

Open Memorandum To The Soviet Politburo

Georgii Arbatov's Links To Lazard Freres' Fascism

The following statement was issued on Sept. 14 by the U.S. Labor Party Executive Committee.

Although the governments and leading parties of the socialist countries rightly despise terrorist gangs such as the "Red Army Fraction" (Baader-Meinhof), influential currents within those governments and parties have induced the socialist governments, including the governments of Yugoslavia, to adopt a foolishly tolerant attitude on certain crucial features of the international terrorist problem.

In this matter, the governments of socialist countries including the Soviet Union are in fact the dupes of intelligence networks under the control of a coalition featuring the Rockefeller brothers, Lazard Freres, and the British allies of those Manhattan-centered forces. On this point, the Politburo is walking into a deadly trap. If you continue on the presently apparent course in this matter, you will be setting up the socialist countries for the charge of being the prime source of the terrorist wave in the OECD countries, a charge already being actively circulated by the U.S. Ambassador to Rome.

The central Soviet figure in this evil circumstance is Georgii Arbatov of the USA-Canada section of the Soviet Academy. If Arbatov is what his every action says he is, he is an agent of Anglo-American intelligence networks associated with the Rockefeller brothers and Lazard Freres, *an agent of fascist forces*. You may have special knowledge which causes you to believe that Arbatov is your "playback-deception" agent within those networks — if so, you are playing a very foolish game with such deception operations, deceiving yourselves most of all.

General Strategic Problem

As you ought to be informed, since this was repeatedly openly stated before the U.S. Congress and in other prominent places, the Kissinger-Schlesinger or Rand-Brookings strategy for subjugating the socialist nations of the Council on Mutual Economic Cooperation (CMEA) is consciously premised on the assumption made by Lazard Freres and Rockefeller brothers circles that agents within the Warsaw Pact command linked to Arbatov et al. have sufficient influence to cause the Soviet leadership in particular to follow a self-defeating policy, to the effect that Kissinger et al. could secure by subversion what NATO could not secure by direct strategic confrontation.

We have publicly stated the nature of this game, especially since the late winter and early spring of 1974. On each point on which Soviet policy has in effect rejected our analysis, the Soviet policy has been proven wrong in a major way by subsequent events. Now, we are correct and you are wrong once again — you are presently being manipulated against Western Europe and on other relevant issues.

The enemy who is manipulating you is a fool. He may have outwitted you in a certain way; in fact, I know by name some of the individuals in New York City who worked out the policies which you subsequently adopted according to the plans of these individuals. Because he has outwitted you, he is very confident, at once fearfully hysterical and manic. However, he overlooks the more fundamental fact, that his manipulation of you is his role in a game to which he is as much a controlled victim as you have been.

As you know, the Arbatovian misevaluation of the Carter-Mondale Administration by the Soviet majority was followed by the Vance-Warnke "Mutt-and-Jeff" act of March 1977. This was followed by the hypocritical "human rights" nonsense, and an escalation of "hot spots" in various parts of the world. The effect upon you was to intensify your "potential adversary" perception of the NATO and allied countries, especially West Germany, whose territory is the principal gambit-pawn for Atlantic Alliance-Warsaw Pact confrontation.

Under these circumstances, your attitude toward the OECD countries worsened, specifically to the point of further alienating you from any positive perception of the national interests of those nations. Thus, when the combined pressures on the CMEA external debt — especially the Polish external debt — and the Willy Brandt-centered propaganda-disinformation campaign concerning a "neo-Nazi" danger was launched against you, you were most susceptible to falling victim to that psychological-warfare campaign (as became most noticeable during June and July of this year), and continues to worsen up to this moment of writing.

What the fools around George Ball and Henry Kissinger refuse to see is that by thus intensifying your hostility toward the national interests of OECD nations, they are manipulating you and the Soviet population into deepened hostility toward the OECD nation *as nations*,

thus conditioning you and the Soviet population toward psychological readiness for war-fighting commitments under conditions of aggravated confrontations.

Thus, Henry Kissinger, George Ball et al., by manipulating you, and you, by permitting yourself to be manipulated, are following the track toward total war. The novelist, John O'Hara, wrote a popular novel, *Appointment in Samara*, whose theme fairly well describes the folly of the Kissinger-Ball and allied forces.

The "Neo-Nazi" Propaganda Campaign

The "neo-Nazi" campaign against the industrialists and trade-unions of West Germany, a campaign complementary to the "fascist-Stalinist" propaganda used for the same purpose in Italy, was initiated approximately a year ago, and escalated following the Princeton, New Jersey conference at which the break between Willy Brandt and Helmut Schmidt was initiated by Brandt's reference to Schmidt as the "acting Chancellor."

The narrower goal of that campaign was to place Brandt back into the West German government as Chancellor. The "neo-Nazi" campaign was supplemented by activation of the Social Democratic Party and Free Democratic Party "left" in West Germany, aiming at effects modeled on Hjalmar Schacht's use of his "German Democratic Party" to destabilize the Social Democratic-dominated government in the 1920's preparatory to the crises leading into the inauguration of Adolf Hitler as Chancellor.

The broader goal of the campaign around the "neo-Nazi" theme was to play upon the paranoia of the socialist countries, notably including East Germany, Yugoslavia, and Poland, concerning their understandable but wrong analysis of the causes for the Hitler phenomenon. In this way, Manhattan pro-fascist financier interests and their London allies (Lazard Freres, Rockefeller brothers, the British Labour Party's Roy Jenkins et al.) intended to prevent the CMEA from deepening its political relations with the Western European labor-industry alliance around Helmut Schmidt, and this also includes the Andreotti-CGIL alliance, and the Gaullist-CGT alliance. The effect on this was to weaken the economic and financial positions of the CMEA and continental European Economic Community countries simultaneously vis-a-vis the supranational financier coalition led by Lazard Freres and the Rockefeller brothers.

The third goal of this "neo-Nazi" campaign was to induce you to take a relatively tolerant attitude toward the wave of terrorism launched by that same supranational financier faction. As you know, notably since the 1962-1963 period, the socialist countries, including Cuba, have been heavily contaminated by the political intelligence networks associated with Lazard Freres and the Rockefeller brothers, partly as a consequence of Secretary Khrushchev's adoption of the "realists" doctrine, and also as a by-product of reorganization of the Soviet KGB. Under these circumstances, various terrorist networks deployed by supranational financier political intelligence networks have enjoyed various forms of assistance from the socialist countries.

Your relationship to these various terrorist and semi-terrorist formations has been varied. Although you

deeply deplore such anarchistic criminality, and despise the European terrorist movements, you have permitted yourselves to be implicated in various ways.

The conservative myth in the United States, "Nelson Rockefeller the Communist," arises in part from such things. Members of the military and intelligence communities in the USA, and those circles close to those communities, are saturated with what appears to them as "hard evidence" that Rockefeller is in some sort of conspiracy with the "international Communist movement," and also "hard evidence" that the socialist countries appear to be the source of terrorism in the United States, Western Europe and elsewhere. This is analogous to the opinion of former Senator William Knowland and others during the late 1940s and early 1950s that the Rockefeller-Fabian-controlled China "old hands" were agents of "international Communism." These "anti-Communist conservatives" mistook massive intelligence operations *against* the socialist countries and Communist organizations for networks controlled by the socialist countries.

The problem of Soviet relations with the People's Republic of China ought to have been a lesson to you in this matter. Because you have generally, stubbornly refused to understand the difference between industrial capitalist interest and monetarist financier interest, you have grossly misinterpreted the self-interests of imperialism in respect to operations in socialist countries and the developing sector, as well as the imperialist use of "radical movements" — since Bentham, Robespierre, et al. — in the industrialized capitalist countries. Hence you (and your predecessors) did not comprehend the nature of the Rockefeller-Fabian operation inside the Communist Party of China — in which intelligence networks, deployed through Canada and other channels, manipulated the Communist Party of China even, in numerous cases, down to the village level of organization.

The same folly your predecessors made in evaluating the China problem prompts you to miscalculate the same forces responsible for setting China against you in respect to their operations (via Arbatov et al.) targeting the Soviet leadership. In short, you have a potentially fatal political weakness, a political "blind side." You vacillate between Karl Marx's method of historical class analysis and the utilitarian's doctrine of "right" versus "left" political divisions. You have a softness toward the doctrines of such Fabian agents as Karl Korsch, the doctrines of such Anglo-Dutch agents as Radek, Bukharin, Ryazanov, Lukacs.

In East Germany, for example, the same weakness shows most conspicuously in the exaggerated estimation of Karl Korsch's crony, Bertolt Brecht, the prophet of the *Proletkult*, of "beggars' opera socialism." It may be the Ostbüro and the World Council of Churches which are among those most immediately responsible for rock star Wolf Bierman and similar Korschite scoundrels in East Germany but, in extolling the Korschite doctrines and the cult of the Brechtian infantilism, East Germany's Socialist Unity Party itself sows the "dragon's seeds" of Ostbüro agents in its own population. The key to Wolf Bierman is the folly of East Germany in fostering "our own rock culture."

Take the case of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I know directly that the Soviet leadership was involved in deploying Trotskyist spokesman Michel Raptis ("Pablo") to the Middle East, where Pablo was engaged in directing the training of European "leftists" for guerilla warfare as an adjunct to the Palestinian commando training program. This arrangement ended with the Czechoslovak events of 1968, in which Pablo attacked the Soviet leadership and was, therefore, suddenly sending messages throughout Europe, begging for plane fare from the Middle East — Soviet indirect funding of Pablo had been abruptly cut off.

The Palestinian case dates from the aftermath of the Cuban Revolution. The alternative of a "new model" of guerrilla warfare was reluctantly entertained among international Communist circles, an effort which foundered because it was unsound and because the Communists (e.g., Che Guevara) sucked into this folly were betrayed by agents (such as Regis Debray) with the complicity of what are today called "Eurocommunists" and by Chinese collaboration with Anglo-American intelligence agencies in Latin America, Africa, and elsewhere.

The general Communist attitude toward neo-Fabian-controlled-terrorists in the developing sector is one ranging from toleration to critical support, plus, of course, a covert foreign counterintelligence activity by relevant Soviet security and intelligence networks. This is complicated and aggravated by the attitudes of foolish developing-sector nationalist governments and movements toward the terrorists actually or nominally associated with their efforts.

The case of Dr. George Habash is exemplary of this problem.

In general, Soviet attitudes toward terrorism in the developing region is a difficult problem of distinguishing between the mistakes of otherwise legitimate national liberation movements and provocateur gangs which neo-Fabian networks situate within or proximate to those liberation movements.

What is most relevant at the moment is the terrorist networks within the industrialized capitalist nations, plus the important links (notably for training purposes) to terrorist special operations operations in the developing sector.

Terrorism Policy

Before continuing along the main lines of the discussion, it is necessary, at this point, to detour by way of a discussion of terrorism as a weapon of warfare.

You may be certain that we are qualified by studies of the problems of regular warfare strategy, partisan warfare, and the role of terrorism and counterterrorism in warfare. More to the point, which may shock you at first, we are advising antiterrorist counterintelligence forces on appropriate methods for counterterrorist operations against the terrorists deployed by the Lazard Freres-Rockefeller brothers-Jenkins combination. That is, we share your competence on the matter of dealing with terrorism and are disposed to supply such competence to aid the forces working against the fascist terrorism of the Baader-Meinhof and allied forces within

the industrialized capitalist nations. Let that be clearly understood.

In regular and partisan warfare, counterterrorism of the sort employed in the early struggles of the Soviet republic and the Yugoslav partisan struggles are unavoidable and necessary. In general, we accept the basic features of Lenin's doctrine on this issue.

The Kappler affair is a suitable example of precisely those instances in which terrorist activities are a criminal provocation. Acting directly against the orders of the Italian partisan command, a renegade group involving Allen Dulles' agent Georgio Amendola, launched an intentionally provocative terrorist action, which produced the predicted result in the top Nazi command. Despite Kappler's efforts to deflect the order, hostages were killed in reprisal for the terrorist act initiated with the complicity of OSS provocateur Amendola.

In Soviet doctrine for such matters, Amendola would have been tried and executed for his complicity in that provocation. On that point, Soviet doctrine commands our full support.

Amendola's role in the Kappler affair deserves comment.

As you know from consulting your archives, Georgio Amendola's father (and mother) were British intelligence agents from approximately 1905, originally deployed under the British intelligence cover known as the "Theosophy" circle. Georgii himself, associated with the anarchist southern branch of British intelligence, and still a British agent, flipped over into the Italian Communist organization in 1929, and thereafter went to Paris, where his eating habits were so disgraceful that the Comintern moved Amendola out into the countryside.

Not only was Amendola's father a British agent, but so was Enrico Berlinguer's father. Together with the British agent Einaudi, the elder Amendola and Berlinguer performed a crucial role in the British intelligence effort, in which Winston Churchill was prominent, bringing Benito Mussolini into power. The sons of the fathers have essentially the same political pedigree, Amendola becoming an Anglo-American agent around 1943, in connection with the Action Party of Italy project, also including Matteoli, Cuccia, Ugo LaMalfa, Riccardo Lombardi, and others. We also know, as you should, that Georgio Amendola and his "current," as well as the competing and loosely allied faction of Ingrao (the creator of "Il Manifesto"), have been under the strong influence of the U.S. Embassy in Rome and New York-London circles affiliated with the International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS) since at least the early 1960s.

You also know that by 1938, Anglo-American-Dutch intelligence had completely taken over the leadership of the Paris Comintern apparatus, an arrangement enhanced by cooperation between British intelligence and German Admiral Canaris, in arranging "selective escapes" to Lisbon, after the Fall of France in 1940. You also know that Santiago Carrillo is a second-generation Anglo-American intelligence agent, and that Lombardo Toledano was an American agent. You know that the "Eurocommunist" network, including the Arbatov and similar networks inside the socialist countries, is part of the same network as the Socialist International forces associated with Olof Palme, Willy Brandt, François

Mitterrand, Bettino Craxi, Riccardo Lombardi, and the League for Industrial Democracy in the USA. These heavily overlap the international networks "mothered" by the Washington, D.C. Institute for Policy Studies, which are heavily overlapped with the most rotten element of the British Labour Party, the circles around Roy Jenkins, Denis Healey, and Healey's protégé David Owen.

These networks provide the left cover for the terrorist and allied environmentalist networks.

This complex of networks is a political arm of the allied forces of Lazard Freres-centered investment banks and the Rockefeller brothers (Chase Manhattan, Exxon), which also control the so-called "Jewish Lobby" around the Joint Distribution Committee and B'nai B'rith in the United States, and are also masters of the Humphrey-Mondale-Americans for Democratic Action faction of the Democratic Party.

So that the alliance between Lazard Freres and the Rockefeller brothers should not be misunderstood, in an oversimplified way, the following qualification is interpolated. When the joint "naval forces" of the Lazard Freres and Rockefeller brothers go into battle, they aim their heavy weapons against a common foe, but meanwhile use their lighter weapons for shooting at each other. It is like a battleship whose heavy weapons are aimed at the common adversary, while factions of the crew shoot it out above and below decks for control of the bridge. The differences are illustrated by the differences between Kissinger and the Mondale crew. Kissinger's primary concern is control of OPEC petroleum, whereas Mondale's primary concern (to the extent that librium permits) is control over the government of Israel.

This overall control of international terrorism and environmentalist networks by Lazard Freres and the Rockefeller brothers can be understood only from the standpoint that terrorism and environmentalism are instruments of Rockefeller-Lazard Freres strategic political-economic policy. Terrorism and environmentalism, like regular warfare, are extensions of the political-economic policies of the forces which control the terrorists and environmentalists.

Granted, numerous nations and other forces have terrorist special-operations capabilities, just as many nations have regular military forces. The problem of terrorism is not presently a problem of terrorism in general, but of the deployment of the terrorist and environmentalist forces controlled by Lazard Freres and the Rockefeller brothers, the forces associated with Henry Kissinger, George Ball, Felix Rohatyn, Robert MacNamara, the IMF's fascist spokesman Witteveen, and controlling U.S. Vice-President Walter F. Mondale.

These are the forces putting the world on track toward global IMF-dictated fascist hyperinflationary austerity and total war, the forces responsible for the desertification of the Sahel, and forces responsible for present emergence of imminent global biological catastrophe in such forms as cholera epidemics in the Middle East.

The objectives of terrorism and environmentalism are to put Mitterrand into government in France, to destabilize the Helmut Schmidt government of West Germany, to bring down the Andreotti DC-PCI government (in fact) in Italy, in order to remove "nationalist" objectives to the

fascist (Schachtian) economic and social policies of the supranational financier forces grouped around Lazard Freres and the Rockefeller brothers.

The Portugal Case

The imminent scenario-operation for Portugal illustrates the sort of jungle into which a majority of the Soviet leadership has apparently wandered with such blind credulousness.

Portugal is one of the priority areas for which the London IISS and other NATO forces project an escalation of terrorism and other "disturbances" to the cumulative effect of launching what is called a NATO "stability operation" or "civic operation" into that nation, using NATO troops. A similar scenario is projected as essential for a "Chile solution" to Rockefeller-Lazard Freres problems in Italy. The political side of the operation is being run through the dirty side of the Socialist International, with Premier Soares's fascist austerity package the triggering issue and the economic policy objective of the overall operation.

Obviously, the fascist Soares package must be defeated. However, if the resistance takes the form of implicating the Communist Party of Portugal in suicidal provocations launched by forces allied with the Institute for Policy Studies and British dirty operations, then the resistance to the fascist package of the Socialist International's Soares is led into a prepared ambush.

We do not refer idly or speculatively to the Portugal case. We know what is planned for Portugal, and we have also watched closely the signals on this issue from Soviet and other leading socialist circles. Please do not waste your energies arguing that you understand the Portugal situation better than we do. You do not.

Your Problem In The Matter

Your potentially fatal political weakness in this matter, as the Portugal case illustrates, is that the majority of the Politburo at present has no competent strategic perspective for the OECD and related nations for the short to intermediate term. The failure of the illusory "détente" policy, of a kind of "popular front" with the "realistic" big financiers and their liberal and social-democratic protégés, has been an inevitable failure. Now that the liberals and the "left" social democracy have visibly gone over to supporting confrontationism and fascist economic and social policies, and the financiers around Lazard Freres and Chase Manhattan have revealed themselves to be on a confrontationist course, you have no developed strategic perspective in view but your admittedly excellent military-strategic policies. Apart from military-strategic policy, the majority of the Politburo has worse than no policy at all. You are floundering, like a fish left on the beach by the outgoing tides of détente.

Your problem is acute. In recent decades, your approaches to "peaceful coexistence" have been based on a concept of "deterrence." This has not been the doctrine of "deterrence" adopted by the Manhattan financial circles, but your own, different version of the point. You have sought mutually acceptable agreements of political security and economic cooperation with the industrialized capitalist countries, complicated by the conflicts

over national independence struggles in the developing sector. Politically, the conception of peaceful coexistence has been a delaying tactic, postponing war, attempting to decrease the risk of war, on the assumption that, over the long term, socialist transformations would begin to emerge within the industrialized capitalist nations. However, you have never put forward any positive practical perspective for relations between the socialist countries and the industrialized capitalist nations as a strategic perspective. You have never developed a competent perception of how socialist movements could be built within the capitalist sector, nor of what forms of capitalist development would be historically progressive in respect of global relations and the general welfare of humanity.

Consequently, in the industrialized capitalist sector, there are only two Communist Parties worth mentioning: the Communist Parties of Italy and France, as mass-based social forces capable of positive influence, plus the remarkable Communist Party of Portugal under the leadership of Cunhal. In the main, the Communist Parties of Italy and France are contaminated by large masses of political refuse, typified in the extreme by the Amendola circle. The viability in those parties as mass-based parties is located principally in the trade-union confederation sections of the party's membership, in the CGT and CGIL; the rest of the party membership in both cases is, in the main, wretched stuff.

What are the political capabilities of those two parties? At best, they are capable only of the tasks of an honest social-democratic party. They are not revolutionary organizations, but rather more or less honest and trustworthy labor parties, mass-based political organizations of the trade-union centered social forces. They are excellent forces, as the history of the Andreotti government has shown, for a reformist undertaking in alliance with capitalist political forces who are committed to technological progress in industrial and agricultural development.

This being the case, what would be the consequence of a partisan resistance by forces in Portugal according to the scenario now being set afoot? Portugal would resist. *Pravda* would cheer the heroes of the struggle. Portugal would be crushed by a massive NATO "stability operation" intervention. *Pravda* would wave the bloody shirt. In short, *adventurism*.

We are not pacifists in these matters. If Portugal were to mobilize to resist the Soares package, and if foreign invaders attempted to crush that resistance, we defend Portugal's people against the fascism of Lazard Freres and the Rockefeller brothers. However, it is insanity to look at such matters in terms of one nation at a time. Our policy is to strengthen Western continental Europe (e.g., France, West Germany, and Italy) around its efforts for a high-technology industrial and agricultural development policy, which is the only feasible basis in sight for defending those nations and also defending the economic and political development of the Iberian peninsula.

In saying that the majority of the Politburo is bankrupt in respect of present political-strategic perspectives toward the OECD nations, we are not being extravagant. We are well aware that leading forces within the CMEA countries have developed approaches of economic coop-

eration and accompanying political security agreements toward the OECD countries, especially those involving projected three-way economic cooperation among Western Europe, Japan, the developing sector, and the CMEA countries. Your military-strategic "last resort" is also excellently conceptualized to the best of our knowledge. You have the germs of a proper strategic-political perspective developed in respect of concrete economic-cooperation policies. You lack the political and class analysis needed to translate those sound economic cooperation policies into a political-strategic perspective.

Your problem is that you refuse to recognize that Giorgio Amendola and his allies are the enemies of the human race, as well as being your enemies in particular. You are duped into viewing Lazard Freres, the Rockefeller brothers, and the "left" Socialist International faction around Sicco Mansholt and Roy Jenkins as well as Willy Brandt, as the "lesser evil." Therefore, although your economic-cooperation perspectives represent the technical side of the proper strategic formulation, you refuse to systematically recognize which class forces in the OECD countries are your lawful potential partners in the political side of such economic cooperation.

The case of the leadership of the Communist Party USA is exemplary of your folly on this issue. The Soviet KGB and GRU both know that the leadership of the Communist Party USA is essentially an instrument of the Anglo-American intelligence faction associated with Lazard Freres and the Rockefeller brothers. They know that this arrangement was first formalized back in 1938, using elements of the U.S. State Department's Lovestoneite intelligence networks and others to constitute the kernel of what is known as the "KGB" unit within the leadership of that party today. This is the unit which, working with the USA-Canada section around Georgii Arbatov, works as a tool of the U.S. National Security Council in regulating the disinformation concerning the USA which is the basis for the political estimates made available to the Politburo and to Central Committee members.

As a result of this and related arrangements, with few and occasional exceptions everything published concerning the USA in the pages of *Pravda* and *Izvestia* is ridiculous garbage, with no connection at all to the actual internal realities of the USA. *Pravda* and *Izvestia*'s coverage of the USA would, with few happy exceptions, justly produce the laughter of ridicule from an average citizen on the street in the USA.

Yet, on one pretext or another, you cling to the myth that the CPUSA is a "brother party" and that "Gus Hall is a personal friend of Comrade Brezhnev." At the same time, you explain that it is important to maintain vital negotiating channels through the Institute for Policy Studies, Dartmouth Conference, and so forth.

Your coverage of West Germany on the "neo-Nazi" mythology is another instance of your being led around by your noses.

Soares pushes outright fascism for Portugal, and yet you regard Willy Brandt as a relatively positive bulwark against fascism in West Germany. On what basis do you arrive at such conclusions? From *Neue Zeit*, *Der Stern*, *Der Spiegel*, *Frankfurter Rundschau*, and so forth? Are

you still being taken in by Major Henry Kissinger's friend, S.K. Kaul, or the well-documented Wolfgang Abendroth? Don't you know the pedigree of those sources? Don't you know that, in the main, the networks deploying the terrorist and environmentalist apparatus and their sympathizers in West Germany are exactly the same intelligence networks which run much of the subversion operations into East Germany, Poland, and elsewhere in the socialist countries, including Yugoslavia?

Don't you know what Roy Jenkins and Sicco Mansholt are, what Henri Spaak was? Don't you know at this late date what Bertrand Russell was? What Jean-Paul Sartre is? What the World Council of Churches conduits? What B'nai B'rith really is?

Don't you know that the Basque and Corsican "separatist movements" are run by British intelligence, albeit with Manhattan policy-inputs from such sources as the circles around Lazard Freres? Don't you know that the lawyer who for years served as a link between the French Communist Party and Santiago Carrillo is part of the international terrorist network intersecting both Baader-Meinhof lawyer Klaus Croissant and the friends of Mitterrand? Don't you know that the Tavistock Institute is the mother organization for the operation known as the Socialist Patients' Collective, the Laingian lunatic-brainwashing project which contributed substantially to the Baader-Meinhof gang? Don't you know who Roy Jenkins is, and how the second generation was spawned by spinning off the operations originally associated with Jenkins into a common pool with entities such as the London Institute of Race Relations?

Don't you realize that these terrorists and environmentalists are being deployed against those social forces of industry and the trade unions who are the social basis for the kinds of economic cooperation the CMEA nations are seeking? Don't you realize that these terrorists and their sympathizers are nothing but the tools of your enemies, being deployed in the effort to crush those who seek peaceful economic cooperation with the CMEA countries?

Is there then any legitimate basis for objecting to the judgment that the Politburo majority is presently bankrupt in respect of political-strategic policy?

The Soviets And Terrorism

How long are you going to permit Lazard Freres and the Rockefeller brothers to dictate Soviet policy on these matters?

Do not attempt to brush off our charges to the effect that you have foolishly permitted Lazard Freres et al. to implicate you in international terrorism. The cited case of Michel Raptis-Pablo is only one of the numerous direct evidences we have of this matter according to our own independent knowledge. Havana, credulously maintaining relations with Paul M. Sweezy, Leonard Boudin, and various other professed Cuban enthusiasts, has been one of the principal "dipping places" into which the neo-Fabian intelligence networks have processed their terrorists for purposes of political cooperation since the early 1960s. Havana is obscenely credulous on the Puerto Rican question, giving credence to "left-CIA" operations

such as MIRA and the FALN offshoot of MIRA. We have masses of proof on this matter.

Not only Havana. For years, the Stockholm-Prague-Havana run was a majority traffic for neo-Fabian "left-CIA" networks associated with Noam Chomsky and others. What press, among others, puffs Philip Agee as some sort of honest this-or-that? That treatment of Agee, is not merely a mistake; from the standpoint of the most elementary counterintelligence work, it is an outright imbecility of the KGB to fail to correct the knowledge of the Soviet leadership on this matter. We have the facts, including a correspondence file of one Michel Vale, to document this.

Then, there was the Bertrand Russell War Crimes Tribunal. Are you still duped by that operation? Is Marshal Tito perhaps duped by it?

Worse, we have your behavior during the period since June 1977. At the same time that Lazard Freres and its associates launched the current escalation of international terrorism, *Pravda*, *Izvestia*, and *New Times* came out on cue peddling the propaganda originating from circles associated with the U.S. National Security Council and Henry Kissinger's offices at Chase Manhattan Bank.

Your intelligence networks are informed that U.S. Labor Party presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. was targeted for assassination in the same batch of victims as Jürgen Ponto. This hit order against LaRouche was accompanied by a planted wave of articles setting LaRouche up for the hit by slandering him as a fascist on various pretexts, including chiefly his opposition to terrorism and his association with the effort to establish a new world economic order. At the same time the initial batch of this terrorist propaganda was released, the *New Times* ran an "ice-box" article into which the terrorist slander against LaRouche was arbitrarily inserted—and the mention of LaRouche omitted in another version of the very same ice-box article.

That is an example of how direct and immediate a control over sections of the Soviet leadership is exerted by the Rockefeller-Lazard factions of the U.S. National Security Council.

We know how that endorsement of LaRouche's assassination was conduited into the pages of *New Times*. Georgii Arbatov, extraordinary agent of the mortal enemies of the Soviet Union, heads up the conduit.

Similarly, review the way in which you covered the assassination of Jürgen Ponto. Look at the obscene manner in which you have covered the kidnapping (and probably, murder) of Hanns-Martin Schleyer. Look over the paranoid character of East German radio's coverage of such issues during this period, even discounting for known "submarines" in certain parts of the East German apparatus.

Don't you see the folly into which you have been manipulated by Lazard Freres, et al.? Wake up before it is too late!!

The Total War Danger

Already, Trilateral Commission graduate Richard Gardner, the U.S. Ambassador to Rome, is busily circulating rumors throughout leading and other circles in Italy, reporting that the Soviet Union is responsible for

terrorism. Since highly placed intelligence agencies have proof that significant numbers of terrorists have enjoyed safe passage and other accommodations in socialist countries, Gardner's propaganda is very dangerous stuff.

If you continue on the stupid course into which you have been lured by Lazard Freres, et al. on this terrorism issue, it will not be difficult for the Kissingers, et al. to whip up a frenzy against the Soviet Union among a population desperately enraged by the climate of fear terrorism engenders. That mood is precisely the circumstance under which confrontations provoking outbreak of total war become politically possible in Western Europe and the United States. Can you not see this important connection? Are you so stubbornly foolish on this question that you will continue to refuse to correct a major error?

We know, and responsible intelligence and security agencies agree with us, that terrorism is principally generated by the supranational financier forces we have named, with aid of the corrupt currents of the Socialist International and the dirtiest elements of British intelligence. They know, as we do, that the Soviet leadership majority has merely allowed itself to be contaminated

with this problem through its own blind stupidity on certain issues.

We know this, but the enemy controls the key press. Lazard Freres controls the *Washington Post* and Paris *le Monde*. *The New York Times*, *Newsweek*, *Le Matin* *Le Nouvel Observateur*, *Libération*, the Lazard Freres Cuccia-controlled press in Italy, the Agnelli-controlled press in Italy, and named publications in West Germany as well as the London *Times*, and so forth, largely influence liberal and other opinion in the relevant nations. If you continue to be so foolishly duped as to continue to give "critical support" to terrorists, to turn blind eyes to terrorists' safe passages through socialist countries, and so forth, it will be most difficult for those of us who are responsible to offset the propaganda of the enemy-controlled press such as the *Washington Post* and *Le Monde*.

You must denounce the fascist terrorists such as the Baader-Meinhof, the Red Brigades, the FALN, and their "sympathizers" for the fascist tools of Lazard Freres and Chase Manhattan they are. You must offer cooperation to the nations which are attempting to control this evil.

If you are really concerned to prevent total war, you will correct the indicated errors, and most quickly.

Lazard Freres Launch Assassins Against Soviet Military Personnel

The following press release was issued on Aug. 14 by the U.S. Labor Party security staff.

In a parody of Admiral Canaris role for British intelligence in the Tukachevsky affair, top-level Anglo-American intelligence networks collaborating with Lazard Freres and the Rockefeller brothers have activated their own assassins plus a wave of "Arbatov agents" within Eastbloc security and intelligence circles for a wave of assassins targetting the infrastructure of the Soviet military intelligence, the GRU.

The report was received by U.S. Labor Party Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., by special channels of communication to his present location in Wiesbaden, West Germany. Independently, corroborating reports were received by Labor Party security in New York City yesterday afternoon. Double-checks of vital points of corroborating intelligence have been completed.

The information received indicates that U.S. Central Intelligence chief Admiral Stansfield Turner is among the persons knowledgeably complicit in this dangerous operation. It is also known that a headline above an otherwise silly article, "Kill the Crocodile," appearing in the *New York Times* was one of the code-signals activating the assassination operation.

The purpose of the operation is well known. It is the basic strategy of Henry Kissinger and other relevant persons that the Soviet leadership will backdown before a sharp thermonuclear confrontation-threat on condition

that the Soviet military command influence on the Soviet Politburo and Central Committee is neutralized, and that factions allied with the patrons of Rockefeller agent-of-influence Georgii Arbatov are effectively influential at top Soviet levels under conditions of a massive replay of the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis.

It is our information that the projected confrontation is being planned for an early date by the factions aligned with Lazard Freres and the Rockefeller brothers. This is corroborated by the past week's close check with top USA banking circles, who report that the Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank and the group of Lazard Freres-centered investment banks uneasily allied with the Rockefeller brothers are on the verge of collapse. It is doubted that those fabulously-leveraged banking institutions could survive the effects of the third-quarter closing without some most extraordinary change in the world situation. This is confirmed by undercover investigations, through cut-outs, of the thinking among Lazard and Rockefeller brothers circles. They are in a state of manic hysteria.

The Canaris Case

Contrary to the cover-story supplied by the recent best-seller, *A Man Called Intrepid*, the top British intelligence secret of World War II was the fact that Admiral Canaris was to all notable effects an agent of British intelligence networks associated with Winston Churchill and the Royal Family. Notably, the key point of the cited best-