Click here for Full Issue of EIR Volume 5, Number 12, March 29, 1978

Brzezinski Is Only A Pawn

This analysis was released on March 22, 1978 by U.S. Labor Party Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following memorandum was written as a background evaluation for the information of friends in the U.S. intelligence community. The nature of the point made is such that the evaluation ought to be circulated publicly in that form. The report is as follows.

If there is one short slogan which is to be selected to be placed on the office wall of every U.S. intelligence and Pentagon staff officer, I would propose Erasmus of Rotterdam's "existence is not a predicate," Erasmus's aphoristic, devastating summary disproof of the Scholastics' "ontological paradox."

Naturally, in order to understand Erasmus's aphorism, the officer would have to master Plato's dialogue, *Parmenides*. Alternatively, I trust that my own writings on the significance of the Platonic dialogue would have proven to be an efficient means for communicating the same essential conception.

From the standpoint of political intelligence work, as distinct from implications for the so-called physical sciences, Erasmus's aphorism signifies that the present world is composed, in first approximation, of sheep and shepherds, and, in the finer discriminations, the shepherds are assorted into mere players and gamemasters. We are gamemasters, and the Soviet leadership, the Israeli government, the Arab governments, most European governments, and Zbigniew Brzezinski, are merely players. The gamemasters directly opposed to us are the inner circles of the British secret service. To complete the picture, we should add the happy information that the inner circles of the Freemasonic and Vatican factions are operating on the level of knowledge appropriate to gamemasters.

My immediate point of reference for this background is twofold. I refer first to the British proposal for a set of currency-military zones dominated by the International Monetary Fund's Special Drawing Rights (SDRs). I refer also to Lord Chalfont's interesting denunciation of the Kissinger strategic doctrine published in this week's press. Both have a certain significance on the immediate level of explicit references for practice. The danger is that evaluation might conclude on that level, and overlook the determining implications of those matters, implications adduced from a literal reading of the developments. This, as I shall make clear, is an illustration of Erasmus's "existence is not a predicate."

The essential method of British Secret Intelligence Service (e.g., the inner British secret-intelligence circles associated with Oxford, Cambridge, and Sussex Universities) is not accidentally very similar to the method of what is called players, each with certain individual dispositions enriched by the director's motivating proposals concerning the scenario, is launched upon a stage. There is no script, but rather the largely predictable unfolding of the scenario embedded in the conflicts among the players.

In world and national politics, the players are governments, heads of parties, and so forth. The audience, the rooters for and supporters of this or that player, are merely sheep, who follow, sheeplike those players they select as their particular shepherds.

This conduct of national and global history was not invented by the British. We can date conscious employment of such methods from the Ionian period, and, most notably the conflict between the Platonic Academy and the Persian (Delphic) intelligence service associated with Aristotle and the Peripatetics. The modern British Secret Intelligence Service is genetically and consciously a neo-Aristotelean continuation of the ancient oligarchical faction. The problem is that masses of people, together with most of their leaders, are ruled by mythologies, including today's Soviet mythologies. Thus, political processes of governments are not motivated by perception of reality, but by a pseudo-reality determined by the interplay of superstitious mythologies.

Over thousands of years to date, the gamemasters, seeking a certain result in reality, motivated the players and sheep to that effect by playing upon prevailing mythologies. The players and sheep are given pseudo-goals ("Prove to the Soviets that we are truly tough.") which coincide with prevailing mythologies. In reality, as the players and sheep drive toward such pseudo-goals, they cause a rather different result than they seek in the domain of reality.

This distinction between witting gamemasters and mere players is applicable not only to President Carter and confused and duped ex-President Gerald Ford. It applies also to the player-ranking of key British agents-of-influence, such as Brzezinski, Schlesinger, Blumenthal, Mondale, Turner, and Kissinger.

Brzezinski is obviously a mere pawn of SIS. We know a sufficient number of the inner circles of SIS's command to know that they would never regard a miserable, semi-psychotic wretch such as Brzezinski as one of their "crowd." To them, Brzezinski is merely a junior executive of the SIS networks' colonial division, a pathetic kook whose efforts to work his way up in status happen to be more or less a convenient feature of Brzezinski's profile at the moment. (One is reminded of a hypothetical case in which a Soviet KGB captain promotes himself to major-general for purposes of discussions with the agent he is controlling.) Brzezinski's

© 1978 EIR News Service Inc. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission strictly prohibited.

notion that he is part of the "inner circle" is a delusion, but, from SIS's standpoint it is more or less convenient to encourage Brzezinski in that paranoid delusion.

Brzezinski is merely a predicate of SIS. SIS's "existence" is not embodied in its mere predicates.

Henry Kissinger has worked his way up to a significantly higher status within the SIS's colonial division. He ranks significantly higher than Brzezinski, whose usefulness begins and ends with his ability to maintain a margin of controlling influence over President James E. Carter. (Brzezinski pinned down the appointment because pill-popper Walter F. Mondale, one of the boys' first choices for Democratic presidential nomination, fell apart emotionally during his pre-nomination campaign.) Kissinger, although on a qualitatively higher level of the hierarchy than Brzezinski, is not truly an "insider" of SIS's inner circles, but rather a kind of inflated "sorcerer's apprentice" of his British masters.

The importance of the U.S. SIS agents-of-influence lies not in themselves, but in the power of the United States. A British agent-of-influence of the same rank as Kissinger in West Germany, France, Italy, Japan, and so forth is qualitatively less important on the global scale than a Kissinger.

Kissinger himself consistently reflects an appropriate awareness of his stooge status through his own fascination with the images of former British stooges, Metternich and Bismarck. He is, for all the power he has gained, merely a stooge, part of the political "Foreign Legion" of SIS. Not a part of the inner circles of the oligarchy.

The two current items noted, the "military-currency zones" and the Chalfont item, reflect two principal problems of evaluation confronting us at this juncture. Let us consider the Chalfont item first.

The Frankenstein Principle

In general, British SIS does not wish a thermonuclear war at this juncture. Rather, they are prepared to risk thermonuclear war in a confrontation whose British aims stop short of shooting-war between NATO and Warsaw Pact forces. The British objective at the moment is clear: they intend a kind of repeat of the 1962 Missiles Crisis in which the United States visibly backs down, in which key British circles aid its back-down by repeating the role of Bertrand Russell et al. during the 1962 crisis to aid that consequence.

The British scheme involves a period of deep humiliation of the United States, accompanied by a neo-Schachtian mode of massive military build-up in the U.S. This is directed toward a U.S.-China military alliance, together with other Pacific and Asian nations for a war against the Soviet Union from that side at a later phase.

This is London's third try at the implementation of its "Eurasian land-mass" geopolitical strategy during this century. In both preceding world wars of this century, the British strategy to send Germany eastward went awry, as Germany's strategic-military self-interests impelled it not to move eastward without first smashing through the western barrier. In both previous instances, the British manipulation of Germany created in an unleashed Germany, a kind of "Frankenstein's monster" out of its manipulator's control. Also, in 1917, the deployment of Lenin as part of the Russian scenario backfired against the Anglo-Dutch in a well-known fashion.

As Britain becomes weaker as a nation, the mass and energy of its controlled players increases relative to British sovereign economic and military power itself. This feature of the process means that the tendency of the players set into motion by SIS to repeat the "Frankenstein's monster principle" in some new fashion becomes increasingly, not less, a problem for London.

Lord Chalfont's warning against the NATO delusion concerning "theater-limited" wars has a double significance. It prepares the way for British peacemaking intervention in an impending U.S.-Soviet confrontation. Yet, at the same time, it echoes my own repeated public criticism of NATO doctrine in a manner suggesting genuine concern emerging among some sections of the British inner circles. If this concern actually exists, and I have good reason to believe that it exists at least among some in that quarter, then the point of reference is the awareness among some British inner circles of the danger of the danger of the "Frankenstein monster principle."

By setting into motion a psychotic Israeli government, a certifiably lunatic Brzezinski, a dangerously, neurotically egoistical Henry Kissinger, a marijuana-smoke-flavored James R. Schlesinger, certain nuts in the Federal Republic of Germany, and so forth, the British have set into motion forces which they may find themselves unable to control at a critical juncture. The link between a psychotic Israel government and the so-called U.S. Jewish Lobby, whose sanity as well as morality is also devoutly to be doubted, could become Britain's post-1939 "Hitler problem" of the late 1970s.

As you know, my own approach to the current strategic problem has been twofold in emphasis. On the capitalist side of the world, my duty, together with my immediate associates, is to catalyze a revival of consciousness of the essential principles among those nations, aiming both to catalyze feasible alternatives to the current world depression and shift the world's political geometry into one in which effective war-avoidance follows. At the same time, my duty has been to use my special insights into the Warsaw Pact nations, to help awaken the leaders of those nations to the fact that they are, in the final analysis, acting as mere pawns in an SIS-rigged game, hoping to cause the Soviets to swerve from the course of confrontation to more sophisticated approaches.

However, I have never given up entirely on Britain. Since the British inner circles are gamemasters, they are advantaged to recognize the correctness of my strategic assessments more quickly than most. Until the Spring of 1977 I had hoped, not entirely without reason, that my own and my associates' articulation of desirable alternatives favoring the United Kingdom's own vital industrial interests would convince the British inner circles of the need to abandon the oligarchically centered policies of the past, and to adopt the policies of the American Revolution as the proven principles of historical experience to date. During Spring (May-June) 1977, the dominant British forces went over fully to their present insane course of action. At that point, I gave up on convincing the British to adopt a morally viable

perception of world affairs, but I have not yet given up on making clear to them the folly of their manifest current ambitions and policies.

The British inner circles, unlike the mere players and credulous sheep of other nations and their governments, know that my characterization of their role over the 19th and present century is correct. Therefore, although ignorant, credulous persons, such as the majority of the Republican National Committee and so forth, may profess to ridicule our warnings, the British inner circles are not such fools. They may ridicule what we say — in their conversations with the sheep of the world — but within their own ranks they take our analysis seriously, because they know at least in certain crucial respects, that our analysis is competently grounded in historical facts, and possibly correct in at least certain of its adductions.

Lord Chalfont's warning against the sort of idiocy credulously spouted by West Germany's Adalbert Weinstein has the outward form of concurrence with crucial features of my warnings. Since such warnings also have the useful function, from British standpoints, of preparing the way for Britain's peacemaking efforts in a Brzezinski-Kissinger-launched confrontation, I do not conclude on the basis of evidence in hand that Chalfont's warning is entirely sincere. Nonetheless, it is probable that at least one section of the SIS inner circles is aware that players such as Dayan, Weizman and Brzezinski are now verging close to an eruption of the same "Frankenstein monster principle" that SIS-sponsored Adolf Hitler represented to the British beginning the Spring of 1940.

The Monetary-Military Zones

I cannot accept the proposition that the scenario of monetary-military zones being circulated by SIS channels represents the centerpiece of actual British intention. Rather, I classify this, like the SIS-sponsored "novel" *The Crash of '79*, as merely the gamemaster's motivation of the players being sent on stage for the "living theater" performance.

We know that the British SIS operative is a modernized version of the same "Persian model" adopted by the court of Philip of Macedon during the mid-fourth century, BC. We have the corroborating evidence, through contacts with leading representatives of SIS's inner circles and other evidence, that the world outlook and intermediate and long-term objectives of SIS inner circles does in fact correspond to that "Persian" or "oligarchical" model.

After all, it was British SIS which created the world's "environmentalists" as well as the "international terrorist" mass-phenomena. The SIS created the Maoist organizations, launched the "post-industrial society," fostered marijuana usage, "methadone maintenance," and now "heroin maintenance," as well as cocaine usage and the general rock-drug counterculture to the purpose and effect of moral and mental destruction of whole broad layers of the youth of the United States and Western Europe. This deep commitment, since the mid-1950s Suez crisis, to the fostering of antiindustrialization, antitechnology phenomena, and the developing of suppurating Phrygian cults among our youth, represent a massive commitment to only one goal, the development of a capability which leads to only one consequence.

It should not be imagined that, on a dime so to speak, the British SIS will drop that deployed commitment in favor of some abrupt new gimmick. They will either play out the utopian oligarchical fantasy to the limit, or abandon that fantasy in favor of the direction we propose.

British policy — the SDR policy Prime Minister James Callaghan has been instructed to carry to Washington and Bonn — is clear, and conforms to the reality of British policy. British policy is currently the following:

(1) Manipulate the U.S. into a confrontation with the Soviet Union from which the U.S. is compelled to back down.

(2) This humiliation of the U.S. probably forces the resignations of Carter and Brzezinski, and puts Walter F. Mondale into the Presidency.

(3) Under a neo-Fabian Administration of Mondale, Blumenthal, Schlesinger et al., the U.S. dollar is destroyed as a world reserve currency, a result forced by U.S. humiliation.

(4) The world is placed under the rule of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, with the creation of the Kissinger-proposed International Resources Bank and "Common Fund" as complementary elements of British imperialist world rule. Any government or other faction which pushes these proposals must be considered an instrument of British imperialism.

(5) The Special Drawing Rights (SDR) are made into an imitation of Nazi Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht's Rentenmark and Mefo-bill structures. "SDR bailout" of the collapsing U.S. dollar places the U.S. under an IMF fascist dictatorship, a financial colony of London.

(6) A humiliated U.S. undergoes a neo-Schachtian internal reorganization. Much U.S. industry is triaged, with aid of trained "asset-stripper" G. William Miller of the Federal Reserve. A residue of industry is cartelized under control of Manhattan-centered private banks acting as agents and correspondents of the City of London and the IMF. A mixture of Humphrey-Hawkins-type fascist programs (e.g., the Nazi *Arbeitsdienst*) is combined with a Nazi-like military economy buildup around the cartelized residue of U.S. industry.

(7) This brutalized U.S., transformed into a fascist state under President Mondale, develops a Pacific alliance against the Soviet Union centering on an alliance with Peking. A Pacific thermonuclear war reduces the United States and Soviet Union as world powers, leaving the British oligarchy in rule of a somewhat radioactive Pax Britannica in the remaining sectors.

(8) Accompanying this process, a combination of permanent regional wars in the developing sector intersects the effects of IMF and World Bank "conditions" to cause a wave of epidemics and other fatalities reducing the population in those nations in the aggregate order of millions during the remainder of this century.

(9) By this means, Lord Milner's old policy is brought to realization, and a world population reduced to the order of between one and two billions by the close of this century lives under a Pax Britannica reflecting the gist of the utopian thinking of H.G. Wells, George Orwell, and "Clockwork Orange."

That is the clear intention of those controlling the behavior of such pawns as Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew

Brzezinski. From the standpoint of British inner circles, the only thing which would deter them from carrying out this policy is the concern that the "Frankenstein monster principle" would intervene to send the whole game awry, to cause the destruction of Britain itself.

The Soviet Complication

The Soviet complication is that although the Soviet leadership is, like Kissinger and Brzezinski, merely a group of players in the pathetic "Living Theater" directed by British SIS, the foolish, Oblomovist Soviets are so euphorically intoxicated with their own deluded view of the current process that they falsely imagine themselves to be gamemasters. Through Blumenthal and Schlesinger's wrecking of the value of the U.S. dollar, the Soviets view themselves as in the process of picking up clients by the baker's dozens in the Islamic world, Africa, and elsewhere, and as accomplishing the "Finlandization" of Europe — which the British induce the Soviets to aspire to and which the same British, through traitors such as Henry Kissinger, induce the Republican National Committee and Carter Administration to fear. The Soviets see only the stage of the SIS-directed "Living Theater" and see themselves as predestined winners of the crisis-ridden first act. They are so obsessively seized by that aspect of the global scenario that they do not see the game as a whole, refuse to look beyond the first act's glorious Soviet triumph, to the ensuing denouement of the second and third acts of the game.

The delusions ruling Moscow are hybrid of two intersecting influences within the Soviet leadership. In the Russian character itself, there is the problem of peasant-rooted Oblomovism. Hence, on this count, the present Soviet leadership are by no means Leninists, and are intellectually and strategically inferior in judgment to Josef Stalin. They are not sensuously involved in the real processes of the world outside the Warsaw Pact alliances — they do not "feel" outer-world reality, and thus live predominantly in a world of their own fantasies in such references. This Oblomovism is aggravated by 60 years of containment and "Cold War." The outer world is made the more strange, the more alien, the more hateful, to them. They are essentially narrow, nationalist *realpolitikers*, and by no means the tribunes of global humanity they sometimes depict themselves to be both in print and rhetorical self-adulation festive occasions.

This fault is re-enforced by their extrapolation from a fundamental methodological error in the work of Karl Marx, a twofold error. Their deformed version of Marx's own error, their "objectivist" notion of a "materialist principle of history," prevents them from even considering the kinds of evidence showing how history is *subjectively* determined.

First, Marx erred absolutely in his conception of British industrial-capitalist development, ignorantly, obsessively, and incompetently refusing to acknowledge that Britain was not a model of lawful industrial-capitalist development, but of a "feudal" state in which the oligarchical-monetarist ruling forces contained and deformed industrial-capitalist development away from the natural form of industrial-capitalist republican development best exemplified by the Federalist and Whig policies flowing from the U.S. Constitutional order.

Second, Marx adapted to the error of Immanuel Kant, the error also embedded in a different but otherwise essential form in Hegel and Feuerbach. Marx argued that existing objective social-economic developments, the existing objective conditions of life as they affected different social classes, predominantly determined the dominant, conflicting currents of ideas and political-social issues. The Soviets have extirpated the contrary, *voluntarist* neoplatonic elements from Marx's thinking (e.g., as the "young" versus "mature" Marx nonsense illustrates), and produced a hideous parody of Marx's reductionist-mechanistic error of epistemology as "official Marxism-Leninism."

Thus, the Soviets render themselves incapable of understanding how and why SIS created Adolf Hilter, the significance of the "Parvus Plan" in both World War I and Nazi policy since Haushofer and Hess wrote that plan into *Mein Kampf*. They are incapable of understanding the nature, objectives, and methods of SIS — which is why the British have run circles around the Soviets, most emphatically since the 1962 Missiles Crisis.

The ponderously obsessive, self-righteously ignorant Soviet spokesman reiterates: "The essential struggle is the class struggle between the proletariat and the imperialist form of industrial-capitalist development." They recite that pathetic nonsense over and over again. "Therefore," they continue the threnody, "it is the struggle between Soviet-led proletarian forces and the main bastions of imperialist-industrial capitalism that is strategically decisive. Therefore, since the United States is the main bastion of the imperialist power, weakening the industrial-capitalist forces centered in U.S. industry is the proper historic-strategic objective governing Soviet Policy."

What about the oligarchical effort to end technological-industrial-centered progress? "Ah", says the foolish, but self-righteously pompous Soviet spokesman, "I see you are an idealist. We are materialists. I see you do not yet understand the science of Marxism-Leninism."

The British SIS operative, overhearing the Soviet pompously reciting once again that foolish litany, quietly laughs his ass off.

So, the British, tongue-in-cheek, manipulate the stupid, myth-ridden giants of the world, the United States and Soviet Union, into the confrontation by which the relatively weak but more clever British aim to accomplish world rule under the fascist utopia, the utopia of Pax Britannica. Tell the Soviets that, and like Primo Carnera, they retort impatiently, "Don't you see how big we are? Who are you to tell us about politics?"