

many political circles, from left to right. Zbigniew Brzezinski, the Administration's strongest Kremlin critic, has emerged as its most ardent exponent of normalization with China. Senator Henry Jackson, the Capital's best informed critic of SALT, has called for full diplomatic relations with Peking. He and others could well interpret a bold Carter move toward Peking as evidence of a no-nonsense attitude toward Moscow. Such an attitude could help SALT II ratification.

... The President's national security advisor briefed his Chinese hosts thoroughly on the details of SALT, listened sympathetically to their complaints about Vietnam and found common ground in opposing the Soviet adventuring in Africa.

New York Times, "Inching Toward China," by James Reston, June 14:

The relations between the U.S. and the PRC move with glacial slowness, but recently there have been a couple of vague indications that the Carter Administration is trying by indirect means to find a formula for normalizing diplomatic relations with Peking. . . The hope in official quarters here is that practical steps, such as improved U.S.-Chinese trade, including dual purpose technology, and the shipment of allied arms to China, with U.S. approval, will lead Peking to indicate on its own, without any demands or requests from Washington, that it will settle the Taiwan problem by peaceful means.

LaRouche: The Urgent Launching Of A Counterpole

The following statement was issued on June 11, by U.S. Labor Party Chairman, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Over the months since early 1974 the U.S. Labor Party has gained accelerating credibility and marginal influence as a source of political intelligence and policy options among numerous circles, both inside and outside the United States.

POLICY STATEMENT

For political reasons, including threats of reprisals and even outright blackmail from London-centered elements inside and outside the U.S., leading circles collaborating or conducting policy discussions with the U.S. Labor Party have been generally most cautious to date in avoiding public identification with the party.

The time has come to bring a representative selection of the forces involved in these discussions out into the public view.

The foremost reason this must now be done is that time is running out on the possibility for instituting the drastic reshaping of U.S. basic policy conceptions needed to get the nation — and the world — safely through the years immediately ahead. The poker game between London and Peking, the effort of these two to outfox one another on the setting up of the alternatives of either an Atlantic-centered or Pacific-centered thermonuclear war, leaves no margin for the sort of silliness on basic policy issues which has dominated the White House and much of the Congress during the past year and a half. The effort we must make involves a complete replacement for the "American Century" doctrine developed during the 1930s and 1940s. We must mobilize the forces capable of formulating such policies without delay.

This challenge would be difficult enough in any case. We have other important difficulties.

The most conspicuous such difficulty is the White House. We have a President of the United States whose most notable virtue is that he represents a first line of defense against such menaces as Vice President Walter F. Mondale, Senator Ted Kennedy, Joe Rauh, Jr., California's Governor Jerry Brown, and kindred embodiments of evil. President Carter's fatal flaw and ironic virtue is that he is essentially a chameleon, who assumes whichever policy colorations he perceives the background configurations of power to require. He desires to be President, and desires to cut the appearance of a President who makes "difficult decisions" and is obeyed. Apart from that, he has little political content but a sense of this present proprietorship over the office. He will hold to that office tenaciously despite all assaults, clinging to his property of the moment not with wisdom, but with the stubborn tenacity of a rural landlord.

Carter will make good decisions if the configuration of power prompts him to perceive such decisions as a proper, chameleon-like posture. In this respect, Carter will be as good or bad as we make him.

The second major difficulty is the presently wretched moral and intellectual condition of the Kissinger-tainted Republican National Committee. As long as the Republican Party tolerates this disgusting exhibition of whorish "consensus politicking" by would-be 1980 presidential nominees, the Republican Party does not function as the element of parliamentary "loyal opposition" it might otherwise contribute to the policymaking process.

The third, related difficulty centers around the destruction of the United States government's independent political-intelligence capabilities by a cabal of Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Walter

Mondale, James Schlesinger, Ted Kennedy, Morton Halperin, and so forth. Vital political-intelligence capabilities have been wiped out in entire regions of the world by the recent Brzezinski-Turner-Mondale gutting of the Central Intelligence Agency and by related measures. To a large degree, the United States government and Congress are becoming helpless dupes for whatever combinations of disinformation and black propaganda British

mimeograph machines at the CIA and National Security Council burp out. Turner's and Brzezinski's brazen lying concerning the authorship of the bloody affair in Zaire's Shaba province, and echoes of massive disinforming of the government of Saudi Arabia in the French and our own policy establishments, are exemplary of the almost-mortal damage that has been effected under Kissinger, Brzezinski, et al.

What is wanted is a nonpartisan counterpole of policy options and political intelligence, composed of selected, courageous elements of various parties and other key policy-formulating circles in U.S. public life. The twin function of such an institution is to provide policy options and intelligence independent of largely corrupted government agencies and think tanks, and at the same time, to afford the "silent majority" of the electorate a visible kernel of alternative policy leadership.

U.S. Labor Party Problems

The problems of the U.S. Labor Party are a most appropriate illustration of the problem. In various local elections, in every case where there is not massive vote fraud, the U.S. Labor Party polls consistently between 8 and 25 percent of the votes. For example, but for the ultracorrupt Kennedy machine, our 1974 tallies of 11 to 15 percent in Boston congressional districts would be substantially exceeded. Conservatively, the U.S. Labor Party commands important influence among between three and five million voters at least, with the greatest majority of these among trade unionists, minorities, and farmers. The influence is probably substantially greater, but we can account for only the figures given, so we make no guesses here concerning any still larger magnitudes.

As most professional politicians know, a principal difficulty in accounting for the absolute magnitude of Labor Party support is that the majority of those Americans who concur with Labor Party programs vote for traditionalist candidates of the Republican, Democratic, and independent-conservative parties. Labor Party campaigning frequently strengthens such parties' candidates indirectly in this way. So, there is an overlap in the electorate among U.S. Labor Party, Republican, Democratic and independent-conservative constituencies.

This overlap is the hard core of what was once termed "the silent majority." If this hard core is set into motion in behalf of a policy, the core will move the "silent majority" as a whole.

The pattern we encounter with immediate Labor Party supporters is this. Significant sections of these supporters, most of whom consider themselves Labor Party members, whether dues-paying or not, will move politically on specific issues, such as against drug decriminalization or other hideous legislative schemes,

and for efforts such as the Export-Import Bank proposals. However, most of these supporters usually hold back from more than some small contributing effort. They make their thinking on this point quite clear. "We are waiting," they say in one way or another, "for leading forces to move visibly together with the U.S. Labor Party." They are waiting for the correlation of forces in which they perceive the possibility of a winning fight.

Republican and Democratic traditionalist political leaders have a better situation with their supporters — in some respects. Because key traditionalist Republicans and Democrats hold elected office, they can move their supporters into action under conditions in which most Labor Party supporters will tend not to move publicly.

Other parties' supporters move on the basis of candidates and elected officials; Labor Party supporters move on the basis of crucial policy issues.

What we must do, in respect to our common electoral basis in the "silent majority," is to create a nonpartisan unified, visible leadership of the sort which typifies the kernel of a potentially winning combination. By bringing together a representative sampling of elected representatives, party officials, trade union figures, industrialists, bankers, military professionals, and so forth around the formulation of an American-Whig policy turn, the core forces of the "silent majority" will be activated into political motion in key localities.

We have proven this principle of tactics repeatedly in local electoral and other situations. The problem is that this successful local tactic has not yet been replicated on a national scale.

Frankly, at the moment, do we really care whether the candidate elected is Republican, U.S. Labor Party, Democratic, or independent-conservative? What we ought to care about is whether or not that candidate is a committed American Whig. We must get Whig candidates into office and Whig policies and policy perceptions into a controlling position at all levels of government. On this account, the problem which the U.S. Labor Party faces in deploying its own forces is a facet of the same problem experienced in somewhat different forms by every traditionalist Republican, Democratic, or independent-conservative leader.

The Policy Problem

The kind of comprehensive overhaul of U.S. policy required is essentially a resumption of the policies of the leaders of the American Revolution and formulators of our Constitution, albeit a resumption tailored to modern conditions and means at hand. Such matters are not partisan matters in the sense that "partisan" is used to mean specific political-party organizations. It is a national, cross-party concern. This is especially to be emphasized because of the fact that although the U.S. Labor Party is homogenous in its policy outlook, no other important political party in the United States is. Both the Republican and Democratic Parties are mixtures of intrinsically unresolvable liberal and conservative currents, and similarly the independent-conservative organizations are mixtures of Whigs and anglophile lunatics, such as the Buckleyites or elements influenced by Birchite Congressman Larry McDonald (D-Ga.).

The issue before us is that of articulating a policy and policy options which are consistent applications of American republican constitutional principles to the strategic configurations of the quarter century now unfolding before us. In other words, it is a matter of defining what our American Neoplatonic-humanist conceptions of a constitutional democratic republic mean in conceptions of outlook and practice for the specific circumstances of this period.

The "silent majority" of the electorate is composed essentially of American Whigs. They are for continuation of technological progress, for educational policies and practices consistent with the requirements of technological progress, and are opposed to turning our youth into a mass of such pot-headed freaks as are of no real use to themselves or anyone else. They do not know how to formulate national domestic and foreign policies consistent with their objectives, but with sufficient patience and effort applied, this electorate can recognize which policies do and do not meet the requirements in terms of results.

Among the industrialists, scientists, trade union leaders, bankers, and so forth, there are circles which are better than 50 percent right in their policy outlook on one or more areas of national and foreign policy. However, in no known case do these circles assess adequately the interconnections among policy goals in one area of policy and the way in which policies in other areas affect the possibility of meeting those goals.

In many specific areas of policy the U.S. Labor Party has benefited considerably from the knowledge of persons and circles which knew more about that specific area than we did. The point is that in no such experience have these same circles and persons been able to put the whole issue into an efficient, competent, comprehensive perspective. This person, eminently sound on economic policy, is often wholly defective in his or her thinking on monetary policy. In general, leading circles study policy areas one or two at a time, and overlook the way in which excluded areas of policy affect even those areas in which they have competent expertise.

The crucial role of the U.S. Labor Party in American policy-formulating processes is that the U.S. Labor

Party is, so far, the only agency which competently accounts for the interconnections among all the principal components of national domestic and foreign policy. It is for this same reason that Labor Party intelligence evaluations are often vastly superior in accuracy and other features of quality to the political intelligence developed by agencies of much vaster material resources. It is understanding how all the elements of policy interreact to form a whole effect which is the most crucial requirement of political-intelligence work.

With the aid of our collaborators and discussion partners from among leading circles, the U.S. Labor Party has developed a comprehensive set of policy conceptions which are consistent with the most vital interests of the United States. What is lacking respecting the content of this policy is tactical elaboration in various areas; the policy conceptions are nonetheless the proper ones within whose terms specific tactical applications must be developed.

What is needed as a next step is a publicly visible, nonpartisan cooperating force of typical national spokesmen from various aspects of the American Whig spectrum as a whole. This cooperating group of persons must thrash out its internal discussions, including discussions of differences, publicly, using the Labor Party's comprehensive conceptual policy framework as the matrix for organizing the discussions and interrelating the elements as elements of a functional whole.

Such an agency must concentrate immediately on servicing the Administration, Congress and other policy making elements of the United States. It must serve as a policy-options resource, and as a counterforce against the London-centered nonsense and other sorts of idiocies which currently play so disruptive and dangerous a role in our national life. In this process, such a counterpole will set the hard core of the "silent majority" into political motion, and thus move the "silent majority" as a whole — to take the usurped power away from the anglophile "liberals" and "radicals," and to put control of the selection of government efficiently back into the hands of the majority of the electorate.

Forcing The Old Guard Out

...so that the Kennedy crowd can move in

In the post-Watergate atmosphere of fear and demoralization pervading Capitol Hill, a combination of wholesale resignations, electoral defeats, a new round of

CONGRESS

"scandals," and cumulative impact of internal "reforms" is threatening to bring about a major transfer of power from traditionalist, constituency-oriented power blocks to the Kennedyites and their cohorts. A

decades-long campaign by self-styled "reform" organizations led by Common Cause, the National Committee for an Effective Congress and the Democratic Study Group to turn the U.S. Congress into a U.S. version of the pathetic British Parliament is beginning to pay off.

When the 96th session of Congress opens for business next January, the most visible effects of this power shift will be in the Senate, where several key committee chairmanships are slated to pass from the grip of old-line Southern conservatives — men who have maintained a bottom-line commitment to the country's industrial and constitutional principles — into the hands of some of the