

Soviet Strategic 'Option A'

The following statement was given by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. on Jan. 25, 1978.

The Warsaw Pact command professes a special strategic warfare option, which I shall identify for convenience here as "Option A." This option applies to the case in which nuclear forces of the United Kingdom attempt to provoke a general war through launching their own national forces' thermonuclear capabilities.

The feasibility of this option depends on prior agreement between the command of the United States and the Soviet Union for this specific problem. My purpose of publishing this summary evaluation of "Option A" is to bring discussion of this matter into the open at a time when the insane British are visibly pushing toward a threshold of such a new thermonuclear provocation.

The agreement between the United States and Soviet command is as follows:

(1) Under the specific condition that British forces or their surrogates take an action which preemptively activates general warfare between the Warsaw Pact and Atlantic Alliance nations, the U.S. thermonuclear shield is automatically removed from the United Kingdom's territories and bases throughout the world.

(2) To make this effective, the Soviet command must, however, openly announce "Option A" to the world press, stating that if Britain triggers a general thermonuclear confrontation, not one square foot of the United Kingdom will remain habitable within one hour following the provocation. Furthermore, unless Atlantic forces act in support of the United Kingdom, Soviet action will be limited to United Kingdom targets alone.

(3) The basis for the "Option A" understanding between the United States and Soviet command is usefully situated in the policies of John Foster Dulles and the "second Eisenhower Administration" generally vis-à-vis the "Suez crisis" and nother notable related transactions of that period.

(4) Soviet policy to this effect will not work, of course, unless the Soviets also commit themselves to a most-favored mutual relationship along with the pro-technological development forces of the United States, France, Italy, Japan, Mexico, and other nations in which such a strong humanist tradition exists respecting perceptions of national interest.

Clearly, if "Option A" is not established, then British adventures lead rapidly, unavoidably into general, international thermonuclear war.

The Winston Churchill Legacy

This is not a new issue. It was the bitter issue between Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Winston Churchill (as reported by eyewitness Elliott Roosevelt) at the Atlantic and Casablanca Congress. During that period, President Roosevelt, who had learned bitter lessons from the "New Deal" corporatist experience, denounced Churchill for his imperialist policies and for Churchill's reactionary "18th century" zero-growth policies.

Americans have special reason to be bitter against the British. The man in the street knows that it was Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, of the profascist, Fabian-funding Chamberlain family, that boosted Hitler's career in World War II at the Munich 1938 conference. Unfortunately, the delusion that Winston Churchill was some sort of hero is credulously swallowed by too many.

(Details of these matters will be reported by Criton Zoakos, Christopher White, and others documenting and analyzing the crucial historical background.)

It was Winston Churchill who acted directly to prevent German generals and industrialists from overthrowing Hitler in 1938. *Churchill personally*. It was Winston Churchill who personally blocked Allied support for the German generals toward the end of the war. When challenged on these points, in a parliamentary question toward the end of the war, Churchill submitted a reply drafted by British intelligence executive Hugh Trevor-Roper, "Kim" Philby's patron, outlining the point that Churchill preferred Hitler's continued rule to rule of Germany by the true industrialist anti-Hitler forces.

It was General George Marshall who warned the congressional Vandenberg Committee that the United States must determine the means by which the British were subverting United States' policies. (It is interesting that President Eisenhower and General Marshall were attacked viciously by those Birchite types of "rightists" who today are visibly being controlled by British intelligence influences. The case of British influences conducted through William F. Buckley and Richard Viguerie, and the role of the circle around Winston Churchill III, are also relevant to answering General Marshall's question.)

It should also be recalled by those old enough to remember, and researched by those too young to remember, that Churchill had the policy of fall-back to the colonies for the contingency in which Britain was overrun. This reflects an element of the mentality of the ruling British circles which Christopher White has documented in his soon-to-be-published "the Families." The ruling British families, dating variously from 800 to 400 years in name and conscious tradition, have a certain degree of sentimental attachment to England, but no intrinsic loyalties to those British people they rule. England, for them, is merely one of their family estates, albeit the estate they are most loathe to give up.

Canada, virtually an occupied territory of British intelligence services, has been built up, together with Australia and Oppenheimer's South Africa, as the principala fall-back locations to which the British ruling families run in the event Britain itself "must be sacrificed" in a thermonuclear war.

Adolf Hitler is a representative of an evil that is almost relatively minor with the pure evil that is to this day represented by the British ruling families. The name of Marlborough, the family of Winston Churchill, and Winston Churchill III, is the proper exemplar of that evil.

*U.S. Policy For Britain
Under "Option A"*

In the case Britain provokes war with the Soviet Union, and that "Option A" prevails, British forces in depth become a Soviet "free-fire zone" in U.S. policy, under conditions that the Soviets take no action to jeopardize the interests of any other forces but those acting in concert with the British, and that the Soviets take no action beyond nullifying British warfare capabilities.

However, the administration of a defeated Britain and its territories must not be attempted by Soviet forces. The Atlantic Alliance — minus Britain — must assume administrative and reconstruction duties in the United Kingdom, and a force headed by India should assume administrative direction of British territories in the developing sector. (Educated Indians have a depth of understanding of the British problem otherwise only approximated by Israeli factional opponents of Golda Meir.)

This discussion of "Option A" will profoundly shock many Americans and others who have not yet fought through the relevant issues. "Are we to abandon our Brit-

ish allies?," of words to that effect, these misguided people will say. They must begin to understand that Britain is our nation's principal enemy. It is Britain, aided by its agents-of-influence inside the United States, which is working to wreck the U.S. dollar, to loot United States' industry, to drive trade unionists and the unemployed from skilled jobs into labor-intensive slavery, which unleashes international terrorism against us, and which now pushes to bring us all into general thermonuclear war. This is our "ally?"

The time has come — if the Soviet leadership seriously wishes to avoid general war — that the Soviets must reveal "Option A" publicly and quickly negotiate agreements with the United States, France, Italy, the Federal Republic of West Germany, and Japan, to that effect. Such an announcement, accompanied by serious Soviet negotiations and initiatives, is urgently needed to stop the British from continuing the evil game they presently have afoot.

Both Americans and Soviet leaders must choose now, between crushing the ruling circles of Britain and general thermonuclear war. There is not much time left.

London Throws Terrorists Against Progold Europe; U.S. Is Next

A new wave of bloody terrorism swept Western Europe this week, as British intelligence delivered the City of London's answer to the threat from West European governments that they are about to institutionalize a new, gold-based monetary arrangement in Luxembourg.

Next on the target list is the United States.

Western press, in particular British and British-linked U.S. press, covered the most provocative of the terrorist attacks in articles retailing Henry Kissinger's line that the western democracies are too weak and ineffective to deal with the rising incidence of crime and terrorism. The terrorism is specifically designed to force the scrapping of national sovereignty in favor of a supranational political and economic reorganization under the hegemony of London.

As the grid below shows, every act of terrorism being used to justify the demand for global reorganization is a political deployment initiated in the City of London.

Target: France

Jan. 23: Belgian industrialist Baron Edouard-Jean Empain, president of the Empain-Schneider industrial group and a close confidante of French President Giscard d'Estaing is kidnapped in Paris by a professional "hit team."

The kidnapping took place in broad daylight as Empain was traveling by chauffeured limousine to his Paris office. Using two vans and a motorcycle, the kidnapers forced the car to a halt in the heavily guarded embassy district of the city, immobilized Empain's driver-bodyguard, and carried Empain off in a matter of minutes. At least one of the terrorists spoke German,

according to sources.

Jan 24: No less than three separate groups claim responsibility for the Empain kidnapping in calls to French police and press. Two of the groups — the Armed Nucleus for Popular Autonomy (NAPAP) and the right-wing Flemish Jovis van Severin Group — are known to be controlled by British intelligence. "Organized crime elements" have also claimed responsibility.

NAPAP, linked to West Germany's terrorist Baader-Meinhof (Red Army Fraction), threatened to execute Empain and "other bosses" unless two Red Army Fraction members and one NAPAP member were released in calls to Radio Luxembourg and *Les Republicains* newspaper. One of the terrorists whose release is demanded is Christain Harbulot who is being held in the murder of a Renault factory guard last March. The NAPAP is also implicated in the 1976 assassination of the Bolivian Ambassador to France and the 1975 attack on the Spanish military attaché to France.

The right-wing Flemish group has demanded \$800,000 in ransom. According to the anonymous caller who phoned in the demand, the group is "not political, we are professionals."

The Giscard government today characterized the Empain kidnapping as an "affair of state" and has constituted a small crisis staff that is working with its counterpart in West Germany as well as with Dutch and Belgian authorities. A permanent hot line has been set up between the West German Defense Ministry and the French government. Road blocks and border sealing are set up in adjoining countries.