

Washington Blows The Horn Of Lunacy

The following statement was issued on Feb. 6 by U.S. Labor Party chairman, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The fiction, traded by the British, that Soviet and Cuban activity in Ethiopia represent a "Soviet imperialist threat" is utter nonsense. However, if the United States behaves on the basis of reacting to that British fabrication — and the announced Sixth and Seventh Fleet deployment are a step in that direction— then the United States' action in support of an illusion will transform the fantasy into a deadly reality.

The problem in the United States centers around the British-inspired destruction of the Central Intelligence Agency and other vital instruments of U.S. intelligence capabilities. By this sort of "sensory deprivation" of the U.S. political command, the British and their agents-of-influence within leading U.S. political and other organizations have been aided in virtually brainwashing former President Gerald Ford and others into swallowing and pathetically regurgitating deadly nonsense on the "Horn of Africa" and other key points of the strategic picture as a whole.

Given the objectives which impel the City of London and the British government, and given the total strategic picture at this moment, an escalation around an otherwise minor point on the strategic spectrum — the Horn of Africa — could set into motion an irreversible political chain reaction leading rapidly into total intercontinental thermonuclear war. My foolish friends in Washington and elsewhere could wake up radioactively dead very soon unless they quickly come to their senses and cease the sort of nonsense former President Ford, among others, is currently regurgitating.

Facts About the Horn of Africa

The following are the facts concerning the Horn of Africa. No leading Pentagon official or U.S. intelligence officer could competently deny any of the following facts.

(1) The conflict between Ethiopia and Somalia was created by British intelligence, with the complicity of Henry Kissinger during the Ford Administration.

(2) Kissinger, in particular, worked with Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies and other relevant institutions inside and outside State Department channels to induce the Ethiopian government to "perceive" Somalia as its natural adversary. This was pushed at the point Somalia was receiving substantial Soviet military and other aid, and was regarded in Washington as the Soviet's "client" on balance.

(3) Meanwhile, British intelligence, working through institutions such as the London Institute of Race Relations, promoted the idea of a "Greater Somalia" involving areas of Ethiopia, Djibouti, and Kenya — one of the British intelligence "particularist" destabilization antics closely interfaced with British international terrorism.

(4) Following the "entropy" developed among the Non-Aligned nations during 1976 following the 1975 Rambouillet summit, Somalia was impelled into an hetero-

nomous direction, and the Organization of African Unity was largely neutralized as a stabilizing institution. Under these circumstances, the government of Somalia was drawn into accelerating support of the "Somalia Liberation Front," a British intelligence creation, in violation of continental agreement of the Organization of African Unity.

(5) Meanwhile, coups in Ethiopia, run by British intelligence (chiefly), with complicity from Kissinger, backfired, bringing into dominance a new Ethiopian governing combination which had connections to networks of Soviet influence.

(6) During the following period, the Soviets exerted their influence in both Ethiopia and Somalia for the purpose of ending the conflict.

(7) Subsequently, influences were recently brought to bear on the government of Somalia to break all significant relations with the Soviet Union and break off relations with Cuba entirely. That blunder on the part of the U.S. government (in part), set into motion the current form of "destabilization" of relations in the Horn of Africa.

(8) The policy of the United States ought to be to establish borders status quo ante, and to foster negotiations relevant to all real issues between the states of Ethiopia and Somalia. Instead, under pressure from the British government British agents-of-influence in the United States, the State Department has been induced to dredge up a factually worthless 19th century swindle, euphemistically regarded as a protocol concerning the Ogaden region, and now takes the position of utmost folly: that Ogaden is de facto and by color of protocol Somalian territory, and then and hence, that Ethiopian counter-attacks against invasion of its Ogaden territories are some form of "aggression" against Somalia.

(9) To insure a conflict in this area, the British and their dupes in Washington have put the Soviet Union into a double bind. If the Soviets continue to supply aid to Ethiopia, they are blamed for "aggression." If they pull out to please London and Washington, they lose credit they see as strategically essential throughout the world.

Strategic Implications

It is true that current Soviet strategic foreign policy includes a determined effort to secure consolidated zones of influence in the developing sector, to compensate for those zones in which it has lost influence since 1971-1974. However, as the offer for joint fusion research by Soviet Central Committee member Nicolai Basov indicates, and as the recent proposal of Boris Ponomarev also indicates, the Soviet leadership is also attempting to open up new dimensions of détente and cooperation with the United States. Overall, the Soviet policy is balanced between preparation for general war, and probing, seeking to find a stronger set of premises for war avoidance.

The significance of this duality in Soviet policy is that if the United States accelerates SALT agreements, creates a favorable environment for MBFR in Europe, and

Europeans Move To Cool Horn Crisis

Speaking on Western German television on Feb. 8 after his talks with French President Valery Giscard d'Estaing, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt said that he and Giscard had agreed that "no foreign power should intervene in the situation," thus completely discrediting press reports asserting that France and West Germany were supplying arms directly to Somalia. (For a fuller report on the Giscard-Schmidt summit, see EUROPE.)

In addition, West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher held a meeting with all the African ambassadors to Bonn to discuss a resolution of the conflict on the Horn.

Military circles in Western Europe are fully aware that the question of full-scale warfare in the horn of Africa is but one front of confrontation between Zbigniew Brzezinski and Henry Kissinger's British-allied circles within the U.S. Administration, and other U.S. government officials working more or less honestly in the American national interest. Adalbert Weinstein, military correspondent of the conservative West

German newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, gives this internal U.S. battle as the explanation for America's refusal so far to provide military aid to Somalia's conflict with Ethiopian forces. His editorial says in part:

"America's self-restraint has become so explicit that no one can dare to count on any American engagement in the horn of Africa. People in Washington are even secretly congratulating themselves on the policy being pursued at this point. In this war, they say, the Somalis are the real attackers; one ought not give encouragement to the aggressor. Aid for the Ethiopian rebels is also impossible, because Africa — which has elevated the inviolability of nations' borders to the status of a taboo — would turn against any nation giving support to the rebels. And why is America practicing such abstinence? This country's policies continue to be determined by what the Americans call 'the lesson of Vietnam.' Ethiopia and Somalia are a problem of American domestic policy, rather than one of foreign policy or even a strategic one..."

increases mutually beneficial cooperation with the USSR, the Soviets will be disposed to make substantial concessions on a variety of other issues. However, if the United States closes the door to the latter course, the Soviets will correspondingly shift at an accelerating rate toward a hard line, making virtually no concessions.

Up to the beginning of the recent Sadat-Begin peace effort, the British government was working to push the Soviets away from joining the United States in creating a favorable climate for progress of those negotiations. While London, with aid of British agents-of-influence Mondale, Brzezinski, and Kissinger, have virtually wrecked the Sadat-Begin negotiations, largely by making Begin a captive of Moshe Dayan, London dropped its mask and surfaced with a virulent Cold War profile, demanding that with the Soviet Union and Cuba over the Horn of Africa.

This is accompanied by the City of London's monetary demand to Moscow that Moscow and other Council for Mutual Economic Assistance nations subordinate their foreign debt and credit to the City of London markets in connection with the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. It is accompanied by London's efforts, with Kissinger's active support, to launch a "Chile scenario" in Italy, to destabilize the governments of France and the Federal Republic of Germany, and to break Japan to London's will.

Moscow will never accept the total package of concessions London is demanding that the U.S. government demand. The Soviets will go to total war before making such extensive submission of their sectoral economic integrity and global strategic capability.

Hence, although Moscow does not have the depth of commitment to Ethiopia it had to Cuba in 1962, when the confrontation in the Horn is situated, as it is now, as part of a total, globally interlinked strategic package, that matter has vital strategic implications which could not

be identified by the "geopolitical" features of the region itself.

Any qualified military commander in the U.S. ought to have the competence to see this clearly for himself.

The one thing which must be avoided is a direct confrontation between the forces of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Indirect or "surrogate" confrontations are risky enough in this period. A direct confrontation means that either one of the powers must back down, or that the following order of warfare is activated:

(1) Total, intercontinental thermonuclear (and other atomic-biological-chemical — ABC) barrage, targeting strategic military and logistical targets out of the near-term reach of the Warsaw Pact ground forces.

(2) An accompanying short-range and intermediate-range ABC barrage, hitting rear-echelon military and logistical targets in the projected theatres of ground combat, and also "paving" the NATO front in-depth, preparatory to ground forces advance.

(3) A broad assault by mechanized forces, in combat group formation, through an ABC-contaminated line-of-march, and a de-escalation of warfare from "maximum deterrent" towards "conventional" warfare with some ABC augmentation.

Estimate of War Risk

The degree of risk of general thermonuclear war in a Horn of Africa direct confrontation between major powers is not to be compared with the situation of the Kennedy Administration Berlin Crisis, the 1962 Cuba Missiles Crisis, or Kissinger's wild gamble with war in 1973. Although there are some "built-in checks" in the "system" still, the Mondale, Brzezinski, and Kissinger-dominated Carter Administration does not have a relatively strong president such as Kennedy or Nixon in place to ensure that situations are more or less competently judged and that firm war-avoidance courses of

action are pursued during a crisis.

Most important is the desperation of London. The City of London is acting at the point that the world monetary system is on the edge of a chain-reaction collapse. London is a hair's breadth away from total bankruptcy. It is desperate to the point of insanity. It has an unprecedented degree of improper influence over the leadership of the Democratic and Republican Parties and the U.S. government, and is in virtual control, through the aid of agents-of-influence such as Brzezinski and Kissinger, of the National Strategic Estimate of the U.S. government.

This is aggravated by the decimation of Central Intelligence Agency capabilities under Kissinger and Schlesinger and now Brzezinski, Mondale, and Turner. The U.S. lacks the quality of intelligence and related capabilities it possessed during previous crises.

What is happening to a large number of influential Democrats and Republicans in the U.S. is that they are being inundated by fraudulent briefings through official and semi-official channels — since Mondale, Brzezinski, Kissinger, and Turner have a dictatorial grip on intelligence estimates to the point of blinding the U.S. policy and command structures in favor of whatever lies they put into circulation in cooperation with London. It is these fraudulent intelligence briefings which former President Ford and others are reflecting in their foolish public and semipublic utterances of the present moment.

Everything is set up to provide a maximized opportunity for triggering of total thermonuclear war by stupidity and miscalculation. This is relevant to the fact that the two major wars of this century developed the

course which they followed through monstrous miscalculation on the part of British policy institutions directly responsible for setting those wars into motion. The checks are such that general war now could occur only through combined stupidity and miscalculation on, in particular, the side of the U.S. government. Unfortunately, it is stupidity and miscalculation which prevails in U.S. leading circles at this moment.

It is to be emphasized that almost none of the leading Democrats and Republicans in the U.S. have better than the foggiest notion of what is occurring in the world. They have no independent intelligence capability even approximating that of the U.S. Labor Party. They depend chiefly on the think tanks, briefings through official and semi-official intelligence channels, and the gossip (and, in large part, calculated lies) circulated by the dominant portion of the so-called news media. Put the Intelligence Estimate in the hands of a small circle of British agents-of-influence, such as Mondale, Brzezinski, Kissinger, et al., and one creates the situation in which the more a Gerry Ford is "authoritatively" informed on world affairs, the less he knows in fact about crucial international and even national developments.

Yet, such grossly misinformed persons are the persons deciding U.S. policies, and represent the policy apparatus on which the fate of humanity depends in a major crisis.

We may witness the radioactive obliteration of most of the U.S. during the developing crisis — as things are going now, our survival will not be to the credit of foolishly credulous persons mouthing the sort of nonsense currently regurgitated by former President Ford.

The Horn Of Africa: Poverty, War—And Potential

The one overwhelming characteristic of the population of what now comprises Ethiopia and Somalia is deprivation and poverty, on a scale virtually unmatched in the rest of the world. In no area on the globe would a development program for establishing basic infrastructure capable of supporting modern living be more necessary, or more welcome.

It is this poverty which, above all else, dictates the actions and response to manipulations of the people and governments there, actions primarily linked to grants for aid and arms. The present war is not in the national interest of either country as any kind of territorial imperative, but is simply the manipulated outgrowth of a minor regional dispute which could have been settled through negotiation years ago.

More precisely, the entire Horn area has been the unfortunate product of British enforced backwardness — the British Empire's policy along the entire route through the Mideast to India for over a century, which has kept the two countries from even beginning the process of entering the modern world.

Ironically, Somalia may have under its soil one of the largest uranium ore deposits in the world, close to the

surface and susceptible to economical strip-mining. These were the findings of a United Nations geological survey of the area in 1968. Since then the estimates have been lowered to a very moderate amount, but still large enough for Westinghouse Corporation to attempt to set up a mining operation there, reportedly in collaboration with an East bloc country, in 1977. Although not yet confirmed as a direct countermove, the Ogaden fighting began to heat up at this same time, forcing Westinghouse to leave the area "for political reasons," according to a spokesman at the U.S. Department of Energy.

The significance of the uranium deposit is not simply that here is natural wealth the British are trying to control. It raises the possibility of changing the entire political and economic geometry of the area through the infrastructure which Westinghouse, its reported East bloc partner, and affiliated companies would have provided.

The current fighting in the Horn has been concentrated in the area of Harrar, in the foothills of a mountain range which geographically divides the entire region between the Ethiopian mountains to the west and the coastal plain which leads to Somalia in the east. The fighting has