

The Italian Network

Marcus Raskin has a three-tier operation. The first is recruitment, the second is operations, and the third is the assassinations department which includes trained killers to assassinate inconvenient people. The first tier is controlled by Eddy Grevillz, who is very well known to Interpol. He is active and confident, comes from Lyons, and is a direct creation of Marcus Raskin. It appears that he lives in a locale in the area of Como in which Rockefeller has "cultural" interests. Investigators have established that he is the father of the Red Brigades.

How the Red Brigades Were Born

Between 1968 and 1969 Grevillz was in Trento where he became involved with the problems of sociology students. This was the University where Curcio and the other Red Brigades came into being. Grevillz also controls the drug traffic among youth. In fact, drug addicts are potential terrorists. Grevillz' men infiltrated themselves into the autonomist drug addicts and made drugs available to them. Later, they suddenly withdrew the drugs and blackmailed the youth, after which began the brainwashing which produces terrorists.

The agents of the criminal "case officers" (which means controllers in their jargon) obtain their (the recruits') loyalty by promising them drugs. This is why contact exists between the CIA and the criminal world. The ties between the CIA and Cosa Nostra are known. The CIA has also made a pact with the Calabrian *drangheta* (local criminal organization in the South-ed.) which in turn contracted to carry out kidnappings.

The complicity of the police is clear. Until some time ago, Grevillz had contact with the "Affari Reservati" and with General Miceli. Today it seems that Grevillz has close relations with the Viminale (Interior Ministry). The secret services have singled out all the responsible individuals but they are all untouchable people.

Erik Fulbright is the second man of the network, charged with using the terrorists politically. The orders come from Langley. The general headquarters are in the Rome office of a large multinational company (whose name we know).

Finally, the assassinations department is directed by Rene Polanski, a Pole who has been known to the police for some time. He gets his orders and carries them out without question.

This is the organization which directs terrorism.

The French Military Goes Psychotic

FRANCE

The following strategic assessment was issued April 28 by U.S. Labor Party Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche.

The French military command, which has not led a successful war since Napoléon's retreat from Moscow, has, true to that tradition, volunteered France for a Rockefeller enterprise which competent NATO countries' military professionals — e.g., in the U.S. and West Germany — correctly regard as suicidal incompetence. President Giscard d'Estaing's African adventure, and the babbling attributed to certain French quarters in yesterday's *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* suggest that Michel Foucault might be heading up Giscard's military advisers.

Admittedly, apart from the Vichy tradition traceable to General Boulanger, France has also produced its Foch and de Gaulle. Unfortunately, on the record, the bunglers predominate until the point they have lost or almost lost a war.

We do not exaggerate France's dismal military record. The Prussian defeat of the Second Empire should have surprised no one. Louis Napoléon's earlier military successes were stage-managed set-ups, arranged for him by the House of Rothschild — who manipulated the finances, and hence the deployment of little Louis' adversary. But for *prima donnas'* interference into the German military command, Germany would have won the First World War almost as quickly as it defeated France in 1940. In both world wars, the most significant German advantage was the imbecility of the French command. The same French officer corps which lost the 1940 Battle of France degenerated still further in the

process of conducting — and losing — the Indo-China War. Algeria was not a war, but a bloated military occupation exercise, in which the overall quality of the French officer corps was degraded still further.

De Gaulle was the exemplary exception to this, the rallying-point for those officers who had actual or potential qualities of strategic perception. Unfortunately, competent military leaders are no longer in the saddle; the Giscard government, by weeding out

Debré Blasts Atlanticist War Aims

In a short statement on French national television May 4, Gaullist leader Michel Debré explicitly denounced NATO's war aims against the Soviet Union. Justifying his — and most Gaullists' — refusal of European political integration, Debré said: "We do not want a war with the Soviet Union decided by others. They will ask us to put our nuclear weapons on the Czechoslovakian border and thus to participate in their war. If we refuse, they will cut off all credit and blackmail us." Debré had not alluded to Atlanticist war plans since the 1973-74 "Oil Hoax."

actual and potential Gaullists from the key military positions, has put the bunglers back to command. The same French military faction which Prussia defeated in 1870, nearly routed in 1914, and crushed in 1940 — the Vichy tradition — is back in command and disposed to parody its worst bunglings and atrocities of the past.

Vichy is the tradition of Louis Napoléon. Then and now,

the generals of Napoléon the Little are distinguished by little minds. They are sometimes expert in tactics, but imbecilic in strategy. They are expert in military occupation tactics against striking French workers or ill-armed colonials. Some are expert in the tactical traditions of the SS Colonel Otto Skorzeny. Clausewitz is beyond their petit-bourgeois comprehension.

The actualities of war are too big for French petit-bourgeois tastes. Tactics, the *little* side of war-fighting, they regard as eminently French. Strategy is not French in their view; it is not little. Petit Vichy France, Petit-bourgeois France, will not tolerate anything which does not agree with its version of French preciousness in task.

Nonetheless, despite their tastes in the matter, such generals of little minds have stumbled into big wars. Indeed, some of them are sufficiently deluded to imagine that they are professionally qualified to conduct war. They prepare for and fight under the delusion that strategy is nothing but a linear extension of established French tactics. They regard war as the total expression of such tactics — and, incidentally, the most suitable climate for the professional career-advancements and ultimately larger pensions.

Consistent with their petit-bourgeois mentality, for them war is the ultimate in existentialist *gestures*. It is existentialist rage: *Attack!* It is exquisite posturing: *Maneuver!* It is the oedipal act of rape, or assassination of a hated sibling: *Destroy!* In fact, it is usually the ultimate existentialist gesture: *Suicide — rout!*

Such generals of little minds are organically incapable of understanding actual strategic thinking on either of its two levels. They are incapable of rising to the level of Clausewitzian conceptions. They are thus inevitably incapable of rising to the higher level, to the analysis of the political processes under which Clausewitzian strategic doctrines are properly subsumed.

There are three great modern traditions of military strategic thinking. The German Clausewitzian, the American “traditionalist” — rooted largely in the lessons of the U.S. Civil War — and the Soviet or Tukachevsky tradition. Charles de Gaulle belongs among those traditions, as do Tito and Giap. Members of those traditions have assimilated a doctrine itself shaped by the knowledge that war is not an extension of tactics, but is armed *political* struggle. In fact, the science of military strategy is in principle a branch of political economy.

It is from the standpoint of political economy that one's own and an adversary's *interests* and in-depth war-fighting *capabilities* are determined. Military capabilities are realized expressions of political-economic capabilities, and military strategic postures are shaped by interests and capabilities. From this standpoint, one understands many crucial points almost axiomatically. For example, there is no level of technological advancement which precludes a war being fought.

Giscard's African Adventure

Although President Giscard d'Estaing obviously has no competent understanding of strategy, he has made it clear that he is fully informed of the real nature of the Zaire operation. Giscard is not such a fool as to believe the nonsense being poured into the ears of credulous

RPR members.

Giscard has identified the SATO connection, the use of “force de frappe” in connection with French naval operations, and the “strategic materials” aspect of the caper. Giscard knows that he is part of the Rockefeller SATO operation of which I warned a nationwide U.S. television audience last November 1. Giscard has made it clear by public statements issued variously by himself, French military spokesmen, and others, that the primary objective of his Africa policy is to put a trigger on an early thermonuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union. He, and undoubtedly François Mitterrand as well, are informed that the African operation is complementary to the unleashing of the Israeli military in a “breakaway ally” caper directed at the Gulf States.

The subsidiary monetarist objectives of the thermonuclear confrontation scenario are to provide Rockefeller total control of Middle East petroleum and African mineral resources. (No doubt, Rothschild has been offered a piece of this action in return for blocking British and French opposition to Rockefeller's Africa and Middle East policy. If Rothschild believes that Rockefeller intends to keep any such promise, Rothschild has forgotten how monetarists think in the sort of fix Rockefeller is in.) The objective is to drive up raw materials prices, cut off major chunks of world petroleum supplies, and thus create a speculative bonanza for the Rockefeller interests. Rockefeller has virtually cornered the coal reserves market for the moment and needs hundreds of billions of dollars from the U.S. Treasury to bail him out with “coal gasification” schemes. An upward zooming of other mineral prices would reproduce the 1973-1974 petrodollar bail-out operation on a much-enlarged scale.

The Africa and Israel operation function vis-a-vis the Warsaw Pact nations as a sea-going variation of the MC 144 “theater nuclear posture” scenario known as the “Schlesinger Doctrine.” Instead of attempting the thoroughly discredited theater-limited nuclear confrontation with the Warsaw Pact in Central Europe, the Israeli and Africa operations propose to apply this theater-limited nuclear exchange to a confrontation with Admiral Gorskov's Soviet fleet.

At this moment, the first phase of the confrontation itself is coordinated directly out of Zbigniew Brzezinski's U.S. National Security Council. The known elements are: U.S. Atlantic and Mediterranean naval forces, the Interpol network and neo-Fabian network, “Special Forces” units, French forces including the French fleet, forces of the Republic of South Africa, various token African stooges to lend color and variety, the Israeli military, and probably British elements.

However, according to statements by Giscard and other official sources, and according to Israeli sources, the U.S. elements of the first-phase deployment will keep a low journalistic profile. In the case of the Middle East, Israel will act apparently without the consent of the U.S. government in launching war, and South Africa, in cooperation with France, will follow a similar, “breakaway ally” scenario. Giscard's extension of the “force de frappe” to French naval operations off the coast of Africa signals that France is intended to replace the role assigned to NATO as the initiator of the theater-

limited nuclear exchange with the Soviet fleet.

Such arrangements are subject to change, but this is the way the game is set up at this point. Changes in details of the scenario do not alter any of the essential strategic implications.

Two fundamental strategic facts are posed. First, the Soviet command will not, under any circumstances, accept a theater-limited nuclear confrontation in any guise or disguise. If they cross an indicated threshold for theater-limited confrontation, they will do so only as part of a launching of total thermonuclear war. This means that they will make such an engagement only under conditions they have opted for, what Soviet and Warsaw Pact doctrine terms "justified thermonuclear war." Second, the combined Middle East and African scenario are, as I warned a nationwide television audience last November 1, the strategic preconditions at which Soviet perception of interests requires total thermonuclear war.

Let it once again be clear what total thermonuclear war means. It means the immediate launching of total Soviet strategic thermonuclear throwweight available against the continental United States, producing Day-One U.S. civilian casualties in the order of between 160 and 180 million persons. It means a form of global naval warfare beyond even the ordinary informed military specialist's imagination. It means that every military target of NATO, France, and their allies will be transformed into radioactive rubble at the same time that the launch is made against the United States. It means not only nuclear weapons, but strategic and tactical biological and chemical warfare. It means ABC military "sanitizing" of Western Europe in the same way an Idaho potato farmer saturates a field before planting it. In the wake of that screen of atomic-biological-chemical warfare, mobile Warsaw Pact spearhead forces, trained and conditioned to deploy in an ABC-contaminated environment, move across Western Europe, reaching France within 48 hours — or as much of France as remains usable outside the piles of radioactive rubble.

This is the insanity with which the French military command is playing.

Granted, the penalty against the Warsaw Pact nations will be hideous. Perhaps 30 percent of their population killed. The military or political strategist who imagines that that penalty will prevent the Soviets from going to war is worse than an imbecile. When a nation's most vital strategic interests are at stake, it will go to war if it has a war-winning capability. *It has no other choice.* At such a point, there is no threshold which continues to operate as a deterrent. Moreover, the Warsaw Pact command has thought this through over a 20-year period, has developed a strategic capability which has only this unique function, and their thinking is absolutely sound.

What the Warsaw Pact penalty does do is to shape the Soviet attitudes towards those it regards as responsible for causing the war.

The strategic precondition for war is de facto control of most of the OECD countries and developing nations by a U.S. Administration with the Carter Administration's policy content and characteristics. The instant the Carter administration shows its hand in a replay of the Kennedy administration's confrontationalist postures, a massive internal alignment occurs in the Soviet Union, putting the command structure for "justified ther-

monuclear war" into place and operational. The first decisive further push, and the action starts. The combined Israeli and African confrontations represent more than sufficient "critical strategic mass" to set everything into motion.

Only a general in the Vichy tradition would be so stupid as to not recognize that.

"Systems Analysis Freaks"

We know very well that neither the Israeli military nor Giscard's advisors authored the actions involved. We know very well who authored the schemes and where the orders actually originated. The U.S. authors were not the U.S. general officer corps, and not the "military industrial complex." It was the Rockefeller-Rothschild crowd and their "systems analysts" — with strong emphasis on the anal in analyst.

"Systems analysis" reduces individual human beings to "units." This is system analysis jargon for human beings: "units." Given arrays of such "units", to each section of the "array", a psycho-profile is attached. On this basis, a "scenario" is constructed.

What all "systems analysts" overlook is the deeper implication of that very principle which they themselves stress as essential to the success of the "scenario": controlled environment. What happens when the control breaks down?

The inherent feature of all the scenarios now being deployed is that their deployment depends upon the included development which causes the breakdown of the Soviets' controlled environment. Each of these scenarios introduces a powerful sensuous element of the type which sets the "reality principle" into motion — most emphatically in the Warsaw Pact command. Once that threshold value is reached, the controlled environment breaks down.

The principle is elementary. A controlled environment is axiomatically a set of illusions imposed on those being controlled. These illusions are induced through the psychological principle of reaction formation. The crude "Mutt and Jeff" psychological warfare or police-interrogation technique is exemplary. Attempt to maintain that illusion in an individual or group which is in fact not under the physical control of the controllers, and at a certain point of pain or similar sensuous perception of reality, the victim will abreact, break out of the psychological environment.

Hence, to the extent that the Rockefellers do in fact have a powerful influence within the Soviet leadership — via New York City, Vienna, and so forth — the only implied consequence of that influence for the scenarios in progress is to make war inevitable. That is, unless the Soviets act to destabilize developing scenarios before they reach the critical point of confrontations, Soviet abreaction will be delayed until the point of war. Hence, war becomes inevitable.

A certain amount of coverup propaganda flowed from U.S. journalistic sewers after the abortive Vance trip to Moscow. It was suggested that an "inexperienced President" had bungled in his "style" of handling the matter. That is utter nonsense. It was a precalculated operation, driven to extremes by David Rockefeller's desperation and by a gross miscalculation on the part of the *top strategic systems analysis*. The Mutt and Jeff

game against the Soviet leadership broke down — Rockefeller's principal Kremlin ace-in-the-hole was destroyed.

These nominal cretins — the systems analysts — are going directly to the brink of general war on the basis of the stated and obsessive conviction that the Warsaw Pact command will give up vital interests as concessions made to avoid threat of general war. It is an imbecilic bluff, based entirely on the pre-calculation that the Soviets will abandon both their vital interests and their military posture under sufficient pressure. This is why they blackmailed Rabin into resigning and why they pushed France into the Africa adventure.

The whole lot are criminal imbeciles. We may be as near as merely days or weeks from the extinction of the United States, France, and Israel, in part, because of the criminal incompetence of the Vichyite French military command.

Alternatives

If the Vichyites and their cronies have any sense left, they will keep their dirty fingernails out of all sabotage projects aimed against the Belgrade Conference. There are significant numbers of us in the United States who are already determined that West Germany, Italy, and other relevant nations shall succeed in any efforts they launch to keep out of a World War II scenario. We happily observe that Giscard's action generates the preconditions for a number of Soviet moves toward such ends.

The West Germany military, which do not generally share the well-known incompetence of the Vichy

military tradition, have approximately the same perception of the strategic situation as the leading traditionalist professional military people and their cothinkers in the United States: such patriotic German thinkers are seeking a solution for their country in this mess — it would be intelligent Soviet thinking to aid them in that search. In Italy and in parts of Scandinavia, and similar situation exists, as also in Turkey.

First, as yesterday's *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* emphatically reminds us, the time is long past to terminate all vestiges of the post-war occupation of Germany. It is time for the Soviets and their allies to act bilaterally to end the Four-Power arrangement in Berlin and all other tainting of West Germany's rightful sovereignty. Such measures would function under condition that powerful positive cooperative interests were established among West Germany, Italy, and other nations with the CMEA nations. One obvious such step is a comprehensive energy development program, inclusive of fission and fusion programs.

The secret of such measures is this. If Rockefeller is blocked from getting his fascist "energy" policy and from precipitating war between now and the end of September, the collapse of the Rockefeller and allied financial power is inevitable. Once that occurs, the Rockefeller grip on the United States as well as other nations weakens rapidly. That means an end of the Carter Administration in relatively short order, and its replacement by a Whig majority-based government. That does not weaken U.S. military power. On the contrary, in real strategic terms, U.S. power is strengthened. However, it is the U.S. technological might that defines U.S. interests and power in the world. On the basis of such changes in the U.S. Administration, we can proceed to clean up the present world depression and launch a global development effort.

What we all need is devices for buying that time. We need to stall the danger of general-war-tinged confrontations for approximately another six months. That done, Rockefeller's power is virtually ended and things that need to be done can be done.

What is required to accomplish that stalling is a combination of unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral actions among forces which agree to oppose Rockefeller's fascist austerity ("energy") policy. They must aid one another in resisting Rockefeller pressure, threats, intrusions and related measures. Such actions will weaken the build-up of scenarios leading into confrontations and will accelerate the collapse of Rockefeller's financial power.

My article, "The Case of Walter Lippmann," will be given limited circulation in advanced-copy form later this week. I urge all who wish to prevent war — especially leading forces among the OECD, CMEA and developing countries — to study that document most closely, as a guide to the principled character of agreement and actions that will succeed for this purpose. If other nations of the world will act to block Rockefeller now, we in the United States — the U.S. Labor Party and other American Whigs — will use the time they give us to muster our forces, put our nation's house in order, and then demonstrate to them that their confidence in the anti-Carter majority of the American people was fully justified.

Debré: U.S. Monetary Policy 'Insane'

The following statement by Gaullist leader Michel Debré was made during his attack in parliament against the austerity program of French President Giscard d'Estaing and Prime Minister Barre and was carefully blacked out of all western press:

...The international monetary order, since 1960, has vanished. The only economic conference worth our attention would be one associating European nations, the U.S., the U.S.S.R., the Arab countries and Japan, and would endeavor to build a new international monetary fund and a new monetary order...More than ever, I must warn against the growing threat of a permanent economic crisis, embryonic since the U.S. decision to break all ties between the dollar and gold. I must warn against the policy of the U.S. Treasury — though blessed by Nobel Prize American economists — which condemns us to deteriorating exchanges and crisis...Internal inflation is due to our own errors, but is to be added to the insane monetary policy of the U.S., from Nairobi to Jamaica...It is paving our future with the blackest stones.