Soviet 'moles' target new administration through Heritage Foundation conduits

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Contributing Editor

There is nothing accidental in the fact that Soviet Politburo spokesman Boris Ponomarev and the Washington, D.C.-based Heritage Foundation are presently attempting to prevent the incoming Reagan administration from developing close cooperation with our nation's allies on the Western European continent.

But, wait a moment. Do not leap quite so quickly to sweeping, irresponsible conclusions. Don't be like Roy Cohn. Don't begin pointing a dirty finger of accusation against every prominent figure who happens to be associated with the Heritage Foundation. Think of Macy's store abutting Manhattan's Herald Square.

The Macy's-Store Principle of counterespionage

In the old days, before Mayor Ed Koch took his turn in the proverbial barrel, Manhattan's streets were not yet a living-theater re-enactment of the movie "Clockwork Orange." In those days one did not require a platoon of Green Berets to reach the Herald Square entrance to Macy's famous department store. In such bygone days, there was no presumption of insanity in the act of either walking or taking a subway to shop at that store.

Somewhere in that incredible past, even I have been seen in Macy's store more than once. If you could travel back in time to those days, I would go so far as to recommend that if you found yourself in the vicinity near the close of a business day, you might find the delicatessen at Macy's of respectable quality.

Directing my memory to such past times, I know that perfectly sensible and decent people used to shop at Macy's in droves. The fact that my associates caught Macy's attempting to cash checks stolen from us in a mail-theft skimming operation has no bearing on the moral qualities of either Macy's merchandise or of the people who find that merchandise of tolerable quality at tolerable prices.

I wouldn't mind if a child of mine bought merchandise at Macy's. I would worry considerably if that child became involved socially with the families of certain Macy's executives.

In other words, one does not burn down the Executive Office Building across from the White House simply because a few Soviet KGB or other unsavory "moles" have managed to secure appointments to departments on those premises. One does not round up associates of the Heritage Foundation as suspected Soviet KGB moles in wholesale lots simply because some unsavory characters are using the Heritage Foundation as a conduit for evil meddling in our government's affairs.

Think of yourself as a U.S. counterespionage operative looking for a Soviet KGB "mole" somewhere around the premises at Macy's. That is the gist of the Macy's-Store Principle of counterespionage.

A lesson in counterintelligence

I have learned a great deal about counterintelligence during the past decade, and, I may add fairly, my associates and I have demonstrated qualifications which go far beyond the mere academic.

Operational counterintelligence is axiomatically prevented from indulging in the principal kinds of blunders committed by the academic. The academic wishes to postpone judgment until all of the evidence is presumed to be in hand, and fully cross-checked. From the standpoint of the academic, it appears that the counter-

intelligence operative is at a considerable disadvantage. The operative must often act long before "conclusive" findings are turned up and cross-checked. Contrary to the mistaken view of the academic on this point, the effective, experienced operative usually produces a far better quality of intelligence than the academic.

In first approximation, the distinction is illustrated by the case of the law-enforcement officer who arrests a knife-wielding assailant. The officer should not hesitate to ponder whether the assailant will actually kill the woman unless deterred. The officer should not attempt to draw the conclusion on the spot, whether or not the assailant is the current reincarnation of "Jack the Ripper." Good counterintelligence is essentially a method for making appropriate on-the-spot judgments for action.

Suppose that the assailant of that illustrative case is in fact a hired assassin of a ring, and that his assault in the particular case is the result of a decision passed through a chain-of-command going back to an ultimate source several levels removed from the ring which immediately deployed the assailant. It may be several cases later before the existence of the ring is pinned down as a connected feature of the first case. It may be through entirely different channels of operations and investigations that the first level above the ring itself is connected positively to the deployment of the ring's resources.

Yet, in such a case as that composed for purposes of illustration here, back at the station-house some alert investigation may recognize from study of both the perpetrator and circumstances of the incident something which points toward the existence of some sort of ring, which casts doubt on the assumption that the criminality of the perpetrator is an isolated "sociological phenomenon." It is such a subtle distinction of emphasis in investigations of a single case which distinguishes ad hoc security and law-enforcement action from the higher levels of counterintelligence.

The method of the qualified counterintelligence operative is essentially identical with the methods properly adopted by a scientist in making successive breakthroughs of the sort we call scientific discovery. That connection is underlined in exemplary fashion by Edgar Allan Poe's development of his character C. Auguste Dupin. Poe's fictional Dupin is based on the great French economist of Monge and Carnot's Ecole Polytechnique, the Dupin directly linked to the Lafayette-led Cincinnatus Society of the 1820s, and directly linked, through such connections as Lafayette and Friedrich List, to the Philadelphia center of the United States' private counterintelligence organization of that same period. This was the same organization, developed under the leadership of Benjamin Franklin, to which Cincinnatus Society operative Poe was attached.

From crucial features of an initial matter of investigation one constructs a set of alternative, interconnected "investigative hypotheses." Such investigative hypotheses have the same proper rules as a well-developed scientific hypothesis in the domain of physical science, so-called. One of the great intelligence operatives of modern history, the Dominican monk Giordano Bruno, the confederate of Tudor England's John Dee (the original, real-life operative who signed his reports to Queen Elizabeth "007"), developed the method for both science and other modes of investigation in extended Platonic dialogues devoted to this matter of adducing reality from patterns of shadows.

We—my associates and I—have undergone such experience repeatedly over the course of the past decade and a half, beginning with our investigation to discover who was really programming the spring-summer 1968 SDS-centered festivities at Columbia University and at the Chicago Democratic convention of that same year. From a mere academician's standpoint, our analysis was often *wrong, in his choice of terms,* in the sense that we had not yet plumbed the bottom of the deployments we were investigating, for example. Yet, generally, we have been *operationally correct;* in the cited case we had simply not progressed far enough. We had rightly identified the "bad guys" immediately behind the SDS leadership and the Mark Rudd-led "Action Faction" as certain "left-wing intelligence networks" efficiently connected to Herbert Marcuse and persons within the Ford Foundation. How the blasted thing really worked, we did not yet know, but we were confronted with a need to act, and what we determined was accurate and necessary for guiding us to appropriate forms of action at that time.

The method of the qualified counterintelligence operative is essentially identical with the methods properly adopted by a scientist in making successive breakthroughs.

Even now, in matters relating to "moles" in the Heritage Foundation, we have not yet gotten to the bottom of the business. However, we do know with certainty more than all but a privileged relative few.

The point of method will become clearer as we proceed with the immediate case at hand. It will become clearer because we have now pointed out to the reader the nature of the methodological problem he or she must take into account in investigating the matter of "moles" in the Heritage Foundation.

Like a good law-enforcement officer confronted with probable evidence of a crime in progress, we must approach the investigation of the Heritage Foundation by examining critically the facts as they appear to us. The apparent fact of the matter in this case is that influential elements working through the Heritage Foundation are steering that Foundation's capabilities to effect the same ends stipulated by the Soviet Politburo's Boris Ponomarev at a recent meeting of communist parties' representatives held in East Berlin.

At the next level of investigation, we must determine whether there is an efficient connection between the Washington offices of the Heritage Foundation and the Soviet KGB offices in Moscow. We find that such a connection exists, and that it involves some of the highest levels of organization at both ends of the connection.

Now, the reader must exert caution. This does not prove, necessarily, that the relevant highly placed connections into the Heritage Foundation are Soviet KGB "moles." At the end of this report, we will have shown that there are certain agents of foreign intelligence organizations deployed as "moles" against the United States' vital strategic interests through Heritage Foundation channels of influence on Capitol Hill. We will also have shown that these "moles" are effectively agents of the policies adopted by those responsible for Boris Ponomarev's statement of new Soviet strategic doctrine at East Berlin. *Operationally,* as a problem for the security of the United States, we must treat them *as if* they were agents of the Soviet KGB. On a deeper level, the matter is slightly more complex.

The history of the investigation

The investigation of the Heritage Foundation began in June 1978. This was begun as a security counterintelligence inquiry, motivated by cross-checked indications of a homicidal assault directed against me as target, during that period. (There were actual, aborted deployments against me in Michigan during this period of time.)

Undercover investigation of the Heritage Foundation's extraordinary, nationwide, intensive deployment against me, begun during May-June 1978, and continuing at the present time, isolated a self-avowed British intelligence operative, Francis M. Watson. Watson volunteered names of key accomplices, aiding undercover

The Foundation

The Heritage Foundation is the main American center for promulgation of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's economic policies. Officially, Heritage is a branch of the Thatcher government's official London think tank, the Center for Policy Studies. The foundation's director of research, Robert L. Scheuttinger, is a fellow of the Center for Policy Studies, reporting to Sir Keith Joseph, Thatcher's industry minister.

The Heritage Foundation was founded in 1975 with funding from the Mobil Oil corporation, and secondary support from Coors Beer. In 1976 it was taken over by its current president, Edwin Feulner, Jr., a graduate of the Fabian London School of Economics, who brought a whole string of top-level British intelligence operatives into association with the Foundation, including Robert Moss, Julian Amery, and Winston Churchill III. Moss edits the London *Economist*'s Foreign Report, a barely concealed front for British intelligence. Amery, son of Sir Leopold Amery of the Loeb-Rhodes trust, is an intimate of the Evelyn de Rothschild-Lord Harlech circle and a member of the elite British Round Table. He has occupied a top post in Britain's MI-6 foreign espionage organization since his World War II days in the Special Operations Executive.

Thatcher, Keith Joseph, and Chancellor of the Exchequer Sir Geoffrey Howe (who wrote the laudatory introduction to Heritage's latest pamphlet on urban free enterprise zones) have already shown what the Heritage Foundation's policies mean in practice. Gasoline prices in Britain have risen to $2.10 a gallon, interest rates are at 14 percent; government subsidies for industry have been eliminated; and the British nationalized industrial core is being hacked apart. With the approval of the Heritage Foundation, the British population is now subject to a degree of austerity not seen during the 1930s.

The Heritage Foundation promotes its ideas through a number of publications, including its quarterly magazine *Policy Review.* The foundation has sought to gain influence with the incoming Reagan administration by submitting a 3,000-page set of recommendations on all aspects of foreign and domestic policy. Two of the foundation's trustees, William Simon and Frank Shakespeare, are rated as having a favorable chance of obtaining a high post in the Reagan administration.

investigators in mapping out cross-checks. Michael Deaver, then associated with the *Citizens for the Republic* newsletter, volunteered the name of Watson and others as the persons approaching him in the effort to insert defamatory falsehoods in that newsletter. Watson and others volunteered admission of the information volunteered by Michael Deaver, and more, subsequently verified, information.

The deployment of the Heritage Foundation was proven to have been conduited through the international Mont Pelerin Society, in cooperation with the London International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). The published roster of the personnel directing the Heritage Foundation, following a previous reorganization, corroborated the investigative evidence that the Foundation was controlled by the Mont Pelerin Society and IISS.

During the same period, persons in the leadership of B'nai B'rith's Anti-Defamation League (ADL) were deployed in parallel and interconnected operations against me and my associates. These operations were directly interlinked with the operations of the Heritage Foundation's Francis M. Watson et al. Although the ADL officials involved are formally agents of the B'nai B'rith, from the standpoint of the ordinary member of B'nai B'rith, the actions taken were essentially *ultra vires*. The intelligence activities of the ADL's Irving Suall et al. are not initiated on behalf of B'nai B'rith, but are a misuse of the resources of B'nai B'rith on orders from a command center of British intelligence based in London.

According to intelligence-witting executives in some of the most influential financial institutions of Western Europe and the United States, the motive for the deployment of assassination threats against me during that period was the impending introduction of the European Monetary System proposal by France's President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of the Federal Republic of Germany. According to these several highly-placed sources, each volunteering information independently of one another, the inside gossip in London-centered financial circles was that I represented a "serious potential danger" because of the agreement between the European Monetary Fund feature of President Giscard's and Chancellor Schmidt's proposal and my own widely circulated proposal for establishing a new, gold-reserve-based international rediscount facility as the crucial institution of international monetary reform.

That information received coincided with the known proprietorship of the Michigan-based Communist Labor Party and other groups complicit in conduiting planned physical assaults on my person.

During the same general period, an official of the Church of England volunteered to undercover operatives that the ADL was being deployed on orders of British intelligence, thus placing the ADL in the position to be the scapegoat for any backfire emerging from the British-intelligence-ordered deployment of ADL resources.

Situating the co-deployment of Heritage Foundation and ADL resources within the "mother" agency responsible for both these libel, slander and harassment campaigns, as well as the projected assassination attacks, the immediate authorship was narrowed to a section of the Anglo-Canadian Special Operations Executive (SOE) of Stephenson et al. Nominally disbanded shortly after the end of the last World War, SOE was continued in a private corporate form, and is in fact larger and much more powerful today than it was at the close of the last war. The elements of this SOE network positively identified as "mother" for the combined Heritage Foundation and ADL deployment are typified by the networks of the British SOE psychological-warfare arm, the London Tavistock Institute (Sussex), plus the same Canadian-based section of the SOE apparatus linked to attempted assassinations of President Charles de Gaulle and indicted by a Louisiana grand jury for complicity in preparing the conditions for the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. The faction of the SOE apparatus associated with Permindex and Major Louis M. Bloomfield is exemplary of the latter.

This is the same network prominent in the link between the Soviet KGB and the "moles" in the Heritage Foundation today.

Before focusing directly on the current problem involving the Heritage Foundation, two points of background information must be developed here for the reader's summary knowledge. Where do the Mont Pelerin Society and IISS, the controllers of the Heritage Foundation, fit within the complex of the British Secret Intelligence Service? In other words, *what is the continuing channel of link to Soviet KGB General H. "Kim" Philby?*

The IISS

The London International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) is not an intelligence investigations and evaluations organization. It is merely a propaganda outlet for other agencies of British SIS, a function attested to by its emphasis on recruiting publishers, editors and journalistic specialists in security-policy matters. London IISS is the "mother" organization for a network of daughter organizations spread around the world. *Its principal function is to spread lies, not to provide candid intelligence.*

IISS fits principally under the London Tavistock Institute (Sussex) branch of psychological-warfare, and dovetails most closely with the "Russian Studies" subdivision of Tavistock networks.

The scientific name for any public official caught waving around credulously an IISS report on strategic matters is a *dupe.*

Admittedly, IISS is on a much lower level than the stratum of British SIS *through which the Philby connection continues to operate.* IISS corresponds to a level in the hierarchy of intelligence where one finds such lower-ranking "hired guns" as Zbigniew Brzezinski. It, like Brzezinski, does not qualify for "need to know" in such matters as the Philby connection.

Nonetheless, although IISS is relatively trash in the pecking order of international intelligence, the way in which IISS is deployed reflects policies at higher levels,

The connection between the Washington offices of the Heritage Foundation and the Soviet KGB offices in Moscow involves some of the highest levels of organization at both ends of the connection. The matter is complex.

as a shadow on the ground reflects the figure walking past. It is part of the spoor.

The Mont Pelerin Society

Formally, the Mont Pelerin Society was set up in Switzerland at the close of the last World War, under the sponsorship of British SIS. It has a working arrangement with British SIS which causes it to appear often as an arm of British secret intelligence.

The Mont Pelerin Society is a key institution in the present Margaret Thatcher government of the United Kingdom. Sir Keith Joseph is the most visible Mont Pelerin agent in that government. A connected case is the government's treasury official, Sir Geoffrey Howe—the man who has been promising the "light at the end of Milton Friedman's monetarist tunnel" for so long that he might better be known as *Sir Geoffrey When?*

Nonetheless, although such facts have considerable practical importance, they do not represent the end of the investigation.

The complementary organization to the Mont Pelerin Society is the fruity Pan-European Union, presently headed by the heir to the throne of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Archduke Otto von Hapsburg. Unlike Queen Elizabeth II, who is no fool, Otto von Hapsburg's intellectual powers hardly reach the magnitude of a potential menace. It is biology, not spirit that determines the Archduke's nominal status in these matters.

The Pan-European Union was originally established under the leadership of Richard Graf von Coudenhouve-Kalergi, back during the same 1920s when wretched concoctions such as Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler were being promoted by the same Venice-centered "black oligarchical" circles which Coudenhove-Kalergi represented. Why Otto von Hapsburg and his friends opposed Adolf Hitler is not a clear-cut, but a complicated, story which it is not necessary to develop here. The relevant point is that Coudenhove-Kalergi was a prominent Markgraf of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire, whose family was established as a marcher-lord in Eastern Europe through Venice's ownership of the Hapsburg house. Many of the Eastern European oligarchical families are of Venetian or Genoese "black nobility" origins, such as the Kalergi (Venice) and Pallavicini (Genoa).

Does this information appear to border on exotic irrelevance? If the reader thinks so, the reader is very badly mistaken. The reader who thinks this is irrelevant could not possibly understand anything of what is occurring in Poland today, or in the raging factional battles now ongoing in Moscow.

The Pan-European Union was reconstituted at the close of the last World War under the personal sponsorship of Winston Churchill and South Africa's Smuts. It is an anti-capitalist conspiracy, as it avows itself to be. It is dedicated to restoring a feudal order in Europe, and eliminating the institution of the sovereign nation-state, in favor of a World Federalist Union composed of feudalistic "regions." It is poor Otto von Hapsburg's special, frequently declared conceit that he will become the "Emperor of Europe," the "Emperor" of a "Europe of the Regions." Granted, many other members of the Pan-European Union and the allied Mont Pelerin Society and World Federalist Union may not share poor Otto's dreams for his coronation, but Otto's views are otherwise consistent with the direction of thinking which predominates in all those associated institutions.

Granted, to the average, red-blooded U.S. citizen, the forces behind the World Federalist Union, the Pan-European Union, and the Mont Pelerin Society appear to be a collection of "real kooks." That may well be the case, but they represent a massive financial and related power in the world. Genghis Khan, too, may have been

a "real kook," but that deprecatory information would have been of little consolation to Genghis Khan's numerous victims.

The point to be understood is that British SIS is merely the most visible portion of a larger complex of power centered around the same Venice-Genoa "black nobility" which has poisoned the life of European civilization since the latter half of the 13th century. The public insulting of Queen Elizabeth II by a Venetian princess, during the Queen's recent visit to the old Pallavicini palace in Genoa, is symptomatic of the view among the old "black nobility" of Europe of the British monarchy as a mere parvenu, Hanoverian branch of the Welf household.

The significance of the British Commonwealth, especially Britain, Canada and the "offshore financial complex" associated with the City of London otherwise, is that Britain is the largest single nation-state power presently controlled top-down by the Venice-Genoa-centered oligarchist faction of Europe.

The forces behind the World Federalist Union, the Pan-European Union, and the Mont Pelerin Society appear to be 'real kooks,' but they represent a massive financial and related power, centered around the 'black nobility.'

Understanding the British

The most commonplace source of the inability of even many U.S. intelligence-community executives to understand British secret-intelligence operations is the disinformed view of most U.S. citizens that the English-speaking culture of the United States is a daughter of the same culture represented by Britain today.

The English-speaking American colonies of the 17th century were established by the Republican party of England, the Commonwealth Party of Oliver Cromwell and John Milton. Those colonies were established not simply to escape religious and related persecution by the Stuart monarchy. The colonies were established as part of a plan developed by the commonwealth factions of both England and France during the preceding century, a plan to hew new republics out of the American wilderness, new republics which, once developed, would tilt the global balance of forces in favor of the victory of republicanism in Europe.

The formation of the United Kingdom occurred as a coup d'état led by a Genoese-financed Cecil family in England, in concert with the Genoese-owned Scottish lowlands aristocracy. This coup d'état is the immediate subject of William Shakespeare's *Hamlet,* a Shakespeare whose plays were suppressed by the post-1660 Restoration monarchy of Britain until the British resurrected Shakespeare as a counter-focus to the dramas of the pro-American Friedrich Schiller at the beginning of the 19th century.

The essential features of the 17th century Civil War in England and Scotland, once all the complications are appropriately accounted for, was a revolt of the English people against Genoese usurpation of the British government. The successful counterrevolution against English and Scottish republicanism, effected in 1660, was a reconquest of Britain by the network of Venice-Genoa-centered financial networks.

This is key to understanding the American Revolution as that revolution actually occurred. The essential, underlying cause for the revolution was the same issue which determined the 17th-century Civil War in Britain. Our forebears represented predominantly the same English political culture as Shakespeare and Milton. It was the consolidation of oligarchical power over Britain which made common government with Britain intolerable to American republicans. Every other issue of the American Revolution was either derivative of that fundamental issue, or was an issue chosen for tactical reasons.

The British Secret Intelligence Service of the post-1603 period is not the 16th-century SIS which employed John Dee. The Genoese financier interest in Britain, brought through tax-farming to become the City of London, spawned a branch of the old Venetian-Genoese Levant Company which became known as the British East India Company, complementing a sibling entity of the Netherlands, the Dutch East India Company. Royal Dutch Shell today cannot be properly understood except from that vantage point. By the middle of the 18th century it had become impossible to distinguish officials of the British East India Company and its offshoots, such as Barings bank, from officials of the SIS. Out of that overlap emerged the practice of referring to British SIS as "The Company."

The man in the street usually considers it exotic that the Anglo-Canadian SOE constituted itself as a private supranational intelligence entity, composed of a complex of interlocking private corporations, at the close of the war. The man in the street ingenuously thinks of intelligence services as agencies of governments, listed

in budgets and tables of organization in the same manner as our own Central Intelligence Agency. He imagines that British intelligence must be essentially the formal SIS, the MI-5 and the various "Q" monstrosities which all report only to the British Monarch, *and not to any Prime Minister.*

That citizen does not understand how the British government is actually organized. Britain is essentially a plantation owned and managed by a private company, by the complex of private corporations which represent the present-day outgrowths of Scottish-border unregulated banking and the British East India Company. The British government is not the agency which deploys British intelligence; it is privately owned British intelligence which deploys the British government as one of its tools.

British 'Company' hatred of LaRouche

If one thinks about it, the hatred of me by the British "Company" is most paradoxical. The monetary reforms I have proposed are the central reason for that hatred, including London's deployment of the Heritage Foundation, Irving Suall et al. against me. On close examination, those proposed reforms would be of the greatest benefit to British industry, and therefore to the British nation generally.

They would accomplish a general rescheduling of the principal portion of the external indebtedness of developing nations and a general reduction of borrowing costs for international trade. This measure would "bail out" not only the major commercial banks of the United States and western continental Europe, but would represent a similar sort of great boon to the British banks. This measure would mean abundant export credit for revitalization of what is presently a collapsing mass of wreckage of British industry today. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher pointed in the direction of the answer to Britain's paradoxical hatred against me when she referred to the British government as something much "older than capitalism."

The difficulty which our average man in the street would tend to experience in attempting to account for the British "Company's" hatred against me, is that the American citizen understandably attempts to explain such matters in terms of motivations consistent with industrial-capitalist society. In the case of Britain, which most citizens assume—wrongly—to be governed by a perception of industrial-capitalist forms of national self-interest, capitalist industry exists, but does not shape the British government's and City of London's perception of vital interests.

The British "Company," like the Genoese-Venetian finance oligarchy out of which the British government grew, is essentially "feudalist" in its assessment of self-interest.

The British "Company's" motives, as typified by the stated purpose of "geopolitics" by Lord Alfred Milner's crowd at the beginning of this present century, is to establish for once and for all a "feudalist" sort of "one-world" order. In the view of the "Company," as in the view of the Hapsburgs, and the view of the Genoese-Venetian "black nobility" generally, the principal enemies of their goals are the sovereign nation-state republic and the kind of industrial-capitalism typified best by U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton's outline of the principal features of the American System during the first administration of President George Washington.

The commonplace error of judgment of most citizens is that they project their own moral values upon the British and others. Our citizens' moral values—at least, for most of our citizens—include emphasis upon the sovereign nation-state and the benefits of industrial progress and power. The British "Company" accepts only the principle of power, and rejects the nation-state and industrial progress as intrinsic adversaries of British "Company" interest.

The British "Company" outlook can be fairly cartooned as the viewpoint of a greal slumlord who aspires to take over the entire world. He desires to increase his rental income, and abhors with a passion restive tenants who clamor for the production of improvements of the rented premises. In other words, his is the "feudalist" outlook, the outlook which emphasizes the gentlemanly practice of parasitically extracting ground-rent, freed from the hand-dirtying business of living from the profitable production of useful product.

This is the British "Company" viewpoint, as such leading American economists as Friedrich List, Mathew Carey, Henry C. Carey, and William D. Kelley and others understood Britain to be, a mixed feudalist-capitalist economy.

Once one understands the British "Company" from that more accurate vantage-point, the connection of the British to the Hapsburg oligarchy and the "black nobility" of Venice, Genoa and Acapulco is more easily understood as well.

The Soviet connection

On the basis of recurring patterns of policy alignments, we can presently distinguish essentially three political currents in the Soviet leadership. One of these is in effect a Soviet form of the pre-Soviet tradition associated with Petrograd since Peter the Great's collaboration with Gottfried Leibniz. It is pro-science and technology, and approaches relations with the West

from that vantage point of reference to Soviet self-interests. At the opposite extreme, there is a "radical" faction usefully assessed as a present-day echo of the Bukharin faction of the 1920s. In between there are pragmatic Soviet nationalists, who tilt back and forth between the directions represented by the other two.

The "neo-Bukharinite" faction, to employ a convenient short-hand term, is the faction of the Soviet leadership which is most intimately linked to both British intelligence and the Hapsburg/Venice-centered "black nobility" of continental Europe and Acapulco. This faction is presently in predominant control of the Soviet KGB and the Soviet Communist Party's foreign-intelligence think tank, IMEMO. This is KGB General H. "Kim" Philby's faction, and the Moscow end of the connection leading to the "moles" in the Heritage Foundation. *This is also the Moscow faction which organized the present destabilization of Poland.*

A summary of the current developments in Poland is the most useful way to represent the current functions of the Moscow-linked "moles" within the Heritage Foundation.

There are principally three distinct elements backing the "solidarist" trade-union operation in Poland.

The first is the Jesuit-led "solidarist" movement itself, based out of the Free University of Lublin, meaningfully located in the old Austro-Hungarian-occupied portion of partitioned Poland, and presently coordinated via Vienna. Although the Jesuit-led movement developed and leads the "solidarist" forces as a whole, the Jesuit "solidarists" did not initiate the wave of strikes which brought down the government of Edward Gierek.

The forces leading the destabilization from inside Poland are *British secret-intelligence agents, such as Stefan Olzowski,* and *Soviet KGB operatives, such as the present, transitional government of Stanislaw Kania.* It was the KGB's Kania who rigged the collapse of the Gierek government. The Olzowski forces are "assets" of the London Tavistock Institute.

The Jesuit-led "solidarists" are currently attempting to maneuver toward both safety and whatever gains they may acquire, within an environment rigged from the top by the Soviet KGB and British intelligence.

Although the Soviet KGB performed the decisive role in arranging for the destabilization, this does not mean that Soviet tanks might not roll into Poland under certain quite possible early conditions. The error of most efforts to evaluate the Polish situation is the blunder of presuming that "Poland" is the primary focus of the action which happens to be played out most visibly to the press in Poland. Poland today is essentially a side-effect of a crucial struggle centered in Moscow itself. What will or might happen to Poland will be determined by the course of present events in Moscow, and not primarily by current developments in Poland.

Essentially, the relevant faction of the British "Company" is currently in a partnership with the neo-Bukharinite faction in Moscow. The immediate strategic objective of the recent Moscow-coordinated "solidarist"destabilization of Poland was to oust an Edward Gierek who was the leading pro-Western statesman of the East bloc as a whole, the close collaborator of France's President Giscard and West Germany's Chancellor Schmidt. The broader objective was to use the Polish destabilization to destroy economic cooperation between eastern and western continental Europe, and to use this shift, combined with further destabilization of the petroleum-exporting Gulf region, to collapse the economies of western continental Europe and Japan.

This operation involves a cooperative effort by KGB-centered and British "Company" forces to push the "center" faction in Moscow against the pro-technology faction, and toward total repudiation of the May 1978 protocol between President Leonid Brezhnev and Chancellor Schmidt. This combination aims at both collapsing the western continental European and Japan economies, and also sparking a brutal form of renewed "cold war" between East and West.

The crushing of the Western European economies is intended to coincide with preemptively forcing the incoming Reagan administration to wreck the U.S. economy by forcing a Thatcher-like, Friedmanite austerity on the United States. In short, London has expressed publicly the fear that the replacement of its puppet, President Carter's administration, by the nationalist-inclined Reagan administration, will lead to an undoing of the wrecking of the U.S. economy which London accomplished through Carter.

The chief asset of London inside the United States at this moment is the Federal Reserve Board of Governors dominated by Fed Chairman Paul A. Volcker.

The complementary asset of London within the United States is the capability of mobilizing an escalating riot potential to greet the incoming Reagan administration. This capability is centered around a complex within our national intelligence community. That complex is essentially the social-democratic apparatus intersecting the Social Democrats U.S.A. (SDUSA), the bureaucracy of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and the League for Industrial Democracy. Most of the undesirable nasties on the spook side of our national life center in this network as such, or in its somewhat cut-out offshoot, the neo-Fabian networks of the Institute for Policy Studies (Ramsey Clark's and Philip Agee's terrorist-connected friends).

It is that network which has contracted to build up both the Wilkinson Ku Klux Klan organization, the Covington Nazi sideshow, and the combination around the Communist Workers Party and Yippies. These typify the assets being developed presently to trigger a riotous bloodbath within the United States.

The third channel of British intelligence penetration is typified by the "moles" deployed under the cover of the Heritage Foundation. These "moles" are assigned primarily to penetrate conservative strata on Capitol Hill and within the incoming administration. Their function is to condition the responses of the Congress and the incoming administration to the kinds of domestic and foreign troubles which the allied British "Company" and Soviet KGB-centered forces are presently preparing.

It is in that sense and in that fashion that certain influences conduited under the cover of the Heritage Foundation's current deployments can be considered as the same thing in effect as Soviet KGB "moles."

Bukharinism

Nikolai Bukharin was among the highest-ranking of the assets of a joint British-Hapsburg network formerly associated most prominently with the "super-agent" Alexander Helphand (Parvus). During the 1920s, during the period of his greatest power, Bukharin was essentially the top agent of Royal Dutch Shell within the Soviet government.

During the same period of the 1920s, British-trained intelligence operative Karl Korsch was key to the reorganization of Parvusite networks in the form of the "Third Camp" movement. This coincided with pulling-out of large sections of the Parvusite network from the Comintern as the so-called Bukharinite "Right Opposition" of Bukharin, Rykov, G. Ryazanov, Brandler, Thalheimer, and the former Bukharinite leader of the Community Party U.S.A., Jay Lovestone. Both ends of the Parvusite networks were tucked into the ILGWU, SDUSA, and LID within the United States, and integrated for operational purposes both with the Ukrainian fascist outgrowth of the Russian Mensheviks, the NTS, and the gnostic movement spun out of chiefly the Mount Athos monastery in Greece and Belgium's University of Louvain.

Bukharinism is a special variety of communism developed directly out of Russian nihilism—from which Bukharin was recruited to Vienna training. This variety of communist is violently anti-industrial capitalist, but is more or less equally hate-filled against a capitalist-like development of high-technology big industry in the Soviet Union. The leadership of this particular brand of communist and allied "third camp" networks has always been under the control of the "black nobility" of Europe, which views such communists and "third campers" as a social battering-ram to be deployed against the essential institutions of both the nation-state and industrial development. They have essentially the same function as weapons against states, such as the United States, as the "rock-drug counterculture" and the "anti-nuclear neo-Malthusians." As has been thoroughly documented, the "rock-drug counterculture" and other obscenities were spawned out of the "New Left's" assembled raw materials.

Britain is essentially a plantation owned and managed by a private company. . . . The British government is not the agency which deploys British intelligence; it is privately owned British intelligence which deploys the British government as one of its tools.

My point is clear; "Bukharinism" is an evil which ought not to exist on the face of this earth, but, unfortunately, it does exist as a very considerable problem of civilization as a whole today.

What is particularly informative is the fact that Francis M. Watson composed the first libel against me and my associates, that published by the Heritage Foundation in 1978, in close collaboration with the scummiest side of the IPS networks, the circles of Philip Agee. In the same period, when William Waldman of McGraw-Hill's *Business Week* concocted the libel it published against me during the fall of 1978, that Mont Pelerin-connected financial editor drew extensively and shamelessly on collaboration with the same Philip Agee circles for boilerplate lies.

Now, purported representatives of the Heritage Foundation have joined the drugged Yippies in fresh targeting operations against me. The "moles" and their dupes within the Heritage Foundation conduct their filth through the congressional staffs of Capitol Hill; the Yippies ply their filth on the streets of New York City. One is bathed, the other is not, but both have the same "mother."

Clearly they hate me, and perhaps fear me a bit, too. I don't like them or their evil "mother" one bit.