

Soviet Debate On Labor Party Goes Public

The following statement was released May 16, 1977 by U.S. Labor Party National Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.:

A Soviet internal debate over the U.S. Labor Party, which may decide indirectly the question of thermonuclear war, has broken into print in the guise of a Soviet Rockefeller booster's published attack on the nineteenth century American Whig economist Henry Carey. The attack comes in this month's issue of the journal of Georgii Arbatov's USA-Canada Institute which publishes the first Russian translation of a letter by Karl Marx on Carey and includes an unbylined introduction describing the American Whig as a "vulgar bourgeois economist." Orders for this Soviet attack on Carey came from New York City associates of David Rockefeller protégé Richard Barnet.

The background to this development is as follows.

Since the period of the 1962 Cuba Missiles Crisis, a majority within the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee had, until Cyrus Vance's recent Moscow visit, adopted the thesis that the Rockefeller and allied financial interests were the peace-seeking "realists," and the war-booster the so-called "military-industrial complex." This wildly misguided estimation was not only in direct, and violent opposition to the views of Eisenhower acquaintance Marshal Zhukov, but was directly opposite to the firm — and correct — continuing estimation of the Soviet military intelligence.

As a result of this credulousness of the Soviet leadership majority, Rockefeller and others were able to build up a strong nest of Rockefeller "agents of influence" within various facets of Soviet and Eastern European institutions, and to launch the involuted Soviet-destabilization operation exposed as Willy Brandt-led (by high-level Italian intelligence operative Giannettini). The best-known of these Soviet nests of Rockefeller agents of influence is the so-called "American Faction" in and around the Soviet Central Committee, involving Georgii Arbatov and Kosygin's daughter and son-in-law. The Vienna-based "systems-analysis" institute, the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, with which Kosygin's son-in-law is directly associated, is part of the major covert operations deployed into Eastern Europe as a whole.

The U.S. end of this Soviet penetration network is David Rockefeller personally. Richard Barnet, co-leader of the Rockefeller-backed Institute for Policy Studies, is currently a key U.S.-based executive co-ordinator of that network. Barnet is also the center of a publisher's dysentery of fraudulent studies attacking industrial

interests in the USA and West Germany (most notably), on behalf of the Rockefellers.

In the aftermath of the breakdown of the Cyrus Vance "Mission to Moscow," the credibility of the so-called "American Faction" of the Soviet leadership plummeted. In this setting, the strategic analysis developed by the U.S. Labor Party was highly regarded among a significant number of the "American Faction's" Soviet and Eastern European critics. Key Soviet and Eastern European circles noted that the November 1, 1976 nationwide half-hour address of U.S. Labor Party Presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. had been proven correct, and the majority line of the "American Faction"-influenced forces around Brezhnev had been totally discredited.

As a result of this turn in the situation, Rockefeller forces in New York City launched a fresh, all-out counteroffensive against U.S. Labor Party credibility in top Soviet circles, including a massive deployment by Richard Barnet (presently on such a mission in Italy), transmitting "marching orders" and pressures both directly to Rockefeller agents of influence in Moscow and through conduits in various Communist parties in Western Europe and elsewhere.

At present, the paradoxical situation exists in Moscow, that the Warsaw Pact is on an imminent war-alert footing, but that the shattered residue of the discredited "American Faction" line is being maintained through official attacks against the U.S. Labor Party.

This situation has many important complications. The Rockefeller-linked forces conducting this campaign against the U.S. Labor Party's intellectual influence are the same forces directly involved in the current wave of international terrorism. This terrorist wave is directed by closely cooperating forces, including Interpol and the so-called "right"-fascist "Black International," Israeli intelligence, the Marcus Raskin-Barnet-headed international neo-Fabian networks of Maoists, Trotskyists and "left"-fascists generally, plus a Rockefeller-headed consortium of complicit financial institutions and "multinationals." One of the targets of this Rockefeller-network wave of international terrorism is the government of Italy, which is fighting back with massive arrests and related actions against neo-Fabian and other terrorist forces, and with direct public exposure of the Rockefeller terrorist network generally.

It is for this reason that Richard Barnet is currently in Italy, publicly spearheading a pro-terrorist campaign in cooperation with the Rome U.S. Embassy, and simultaneously launching a major public attack on the U.S. Labor Party in Italy.

The gist of the matter is this. If those Soviet forces endorsing the U.S. Labor Party strategic analysis prevail in time, the Soviet leadership will move to establish a new treaty relationship with the USA, NATO, Japan and other countries. This new Soviet policy will be based on the stated principle that the nations of the world have a common fundamental interest in global technological progress, in rapid expansion of industrial and agricultural production, and in cooperation for rapid development of fission and fusion technologies in particular.

Such a Soviet posture would provide the positive basis for political security and economic-cooperation agreements through which the adversary relationship between the USA-NATO and Warsaw Pact nations could be rapidly defused and ultimately ended.

If such a shift in Soviet outlook were introduced to such locations as the forthcoming Belgrade conference, it would provide trade-union, industrialist and farmer forces in the USA and other OECD nations with the kinds of options they require to check the brinkmanship of the Rockefeller-led forces. The Rockefeller forces are painfully aware of this.

The key problem for the Soviet leadership is that they have never understood the United States, and have no competent knowledge of the American Revolution and its deep-rooted traditional influences among the majority of trade-unionists, industrialists and technology-oriented

farmers. For this reason, the present, wide-spread circulation of U.S. Labor Party analysis of The American Revolution and its continuing impact on internal life within the present-day U.S. is an eye-opener to all top-level Soviet and Eastern European circles seeking to discover a political way out of the war-danger.

For this reason, Richard Barnet and his associates have launched a major propaganda campaign against George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, and the pre-Lincoln American Whigs, feeding this Rockefeller line into top Soviet circles through the agents of influence of the "American Faction." Since Whig economist Henry Carey, the major influence on Abraham Lincoln's economic thought, was criticised by Karl Marx — partially rightly, but in the main wrongly, because of Marx's own ignorance of the American Revolution and early 19th century USA— Barnet and his friends have chosen a public attack on Henry Carey, the leading U.S. anti-slavery economist, as the present leading feature of their efforts to prove that U.S. industrialists have "always been reactionary."

The grave practical danger in this situation is that unless the Soviet leadership makes an immediate and effective proposal to the pro-industrialist interests of the advanced-capitalist countries, there are very few remaining efficient options for the rest of us to stop the presently accelerating count-down toward intercontinental thermonuclear war.

Non-Proliferation—Inducing The Soviets To Oppose Energy Development

Scarcely two months ago, *Newsweek* fabricated a report that the Soviet Union was prepared to back Jimmy Carter's curbs on nuclear technology exports, then freshly announced, and would do so at the April 28 meeting of the London Club of nuclear exporters. Items in the Soviet press, notably condemnations of West Germany's nuclear technology sales to Brazil, were adduced by Administration experts and advisors to support the prediction.

Nothing of the sort took place. At the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) conference on the spread of nuclear energy, held this month in Salzburg, Austria, the Soviet delegation reportedly cheered U.S. delegates who firmly *opposed* Carter's intention to ban plutonium and the development of plutonium-generating fast breeder reactors. In the wake of Western summit talks in London, where the Europeans said "no thank you" to Carter's plans, Britain's energy minister Wedgewood Benn flew to Moscow to discuss exchanges of off-shore oil know-how for advice on thermonuclear fusion development from the USSR. The Soviet ambassador in Bonn raised the prospect of reviving the stalled Soviet-West German Kaliningrad nuclear power station deal. And Japanese Prime Minister Fukuda hinted at Soviet inclusion in the nuclear matters "study group" Europe agreed to form as a sop to Carter.

1977 is not the first year in which politicians and specialists representing Rockefeller financial interests have proclaimed that they and the Soviet Union have a common interest in curbing dissemination of nuclear technology. Rockefeller-linked journalists in the mid-1960s, a Johns Hopkins survey in 1970, and the U.S. Nations Association earlier this decade pointed to this supposed convergence. In papers prepared for a 1971 conference of the respective U.S. and USSR U.N. associations, a U.S. team, of which present State Department Soviet desk head Marshal Shulman was a member, concluded that Moscow was more opposed to nuclear technology and fuel transfer than the U.S., in cases where non-signatories of the Non-Proliferation Treaty were on the receiving end.

In reality, there is not, nor could there be, a common interest against nuclear energy development between the Soviet leaders, whose primary concern is growth of the Soviet economy through technological advance, and the Rockefellers, bent on deindustrialization. Any appearances to that effect are a result of Zbigniew Brzezinski's "convergence theory" in action: the convergence is between the Rockefellers' policies and the Soviets' manipulated fears. In the major case of nuclear energy, the Rockefeller interests have played on the Soviet leadership's horror of some U.S. client state let-