

Why Europeans think the U.S. has

1980 presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche speaks out

The aggregate reactions my associates and I have received from leading and other circles in Europe and other nations outside the United States is a shocked, alarmed conviction that the Carter Administration and the Republican National Committee have both gone utterly, clinically insane.

Usually, these expressed opinions are associated with specific criticisms. Yet, after taking note of those criticisms, we are obliged to emphasize that the quality of insanity surrounding the Carter Administration is of a more profound kind than any or all of these specific issues suffice to explain.

The central point of criticism is the perception that the Carter Administration, and also the Kissinger-linked forces of the Republican National Committee, are currently in a dead run toward early general thermonuclear war. The Europeans and others are dumbfounded by this on two principal counts. First, they have no evidence that the Soviet Union has or is guilty of any policy thrust which the United States should regard as even marginally threatening to any actual U.S. strategic interests. Second, not only are these observers convinced that the U.S. would lose a general thermonuclear war conducted at this time; there is massive evidence to the effect that the U.S. Pentagon accepts more or less the facts on which such an estimate is premised.

Moscow finds itself in the position of a man holding a pistol, while a maniac, the U.S., runs toward Moscow, brandishing a knife and yelling "Kill, kill, kill!"

This criticism is linked to the spectacle of the Carter Administration's abysmal display of utter cowardice before the demands and related antics of the Peking government. Here, the Hua-Teng regime, which lacks the capability to fight a serious war, and whose present regime hangs by a frayed thread above the abyss of popular overturn of its authority, seems to intimidate Messrs. Carter et al. into submitting to its tiniest whims, whereas the same Carter Administration is manifestly contemptuous of the superior war-fighting capabilities of the Soviet Union.

Next, among directly connected issues, is the Carter Administration's conduct in Iran.

Iran, long a U.S. ally, and housing a major element of the U.S. SALT-related monitoring capabilities, was not only destabilized by Britain, with complicity of the USA, Israel, and Peking, overthrowing the U.S.'s ally, the Shah. The same Khomeini who the U.S. has insisted, on London's advice, to be a Soviet pawn, is currently receiving the backing of the U.S. government — under the guise of a U.S. anti-Soviet gesture.

The U.S. Carter Administration, formally dedicated to "human rights," has put its political-strategic forces on the side of a Peking puppet-entity, the former Pol Pot regime of Cambodia. This latter regime has perpetrated the most massive genocide in modern history, with even U.S. estimates conceding that the Pot regime wiped out at least one-third of that nation's population during its relatively short reign.

The Carter Administration, on the one side, avows that Middle East stability is vital to the petroleum interests of the U.S., as well as of Western Europe, Japan, et al. Yet, it was the U.S. which, with aid of the Aspen Institute, led the destabilization of Iran and which now projects the destabilization of Saudi Arabia.

On the strategic-economic front, the same lunacy prevails.

The U.S. economy and dollar are threatened with a "Crash of 1979," the worst collapse in modern U.S. economic and monetary history. The economic cause for this — as distinct from monetary considerations coordinated from London — is a galloping, two-digit inflation. This inflation is caused largely by the shrinkage of the percentile of the total U.S. labor force engaged in high-technology production of tangible goods, and, in the same sense, by a growth of industrial and other obsolescence under these conditions. This problem cannot be remedied without the inclusion of a job-creating capital-formation boom and emphasis on capital-intensive, high-technology investment and production.

How does the Carter Administration behave?

First, it adopts a so-called anti-inflation program of fiscal austerity and monetary austerity measures whose only possible effect is to accelerate the collapse of levels of employment on high-technology tangible goods production both absolutely and as a relative proportion of the total flow of funds through the economy. In other words, the Carter Administration's policy is designed efficiently to accelerate the rate of inflation!

This lunatic sort of "anti-inflation" policy is not adopted because of lack of alternative options.

The Tokyo capital market has offered to turn masses of capital back to the U.S., to promote U.S. investment and exports, at relatively low rates of interest. The Carter Administration makes nasty threats against Japan for even suggesting such an offer.

The European Monetary System, whose semiformal, but effectively full-scale operation is the chief reason the U.S. economy and dollar have not already fallen into the abyss, offers the U.S. not only support for the dollar, but also forms of credit-aid like those offered by Japan. The Carter Administration is currently dedicated, overtly, to wrecking the European Monetary System.

Mexico has offered to use its earnings from petroleum and other primary commodity production to purchase massive amounts of capital goods from the United States. Brzezinski, Schlesinger and the White House, with the collaboration of the State Department, threaten to overthrow the government of Mexico, Iran-style, for making such a proposal.

It is to be emphasized, for fairness, that the Republican National Committee is fully as lunatic on these issues as the Carter Administration — on some points, even more lunatic.

If the same kind of self-destructive, even suicidal obsessions were manifest in the case of an individual citizen, we would

gone insane

readily secure a court decision for that person's commitment to psychiatric custody.

Yet, although these symptoms suffice to prove de facto clinical insanity by the Carter Administration and Republican National Committee majority, these are the results, not the causes, of the insanity manifested. It is the cause of this insanity which must be understood.

Carter's hostility to "the tyranny of reason"

The general character of the insanity of both the Carter Administration and the RNC majority is that the Carter Administration "refuses to be bullied" into "submitting" to the evidence of reason. During the recent Cambodia crisis, apologists for the Carter policy said, "Of course our policy is insane, but it is our policy nonetheless, and we're sticking to it." The same sort of "explanation" has been offered in defense of Carter Administration policies on the China policy: Of course the White House China policy is lunacy, but you're not going to see it changed. In other words, the Carter Administration is saying: "We insist on our Free Will. We will not be bullied into changing our policies by any amount of proof that those policies are wrong, or even that they are suicidal. Mr. Carter is the President, and he will decide."

This sort of degeneration in U.S. policy making was first brought forcefully into public view during the course of the so-called Shaba II affair.

The U.S. government's diplomatic and intelligence services have conclusive evidence from the best official and other sources. The "mercenary" operation in Zaire's Shaba province was run, chiefly by British intelligence, through such conduits as Lonrho, and with full complicity of Belgian financial and governmental agencies. The French and Belgians suffered a controlled confrontation over this issue. Tanzania kicked Lonrho officials out of that country because of their complicity in the operation. Certain elements of the U.S. intelligence community attempted to get the facts through to the White House and Congress.

President Carter backed up Zbigniew Brzezinski's lying Sunday TV declarations on the Shaba II business, stating that he, Carter, had chosen to believe the report that Soviet and Cuban hands were principal to the Shaba II caper. Since Mr. Carter had "made up his mind," any facts were officially ruled out of consideration — even when Mr. Carter's belief was totally out of correspondence with any reality in the situation.

The same thing arose in connection with the "Camp David" caper. The U.S. Labor Party was not the only agency which warned the Carter Administration that the Arabs would not accept the agreement imposed upon President Sadat. The reaction: **Our mind is made up; do not annoy us with facts.** What happened conformed precisely to what we predicted would develop. Rather than accept the reality, that the "Camp David"

caper was a piece of folly from inception, the White House connives at destabilization of both Iran and Saudi Arabia, to "punish those nations" for not bending to White House orders on command.

Carter, the ultrademocrat of the 1976 campaign, turns out to be in the model of the Emperor Nero, an "imperial president," who imagines he can do no wrong, a tyrant, whose personal caprices are taken as law, in defiance of all reality. Alas, the transition from ultrademocratic demagogue to bloody tyrant is a commonplace in human history — a lesson this nation should have learned, and then we should not have had to experience the lesson once again.

The posture of the White House of late is: "The President's mind is made up. If he decides to repeal the law of gravity, gravity will either repeal itself, or else the White House will take reprisals."

The wellspring of lunacy

There is no doubt but that Zbigniew Brzezinski is personally clinically insane. This insanity of Brzezinski's certainly contributes significantly to the deterioration of President Carter's behavior and judgment during recent months. However, it would be a fallacy of composition to over-localize the problem to Mr. Brzezinski.

The typification of the causes of the lunacy of the Carter Administration generally is better located on the inside of the Administration in terms of James R. Schlesinger and the Institute for Policy Studies and Kennedy-Goldberg elements there, and from the outside of the Administration as such in the Hobbesian alliance between California Governor Jerry Brown (Goldberg) and the Kennedy machine proper.

The Jerry Brown (Goldberg) and Kennedy machines are a coordinated "Mutt and Jeff" act. The Zen-Buddhist kook, Brown, hits Carter from the "right" (Mutt), while Kennedy hits Carter from the "left" (a rather heavily soused, alcoholic Jeff).

The Brown-Kennedy axis is complemented by and overlaps with the Rostow-Keegan-Zumwalt-Schlesinger axis. Brown-Kennedy represent the "left wing," the Bertrand Russell-leaning wing, while Rostow-Schlesinger-Fritz Kraemer et al., represent the tendency of the Otto von Hapsburg-led Pan-European Union (the Mont Pelerin Society).

To understand the combined effect of these assorted forces on the U.S. government, one must reduce this assortment to its common denominator: **environmentalism.**

The "environmentalist" movement internationally is predominantly a creation of the Bertrand Russell faction of British intelligence. However, as the procannibalism Aurelio Peccei of the Club of Rome exemplifies, on the basic issue, the Russelites and the "right wingers" (e.g., Mont Pelerin Society) have identical views. This was emphasized by geopolitician Halford Mackinder at the end of World War I. Mackinder insisted that

there were really no fundamental differences between Bertrand Russell and Lord Milner's group (the Coefficients-Round Table group) behind Russell's storming-out of the group in 1902.

The "right wing" faction of British-Hapsburg forces proposes to turn back the clock of world technology for civilian economy, and accepts the genocidal mass-depopulation this will cause. However, the British-Hapsburg right-wing group wishes to keep an "island" of high-technology within the military domain, and to maintain a continuity of British-led parameters of power during the course of the transition to a New Dark Age. The Russell, or "left" faction, is opposed to any stabilizing policy; the Russellites wish to go directly to massive chaos and confusion, to wreck everything now.

The philosophical arguments these various criminal lunatics employ to argue for their policies are directed to discrediting, denouncing, and eliminating the influence of what they often denounce as the "Cartesian tyranny of reason." Like Tavistock agents Michel Foucault, Jean-Paul Sartre, and the pro-Nazi Martin Heidigger, these avowed irrationalists, existentialists, hate reason.

These types insist that the so-called inner psychological needs of the isolated individual are the ultimate reality to which political life must submit. Their view is the "right of the individual" to "do my own thing." They argue that to attempt to oblige an individual not to take mind-destroying drugs, for example, is a form of "oppression" of that individual's "freedom of choice."

This is the essence of the politics of the Zen-Buddhist kook, Governor Jerry Brown, the sodden alcoholic Senator Edward Kennedy, the profascist Milton Friedman of the Mont Pelerin Society, and the "energy doctrine" of James R. Schlesinger. **They are all morally insane.**

Carter "doing his own thing" in the White House will probably mean the early thermonuclear destruction and Soviet conquest of this nation. The key to the insanity shown by Carter is his essential post-Navy, personal fear of radioactivity, his dedication to the environmentalist cause.

West German to USSR:

Speaking in Moscow on Jan. 22, on the eve of Teng Hsiao-ping's trip to the U.S., the State Minister of the West German Foreign Ministry, Dr. Klaus von Dohnanyi, delivered a forecast of detente and mutual prosperity between West Germany and the Soviet Union. Detailing how trade has grown between the two countries, the State Minister also outlined perspectives for trade between the USSR and West Germany to continue growing — and pointedly rejected the "China card" strategy of leading U.S. and British policymakers.

... Any attempt to describe the relations between the BRD and the Soviet Union in the coming decades first has to take into account the past and present of these relations. Here a problem already begins in our dialogue.

We know the past; the "facts" are allegedly given. We experience the present in common, we observe the same events. But we consider facts and events from different perspectives. We give various interpretations according to our location, our interests, our history and our present.

I want, nevertheless, to give a short description of the past and present, one we can probably agree on. I will not be able, of course, to limit myself to German-Soviet relations. These have to be seen and understood in the context of East-West relations and world political developments.

Our common history reaches very far back. I am going to begin, though, with the end of the Second World War. The most important consequences of the Second World War were a divided Germany and a divided Europe. A Soviet Union, having become a world power, but which was at first only a really equally weighty partner (and then counter-player) to the USA. The final shattering of prewar colonial powers: the unavoidable reduction, for this reason, of the political and economic importance of traditional West European powers. A previously unknown technological boost to armaments and the discovery of new weapons, whose effect took the classical form of war as "continuation of politics with other means" into an absurdity...

The Moscow treaty of 1970 up to the final act of Helsinki, the development of economic relations up to the 1978 long-term economic cooperation agreement, characterizes a successful policy of detente and cooperation on both sides.

Thus, our starting point for the 1980s is not bad: the Federal Republic, whose security interests are anchored in the Western Alliance and whose economy (is integrated) in the European Community, wishes to continue the policy of detente and cooperation in the 1980s. We also assume that the Soviet Union wants to maintain such a policy as well. But it would be crass light-mindedness if one were to assume that the continuation of this policy which has secured us peace in Europe were to be seen as something self-evident. Rather, there are not only considerable chances, but considerable risks for detente. To use our chances and to recognize the risks — to limit them and overcome them — will be our common political task.

The chances lie mostly in the agreement of our most impor-