

EIR Feature

Conditions in which Moscow would accept Reagan's SDI offer

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Probably, if Moscow ever decides to accept the President's repeated offer of cooperation on SDI, I will be the first to know. The first preparatory step Moscow would make, if they were thinking of negotiating such cooperation with the President, would be to attempt to open a back-channel to me personally.

"Unbelievable! The Soviets hate LaRouche probably more than any other person living today!" would be the automatic, understandable reaction, among well-informed U.S. figures. The Soviets have made that hatred clear to U.S. and other diplomats, and through Soviet "back-channels" such as those of Soviet agents Armand Hammer and Georgii Arbatov. The current reading is, that Moscow would rather have me dead than deal with me. That estimate is accurate, but only up to a point.

Under certain conditions, Moscow would regard its own continuing hatred of me as irrelevant. The reason for this, is a very simple one. Except in lunatic asylums, and some Western "strategic think-tanks," peace negotiations are always conducted between bitter adversaries.

Moscow is operating currently on a strategic war-plan best described as the Andropov-Ogarkov war-plan. According to its own military doctrine, the Soviet empire is currently operating in a state of pre-war mobilization for early general (thermonuclear first-strike) warfare against the United States. Its escalation of international narco-terrorism, is a part of the various shooting and other measures of "irregular warfare" being deployed as part of the preliminary phase of Soviet general warfare against us. We are already in a state of war, such that, in fact, those who are giving aid and comfort to the Soviets presently are committing treason.

If Moscow should decide to back down from its present commitment to war, it is probable that the first signal the United States would receive, would be Moscow's efforts to open up private discussions with me.

The reason Moscow is dead set against a U.S. SDI, while the 17-year-old Soviet build-up of their own SDI is in full-steam-ahead mode, is that Moscow views itself as in a state of war against us. Currently, all Soviet diplomacy is



Statue of Theodore Roosevelt outside the center of Nazi race science in America, New York's Museum of Natural History. To achieve peaceful relations between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., both sides must shift policies toward Central and South America, the strategic center of the world today. That means the United States must junk the "Teddy Roosevelt" policies.

merely a helping hand of deception, in aid of Soviet military and related warfare objectives.

In this state of affairs, Moscow has no serious interest in U.S.-Soviet arms-control agreements, except as propaganda exercises used to manipulate the liberal Soviet appeasers within the Congress and other Western liberal and social-democratic circles. President Reagan could offer them the "kitchen sink" in nuclear-weapons demobilization, and Moscow would only laugh at such offers. At the present time, as they showed at Reykjavik, they are really not interested.

Moscow would wish to negotiate the President's SDI offer only as part of a Soviet decision to pull back from its own present escalation of preparations for general nuclear warfare. If Moscow were thinking of such a de-escalation, one of its first thoughts would be, to seek to open a "back-channel" to me.

How the Soviets would approach LaRouche

Any Soviet approach to me would be based on two key points. First, Moscow regards me as the intellectual author of the SDI. Second, Moscow's only alternative option at present, is a document of mine published in the April 17, 1984, edition of *Executive Intelligence Review*, "The LaRouche Doctrine: Draft Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R." Any Soviet approach to me, would be based chiefly upon those two points. To be more precise, Moscow's agenda for discussions with me would be an updated version of the agenda presented in my April 1984 "trial balloon."

That negotiating agenda would be dominated by four

points of agenda: 1) Cooperation on SDI; 2) Cooperation in the exploration and colonization of space; 3) Establishment of a new, gold-reserve-based international monetary system, in which Moscow would participate as a cooperating, rather than member-nation; and 4) Cooperation in conquering the species-threatening pandemic, AIDS. The general principle, which Moscow would reluctantly consider for adoption, is the doctrine of absolute sovereignty of nation-states. Agreement in the four indicated areas of potential cooperation, would be premised upon common agreement to this doctrine of sovereignty.

If Moscow were to make such an approach in my direction, this would occur early during the 12 months ahead. This would occur only on condition that Moscow estimated that it had become impossible to sabotage the U.S.'s SDI. In that case, Moscow's strategic planners would estimate that the Andropov-Ogarkov doctrine for early Soviet world-domination had become more or less inoperable. Moscow would not consider seeking a discussion-channel to me, unless it assumed that such a condition is probable.

Otherwise, Moscow would prefer that I die as soon as possible, preferably "taken care of" by the circles associated with U.S. Attorney William Weld's backers. As long as the currently operational Andropov-Ogarkov doctrine is in effect, I am a threat to Soviet strategic interests, a threat of varying importance to them in various parts of the world. What they fear is not so much my direct personal influence, as my capacity to generate influential ideas tending to frustrate Soviet operations. They wish to stop my generating new and influential ideas; therefore, they demand that circles such

as Weld's backers "take care of that problem."

However, if they were to wish to shift to cooperative war-avoidance with the U.S.A. and our allies, they would wish to thrash out such policies with me, rather than kill me. They would still hate my guts, and pour out vituperations against me, but, under those precise circumstances, they would deal with me "realistically."

Some well-informed circles in our government would generally agree with the picture I have just sketched. There are those who watch every Soviet feint in my direction. These aspects of Soviet behavior are studied as a signal of current trends in Soviet policy-making. For example, a stepped-up Soviet operation against me and my friends, is a sure sign that the Soviets are committed to a very hard line against the United States, in current negotiations and other operations. Any Soviet probe for discussions with my circles, indicates that alternative Soviet policies toward the United States are being considered by at least some influential circles in Moscow.

We are watching for such signals. The absence of such a signal means that President Reagan will get nothing useful from negotiations with Moscow; the existence of such a signal indicates that some interesting possibilities may be developing. Since March 23, 1983, the most precise reading on Soviet policy toward the United States has been obtained by careful study of the shifting patterns of Soviet attacks on me and my friends.

Soviet classification of LaRouche

To understand why and how the Soviets would seek a "back-channel" opening to me under specific circumstances, the following background is helpful. This information is essential to our intelligence and counterintelligence analysts, and useful to concerned citizens generally.

The earliest reading on a precise sort of Soviet classification of me appeared in the East bloc's computerized filing-system about 1977. Since that time, I have been classified "ideologically" by Moscow as an "ideologue of late capitalism." Sometime during the early 1980s, Moscow assumed that I am a Roman Catholic traditionalist in philosophical outlook, although Protestant by confession.

By "ideologue of late capitalism," a frequent phrase used in connection with my name in KGB-linked publications, Moscow states that it means that my work in economics has the effect of offering the Western capitalist system a new lease on life. They view me also as a well-informed critic of Karl Marx on all counts, especially my criticisms of the central fallacies in Marx's economic doctrines. They regard me as criticizing Marx from the standpoint of Alexander Hamilton's so-called "mercantilist" economic principles, the American System of political-economy, as named by Hamilton, and as otherwise defined by the influences of France's Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Gottfried Leibniz, the two Careys, and Friedrich List.

This is essentially an accurate thumbnail characterization

of my standpoint in economic science.

They view me as philosophically Catholic because of my emphasis upon the special quality of Platonism established by the work of St. Augustine. As a Protestant, this places me in the same general area as the Gottfried Leibniz who has had the greatest single intellectual influence on my life.

This latter is very annoying to Moscow, for the same reason that Moscow admires such "Liberation Theologists" as Hans Küng and the local, controversial Father Curran as the sort of nominal Catholics more agreeable to Moscow. The Western currents tending most closely to Moscow's own philosophical standpoint are the British empiricists, such as David Hume, the proto-fascist professor of law Friedrich Karl Savigny, and the proto-fascist sociologist Max Weber. Moscow denies the existence of a universal natural (moral) law commonly applicable to all peoples. Moscow bases itself, as Hitler's Nazis did, on the "collective will" of a specific race or nationality. Hence, Moscow's repeated propaganda-appeals to "the will of the Russian people" or "world public opinion."

During the 1980s, Moscow came to view me, resentfully, as something of a genius in economics. Two sets of facts were of utmost practical importance to them in this connection. First, Moscow recognized that *EIR's* LaRouche-Riemann forecasts had been accurate, where Moscow's own, as well as those of most Western forecasters, had been way off the mark. Second, Moscow recognized earlier than all but a few in the West, that my 1982 design for a strategic ballistic missile defense was based primarily on profound and accurate economic-scientific principles: the effect of "spillovers" from SDI research in fostering high rates of growth in Western economies.

If Moscow should elect to negotiate the kind of SDI cooperation President Reagan has offered repeatedly, Moscow's prime strategic concern in those negotiations will be, effecting rates of "spillover" within the Soviet bloc economy matching approximately the rates in the West. My economics expertise would be of special concern to them under such circumstances.

Moscow "trusts" me more than any other public figure in the West, in two special senses: 1) It "trusts" me to the degree that it believes that my actions will never deviate from the philosophical standpoint I represent; 2) It views me as the most "universal mind" among well-known public figures of the West. It estimates that I am the Western figure whose views on the all-sidedness of a general policy are the most reliable for purposes of policy-planning.

América Latina versus LaRouche

The case of my influence in Central and South America, provides a good illustration of this practical side of the Soviet view of me as a policy-thinker.

At this moment, and over several years to date, my intellectual influence in Central and South America has been the central focus of all Soviet operations against the United States

in these regions. The official voice for Soviet policy in these regions is the Soviet magazine *América Latina*, directed by the Asia-Latin America ethnology section of Soviet intelligence, under aging Evgenii Primakov. Today, all Soviet operations in Central and South America are principally focused against me and my friends in that quarter. The policies for these targetings of my friends and me, are spelled out in detail in *América Latina*.

The Soviet intelligence services have two principal allies in these operations: Willy Brandt's Socialist International (SI) and the AIFLD/ORIT social-democratic organization, the latter nominally a joint operation of the U.S. Department of State and Irving Brown's International Department of Lane Kirkland's AFL-CIO bureaucracy. Both the SI and AIFLD/ORIT are currently following the *América Latina* line exactly, and both are working in intimate collaboration with Soviet forces in the region.

AIFLD has a long pedigree as a partner of Soviet operations, dating back to an assortment of firms headquartered at 120 Broadway, Manhattan, where Secretary Shultz's father was employed, during the period of the Bolshevik Revolution. In short, AIFLD is an outgrowth of the U.S. branch of a Soviet intelligence organization formerly known as Chicherin's and Dzerzhinsky's "Trust," the same arrangement which gave us John Reed, Sidney Reilly, Sergius Riis, and Soviet agent Armand Hammer. AIFLD-linked W. R. Grace's links to Soviet intelligence date from this period at 120 Broadway.

The aging mentor of AIFLD is the former head of the Communist Party U.S.A., the Jay Lovestone operating out of the New York City headquarters of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU). Lovestone left the formal employ of Joe Stalin approximately 1938, to become a "State Department socialist," and entered into the Central Intelligence Agency circuits under the auspices of the Office of Policy Control, during the famous fight between the military and the bankers over control of the future political-intelligence services of the U.S.A. Lovestone was allied with the Kermit Roosevelt, Miles Copeland, Frank Wisner, H. "Kim" Philby, John J. McCloy "bankers' CIA" faction, where his circle's power in our intelligence establishment has been based ever since.

Similarly, according to various documents, eyewitness reports, and declarations of John J. McCloy himself, Willy Brandt became an asset of McCloy in postwar Berlin. According to eyewitnesses, it was McCloy, as early as 1963, who began grooming Egon Bahr-guided Brandt to become the future Chancellor of West Germany. Brandt, according to a high-level eyewitness, played a key role to Khrushchov's advantage in the 1961 Berlin Wall crisis, but with backing from high levels inside the U.S. government!

The ordinary citizen in the street may pooh-pooh reports that certain banking interests and a leading element of the AFL-CIO bureaucracy are functioning as open Soviet-intelligence allies in Central and South America today. Contrary

to those foolish people who deny any facts contrary to their ignorant prejudices, it is a plain fact that this arrangement exists, and that this arrangement has very deep roots. This is one aspect of what the Trilateral Commission's Zbigniew Brzezinski means when he insists that U.S. foreign policy and U.S. strategy must be subordinated to "global society" agreements reached between Moscow and New York City.

Moscow 'trusts' me more than any other public figure in the West, in two special senses: 1) It 'trusts' me to the degree that it believes that my actions will never deviate from the philosophical standpoint I represent; 2) It views me as the most 'universal mind' among well-known public figures of the West.

Most important, the Soviet dictatorship is intimately aware of such arrangements with what Soviet officials at the highest level describe as "our liberal friends" in the West. Any Soviet calculation of policies, and policy changes, toward the United States, is based on consideration of the effect of such a Soviet policy change on these special arrangements with Kissinger's sponsors in the West.

It must be understood, that although the "bankers' CIA" faction seems often to work for Soviet advantage, against vital U.S. strategic interests, these fellows generally are not Soviet agents. They are not agents of the Soviet regime, but its business partners, as they have been ever since George Shultz's father was employed by the 120 Broadway division of the Soviet "Trust," at the close of World War I.

This "bankers' CIA" faction is essentially a creation of the Morgan interests, whose intelligence arm was developed around the extended family of President Theodore Roosevelt. This organization existed long before the CIA was founded, decades before the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution. It appeared in its modern form during the 1890s, with the founding of the Cleveland Civic Federation by Morgan's Mark Hanna; this was the kernel for the formation of the National Civic Federation, the predecessor of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), and the political-intelligence arm of U.S. bankers during World War I. Early, this National Civic Federation was the U.S. adjunct of the London Round Table; it was merged into CFR during the 1920s, with the establishment of CFR on the initiative of London Chatham House (Royal Institute for International Affairs), both British entities the

Fabian Society's left wing of the United Kingdom's intelligence community, and the section of the British Establishment traditionally closest to the Soviet "Trust."

This entity in our national life has been variously described as "Force X," "The Secret Team," "the bankers' CIA," and so on. "Bankers' CIA," the least exotic of these descriptions, is also the most accurate shorthand term. A more precise description would be, "Teddy Roosevelt's extended family."

Although the 'bankers' CIA' faction seems often to work for Soviet advantage, these fellows generally are not agents of the Soviet regime, but its business partners, as they have been ever since George Shultz's father was employed by the 120 Broadway division of the Soviet 'Trust,' at the close of World War I.

Although the Boston crowd, descendants of Aaron Burr's treasonous cabals of the 1776-1814 period, and the Morgan offshoot of the Perkins "opium-trading" Syndicate, are the center of financial power of this establishment, the extended family of Teddy Roosevelt has played a crucial role on the side of the intelligence community. The "financial-aristocratic" marriages of members of the Roosevelt family, into key Wall Street law firms, such as John J. McCloy's Milbank, Tweed, plus the faction of the intelligence community dominated by members of this extended family, plus the Georgia-based "mafia" of the Bulloch and Root families. This is the heart of that part of the U.S. policy-shaping and intelligence communities with the principal, longstanding partnerships with Soviet intelligence. Harvard University's law school, has been a center of this connection to Soviet intelligence, since the earliest period of the Bolshevik dictatorship.

Everything which Hispanic-American patriots have hated in the United States during the 20th century, and quite justly so, is associated with the name of Teddy Roosevelt and the Georgia "mafia" of Elihu Root's Coca-Cola.

The recent antics of Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) are typical of this.

The most obvious pro-Soviet influence operating on the inside of Helms's Washington, D.C. office, is one Jon Speller, the leading U.S. collaborator of the Soviet-directed international narco-terrorist gang, the Canada-based Khalistan

Liberation Front, the organization which claimed credit for the assassination of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. Speller and the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), are leading backers of that narco-terrorist gang today, and the two influences on Helms responsible for his own letter endorsing these drug-pushing terrorists.

Helms has also backed the ex-Nazi Party of Mexico, the National Action Party (PAN). Former Hitler-lover, and still-professed anti-Semite José Conchello, the senior figure of the PAN (and an honored guest at the 1984 Republican Convention!), is a Soviet asset, working in open collaboration with the Soviets' official Mexico party, the communist PSUM. In Panama, Helms has backed Arnulfo Arias's former official Nazi Party of that country, a party which is a witting collaborator of Soviet Western hemisphere operations today. Pull the files of U.S. military intelligence on Soviet and Nazi operatives in the Caribbean basin during the 1930s and early 1940s, all Soviet assets today, and Helms's office is found energetically backing many among those factional forces today.

The ADL, Speller's partner in influences upon Helms's office today, is also openly an agent of the Soviet intelligence services. The ADL specializes in targeting anti-Soviet groups in the U.S., picking targets designated for such attacks by Soviet and East German (VFN) intelligence. Anti-Soviet Tschirim Soobzokov was assassinated after being fingered by ADL asset Mordechai Levy, on the basis of documents forged by the Soviet KGB. Missile scientist Arthur Rudolph was also victimized on the basis of KGB forgeries, with ADL assistance, as part of Soviet operations against the SDI. Innocent, but anti-Soviet John Demjanjuk was targeted also on the basis of KGB forgeries. The terrorist assassination of California Reagan supporter Alex Odeh, is part of this same operation. ADL works most closely with a Soviet nest within the U.S. Department of Justice, around Mark Richards and the Office of Special Investigations (OSI).

However, Helms's problem is not merely the corrupting influence of Soviet assets such as Jon Speller and the ADL.

Speller was professedly trained by a famous agent of the Soviet intelligence services, Commander Sergius Riis. Riis was a personal collaborator of Leon Trotsky during the pre-1923 period, in setting up U.S. bankers' participation in the Soviet intelligence organization known as "the Trust." Riis was an asset of the "extended Roosevelt family's" 120 Broadway organizations during that period.

Strictly speaking, Sen. Jesse Helms has become "the Jimmy Carter" of Republican North Carolina, an asset of the same Coca-Cola "mafia" which produced Jimmy Carter the politician out of the great-ape brainwashing facility at Emory University's Yerkes center, the agency behind Jimmy Carter's "psychological adviser," Dr. Peter Bourne. Since Helms went sour, as many of his former backers put the point, he has been a consistent supporter of the policies of the Teddy Roosevelt mafia in U.S. politics. Soviet asset Speller is rightly seen as merely one aspect of the Teddy Roosevelt links of

Senator Helms.

Helms's actions in support of Soviet operations of destabilization in the Caribbean region, are run in support of the Teddy Roosevelt mafia's policies, and in cooperation with that mafia, including the Fabian League for Industrial Democracy (LID), LID's ADL offshoot, Lane Kirkland, Elliott Abrams, and J. Peter Grace: all offshoots of the Soviets' National Civic Federation "Trust" cronies, at old 120 Broadway.

Teddy Roosevelt was not the "conservative" the popular myths credit him with being. In domestic and foreign policy, Roosevelt, like Woodrow Wilson, was a raving Fabian; in terms of organizational alignments, he was a tool of the Fabian Society backers among U.S. financier circles, linked to "Trust"-relevant law firms, such as Cravath Swaine and Moore; and Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison; Milbank, Tweed, et al. The Georgia side of Roosevelt's mafia, centered around the families of his mother, a Bulloch, and Elihu Root, is the "southern strategy" side of this Wall Street Fabian crowd.

Helms's current policies fit neatly into the current policies of the "southern strategy" side of the Teddy Roosevelt mafia.

This Morgan-Harvard-Roosevelt mafia, is the most important element of Soviet influence inside the U.S.A. today. The Communist Party U.S.A., for example, was merely an asset of Morgan representatives such as Corliss Lamont. It is these nominally conservative, and powerful elements of the "bankers' CIA," on which Moscow really depends to influence U.S. policy, domestically, strategically, diplomatically.

Any takedown of current Soviet strategic doctrines toward the U.S.A. would mean a Soviet break with the revived "Trust" arrangements inside the U.S.A.: a break with the extended family of Teddy Roosevelt. Presently, Moscow is using the Morgan-Harvard-Roosevelt mafia, the "bankers' CIA," in an effort to kill LaRouche and wipe out circles and persons linked to me. William Weld, a business partner of the Communist China People's Liberation Army, is merely a tool of this mafia, carrying out such Soviet orders.

To negotiate peaceful relations with the U.S.A., Moscow would be obliged to take up the agenda LaRouche sent up as a trial balloon in the April 1984 *EIR* piece. This would represent a virtual break with Moscow's Teddy-Roosevelt-mafia assets; the clearest feature of that break is the Roosevelt mafia's current policy toward Hispanic-American republics.

A new international economic order

The keystone of any durable agreement to peaceful relations between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. is a fundamental change in both U.S. and Soviet relations toward Central and South America. Essentially, this would mean U.S. adoption of the policies set forth in my 1982 "Operation Juárez," plus Soviet supporting posture toward such a change in U.S.-"Latin American" relations. It would mean, on the U.S. side, junking the "Teddy Roosevelt" policies of the Soviets'

AIFLD, J. Peter Grace, Citibank, allies. It would mean, on the Soviet side, dumping Soviet-directed destabilization in the Western hemisphere, and reversing the current KGB policies expressed by the Primakov-Mikoyan *América Latina* periodical.

In this respect, Central and South America are today, strategically, the center of the world. Objectively, Western Europe is the linchpin of U.S. defensibility against the Soviet war-plan scenarios. However, the ability of the U.S.A., Canada, Western Europe, and Japan, to develop an effective strategic depth for the long haul, depends upon a radically changed relationship between the OECD and developing nations generally. "Latin America" is the keystone for such a change in strategic policy.

"Latin America" is a very bad, although popularized term. The term came into existence during the 1850s and 1860s, as a direct outgrowth of the efforts of Napoleon III to transform Hispanic America into a French empire. Napoleon III used the pro-feudalist, "Carlist" radicals of Spain and the Americas as his wedge for this attempted takeover of Hispanic and Portuguese America. The Spanish efforts to reconquer Peru and Mexico, during the 1850s and 1860s, and Napoleon III's Spanish-Britain-backed placing of a bloody Hapsburg dictator on looted Mexico's back, were the central event in this process. The term "Latin America" was coined during this period, as a code-word for this process of attempted conquest.

The mistaken use of the popular term, "Latin America," tends to prevent policy-analysts from even beginning to understand the strategic significance of Central and South America.

The populations of Central and South America do not have a "Latin culture." The languages of the republics are dialects of an Italian spoken by the ordinary Roman legionnaire of the period of the Roman republic, prior to the "Syrianization" of the legions under the Roman Empire. Spanish is recognizably a dialect of Italian today, such that Spaniards can easily learn to read Italian without formal education in Italian, and Italians can similarly learn Spanish almost in days of becoming acclimatized to the slight differences learn Spanish almost in days of becoming acclimatized to the slight differences in accent and vocabulary. Portuguese is a related case. French, too, is a dialect of Italian. The majority of the population of France, like François Rabelais, spoke a recognizable Italian into the 19th century; "Parisian French" is a synthetic transformation of Italian French, begun in the French court during the 17th century, but not really popularized until the middle of the 19th.

The myth, that French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Romanian, are "vulgate" dialects of Latin, was an absurdity popularized at the beginning of the 19th century. This myth was concocted as part of an effort to frustrate the work of Prussian ambassador to Rome, Wilhelm von Humboldt's effort to include in-depth studies of Italian under his classical philological treatment of Indo-European languages. Italian



The poet Dante Alighieri (1265-1321), who formed Italian as a literary language with his "Commedia." The culture of the Ibero-American republics is based on the revolution in statecraft effected by the influence of Dante's and Petrarca's work on the Italian Renaissance.

is a language at least as old, perhaps older than the Latin originally spoken by tiny colonies near the Tiber and in the region known today as Venice. Italian is the language which the ordinary Italian legionnaire-settler, usually an Italian-speaker, carried into France and Iberia, to form the basis for modern French, Spanish, Portuguese, and so forth, as the Sardinian Italian dialect is recognizably the father of Romanian.

The relevance of these corrective distinctions, is that the Hispanic republics of the Americas, most emphatically, have a distinct Roman Catholic culture derived from the evolution of the Italian-speaking heritage. It is this cultural heritage which makes these republics, as a group, of such decisive strategic importance today.

Most broadly, the culture of these republics is Augustinian. More immediately, their culture is based upon the revolution in statecraft effected by the influence of Dante Alighieri's and Petrarca's work upon the 15th-century Italian Golden Renaissance. Although the most sensitive poets and other writers worked to introduce classical Greek influences into the Spanish poetry from the 17th century onward, the reconstruction of Spanish as a modern form of literate language was based chiefly upon the Italian literary models of the 14th and 15th centuries.

What this means, is that the populations of Hispanic America, most emphatically, have the highest relative potential for high rates of technological and related progress in any part of the developing sector today.

Also, all complicating, contrary influences aside, the political culture of the Hispanic republics of the Americas, is a Roman Catholic version of the same principles motivating the U.S. Declaration of Independence. With these qualifications, the republics of Hispanic America are the nations closest to roots of our own, historically and culturally, as well as geographically.

These two considerations make the republics of Central

and South America the strategic pivot of proper OECD nations' policies today. To a large degree, the Philippines are also more or less an Asian extension, culturally, of Hispanic America. Among developing nations generally, after these Hispanic nations, the national culture with the greatest potential is the Vedantist current of India.

Hence, because of these combined political, cultural, and geographical considerations, what the world might become during the 21st century, will be decided by our policy toward these Hispanic republics today. What we decide, respecting Hispanic America, will determine our relations with Brazil, and also the policy-matrix governing our relations with the nations of Africa, the Middle East, and Asia generally.

From the U.S. side, our policy toward the republics of the Americas must be based upon a revival of two crucial elements of the early decades of our republic's existence: 1) "Mercantilist" economic relations among sovereign states, congruent with Alexander Hamilton's specifications for the American System of political-economy; 2) The revival of the original 1823 Monroe Doctrine, as expounded by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, and as correctly interpreted by Argentina's minister Luis M. Drago: the "Drago Corollary."

This is the policy articulated as an alternative to international financial collapse, in my 1982 "Operation Juárez." This is the direction of policy of President Alan García's Peru today, and is the thrust of the doctrine adopted by the multinational association of Hispanic American republics, SELA, repeatedly, and again most recently.

This is also the policy affirmed in the August 1976 closing resolution of the Non-Aligned Nations organization, at Colombo, Sri Lanka. It was reaffirmed, under Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's leadership, in the March 1983 Non-Aligned Meeting at Delhi, and affirmed again at the most recent Non-Aligned meeting in Zimbabwe. In principle, it is also the policy affirmed by former Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres, as his "New Marshall Plan" proposal, as echoed in parallel statements by the government of Egypt.

The principles which must be affirmed are chiefly these:

1) All nations of the world are absolutely sovereign up to the point of warfare to defend their sovereignty against external attacks upon that sovereignty. No foreign agency, including supranational agencies, has the right to dictate the internal affairs of a sovereign state.

2) All states have the obligation and right to pursue technological progress in an energy-intensive, capital-intensive mode, to the effect of serving the general welfare of present populations and their posterity. They have the right to reasonable access to credit and trade arrangements, as may be necessary to serve these purposes.

3) It is to the advantage of states sharing common principles of universal moral law, to assist one another in maintaining their respective sovereignties and in fruitful pursuit of technological progress in conditions of general welfare of their populations.

Upon those three simple principles of international law, all good things within practicable reach can be achieved. If the U.S.A. achieves such an order of affairs among states within this hemisphere, most of the world must soon follow.

However, such principles mean an end to present Soviet policies toward developing nations, and also an end to the Teddy Roosevelt mafia's policies.

Since 1974-75, Moscow has been consistently an adversary of every effort by the Non-Aligned Nations to introduce what that organization has described as an equitable form of "new international economic system." Moscow has organized internal sabotage of the Non-Aligned Nations' efforts through its agents within those nations, and in collaboration with allied Anglo-Saxon influences within the Commonwealth group.

I do not exaggerate in the least. In each of the relevant events, I was in part a direct participant, and otherwise present through the role of close friends. Each time, we seemed near to agreement on action, it was Moscow which intervened to sabotage agreement. This was the case in 1974-76. It was conspicuously Moscow which neutralized the work of the 1983 New Delhi meeting, and Moscow which deployed against President Alan Garcia, and attempted to wreck the Non-Aligned group entirely, at the 1986 Zimbabwe meeting. Moscow has never been a friend of developing nations' welfare.

Moscow's attitude toward developing nations has been twofold: 1) Always to intervene on the side of the "bankers' CIA" against proposals for a new international economic order; 2) Always to exploit the social ferment fostered by economic misery, to use developing nations against the United States.

Moscow understands very well what I am writing here. In private, Moscow would agree absolutely with my strategic assessment on this point, although from a position directly opposite to my own.

Moscow understands my April 1984 trial balloon in *EIR* very well. In that, I stress that the possibility of durable war-avoidance between the two thermonuclear superpowers depends absolutely upon a common commitment to what Dr. Edward Teller named, in 1982, as "the common aims of mankind." These common aims center around two: 1) Economic justice, at long last, for the peoples and nations of the developing sector; 2) Common efforts for the exploration and colonization of space. Cooperation on SDI's deployment, is subsumed under these two principal, long-term, common aims.

Were Moscow to elect such an agenda of war-avoidance negotiations between the superpowers, this would mean Moscow's abrupt break with its friends of the Teddy Roosevelt mafia. This would require a direct approach to President Reagan and leading circles in Japan, Western Europe, and the developing sector, opposing the Teddy Roosevelt mafia and its like on these issues. My case aside, many other figures and circles with much more explicit power and in-

fluence than I possess, are relevant leaders on many of the particular aspects of such an agenda. My special relevance is simply that I am the one person in today's world at the center of all the items of this agenda; I am the intellectual center, at which all threads of other elements of the agenda find a common point of union.

The likelihoods

Moscow will not give up its present war-plan, if either of two conditions are probable during the foreseeable future: 1) That Moscow can conquer the world by default, by decoupling the United States strategically from Western Europe, as Kissinger and Brzezinski propose this; 2) That Moscow can envisage its reaching an early point, at which Soviet first-strike and defense capabilities, combined, enable it to conquer the United States militarily. Only if both these options seem not likely, would Moscow consider dropping its present war-posture for negotiating measures of durable war-avoidance.

The only condition likely to bring such a change about, is a more energetic U.S. commitment to a global SDI deployment, emphasizing intimate partnership in this with Western Europe and Japan. Such partnership would stimulate an economic recovery in the OECD nations as a whole, would nullify the Kissinger-Brzezinski decoupling efforts, and would neutralize Soviet first-strike war-plans. In brief, energetic development and deployment of SDI has the effect of pushing current Soviet war-plans back to the drawing board.

That is why the Soviets are treating President Reagan's arms-reduction negotiations as a bad joke; only the SDI is of concern to them. Nothing but SDI is of any profound strategic importance to them.

If the Soviets sense that SDI-centered actions have virtually contained the Andropov-Ogarkov war-planning actions, they are forced to consider a new period of long-term coexistence between the OECD and Soviet empire. Their imperial interests demand that they not lose strength during an extended period of restrengthening of Western economies and strategic capabilities. They will turn toward hard negotiating, seeking every technological and economic concession they can get out of the new world-pie so ordered.

The precedent for a Soviet conditional break with the Teddy Roosevelt mafia, is found in the Moscow Trials, and the bitterness of the 1938-53 period of Stalin's rule. Stalin butchered much of the "Trust" apparatus inside Russia, by eliminating the power-structure of the Left and Right Oppositions of the Communist International. About 1955, Nikita S. Khrushchov revived the "Trust"-modeled relations with the Teddy Roosevelt mafia, as I have indicated the nature of that beast here.

Whenever the narrow "national" interests of the Russian empire come into conflict with the Soviets' Western liberal partners, Moscow will discover an in-built precedent from the Stalin period for a temporary break, or at least a significant distancing from the Teddy Roosevelt mafia.