

Open Letter to William Brock

Some Republicans Have Lousy Intelligence Sources

The following statement was issued Oct. 7 by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., chairman of the U.S. Labor Party.

The statement by Republican National Committee spokesman William Brock, wildly asserting that the Carter Administration "is reviving a role in the Geneva talks for Russia," shows what a miserably incompetent quality of political intelligence information pours into key Republican — and some other — circles.

First of all, if Mr. Brock had been following even the press headlines during recent weeks, he would recall Prime Minister Menachem Begin's recent visit to Romania, and would recall that Israel welcomed a Romanian effort at mediation in the dangerous Middle East situation. Mr. Brock would also note that Mr. Begin has had some harsh things to say concerning the London *Times*. Mr. Brock would also note that following Mr. Begin's successful visit to Bucharest, France's Prime Minister Barre held extended talks with the White House, and that it was in this context that abrupt progress in talks with Mr. Andrei Gromyko occurred.

Second, Mr. Brock seems not to know the nature of longstanding relations between Moscow and Israel. Underneath the rhetoric, and behind the facade of a break in formal diplomatic relations between Israel and Moscow, Soviet policy toward Israel has been consistent at bottom since the Soviet Union first sponsored the United Nations resolution establishing the independence of a state of Israel. A number of Israel's leading figures have stressed the importance of that Soviet policy-doctrine concerning Israel both directly to me, in one significant instance, and otherwise to my closest associates. Every leading Israeli political figure thoroughly understands the nature and the political algebra of this long-standing Soviet policy-doctrine, and many of these Israeli leaders have regarded that Soviet doctrine as Israel's hidden asset — the joker — to be deployed into the game whenever Washington failed to provide Israel the sort of political assistance Israel urgently required.

Third, if Mr. Brock believes gossip to the effect that the Soviets were somehow "out of the Middle East," he has been taken in by the sort of fairy-tales Senator Henry Jackson peddles. Granted, the nature of Soviet influence in the region is far more complex than the editors of the *New York Daily News* might be able to comprehend, and

is a kind of influence which has undergone shifts in character and forms since 1967. However, if Mr. Brock were competently informed as to how matters actually operate from Capetown to Alma Ata and Istanbul, he could not have been guilty of so incompetent an observation as was recently seen in his public criticism of the White House on the Carter-Gromyko joint statement and Mr. Carter's United Nations address.

I suggest to Mr. Brock and others that they take into account the Soviet role in the Gulf area — a matter which has much exercised James R. Schlesinger, and which earlier evoked high excitement in Mr. Kissinger's State Department and the Brookings Institution. I also address Mr. Brock's attention to recent developments in Sudan, both in that country's internal affairs, and its shift in relation to both Ethiopia and Libya.

Fourth, Mr. Brock has acted with manifest ignorance of the constellation of forces immediately acting upon himself and his immediate associates, forces which include Vice President Mondale, Patricia Harris, Secretary Blumenthal, James R. Schlesinger, and of course the so-called Jewish Lobby. I do not know to what extent Admiral Stansfield Turner may be cooperating with those forces, or, alternatively, being governed by a sense of loyalty to President Carter, but of the wretched role of Mr. William Buckley's cronies, including Richard "fifty per center" Viguerie, I have no doubts.

To illustrate the latter problem, I propose to Mr. Brock that he state what he currently believes to be the extent of Mexico's accessible petroleum and natural gas reserves? I raise that point because the nonsensical depreciation of the extent of those reserves has been credulously swallowed by numerous Republicans and others. Does Mr. Brock know that in terms of known petroleum, natural gas, phosphate and uranium reserves, Mexico is one of the major "natural resources" powers in the world? Does Mr. Brock understand how false information circulated among his associates concerning Mexican natural resources helps to put U.S.-Mexican policy on a track contrary to the mutual interests of Mexico and the USA?

When is the Republican National Committee going to learn to discount disinformational garbage from indicated channels and to develop for itself a reliable set of intelligence sources?

The Strategic Situation

I offer Mr. Brock and others the following profile of the current strategic situation. I begin by outlining the general configuration of principal global forces, concentrating on ABCs. This simplification serves the double purpose of starting from the visible level of briefings-education enjoyed by Mr. Brock's associates, and also providing the sort of summary useful to the intelligent ordinary man in the street.

All basic analysis of the strategic correlation of political and related forces in the world begins with an identification of the following principal elements:

1. *The two great powers, the United States and the Soviet Union.*

All relations among states throughout the world center about this two great-power configuration, and there is no crisis in any nation, however specific or small, which does not in some important way intersect that great-power configuration.

2. *The Republic of China.*

With aid of Anglo-American political intelligence penetration in depth of the Communist Party of China, the peasant ideology within China has been grossly enhanced, to the effect of bringing forward an intensely racist impulse of "Great Han" national chauvinism. China bitterly hates the United States, and sees the United States as having been successful in containment of China, beginning with the Indonesia coup of October-November 1965 and continuing through the direct and indirect consequences of the protracted U.S. war in Indochina. China's basic foreign policy is to attempt to break out of that containment by fostering general war preconditions between the United States and USSR.

China's long-term policy to date continues to be the former policy of "the countryside encircling the cities" on a global scale. The failure of the Maoist strategy of "national liberation struggles" of the 1950s and early-through-middle 1960s has "taught" Peking that those struggles cannot succeed in face of the constellation of industrialized nations' power represented by the Warsaw Pact and OECD nations. Hence, Peking has gone over, most notably since the spring and summer of 1966, toward a policy of placing China's power in the balance between the two great powers in such a way as to favor the mutual ruination of both the NATO and Warsaw Pact powers.

3. *The potential for the reemergence of an Adenauer-De Gaulle power bloc of western continental European and (possibly) Japanese forces.*

This force is the natural strategic primary ally of the United States around a policy of global high-technology industrial and agricultural expansion in a capital-intensive mode.

4. *A supranational bloc of monetarist and their political intelligence forces centered in the City of London and extended internationally principally through such components of the London Round Table and Inter-*

national Institute of Strategic Studies as Lazard Freres.

The Fabian and neo-Fabian liberal-radical constellations inside the United States, featuring the so-called Jewish Lobby and the Institute for Policy Studies and its international networks, are the principal U.S. component of that British-centered network. That same British faction is otherwise centered in the neo-Fabian wing of the Socialist International, and the "Eurocommunist" subsidiary of the Socialist International. This is the command structure which runs the overwhelming bulk of environmentalism and international terrorism today, including the proterrorist factions of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the latter terrorists operating with participating complicity by elements of Israeli intelligence.

In general, the underlying configuration on economic-policy issues is an alliance of the anti-Fabian forces against the London-Peking axis. Concerning the issues of global economic policies, the factions in the United States committed to American traditions are in de facto potential strategic alliance with France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, and the Soviet Union, against the London-Peking axis. That may profoundly shock Mr. Brock and others, but that, contrary to headlines of the *Washington Post*, *New York Times*, and *New York Post*, happens to be reality.

To put the same point in another way, there is a fundamental dissymmetry in global power relations. On the one side there is the now-traditional adversary relationship between NATO and Warsaw Pact forces. This is not primarily but only in a tertiary sense a conflict between capitalism and communism. Primarily, the conflict is a great power conflict, in which the substance of the matter is the struggle to strengthen the political and military-strategic correlations of forces at the established adversary's expense on the same accounts. On the other side, there is agreement among the United States, France, West Germany, Japan, and the CMEA nations on the issues of prevailing global economic policy. This was understood, and in the broad sense correctly, by the late Charles de Gaulle, and is a predominant trend of policy outlooks organic to industrialist political forces in France, Italy, Luxemburg, West Germany, and Denmark.

This dissymmetry in the strategic situation promotes a corresponding "schizophrenia" of the sort plainly visible at present in France, West Germany, and Italy. Like the protechnology political currents in the U.S., the cited forces in Europe are concerned to maintain credible margins of political-military strategic advantage relative to Warsaw Pact forces, while simultaneously pursuing economic cooperation concerning global policies with the CMEA facet of the Warsaw Pact.

Hence, the essential art of politics which must be mastered by the White House and Congress at this crucial juncture is to recognize that reality of the dissymmetry without falling prey to the "schizophrenic" potentialities of that most ironical arrangement. Put otherwise, the task facing the White House, the Congress and relevant other leading institutions, is to be the master, not the victim of that dissymmetry in the problem before us.

The Communism Issue

For reasons developed in my *The Case of Walter Lippmann*, communism is not and could not be a substantial issue between the principal powers. The mass communist parties of Italy and France are essentially social democracies, organically impelled toward programmatic political alliances with Christian Democratic and Gaullist political representatives of industrial interest in those nations. Otherwise, excepting some very tiny Communist Parties, the Communist Parties of the OECD nations are nothing but a bad joke which communism has played upon itself. In many cases, such as the Communist Party USA, the Communist Party of Mexico, and elsewhere, the Communist Parties are predominantly under the ideological and practical control of intelligence agencies of the OECD nations, principally the combined forces of British intelligence and the U.S. neo-Fabians, working predominantly through channels of the Socialist International.

This prevailing impotence of communism is best understood by pinpointing the reasons the Bolshevik and Cuban revolutions succeeded despite the predominant flaws in the ideologies of the Russian and Cuban Communists. In both instances, the Communists prevailed because native capitalist forces and those forces' foreign allies blocked primary objectives otherwise identical with those of the American Revolution. In short, communism as defined by "Marxism-Leninism" succeeds only in exceptional cases, exceptions which arise only where no one but the communists acts as a credible force for the development of republican forms otherwise characteristic of industrial-capitalist development. For that reason, communist forces are endemically a potential force within the developing sector, and correspondingly have been intellectually and politically impotent over the past six decades in the industrialized sector.

However, especially in the developing sector, and for the same general reasons, political organizations oriented to Moscow intellectually are a significant element in the interplay of great-power encounters.

Hence, apart from habituated verbal posturings, it is emphatically correct to state that the communism issue is in fact only a tertiary feature of the principal great-power conflicts.

Ironically, the same logic governs the complementary feature of the dissymmetry. Although communist states are distinct from industrial-capitalist states in respect of the political form of ownership of basic means of production and distribution, otherwise they have identical internal economic-policy impulses: technological progress in industrial and agricultural expansion involving high rates of capital formation. This internal impulse leads, if consistently expressed, to a common interest in high-technology global economic policies.

It should be added that on the Soviet side that impulse toward economic cooperation within the continued adversary relationship is actively sabotaged, with varying effectiveness, by the Soviet and East Bloc currents associated with Georgii Arbatov and Arbatov's patrons.

At the moment, Arbatov and his ilk are following policies which exactly dovetail with those of the British MI-6 and related forces in their efforts to sabotage the progress of Soviet-West German economic cooperation discussions.

As I have noted in other published locations, the Arbatov impulse has three elements of the primary importance.

Firstly, in pedigree, Arbatov and his patrons are de facto British intelligence agents-of-influence within the East Bloc, and hence the current dovetailing of Arbatovian and MI-6 policies concerning West Germany is no coincidence. It should be emphasized that British Intelligence is used here both explicitly and generically, including, in its latter aspect, the Lazard Freres and allied networks inside the U.S., including the neo-Fabian Institute for Policy Studies networks.

Secondly, Arbatov and his known associates are proceeding from an expressed inner conviction. They are Orwellian Malthusians of the same "British philosophical radicalism outlook otherwise manifest by Karl Korsch or by Roy Jenkins et al., although of a communist variety. If a fascist transformation of the Soviet Union were possible, it would be forces of Mr. Arbatov's outlook who would lead it.

Thirdly, apart from the Arbatovians, there are Soviet nationalists who otherwise reject Arbatov's ideology, who foolishly gloat over environmentalist and terrorist destabilization and weakening of the NATO countries. This is an expression of Soviet national-chauvinist ("Oblomovist") tendencies which are mildly analogous to the "Great Han" lunacy radiating from Peking.

U.S. Military Strategy

An excellent example of the problem of "schizophrenia" is the folly of Defense Secretary Harold Brown in attempting to give notoriety to the development of U.S. weapons-systems.

Just as the Soviets are proceeding rapidly with the development of new generations of weapons systems, in both the deployment and pre-deployment phases, there is no basis for proposing that the U.S. turn away from research and development in these areas. It is one thing to quietly proceed with such work, and another to make great diplomatic noises concerning such research and development activity. This applies to the so-called neutron bomb. The neutron bomb is a product of a useful area of research, research which has all sorts of applications. This is quite apart from the strategic value of such a weapon, on which accounts the public pronouncements to date are properly subject to a morbid sort of ridiculing laughter. It is also quite apart from making a great diplomatic public-relations fuss over neutron bomb deployment, foolish chatter which aborts progress in diplomatic matters on all fronts.

I am not pushing preparations for war with the Warsaw Pact, I am merely stressing two realities. Most immediately, as long as the potential-adversary relations continues to be institutionalized policy, consequences follow in all areas of domestic and foreign policy. It would be infantile pacifism to pretend otherwise. More broadly, as long as we must have military weapons research, let us have the benefits of genuine research on the broadest basis. Everyone with brains

functioning knows that both we and the Soviets are so engaged: it is not necessary to introduce this theme in a reckless, wild manner on each Tuesday morning from the public relations office of the Defense Department.

The idea that military capabilities cause wars is the sort of nonsense one might expect from the evil Bertrand Russell. However, if the U.S. Secretary of Defense runs around like an hysterical common gossip, announcing new "wonder weapons" Goebbels-fashion, that is quite a different matter.

I set forth the gist of proper United States weapons policy in my remarks, submitted to the Congress, commenting on General George Brown's report earlier this year. Those remarks could be considerably amplified, but the essential point remains valid for the present and the foreseeable immediate future. As to the political solution to this situation, I believe my pertinent observations in *The Case of Walter Lippmann* suffice.

The Immediate Issue

At this point, we should turn our attention back to the immediate implications of Mr. Brock's unfortunate form of criticism of President Carter.

Immediately, the United States is confronted by a threatened collapse of the U.S. dollar. Although this collapse threat is the culmination of many problems and follies from inside the U.S. itself, especially over the past ten years since the sterling devaluation of November 1967, the immediate threat originates with the City of London and complicit U.S. circles, involved in for U.S. citizens, an unpatriotic exercise bordering upon treason.

During the next 30 days, the White House's and Congress's principal attentions ought to be focused on immediate remedies for the threatened collapse. During this period, it is of considerable importance that the Middle East situation be stabilized, and that improvements be secured in the dangerous situation in South Africa. Whatever the shortcomings within Mr. Carter's approach to a Geneva Summit, his agreements with Foreign Minister Gromyko, made possible by Prime Minister Begin and fostered by Prime Minister Barre, represent the first major foreign-policy accomplishment of the Carter Administration, with benefits on many fronts, and at worst represents a context in which the Middle East situation can be stabilized over the immediate weeks ahead.

As you know, the U.S. Labor Party has had much stronger criticisms of the Carter Administration overall than have been forthcoming from the Republican National Committee. However, when that Administration acts in vital U.S. national interests one would think it the duty of all leading citizens to act in accordance with U.S. interests on such a matter. On such grounds, the U.S. Labor Party and numbers of both Republicans and Democrats came around to vigorously defend Bert Lance from the neo-Fabian gangsters because Lance's policies, against the lunatic policies of those who launched the calumny against him, were relatively in the vital best interests of the United States.

Instead, by a process involving Israeli Foreign Minister Dayan, the "Jewish Lobby," Schlesinger, Blumenthal, Senator Jackson and others—members of

the Republican National Committee who ought to have known better—allow themselves to be manipulated into acting as virtual pawns of the same crowd of London-centered forces acting to collapse the U.S. dollar. More or less, as Governor Connally has correctly observed, too many Republican National Committee members allow themselves to be manipulated into sideshows of gossip-mongering and imagined short-term Byzantine deals to petty advantage. Rather than basing commitments on fundamental policy issues, the essence of this pathetic manipulation of the Republican National Committees' members is epitomized by the case of Richard "fifty per center" Viguerie.

With France, Germany and Israeli radio now praising certain of the crucial first-fruits of Mr. Carter's foreign policy success—including Palestine Liberation Organization steps toward recognizing Israel—members of the Republican National Committee line up against Israel's chances for peace with those members of the "Jewish Lobby"—neither Israeli citizens nor among those Israelis who will bear the consequences of a new war—who don't like the majority-based government of Israel's Prime Minister Begin.

You align yourselves with those London-centered forces who are engaged in an attempted minority-based coup d'etat against the legitimate government of Israel, and whose only policy for the Middle East is a new holocaust capable of triggering general thermonuclear war. In fact, you offer no policy as an alternative to the White House's, and could not: as I know, *the present Republican National Committee has no Middle East policy.*

In fact, the Republican National Committee not only has no Middle East policy worth mentioning (only a collection of useless shibboleths), but also no energy policy, no monetary policy, and no foreign policy but the expressed hope, by some that Mr. Kissinger will permanently retire, and by others that he will prove capable of producing a policy for the Republican National Committee. Of course, there are prominent Republicans and Democratic leaders who have some elements of a policy on important questions, and an openness toward quickly acquiring a policy as well as some good instincts for that purpose.

It is notable that Nelson A. Rockefeller has made some open gestures in the direction of an energy policy, centering around his public interchange with Senator Russell Long. Overlooking the errors of omission and commission in Mr. Rockefeller's proposals to date, the philosophy he expressed—stopping the degradation of the U.S. into pastoral impotence by turning to policies of energy production—ought to be used at least as a point of reference for discussions at this juncture.

As you know, Mr. Rockefeller, like the Carter Administration, has not been exactly the cynosure of the U.S. Labor Party to date. However, when the White House and Mr. Rockefeller variously move in positive directions in behalf of vital national interests, we are not such "subjective" fools as to do anything but intervene to encourage such happy deployments. The Republican National Committee ought to be guided, we think, by similar perceptions.

What is needed right now? This weekend, this coming week?

We have to stop a breaking of the U.S. dollar, breaking of the dollar by London-centered forces to which Lazard, the "Jewish Lobby," et al. are directly allied. To this end, we have only one workable economic weapon, the marvelous reserve economic power of U.S. industry and agriculture.

Our vulnerability is not chiefly the flow of Arab funds through the City of London. Our vulnerability is the fact that we are generating unprecedented deficits on foreign exchange balance, deficits supported neither by gold reserves nor by tangible-goods exports.

This would be aided by moving in alliance with France toward a gold-reserve policy based on the current (and upward-moving) current market value of gold. However, a gold policy by itself would be a gesture in futility, albeit a golden gesture.

We need to turn loose the export-potentials of our idled industrial-output capacity and our agricultural capacities. By flooding the world market with the high-technology products in which the U.S. has the greatest potential competitiveness, we can make the U.S. dollar the most desired trading-currency in the world once again, and we could do it like turning on a dime.

If we take preliminary steps in that direction during the 30 days immediately ahead, and on condition that we mobilize forces now around a commitment to a short-term objective, we win. If we do not, the United States loses miserably to the City of London.

Although France, West Germany and Japan have the nucleus of a substantial nuclear-energy export program, only the United States commands the magnitude of productive and related resources to launch nuclear-energy exports on the scale immediately required. We could immediately establish an entity, modeled legally on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, on the committed magnitude of between \$50 to \$100 billions — as an initial slug. This export effort should be undertaken in direct cooperation with France, West Germany, and Japan as keystone partners for the broad effort.

Our objective should be reaching over the immediate years ahead a level of thousands of gigawatts capacity starts in both nuclear-energy facilities and grid-systems each year, forseeing this nuclear thrust as laying the necessary basis for addition of combined fission-fusion and fusion energy production coming on line during the 1980s and 1990s.

If Mr. Brock and his associates will inform themselves of the bills of materials and process-sheet requirements for nuclear energy installations scaled up to the indicated order of magnitude, they will note the massive requirements for specialty-steel and other basic industry inputs. Such a combined nuclear energy plant and grid-system package, on such a scale, is the basis for a massive recapitalization of those upstream industries, and is, through multiplier effects, the obvious immediate solution to the unemployment and related economic problems of the United States.

Such a program would not be a charitable outlay, and inflationary WPA-type boondoggle, or an inflationary stimulus. Provided expanded energy-production is properly applied to the development of economies, it is the soundest long-term investment imaginable. By increasing the available cheap and useful energy available per capita for production, we multiply the productivities

of employed labor through the more advanced productive technologies this makes possible.

The basic policies of the OECD countries, under such a U.S. initiative, would turn around into directions already demanded by France, West Germany, Japan, and others, and also desired by many developing-sector nations. Nuclear and other modern energy systems, plus other high-technology capital goods and engineering, is swap for petroleum and other primary commodities.

Under those conditions, U.S. dollars become the most desirable possessions of other countries once again. Even the smell of such a policy coming down the White House and Congressional ways would shift the policy of every nation concerning dollar holdings and valuations.

For example, Mexico. Mexico has vast reserves of petroleum, natural gas, uranium, and phosphates. By pouring U.S. technology into Mexico, through agreements made with the Mexican government to this effect, U.S. investments will attract matching dollar-balances from other nations into these undertakings, enabling increased Mexican output to bring its own foreign exchange balance into a favourable position, with significant beneficial flow into the U.S. itself.

Colombia has vast natural resources for development. The Rio de la Plata potential is one of the greatest opportunities for combined quick results in industry and agriculture in a hungry world. The game Ambassador Young is playing with the British in Southern Africa is violently contrary to vital U.S. interests in that region, including our interest in peace. We require a direct settlement for the region among the Republic of South Africa with Angola, Mozambique and other states, a settlement which is possible on the basis of regional high-technology cooperation for development.

The great nation of India, despite the predictably miserable failure of Ford Foundation, World Bank, and International Monetary Fund policies in that nation, has vast potentials under a high-technology development program.

No nation but the United States has the margin of productive potential to fulfill the needs represented by immediate, viable opportunities of that sort. Let us then, get on with it. The looming dollar crash allows us no more time for Naderism and shilly-shallying.

The issue—the fundamental issue—before the United States and the world today is whether the American System or the fungus-covered British System will dominate the world's monetary and economic order. We need only turn the American System loose—the system founded by Benjamin Franklin and his collaborators, the system based on the principle of developing a mighty outpouring of real wealth through the promotion of science and technology as the lever for vastly increasing the productive powers of labor. That is America's fundamental strength and its fundamental weapon. Now is the time to use it, to bring the rule of the fungus-covered British System to an end.

We must do it now, or the dollar is headed for a bust.

We need time, free of other distractions, free of the threat of a Middle East war, to get that underway during the days and several weeks immediately ahead. Any other policy, any other course, is despicable nonsense.

Know this, Mr. Brock. If the United States and Soviet Union are agreed on enforcing peace in the Middle East,

with support from France, West Germany, and Italy, neither London nor all the Sheiks of Araby, nor all the hysterics of the London-influenced "Jewish Lobby," have the power to dare to launch a war against that combined firm intent.

Granted, if we pursue such a course, as we must, the City of London will collapse. No matter: at this juncture, that would be the greatest boon we could give to the British people. U.S. and continental European credit,

under conditions of global economic recovery, would follow Mr. Henry Ford's example, and not permit the productive potentials of even the presently-creaking British economy to go to waste.

Think clearly, Mr. Brock: think tough, Mr. Brock. The sort of soft, muddleheaded retailing of disinformation reflected in your recent statement are not the quality of which effective national leadership is made.