

from the Soviets, see ECONOMICS.)

Clearly Schmidt did win Fukuda's support for this strategy to win the United States away from its suicidal adherence to British economic recipes of austerity and recession. The two leaders affirmed their "trilateral partnership and alliance with the USA," while rejecting antidollar schemes such as Belgian Premier Tindemans' proposal that the mark and the yen become leading currencies against the U.S. dollar.

In the absence of a sane U.S. policy, however, the dollar continued to plummet on the world markets. The dangerous momen-

tum that the dollar's slide is reaching was reflected by the panic-mongering "prediction" of a major dollar crash by early next year that appeared Oct. 12 in the French daily *Le Figaro*. The article, while foreseeing the death of the dollar, also lied that the European Monetary Fund will take as much as two years to come into operation!

But Schmidt and his allies are countering such attempts to derail the EMF with a directly political approach.

On the same day that *Le Figaro* published its antidollar story, the West German business daily *Handelsblatt* ran a statement by Schmidt economics aide Dieter

Hiss emphasizing that the central significance of the EMF is not technical, but political — the political coherence and stability of the European Community.

And in Tokyo, Schmidt opened an attack on the British and U.S. Anglophile strategy of "playing the China card" in the context of his discussions with Fukuda of European-Japanese relations. He wanted "economic, cultural, and scientific cooperation with China," he told his Japanese hosts. But, he said, "I do not count myself among those who see any promise of good to come from present tensions between the Soviet Union and China, either for Europe, or for Asia."

NSC's trade sabotage scored

Dean Rusk and Stevenson committee slam Brzezinski

The National Security Council under Zbigniew Brzezinski has usurped authority and powers that the Constitution and government statutes specifically forbid to it, Dean Rusk told Capitol Hill last week. The former Secretary of State under the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations testified Oct. 11 before Sen. Adlai Stevenson III's International Trade Subcommittee, on the subject of "foreign policy and exports."

The Stevenson hearings are formally devoted to the question of Export-Import Bank lending limitations. But the recent underlying theme has been the disruption of American export contracts by National Security Council introduction of "security threat" or "human rights" prohibitions, whenever those contracts involve sale or transfer of technologies above the rank of pick-and-shovel.

Brzezinski should be specifically prohibited from harming East-West and other trade in this fashion, Rusk emphasized; there are justifiable means to cage him.

"The NSC was statutorily established to act in a staff capacity, not in a line capacity" — it has not authority to make or veto trade policies or any other policy, he said. Moreover, its members have not been confirmed by Congress; it cannot make Cabinet-type decisions. Rusk recommended that Congress legislate the NSC's exclusion from the trade and general foreign policy review-process.

Although Rusk declined to address the topic, the subsequent, probing questions of Senator Stevenson summarized the strategic import of the immediate NSC transgression-issue. How does American export policy, he asked, relate to the goal of "globalization of the world monetary system to encompass the Soviet-Comecon sector. . . ?"

In fact, American exports of high-technology industrial goods define America's potential relationship to the imminent European Monetary System, which has that goal. And Zbigniew Brzezinski's British-aligned opposition to the

EMS is at the heart of the NSC's unlawful "national security" prohibitions against high-technology exports by the United States.

Rusk was only one of the experienced and informed witnesses who, one after another, slammed the NSC before yesterday's hearings. George Ball, a former Undersecretary of State, said that what concerned him most was also the NSC's sudden new power to veto all technology transfers and export licenses. David Packard, of Hewlett-Packard, a former Secretary of Defense, declared that, contrary to the recent case of attempted NSC prohibition of oil-drilling technology's sale to the USSR, "On balance there are very valid reasons to help the Soviets increase their oil and gas production." Packard also cautioned against "using the China card" — a policy associated with Brzezinski — as a diplomatic threat to the Soviet Union. China, he emphasized, is not capable of absorbing exports of American technology. The Soviet Union is.

In truth, the NSC is the only one,

albeit critical, obstacle to the original goal of the Stevenson hearings: rechartering the Eximbank to significantly increase its export-financing ceiling. As a matter of fact, British financial interests recently intervened through inept or suspect American congressmen to secure another in a long list of "amendments" to the Eximbank bill, effectively mangling its purpose, and last week, killing it.

During the first week of October, Democratic Senator Ernest Hollings of South Carolina, with William Hathaway of Massachusetts, introduced an amendment which would exclude American textiles from the multi-lateral trade negotiations (GATT) — an open door for provocative tariff barriers. The amendment both implies sabotage of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, and a veto of the Eximbank bill by President Carter. The amendment is so wholly outside the framework of the Eximbank charter, it at least temporarily kills it.

Why did Hollings do it? The British told him it would be a fine idea. During the floor debate, Hollings reported that "chief representatives of the textile industry were in London and talked with Sydney Rothwell," who is commercial director of "the British Textile Employers Association" in Manchester, England. The Americans, continued the Senator, asked Rothwell if Hollings's amendment would wreck the GATT talks, as special trade negotiator Robert Strauss among others declared it would. Hollings triumphantly concluded: "Rothwell immediately replied 'No!'," and told them they could say he said so.

There was not a murmur from the proud, powerful United States Senate, which proceeded to undercut the best available vehicle for an export-led American industrial boom. By now, all of London must be laughing.

—Maureen Manning

Drugs and political murder— the Soviets launch a probe

In the last week of August, U.S. Labor Party Chairman Lyndon LaRouche, an *Executive Intelligence Review* contributing editor, indicted British crown drug-running networks centered in Hong Kong and Asia's "Golden Triangle" for the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. LaRouche specified as the salient fact the connections between these Peking-linked British drug networks and British-Canadian creation and control of the American "Mafia."

In the last week of September, Soviet journalist J. Semyonov, writing in the Soviet youth organization's magazine, *Ogonyok*, began a four-part series titled "Capriccio Siciliano." The murder of President Kennedy, Semyonov concluded, was a conspiracy carried out by the Peking secret services in coordination with the U.S.-based drug-running "Mafia."

There was no direct relationship between these two investigations of the JFK murder; the two investigators did not even examine the same realms of evidence. For such reasons, their conclusions do not agree in every detail. Yet they arrived at the same basic conclusion, for one reason: their investigations used an essentially identical method.

That is the enormous value — apart from the actually explosive

revelations — contained in the Semyonov series. For that reason, the *Executive Intelligence Review* will run an exclusive English translation of this four-part Soviet exposé, whose last installments point to the use of the same JFK-murder networks in the death of Italian industrialist Enrico Mattei and others.

What method? Semyonov explains: A conspiracy to murder a figure like the American President can only be investigated by first answering the question: "Cui Bono?" (to whose benefit?). And again: "Who would have done it this way, and not that way?" Et cetera.

"For whom was it useful to prepare Oswald for the role of Kennedy's assassin?" he asks. "To the ultraright undoubtedly. The hawks could not forgive Kennedy his attempts to begin the dialogue with the Soviet Union...But also, the ultraleft could not forgive him this. Was the assassination...not a means to sow the seeds of hatred against the Russians forever in the American people, if the assassination was 'linked' to Moscow?"

"And who in the United States can kill *on order*? The Mafia.

"And what brings the Mafia its maximal income? Narcotics.

"And who supplies the Mafia with narcotics...?"