

LaRouche intervenes in Washington policy crisis

by Warren J. Hamerman

On June 29, as the decayed structures of the “Old World” global monetary system threatened to detonate and as Yuri Andropov deployed his assets in the United States to attempt a “roll-back” of the Mutually Assured Survival strategic doctrine announced by President Reagan on March 23, *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. delivered a special strategic briefing to 65 high-level diplomatic, governmental, and political representatives in Washington, D.C.

LaRouche, who chairs the National Democratic Policy Committee’s advisory committee, began his address to the audience, which included officials from more than 21 governments, by asserting that 16 months ago in Washington at an *EIR* conference, in February of 1982, he had introduced a proposed change in strategic doctrine and a new agenda for U.S.-Soviet relations. On March 23, President Reagan introduced a substantial portion of the military part of that proposal, and the administration is also proposing general negotiations with the U.S.S.R. of the type LaRouche advocated to end the era of thermonuclear terror.

LaRouche continued, “Another feature of my proposal, also echoed by Edward Teller, would eliminate not the means of war, but the reason for it. The era of stability in which we can attack the cause of war must be sought. Weapons do not cause war; people do. We have to change people to stop war. Changing people requires one thing. Every nation on this planet is immoral. My State Department is immoral—and probably also unlawful and intoxicating! Why? Because we are murdering more people through the International Monetary Fund and Bank for International Settlements than Adolf Hitler did. IMF conditionalities kill more people than Ausch-

witz. We cannot appeal to people’s morality to stop war. The only basis for peace is an agreement to cooperate in what Dr. Teller called ‘the common aims of mankind.’ Unless the U.S. implements this program, we are going to have a war.”

As LaRouche spoke the U.S. Congress was in the final stages of preparation for an anticipated middle of July approval in the Senate of the A. Volcker as Federal Reserve chairman and a simultaneous House of Representatives approval of the \$8.5 billion U.S. quota increase to the International Monetary Fund. In fact, unknown to LaRouche at the time he was speaking, former Treasury secretaries—including John Sneider, C. Douglas Dillon, Henry Fowler, John Connally, George Shultz, G. William Miller, and Michael Blumenthal—had met with President Reagan the day before at the White House to intimidate him into making the U.S. the financial “backstop” of the bankrupt International Monetary Fund. When LaRouche subsequently heard of the White House blackmail session he commented: “The very same treasury secretaries who created the world financial mess now demand that the President ignore solving the mess. I consider anyone who accepts their advice to be a Benedict Arnold. If the advice of the former treasury secretaries is followed, then the American public had better get used to living in dire poverty and speaking Russian.”

In fact, at the very same time that certain administration officials were attempting to sell the credulous the hoax that the U.S. economy was experiencing a recovery, senior White House economic analysts were operating from scenarios projecting an 80 per cent probability that the Third World



Stuart Lewis/NSIPS

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

debt structures will blow out this summer. Even the Federal Reserve Board concedes a greater than 25 per cent chance of such a full-scale world monetary crisis this year.

At the Washington policy seminar on June 29 LaRouche outlined how the Russian Orthodox Church, effectively “the fourth arm of the Soviet government,” was deploying worldwide to prevent any global stability. For instance, the Russians are working together with Israeli “Lavie Project” operatives in Central America, an area of conflict which the United States mistakenly believes is a parallel to Vietnam. LaRouche emphasized that Central America is not another Vietnam but another Thirty Years’ War, in the exact sense that Friedrich Schiller wrote about the religious cult and depopulation aspects of the Thirty Years’ War.

In contrast to the dangers of imminent world war, LaRouche described how developments in laser and plasma research could transform the technological capacities of mankind. “We are at most two generations away from the point where one skilled worker will represent more productivity than the whole human race during the 19th century! But with this kind of power in sight, there is still material shortage on earth. The point this trouble began was 48 hours after the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His policies were to create the ‘American Century.’ Enough of these 18th-century colonial methods! We ought to create sovereign nation states and develop these nations by American methods! However, after Roosevelt died, what happened? You had people like Bertrand Russell—one of the most evil people imaginable—propose conducting ‘preventive nuclear war.’ ”

Era of madness

LaRouche proceeded to outline a conceptual history of the post-World War II strategic doctrine evolution from “Operation Dropshot” in 1947, through the Soviets’ development of their own fission and then the first fusion bomb, which transformed Bertrand Russell into a “pacifist,” and how Leo Szilard, McGeorge Bundy, Henry Kissinger, the Harrimans, the Morgans, and the Cabots proposed using thermonuclear weapons as weapons of terror to relieve tensions through “limited nuclear war”—MAD policies which became the official policies of the U.S. government and NATO. Then the Russell Association for World Government evolved into the Pugwash Conference, “which was from the beginning a ‘back channel’ to the Soviet Union for our Eastern Establishment—meaning the U.S. State Department and so forth.”

LaRouche laid out the fundamental aspects of the danger: “For 25 years these people have been sitting in back channels and manipulating policies of governments in the name of ‘peace’—i.e., MAD and deterrence—bringing us now to the edge of nuclear war. What Russell proposed was an Anglo-Saxon world empire—that’s what a world government is. . . . To understand what a world empire is, you must look at the real history, at the Chaldeans who set up the Babylonian Empire and then the Persian Empire. When that didn’t work, they cooked up a deal with the Oracle at Delphi to divide the Empire into an Eastern and Western Division—precisely what Pugwash proposed to the Soviet Union. They propose to divide the world into two divisions of empire, which will not work, as Alexander the Great demonstrated. We are now at the edge of war because the Soviet Union has adapted to, has colluded under the guise of detente to set up two empires.”

The racist world empires

LaRouche demonstrated that the proposal could never work because both divisions of the world empire have always intensively “cheated” on one another. “Only a ‘One Empire’ or a ‘No Empire’ system can work. A ‘Two Empire’ system, with each cheating on the other, is a prescription for war. What’s the motivation of these characters who want to set up empires? Why, they are racists! They want to reduce the number of people whose skin color is not the ‘desired shade.’ ” LaRouche advised anyone who did not believe him to read Russell’s *Problems of Empire* or the books of Alexander King of NATO and the Club of Rome.

LaRouche continued: “The purpose of Malthusianism and the Club of Rome, the Aspen Institute, and the Ford Foundation is that they are nothing but racist institutions that wish to depopulate the parts of the world that the Anglo-Saxon race might need in the future. An empire is a means of regulating other races.” LaRouche traced the histories of Empires from the Chaldeans to Venice’s creation of the Ottoman Empire against the Paleologues, then the Hapsburgs, up through Volpe di Misurata and Alexander Helphand Parvus who set up the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1907 for Venice. LaRouche also traced the way in which the Nazi and

terrorist networks from the Middle East through Pakistan are operating from Swiss and Venetian control today.

The effect of the evils committed by the empire and Nazi networks has been confounded, LaRouche stated, by the widespread problem of the incompetence of governments. LaRouche gave the example of Ronald Reagan, "a man whom I like as a person and would do everything I can to help him. However, it would take almost a miracle to make our government competent."

LaRouche also exposed the dangerous folly of the so-called Three-Empire game when the Anglo-Americans opened a back channel to Peking. Thus, one has some people working for the Anglo-Saxon empire, others the Russian Imperial Empire and others the Chinese empire—and all of them cheating on each other!

Morality and statecraft

If minority percentages composed of the good elements from various governments around the world can be organized for the "common aims of mankind," LaRouche proposed, mankind may yet be saved. He concluded his speech by elaborating his proposals for the substance of such a program.

LaRouche asserted: "We must go back to the system developed in the 15th century of sovereign nation states—sovereign but acting from a 'community of principle' in the mutual benefit of each other for realizing technological power. We must begin to move in that direction so as to produce

a moral change in the world—and we, or at least our children, will be changed individually by that. Because life is short, if one concentrates on personal pleasures, these are taken into the grave and do not mean anything. But if someone dedicates his life to a sovereign, moral nation-state, this can assure that his life's contribution will mean something for future generations. The state must be dedicated to ensure that the good contributions of each citizen will mean something in the future. And, it is the same for entire nations, which also have a very short life in the span of history. What counts, then, is something higher than the individual nation—humanity as a whole; but just as the individual finds moral realization in the nation, so the nation finds moral realization in the furtherance of humanity as a whole. Therefore, if we can afford to each child a sense that that is the world order, that nations contribute to the common good of mankind and individuals contribute to the good of their nation—on that basis, we have morality.

"I spoke of the power that's within our reach. I have some good ideas about projects such as cutting a key canal in Asia and another in Central America. . . . However, what will really make this possible is *space*! We can have powered flight between planets by 2005, or at least 2015, if nations are committed to it. We could have colonies on the moon. Why? Because with that as our base, we can mine the surface of Mars for the materials needed for interplanetary powered flight.

LaRouche: 'Yuri Andropov must negotiate seriously

The following statement was issued by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Advisory Council Chairman, National Democratic Policy Committee, in Washington on July 7.

Acting solely as a private citizen and public political figure of the United States, I have issued the following open challenge to the morality of Soviet General Secretary Yuri Andropov:

Secretary Andropov, you have stated repeatedly and falsely that you have been willing to negotiate seriously, whereas, you allege, President Ronald Reagan is not. On the contrary, you know that I know that it is you who have refused to negotiate, and therefore it is you who are plunging the world toward a new strategic missile-crisis and growing risk of a state of "launch-on-warning" between the two superpowers.

In February 1982, at a public two-day seminar held here, in Washington, D.C., I challenged both the Soviet Union and the United States to adopt a new strategic doctrine, by means of which the looming missile-crisis of late 1983 might be avoided. Your government, so far, has rejected this proposal, whereas, the President's declaration of March 23, 1983, proposed precisely that offer to your government. You denounced that offer from the President, but refused to allow the Soviet population to read what President Reagan offered within the Soviet press.

I am not blind to the fact that there are certain secondary difficulties in adopting such a new basis for negotiations. However, I insist that it is insane to continue, as you are, on that same course of strategic policy which has brought us to the present brink of thermonuclear war-fighting—the evil policies of the Pugwash Conferences, the policies of Nuclear Deterrence which created the present missile-crisis. Would it not be better to negotiate the secondary difficulties than to continue a Nuclear Deterrence policy which almost ensures a plunge into thermonuclear warfare?

I am also not ignorant of some of the other considerations affecting Soviet policy. You appear on the edge of gobbling up Germany through aid of old aristocrats and

“What’s important is bringing the affairs of earth into orbit so that people on earth know there is a moral purpose in the future to their existence, and to give a sense of limitless responsibility and possibility for humanity. To develop ourselves as a people we need to do these things with the idea of uplifting culture. . . . So the function of the United States and Soviet Union agreeing on the kind of military doctrine enunciated by Reagan—the significance is not to settle the danger of war with this crazy ‘détente’ of the two empire system—is for the U.S. and Soviet Union to take the initiative as leading powers to bring that kind of change into being, because it requires crash programs in technologies which will bring advances that can help us solve the problems of developing countries. Therefore, we can shape culture so that we do not make the same mistakes again.”

The KGB’s assets on Capitol Hill

Ironically, the very day that LaRouche was speaking in Washington—June 29—one day *before* the FBI publicly announced that it was investigating “Debategate,” the same trumped-up scandal over the Carter campaign’s briefings in the 1980 electoral debates was the lead story on Moscow Domestic Television Service’s “World Today” news program. The story was also the lead on Moscow World Service radio broadcasts that night: denouncing Reagan’s crimes and praising the courageous American “press, representatives of the public, and the Congress” who were committed to pun-

church organizations. You have control over the Nuclear Freeze Movement in the United States, and apparently have significant direct or indirect control over not only the Democratic Party Chairman Charles T. Manatt, but also the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Perhaps you believe that with such assets as even the United States’s FBI working on your side against the President’s strategic doctrine, why should you negotiate anything, if Manatt et al. are about to deliver you the United States free of charge?

If that is your thinking—if you think you can gain support against President Reagan from the Democratic Party and FBI, you are playing a dangerous, possibly, suicidal game. You misread the American people. Once they see the Soviet Union “Finlandizing” West Germany and possibly also Italy and France, they will react to this as they did to the Dec. 7, 1941, bombing of Pearl Harbor by Japan.

You are letting something out of the bottle that even the put back in again. Act to stop this nonsense now. Let the world know that you are sensible enough to accept the generous offer President Reagan extended on March 23, 1983. Prove that you are truly a man of peace.

ishing the President for his crimes. These are the Soviet media which had viciously attacked President Reagan’s March 23 shift away from the Kissinger-Harriman strategic doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction toward the development and deployment of high-energy laser and particle beam defensive anti-missile systems.

“Debategate” is in actuality an Andropov deployment through KGB assets in the United States—such as the FBI, current chairman of the Democratic National Committee Charles “Banker” Manatt, and the media—to topple President Reagan by targeting the National Security Council, Central Intelligence Agency and key officials in charge of U.S. national security.

At the same time, over one quarter of the U.S. House of Representatives and 10 per cent of the U.S. Senate are official co-sponsors of a Congressional Joint Resolution (H.J.R. 120), initiated by Sen. Paul Tsongas (D-Mass.) and Rep. Joe Moakley (D-Mass.) which was written, in effect, in Moscow. One freshman Democrat member of the House of Representatives, sitting in his office on Capitol Hill, recently told me: “You have no idea how bad it is around here. A substantial number of the members of Congress would vote right now to begin dismantling our defense system; a lot of them would vote right now for unilateral disarmament!!!”

With some 45 additional co-sponsors announced in June, 122 members of the House of Representatives and 10 Senators endorse the resolution which calls for immediate negotiations to ban any weapons use in space (whether the weapons are space-based, land-based, or air-based). All of the leading Harriman Democrats and the Kissinger Republicans back this direct attack on the March 23 strategic doctrine, including Sens. Paul Tsongas (D-Mass.), Paul Sarbanes (D-Md.), Gary Hart (D-Col.), Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.), Mark Hatfield (R-Oreg.), William Proxmire (D-Wisc.) and Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.).

The 122 leaders of the “Unilateral Disarmament” movement in the House of Representatives include, not surprisingly, the very same Congressmen who have been militant supporters of Global 2000 genocide for the developing sector, the leaders of the effort to pass national legislation decriminalizing marijuana and the patrons of radical terrorist networks. (See “Is Your Senator or Congressman Pushing the KGB Line on Capitol Hill?”, *New Solidarity*, July 11, 1983.)

Between July 11 and the traditional August recess of Congress, the Senate is expected to railroad through a vote approving the renomination of Paul A. Volcker as Federal Reserve chairman and the House of Representatives is expected to approve the \$8.5 billion U.S. tranche for the IMF. Thus, only the bold and timely policies proposed by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. in his intervention into the Washington policy crisis of late June, can avert a strategic showdown culminating in global financial chaos and world war. The collapsed “old world empire” system must now be replaced by Lyndon LaRouche’s New World Economic Order program.