depression during November and December of this year.

The foreign monetary and economic policies of the Carter Administration center around the IMF "floating rate system" proposal. In addition to the creation of "regional currency blocs," Carter policy is the imposition of *fascist* monetary and economic policies on all developing nations, including a sabotage of high-technology development programs and an insistence on "appropriate" technologies (labor-intensive servitude) in agriculture. These policies for the developing sector are explicitly fascist in the perception of their authors, are modeled wittingly on the economics of the Nazi-occupation policies.

As is shown by examination of Middle East, Africa, Latin America and general-strategic policies, *the current Carter Administration foreign policy under Kissinger's influence is a genocidal policy:* the aim is to launch biological holocaust and war throughout the developing sector, to the purpose of enhancing the relative position of the Anglo-Saxon race, as otherwise proposed by Otto von Hapsburg. The British architects of Kissinger's policies place great emphasis on Hitler's failure to exploit Slavic and other minorities as temporary allies for the destruction of the Soviet Union: British policy is to incite the non-Anglo-Saxons to destroy one another in aid of long-term Anglo-Saxon world rule.

(2) Middle East and Islamic policy

On the surface, Kissinger, the Aspen Institute, and Johns Hopkins CSIS are leading among U.S.-based, British intelligence-controlled agencies proposing a general destabilization of all Islamic nations, with Kissinger's project for an Israel-Egypt (Coptic) military alliance and Kissinger's butchery of Lebanon the launching points for this general project. Kissinger aims (on behalf of his masters) at a disruption of Middle East petroleum supplies, as a way of wrecking the European and Japanese economies.

(3) Africa policy

Carter Administration policy has currently flipped back to the Africa policy which Congress outlawed under the Ford Administration. In place of the Ponto Plan (named after its principal proponent, Baader-Meinhof-murdered Jürgen Ponto of Germany's Dresdner Bank), for economic cooperation agreements among white and black populations of Africa, Carter Administration policy has adopted the wretched British agent Ian Smith, and is now committed to a combination of racial and intraracial bloodbath throughout all of southern Africa. This is a part of London's (and Kissinger's) genocide policy for entire regions of the developing sector.

Discarding the 'China card' for a U.S. war buildup

Kissinger's turn from the "China card" to the "American card" and the subsequent shift in White House policy was first signaled in an article by Kissinger's close associate Edward Luttwak in the October issue of Commentary Magazine, *the official publication of the American Jewish Committee. Luttwak, a British subject, discredits the China card option in favor of consolidating conservatives behind a military buildup policy here at home. In his article, titled "Against the China Card," Luttwak, who works at Kissinger's Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies, declares:*

"It seems that after all the years of our troubles with the Soviet Union a transference of purposes has taken place, from the positive of preserving Western security to the negative of opposing the Soviet Union. It is, of course, true that the Soviet Union remains by far the most powerful of our adversaries, and there is every reason to believe that this will be true in the future also. Nor can one disagree with the contention that it is now a matter of high urgency to muster additional strength to oppose the steady course of power-accumulation which the Soviet Union has followed for fifteen years and more. Finally, one may agree also that the West is in fact losing the military competition and that a strategic remedy is now needed. But the China card is the most unstrategic of remedies, being rather a tactical quickfix writ large. Only its unpremeditated consequences will be strategic in import — and exceedingly unfavorable.

"There can be no reliable prediction of what the Chinese might do with an enhancement of their military power....As for Peking's willingness to cooperate on a purely diplomatic level, we have now only the promise that after normalization much can be expected.

"The problems then arise from the consequences of the move, not from its feasibility.

"If the Russians were to decide that the threat of a Sino-American alliance was not merely ominous in its long-term consequences but also dangerous in the short-term, they might be driven to use force against China....The Peking

(4) Latin American policy

The Carter Administration policy of this moment is a reversion to the joint policies of Kissinger and Luigi Einaudi (under the Kissinger State Department during the Nixon and Ford administrations). Economically, this is a Chile-model policy for all Latin America, combined with the Einaudi "Second War of the Pacific" policy, for a general bloodbath throughout all of Latin America. This is also part of London's (and Kissinger's) genocide policy for the developing sector.

(5) Far East policy

Just as London has adjusted its own China policy, so London's puppet, Kissinger, has adjusted his own policy. So, Carter Administration policy has followed Kissinger's turn on this matter. The "China Card" is now being deemphasized in preference for the "U.S. Card." Current Kissinger "China policy" as such is an anti-Japan policy, or, to be exact, an anti-Fukuda, anti-Mitsubishi policy. Kissinger (like London) is determined to wreck Japan's industrialization policy, breaking the Japanese leg of the new world monetary system.

The fraudulent "Koreagate" operation in the Congress targeted the rapid-industrialization domestic and foreign policies of the Republic of Korea as a parallel thrust for the anti-Japan policy.

The Kissinger (London) policy for the Asian subcontinent is a by-product of the Islamic and Far East policies. India is scheduled to be destroyed, plunged into massive genocide, through aid of the alliance between Brandt's Socialist International (George Fernandes et al.), the Maoists, and the fascist RSS. Senator Patrick Moynihan has adopted the RSS as his own publicly during recent weeks.

(6) NATO-Soviet policy

London and Kissinger are the visible sources of the current Carter Administration policy of breaking off the SALT II negotiations — at the point "95 percent agreement" is reported by Warnke and other prominent circles associated with those negotiations. This is the "U.S. Card" policy of London.

By linking the U.S. more closely to Israel and to Ian Smith, London has created two deadly triggers for a thermonuclear confrontation between the U.S. and Soviet Union. This general reorientation of the Carter Administration brings the issue of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to the fore in the most practical and relevant manner. It is also directly related to London's strategic approach to attempting to wreck the EMS.

Kennedy was assassinated on orders from London, with the assassination controlled by networks of drug-linked organized crime and Cuban "right wingers" most intimately linked to the Bronfmans and other

---

regime would be undermined internally by the exposure of its military inadequacy, and the American alliance would be shown to be hollow.

"...far from being a substitute for American strength, the 'China card' would require a prior augmentation of American military power as the essential precondition of so risky a move. Otherwise a violent Soviet reaction could not be reliably deterred, nor defeated. This of course makes nonsense out of the whole scheme....the relative strength of the United States can scarcely be expected to increase through an alliance with a China that is altogether more vulnerable to Soviet attack than the United States could ever be.

"By all means achieve diplomatic relations with Peking....Even the supply of military-industrial technology from Europe must be seriously considered. Beyond that, however, the 'China card' should not be played. Instead we should play the American card, mustering more of our own strength for our own purposes.

"In this particular case the attempt to derive a free benefit from Chinese strength in order to spare ourselves efforts which we are very well equipped to make, would fatally compromise not only our strategic position, but also our most fundamental political purposes."

"We should confront the Soviet Union...."

That the "American card" means a military buildup policy was stated bluntly by a source close to Kissinger commenting on Luttwak's views in an interview last week with the Executive Intelligence Review.

"Brzezinski has been defeated at the National Security Council. He no longer runs policy. The China card is out.

"I too favor not provoking the Soviet Union over China, especially over China. We should confront the Soviet Union, but we can only do that if we are strong militarily. We must build up our military strength in order to do that. Brzezinski has been pursuing the China card as a way of cutting our defense budget, thus having us lean on the Chinese.

"My military buildup policy is exactly consistent with the policy goals stipulated by the NATO summit. If we try to use China against the Soviet Union we lose all possibilities of influencing the Soviet situation the way we want to ... aiding the growth of the wrong factions in the Soviet Union."