

An Open Memo to Congressmen: Soviet ‘Open Diplomacy’

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 2, Number 22, May 15, 1975. [View PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

NEW YORK, May 11—Those of you who have been subjected to massive covert and overt intimidation by pro-Rockefeller forces are not unaware of the reasons why the Rockefeller-allied major news agencies have collaborated to variously suppress and distort the most important Soviet “open diplomacy” pronouncements in decades.

With these two most pertinent official documents, Secretary-General Brezhnev’s address and the “open call” of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Supreme Soviet, you have on your desk the strongest possible basis for a way out of war and economic chaos, through immediate positive negotiations with the Soviet Union. Both should be studied in the light of my May 7 communication to you.

I append a summary analysis, prepared by our intelligence staff, concerning the pattern of treatment of these two documents by representative press agencies.

Reaffirms Deterrent Policy

The most conspicuous passage in the address of Secretary-General Brezhnev is the public reaffirmation of the longstanding Soviet version of “mutually assured destruction” in respect of any nuclear confrontation affecting what the Soviets regard as a decisive strategic self-interest.

The affirmation of such a policy by an authoritative spokesman of the Soviet state is, of course, an indispensable feature of the policy itself. “Deterrence” is not effective unless the commitment to comprehensive thermonuclear retaliation is announced.

According to the same generally-acknowledged doctrine, once such a statement of policy is issued by one side, the other side must carefully weight the question whether the threat of deterrence is actually a bluff.

The pro-Schlesinger forces insist that Soviet deterrent is a bluff; those who have lost the courage of their own judgment under massive personal pressures, wishfully, hysterically insist that the Brezhnev affirmation is a bluff.

As we know, as qualified political and military sources corroborate our view, the Brezhnev announcement is absolutely no bluff. Indeed, certain NATO spokesmen speak clearly—so far behind doors—of the insanity and incompetence of “office boy” generals such as Haig, and denounce as insanely irresponsible those who confide strategic military command responsibilities to computer print-outs.

The key paragraph in the Brezhnev address affirms the conclusion independently reached, that any effort at thermonuclear showdown at a point of fundamental Soviet political or military strategic self-interest, such as the Near East or Balkans, means total Soviet retaliation against the entirety of NATO and NATO's political and military allies. If the members of Congress fail to muster the courage to resist mere personal intimidation, the continuation of the present Rockefeller-associated drive toward confrontation means the general incineration of most families in the U.S.A., including the families of weak-kneed congressmen.

The “Open Call”

The main features of Secretary-General Brezhnev's address are overwhelmingly corroborated by the form and contents of the “Open Call” (as published by *Neues Deutschland* of May 10). Three main features of that document are of outstanding significance.

First, the “Open Call” is a resort to “open diplomacy,” bypassing all the ordinary channels of protocol. “Open diplomacy” is not without precedent in Soviet practice; however, the resumption of such a tactic at this time is in itself a fact of the most extraordinary significance. Such “open diplomacy” represents nothing less than a next-to-last resort on the brink of an impending general catastrophe.

Second, the “Open Call” carries the highest possible authority which could be given any document issued from the Soviet Union. All of the highest agencies of Soviet society have subscribed to its authorship: the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and the Soviet government.

Third, the burden of the “Open Call” is a proposal for an entirely new range of profound measures of economic cooperation as the professed alternative to both thermonuclear holocaust and general economic chaos.

The “Open Call” is in no respect a timid document. The opening paragraph is clear in its references to the parallels of 30 years earlier. “... the victory cost an immeasurably high price. It was paid for with the lives of dozens of millions of men, women, and children, with colossal destruction, with the devastation of many states. The extent of the losses that were suffered was immense, the severity of the sacrifices immeasurable. But they were not in vain....”

It is only after such points have been emphasized and developed that the "Open Call" proceeds to develop proposed alternatives.

The passage most to be emphasized in that connection is the following:

"The gigantic growth of technical and scientific knowledge at the present, and the interrelated, powerful development of the productive forces in peacetime, now make it possible to transform the material culture and life of humanity. The achievements of the scientific-technical revolution make possible a fundamental improvement of living conditions on earth, and the extirpation of hunger, poverty and epidemics."

The document, a short space later, emphasizes that such measures are "demanded in memory of the dead and in the interests of the living."

In practice, these Soviet proposals are as clear a statement as any reasonable person could desire in support of Soviet intent to cooperate in such ventures as the International Development Bank. Already, we have determined that governments and parties representing an overwhelming majority of the so-called "Third World" population are disposed to accept a proposal of this type. The current Soviet "Open Call" is the most authoritative public commitment of the leadership of the Comecon sector to cooperative agreements of the same genre.

Informed political persons are aware of the thinness of the pro-Rockefeller forces currently dominating North American and Western European life. The emphasis on covert and overt "dirty tricks" intimidation by the pro-Rockefeller forces essentially reflects the marginal and diminishing popular constituency which the pro-Rockefeller forces enjoy throughout the industrialized capitalist sector.

The pro-Rockefeller forces appear to have a powerful grip on the machinery of power, but at the same time suffer an accelerating loss in political support in depth. Once the grip of the pro-Rockefeller forces is loosened, that entire machine will collapse in the fashion of a burst dam.

This, of course, is the immediate source of the thermonuclear holocaust danger. Unless the pro-Rockefeller forces can establish consolidated rule by terror during the immediate weeks ahead, the collapse of the monetary system and aggravated erosion of their constituencies means an end to their hegemony. Rockefeller may be likened to a new King Canute—unfortunately with a thermonuclear capability supplementing his desperate shouting.

The current open revolt of the West German industrialists faction led by Herr Stoltenberg is the most conspicuous sign of a general and growing contempt for Rockefeller policies within NATO circles themselves. French "pluton" compliance with pro-Rockefeller forces is on

shaky domestic ground. A significant conservative British faction is moving in the direction of allying with Stoltenberg and Company. There is a less powerful but potential eruption of opposition with Italy. The accelerating growth of the influence of the U.S. Labor Party here is in substantial part a direct result of our leading position in vocal denunciation of pro-Rockefeller policies.

West Germany, which is a keystone of NATO capabilities, merits special consideration. The pro-confrontation faction in that nation presently consists of SPD chairman Willy Brandt, Franz-Josef Strauss, Herr Biedenkopf and his protégé Helmut Kohl, and the West German Maoist-nihilist sects! (Of course, we have our own U.S. Maoists and semi-Maoists, such as Jeffrey Record, Ray Cline, and Senator Jackson converging upon alliance in fact with the "Revolutionary Union.")

It is exemplary of the vulnerability of the Brandt-Strauss-Biedenkopf *de facto* strategic coalition that Herr Brandt and his allies reacted with hysteria to publicity circulated in West Germany by a relatively small Labor Committees organization there. The spectacle of the pro-Rockefeller *de facto* coalition's alliance is destroying the SPD, factionally splitting the Christian Democratic Union and creating large-scale constituencies for alternative political leaderships.

The mixed British reaction to Eric Severeid's recent pompous eruptions reflects the situation there, as does, similarly, the special response to the Soviet "Open Call."

Underneath the efforts of the pro-Rockefeller forces to keep a grip on government by sheer muscle of intimidation, the broad social base of most parties in the capitalist industrialized sector is ready to dump Rockefeller and his allies and to consolidate around new leaders offering credible solutions to the threats of war and economic chaos.

Provided a significant minority of forces join us in that stubborn effort, we confidently assure you that within a short period of weeks, major forces in all sectors of the world will rally, to collaborate with us in establishing a new monetary system and enacting related measures essential to arresting economic collapse and resuming the expansion of agricultural and industrial production and employment on a world scale.

Given the pre-existing readiness of major "Third World" forces for such proposals, and the present clear commitment from the Soviet leadership, we now have before us all the essential ingredients of political feasibility for the steps we have proposed to you.