

The Cornerstones Of U.S. World Leadership

A Draft U.S. Military Strategic Policy

The following policy statement was issued on June 10, by U.S. Labor Party Chairman, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.:

Major-General John K. Singlaub has recently published a five-part, syndicated newspaper series, a series focused on the issue of withdrawal of U.S. forces from Korea. I have before me the copies of that series taken from the *Atlanta Journal*. It is unnecessary for me to comment extensively on the internal features of General Singlaub's military-strategic argument here. I merely inform the non-military-professional reader that the argument is not only sound, but represents knowledge shared by most leading officers of the U.S. Army, serving and retired. My duty on this occasion is to add to the General's report those elements of political strategic thinking which are still, unfortunately, lacking in the knowledge of our military professionals as well as most political leaders.

For a summary of General Singlaub's analysis, see page 12.

To define the task of this strategic policy statement in military terms of reference, I aim inclusively to revive within the U.S. Army (and brother services) the richer comprehension of military strategy employed by Franklin, Washington, Lafayette, d'Estaing, Hamilton, John Quincy Adams, and General Winfield Scott, to revive the development which dominated West Point during the 1818-1828 period.

As I sit to write this, I have before me recent statements of Admiral Thomas Moorer, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Senator Barry Goldwater and others. These statements not only show all three to have been grossly *disinformed*, but in that way reflect the fact that the destruction of the capabilities of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency has left the government of the United States blinded in crucial aspects of current strategic developments, and has consequently aided British intelligence services in spreading the wildest sort of lies even among persons of such exceptional sophistication as Admiral Moorer and of such extensive personal resources as Nelson A. Rockefeller. Barry Goldwater, a person for whom I have affectionate respect, has been hoodwinked frequently enough before — that is the weak side of the Senator. However, to hoodwink both Admiral Moorer and Nelson Rockefeller in the manner their recent statements reflect takes some doing — it happens, in this matter, that I know the British disinformation operation running amok in Iran, India, Saudi Arabia and re-

lated precincts, and have a pretty fair idea of the way in which both Moorer and Rockefeller were duped.

I take those problems into account as I write this policy statement.

I also take into account the fact that a rip-roaring factional struggle has erupted from within the highest levels of the British intelligence community. Certain British intelligence circles — including some with which we had an amiable sort of connection prior to developments of the December 1976-June 1977 period — are justly alarmed by the raving incompetence of U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski's performance during his recent visit to Peking, and by the lunacy of Vice-President Walter F. Mondale's performance on his wild-eyed jaunt through Southeast Asian precincts.

Like Benjamin Franklin, I know the British Black Guelph monarchy to be the United States's continuing chief adversary, but I know there are useful potentialities in Britain and also know that the British inner circles are the only significant force in the world, apart from the Vatican, which operates at approximately my own level of competence in knowing the real, underlying issues and processes determining current history. Consequently, I appreciate why certain privileged elements of the British intelligence community are currently enraged at the incompetent performance of such SIS puppets as Henry A. Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski.

In stating that, I do not wish to wrongly deprecate the competence of many important circles in the United States and other nations, circles with which our forces regard and treat as actual or prospective allies in the task of U.S. world leadership now lying before us. In viewing certain British intelligence circles as my opposite number, I am stressing that most of the U.S. Labor Party's actual and prospective allies lack specific elements of competence which only my associates, key Vatican circles and the British presently possess. At this moment, one of my principal tasks is to bring the actual and prospective allies of the U.S. Labor Party within the United States up to a level of parity of strategic knowledge with our nation's various adversaries and potential allies within the United Kingdom.

First, I shall situate the importance of General Singlaub's argument within the setting of the "China option" geopolitical strategy. Next, I shall develop the outlines of the strategy the U.S. requires at this juncture, proceeding in steps. My first step is to set forth U.S. political strategy within the capitalist sector as a whole. Having developed that in basic outline, I shall focus next on the problem of Soviet relations, and then situate China within the whole political-military package.

This outline of U.S. strategy is not merely a proposal. Elements of this global strategy have been put into place by the recent treaties between West Germany's Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev. Key elements within the U.S. policy establishment are already committed to or disposed to adopt key elements of that strategy. It is the only strategic posture open to us which is in agreement with the most vital domestic and strategic interests of the United States.

The Split in British Intelligence

Although Senator George McGovern's exposure of Admiral Turner and Brzezinski's lying to the White House and nation is an expression of native American forces, during recent days McGovern has gained elements of support from "liberal" circles directly allied with British intelligence. This pattern is echoed in the United Kingdom itself, where Prime Minister James Callaghan has acted toward heading off the growing danger of an Atlantic-centered thermonuclear war erupting out of simultaneous Middle East and African bloodbaths. Although it is standard British "deception warfare" practice to push two, directly opposing policies simultaneously, in this case Mr. Callaghan's sharp rebuke to the regrettable Mrs. Thatcher reflects genuine and correct concern within top British circles.

Our own (so to speak) Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski are agents of the British Secret Intelligence Service (SIS). They are not on the MI-5, MI-6 or SIS payroll proper, but they are nonetheless agents of the old British colonial office-centered crowd gathered around the Round Table organizations and such London-controlled institutions as the bureaucracies of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. Contrary to the misperceptions of the credulous Senator Howard Baker and others, Henry Kissinger is an important tool of British intelligence services, but is not a top-ranking figure in his own right. Kissinger, like Brzezinski, is a tertiary figure within the British Round Table and Bilderberg networks, who is never given the whole truth of the operations to which he is assigned. Kissinger and

Like Benjamin Franklin, I know the British Black Guelph monarchy to be the United States's continuing adversary.

Brzezinski are informed only on a "need to know" basis, and are given whatever mixtures of fact and myth their British masters deem appropriate to motivating such tools to fulfill their intelligence assignments.

Kissinger, like the still lower-level Brzezinski, is an agent of the British intelligence services "in place" within the top policy-making circles of the U.S. policy and intelligence establishment. For obvious reasons, in those instances in which Kissinger or Brzezinski fouls up an assigned mission, it is not prudent for the British monarchy to publicly fire him or to discreetly terminate Mr. Kissinger's services in the permanent fashion customary for dealing with expendable British agents proper. It would be indiscreet of the British to express their displeasure with Mr. Brzezinski by delivering him boxed, crated or bagged to the White House door.

Nonetheless, very important, top-ranking elements of

the British intelligence services are extremely displeased with Mr. Brzezinski's recent performance in Peking. They have the most powerful motives for being displeased. Their displeasure is aggravated by the fact that it was the British themselves who stuck this lunatic parvenu, this house-servant of the old Polish aristocracy into the position of managing President Jimmy Carter. Among the more chauvinistic of some leading British strata, there is presently a morbid sympathy with the spate of Polish jokes Peking's representatives are relating in the wake of Mr. Brzezinski's recent visit to China.

We have reported the matter before. It must be summarized once again in this present context.

Under the direction of such top British intelligence agents as Lord Milner and through the Wittelsbach and Hapsburg circles of British agent Houston Chamberlain, the British monarchy at the turn of this century adopted what is known as the "geopolitical" doctrine. Major General Professor Karl Haushofer and Haushofer's leading protégé, Rudolf Hess, were British intelligence agents run through the Wittelsbach (Houston Chamberlain-linked) branch of SIS. Adolf Hitler was created by this British network around the Wittelsbach family in southern Germany.

The central features of this geopolitical doctrine were, first, to subvert the United States's policy-making institutions to make the USA a virtual puppet of British interest, and, simultaneously, to break up Russia with aid of German military forces. Two world wars were the result of British miscalculation in attempting to implement that geopolitical policy.

With the close of World War II, especially after the recovery of the Soviet Union through 1953-1954, the British were compelled to reluctantly abandon the policy of "balkanizing" Russia through a military thrust from central Europe. The turning point was the Eisenhower Administration's crushing of Britain and Britain's French Fourth Republic puppet in the 1956 Suez affair. (This is why the Rothschilds, et al. deployed the John Birch Society against Eisenhower, and why a Lever Brothers-connected figure funded George Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi Party through Anti-Defamation League peripheries. Incidentally, it was two Jews and a Catholic priest who founded the Ku Klux Klan. Rothschild agent Judah Benjamin, Bernard Baruch's grandfather and a Catholic priest of the wrong Vatican faction were the creators of the KKK. There is nothing new in the Rothschild's twentieth-century funding of both anarchist and "far right" groups simultaneously. The Buckley organization is of the same parentage.)

Beginning 1956, the British launched what was then their long-haul policy of developing a China-USA anti-Soviet alliance to replace the role Britain assigned to Germany in the two preceding world wars of this century. The Sino-Soviet fissure of the late 1950s — dutifully echoed at that time by the Communist Party USA's Gus Hall on his emergence from prison — was the result of a British inside job conducted simultaneously in both Peking and Moscow. The long-haul objective of this policy was to generate a future Pacific-centered thermonuclear war in which the United States, Japan, China and the Soviet Union would destroy one another, leaving Britain hegemonic in the surviving portions of the world.

Now, two decades later, that British geopolitical policy is coming toward the final countdown. It has been recent British policy to consolidate an anti-Soviet alliance between the United States and Peking, and to create in the United States a new "Cold War" posture, such that the internal political processes of the USA were irreversibly committed to a Pacific-centered war with the Soviet Union sometime after 1980.

Brzezinski screwed it up.

Peking's leading circles are well aware of this British game. They have no intention of being semidestroyed in a post-1980s thermonuclear war. They have no intention of being embroiled in a Pacific thermonuclear war against the Soviet Union. *Peking's policy is that of attempting to judo the British geopolitical policy*, to the effect of catalyzing an early *Atlantic-centered* thermonuclear war. Mao Tse Tung's policy of 1965 has never changed. Peking adheres to the "countryside" (the developing nations) conquering the "cities" (the industrialized nations), and intends to aid that process of securing Peking's world hegemony by fostering a general thermonuclear war between the Warsaw Pact and NATO forces. "Encourage the foreign devils to destroy one another!" is the name of Peking policy.

So, we have two witting chief players in that game, London and Peking. London's objective is to manipulate Peking and Washington into an irreversible commitment to a *Pacific* confrontation. Peking's objective is to judo London's manipulative efforts to cause London and Washington to become locked into an irreversible posture of *Atlantic-centered* thermonuclear confrontation. Both London and Peking have various fallback policy options, but the game we have summarily described is the main line.

The way the London-Peking game is currently played is a matter of newspaper lead articles and lunatic Brzezinski's public fulminations. The line is that Washington must not only "normalize" its relations with Peking, but must win the Pekingese to a war posture by "proving" to Peking that the United States is irreversibly committed to war with the Soviet Union.

The proposed U.S. withdrawal from Korea by 1980 is a key element in London's plotted destruction of the United States. A combination of a new war in Korea with a war and Peking's Cambodian puppet-state locks the United States (and Japan) into a massively escalated anti-Soviet military posture in the Pacific. On the Korea business, Peking has been in full agreement with London — for its own reasons. (Certain nuances of the firing of General Douglas MacArthur by the dupe of anglophile Jimmy Byrnes, Harry Truman, must be appreciated from the standpoint of the long-standing London-Peking connection.)

To most American general officers, the White House's decision in the Korean withdrawal is a manifestation of stupidity. Every leading U.S. general officer — excepting British puppets such as Alexander Haig — fully understands that General Singlaub's analysis is correct. Hence, until they grasp the key features of London's geopolitical "China option" strategy, those general officers understandably judge the White House to be stupid. What the general officers generally overlook is that the British-controlled advisors behind Carter's erring decision are not stupid — at least not stupid in the way most

general officers have mistakenly viewed the problem. The forces behind Carter's advisor Brzezinski intend to trigger exactly the destabilization against which General Singlaub warns.

Peking has evaluated a South Atlantic conflict over Africa, if combined with a British Shi'ite "right-wing" coup against the Saudi government and Iranian government, as ensuring that the United States and Western Europe are locked into an early *Atlantic-centered* thermonuclear war. Within a few hours of Brzezinski's arrival in Peking, Peking's leaders had that suggestible lunatic brainwashed to this purpose.

One must not underestimate Peking's influence in the Shi'ite conspiracy. As long as one key element of the

There is presently a morbid sympathy with the spate of Polish jokes Peking's representatives are relating in the wake of Mr. Brzezinski's recent visit to China.

British command clings to the ongoing version of the "China option" geopolitical strategic deployment, Peking controls the marginal influence within India, Bengal, Burma, Pakistan, Baghdad and elsewhere which ensures a destabilization of the Persian Gulf region. Our high-level intelligence sources from that region have given us chapter and verse on the way in which Peking and British intelligence have duped Nelson A. Rockefeller, key Saudi circles and others on the authorship and objectives of the plot to simultaneously destabilize Iran and Saudi Arabia.

We do not have any firm readings, as of the present moment of writing, that Mr. Callaghan and his associates have grasped the implications of the Persian Gulf plot. It is indisputably clear that they are alarmed by the effect of Mr. Brzezinski's brainwashing on the situation in Africa. Since the forces associated with Winston Churchill III are still committed to the game, despite Brzezinski's brainwashing in Peking, Mr. Callaghan's outbursts reflect a fight within the British ruling circles, rather than the desirable British commitment to defuse the African and Middle East potential for the *Atlantic-centered* posture.

In this author's informed personal estimation, we can not exclude the possibility that the British might shift radically toward some degree of support for the author's own Grand Design policies. Fortunate developments in Africa, including the Republic of South Africa, and Harry Oppenheimer's dissenting view in favor of capital-intensive development at the recent Mexico City conference, are hints in direction of such an option. Certain British elements would tend to adapt to this writer's Grand Design policies if they foresaw no other reasonable choice. These include forces which do not wish a destabilization in the Gulf. However, the British command can not turn uniformly in the direction Mr. Callaghan's turn-about on Africa implies unless they do adapt to the author's Grand Design policy.

The danger is grave, since there are forces within Britain — including some associated with the leadership of Hill-Samuel — who have avowed most convincingly that "our networks will never cooperate with your networks." This latter declaration does not signify the U.S.

Labor Party alone; the British forces which have not only plotted my Baader-Meinhof assassination to have occurred during August 1977 profoundly hate all U.S. policy elements closely associated with the second Eisenhower Administration. Mr. Callaghan and his allies would have to crush such elements of the British elite to put Britain onto a sound policy.

What Controls Brzezinski?

The American military professional familiar with British opposite numbers is capable of grasping the British problem in a certain way. Just as Franklin Delano Roosevelt referred to the father of Prince Philip as "that bastard" and as General George Marshall understood that the British were swindling the United States during World War II, as in his remarks before the Vandenberg committee, so any intelligent general officer tends to reach similar conclusions concerning the British from long experience. However, just as the author himself has had amiable contacts with key British bankers and others during the pre-1977 period, no one hates the British people generically, and British military circles are not devoid of persons of honorable impulses.

The conceptual problem facing the American officer —

London's objective is to manipulate Peking and Washington into an irreversible commitment to a *Pacific* confrontation.

and many others — is the damnable tendency to think in nationalist or racist terms. What is lost sight of in that misguided thinking is that all human beings are human beings, who have within them those potentials such that no difference of national origin or race is of any significance respecting equality of relations among persons. Nor, for that matter, sexual differences.

I strongly suspect — and this is no mere guess — that the root of racialism and pathological forms of nationalism is the tendency among both men and women to regard one another as members of different species. Rather than seeing a loving heterosexual relationship between a man and a woman as the unification of the human species in all its combined powers in that specific way, male chauvinists like the evil radical feminists define the sexes either as different species or imply such a wretched perception in respect to practice — as a different species which can be used, and loved only as one loves a housepet. This evil confusion of sexual differences with species-nature differences is still culturally embedded in the child. Since most of the cases of psychological impotence I have studied are correlated with a blocked personal relationship between man and woman or in corresponding attitudes toward such relationships, I can not be far from the absolute truth in saying that "sexism" — both male and feminist varieties — is the touchstone of racism and pathological nationalism.

The problem with the British people is the British monarchy. As that influence is more or less deeply embedded in that people, they are more susceptible to being evil. As they shift from that pathological outlook toward defining interests in an American way, the British

are potentially almost as good as Americans. In that latter condition, having been reared on the inside of an evil political system, a British person with an American outlook often has the advantage of being less naive than a comparable American. He knows how evil prevailing British institutions and culture are — from the inside.

The root of our problem with the British has never been the British people, the actual interests of the United Kingdom. It was from Britain that our forefathers brought the humanist traditions developed as the foundation of the American Revolution and our constitutional republic — much as we are indebted to Leibniz, and to France in a direct way on that account. Our forefathers went to war with Britain only to the extent that the British people supported our mortal enemy, the British monarchy. It is the British monarchy which has been the chief enemy of the American people from 1603 to the present date. Without the British monarchy, the nation suffering now under that rule would tend to perceive its interests in the same way Americans do, and would join us in a corresponding community of principle. I am no more an anglophobe than John Milton, Priestley, Paine, Price, or Shelley.

To define our enemy more efficiently we must look outside England, to such figures as Otto von Habsburg and the Wittelsbach family which gave us Adolf Hitler, Heinrich Himmler, Rudolf Hess, and Rosenberg as its immediate puppets. Throughout Europe there squats an evil spawn of the old Black Guelph aristocracy. These evil men and women are a cohesive political force of vast power, a force which accurately describes itself as the *oligarchist faction*.

To appreciate the significance of this faction in today's work, consider the case of Prince Johann Schwartzberg. This gentleman and his wife went on to their infernal rewards by way of an automobile "accident," an event which occurred in the wake of hard information that the gentleman was involved in the bloody kidnapping and murder of former Italian Prime Minister Aldo Moro. Herr Schwartzberg, in addition to being related to the House of Hapsburg and an Austrian, was a leading member of the Maltese Order, and was diplomatic representative of that order to Italy. The Maltese Order is an ancient, medieval intelligence and covert operations organization fully taken over by the fifteenth and sixteenth century Black Guelph circles of Genoa, the circles which controlled John Calvin and the hard core of Geneva finance.

As the British and Dutch monarchies emerged, following the Napoleonic wars and fall of Metternich, as the center of the oligarchical faction internationally, the Maltese Order came under the direction of the Anglo-Dutch "Bildbergers," basing itself on the island of Malta and the Black Guelph financial center at Geneva. During the middle of the nineteenth century, the British expanded the intelligence and covert operations capabilities of the Maltese Order by creating the International Red Cross as a covert operations conduit for the Maltese. Although the Red Cross volunteers do the things popular opinion imagines them to do, that honest side of the Red Cross operation has served as a cover for running various high-level intelligence and assassination operations, a capability which the British have, on occasion, "loaned" to the United States. In recent months, the anti-

terrorist intelligence and security units of certain nations I shall not name were frustrated by the fact that key controlling figures in the terrorist operations were running about with the immunities of Maltese diplomatic tags. I need only emphasize that I received hard information from several distinct Western intelligence agencies on this subject over a period of months, including some agencies which contributed to saving my life from an impending Baader-Meinhof assassination last August and September.

Otto von Habsburg himself has given us direct representation of his strategic views, and we have massive corroborating evidence to support his statements to us in this matter. (Some of the oligarchists enjoy chatting with us occasionally, since they regard us as one of the few opponents — and intended victims — competent to appreciate their thinking on the level they actually formulate policies. Some of them love to brag wherever they find a conversation-partner capable of challenging their views on matters.) Otto von Habsburg is an embodiment of uncomplicated evil, apart from being a key force behind the effort to launch a promonarchist “fourth party” in the Federal Republic of Germany at this juncture.

The chief significance of the British monarchy, in the stated view of Otto von Habsburg, is that it is the power-base for the oligarchist faction internationally. It does not represent England; it rules England; it uses England. (See box on page 11)

The nature of this evil is not that it admires monarchy as a political institution. Anti-oligarchist, Platonic Alexander the Great was a monarch. So were France’s Louis XI and Henri IV. Richelieu, Mazarin, and Colbert were republican monarchists, as was the Lafayette who was throughout his life a key supporter of a democratic constitutional republic in the United States. The notion that monarchy equals feudal oligarchy is a myth created by scoundrels such as David Hume, Adam Smith, Walter Scott and other SIS liars gathered around the *Edinburgh Review* and later *Blackwood’s Magazine*. We republicans abhor monarchy for ourselves, for reasons set forth by John Milton and Thomas Paine, but a good monarchy has always been a bastion for humanist progress against the pure evil represented by the “feudalist” oligarchists. If a particular king serves the interest of humanity at a certain place and time, so much the better.

Whereas the natural disposition of the industrialist classes of Britain — industrialists and skilled and semi-skilled workers — is to foster global, high-technology expansion, the forces of industrial capitalism have not ruled England since 1660. They have existed as a contained, subjugated element under rule by an anti-capitalist, “feudalist” oligarchy. The “Holy Alliance” established at the 1815 Treaty of Vienna is the expression of the anticapitalist, antirepublican dominant impulse of that faction as a whole, from Otto von Habsburg and the Aga Khan through the Guelph currently squatting on the British throne. *From a capitalist standpoint, British policy is lunatic*. It is only as one realizes that Britain is politically not a capitalist nation, but an oligarchist-ruled nation, that one comprehends the controlling impulses governing British monarchical policy overall.

As we have documented at length in other published locations, the British monarchy is the central institution presently commanded by an oligarchical faction his-

torically datable to no later than the Babylonian usurious tax-farmers who ruled Babylon during the eighth and seventh centuries BC. The continuity of that faction over the intervening millennia of Mediterranean-centered civilization is unbroken to the present date. This faction, which is dated in historical Hellenic culture from the bucolic oligarchist Hesiod, has always been an antitechnology, anticities, zero-growth faction. It has consistently produced forms like the Nazi movement created by the aristocratic Wittelsbach family, for the purpose of breaking the power of the industrial classes and eradicating the influence of “rationalism,” in favor of an agrarian-

Franklin Delano Roosevelt referred to the father of Prince Philip as “that bastard.”

centered order ruled by a parasitical aristocracy composed of landlords and usurious tax-farming aristocracies. When the regrettable Mrs. Thatcher described the British monarchy to be older than capitalism, she hinted at the truth of its origins — in Sodom and Gomorrah.

There is nothing inconsistent in the fact that the current bearer of the title of Count Bernstorff keeps tame Maoists and environmentalists subsidized in the cellar of his *Schloss* (castle). The Bernstorff family, closely linked to the ruling Hanoverian (Black Guelph) House of Britain, maintains the antihumanistic, anticapitalistic oligarchist policies that are older than Hesiod.

What deludes many observers is the fact that the chief components of the oligarchist elite are the Black Guelph titled aristocracy *plus a financial elite typified by the Barings, Rothschilds, Lloyds and so forth*. On the grounds of the role of such bankers, the dupes imagine that the British monarchy’s policies are somehow “capitalist.” These poor dupes — and I include some leading bankers as well as credulous figures such as Senator Howard Baker — show themselves ignorant of the fact that industrial-capitalist forms of banking are directly opposite in principle to tax-farming policies of banking. On the grounds that misguided commercial banks in the United States practice both forms of banking practice, without being able to comprehend the difference between the two, the United States has repeatedly plunged into depressions, like the growing current depression, which had no basis in the objective necessity of industrial-capitalist development — a matter which Karl Marx also never comprehended competently.

Insofar as the credit generated through the fiscal activities of the state (the true source of all significant masses of credit) flows into technologically vectored capital-intensive investment in industry, agriculture and infrastructure, and that the individual investments are a sound contribution to increasing the amount of useful, tangible wealth produced, per capita and profits per current-replacement-cost of productive investments rise simultaneously. Thus, no unpayable debt accumulations could occur in the economy as a whole. The centralized credit policies and fiscal policies of a sound capitalist economy are termed “dirigist.” This “dirigism” does not mean government intervention into the management of the individual industrial firm or farm, but rather main-

taining cheap credit and relatively lower tax burdens for productive investment and basic real household income, while letting the costs of a constricted flow of credit into speculative and wasteful activities float up to high borrowing costs and reduced rates of return.

Every misguided influential person who opposes "dirigism" emphasizes two included points. He or she worships obscenely the memory of the oligarchist and

The British monarchy does not represent England; it rules England; it uses England.

liar Adam Smith, and seeks to protect the anticapitalist aspect of financial practices in the name of "free trade." The poor, miseducated fellow does not know that the American Revolution was made against the policies of Adam Smith. The poor fellow does not see what a clown he makes of himself in being a champion of farming and industry on the one side and Adam Smith's fraudulent doctrines on the other. Such a person is ultimately incompetent in economics, finance and politics. He is half-capitalist, half-anticapitalist, and does not know the difference between the two.

In fact, our universities have not produced a single known competent economist from their political-economy departments throughout the twentieth century. To have an advanced degree from such an institution is virtually to certify one's utter incompetence to practice the profession of economist.

The difference between the two kinds of finance is this. Industrial-capitalist investments are of the type which reproduce more useful, tangible wealth than they consume in production — without respect to such intangibles as services, which are nonproductive *if taken in and of themselves*. Services are productive only insofar as they maintain and increase social-productivity of investments as measured in terms of tangible elements of input and output. Unproductive investments are typified by investments in a purely speculative increase in the value of stocks and bonds, state debt instruments, currencies, and real estate. By fostering a flow of credit away from productive investments into speculative investments, the speculative investments provide debt-service payment and other required margins of income only by looting the productive component of circulating capital of the society. Fiscal and credit policies which do not penalize speculative investments in favor of productive investments thus lead to recurring depressions, inflationary spirals, and so forth.

The doctrine of Adam Smith, of John Stuart Mill, or John Maynard Keynes, and such degenerates as Milton Friedman and Hjalmar Schacht, is based on the economic principles of the Norman Domesday Book. These incompetent (feudalist) economic doctrines are based on the feudal principle which economic theory terms the doctrine of ground-rent, or the so-called physiocratic doctrine. It assumes that all tangible forms of wealth are derived from a predetermined domain of "natural resources," a fixed "bounty of nature." They deny the reality of capitalist technological progress (and progress before capitalism). They deny the historical fact that the

advancement of technology (and matching advancements in the culture of the labor force) are the source of boundlessly increasing total mass and per capita rate of wealth produced and available for consumption.

When society borrows from a *fixed* level of real income, and borrows at interest, then it follows as a mere matter of arithmetic that a continued borrowing must asymptotically loot existing production-income to the point of zero return. If the earnings of invested and borrowed capital are derived from the expansion profits of technologically-advanced forms of expanded production, and if the rate of technological advancement is sufficiently promoted, then the rate of earnings on invested capital must secularly increase at the same time that the after-debt-service earnings also increase secularly. The more a national economy can borrow efficiently under such latter policies, the more easily it can pay debt while increasing its potential as a growing market for imports.

The former financial (monetary) policy is British doctrine, is the parasitical or feudalist conception of credit and fiscal policies. The latter financial policy is the humanist doctrine, the policy on which the greatness of the United States rests.

Through the brilliant success of Germany's Chancellor Helmut Schmidt in negotiating recently the agreements on principle between himself and President Leonid Brezhnev, Western Europe, Japan and the United States have been delivered the means for launching a massive expansion of investment and export markets into the developing sector as a whole. That is, the Soviet Union has committed itself to establishing a 25 year agreement with the United States, Japan, Western Europe and other nations concerning joint economic and social development of the developing sector as a whole. Under this arrangement, Soviet capital imports will be paid for partially with direct compensation from Soviet raw materials, energy and advanced technologies, and otherwise indirectly paid by contributing Soviet exports of a sort appropriate to joint development of the developing sector.

If this potential is consolidated by appropriate agreements, the economic advantages actually and potentially commanded by the United States can be unleashed through world trade, with U.S. export levels quickly rising to between two and three hundred billions annually above present levels. Under these conditions, the United States would quickly acquire a greater degree of power in the world than it has ever enjoyed before. This would not be the power of an "empire," but the power of American world leadership mediated through a policy of keeping the United States the most advanced source of capital goods for the world as a whole.

From the standpoint of the demoralized ordinary Briton glumly surveying the dilapidation of his nation's ruined industrial economy, one might think that the British would be in the lead in attempting to secure such a role for the United States. Ah, but the British people do not govern Britain or shape its policies — the oligarchists of the monarchy and City of London do. From the oligarchist standpoint, the success — at last — of President Eisenhower's Atoms-for-Peace policy means that the oligarchical cause is forever doomed. Several

thousand years of oligarchist struggle to dominate the world will be abruptly ended, the oligarchists crushed politically, and turned either into honest citizens or costumed living museum-pieces for the amusement of children. These oligarchist, a species so threatened with extinction, would rather destroy the whole world than accept the extinction of their unsuitable species. They control the British and Dutch monarchies, control powerful institutions of monetarist banking, and through that power also control many corporations — especially in the crucial area of global communications, and in the areas of news and entertainment media.

We are threatened with either a Pacific-centered or Atlantic-centered thermonuclear extermination of the United States for no other ultimate reason than this.

The Grand Design

The essential strategic self-interest of the United States is to join with other nations to the purpose of transforming the declining economies of the developing sector into an area of escalating import capabilities, through high-technology transformation of the social productivities of those nations. Although the transformation of agricultural production is a massive component of the total effort, the focal point of the undertaking is the creation of new urban centers of diffusion of high-technology, through complexes of industries and centers of learning and culture which are built around (principally) paired nuclear-energy production facilities in the half to one-and-a-half gigawatt range.

The long-term commitment of the United States with respect to the world division of labor emerging from such an initial 25 year, first-phase development effort, is to develop the U.S. economy around the principle of being the principal exporter of capital goods for capital-goods producers. In other words, as developing nations develop modern agriculture and industries, and develop basic capital-goods industries, the export-function of the U.S. economy must be to supply both the ultramodern forms of capital goods and the kinds of capital goods which foreign capital-goods producers require.

Domestically, this requires a rather obvious sort of labor-force policy. Rather than attempting to duplicate the skill-levels of the industries of our nation's foreign customers, we must take advantage of that fact that our nation (minus its pot-addicts and other unfortunate exceptions) represents the most advanced labor force in the world, best qualified to maintain large-scale new forms of production in a way which can not be equalled on such a scale in other nations. Whatever the rest of the world can do, we must do better, maintaining this capability by accelerating the scientific and technological proficiency of our labor force. This will require early and drastic reforms in the content of public-school and university education, a reform which must begin by undoing the wrecking operations launched beginning in the early 1960s under the guise of "liberal educational reforms." We must proceed to eliminate the pockets of labor-intensive employment from our industries and agriculture, employ computer technology properly to eliminate the cancerous mass of administrative routine and other redundant forms of services, so that the

character of the labor force emphasizes a high ratio of skilled productive operatives, scientists and engineers, and emphasizes medical professionals and teachers as the dominate component of the services sector of employment.

This internal policy must be accomplished in our capitalist nation by the appropriate design of built-in incentives in our fiscal and credit policies, including accelerated depreciations beyond any so far used for research-and-development, for industry and farming and for productive improvements in land. Fiscal and credit policies must simultaneously aim at rapid expansion of the tax-base, maintaining relatively low rates of taxation on industry, agriculture and improvements in land, while also fostering high-technology export capacities.

That internal policy serves politically as the mediation of proper foreign policies into the day-to-day perception of self-interests of our electorate. For everything we do right overseas, there is a corresponding, correlated benefit within the national economy itself.

The management of our foreign policy depends upon a network of special allies, a group of allies representing a "community of interest." These allies are summarily identified as follows.

The closest natural ally of the United States for such policies is Mexico. The Mexico of Benito Juarez, as realized in the present constitution, and by the administrations of Obregon, Cardenas, Echeverria and Lopez Portillo represents not only our immediate neighbor, but one of the few nations in the world which has a constitutional order based on those same principles of humanist republicanism embraced by the founders of our own nation. The 25 year transformation of a nation of sixty million Mexicans into the kind of modern republic to which President Lopez Portillo is committed must become the jewel of United States foreign policy.

Immediately, Mexico must be most intimately associated with us in our counselling on policy for the American hemisphere as a whole. This should not be viewed as disparaging other nations of this hemisphere, but holding out to those nations the surety that the industrialized United States and the developing nation of Mexico together define the matrix of USA policy for the hemisphere.

Together with Mexico and other Latin American nations we reach east across the Pacific to Japan. Although there are within Japan certain British-tainted factions, as we have an overabundance of such contamination in our own electorate and institutions, the modern nation of Japan was created by leading Japanese who were intimate collaborators of the Abraham Lincoln Administration, and students of Alexander Hamilton and Henry C. Carey. Through the Meiji revolution, through these forces within Japan, that nation was lifted within a quarter of a century from the corruption of feudalism and Chinese cultural influences into a modern industrial power. This spark of genius within Japan was revived with cooperation of the American postwar occupation under direction of General Douglas MacArthur — largely free of contaminating British corruption of American policy there. It is those leading forces within Japan who maintain the tradition of the Meiji revolution which

embody the clearest continuation of the political-economic principles of the Federalist and Whig currents of our own nation. Moreover, their intellectual and other influence throughout the Western Pacific and Indian Ocean region is great, and their capabilities astounding.

Overlooking China for the moment, Southeast Asia represents a half billion people and India another seven hundred millions. From our continent's West Coast to the

Our universities have not produced a single known competent economist from their political-economy departments throughout the twentieth century.

East Coast of Africa and Cairo, our destiny proceeds in natural partnership and community of interest with the Meiji revolution tradition of Japan.

To the East the cornerstone of USA community of interest in Western Europe is currently expressed by the three nations of Italy, France and the Republic of West Germany. More specifically, the forces represented by the Andreotti government of Italy, the Gaullist forces of France, and the intersection of the Schmidt government and the forces around Otto Wolff von Amerongen in Germany.

Together with these humanist, city-builder forces we build a policy for the entire Mediterranean region and for Africa, reaching to the humanist forces of the Oom Kruger tradition in the Republic of South Africa. In the Middle East, Iran and Egypt are the keystone nations for our regional policy. We must secure the success of the development efforts of Shah-in-Shah Reza Pahlevi of Iran and make of Egypt the center-piece for the development of the Arab region as a whole. In Iran and Cairo, our alliance with Japan meets and overlaps our alliance with our Western European partners.

Our Middle East policy is not British policy — not the politics of oil. Our petroleum policy, in concert with the oil-exporting Islamic nations, is to trade-off the present use of petroleum as the means for building the region as a center of nuclear-energy production and of new cities — in the humanist tradition of the great period of the Caliphate of Baghdad.

Soviet-USA Policy Options

At this moment, there are three perceptible policy tendencies within the Soviet leading circles. One group, presently associated with President Leonid Brezhnev, represents the currents advancing the principles of the Schmidt-Brezhnev treaty. A second current, most efficiently designated as *Bukharinite*, is effectively an agent-of-influence of the British Secret Intelligence Service and its Socialist International subdivision. A third current, ostensibly associated with Mikhail Suslov, is a faction associated with "Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy," a faction which is presently toying with exploiting the Soviet's growing war-winning-strategic advantage to crush the power of the United States.

At last account, there has appeared to be a kind of de facto alliance between the Bukharinites and the indicated sort of "hard-liner." Both are encouraging the

"ecologist" movement in the capitalist sector, knowing that the policies of Willy Brandt, James R. Schlesinger, Henry A. Kissinger, et al., mean a catastrophic weakening of the viability of the United States and our nation's immediate military allies. These forces, at least the Bukharinites, also look favorably upon the economic-genocidal policies of the IMF, World Bank and "Brandt Commission," knowing that such policies mean transforming the entire developing sector — and other sectors — into a permanent region of destabilizations, coups, riots and general bloodbath. Some do this as outright British agents; others do this because they view hunger and misery as favorable preconditions for "socialist revolutions."

The immediate problem is that if the policies of Brzezinski, Kissinger, Rostow, Schlesinger and other lunatics prevail in the White House and Congress, the rejection of SALT and of Brezhnev's offers means the toppling of Brezhnev and Kirilenko in favor of the hard-line "war-hawk" faction. In that case, given the policies of G. William Miller, Blumenthal, Schlesinger as prevailing within the White House, congressional and Manhattan financial circles, *the United States will be plunged toward a war with the Soviet Union which the United States would lose in a matter of weeks.*

Make no mistake on this issue. No serving or retired officer can publicly state the facts as plainly as I do, and may in fact be obliged to make public statements directly contrary to his own best knowledge and estimations. Although I am not under oath on these matters, I think myself obliged not to report certain of the facts which I have adduced in this connection. I will say that General Alexander Haig is either an utter fool (a possible condition) or simply a liar, and that Secretary Brown has certain constraints on what he says. As for President Carter, so far he sincerely lacks comprehension of the problems involved. Outside the domain of estimates of capabilities, I will also say that the current economic policy of the United States and current Pentagon policies preclude the United States from developing a capability of doing more than massive damage to the Soviet bloc in the process of going down to virtually certain defeat. I will add that the China option does not qualitatively improve this configuration for confrontation.

It is probable that Zbigniew Brzezinski is honest in at least his total incompetence in matters of military strategy. The whole RAND, CSIS and related crews of "utopians" represent nothing but a revival of the "cabinet warfare" strategic thinking which prevailed prior to the American Revolution and Napoleonic wars, and which was revived under the hegemony of Metternich and Bismarck during the nineteenth century — before being discredited once again during two world wars and in Vietnam.

The thinking of these lunatic incompetents is at best a replication of the Nazi Blitzkrieg doctrine. Because the Nazis lacked the in-depth capability for winning a sustained war, their military policy depended on knocking out the opponent in one quick punch through decisive advantage in the first phases of general assault. Once, as in the Soviet Union, the first assault was absorbed and the forces under General Zhukov began

systematically deploying Soviet in-depth counter-offensive capabilities, the Wehrmacht and Waffen SS were systematically ground into extinction by Zhukov's tactics.

The "cost-benefit" methods introduced under McNamara are at best a limiting of warfare to a Blitzkrieg capability, depending upon the fatal misassumption that total thermonuclear war is the never-quite-reached asymptote of general war. Since both adversaries in a NATO-Warsaw Pact war will have completed the total thermonuclear bombardment assault against both forces and logistical (i.e., population) centers in strategic depth within less than six hours of 00:00 of war, the official policy of the Pentagon is criminal incompetence.

True wars, as distinct from cabinet-warfare exercises, are essentially meatgrinders. Both forces suffer massive attrition in the first wave of engagements. At that point, in-depth deployable capabilities come into play — with increasing emphasis upon the reserve forces. The winning of a war concentrates on the issue of which side comes out of each phase of the meatgrinder with a marginal gain in relative counteroffensive capabilities, through mobilization of deployable reserves to supplement savagely depleted first-line forces of the preceding phase. War is won when one side is able to occupy and pacify adversary populated territory with one's armed ground forces.

Everything in warfare is nothing but means and auxiliary to the central objective of putting one's armed ground forces into successful occupation and pacification of adversary populated terrain.

General Singlaub has pointed in that direction in his assessment of the relative capabilities of North Korean and South Korean military forces. The North Koreans have fewer troops and so forth, but more combat divisions — because the civilian infrastructure of North Korea provides most of the essential logistical support under conditions of war.

The notion that the USA construct a capable Blitzkrieg force on the basis of a depression-ridden economy, under conditions of rampant "environmentalism" and so forth, is a piece of military-strategic absurdity. The "all-volunteer army" is exemplary of the problem in general. Modern first-line troops must depend upon young men in the 18-25 age-range, well-trained, highly educable, effectively motivated for sustained combat operations, well led and so forth. The notion of making the Army a part of the CETA program, of tolerating a marijuana-stinking barracks life, and so forth, shows that either the Pentagon is utterly incompetent in the ABCs of military science since Machiavelli, or that the Pentagon has become a political organization whose policies are adapted to the front-page of the *Washington Post*.

It is a strong economy, a climate of technological progress in expanding capital-intensive employment and production, which produces a USA population of civilian militia reserves and an overlapping permanent regular force and cadres which gives our nation combat potentiality in depth.

A nation which is not able to commit the best-educated, most skilled portion of its youthful population to a permanent force, cadre and militia is a nation which is unqualified to conduct war against a well-matched

adversary. One should compare the recruitment, training and equipping of the Red Army — an Army trained to fight total thermonuclear war with the shabby, cabinet-warfare, cost-benefit-economy-threadbare policies governing U.S. forces.

Without attributing the foregoing to any military figure, it is fair to state that similar concerns are enraging large numbers of military professionals, and that this desperation concerning the hopelessness of

The Grand Design does not mean no Soviet or USA military forces in Africa or Asia.

getting a sense of reality through to the White House defines the climate in which General Singlaub's public role expresses the perceptions and moods throughout the ranks of general officers and many field-grade officers. For my own part, I emphasize that the present combination of strategic posture by Kissinger, Brzezinski, et al., with the military capabilities and national economic policies of the recent years since "Watergate" adds up to a picture of sheer lunacy. Rampant "anticommunism" plus anti-nuclear-energy policies add up to the policies of a bunch of immoral nuts who seem determined on getting us all killed or conquered.

If the Schmidt-Brezhnev policy matrix prevails on the Soviet side, and if we shape our negotiations with the Soviet Union on that basis, the following results are immediately within reach.

First, there is no notable impediment to reaching the indicated "community of principle" agreement with the government of Mexico — provided we drop our presently lunatic policies against Mexico and adopt policies in conformity with our vital self-interests in capital-intensive investment patterns and exports.

Second, the forces representing the Meiji revolution tradition in Japan want nothing but the sort of policies I have outlined.

President Giscard d'Estaing is known in informed French circles as the pro-American faction's leader, Helmut Schmidt was aptly described by Franz-Josef Strauss as speaking fluent *American* English. The Andreotti government is "more American" than the Carter Administration has been on performance to date. Iran is our ally. Egypt would like nothing better than the sort of USA policy we have outlined.

What we require from the Soviets is not military agreements. If we secure the economic-cooperation and related political agreements, the military agreements can be reached with a minimal amount of difficulty. President Brezhnev has adopted the policy of the Grand Design in his treaties with Chancellor Schmidt and has made it abundantly clear that these are his proposed policies for dealing with Japan, the United States and all of Western Europe.

The keystone of such Grand Design agreements with the Soviet Union is an *understanding of what the Grand Design means. It does not mean no Soviet or USA military forces in Africa or Asia.* On the contrary, if any

regime in the developing nations is suffering a regime which imposes zero-growth forms of economic-genocidal austerity on its people, any such emulation of Nazi policies such as that existing today in Chile impels all partners to the Grand Design policy to desire the elimination of such a government, and to aid a people in ridding itself of such a government within the limits of the principle of the

Old China hangs like a monstrous cancerous growth on the body of China as a whole.

sovereignty of nations. I have reviewed this matter in my *The Case of Walter Lippmann*.

The difficulty which many suffer in this connection is their foolish, deeply encultured delusion that the fundamental conflict in the world is between capitalism and socialism. Rather, the fundamental conflict today is what it has been for three thousand years of Mediterranean-centered civilization, the war between the respective followers of the humanist Homer and the bucolic oligarchist Hesiod. Any state which follows a humanist, Grand Design policy of technological progress and republican objectives for the development of its people is a state which is equally deserving of our support, whether socialist or capitalist. Any state which follows the policies of Hesiod, whether socialist or capitalist in nominal form, is an abomination to us.

The common enemy of President Brezhnev and the United States is Ralph Nader, Joe Rauh, Jr., and what they represent.

The key to achieving success in this negotiation with the Soviet Union is the current Pope Paul VI and the traditionalist (humanist) forces intimately associated with him. This force within the Catholic Church has the special distinction of richly understanding the *ecumenical* principles associated with the fifteenth century Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa and how those principles apply to the specific circumstances of the present global situation. The issue is not whether Pope Paul VI is infallible on each issue. The point is that the international moral authority of the Pope, joined with the invaluable understanding of the ecumenical notion of the Grand Design among those circles, provides the nations with an invaluable mediating agency for overcoming the evil inclusively represented by such creatures of Buckleyite Malachi Martin, the Fascist Bishop LeFebvre, and certain misguided protestant and other misguided souls.

What a Grand Design agreement with the Soviet Union means is that Neoplatonic humanist ground-rules govern every aspect of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States in every part of the world. It means, from the United States side, that we proceed in terms of the principles of John Quincy Adams, Sylvanus Thayer and General Winfield Scott, principles which President Brezhnev has committed himself repeatedly to desiring as the basis for USA-Soviet relations.

It means that the United States and its indicated "cornerstone" allies enter into an overall agreement with the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and Cuba. This agreement is based on the Neoplatonic humanist

principles of the Grand Design, as those principles were understood by our nation's Founding Fathers, by Leibniz, by France's Henri IV, by Friedrich II Hohenstaufen and by the cothinkers of Al Farrabi and Ibn Sina in the golden age of Islam. Under this agreement, we do not carve the world up into "empires" or spheres of influence as the British do, but lay down humanist ground-rules governing our mutual political and economic cooperation and encounters in "third nations."

If we fail to reach such agreement, or, worse, if the "war hawks" come into power to replace the forces associated with Brezhnev, then we are doomed to fight war, and must proceed with war-avoidance policies attuned to the continuing risks of general thermonuclear war. It is my extremely well-informed estimate that at this moment, Secretary Cyrus Vance and Ambassador Andrew Young could successfully secure the desired agreement in full in a series of steps, provided we rid the government of the influence of Brzezinski, Kissinger, Schlesinger, Peter Bourne and similar regrettable persons. The price of failing to follow such a policy is to risk 150 million American dead in the medium-term.

The Horror That Is China

Statistics and most-reliable first-hand reports assure me that China today is a cruel hell-hole. The heritage of Confucianism, one of the most hideous, bestial doctrines the earth has experienced, is perpetuated through the weight of the idiocy of Chinese traditions and Chinese rural life. There are positive elements in China, especially around those cities which are the centers of industrialization, but the Old China hangs like a monstrous cancerous growth on the body of China as a whole.

The policies of China, the policies which motivated Peking's easily-accomplished brainwashing of the suggestible lunatic Brzezinski, the willingness to connive at the destruction of the industrialized portion of the world, show the Chinese nation to be the most racist culture among the major nations on earth today. China is not yet a civilized nation in any meaningful sense of that term.

China must be contained as long as this hideous condition persists, until China comes under a new range of leaders who resume at least the kind of *Japanese-influenced* humanist policies adopted by Sun Yat Sen. Containment must not mean aversive "Cold War" containment. It means a policy of selective assistance and economic cooperation with China according to the principles of the Grand Design. We must selectively aid China in ridding itself of Chinese traditions, by fostering its industrial and related technological progress. We must aid China's masses in experiencing the moral transformation of a people, which is made possible through locating the individual's sense of social identity and importance in contributions to technological progress. What must be contained is hideous manifestations such as that we witness in Cambodia today. Any effort of China to nurture states or policies resembling the Cambodian nightmare, or to impose the Chinese traditionalist-racist outlook in world affairs must be firmly rejected and contained.

If such a firm policy is adopted, China will accept it. The worst factional forces in China will accept what they can not change because the evil within them is consistently the evil of stoicism. The best factional forces within China will rejoice — at least discreetly — because they will recognize that we are acting to put the future into their hands.

How much General Singlaub might agree with the foregoing, I shall not estimate. Whatever the proper judgment on that point, the fact remains that pulling the Second Division out of Korea does mean uncorking the evil within China throughout Asia, and so destabilizing that and other regions of the world that the very survival of civilization would stand in jeopardy. Anyone who does not agree with Singlaub on that point is either innocently ignorant or a moral imbecile.

However, it is not sufficient to attack such matters negatively, merely to attack wrong military policies and so forth. Unfortunately, so far, the flaw of our leading military professionals is that their reaction to incompetent strategic policies from the White House and

Pentagon has been chiefly negative. They do not put forward the positive strategic political policies necessary to define a basis for competent strategic military postures. They err, as does Admiral Moorer's recent proposal, in producing recipe-like military-posture configurations, not positive policies. Although I often sympathize with them as well as respecting the cause of their concern, I must point out to them that their approach to such matters has been so far overall incompetent because it has been incompetent in respect of political strategy.

My task is to intervene in this situation with full appreciation of the importance and certain basic elements of correctness in what General Singlaub and some others have stated. My task is to provide what they have so far been unable to provide: the essential political strategy within which terms a sound military posture and capabilities can be developed. I shall do more — much more — but what I have said here serves as an initial, summary outline of what I propose.

Black Guelphs: The Elite Must Rule

Otto von Habsburg, eldest son of the late Emperor Charles of Austria-Hungary, recently declared his longing to rid the world of humanism and return the globe to the rule of a feudal elite.

Von Habsburg, a close associate of William F. Buckley and Henry Kissinger's mentor Fritz Kramer, said in a June 10 speech:

We enjoy our wealth today only because our grandfathers reduced their consumption...man hasn't changed. The idea of modern man has sprung up all the time, but it has usually turned out to be the most reactionary idea. Man is still the same...Europe should be arranged according to tribal and regional principles. The principle of the tribe has proven to be the most stable in history.

Denouncing Soviet industrial expansion, von Habsburg warned:

The Soviets are basically very unstable. Their economy is so run down that they depend on the Western economies for support. And they are also oppressing their own people. Most people think that all Soviets are white, but that is not true. The majority of Soviet citizens are of the yellow race, and this will be significant one day.

There is the illusion of giving money for Siberian development. But these projects are just maintaining colonialism in that area. Siberia does not belong to Russia. The Chinese will take this up some day when the yellow race rebels....The Russian race will one day be reduced to that area they had before the colonization began...but in the West there are a lot of illusions about Russia. If it happens again, it will not

be the first time the Americans are paying those who will murder them one day.

Privately, von Habsburg confided to European Labor Party organizers that the British monarchy was the force to oversee this return to tribal-based feudalism. The genius of the British aristocracy is that they have always been able to produce new elites. There are natural elites in this world. and they should do the ruling.

At Harvard University on June 8 Alexander Solzhenitsyn, playing the boyar analogue to Habsburg's Black Guelph, called for a return to spiritualism and abandonment of the humanist tradition of material progress.

Should someone ask me whether I would indicate the West such as it is today as a model to my country, frankly I would have to answer negatively. Through intense suffering our country (Russia) has now achieved a spiritual development of such intensity that the Western system in its present state of spiritual exhaustion does not look attractive....How did the West decline from its triumphal march to its present sickness? The mistake must be at the root, at the very basis of human thinking in the past centuries. (An erroneous world view) became the basis for government and social science, and could be defined as rationalistic humanism or humanistic autonomy: the proclaimed and enforced autonomy of man from any higher force above him. It based modern Western civilization on the dangerous need to worship man and his material needs.