulated on the morning of Nov. 3 into conceding a fraudulent election result, at which internal forces within the United States could, unaided, prevent the United States from plunging into thermonuclear war by as early as the summer of 1977.* Following Ford's manifestation of susceptibility to psychological manipulations on Nov. 3, 1976 (in the vicinity of between 10 and 11 a.m. that morning), the United States was doomed to die in thermonuclear holocaust probably by September 1977, together with hundreds of millions of variously killed, epidemic-ridden people in Europe and the developing sector. *Without bold external pressure against crucial points of the Carter machine, the world is doomed to thermonuclear war probably this year.* Any other estimation of the situation is criminal imbecility.

The crucial point — the most crucial point — is the reserve position of the U.S. dollar. Destroy the political hegemony of the dollar-denominated international monetary structures, and the paper which represents the point of self-interest of the Lower Manhattan monetarist faction collapses automatically. Such action, and only such action, will kill the active element of the U.S. drive toward early strategic thermonuclear confrontation. Anyone who temporizes in accelerating such action must be judged either as desiring thermonuclear war or too cowardly or foolish to prevent it.

The auxiliary points for minimizing the war danger are Africa, the Middle East, and so forth. The most resolute action against war-hawk factions in Israel and against the Ian Smith puppet forces in Rhodesia must be taken quickly, to nip potential Interpol-Institute for Policy Studies and allied agencies' scenarios in the bud before a general Middle East war and African "Vietnam"

become institutionalized.

The fixed base for both the principal and auxiliary deployments against the Carter forces must be the rapid development of a triangular, gold-based monetary system among European OECD, developing sector, and Comecon forces. This represents a bastion of recovery from the present global depression, the umbrella under which other deployments are launched, and the incentive for the USA to immediately join a new monetary system at the juncture of the induced collapse of Lower Manhattan's debt-overhang holdings.

Any step which is not a step toward accelerating such deployments is a step towards probable thermonuclear war during 1977.

In this context, internal U.S. resistance to Carter by industrialist forces, from the labor movement, by farmers, and others, represents the indispensable pre-assembly of the institutions which must determine U.S. policy under conditions of the collapse of the power of the Trilateral Commission and its allies. The national tactical skirmishes reflecting that potentiality have that order of importance.

Otherwise, it is stressed that well-informed circles should be constantly alert to the presence of a tendency among them to fall into diplomatic cretinism. These circles, swimming in a sea of daily personal diplomatic and related political and bureaucratic associations, naturally tend to mistake the agreeableness and disagreeableness of personal exchanges among representatives of various forces for reality, and similarly make themselves prey to a theory of history associated with the cult of diplomatic and bureaucratic gossip. "Aha!" one says, "So-and-so has replaced... This means that..." and the others nod.

It must be recognized that the configuration of personalities, documents and so forth of any moment are simply the predicates of an underlying determining reality. Underlying realities may determine personal careers, key world-historical individuals may represent creatively the hegemony of one historic current over another, but it is the underlying self-interests of institutionalized forces which ultimately determine the mere predicates of personal career developments.

Even Carter et al. have no capability for wilfully arresting the war-drive as long as they adhere to the monetarist conception of Lower Manhattan's imperiled self-interests. That is fundamental.