

3. British Promise East Europe Uprisings To Reduce Pressure On Israel

Warns LaRouche: This could instead bring on World War III

British intelligence networks are currently saturating many nations' intelligence services with the planted disinformation that the Soviets will not be able to honor their military commitments to Syria during an Israeli attack now scheduled and being deployed to occur during early September. This widely circulated disinformation is intended to reduce anti-adventurist political pressure on Israel from the Carter Administration and from Western European governments.

The reason given for Soviet inaction in defense of Syria is this. It is reported in many capitals that the British have insurrections in Yugoslavia, Hungary, and other eastern European nations timed to erupt in coordination with an Israeli assault on Syrian military forces. The recent trip of Peking's Hua to Romania, Yugoslavia, and Iran is viewed as part of the preparations for such insurrections, as part of Peking's current alliance with Israel and Britain.

The argument used in connection with the cited rumor is that the British will launch Eastern European insurrections just as they launched the 1956 insurrection in Hungary, then as part of the pattern of the strategic crisis operations coordinate with joint British, French and Israeli attacks upon Egypt during the period of the Suez crisis.

Such arguments are being circulated from intelligence into legislative, party and other circles in various NATO and developing nations, and have been in such extended circulation to our knowledge for about two weeks. The point of the argument is that: "Since nuclear armed Israeli forces will succeed in this enterprise, there is no general-war risk incurred sufficient to require additional pressure against the Israeli government at this time."

Maltese Eastern European Networks

It is true that the British-Maltese-Zionist networks penetrating Eastern Europe have a monstrous destabilization capability in Yugoslavia, very significant potentialities of undetermined exact capabilities

disturbance capabilities in all Eastern European nations, excepting Bulgaria and the Soviet Union. However, it is known that a Macedonian nationalist project is afoot against both Greece and Bulgaria, with Peking co-sponsorship. The British-Maltese-Zionist networks do have the capability to launch

disturbances in Eastern Europe at the same time as an Israeli attack on Syrian forces.

It is also true that this capability and these networks are known to Soviet security services. Current Eastern European military circles published warnings against Zbigniew Brzezinski are code designations for precisely those known Eastern European networks.

In such a case, the "Brezhnev doctrine" will be immediately and ruthlessly enforced, and Soviet determination to punish and weaken the current Israeli government and its conspirators will be intensified beyond all precedents.

Most emphatically, the simultaneous effort to "ring" the Soviet Union with total containment and with destabilizations in Eastern Europe is regarded as one of the specific combinations at which the Soviet command contemplates risking total thermonuclear war to eliminate such threats. The logic of the 1962 missile crisis is of relatively modest implications, in comparison with the lunatic gambles of the promoters of the cited rumors.

Soviet Reaction

The general order of warfare between Soviet and USA-NATO forces for World War III is known in advance. The nature of thermonuclear warfare excludes any significant variations from that known order. The order of Soviet strategic responses to an Israeli assault on Syrian forces is not so precisely predeterminable. The Soviet command does have a range of options for that case.

Consequently, it would be nonsense to argue that disturbances in Eastern Europe would not influence Soviet policy for an Israeli attack on Syrian forces. All Soviet policies for conflicts short of preconditions for general war are shaped by a Soviet determination to avoid general war *if possible*. Thus, while the Soviets will under no circumstances neglect full honoring of their military pact with Syria, the exact combination of means they will employ in support of that military treaty, and the exact order of timing of each implementation is open to adjustments.

What the deceived persons swallowing the cited rumors overlook is the factor of Soviet perception of the strategic significance of an Israeli attack upon Syrian forces. When such an Israeli military adventure is made coincident with either uprisings in Eastern Europe, or with credible threat of such

uprisings, and when, at the same time, the principal strategic target of the Israel military adventure is the Bremen EEC agreements of July 1978 and related aspects of the Bonn 1978 agreements among Giscard, Schmidt, Carter, and others, the Soviets must tend to regard the Israeli adventure as a de facto commitment of the British and British-allied USA and NATO factions to general thermonuclear war during the immediate future to some point during the medium term.

This does not mean that the Soviets view USA-NATO factions indicated as being committed consciously to actual war fighting. Rather, it represents a policy and tempo of commitments by British-Maltese forces, a scenario which forces the powers to the point of general war.

I see no possibility that the Soviets will react blindly. They will tend not to undercut the efforts of Giscard or Schmidt to find a peaceful solution, and will honor the policies instituted by the Vatican under Pope Paul VI. Furthermore, to the extent they adequately understand the internal dynamics of the United States, they will attempt to follow paths which enable President Carter and rational forces around Carter to extricate the United States government from the British-Maltese policy-grip.

However, the Soviet capability of following a subtly-differentiated war-avoidance course should not be overestimated. The leading Soviet circles fought in World War II, during which the nation suffered a casualty-rate of upwards of 30 percent in combined people-material destruction. This is approximately the destruction they expect their nation to suffer in general war. Their strategic military policy and capability has been developed to solely one purpose since the 1962 missile crisis; to win general thermonuclear war if the Soviet and allied forces are either attacked, or the Soviet strategic defense capability (the geopolitical combination) can not be maintained except by bold actions which confront NATO forces with the alternatives of back-down or general war.

The immediate danger is that the USA, under the influence of the British-Maltese-Zionist cabal centered in the City of London, will be lured into a pattern of policies and actions which have the effect of shifting Soviet leadership mentality and posture into one of preparations for imminent general thermonuclear war.

If the Israelis launch an attack against Syrian military forces under the pretext of aiding Israeli fascist puppet forces in Lebanon (Chamoun, Habib Malik, et al.) is coordinated with a push for "IMF conditions" policy and destabilizations in Eastern European countries, and if this is effected in concert with the present regime in Peking, then the USA is already peering into the abyss of radioactive hell.

Warning to President Carter

President Carter and trustworthy members of his

White House staff should pull files disclosing the reasons President John F. Kennedy ordered the firing of Henry A. Kissinger, and why the White House staff of President Gerald Ford arranged the resignation of then Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger. The White House should also draw upon most-secret and other State Department and CIA files concerning Harvard's William Yandell Elliot, the 1930s and 1940s associate of circles presently behind terrorism in Italy, and later the sponsor of Henry A. Kissinger, Daniel Ellsberg, and key in the grooming of Kissinger, Ellsberg, Schlesinger and Brzezinski for their 1960s and 1970s careers. The White House should also examine the files concerning strategic policy disputes between President John F. Kennedy and the British monarchy.

The White House should also examine a current, confidential report of the Bank of England. This report outlines the British monarchy's current plan for destroying the value of the U.S. dollar and wrecking the U.S. economy, with the aid of the policies of W. Michael Blumenthal, G. William Miller and Milton Friedman.

The White House should also review the complete dossier of CIA director Admiral Stansfield Turner. Exemplary are Turner's educational history, his membership in the British intelligence organization IISS, and his associations during his latest naval command assignment.

The White House should also review the DEA files back into the prohibition period, and historical files concerning British opium traffic back into the late 18th century. The centerpiece of this study should be the Bronfman family of Canada, during the whiskey-smuggling of the prohibition period and the drug-smuggling along the same routes and through the same financial conduits of "black funds" used for whiskey-smuggling. The links of top Canadian financial interests to "golden triangle" (Shanghai, Hong Kong, and Singapore) banks, and the "silver triangle" (British West Indies) banks to the conduiting of tens of billions of dollars of "black funds" from illegal-drug traffic into Eurodollar and pound-sterling pools, and into Switzerland and Liechtenstein, should also be examined. The nature of the connection between Bronfman-centered financial and political circles and the top circles of the black Maltese should also be noted.

The office of Senator Jacob Javits should come under special scrutiny.

The Carter Administration cannot reasonably hope to avoid thermonuclear war during the present term, or to defend the dollar and U.S. economy from depression-collapse unless the key agents of adversary-policy are rooted out of the Administration. These persons include Henry A. Kissinger, James R. Schlesinger, Admiral Stansfield Turner, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Anthony Solomon, W. Michael Blumenthal, G. William Miller, Richard Cooper. Vice President Walter F. Mondale must be "contained" as

part of the same problem. Not to make such corrective actions respecting personnel is virtually to ensure the collapse of the U.S. dollar and of the U.S. economy and to make general thermonuclear war increasingly probable during the weeks and months ahead.

It should also be emphasized that the ordinary Jewish-American is an honest person, who predominately desires Middle East peace, but who is also terrified by the evil power of top circles of the leading Zionist organizations — especially the Joint Distribution Committee, the international B'nai B'rith, and the USA's ADL and French LICA organizations. Many Jews have been personally ruined or worse merely for bucking these institutions, organizations which have an assassination capability linked to the Mossad element of Israeli intelligence and to the Bronfman-linked mafia forces. If the Carter Administration wishes the support of American Jews for a USA imposition of Middle East equitable peace, along UNO 242 lines, the Administration must recognize its obligation to afford the majority of American Jews the protection they require against "Zionist" reprisals.

The Administration must come to understand how the policy enunciated by President Carter to a UNO audience has been repeatedly undermined and sabotaged by the persons we have identified and their allies. The mere fact that an intelligence estimate is pushed by Brzezinski, Kissinger or Turner is sufficient reason to doubt its veracity. The mere fact that a policy is pushed by these cited persons is sufficient reason to suspect its contrariness to the most vital interests of the United States.

Once again, the British and their agents within the Administration have pushed the U.S. government toward supporting a deadly adventure on the basis of false information to the effect that the Soviet leadership will not honor its agreements with its allies. In this case, it is argued that by doing the very maximum in the way of provoking the Soviet leadership to the most extreme rage, that this course of action will make the Soviets impotent and irresolute in dealing with the proposed adventure.

Gentlemen, the misinformed gamble to which I point is sheer strategic lunacy.

—Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr.

4. The Active Israeli War Strategy

Israel is openly threatening to launch an attack on Syria via Lebanon, a move that could readily trigger a fifth Middle East war that, given the Soviet Union's commitment to defend Syria, could quickly escalate into a U.S.-Soviet confrontation.

Prime Minister Menachem Begin held two urgent meetings on Aug. 28 with senior members of the Israeli Knesset to discuss intervening militarily in Lebanon under the pretext of "saving" Lebanese Christians from being "massacred" by the Syrian peacekeeping forces. One account of the meeting appeared in the Aug. 29 *Christian Science Monitor* in an article datelined Jerusalem and entitled, "Israel Yearning to Aid Christians":

Powerful voices here are calling for direct military intervention by Israel to relieve the hard-pressed Christian militias in Lebanon.

(After meeting with Begin on Aug. 28), the chief whip of the ruling Likud majority, Pessah Grupper, told the press:

"I see no way out but a direct intervention. The Syrians are aiming at conquering the Mount Lebanon Province."

Any such Syrian move, it is said here, would lead to a slaughter of the Christian population there and threaten Israel's own security.

Influential circles in the Israeli Defense Ministry have voiced the view that it is precisely because of the inhibiting effect of Camp David that the Syrians dare to conduct their offensive now. Others feel the direct danger to Israel could prove so great, that it would far outweigh a possible failure of the Camp David conference.

The chairman of the Israeli Parliamentary Committee

for Foreign Affairs and Defense, Prof. Moshe Arens, commented, "We must not let the Syrians take advantage of the conference to conquer all of Lebanon."

Professor Arens, who subsequently took part in both of the Aug. 28 meetings with Mr. Begin, also stated that the Syrian offensive was meant to pulverize the resistance of the Christian population. A military intervention by Israel, therefore, in his view, "should no longer be delayed."

Former Foreign Minister Yigal Allon, currently the chairman of the Knesset subcommittee on Lebanon, also attended the meeting with Begin, piously stating afterward, "As much as we want to avoid any military confrontation, (Syria's actions in Lebanon) are beyond what we can accept."

In an Aug. 27 commentary in the Hebrew language newspaper Ma'ariv, reporter Shemu'el Segev reports that while the official Israeli cabinet position toward Lebanon at this point is a "cautious approach" toward becoming "embroiled in war," this approach is "(not) accepted by the entire political establishment in Israel."

Segev explains:

There are factors in Israel who believe that . . . Israel ought to exploit the situation in order to deliver a decisive blow to Syria — be it for the purpose of breaking the Syrian's war machine, or to mellow Syria's positions on the subject of the political negotiations with Israel. The proponents of this view believe that even if President Al-Asad (of Syria) perseveres in his refusal to join (Egyptian President) As-Sadat's initiative and conduct peace negotiations with Israel, then a serious blow will