

Whether or not the U.S. press and general public wish to perpetually regurgitate and credulously swallow once again the popularized myths concerning the Kennedy Administration, certain leading forces in the world's governments know the truth and operate on the basis of that knowledge. Excepting Georgii Arbatov and his accomplices, who are admittedly in David Rockefeller's pocket, the Soviet policy will be premised on the truth about the Kennedy Administration precedents for the current crises, and not the delusions popularized in the U.S. press.

Internal Soviet Considerations

The Soviet leadership overall is stupid on only one crucial point. That stupidity is this: because of their nationalist-Oblomovist tendencies, for lack of any competently sensuous grasp of the "outside world's" internal social-political life, and because of wishful, almost obsessive illusions concerning Communist organizations in the OECD and developing nations, the Soviet leadership is methodologically incompetent in matters concerning internal political processes in those "outside world" nations. In practical matters otherwise, in matters of military strategies and statecraft, they are well informed and capable.

Internally, within the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact nations, the principal political problems are two.

Within the Soviet Union and CPSU itself, the most glaring problem is Soviet agriculture's backwardness. This is partly a technical-economic problem of adequate mechanization and so forth, but is also a reflection of pervasive political administrative incompetence by those sections of the state apparatus and party which have ongoing, historic responsibility for such administrative incompetence and its results.

Secondly, with respect to the bloc, since Soviet primitive accumulation against Eastern European countries at the end of World War II, in the effort thus to reconstruct the war-shattered Soviet economy, subsequent political-economic relations within the bloc have involved a struggle to dump the irrational cooperation in *parallel national-economic* development policies of the 1950s and so forth, and to move toward bloc-wide centralized planning, thus enhancing the overall division of labor in especially capital goods production. This involves a problem for Poland, because of its internal agricultural and related political problems of underdevelopment, and the irrational autarchical tendencies to be overcome in Rumania. This is also an internal problem for the Soviet leadership, because of implied Soviet political and economic concessions to the bloc overall in institutionalizing

such centralized economic planning bloc-wide.

These problems are most relevant as key background considerations in the composition and balance of CPSU tendencies on all issues, and are very weighty matters respecting the intermediate-term and longer-term implications of CMEA's transfer-ruble role as a gold-based currency in the forming of a new monetary system. The CMEA countries have a more than adequate growth-potential under such new monetary agreements, but that growth depends upon success in accelerating the per-hectare and per-man-hour productivities of agriculture, and upon centralized bloc-wide planning in the capital goods sector.

For related reasons, the underlying determinants of Soviet factional and related policy configurations are not competently understood in even those OECD circles which have the relevant facts at their disposal. Chiefly, understanding the Soviet and CMEA problems requires a method of political-economic analysis which most "Western" monetarist circles would not wish to see applied to the capitalist sector.

Possible Soviet Reactions

In the case in which the Arbatov Doctrine is dumped by the Soviet leadership, there are, as we have indicated, two overall "scenarios" which will alternatively predominate in the Politburo. The first would be an embittered retreat from the hateful "outside world" to "Mother Russia." Under conditions of current Carter policy, that "scenario" leads to an early general war, in which one may be absolutely assured the Soviet military will destroy the United States with a total commitment of all available strategic strike forces within the first hour (e.g., the death of 160-180 millions of the U.S. population). The second would be a reversal of outward-focused strategic options from Carter pacts to commitments to Western European and developing forces.

Under the second variant, the Soviet leadership would not permit Carter provocations to determine the timing and subject of Soviet counteraction. They would, instead, go for vulnerable flanks of their choosing against the Rockefeller interests. Their included option, in this case, for minimizing the danger of early confrontation with Carter would be to launch an international campaign emphasizing the fact of Carter's mental imbalance — sympathizing with the plight of the otherwise Soviet-beloved U.S. nation, which is obliged to temporarily suffer the pains of having a certifiable lunatic and Rockefeller puppet as President.

— Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Georgii Arbatov: Rockefeller's Man In Moscow

Recent cross-checking of information from high-level sources in several nations has established as fact that Soviet Communist Party Central Committee member Georgii Arbatov is not only the Rockefeller brothers' agent in Moscow, but is significantly part of a New York City-based apparatus going back to at least the 1938 period of British intelligence executive Colonel William

Stephenson's Rockefeller Center-based operations. This element in current global relations must be exposed and removed as the single most probable contributing factor in causing an early thermonuclear war.

Although our recent findings to this effect depend significantly on crucial pieces of information supplied to us by high-level sources, our ability to solve the puzzle in-

volved with the aid of these pieces of information dates back to 1973. The relevant lines of continuing researches by our organization's executive and security agencies involve three overlapping topical areas of ongoing research.

The first line of investigations centered about an apparent collaboration by Soviet and USA-NATO intelligence networks in February 1973 to January 1974 disruption operations against the USLP, including the February 1973—August 1, 1973 developments around the drugging of Konstantin George, and the December 1973—January 1974 events, including the drugging of Christopher White by a joint MI-5—U.S. intelligence team, and the aborted assassination project against LaRouche involving the leadership of the Communist Party USA (as confirmed by FOIA-released FBI documents). By the middle of the first week of January we had adduced from facts of the White case that the disruption operation was essentially controlled by U.S.-based intelligence organizations using their controlled "laundering" covers within East Berlin and various Communist parties. That conclusion concerning the apparent "CIA-KGB" joint-operation was essentially correct but, as subsequent events proved, involved a certain ingenuousness on our part at that time concerning the differentiated structure of the U.S.-based intelligence community.

The second line of investigation centers about the case of Alexander Helphand-Parvus, and the connected case of Admiral Wilhelm Canaris. This investigation exposed the hidden truths concerning the modern history of the socialist movement, as well as the most crucial background facts concerning the causes for the outbreak and course of two world wars.

The third line of investigation involved a re-study of the 1940 assassination of L.D. Trotsky. This was provoked by our Fall, 1973 receipt from Mexican sources of the (unused) report of the investigation made in preparation for the film which featured Richard Burton in a cinematic travesty on history. Through hard information from various sources, we made the following relevant determinations: that the overall Trotsky assassination operation was under the supervision of Colonel William Stephenson and Nelson A. Rockefeller, together with British intelligence networks working under Rockefeller's pre-CIAA (Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs) direction in concert with sections of the FBI assigned to Rockefeller. That the operation itself was principally under the joint direction of Lombardo Toledano (a Rockefeller network agent) and Santiago Carrillo (historically a British intelligence agent), using Diego Rivera, Carrillo protégé Mercader (the assassin), with assistance from a network of combined British and Rockefeller (mainly) agents working under the cover of a Comintern nest in New York City and linked to a "Third Camp" U.S.-British intelligence network tied to Sidney Hook (a former collaborator of Toledano) within and around the Trotskyist leaderships in New York City.

Now, added to the results of those three lines of somewhat parallel, somewhat overlapping investigations, we have the following pieces of crucial information which we have cross-checked with various authoritative, relevant sources.

That there is a unit in and around the Communist Party in New York City which performs the *up-front* function of supplying the Soviet leadership (mainly) with two sets of lists of U.S. and Canadian citizens. The first is a "white list," of individuals who should be welcomed in the Soviet Union; the other is a "black list," on which this reporter's name is currently most prominent. This unit dates to approximately 1938, and is the same unit involved in New York City aspects of the Trotsky assassination. Furthermore, *this unit is a de facto extension of the U.S. State Department and has a longstanding overlap with the FBI.*

This unit overlaps the activities of Georgii Arbatov and those others who regularly negotiate secret agreements between the Soviet leadership and the Rockefeller interests. This same unit performs a related auxiliary function in conducting disinformation to the Soviet leadership concerning U.S. policies, internal USA political and social developments and so forth.

Elements of the KGB are reported to have known of this unit and its operations for years, although not the full implications of either the unit's functioning or of Arbatov's current, deeper role in respect of his dealings with USA East Coast leading interests. Up to a recent time, at least, according to information received from two highly placed, distinct, and credible sources, the Soviet military intelligence has not known of the functions of the unit or its deeper implications.

The significance of the operation more broadly is that it is chiefly through this unit and related conduits including Arbatov that the Soviet leadership has currently adopted an operational policy which both undermines the strategic position of Western Europe, Japan and the developing nations, and otherwise puts the Soviet leadership into the scenario-track leading toward early thermonuclear war.

This operation also intersects the internal political life of the Soviet Union and other CMEA countries. The common origin of the right-wing factions in the Soviet Communist Party and the networks historically subsuming the cited New York City unit is the old "Parvus network." The notable leading personalities of the "Parvus network" for the 1920s are Karl Radek, N. Bukharin, and Riazanov, among others.

For immediate purposes, Bukharin is the most relevant of these former Parvus agents. Around the Bukharin group Anglo-Dutch influences promoted the anti-industrialization policies of the 1923-1927 period, in the interests of Anglo-Dutch grain and petroleum policies respecting Soviet foreign trade. Although Bukharin and his factional allies were defeated after the 1927-29 period, and Bukharin and Radek ushered from the scene during the Moscow Trials period, the traditions of the right-wing Bukharinist current have by no means ever been fully eradicated from sections of the Soviet party and state. It is these descendants of that Bukharinist tendency which the Arbatov operation most prominently intersects in the CPSU itself.

Although the majority of such CPSU right-wing strata are Soviet patriots without doubt, they are the ultra-Oblomovist current, as distinct from those "hard-line," scientific, industrialist, and related military currents which reflect lawfully the voluntarist tendencies of

technologically-oriented industrial and related development. They represent, as Lenin himself would have emphasized, the petit-bourgeois sociological outlook of the peasantry, as reinforced by the petit-bourgeois tendencies characteristic of layers of the state bureaucracy. Consistent with that sociological-ideological character, they are — in Soviet language — “anti-Leninist” in epistemological tendency, that is “objectivist” and anti-“voluntarist,” sharing the mechanistic interpretation of Marx’s writings common to Rothschild protégé Alexander Herzen, Rockefeller-network protégé Sidney Hook, and the emigré Russian Mensheviks.

It is correct, in one sense, to view the CPSU leadership as successfully duped concerning the Anglo-American political intelligence agencies’ takeover of leading sections of the old Communist International and the majority of Communist party leaderships of the OECD and developing nations. However, as various U.S. and NATO political intelligence agencies have lately repeatedly emphasized, the Rockefeller faction’s proposed confrontationist strategic policy toward the Soviet leadership depends upon the assumption that the “hard-liners” and “Clausewitzians” within the Soviet leadership will be outflanked by an Oblomovist current around Brezhnev. That Oblomovist current includes outright de facto Rockefeller agents such as Georgii Arbatov, but also Soviet patriots, whose right-wing (e.g., “liberal” social-political tendencies renders them wishfully susceptible to the influence of Rockefeller and allied agents planted among them.

Consequently, because of the much-increased danger of war flowing from the influence of the cited Rockefeller-linked network, we publicly urge relevant agencies in Western Europe and elsewhere to “blow” the facts of this privately-controlled intelligence network in such a way that appropriate Soviet agencies can eradicate the problem. This, we propose, is of greater urgency than

exposing the fraud of the so-called “dissidents” caper of madman Zbigniew Brzezinski. Brzezinski’s “dissidents” provocations can lead to a war danger only if the presently operational “Arbatov line” sets the stage for the subsequent and inevitable general-war turn.

The most stupid policy imaginable, from the standpoint of industrial self-interest of the OECD countries, is toleration of Rockefeller efforts to confuse and thus enrage the Soviet leadership. The establishment of a new monetary system, the most vital interest of every nation in the world — including the USA — requires a surgically precise and correct perception of the common intersection of not only the short-term, but intermediate-term and long-term interests of the CMEA, OECD, and developing nations. As the effects of the “Arbatov line” already demonstrate, such negotiations are virtually impossible as long as the element of irrationality is fostered in any leading relevant quarter.

This has a particular, concrete importance respecting the Soviet leadership. Although the Soviets are capable of correctly estimating the validity of the International Development Bank and equivalent proposals, such variants are strange to their traditional strategical outlooks. Hence, successful negotiations — requiring that Soviet leaders proceed with a competent insight into the OECD nations’ side of the matter — require the highest degree of clearheadedness from the Soviet and CMEA representatives’ side. The climate of frank and clear-headed discussions and negotiations must be energetically fostered. This is already difficult enough without the introduction of major digressions and delays. Tolerating continued deployment of Rockefeller agent Georgii Arbatov by “our OECD side of the fence” is downright insanity . . . immediately, from the standpoint of the risk of war, and overall, by virtue of our need to establish immediately effective means for recovery from the present global depression.

— Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.