



# NEW SOLIDARITY International Press Service

IPS WEEKLY

P.O. Box 1972, G.P.O.  
New York, New York 10001  
Editorial (212)279-5950  
Customer Service (212)564-8529

Vol. II Issue 54

December 20, 1975

### IN THIS ISSUE:

#### Special Analysis of Paris Conference on International Economic Cooperation (CIEC)

Kissinger Blackmails 3rd World; Global Genocide or Nuclear War.....	A 1
Third World Blocks Kissinger Sabotage of North-South Meet.....	A 3
Grid of International Press and Relevant IPS Interviews on CIEC.....	A 4
Domestic Markets Newsletter.....	A10
U.S. Political Newsletter.....	A13
Special Update on Hilex 75	
The Soviet Nuclear War Fighting Strategy.....	B 1
Nuclear Showdown is at Hand.....	B 5
NATO Deploys Hilex Military Forces for Keeps.....	B 9
St. Dept. Unleashes Economic Warfare on World Shipping Trade.....	B10
FEA: Core to Hilex Energy Subroutine.....	B12
Grid of Federal Agencies' Response to Hilex 75....	B14

IPS DAILY REPORTS FROM DECEMBER 13 THROUGH DECEMBER 19



## **Kissinger Blackmails 3rd World: Global Genocide or Nuclear War**

by David Goldman

Dec. 17 (IPS)—In the face of determined resistance by Third World leaders, U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger told the world yesterday that he would use the threat of nuclear war to enforce a policy of genocide against the population of the Third World. Speaking at the 27-nation Conference on International Economic Cooperation in Paris, Kissinger proposed to set in motion by early spring a holocaust in human ecology which would destroy the world's population almost as rapidly and far more thoroughly than the thermonuclear exchange which Kissinger's policies will otherwise provoke.

The controller of the Hilex 75 war preparations provided the world with the grim spectacle of the last dinosaur, its nest destroyed, cornered and fighting for its life, flailing its still-dangerous tail about wildly. Survival is the question before Kissinger and his employers, Nelson and David Rockefeller, whose existence at this juncture is recognized to be a deadly threat to the safety of the overwhelming majority of the world's population. The real political muscle of the world — the leading developing nations, the Soviet sector, and key industrial and commercial factions in the capitalist countries is publicly and actively committed to three-way trade and development. Against this the Rockefellers now have only the nuclear button.

Kissinger's brusque rejection of even limited efforts to maintain Third World consumption levels, and insistence on the collection of the Third World's \$200 billion in outstanding debt, made clear to Third World nations attending the Paris North-South Conference that they have no choice but to freeze debt payments and create new institutions for development at the present conference or immediately afterwards — or watch their populations collapse into a holocaust of starvation and epidemics which would spill over into the industrialized countries within months. The immediate consequence of this action would be the overnight destruction of the Rockefeller faction and its political franchises. If the United States delegation succeeds in its aim of dissipating the Paris conference into impotent junior-official discussions, the debt-collection policy of the Rockefeller financier group and its associates will quickly make the world uninhabitable — un-

less that process is preempted by thermonuclear War.

### **Third World Response**

Key Third World diplomats at the conference gave notice of their policy commitment to dispense with the suffocating dollar debt burden and join with the Soviet Union and pro-development factions in Western Europe, Japan, and the United States in the founding of a new world trade and credit structure. These leaders can either act within the next few days to force their policy onto the world agenda, or set to rest their objections to joining their populations on the chopping block.

Said a member of the Mexican delegation of the Kissinger speech, "They always offer us bilateral deals and we always lose," affirming the commitment of leading Third World countries — including Algeria, Iraq, India, and Peru — to three-way trade and development between themselves, the socialist countries, and the advanced sector. In his speech to the conference, the Mexican representative Javier Alejo insisted that the key issue was bringing the socialist bloc into the deliberations. Alejo added in a press interview that Kissinger is trying to isolate the Third World from the socialist bloc.

The Mexican government is fully aware of the consequences of failure, as Alejo made clear in his speech: "Inequality (between Third World and advanced countries) cannot continue without this provoking a generalized global crisis which endangers not only peace, but also the very survival of society."

### **Threats**

Specifically, Kissinger has issued a *sub rosa* warning to the Soviet Union and its allies to hold back from intervention in the Third World, at the risk of nuclear war. Should the Soviets offer the socialist bloc's international currency, the transfer ruble, as a replacement for the bankrupt U.S. dollar, Kissinger threatened, the U.S. would go to war. Key industrial and political factions in West Germany, Italy, and Japan, as well as numerous Third World governments, have sounded the Soviets on the use of the transfer ruble outside the Soviet bloc since at least August 1975, when the Soviet Union issued a memorandum to the United Nations Council on Trade and Development on the international use of their currency.

At a symposium on China running concurrently with the North-South

meeting in Paris, Henry Tasca, the organizer of the 1967 coup in Greece and presently Rockefeller agent in charge of operations in Rumania, made the nuclear blackmail explicit: "There is a threat of nuclear war on the part of the socialist countries," Tasca said, "and in this context the communist parties (of Western Europe) must participate in Western European defense against this aggression."

But the effectiveness of the nuclear deterrent against Soviet economic leadership is nil, as long as the Soviet leadership sees NATO moving toward a nuclear strike under cover of the Hilex 75 operation. Short of responding with ballistic missiles, the Soviets' necessary course of action is to hasten the destruction of dollar-based credit structures, and the consequent destruction of the same Atlanticist financier factions who are pointing NATO's guns at the Soviets.

An indirect indication of Soviet intent came in a declaration on the North-South conference issued by 61 trade unions from the Soviet Union, Iraq, Algeria, Egypt, France, Italy, and Yugoslavia, deploring the absence of the socialist countries from the Paris meeting. "A new world economic order can only be reached," the declaration says, "with the participation of all countries within the framework of the United Nations, notably with the help of the UN Social and Economic Committee, which would make the voice of the workers heard."

From West Germany, the Social Democrats' weekly *Vorwaerts* issued a supplement to its most recent edition documenting joint European and Soviet willingness to cooperate in the creation of a New World Economic Order (see page 2).

### **"We Can Withstand Economic War..."**

"The United States, the world's strongest economy, has demonstrated its resilience... We might best survive any new round of economic warfare... The industrial countries have put their payments back in balance over the last year, although at high cost to the well-being of their people... but the developing countries, by definition, have less of a margin to reduce consumption... developing countries will be forced to cut back imports... current projections indicate that the developing world will be collectively in deficit by about \$35 billion."

Kissinger's message on the condition of the Third World, interspersed between drivel about "cooperation," reminds the reader of a Nazi doctor describing the symptoms of a gasoline injection to his victim. The Secretary of State added, "The gravest challenge is political. Economic distress magnifies the problems of government in all countries, clouding the prospects of social peace and democratic institutions." The message is unmistakable: wars, coups d'etat, and massacres are the reward for those who step out of line; witness Angola, Lebanon, Bangladesh, and so on.

Cynically, Kissinger concluded, "The American people have always believed in a world of conciliation rather than a world ruled by intimidation, pressure, or force. My country, in spite of its own strengths and advantages, has chosen the path of cooperation." It is not surprising that the Third World views the Rockefeller brothers as the four horsemen of the apocalypse, and Henry Kissinger as the horse's ass.

With the exception of the West German daily Die Welt — which "leaked" that Kissinger is threatening to cut off aid to any Third World country that gets out of line — the European and U.S. press have covered up the content of Kissinger's address yesterday, which was intended to terrorize its immediate audience. State Department spokesmen insist that the Kissinger speech was "conciliatory."

On the question of Third World debt service — which now amounts to \$25 billion annually — Kissinger proposed to loot the Treasuries of Europe and Japan and provide additional monetary muscle to the world's monetary policeman, the International Monetary Fund. Specifically, the U.S. plan involves a one-third increase in the quotas, or subscriptions, of members of the fund, and the sale of International Monetary Fund gold to provide funds for debt-refinancing.

In fact, Rockefeller and Kissinger are gripped by the psychotic delusion that they can place the explosive Third World debt, which has been to an increasing extent in default since June 30, under control. The International Monetary Fund's function, as it has been in the past, is not to provide cash, but to enforce the most oppressive austerity on Third World countries. What Rockefeller and Kissinger expect to sustain the illiquid debt structures is the current military control over the entire Western financial apparatus (see page 6). Under the coordination arrangements established at the Nov. 15 Economic Summit at Rambouillet, France, the U.S. Federal Reserve Bank has integrated the central banks of Western Europe as the Federal Reserve Bank of Frankfurt, the Fed of Paris, Rome, London, and so on. This permits the Rockefeller group to temporarily bleed support for the inflated dollar on the foreign exchange markets. Europe has "agreed" to this under Kissinger's nuclear blackmail.

These monetary sidelines of the overall Hilex 75 maneuver are sufficient to prevent the destruction of the Rockefeller Empire in the next several weeks. Past this, as IPS reported, the Rockefeller group expects to have successfully concluded the Hilex operation and have opened up the Soviet bloc for looting.

Putting aside even the insanity of the Rockefellers' nuclear blackmail, the effect of the looting policies which Kissinger implicitly proposed would be to trigger the worst explosion of famine and disease that the human race has yet known. Brazil, the capitalists' "flagship" development area, has reduced its imports by 30 per cent during the past six months; this hideous austerity measure cuts directly into food and other essential imports. The Third World as a whole has been forced to reduce its imports by between 30 and 40 per cent (excluding the oil producers). Within weeks, the population of Chile and Brazil will collapse, followed quickly by Argentina and the rest of Latin America. The outbreak of plague and other epidemic disease in the Indian subcontinent will become unavoidable. Virtually all of sub-Saharan Africa, written off as a loss by the Rockefeller faction, will face extinction.

What the Paris conference has demonstrated is that the dying Rockefeller species is utterly determined to take the rest of the world with it — and that the forces exist in the Third World, the industrial countries, and the Soviet bloc to destroy the Rockefellers fast and for good.

# Third World Blocks Kissinger Sabotage Of North-South Meet

by Daniel Sneider USLP Nominee for Secretary of State

Dec. 20 (IPS)—The leadership of the Third World, acting in coordination with the Socialist bloc, destroyed the efforts this week by U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger to use the Paris Congerence on International Economic Cooperation to split the developing countries between oil producers and non-oil producers and thereby set the stage for a series of manipulated oil and raw material embargoes.

Instead, the Third World countries forced substantive discussion to center around the necessity for Third World debt moratoria and the inclusion of the Comecon sector and its transfer ruble in the new international institutions of the New Economic Order.

By refusing to succumb to Kissinger nuclear blackmail threats, the Third World leadership effectively isolated and exposed the agent-controlled governments, such as Zaire, Saudi Arabia, and Venezuela, who had been assigned a wrecking role in the conference.

However, without the immediate preemptive creation of a new non-dollar based international economic institution to replace the bankrupt International Monetary Fund and without moves in the advanced sector to dismantle the Rockefeller war machine, the Third World victory at Paris pushes the world closer to a thermonuclear holocaust provoked by the desperate Rockefellers.

## Third World Call for Debt Moratoria, New Order

The developing countries, led by the progressive governments of Iraq, Algeria, India, Peru and Mexico, rejected the attempts to isolate OPEC from the rest of the Third World and pressed for the crucial participation of the Soviet bloc in the negotiations. Mexican head delegate and Natural Resources Minister Francisco Javier Alejo, told the Mexican daily Excelsior Dec. 15 that "The objective of the United States at the North-South conference is to isolate the Soviet Union." Alejo told the conference Dec. 16 earlier that the socialist countries "have to assume the function and co-responsibility incumbent upon them in a scheme of international cooperation." Aides to Undersecretary of State

Charles Robinson, who was present at the talks, refused to deny that the question of Comecon participation explicitly involved the role of the Transfer-ruble in a new international monetary system. Today's New York Times revealed that the Soviet Union, through its Foreign Trade Minister Patolichev, had demanded several months ago, to be allowed to participate in the CIEC. This request was turned down by Kissinger.

Many developing country governments called for the dumping of the dollar and dollar debt to the Rockefeller banks to establish a new monetary system. A Pakistani delegate was quoted in the New York Times as stating: "I think there is no choice but to wipe out the (Third World) debts". Mexican representative Alejo, termed the formulation of a new international monetary system as necessary for "the rapid and equal growth of world production and trade, control of inflation and the attainment of high levels of employment, as well as the betterment of the quality and conditions of life of the developing countries." Alejo, described the current state of the world economy as one of autarchy, and warned that "to maintain the tendency toward autarchy would be suicidal, because it would mean forgetting that the world correlation of forces has shifted."

## Attacking Kissinger

Kissinger's moves to divide the conference along oil producer-consumer lines were denounced as maneuvers, in effect, for war by the leading leading Third World governments. Peruvian Foreign Minister De La Flor, when asked for his response to this operation replied: "Peru will prefer that this conference fails if that is the price that must be paid to maintain Third World unity." Iraqi Foreign Minister, Hammadi, according to the Dec 18 L'Humanité, the newspaper of the French Communist Party (PCF), "stressed that there is a probability of attacks against OPEC in order to prevent the creation of a new and stable international economic system."

Indian Foreign Minister Y.B. Chavan, replying to Kissinger efforts to pin the blame for the present capitalist depression on the developing countries, and particularly OPEC, said that "a

small number of people" controls 80 per cent of the world commerce and 95 per cent of world investment. "We all know who they are," he added.

## Kissinger's Agents Exposed

The counterattack by the developing countries left his agents inside standing high and dry, in full view. The OPEC agents, the satrapies of EXXON known as the governments of Venezuela and Saudi Arabia, are no longer treated as part of the Third World.

Venezuela, through its oily Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Perez Guerrero, supposedly represented all of the 19 developing countries as co-chairman of the conference. Perez's role as spokesman for Kissinger was so blatant in the negotiations that Third World delegates openly charged him with "deception" and misrepresenting their views.

The Mexican daily, Excelsior reported that "several Third World countries lament having elected Perez Guerrero" and have proposed that another representative accompany him to future meetings with the industrialized countries. Excelsior noted that Venezuela "has for several months constituted a new variant conceived by the United States to defend its interests."

Perez's efforts to set up Rockefeller's phony confrontation-oil embargo, took place during the heated negotiations on the scope and content of the work of the Four Commissions on Energy, Raw Materials, Finance, and Development. These bodies have the responsibility for doing the substantive work of the CIEC. Algerian Foreign Minister Bouteflika insisted that the Commission's work be tightly determined as a result of a political decision at the highest level—which meant a prior agreement on certain 'non-negotiable' demands before anything could proceed. The U.S., who have no desire for any serious talks to take place refuse to accept Bouteflika's proposal.

The conference was extended an extra day on the question. It ended with a formal agreement to meet in late January for the co-chairmen of the Four Commissions. At that point they will first determine the contents of the Commissions' work. The Commissions won't begin substantive work until february.



GRID OF  
INTERNATIONAL PRESS

# NEW SOLIDARITY International Press Service

P. O. Box 1972, G. P. O.  
New York, New York 10001  
Editorial (212)279-5950  
Customer Service (212)564-8529

---

## GRID OF INTERNATIONAL PRESS AND RELEVANT IPS INTERVIEWS ON THE PARIS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The following grid is broken down topically:

PART 1 \*The Kissinger Speech: conciliation or threat?

PART 2 \*The Question of Soviet Participation

PART 3 \*Third World and Eastern European Statements to  
the Conference

PART 4A\*European Evaluation of Conference Prospects

4B\*Japanese Evaluation of Conference Prospects

PART 1

Kissinger's speech: conciliation or threat?

Kissinger (excerpts from speech Dec. 16) "The United States, the world's strongest economy, has demonstrated its resilience ... We might best survive any new round of economic warfare ... the developing countries, by definition, have less of a margin to reduce consumption ... developing countries will be forced to cut back imports ... current projections indicate that the developing world will be collectively in deficit by about \$35 billion ... Economic distress magnifies the problems of government in all countries ..."

L'Aurore, France, Dec. 16 -- "Wolf Kissinger Puts on Sheeps Skins; Preaches Conciliation" "The most encouraging element of this first day is the moderate speech of U.S. Secretary Henry Kissinger. It had been said that he was going to make a very hard intervention, but that was not the case."

Excelsior, Mexico, Dec. 16 -- After Kissinger's speech, U.S. Undersecretary of State Charles Robinson spoke to reporters and said, "The U.S. does not accept that expression (new world economic order), which presumes the socialization of the world economy, and our government believes in free enterprise." Excelsior contrasts Kissinger's professed concern with the sufferings of the "Fourth World" from the oil embargo with his calls for "Fourth World" population decrease and his warnings of economic dangers if "cooperation" is not achieved.

Corriere de la Sera, Italy Dec. 16 -- "The U.S. is already blackmailing the Third World by withdrawing American aid unless they (the Third World) are ready to meet U.S. proposals."

Outidion de Paris, France, Dec. 17 -- Kissinger Shows Velvet Paws: "Does the good will which he showed yesterday, contrary to what was threatened, stem from the fact that he got everything he wanted from the industrialized sector."

PART 2

Excelsior, Mexico, Dec. 16 -- Exclusive interview with chief Mexican delegate to the Conference Francisco Javier Alejo: "The objective of the United States at the North-South conference is to isolate the Soviet Union."

La Stampa, Italy, Dec. 16 -- "The Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China are not present (at the conference), therefore it is mostly symbolic."

New York Times, (Flora Lewis) Dec. 17 -- "... lively interest shown yesterday by a number of third-world delegates in the suggestion by the French President for involving the Communist states in the work of the conference. Officials said ... the United States opposes any such move."

Excelsior, Mexico, Dec. 17 -- Speech of Mexican Minister Alejo to conference: "The (socialist countries) have to assume the function and co-responsibility incumbent upon them in a scheme of international cooperation."

Dec. 18 (IPS) Interview with aide to Undersecretary of State Charles Robinson -- "The U.S. has made its position clear that the scope of the CIEC cannot be widened to include non-market economies (the Comecon sector)." When asked about the possibility of a transfer ruble based monetary system being raised at the conference: "A new world economic order and a new world currency system does not relate to the guidelines under which we have agreed to hold this conference ... there may very well be discussion of this ... We would not discuss this."

Le Monde, France, Dec. 18 -- reporting on the speech of Yugoslav Foreign Minister Minic: "We are mostly regretting the fact that there has not been any agreement to enlarge this conference in conformity with the developing countries' proposals ... I also associate myself with the remark made by (French President) Giscard d'Estaing who, if I understand him right, noted the absence of the Socialist countries and to his proposal to envisage the manner in which they will have to be informed about our works or invited to associate themselves to them or give their contributions."

### PART 3 THIRD WORLD & EASTERN EUROPEAN STATEMENTS TO CONFERENCE

Excelsior, Dec. 17 -- "Peruvian chancellor Miguel Angel de la Flor declared that the Paris conference "should inexorably produce a structural modification of the economic system that has prevailed up to now ... It is not a matter of reform in the old order but of creating one which is philosophically and structurally new, which establishes an international division of labor and the subsequent distribution of world income ... The time has come to renounce the old privileges and accept the sacrifices imposed by an authentic transformation."

Tass, Soviet Press service, reported in Mexican daily El Dia, Dec. 17 -- The conference is "a tense confrontation between the rich and poor countries ... Many of the participants are attempting to put an end to the present system of banditry and exploitation through the artificial reduction in raw materials prices and the establishment of inflationary prices for industrial merchandise."

Excelsior, Mexico, Dec. 18 -- At his Dec. 17 speech to the conference, Alejo called for genuine participation of the Third World in formulating a new international monetary system which would contribute "to the rapid and equal growth of world production and trade, the control of inflation and the attainment of high levels of employment, as well as the netterment of the quality and conditions of life of the developing countries." Alejo described the current international monetary system as the "legacy of a political and economic system erected by only one third of the countries that today make up the international community ..."



Agence France Presse, Dec. 18 -- Mexican natural resources minister Francisco Javier Alejo, in a press conference statement at the conference, said "Mexico will call for the creation of an organization in charge of regulating international trade ... directed at correcting the distortions of the world raw materials market."

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, West Germany, Dec. 18 -- "Algerian foreign minister Bouteflika said that the correct line at the commissions' work would be a general political orientation. For this he received the support of Peru and other Third World states, but as good as none from Saudi Arabian oil minister Yamani."

New York Times, Dec. 18 -- "I think there is no choice but to wipe out the (Third World) debts," said a high Pakistani official... 'I mean to reschedule them. That's a politier, more acceptable way of putting it.'"

L'Humanite, daily newspaper of the Communist Party of France, Dec. 18 -- Iraqi Foreign Minister Hammadi "stressed that there is a probability of attacks against OPEC in order to prevent the creation of a new a stable international economic system." Bouteflika "emphasized the work which has already been done by the United Nations, 'in the most qualified international institutions'..." and "attacked attempts to isolate OPEC from the rest of the Third World." Yugoslav delegate Milos Minic said, "'We are still faced with a refusal to solve these (world economic) problems, and "stressed the need to stop the constant deterioration of the terms of trade."

Neues Deutschland, Democratic Republic of Germany, Dec. 18 -- Kissinger is trying to make OPEC responsible for the world economic crisis. The standing committee of the 61 trade-union organizations of gas and chemical workers has published a declaration in Paris that the Western industrial nations are pursuing the goal at the conference of maintaining colonialist and neo-colonialist exploitation.

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Dec. 18 -- The Brazilian foreign minister demanded "getting away from further analyses and proceeding directly to reach new solutions on the current world situation."

Le Figaro, French daily, Dec. 18 -- Before leaving for Washington, Kissinger stated that the North-South conference is in good health and met with delegations from Zambia, Zaire, and Nigeria, allegedly to discuss Angola.

New York Times, Dec. 19 -- "The tone of the meeting ... was set by the Indian Foreign Minister, Y.B. Chavan, who quietly said that a 'small number of people' controls 80 per cent of world commerce and 95 per cent of world investments, while the same people consume 70 per cent of the world resources. 'We all know who they are,' he said, 'but I make no recriminations.'"

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Dec. 19 -- "... what is up for debate is whether the Third World's dirigistic solution or the industrialized countries' free market will be decisive."

#### PART 4A EUROPEAN EVALUATION OF CONFERENCE PROSPECTS

Financial Times, Britain, Dec. 16 -- "At the last OPEC ... meeting there was considerable evidence that Saudi Arabia, the most important member, is prepared to wreck the cartel rather than go along with extremist..demands..."

Die Ziet, West Germany, Dec. 17 -- Editor Theo Sommer, a Tri-lateral Commission member, insists Third World if pressed to limit will take desparate action including nuclear threats, "wars of distribution and other wars."

La Stampa, Italy, Dec. 17 -- Italian Prime Minister Mario Rumor, speaking for the EEC has counterposed the challenge to the Americans. He emphasized in remarks to the conference "the Third World and the industrialized sector must not only attempt to end the world economic crisis, but must also create a structure more equitable to international economic relations." The EEC has therefore "declared itself available to open discussions with all sectors, committed to follow the declarations of the last UN General Assembly."

Corriere de la Sera, Italy, Dec. 17 -- "The turn in Washington," reports that U.S. has changed policy from confrontation to conciliation and cooperation; "Simon's policies have been replaced by Kissinger's" cites Brookings Institute report that crisis in oil price rise is "controllable and destined to diminish constantly; the reduction in price of oil can and must be reduced; this is urgent and vital; while other countries possess "oil-power" the U.S. possess agri-power (food), a very "large card up the U.S' sleeve."

France Soir, France, Dec. 18 -- Algeria attempts to stall North-South conference to get out of isolation: "In reality, the Algerian last salvo corresponds with motivation which go beyond the conference. Algeria, which a short time ago, was still one of the leaders of the Third World, is losing speed on the diplomatic scene. The attitude of Col. Boumedienne on the Western Sahara question has plunged Algeria into solitude. It has been abandoned not only by the Africans but also by the Arab states. Furthermore the difficulty it is experiencing in the financing of its development plan led it to contract a loan with Saudi Arabia which places its diplomacy in an uncomfortable position."

Quotidien de Paris, France, Dec. 18 -- "If we place ourselves in this perspective, one capital thing occurred since Monday: the U.S. and Saudi Arabia succeeded in imposing on their respective groups to be moninated as co-president of the energy commission. This is extremely important insofar as the U.S. represents potentially the greatest oil market in the world and Saudi Arabia the most colossal reserves of crude known to man ... This creates a sort of "objective" natural solidarity between those two countries, a solidarity rein-

forced by history and by a common vision of the threat represented by the Soviet empire."

PART 4B JAPANESE EVALUATION OF CONFERENCE PROSPECTS

Mainichi, Japan, Dec. 13 -- "Few Results Expected From North South Conference: "The conference was once called for a three cornered dialogue among the rich nations, the oil producers, and the developing countries without oil ... critics fear that the Paris conference may turn out to be a place not for dialogue but for conflicts over varied national interests ... One high ranking (Japanese) Foreign Ministry official says Japan is not in a position to solve the North-South problem ..."

Mainichi, Japan, Dec. 14 -- "Chances are slim that the forthcoming conference ... will yield tangible agreement on crucial primary commodities, (Japanese) government sources said ... Indications are the conference will fall short of the growing expectations that a practical solution (could be reached before the UNCTAD meeting in May).

Yomiuri, Japan, Dec. 15 -- North South Dialogue: "At the conference the industrialized nations would be prudent if they restrained themselves from indulging in short-term tricks of diplomacy ... we fear that the U.S., which has rapidly been recovering its self confidence in international affairs, will take a hawkish attitude..."

Interview with Larry Raicht, State Department, energy desk, Dec. 17 -- Asked about Japan's position on energy, he said they had proposed fusion research development. When questioned, he indicated that he was not saying that he thought that Japan would bring this up at the North-South conference, but that it is their position and they may discuss it at North-South energy commission. How would the U.S. react? "The U.S. favors cooperation" How would the developing countries react? Have they taken notice of this proposal? No response, but said that at the Ramboulet summit, Japanese Prime Minister Miki has only directed his call for cooperation to the Western world, not including the East bloc or the Lesser-Developed Countries (LDCs). He said that the Miki proposal was in the Japanese press two weeks before Rambouillet.



# NEW SOLIDARITY International Press Service

DOMESTIC MARKET NEWSLETTER

P.O. Box 1972, G.P.O.  
New York, New York 10001  
Editorial (212)279-5950  
Customer Service (212)564-8529

## LOOKING AHEAD TO 1976: FANTASIES OF RECOVERY ARE ALL BURSTING

Dec. 20 (IPS) -- While the press was touting car sales for the first 10 days of December as cause for Christmas cheer, the industry analysts this week were pointing out that the 43 per cent gain in sales when compared with last year's figures were deceptive. The large increase was over "rock bottom," -- the worst sales in industry history; Sales levels are still not anywhere near normal.

Nevertheless, both General Motors and Ford have just made optimistic -- if simplistic -- predictions about further pick up in sales in 1976. GM Board Chairman Thomas Murphy said 1976 would be the third best sales year in auto history, while Henry Ford II was only slightly more conservative in his optimism. Furthermore, GM announced that it is planning increased production runs for the first quarter of the year, while Ford will increase its capital spending -- particularly in the U.S. At the same time, however, American Motors and Chrysler, the auto companies that have suffered the worst losses ever in the last two years, announced temporary plant closings to work off backed up inventories.

Analysts indicated that GM's predictions and revised production schedule were based on expectations of "what usually happens after recessions" and anticipated increase in disposable income -- in other words, not even on any empirical trends. While the compromise over the tax cut bodes well for "consumer confidence," that magical ingredient which is supposed to trigger the recovery, it is still very likely that the stepped up auto production will end up sitting unsold in the lots of dealers and factories. Ford has already announced that it is ready to retract its just-announced minimal price increases on 1976 models, if they threaten sales.

The higher sales in November and December are explained by the fact that banks are once again making auto loans, at better terms. The banks last year, which provide over 70 per cent of auto credit, withdrew from the market. People who put off replacing their dilapidated cars -- are now buying -- at least for the time being.

A much more significant economic indicator -- orders for durable goods -- provides no cause for rejoicing. The Commerce Department announced on Friday that new orders to manufacturers declined by 1.2 per cent in November, with cutbacks hitting the primary metals industries the hardest. In addition, unfilled orders declined by \$868 million. This trend, which began October of 1974, leaves manufacturers without a backlog of orders to work on.

The outlook for the capital goods sector, which is crucial to the future growth of the economy, is miserable. While analysts console themselves by noting that there is normally a six to nine month "lead time" between a pick up in the economy and a pick up in orders for machinery, they admit that they have no idea when orders will

start rolling in or where they will come from. Machine tool orders are virtually non-existent. No one wants to get stuck with inventories of highly specialized machinery that they foresee no use for -- a testament to the faith the industrial sector has in "recovery."

The machinery sector has held up through 1975 primarily by foreign -- primarily-Arab -- orders. For example, Caterpillar, produced 56+ per cent of its yearly output for foreign markets. Without these orders, it would have been severely hurt, according to industry analysts. Now, with the shrinking of oil revenues, even the Arabs have stopped buying.

In addition to foreign demand, orders for farm machinery -- in particular large tractors and combines -- helped support the entire industry. Most of the buyers were U.S. farmers, who had a good year because of the Soviet wheat deal. John Deere's farm sales (more than 75 per cent of their business) compensated for a 20 per cent decline (in dollar terms--unit sales were down much more) in sales of construction machinery; there were virtually no orders for some lines of small construction machines, while sales of larger machines were buoyed by Arab demand.

Orders for farm machinery still look good heading into 1976. However, any moves toward economic warfare by Rockefeller could completely wreck this sector as well.

It is therefore not surprising that the big midwestern machinery producers, including Caterpillar, Ingersoll-Rand, Deere, and International Harvester, the industrial base of the Chicago faction, are vehemently opposed to the Rockefeller's economic warfare-anti-development policy.

#### THE WATERGATING OF FORD -- THE ECONOMIC ANGLE

One of the immediate effects of three pieces of legislation now sitting on Ford's desk is to place Ford in a "damned if I do, damned if I don't" vise. He will be further discredited on economic policy, whether he signs or vetoes the bills.

If Ford vetoes the construction bill, he will bring down the wrath of Rockefeller operative John Dunlop, his Secretary of Labor, the labor movement, and the Democrats. The most publicized part of the bill -- the so-called "common situs" section -- amends the secondary boycott law to permit construction workers to picket an entire construction site, where more than the struck contractor may be operating. This provision has been fought for by the building trades unions for 25 years. If he signs the bill however, he will alienate himself further from the mainstream of the Republican Party who will charge him with "yielding to labor."

Taken as a whole, the bill is decidedly anti labor -- fascist legislation. The "pro-labor" common situs provisions are a hoax. They will not go into effect until the end of this year on many sites and will go into effect in 1978 on others. In addition, Title II of the bill, known as the "Dunlop Bill" after its author, establishes a corporatist, tripartite "Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Committee," with industry, labor, and so-called public members. The Committee is empowered to intervene into local construction contracts, cancel strikes, and authorize the national construction unions to bypass local union officers and members in imposing wage settlements.

Ford is in the same situation with respect to the Energy bill, written by Federal Energy Administration (FEA) chief and Rockefeller man Frank Zarb.

If Ford vetoes the bill and fails to get alternative legislation enacted, then full oil price decontrol will go into effect immediately, and the Democratic congress will be at Ford's throat blaming him for the resultant economic dislocations. Ford also runs the risk of a major cabinet crisis: the bill was designed by Rockefeller agent Zarb and there has been speculation that Zarb could resign in the event of a Ford veto -- the same situation exists with respect to the construction bill, where a Ford veto would pit him against Dunlop.

If he signs the bill, the oil industry will start screaming, because of the initial roll back of the prices provided for in the bill.

The final version of the energy legislation includes the provision for the creation of a national petroleum reserve of up to one billion barrels (compared to current crude oil reserves of 260 million barrels in private hands) to cushion against an Arab embargo. In addition, the bill would enable the President to assume primary authority for allocation of these supplies in the event of an emergency - with no Congressional approval necessary.

Such top-down control of energy supplies is essential for Rockefeller to carry out the economic warfare-energy embargo sub routine of the now operational Hilex 75 NATO exercise.

Ford's apparent compromise on the tax bill has already been interpreted as a major retreat -- in much the same way that his New York City compromise was. Rep. Al Ullman (D-Ore), chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, commented that the spending control language that was written into the bill was a "far cry" from the commitment to a \$395 million spending ceiling for fiscal 1977. The President told us for three months that that (the 395 ceiling) was the only thing he would take," Ullman said. The New York Times took the opportunity this morning to blast both Ford, for doggedly insisting on the spending ceiling and vetoing the original bill -- risking a tax increase in the face of a new slowdown in the economy, and the Congress, especially the House Democrats, for stalling on accepting the compromise. As the bill stands now, the 1975 tax cut is extended through the first half of 1976, and Congress "commits itself" to holding down federal spending.

#### AND THE MORATORIUM AGAIN

The New York debt moratorium which went into effect last week on 1.6 billion in city notes was again causing problems for the New York banking community. Just when they thought that they could keep the moratorium hushed up, the banks were placed in a rather strange position of having to defend the moratorium in Manhattan Supreme Court from a legal challenge by a small local bank.

If they are successful in their defense, the banks and their operatives in the Municipal Assistance Corporation (MAC) will have firmly established the legal sanctity of the debt moratorium -- a powerful weapon that could at any moment be turned against them.

MAC counsel and Rockefeller-lawyer Simon Rifkind termed the Flushing National Bank "sinister" for having brought up the suit in the first place. Stressing that no one, especially the large New York

banks and MAC really wanted the moratorium, Rifkind said that it had been forced upon them. "The city's inability to meet principal payments is a fiscal, if not legal fact," he told Judge Baer. (Under the terms of moratorium the city must still make 6 per cent interest payments to its note holders. A plan to have the note holders swap for MAC Securities has failed to produce any takers.)

"Alone among all the banking institutions in the city" Rifkind said angrily, "Flushing National has mounted a campaign to propel this metropolis into bankruptcy towards financial disaster."

Judge Baer apparently sympathetic to the plight of MAC and the Rockefeller banks, interrupted counsel for Flushing National several times asking what relevance his arguments had to the case. Finally, exasperated he asked, "what benefit would be served if you win this case?" "The first thing is the upholding of the constitution," the Flushing counsel replied.

The New York banks however remain nervous that the Judge might just rule in Flushing's favor on the constitutional argument that the moratorium discriminates against classes of debtors (ie. bondholders vs. note holders). If that happens, the bankers would have no option left but to extend the moratorium to cover all New York paper-bonds, notes, everything — or face what they had tried so hard to avoid -- full-scale unmanaged default and an immediate collapse of the Rockefeller New York banks.

As one observer noted, "Whatever its outcome, the New York banks, are going to lose more than they gained in this trial."

The Judge will make his decision next week.

#### ALBANY LEGISLATURE TURNED INTO REICHSTAG

While the banks were having their problems in court, they were also having their problems in Albany securing a state tax-austerity package to guarantee their debt repayment.

In the face of a full-scale Republican revolt in the assembly, the banks austerity-floor managers, were forced to revert to Gestapo tactics to insure the passage of a portion of the new taxes.

With the agreement of State Senate Majority leader Warren Anderson (R-Binghamton), a Rockefeller Republican, Assembly Speaker Stanley Steingut (D-Bklyn) called in State Police armed with riot sticks and pistols to prevent the anti-austerity revolt in the Assembly from spreading to the Senate. Assembly Minority Leader Perry Duryea (R-Montauk) had assembled a phalanx of several burly Republican to take the word to the Senate GOP that they must not pass the \$600 million in new business taxes that had just squeaked through the lower house. After a scuffle, Duryea's men overpowered Assembly guards and were about to make their way out, when Steingut, a supporter of the New York banks' austerity floor manager, Gov. Hugh Carey, made his move. The pistol toting State police sealed the doors, keeping the angry legislators locked up while the Senate voted. As a precaution, the State Police, who are under the command of the governor, sealed the doors of the Senate as well. The legislation squeaked through the Senate and was immediately signed into law by Gov. Carey.

The legislators around the country were thus given a foretaste of the tactics the banks intend to use to secure their debt.

Already the move by the banks to turn the legislature into a replica of the Nazis' Reichstag is beginning to backfire.

Duryea has said that he will approve no more taxes, no more cuts -- under any circumstances -- and will organize to make sure that the legislators have the right to speak their peace.





U.S. POLITICAL  
NEWSLETTER

# NEW SOLIDARITY International Press Service

P.O. Box 1972, G.P.O.  
New York, New York 10001  
Editorial (212)279-5950  
Customer Service (212)564-8529

## THE BATTLE FOR THE PRESIDENCY

Dec. 20 (IPS) -- As part of their insurrectionary effort to seize full control of the executive branch of the U.S. government, forces linked to the Vice President Nelson Rockefeller and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger this week escalated their attack on the President of the United States. This drive which has as its immediate objective isolation and demoralization of President Ford, has, as its ultimate strategic objective, the assassination or removal of the President from office. Should this Rockefeller coup occur or seem inevitable, the Soviet Union - seeing the United States government in the hands of avowed madmen Kissinger and Rockefeller -- will launch a pre-emptive nuclear first strike against U.S. military, industrial and population centers.

On Dec. 18, Washington Post reporters Woodward and Bernstein dragged out some year-old evidence which "proved" that President Ford had perjured himself in testimony last year before Congress concerning his pardon of former President Richard Nixon. The article purports that former White House Chief of Staff and current NATO Supreme Commander, Gen. Alexander Haig had discussed with Ford the Nixon pardon during a period of time in which, the President had told the Congress no such discussions took place.

The leaked story smells of a National Security Council-ordered "paste-up" job on several counts. Rockefeller has called on exactly the same crew for the Ford Watergating who were so ably employed by the CIA and related agencies in the successful elimination of Richard Nixon.

(IPS was the first news service to break the story of the CIA-orchestration of Watergate. Extensive documentation of this Rockefeller operation is available upon request from IPS.) "Reporters" Woodward and Bernstein are the CIA press conduits who broke first Nixon Watergate "cover-up" story and who did the "investigative reporting" that pinned the mantle on the duped Nixon and his political allies. Alex Haig, referred to in knowledgeable military circles as a "paper clip general," is also known to be the personal towel-boy of Henry Kissinger. As White House Chief of Staff during Nixon's last months in office, Haig served as an "inside man", running the government for Rockefeller while continuously misadvising President Nixon against making a fight against the insurgents. It was Haig who made the final arrangements that eased Nixon out of office altogether.

More importantly, the sudden revelation of the "Ford perjury evidence" follows by less than a week the U.S. Labor Party's presentation to honest Congressional Republicans and Democrats of an airtight perjury case against the Vice President. Rockefeller had lied to Congressional Committees during his confirmation hearings about his use, as Governor, of the State Police to compile one million

political dossiers on individuals who had committed no crime.

Members of the House Judiciary Committee and others have already shown interest in the Rockefeller perjury evidence as a step towards his impeachment.

The Ford perjury concoction must therefore be seen as a counterescalation by Rockefeller forces to take the heat off "their boy."

Despite the transparency of the case against Ford, the Woodward and Bernstein article and subsequent follow-ups have found their way in major newspapers around the country: the National Security Council (NSC) merely called up its various media outlets and in the best tradition of the Nazi propaganda lords ordered the placement of the concocted story. As if on cue, Rep. Peter "Dopey" Rodino (D-NJ), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and Rep. Elizabeth Holtzman (D-NY) put a statement into the Congressional record indicating that they were willing to fully investigate the Ford pardon question to see if it warranted action by the House. Rodino and Holtzman both played a prominent role in the Judiciary Committee impeachment proceedings against Nixon.

ONCE A FOOL, TWICE . . .

There are signs that this particular Rockefeller operation against Ford will not get off the ground. The New York Times, reflecting opposition within its editorial board to the Rockefeller-Kissinger nuclear confrontation strategy, buried its coverage of the "Pardon Affair" on an inside page. The Times, which played a crucial part in the Watergate operation against Nixon, this time slanted its story to be favorable to President Ford, indicating that any confusion in Ford's testimony to Congress was likely caused by his being misinformed by Alexander Haig and Haig's associates in the White House.

Aside from the Rodino-Holtzman were "awaiting orders" statement, there is little enthusiasm for the affair on Capitol Hill. Many Congressmen feel that they were played for suckers in the Nixon Watergating and are not about to dive into the same sink-hole again -- regardless of the urgings from Rockefeller's media conduits.

#### ROCKEFELLER ANNOUNCES FORDS IMMINENT POLITICAL DEMISE

As the perjury scandal broke in the Post, the rest of Rockefeller's loyal press corps were intensifying their now weeks long campaign to paint the President as a piece of political carrion.

The magazine Newsweek, owned by Washington Post publisher Katherine Graham, this week put a picture of the President on its cover and gave it the headline "Ford in Trouble." The cover story, a compilation of "reports" about the President's growing unpopularity and his weakness in the GOP concludes that the President may become such a lame duck that it will be impossible for him to continue on as President.

Simultaneously, a spate of "opinions" from Rockefeller-linked syndicated columnists, including Evans and Novak, heralded the "Decline of the President."

Then on Thursday, Rockefeller himself and cabal member and former Nixon Defense Secretary Melvin Laird, a Ford "advisor," warned in separate speeches that the President could only save himself by immediately adopting plans for a fascist economy and concomitant Schactian spending programs. If Ford doesn't wake up to this, the pair indicated, the President will have a very short tenure in office.

Rockefeller, also told a CBS interviewer that he had not ruled out a run for the Presidency this year - if certain undefined things occurred. "You can never tell what will happen," a grinning Rockefeller told CBS, "I wasn't referring to 1976 when I said that I would be too old to run for President."

### THE REAGAN BOOM

As Ford's popularity plummeted, polls showed that Rockefeller puppet and ex-Borax salesman, Ronald Reagan had pulled comfortably ahead of the President. Various syndicated columnists, again acting on orders from their NSC master, suddenly decided that Reagan made interesting copy and ran voluminous explanations of his new found popularity. "He looks good in comparison to how bad Ford is," Evan and Novak wrote. CIA agent William F. Buckley termed "Reagan the man for the 1970s" and spewed his usual hyperbole about the candidates' "charismatic" qualities.

The "Reagan boom," like the Ford demise, is a totally manufactured phenomenon. No one offered any more evidence of his popularity than last week's Gallup poll. Pollster Gallup is a virtual employee of the Rockefeller family and its interests and generally finds evidence to support whatever his masters want.

While Ford may in fact lose some early primaries to Reagan, it is not that prospect, but outright Rockefeller subversion that is currently the cause of the confusion within the Ford camp. Take for example the performance of Ford's self-avowed "number one" supporter the Vice President -- at a recent Southern Republican conference. Rockefeller who was there, as he reminded everybody, as "the representative of the President," pulled some Southern GOP leaders into a back room and cursed at them. "You cocksuckers," the President's number one supporter screamed. "First you force me off the ticket and then you don't lift a finger to support the President." Rockefeller then threatened the GOP leaders, most of whom were at that moment in the Ford camp, that they had better "get off their asses." - or else. With such people on your side, who needs enemies.

The next day, the press carried reports that Ford was in trouble with Southern GOP leader.

The Reagan campaign is itself a wrecking operation aimed at hopelessly splitting the GOP. It is a "no-win" campaign -- performing a similar, though not identical, function as the McGovern campaign did on the Democratic Party in 1972.

The Rockefeller strategy is simple: destroy the GOP and put a loyal fascist Democrat like Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn) in the White House. Not surprisingly, a poll later in the week showed Hubert as handily beating either Ford or Reagan. By week's end, the CIA press sewers were carefully giving balanced coverage to the Reagan and the "once-and-future candidate" Hubert Humphrey.

## GETTING KISSINGER ON ANGOLA

Congress this week took unusually strong measures to end the Kissinger-ordered U.S. involvement in Angola. The Senate yesterday passed by an overwhelming margin an ammendment to the Defense Appropriation bill introduced by Sen. John Tunney (D-Calif) and Sen. Dick Clark (D-Iowa) which bars the use of funds for either covert or overt U.S. aid to anti-Communist forces in Angola.

Kissinger flew home from his defeat by the Third World at the Paris North South conference to try to salvage the Angola fiasco. While still in Paris he had attempted to involve the President in the affair, force the President to make a firm stand on the matter, by leaking information to the effect that the President had made the "final decision" to approve the funnelling of CIA monies to National Front (FNLA) and the National Union (UNITA). While loyal CIA press conduits around the country prominently featured the Kissinger story, few people took it serious. Everyone knows that Angola was Kissinger's operation -- the New York Times had splashed that fact across its front page last Sunday.

Kissinger then shifted gears. He leaked stories reiterating his claim that Angola was of "strategic importance" and that the pro-Soviet forces would win quickly if the U.S. withdrew aid. Again the Times, leaked the truth: a midweek article, quotes a high Defense department official as saying that Angola is of "no strategic importance:" It is not a Soviet-American test of wills, but a test case between Henry Kissinger and Moscow."

Then in the middle of the Congressional debate, Times columnist Anthony Lewis printed a column calling Kissinger a war criminal for his senseless ordering of the bombing of Hiaphong in 1972. The message was clear -- the criminal's actions in Angola are equally provocative and dangerous.

Significantly, President Ford had already decided to let Kissinger fry. The President made no effort to say that Congress was meddling in something it shouldn't. Instead, he said he would "welcome Congressional debate" and that Congress was by no means "over reacting." Ford thereby let it be known that he would hold no grudge for an aid ban. The President, reportedly dispatched Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld to tell key Congressional leaders that he wanted the Defense Appropriation bill passed and wasn't too upset about the Tunney Ammendment.

Kissinger, meanwhile, reportedly pulled 25 Senators into an hour-long session the night before the vote and cajoled, pleaded and threatened people in a vain effort to gain support for his Angola policy - or at least compromise on it. Kissinger went to see Ford, hoping that the President would say something in favor a face-saving compromise; Ford said nothing.

Ford's comments following the vote; "We are setting up a possible tragedy" though splashed on Front pages -- seem relatively mild. They are aimed primarily at protecting himself from sniping by right flank -- Reagan, et al.

No doubt was left as to who the target of the Angola ammendment was. Even the normally spineless Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich) of the Black Caucus announced that he hoped that the actions of

of the Black Caucus announced that he hoped that the actions of Congress will go a long way towards removing Kissinger and his "Teddy Boy," UN Ambassador Daniel Moynihan from office.

#### FORD PEACE INITIATIVES IN MIDEAST

President Ford took decisive steps Dec.14 to diffuse the threat of war in the Mideast when he delivered a note to Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin asking that Israel take no unilateral action against Arab countries without consulting the U.S. first and proposing to move discussion of Mideast peace settlement back to Geneva Conference. Ford's proposal flies directly in the face of the years of Kissinger unilateral, "set-by-step" diplomatic wrecking operations in the Mideast. It gives clear support to the long standing Soviet proposal to end the Kissinger shuttle and bring the whole matter to Geneva.

Kissinger did his best to wreck the President's initiative. The NSC apparently ordered a blackout of coverage even after an Israeli paper broke the story last week. However, in a sign of Kissinger's stumbling control over such matters, UPI sent out a dispatch on the matter anyway which became a lead article in the Monday Chicago Sun Times.

Kissinger then attempted to edit out the most explosive section of the Ford proposal: Several papers ran prominent stories omitting any mention the President's offer to restart the Geneva Conference. As of week's end a near full embargo had been clamped on the story by Kissinger's Atlanticist allies in Europe.

Nonetheless, the word was out, and the Soviet's have evidence that Kissinger-Rockefeller control of U.S. policy is by no means irrevocably hegemonic - yet.

#### A STRATEGY WITH LIMITATIONS -- AND DIRE CONSEQUENCES

The limits of the get Kissinger strategy became obvious towards the end of the week, as anti-Rockefeller forces did not escalate to dismantle the whole Rockefeller machine as it is represented in the international military, economic and political deployment under the codename Hilex. Although Labor Party organizers reported that the Hilex briefings have had an unprecedented impact on Capitol Hill, with the psychological tension at an all time high, no Congressman has yet moved openly.

The more gullible sections of Congress, including parts of the Black Caucus, Sen. Stevenson (D-Ill.) and others, are falling for less obvious aspects of the Hilex deployment. On Dec.17, the Black Caucus warned that Soviet "intervention" into Angola will threaten U.S.-Soviet economic relations. The same day, Rockefeller's pet Senator, Hubert Humphrey, with backing from Sen. Stevenson, called for the economic boycott by the U.S. of the Soviet Union (or described as "any country") should it remain in Angola.

IPS learned however, that several Congressmen have put pressure on Rep. Otis Pike (D-NY) Chairman of the House Intelligence Committee to use his Committee to get Kissinger by exposing Hilex. While it will remain in continuous closed closed door sessions during the next two weeks over declassification of CIA material, the

Pike Committee has thus far not acted against Hilex. The entire Congress, after completing work on tax legislation yesterday, has adjourned until Jan. 19.

The criminal stupidity and cowardice shown by Congress in refusing to go after the whole Rockefeller machine merely shortens the distance to the nuclear typewire and gives the Rockefellers a continuing tactical advantage.

## The Soviet Nuclear War-Fighting-Strategy

Although James R. Schlesinger has been removed from the office of U.S. Secretary of Defense, his criminal collaborators Henry Kissinger and Nelson A. Rockefeller remain entrenched in their governmental positions, Schlesinger's insane "limited nuclear war" strategic doctrine continues to define U.S. military policy, and the operational capabilities and machinery associated with the "Schlesinger Doctrine" remain in place and untouched.

This reality, given the publicly stated determination of the Rockefeller clique to defend their worldwide financial empire at all costs and the current actual deployments backing up that determination, poses the **immediate** threat of a general thermonuclear Third World War.

As U.S.-Labor Party presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche identified in his Dec. 14 campaign statement, "Scenario for World War III," the Schlesinger and related RAND-type war-fighting strategies

are based on the fatal misconception of step-function-like escalation which can be interrupted at various points by conflict-limiting or conflict-terminating negotiations. Contrary to such idiotic wishful thinking, however, it is precisely the unfolding of such an obviously preplanned pattern of escalating war deployments and provocations which at a certain — imminent — point must convince the Soviet leadership that all-out war is inevitable.

Thus the most important thing to be understood in the present world political situation is: once the threshold point to full-scale war is reached, once even the smallest commitment to thermonuclear war is made, then we have entered an entirely new manifold of thought and actions, a different universe governed by radically altered laws.

The deterrent aspect of nuclear war is operable only as long as actual nuclear war-fighting is still seen as avoidable. Beyond that point the

fear of further escalation is no longer in effect, and no sane person can be expected to take seriously a call for negotiations or implied constraints.

Instead, policy-making will now be guided by accepting all contingencies of unlimited escalation and will seek to define military and political victory, even of a most marginal sort, in terms of the inescapable parameters of generalized thermonuclear exchange.

Before proceeding to a more detailed characterization of the situation, it should be noted that the maxim of subordinating politics to the goal of achieving every conceivable military advantage once the initiation of war-fighting has been determined to be inevitable is as much part of the classic Clausewitzian doctrine of war as the characterization of war as the continuation of politics by other means. Thus we are not adducing here new principles of warfare

exclusively determined by the conditions of nuclear war-fighting, but rather principles which even Schlesinger and his followers know full well to be the firm conceptual basis of all Soviet military thinking.

#### **The Nuclear First Strike**

Once a determination of the inevitability of actual fullscale war-fighting is made, there will be hardly any argument within Soviet or U.S.-NATO military circles that a decisive net advantage accrues to the side launching a total first strike. Nor should there be any illusions to the effect that the Soviet Union, if actually forced into a war-fighting posture by the insane Rockefeller clique, would or rationally could limit itself to a counterforce first strike i.e., a strike limited to military targets. A total (that is, counterforce plus countervalue — industry and population centers) Soviet first strike is necessitated by three interrelated considerations:

- (1) The U.S. retaliatory capacity,
- (2) The Soviet military forces structure,
- (3) The need to exploit marginal technological advantages.

Given the virtual strategic nuclear parity between the U.S. and USSR, victory in a nuclear exchange can only be defined if one is simultaneously prepared to accept the obvious — the unavoidable destruction of a sizeable percentage of one's own population and industrial capacity. Given this fact, it is necessary to minimize the destruction percentage by ruthlessly exploiting every marginal, military technological capability.

This, of course, is possible only if one does not at the same time entertain all sorts of illusions about negotiations and early conflict termination — constraints of precisely the kind that would preclude bringing into play certain marginal capacities whose very utilization could only signal total war, rapid 0 to 100 per cent escalation.

#### **(1) The unfeasibility of a Soviet damage-limiting counterforce first strike**

To successfully launch such a strike, the Soviet Union would have to have the capability of simultaneously destroying the bulk of U.S. ICBM's (intercontinental ballistic missiles), SLBMs (Submarine-launched ballistic missiles), and SAC (Strategic Air Command) bombers. No such Soviet capability exists.

First, while a number of U.S. ICBMs might be destroyed by a Soviet strike, the re-entry-vehicle-fratricide factor forces Soviet launching over a sufficiently extended time period such that even after "categorical warning" (an actual hit, avoiding the uncertainties of launch-on-warning), a majority of U.S. "Minutemen," etc. would still be intact and ready to fire.

Second, about half of the 8,500 independently targetable U.S. strategic nuclear weapons are SLBM-mounted and highly invulnerable to pre-emptive attack.

Third, the U.S.'s 500 SAC bombers are equipped with terrain-following radar (TFR) and are relatively difficult to pick up once on an actual attack mission.

This should suffice to prove that the Soviet Union could not conceivably limit a first strike to military targets (and note that we have not even taken into account the 22,000 or so land or aircraft-carrier based U.S. tactical nuclear weapons). It simultaneously shows the urgent need on the part of the Soviet Union to avail itself of the first strike advantage! The latter point is further underlined by:

#### **(2) The Soviet military forces structure**

While no detailed analysis can be developed here (and so ignoring in this context the overwhelming Soviet conventional forces superiority in Europe), two things are of immediate relevance.

First, the much smaller number (2,500) of independently targetable Soviet strategic weapons is not distributed among ICBMs, SLBMs, and long-range bombers in the same advantageous (for assured destruction second strike) fashion as in the U.S. case. A significant majority is



ICBM-mounted, and the Soviet long-range bomber threat is presently negligible.

Second, aside from the SLBM-carrying nuclear submarines, the remaining surface and subsurface components of the Soviet Navy are principally geared to preventive first strikes against U.S. aircraft carriers, etc. Thus these components would be of very limited value if employed otherwise than as indicated by a total first strike.

Broadly, these conclusions from the Soviet force structure cohere with conclusions to be drawn from:

**(3) The necessity of utilizing marginal technological advantages**

Material for a case study — though due to limited information some of the following will be only hypothetical — is provided by recent U.S. press reports (Aviation Week, Baltimore Sun, etc.) on the blinding of U.S. communications satellites by the Soviets using beams of intense infrared radiation.

Here are the relevant details: On Oct. 18 one of the three U.S. synchronous-orbit satellites warning against Soviet ICBM launchings was struck by an extremely intensive infrared beam. This "blinded" the satellite and therefore possibly impaired the entire three-way synchronous-orbit system, but did no permanent damage. The U.S. military thought that the apparent beam sending might have been the result of sensor malfunction of the satellite itself.

However, on Nov. 17-18 three U.S. satellites were simultaneously hit with the same intense infrared radiation, originating from the western part of the Soviet Union. Two of the satellites were high-orbit communications satellites used in the United States' SAC bomber command net, and the third was another of the U.S.'s synchronous early-warning satellites. The radiation lasted for more than four hours.

The implications of this development are as follows:

If the reported radiation indeed originated from Soviet lasers — and there seems little reason to doubt that it did — then since laser radiation obeys an inverse square law, and since at least some of the blinded satellites were in high 25,000 mile orbits, the Soviet Union must possess lasers far more powerful than those of the U.S. These lasers at closer range would not only be able to blind satellites, but knock them down and, given appropriate targeting procedures, might do the same to incoming missiles. But even ignoring such much more far-reaching implications, a Soviet capability to even temporarily blind early warning satellites or, say, navigational satellites used in getting an accurate positional fix for nuclear submarines, would be the kind of marginal technological capability which could reduce by some percentage points the levels of destruction incurred by the Soviet Union as the result of an unavoidable U.S. second strike. As such, it would play an extremely significant role once actual nuclear war fighting has been judged inevitable.

Of course exploitation of such laser blinding and similar techniques is conceivable only in the context of a preventive first strike strategy. In a "limited nuclear war" strategy its utilization would be unthinkable, because it would immediately indicate a rapid escalation intention.

**Marginal Technologies: The Broader Implications**

There exists significant specific circumstantial evidence that the Soviet Union actually possesses the laser capability implied by the satellite blinding incidents. Aside from the immediate short-term military-strategic consequences, the broader implications for the interconnectedness of military strategy and strategies for scientific research and development are, briefly, this: As evidenced by the "Strategic Studies" document, the ability to arrive at the correct political and military strategic estimates and to define the necessary general parameters for advances in theoretical natural sciences are based on identical epistemological premises. To the extent that Soviet scien-

tists and military experts approximate or actually share these premises in limited areas, we are not surprised at their apparent, potentially crucial advances in the indicated fields.

"Fixed position" strategies are equally lethal in political, military, and scientific research policy planning, and decisive qualitative advances depend on the identification of apparently marginal, "infinitesimal" aberrations which, despite their momentary quantitative significance, define precisely the imminent capacities of present constellations for evolution into qualitatively new global forms. It is the concentration of limited resources on the development of crucial technologies — the crucial nature of which emerges from an evaluation of their significance for fundamental advances in theoretical science — which now through advances in laser technology may have broken open not the race toward controlled thermonuclear reactions (fusion power) but also the strategic arms race.

While the U.S., under the sway of the Schlesinger Doctrine, concentrated on developing more and more gadgetry (warheads of all imaginable sizes, MIRVs, MARVs, etc.) but essentially in the same fixed mode, the USSR bypassed all RAND-type options by covering itself through the deployment of extremely high payload ICBMs and under that shield developing the kind of revolutionary though initially quantitatively marginal new technologies which, once globalized, would in one strike render the entire RAND-determined U.S. strategic arsenal obsolete.

---

# Nuclear Showdown Is At Hand

by Nikos Syvriotis  
NCLC Director of Intelligence

The Executive Committee of the ICLC has concluded, upon review of evidence now available that the ultimate military conclusion of the Rockefeller-Kissinger insurrectionary war drive concealed under cover of Hilex 75, will be the destruction of every U.S. urban center, every U.S. industrial center, every U.S. administrative center, and every military installation by a pre-emptive strike by the Soviet Union.

In a communication yesterday to his New York offices, U.S. Labor Party Presidential Candidate Lyndon LaRouche pointed out that one of the important ingredients of Hilex 75 is the U.S. population's hysterically obsessive conviction that World War III cannot possibly occur in the United States but that World War III will occur just like the previous two world wars — somewhere in the distant "over there." This mistaken view has encouraged the toleration of the now active "tactical nuclear war" doctrine of Mr. Schlesinger which envisages a limited nuclear war being fought over West European soil.

Hilex 75 has been adopted and put to operation by Rockefeller and Kissinger for the purpose of destabilizing the Soviet leadership to the point where they are forced to engage in tactical nuclear exchanges. We, on the other hand, can assert that no such tactical exchanges will take place. On the contrary, once the amount of Hilex 75 provocations reaches a certain predetermined threshold, Soviet strategic missiles will be launched to annihilate the North American continent in a first pre-emptive strike. Only **after this** occurs will Soviet tactical nuclear and conventional deployments overwhelm Western Europe.

Rockefeller's and Schlesinger-Kissinger's Hilex 75 is now proceeding on the horrendously mistaken assumption that the Soviet Union will indeed involve itself first in a tactical nuclear war over Western Europe and then later escalate (or consider escalating) into a war against continental USA. They have premised this mistaken assumption on the fact that both tactical nuclear weapons and superior conventional forces are deployed by the Soviets against NATO forces in Europe. What RAND Corporation and its insane

spokesmen at the Pentagon ignore is the elementary fact that those Soviet deployments are assigned the virtually secondary task of quickly overcoming any conceivable remnants of NATO resistance and of minimizing possible damage from NATO tactical nuclear weapons **only** after the United States has first been knocked out by a first strike.

As long as the Hilex 75 operation continues to go on, the U.S. population is being held nuclear hostage by Rockefeller. There is no doubt that in the overriding interest of the human race only one course will be followed: the military destruction of the criminal Rockefeller conspiracy if he is not destroyed politically on time to prevent him from launching his final provocation.

## How Hilex 75 Must Be Stopped

There exists one way by which the world can be extricated from this dramatic situation: the hostage himself, i.e. the U.S. population from the Chief Executive and Congress on down must be able to neutralize, disarm, and destroy the Hilex 75 conspiracy and the chief conspirators in the President's Cabinet, primarily Nelson Rockefeller, Henry Kissinger, and Edward Levi.

In the course of the past week, the U.S. Labor Party has conducted a political campaign of unprecedented scope and quality in the effort to draw large layers of the population to battle to destroy Hilex 75. We have been able to fashion unique tactics and psychological warfare techniques designed to wreck Hilex 75. Since the issuance of our Mass Psychological Inoculation Bureau Special Bulletin No. 1 and the first Hilex 75 memorandum, literally hundreds of men and women positioned in the Federal Administration have supplied us with a gross amount of information regarding this heinous operation.

No shred of doubt should be tolerated on this. When we first discovered the conspiracy and reported on it we had, if anything, underestimated both its scope and maturity. As documented in detail below, every single Department in the Administration is involved. First, a few explanations on the method of intelligence analysis and collection which non-specialists will tend to ignore.

The NCLC Intelligence Department has been in a position to intercept or

otherwise acquire statements and views over Hilex 75 from a broad cross-section of both civilian and military officials in every single governmental service on the order of a few thousand over the past six days. Two results were obtained by this mass of information. First, we were able to determine which departments and Divisions were involved. Secondly, we pieced together a map of the **perception** that the various layers of the participating possess (before Psychological Inoculation reached them) of what they were doing. The reader should bear in mind that each of the tens of thousands of participants in Hilex 75 has been told by the controlling agency, in this instance the National Security Agency acting on behalf of the conspirators within the National Security Council, a fictitious story concerning the purpose and nature of his assignment. This fictitious story is tailored to the psychological profile and administrative milieu of the recipient of the instruction. This is known as the "need to know principle." Not only are you told only what you need to know to carry out the assigned task, but you are told also what is needed to protect the secrecy of the operation from adversary observers.

Therefore, if one discovers the existence of a systematic deception structure, as the one we discovered with respect to Hilex 75, one has **ipso facto** supplied crucial evidence of a conspiracy; a conspiracy whose participants are unaware of the operation of which they are a part.

Regarding this "perceptions map," we identified four general types of such "cover stories" which the controlling agency of Hilex 75 has handed out to participants according to rank in the echelons and to the type of role each Department Division is assigned to fulfill.

First type: It is a paper exercise, we have been informed to expect simulation instructions sometime in the near future.

Second type: It is a paper exercise, we have received simulation instructions and are presently participating.

Third type: We have instructions not to disclose information about Hilex 75.

Fourth type: Participants casually admit that the exercise is conducted "live" but display extremely narrow knowledge of the scope of the operation.

Finally, there is a fifth unique

response supplied by every one of the country's Regional Readiness Centers who, unlike the Washington, D.C. participants, have no possibility of confusing simulation with actual event. "All inquiries on Hilex 75 must be made at the State Department, Mr. Kinney's office" (Or Political and Military Affairs Office).

These five conflicting stories are disclosing one truth: somebody is attempting to protect the secrecy of the operation. Therefore, the case of conspiracy has been established.

Ironically, individuals at the highest level, such as for example Treasury Secretary William Simon, have been given only portions of the overall picture. The President of the United States probably knows least of all. He is certainly not informed of the thermo-nuclear endgame which includes his own assassination. It is doubtful whether many operatives beside Kissinger, Schlesinger, and the Rockefeller family are fully apprised of the complete scope of Hilex 75 — or rather the actual program of events of which Hilex 75 is a paramount administrative deployment. It is almost certain at this time that not even the Joint Chiefs of Staff are fully aware of the entire gameplan (even though the function of J-3 should be looked into) as the gameplan calls for subroutines which are designed to manipulate the Joint Chiefs themselves into Schlesinger Doctrine-style "tactical nuclear war" fighting.

#### **The Diplomatic Antecedents of Hilex 75**

Henry Kissinger outlined in a somewhat cryptic fashion the key elements of the live Hilex 75 as we know them today on Nov. 12 in Pittsburgh, Pa. and again more precisely Nov. 24 in Detroit, Mich.. Between these two statements the Six-Powers Economic Summit in Rambouillet, France took place where according to Kissinger himself, the principle of fear as the unifying ingredient of the "Atlantic Community and Japan" was forcefully reestablished by himself. From that point on West Germany and Japan have been held at nuclear gunpoint and are compelled to participate in Hilex 75.

The major points that Kissinger underlines in his Pittsburgh and Detroit addresses are:

Upholding the Schlesinger doctrine of tactical nuclear war.

Whipping Western Europe and Japan into line by means of military and economic blackmail.

Declaring the opening of nuclear confrontation with the USSR: "We must manage a fundamental conflict in the shadow of nuclear holocaust."

Declaring economic warfare against the developing sector of the world

economy.

Declaring Maoist China to be a key allied element in this showdown.

Every one of these elements can be recognized to be a key component of Hilex 75 as it was described by Der Spiegel magazine in July, 1975 and as also Hilex 75 is being described to us by its unwitting participants.

It is now clear in retrospect that the Chateau Rambouillet meeting played an important role in forcing upon Rockefeller's European vassals the political decision to go ahead with Hilex 75. That option had become a live consideration by Kissinger and Rockefeller back in May. It was on May 31, when the June 30 financial rollover crisis had already been forecast, that Kissinger arranged with France's Giscard d'Estaing to trap the unsuspecting President of the United States into such a meeting. Giscard made the proposal to Ford during the CSCE ceremonies in Helsinki the following month. From that point on, former Secretary of Treasury George Shultz, now with the Bechtel Corp., assumed the task of preparing the set-up for Ford in coordination with his old Finance Ministry cronies, Helmut Schmidt and Valery Giscard d'Estaing.

Although all the details have not yet come to light, it is now obvious that Treasury Secretary Simon was roped into the Hilex 75 tentacles in the course of his fight around the New York City budget collapse. Some time after Chancellor Schmidt's hasty trip to the USA, both the President and the Treasury Secretary began to waver in their opposition to bail out Rockefeller's New York banks. Suddenly they both began to talk in phrases one is accustomed to hearing from the West German Chancellor and Kissinger — "worldwide interdependence," "the impact of a New York default on the world economy" and so forth.

In the midst of all this, two things occurred: Schlesinger was fired and it was reported that the President is opposed to "tactical nuclear war gadgets." Both Simon and Ford then embarked on their way to Chateau Rambouillet as rumors began to fly that Simon would join the National Security Council. From subsequent events, it appears that it was at Rambouillet that the President and Simon were given only one aspect of the Hilex picture and were led deceptively to believe that that was all. They were told of the economic warfare to be declared worldwide against the "South" and the "East." As solid conservatives they both bought it. Hence their subsequent change of line on the New York issue.

Kissinger had succeeded in getting President Ford to put the noose around his own neck at Chateau Rambouillet. The President was not apprised of the fact that this economic warfare package he was given would be totally useless unless it was part of the broader scenario that climbs all the way up to nuclear showdown, and includes his own assassination as a show of ruthlessness against the Soviet leadership. The isolation imposed between the new Secretary of Defense and the President for a number of crucial days helped the conspirators significantly.

In this light, two international meetings are of significance. The European Economic Community summit in Rome and the trip of Kissinger and his Special Action Group of the National Security Council to Peking. According to Kissinger himself, the meetings "amounted to a very detailed, to a very substantial, and in many areas very concrete discussions that went beyond an exchange of views.... It was a general review of the world situation in almost every part of the world." The type of U.S. and Chinese personnel involved in those talks: Maoist deployments from the subcontinent to the North Sea "Cod War" to South East Asia and Indonesia; and intelligence analysis of Chinese propaganda indicate that the People's Republic of China is a full participant in the Hilex 75 venture.

The Rome EEC summit covered a narrower scope than the Peking meeting. It prepared for the wrecking of the North-South Conference; for the eruption of another manufactured "Middle East Crisis"; for the administration of total control of all energy supply in Europe as per International Energy Agency directives. All the local ingredients of economic warfare were in place.

#### **Phase Two**

On Dec. 11, full-scale economic warfare against the socialist bloc and the Third World became the object of full-fledged Hilex deployment. The entire NATO-OECD-State Department-Chase-Morgan-IMCO structure of economic warfighting has been uncovered by the ICLC as well as the various hybrid support operations such as artificially provoked strikes especially in transport, etc.

As the NATO Defense Ministers Communiqué and in particular Admiral Hill-Norton's statement made clear, the declaration of economic warfare simultaneously against East, South, and the populations of Western Europe, Japan, and the USA is also being used as a psychological warfare and

military escalation trigger: the actual conduct of NATO economic warfare is attributed by NATO to threatened Soviet cutoff of vital sea lanes!

NATO-OECD coordinated economic warfare is already integrally utilized to exponentially escalate on all the other components of Hilex 75. This also constitutes prima facie proof of our charges that the president of the United States is called on to examine closely: The economic warfare policy, which he possibly was deceived into approving, is now overtly being used for nuclear escalation.

In addition, the overt militarization of the West European continent in the last 24-36 hours is the direct product of Helix 75-phase two operations. Under cover of the need to defend the population against terrorists deployed by NATO itself, the Western European population has been goaded and terrorized to accepting the placement of their countries on a war footing, thereby assuring NATO top-down command and control for the final countdown to nuclear war.

In the last 36 hours alone: In Belgium, Brussels was placed under total military control. In the Republic of Eire, the army engaged in its largest military maneuvers to date across the country in so-called anti-terrorist exercises. In Northern Ireland, MI5 terrorists exploded their largest bomb in an army camp. In Britain, the Netherlands, and Scandinavia, terrorist security alerts provided the excuses for further militarization of the population. In France, a reported kidnapper provoked the militarization of the country's borders and entry points; army and gendarme maneuvers continue in the west and east. In West Germany, police mobilization in Munich escalated. In Italy, explosions wrecked three communications centers; troops are now deployed along railroads.

#### Hairtrigger Distance

Since the ICLC's exposure of Hilex 75 eight days ago, every government in the world has been fully apprised of precisely what is now occurring. Major Third World powers such as India, Mexico, and Iraq are now conducting "open diplomacy" types of political counteroffensives explicitly targetting Nelson and David Rockefeller and Henry Kissinger as immediate instigators of thermonuclear war. The United Nations yesterday upheld Mexican President Echeverria's "Charter of Economic Rights," including the appended declaration that the only thing that will rescue the world from thermonuclear destruction in the days and weeks ahead is the massive worldwide acceptance of the new World Economic Order: the entire Third World is presently conducting a dramatic counteroffensive aimed at making the Paris North-South talks Dec. 16 a full-fledged success in terms of acceptance of the New World Economic Order. Should Kissinger succeed in sabotaging the meeting *per se*, the Third World is politically preparing as a whole to declare worldwide debt moratoria and proceed into the New World Economic Order without the USA. To this effect, dramatic coordination is occurring between the Socialist states' effort to enforce disarmament and the Third World's urgent demands for technology transfers. In short, Rockefeller policy in the United Nations is being literally torn to pieces.

This galloping pace of events is the one ingredient that is forcing us faster and faster to the point of ultimate nuclear showdown. The other is the massive "White Communism" coup that is now reigning over the West European Communist parties. Kissinger's decision, implemented via Gen. Vernon Walters, Deputy Director of the CIA in Madrid, to bring out all the "deep freeze" agents in the leaderships

of the Communist Parties to attack the USSR can only be taken by the Soviet leadership as a strategic threat which must be answered in a fashion that will necessarily escalate the conflict further. Should the Soviet Union respond to the situation with a Leninist "Zimmerwald" tactic, the Kissinger-Walters "white Communism" operation will crumble within hours and Western Europe will be in a state of mass insurrection overnight.

These two boiling situations indicate precisely how fast Rockefeller is approaching the button. The more successfully humanity outside the United States is resisting the Rockefeller beast, the closer the beast gets to the button. Unless the United States population closes ranks to follow the U.S. Labor Party's instructions on how to eliminate Rockefeller and his criminal associates, then humanity outside will have no recourse, for the sake of all, but to deliver the first strike. The prospects are grim but the way out exists. Every hour that is lost without resolute action to destroy Rockefeller, is an hour closer to the total destruction of humanity. The Germans who omitted to fight the Hitlerpest because "they didn't know" or because "they were only following orders" were just as responsible for turning Germany into a "Trummerfeld" as Hitler and his Anglo-American masters were.

The Statutes of Nuremberg have already established the unmistakable criteria for such matters of "following orders" or "not knowing."

The Labor Committee does not, as of this writing, yet possess the material power with which to impose the Nuremberg Statutes right now. Right now we, alone among the people of the United States, speak with the fortitude of history's judgment and we thus warn that the American people shall either live up to the moral commands of Nuremberg, or they shall not live at all.

# NATO Brussels Meeting Maps Nuclear Showdown

Uwe Parpart  
National Executive Committee

First reports from the present Brussels NATO Defense Planning Committee meeting, a body constituted of the defense ministers of the North Atlantic Alliance, indicate that the meeting is dominated by two inter-related themes: (1) growing NATO "concern" over "rapidly improving Warsaw Pact war-fighting capabilities" in Europe, and (2) the alleged challenge posed to both Western Europe and North America by "vastly increased Soviet naval strength" and by new deployment capabilities for the Soviet Navy through the acquisition of several bases on the African continent.

A NATO intelligence report to this effect for the alliance's chiefs of staff was circulated at a Dec. 9 Defense Planning Committee meeting and further elaborated by Admiral Sir Peter Hill-Norton, the current chairman of the NATO Military Committee (MC).

According to Hill-Norton, Warsaw Pact developments are characterized by "a steady and continuous improvement in both quality and quantity of weapons, equipment, and training, with growing emphasis on offensive capability." Commenting on the establishment of Soviet air and naval facilities in Somalia and Guinea and alleged Soviet plans for bases in Angola and Nigeria, the honorable admiral interprets these moves, which at least in part are purely his own invention, as underlining the importance that the Soviets attach to cutting the lifeline between North America and Europe and between Europe and the oil-producing areas."

This is exactly the line spouted by Nelson Rockefeller in his Dec. 5 speech before a National Association of Manufacturers' (NAM) meeting, which simultaneously initiated a key feature of the ongoing NATO Hilex 75 exercise: a Third World raw materials and oil embargo, causing massive social disruption in Western Europe. What is real about Rockefeller's and NATO's scheme of things is their own desperate determination to instigate such embargos — motivated by some "nice little war" in the appropriate areas — and to simultaneously create provocations against the Soviet Union and its

allies, which would lead to MC 14-4 style "limited" East-West nuclear confrontation.

The Hill-Norton report's most immediate significance is its attempt to retroactively justify the cumulatively most extensive and provocative series of military maneuvers (in the period from August to December 1975) conducted by NATO since its inception. The main thrust of these maneuvers — emphasized as well by the August assignment of two additional U.S. brigades to Europe and their deployment in northwest Germany — has been the defense of NATO's northern flank and the securing of the North Atlantic-North Sea U.S.-Europe NATO resupply lines. Thus in the "Autumn Forge" series of maneuvers between September and November, the "Reforger '75" airlifting and associated land exercises in West Germany, and the massive "Ocean Safari" maneuver off the west coast of Scotland involving U.S. ships, several hundred planes, and over 17,000 men were of key significance.

The dangerously provocative character of these two maneuvers in particular is indicated by two facts: (1) the context in which they occurred: the "Shapex '75" NATO headquarters exercise simulating a sequence of events in which the Soviet Union allegedly takes military advantage of economic and social dislocation in Western Europe, and (2) the undeniable reality that northwestern Europe is conventionally undefensible against a full Warsaw Pact onslaught, so that major NATO deployments in that area must signal to the Soviet Union aggressive NATO intervention aimed at creating a Schlesinger-style "limited" nuclear confrontation.

The Soviet Union is fully aware of this situation, correctly defining it as a massive effort by "some influential circles in the Western countries" to violate and subvert the August 1975 Helsinki accords on European cooperation and "through all sorts of pinpricks intended to cause a reply reaction," forcing the Soviet Union into counter deployments. No such "limited" Soviet deployments obliging a Schlesinger-type game plan will

occur. Rather, as the Soviet leadership has stressed on numerous occasions, the Soviet Union is fully prepared to meet any actual provocations against Warsaw Pact territory with the full force of its military might.

We merely shall reference at this point three groups of actual worldwide NATO and U.S.-directed military deployments further underlining the immediacy of the war danger:

## \* NATO's Northern Flank

The "Ocean Safari" maneuver, officially concluded on Nov. 18, has been de facto extended, involving primarily British units, under the cover of British-West German disputes with Iceland over the latter country's claim to a 200 mile zone for exclusive fishing rights. Britain has sent several frigates and smaller units to protect its fishing trawlers in Icelandic waters. Conveniently, the Norwegians are supporting Iceland's claims — both countries might quit NATO as a result of the dispute according to the Swedish press and thus "lay Norway open for a Russian invasion." No need to develop the scenario further.

## \* "Terrorism" in Britain and the Netherlands.

Over the past two weeks IRA and South Moluccan (!) kidnapping operations have been used by British and Dutch authorities to fully militarize their respective countries and simultaneously subject their populations to a barrage of psychological warfare intimidation measures, now beginning to spill over into West Germany. The Italian defense and interior ministries, in turn, are taking advantage of these developments to motivate a "temporary" military takeover of all nodal points of the nation's telecommunications system.

## \* Third World Trouble Spots

It suffices today that the situation on the Indian subcontinent, the Thailand blockade of Laos, the South African and Zairean intervention into Angola, and the renewed major flare-ups in Lebanon — not necessarily any one it itself, but taken in conjuncture — could, at any moment, build to the threshold potential for actual NATO-Warsaw Pact nuclear confrontation.

# NATO Deploys Hilex Military Forces for Keeps

Ron Kastner  
NCLC Security Staff

In Norway this week, the Conservative Party leader, Kaare Willoch, stated the following: "Norway will find itself in a special situation in case of an international crisis. The Soviet armament buildup on the Kola peninsula has additional ingredients which cannot be explained from global strategic considerations only." The Norwegian press is replete with comments like these which echo the war mongering speech of Sir Peter Hill-Norton at the current NATO conference in Brussels.

## The Northern Flank

The key Norwegian Sea area is being beefed up with British naval deployments as a result of the "cod war." According to the Hilex 75 scenario, the Soviets would "take advantage of" such destabilized areas as that created by a "Cod War."

The geographical area between Iceland and the British Shetland Islands, as well as the North Sea, has received a great deal of attention from NATO planners. In terms of military strength, more ballistic submarines patrol within this area than in any other, simply because of the proximity to nuclear targets of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The approximate range of submarine-launched missiles is 3-4,000 miles.

Commercially, the North Sea is vital. It is the only access route to the Baltic Sea and ports like Leningrad and Riga, especially in the winter when the northern ports are frozen in. Since April, 1975 NATO has run three major

maneuvers in these areas, Bold Game, Reforger 75, and Ocean Safari, and has set up a new defense pact to protect the North Sea oil rigs, increasing permanent naval presence there.

The initial scare stories which were released specifically concerning newly realized Soviet naval strength and Soviet ability to interdict shipping lanes to and from Europe via the northern waters began in May 1975. At that time the Soviet Union conducted a massive global maneuver known as OKEAN '75 which was the Soviet military response to the Schlesinger policy of limited nuclear warfare known as MC 14-4.

The comments this week in Brussels by Admiral Sir Peter Hill-Norton were merely repeats of the original red-scare speech on the Soviet Navy given by Vice-President Rockefeller at the May, 1975 graduation ceremonies at the Annapolis Naval Academy.

NATO's southern flank is even now alive with covert military deployment. Two features geographically define Hilex "exercises" in the Mediterranean; 1) the active deployment of the U.S. Sixth Fleet and allied vessels into positions potentially threatening to Soviet sea lanes, and 2) an ongoing land army role in civilian population control.

This is now operational: As of Dec. 4, two large active maneuvers were taking place in the Mediterranean. One, called PHIBLEX '75, is a concentration of ships south of Spain controlling the Straits of Gibraltar, the key access route to the Atlantic Ocean. The highlight of the exercise was an

amphibious invasion landing in Spain at Almeria. The other "exercise" consists of joint French-Greek maneuvers, the "non-NATO" Hilex participants, in the Aegean Sea, simulating control of access and egress routes to the narrow straits through which Soviet ships must pass from the Black Sea.

In concomitant live actions, forces of the Italian army have commandeered communications facilities in both Rome and Abruzzo under the pretext of guarding them from terrorists. They have also taken the strategic rail line stretching from Bologna to Florence for the same reasons. Corriere della Sera reported that other services may also have to be "guarded."

Part of the Hill-Norton speech at the NATO conference dealt very specifically with such support contingencies, stressing "the urgency of involving civil agencies in Europe to augment the military in all aspects of logistics support" since "Soviet improvements have cut the time NATO has to prepare itself for attack."

That the Italian-type moves for population control are planned is further confirmed by similar exercises conducted last spring by NATO in central Europe. Operation Cargo Canoe combined territorial units of four countries specifically for the purpose of testing the logistics support functions of home-based units. Such simulations, and mobilizations of these types of civilian and local guard units are the mainstay social control capability of NATO governments under emergency conditions.



# Background to Hilex Food Control Maneuvers

Alice Roth

NCLC Financial Intelligence Staff

Integral to the entire Rockefeller-NATO Hilex 75 nuclear confrontation strategy is the use of the U.S.' so-called food weapon — via National Security Council-orchestrated U.S. grain export embargo against the Soviet Union and developing countries. The actual decision to impose the embargo dates back at least to the NATO Shapex 75 exercises in mid-May, the dry-run for the current live operation.

Following Shapex, a rapid-fire series of international deployments set the stage for the Hilex 75 food control operation.

## Shapex

Participating in Shapex 75 was a representative of Lester Brown's World Watch Institute think-tank based in Washington, D.C., and funded by the Rockefellers. It was set up in early 1975 to study the "non-military aspects of national security," such as food and population control, weather modification, and deforestation.

Simultaneous with the Shapex 75 deployment, a closely guarded meeting of top Rockefeller agents took place on May 15 in Rensselaerville, N.Y. to plan their intervention into the then-upcoming United Nations' Special Session on Development and the World Food Council. Among the participants were economist Robert Triffin, World Watch and former U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) secretary Orville Freeman, C. Fred Bergsten of the Brookings Institute, and Manuel Perez-Guerrero, Venezuela's Minister for International Economic Affairs. The chief outcome of this gathering was a renewed propaganda push around the old Kissinger plan for an international grain reserve as the key feature of an overall drive for top-down NSC control over world commodity flows.

## Hilex Food Control Launched

On May 28, at the IEA-OECD meetings in Paris, Kissinger reiterated his call for a 30 million ton international grain reserve in deliberate counterposition to Third World demands for genuine food aid linked to agricultural development and debt moratoria along the lines of the International Caucus of Labor Committees' International Development Bank proposal. Kissinger's demand that the Soviets participate in this "food security system" was obvious blackmail, effectively requesting the Soviets to concede control over their own food supplies to a

supra-national U.S.-controlled authority!

At the June World Food Council (WFC) meeting, Iraq, Algeria, and other pro-development Third World governments successfully, but only temporarily, stymied this Rockefeller-Kissinger food control offensive. Charging that the World Food Council was controlled by the U.S., they demanded the resignation of WFC head John Hannah, a former Agency for International Development official and Rockefeller family intimate.

With the grain reserve plan temporarily relegated to the back burner, the Rockefeller forces turned to their second option: the direct sabotage of U.S. grain shipments to the Soviet Union. Subsequent deployments to wield the food weapon against the Soviet economy are a matter of public record, reviewed here summarily.

## Cutoff Soviet Grain

On Sept. 3, the NSC officially took over control of U.S. grain trade, the source of over one-half of world grain supplies, in an operation conceived and directed by the State Department and Secretary of Labor John Dunlop. The operation was kicked off in late July when, at the bidding of these forces, the labor faker agents of Teddy Gleason's reactionary International Longshoreman's Association (ILA) voted at their convention to boycott any and all further grain shipments to the Soviet Union on the excuse that these shipments were inflationary. In early August at the AFL-CIO convention, AFL-CIO Secretary Treasurer and Trilateral Commission member Lane Kirkland persuaded the AFL-CIO to announce its backing of the Gleason boycott. In early August at the AFL-CIO convention, AFL-CIO President George Meany reiterated the boycott threat and longshoremen in the key port of Houston began implementing the boycott. This de facto boycott was subsequently pronounced to be official for the administration. Dunlop later claimed full responsibility for the announcement, pending Secretary of State Kissinger's approval, in an interview with the Washington Post.

Interestingly, the Washington Post reported at the same time that the Policy Planning staff of the State Department had decided on the embargo in secret meetings as early as August 1975. According to the Post, the

State Department decision was made on the basis of a report prepared by Wellesley College professor Marshall Goldman on the vulnerability of the Soviet economy to such action. Reportedly Goldman is currently in consultation with the State Department officials concerning a second embargo.

## NSC Takes Over

### Agriculture Department

On Sept. 11, Undersecretary of State William Robinson was dispatched to Moscow to begin grain trade talks with the Soviets. In late September, however, the State Department **unilaterally** embargoed all grain exports to Poland, an announcement made while the uninformed U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz was negotiating on agricultural trade with Polish officials. The State Department simultaneously revealed that the U.S. was demanding a long-term grain-for-oil commitment from the Soviets. In response, Senator George McGovern (D-S.D.) vigorously protested against these maneuvers, which he termed a State Department-Dunlop takeover of policy matters normally under the control of the Department of Agriculture. Butz' reputation as a "free trader" resistant to export controls is well-known and clearly points up the undermining of the USDA's authority by the NSC.

In early October, a high official of the Export-Import Bank admitted to IPS that Kissinger's policy was to "force the Soviets to change their economic and political priorities" and that the grain-for-oil deal was "a private operation" run by Kissinger, Schlesinger and the think tanks, adding that the "deal is testing the waters, really."

## Food Weapon Psy-War

Beginning in early December with the official activation of Hilex 75, a coordinate psy-war campaign was begun, involving the press, key Rockefeller cabal figures, and presidential candidates. A second grain embargo is now in the works, this time aimed not only against the Soviets but against OPEC and the pro-development Third World countries as well.

\* On Dec. 3, at the Washington, D.C. Pacem in Terris conference, Robert O. Anderson, the president of Atlantic Richfield, stated the food control policy succinctly: "The U.S. has politicized food in the same way that OPEC has politicized petroleum." This statement came on the heels of presidential candi-



date and Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter's recommendation that the U.S. withhold its grain supplies in the event of another Arab oil embargo. Clear evidence indicates that the Rockefeller faction is, in fact, planning to provoke such an oil embargo, as part of the Hilex international manipulation.

\* On Dec. 6 the New York Times and Baltimore Sun announced the relaunching of the August-September grain boycott operation in front page articles mooted the cutoff of shipments of grain already purchased under contract by the Soviet Union. According to these press sources, the threatened cutoff was due to Soviet refusal to extend a 1972 freight rate agreement whereby they agreed to pay \$16 per ton above the world market rates for U.S. shipments.

\* Simultaneously ILA head Gleason threatened a renewed boycott, a threat accompanied by massive press trumpeting of Soviet crop failure. The bulk of the Soviet purchase, 8 million tons of a total 13 million, still remains to be shipped.

\* On Dec. 5 the London Daily Telegraph editorialized that the USSR's grain crop was the worst Soviet economic disaster since World War II and questioned the rationale of trading with a country that "diverts so many resources for war production." In a similarly intentioned editorial, the London Daily Express urged the U.S., Canada and Australia not to bail out the Soviets, but to bring home through a food shortage how incompetent their leaders are."

\* In a Dec. 7 New York Times feature Lester Brown declared that food will be a major topic at the Paris North-South conference. "Future access to food supplies is occupying more and more time of political leaders," Brown said. The article predicted the imminent operation of a U.S.-Canadian-run "global food rationing program."

More than current grain supplies are at stake. The sabotage of grain exports to the Soviet Union and Third World nations would create a glut in the domestic market, immediately collapsing the prices which U.S. farmers receive for their grain. Farm prices are already declining due to the worldwide depression and reduced exports. Wheat prices alone have fallen approximately 20 per cent since late August. If exports are further sabotaged, farmers will be driven into bankruptcy and the 1976 spring planting will be jeopardized.

## State Department Unleashes Economic Warfare on World Shipping Trade

Susan Cohen  
NCLC Financial Intelligence Staff

The trade-starved world shipping industry has been targetted for stripping down and regimentation under top-down State Department-NATO control in a multi-front operation directed squarely against the Soviet Union and key pro-development Third World countries. The economic warfare drive is presently being run from the State Department's Regional Political-Economic and Military (RPE-RPM) "boiler room"—Henry Kissinger's hub of NATO Hilex operations — and is coordinated with provocative blasts on the Soviet "naval threat" emanating from NATO in Brussels.

### Warfare Fronts

\*RPE hatchmen are cooperating with Chase Manhattan Bank, Morgan Guaranty Trust and Citibank in ongoing private meetings with NATO-connected independent tanker owners to enforce an Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO)-sponsored "pollution control" scheme to reduce capacity by 30 to 50 per cent on a tanker-by-tanker basis throughout the industry. The scheme, refused by the tanker industry only at the price of immediate bankruptcy, is calculated to drive up rates and wreck havoc in the industry at the same time. State Department Maritime Affairs chief and RPE operative Richard Bank, who will lead the U.S. delegation at an otherwise secret, January OECD Maritime meeting where the IMCO scheme is expected to be finalized, is warning colleagues that the plan will cause a "major uproar" and will especially provoke the OPEC countries. This will provide a convenient pretext for the Rockefeller-run Saudi Arabians to self-righteously declare a new oil embargo hoax as per the Hilex script.

\*Hoked-up hysteria about the "threat" of the Soviet bloc merchant fleet is being liberally wielded to enforce stringent rationalization and strict obedience to State Department marching orders throughout the shipping industry. Yesterday the Council of European and Japanese National Shippers Association (CENSA) issued a report in London charging the Soviet bloc with the "penetration" of the traditional Western-controlled shipping trade "in pursuit of political objectives," and demanded "concerted ac-

tion by Western governments to preserve the traditional free enterprise international shipping system." The CENSA report followed on the heels of the NATO Military Committee's noisy charges earlier this week in Brussels that the Soviet Union intended to establish port facilities in Nigeria and Angola for the purpose of "cutting the lifeline" between North America and Europe and the oil-producing countries. NATO's groundless charges were coupled with a call for complete integration of European civilian with NATO military transport.

\*This week the NATO-connected Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) summoned Japanese officials to Paris to discuss "overcapacity problems," in a continuing effort to cut off the supply of Japanese ships to the Soviet bloc and leading pro-development Third World countries. Japan has recently concluded agreements to provide ships to India and Iraq, and is presently negotiating a \$1 billion shipbuilding contract with the Soviet Union. The Japanese, who have received the bulk of orders for new ships over the past four months, have been charged with "breaking OECD rules" on government subsidies to the shipbuilding industry.

\*According to OECD Maritime Affairs controller Bank, the OECD is also "keeping an eye on" the attempt by eight Latin American nations headed by Mexico and Cuba to develop an independent Caribbean fleet. State Department sources report that Bank's deputy was in Mexico City today.

### The HUB

The coordinated NATO-OECD-State Department assault on shipping is run through IMCO, an innocuous "environmental and safety" UN governmental treaty organization otherwise run from the office of Thomas Enders' Director of Maritime Affairs at the State Department, Richard Bank. Bank is State's controlling link to the OECD, handling all maritime deployments in connection with the RPE-RPM "boiler room." Sources confirm that IMCO, "headquarters" in London, operates a top-secret military security monitoring service for major shipping companies on a day-to-day basis.

Bank has acknowledged to insiders

that the multi-faceted disruption of the shipping industry will be consolidated at a "confidential" January meeting of the OECD Maritime Transport Committee in Paris. The U.S. delegation he is heading, will push for government-level ratification of the IMCO wrecking scheme.

The "classified" OECD agenda is a battle plan for shipping warfare. According to Bank, the NATO front group will discuss the Suez Canal, the Panama Canal — obvious strategic flash-points — along with the IMCO proposal, the problem of Japanese government subsidies, and "State Trading Competition" — the usual code phrase for the East bloc shipping "threat."

#### **NATO Coordination**

Banking sources are saying that the tanker conference now in session in London is working closely with NATO to coordinate the war plan. Linking the conference with NATO propaganda over Soviet naval power, one official amplified the NATO anti-Soviet psy-war line: "If you've got the Soviets in Luanda (in Angola-Ed.) and Nigeria, with that tremendous volume of traffic going around the Cape, it's not hard to sink a LCC (very large crude carrier)!" They're "talking about contingency planning," he added emphatically.

Other banking sources involved in the tanker talks asserted that IMCO was actually running the conference. Maritime Affairs chief Bank himself insists that tanker owners enjoy an intimate relationship with NATO involving "the closest coordination" over "many years".

#### **Banking Interface**

That the economic warfare assault on world shipping is directly interfaced with the Rockefeller bankers' policy to scrap the world's shipping fleet before accepting a moratorium on billions of outstanding loans has been amply confirmed by those very circles. According to financial sources, Chase Manhattan alone has fully \$1.7 billion in bad loans to the tanker industry. A highly-placed source referring to the IMCO capacity reduction hoax, stressed that "this is what the bankers want." If the shippers don't go for this, they will be bankrupted, he added. With an at least 12 per cent collapse in world trade over the past two years, nearly one-half of total world shipping tonnage is presently mothballed — at a cost of \$3000 to \$4000 per ship per day to the shipowners.

## **FEA: Core to Hilex Energy Subroutine**

**Dr. Morris Levitt**

**NCLC Research and Development Staff**

The intersection point for all major international and domestic components of the Hilex 75 energy control policy is the office of Frank Zarb, Director of the Federal Energy Administration (FEA). The FEA is the nodal point from which the planning for an International Energy Agency (IEA)-provoked international oil embargo has been coordinated with preparations for militarization of U.S. energy distribution and allocation.

The FEA's world energy control operation is handled through two key FEA units: the Office of International Affairs and the Office of Regulatory Programs. From sources close to both FEA offices, the NCLC has determined that the two units are consciously and surreptitiously implementing major sections of the Hilex scenario.

#### **North-South Sabotage**

According to banking sources, the key U.S. figure in the adoption of the Hilex scenario for energy shortages and sabotage of the North-South conference at the IEA Governors meeting in Brussels this week was Clement Malin, who had told interviewers before he departed for the meeting that an oil embargo would be the best way for the Arabs to sabotage the North-South talks.

One source, who was briefed by Malin's top assistant, Win Jones, following Malin's return, said that the IEA meeting adopted a two-pronged strategy to ensure that 1) there are no substantive deliberations or decisions at the Paris North-South talks, and 2) that the issue of oil prices being "too high" is raised at the talks, to split the oil-producing and oil-consuming nations within the developing sector, and to provoke an Arab oil boycott. Accordingly, James told the source, the industrial countries have agreed to a "balanced approach" — an indication that they will raise a general demand for lower oil prices while avoiding being pinned down to a concrete negotiating position which might lead to bona fide discussions within the context posed by the Third World demand for a "new world economic order."

Official spokesmen for the IEA, including IEA head Etienne Davignon, have publicly denied that these issues were even discussed in Brussels, but James's account of the talks is coherent with the European Economic Community's recently announced energy

policy (developed under the leadership of EEC Energy Commissioner Henri Simonet) of sharing European energy supplies and integrating energy transport under military auspices. Davignon's denials, therefore, must be taken as a further indication of the progress of the Hilex conspiracy.

#### **Militarization Of U.S. Energy Stocks**

In the U.S., the FEA and its office of Regulatory Programs (headed by Gorman Smith) are at the center of plans for the seizure, centralization, and control of energy supplies.

Their program has evolved on two levels. Within the FEA itself, the staff of the Office of Regulatory Programs conducted a "study" six months ago which developed plans for the militarization of U.S. energy supplies. The study was based on two assumptions: that there was an oil embargo in progress and that the FEA had at its disposal only such "normal" fiscal and regulatory devices for setting priorities in allocation as taxes, tariffs, and price controls.

At the same time, Zarb has personally approved legislation for direct military-type regulation of energy supplies. The proposals are embodied in two bills now before Congress: S. 622 and H.R. 7014. In the event of an emergency, the bills — which were drafted by the staff of the Energy and Power Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee — would create a special Task Force at the FEA to supercede the FEA's Regulatory Office, and provide as well for involvement in the Task Force by conspirators in such key federal departments as Transportation, Commerce, and Interior.

In addition, a more "permanent" Program Office would be created in the FEA, with the power to allocate to itself fully 150 million barrels of oil at the beginning of an "energy emergency," about 60 per cent of present stocks in storage at refineries and distribution points.

In an indication that the Hilex conspirators are well aware of the controversial nature of the bills, and Energy and Power Committee staffer told the NCLC that "we could submit the bills provisions title by title" (public attention has been focused on the bill's less significant price decontrol provisions) but prefer not to.

While Zarb's apparatus thus per-

cieves a continued need for a cover for their military control proposals, Mr. Yaffe, a top FEA planner, has admitted to a responsible source that he is well aware of the Hilex 75 scenario, and is interested in seeing how it "comes out." Without any prompting, Yaffe hastened to assure the source that his unit was not looking at military action or counter-measures, though these terms of reference had not been previously introduced.

To back up the threat of an oil hoax, the FEA retains its capacity to engineer a "natural gas shortage." According to a leading Canadian brokerage house, the Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation expects to be able to supply only 64 per cent of industrial requirements this winter.

To complete the picture of Zarb's official apparatus: Zarb special assistant Randall Hardy coordinates the White House Energy Resources Council. The ERC is described by a top source at ERDA as a "sub-Domestic Council," i.e., an adjunct to the National Security Council.

The FEA has also used moves to cripple Canadian oil production and exports by the IEA-linked Canadian Natural Energy Board and the Canad-

ian Department of Energy, Mines and Resources (EMR) to increase its stranglehold over U.S. energy supplies.

The Canadian moves, launched under the rubric of "conservationism," have reduced oil extraction in such provinces as oil-rich and Rockefeller-dominated Alberta by approximately one-half. At the same time, the EMR has activated export controls which have already cut Canadian crude oil exports by 25 per cent, with plans for an ultimate reduction to one-third of previous levels.

Since 99 per cent of Canadian crude exports go to the U.S., the FEA has moved in to "allocate" Canadian crude to geographically specific U.S. refining areas, particularly the Pacific Northwest and Great Lakes regions.

Thus NATO Military Committee chairman Sir Peter Hill Norton's propaganda about possible "Soviet interdiction" of U.S. and European shipping and oil transport lanes has already been materialized by U.S. and Canadian Hilex agents at the world's "friendliest" border.

Parallel to FEA activities, another "independent" agency set up in the period of the 1973 Oil Hoax, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, is also poised to activate its elaborate command and

control machinery — backed by a barrage of RAND-authored black propaganda — to deal with the "threat" of sabotage or attack on nuclear plants. The NRC manual of December, 1974, Nureg 75-111, provides guidelines for integrating practically every conceivable level of local government into nuclear plant disaster mobilizations.

The most recent move towards activation of this apparatus appeared in Dec. 12 Wall Street Journal article on an NRC report on the alleged increased vulnerability of nuclear plants to Soviet attack or sabotage. Not mentioned in the Journal article was the fact that this conclusion has been concocted from a lone report by the Mitre Corporation, a notorious CIA-connected think-tank, which appeared on one page of a multi-volume set of reports released by the NRC and reported on in the press two weeks earlier.

Despite this flimsy basis underlying the alleged "nuclear disaster" warnings, plans are already afoot in the state of California to integrate federal, state, and local law enforcement and other disaster-related agencies into one unified command structure in the event of a nuclear disaster such as the theft of a nuclear warhead by "terrorists."

# Grid of Federal Agencies' Responses to Hilex 75

OFFICE	NAME	TITLE	CALLER	DATE	COMMENTS
<b>National Security Agency (NSA)</b>					
Refused to say	Col. Renny	Refused to say	Mitchell Hirsch	12-11	Said "How do you know there aren't at least two simulation centers for Hilex?"
<b>U.S. Department of the Interior</b>					
Defense Electric Power Administration (202) 343-1100	Mr. Swart	Staff member	Joseph Marques	12-10	Did not know about Hilex, but said his office had been involved in Rex 75 and would be involved in Rex 76. For information on Hilex, he referred caller to Dr. James Pettee, John Splain, or Col. - Peterson at Office of Preparedness.
<b>U.S. Department of Agriculture</b>					
Emergency Preparedness (202) 343-5631	James Davis	Head	Kathleen Murphy	12-9	Confirmed involvement with Hilex; refused to talk about it until we contacted Col. Peterson in FPA.
Intergovernmental Affairs (202) 447-7615	R.B. Wilson	Director	Joseph Marques	12-11	"No comment." Referred us immediately to State Department.
<b>U.S. Department of Labor</b>					
Liaison Office to FPA (202) 523-6963	William McGloughlin	FPA Liaison Officer	Joseph Marques	12-10	Said he was not "at liberty to talk" about Hilex. "All civilian agencies were involved." Said to call Baird at FPA.
<b>U.S. Department of Justice</b>					
Liaison Office to FPA (202) 739-2325	Sue Welch	assistant to Wypolmerski (director)	Joseph Marques	12-10	Wypolmerski "on leave." Said she was "not familiar" with Hilex but has "seen the word."
Liaison Office to FPA (202) 739-2325	Mr. Wypolmerski	Director FPA Liaison	Kathleen Murphy	12-11	About Hilex: "If I do (know), I'm not saying." "I'm not in a position to say... Call State Department."
<b>U.S. Department of Commerce</b>					
Office of Industrial Mobilization (202) 561-9451	Mr. Aaronson	Staff member	Kathleen Murphy	12-9	Hilex is a NATO maneuver. U.S. participating through "a 'cell' in State Department which includes representatives from Defense, Commerce, Agriculture, State, Interior and Transportation Departments." As far as he knows, "Commerce Department's role in Hilex will be to oversee two or three key production items, including chromium, to determine necessity of sending reserve supplies to W. Europe." Said U.S. component of Hilex would mostly involve transportation. Referred me to Douglas Kinney at the State Department for more information. "I can't comment at this time on the nuclear weapons exchange element of Hilex. It's very tricky, youknow."
Emergency Readiness (202) ST3-9200	Mr. Pidgeon	Staff member	Joseph Marques	12-10	FPA instructed him to refer callers about Hilex to State Department.
Bureau of Int'l Commerce: Commerce Action Group for the Near East (202) 967-5261	Mr. Peter Hale	Staff member	Joseph Marques	12-11	Was not asked about Hilex but said that Gerald Parsky in Treasury and Frank Zarb at FEA would handle emergency operations in case of oil embargo.

B14

Emergency Planning Office, Federal Maritime Administration (202) 967-3232	Mr. Case	Director	K. Brown	12-11	IPS asked about contingent plans for a national longshore strike: "You might as well ask me what are my contingency plans for a strategic nuclear exchange." Hilex is live, are you familiar with it. "Yes." Do you know the scenario. "Yes." So you know it ends with a nuclear strike against the Soviet Union. "Yes, but why don't you tell me about it?"... "No, I didn't know it was to be live, to the best of my information. I'm listening to what you say with great interest...go on."
Office of Energy Readiness (202) 783-3627	Mr. Pidgeon	Director	K. Brown	12-11	"Yes, I know about Hilex." (IPS) It's a live operation, etc. "That's a lot of twaddle... you're just causing trouble," refused to comment further.
Department of Industrial Resources, Division of Industrial Mobilization (202) 967-5141	Secretary to Mr. Aaronson	Director of Industrial Resources	K. Brown	12-9	IPS asked if she had received instructions on what to tell anyone asking about Hilex. She said, "Yes, I have my instructions," but refused to elaborate.

## U.S. Department of Defense

Secretary of Defense Public Affairs (202) 697-5331	Duty Officer	Duty Officer	Ronald Kokinda	12-8	"We can find no information on this (Hilex) here... call a Mr. Sneider over at the State Department... he is a NATO Public Affairs type."
Int'l Security Affairs (202) 697-9729	Col. H. H. Brundt	Executive Officer to Director Robert Ellsworth	Ronald Kokinda	12-9	"Yes, I'm fully aware that this is (Hilex) going on... I don't think this (insurrection) is going on. I'll draw my own conclusions."
Army Civil Affairs Special Operations (202) 695-4110	Mr. Staudt	Staff member	Robert Kay	12-9	"I'm only involved in Hilex in a peripheral way...we are involved in operations overseas. but not in the U S. except in an emergency situation." "Call Major Murray (head of DOMS) he would know."
Joint Chiefs J-3 Exercise Plans and Analysis Div.	Col. Block	monitors Joint Chiefs' exercises	Information made available to IPS	12-9	Mr. Block said he'd been getting calls all day about Hilex, that he didn't have "any idea" what it was, that Congressional offices and the Department of Defense Office of Public Affairs and others had been calling him for information. He had previously known of its existence from seeing some "spill over messages" (orders to others concerning Hilex that did not apply to him) in recent months.
Joint Chiefs J-5 Studies Analysis and Gaming Agency	Col. Flynn's Asst.	monitors Joint Chiefs' exercises	Information made available to IPS	12-9	On Hilex: "Beats me what it is." "I don't think it's one of ours."
Joint Chiefs J-5 Studies Analysis and Gaming Agency	Col. Webster	SAGA Political Military Division	Information made available to IPS	12-9	"Oh, yeah, I've heard of Hilex. It was messy. It had us running for a while today because of a possible conflict with something we were planning." He said this new plan might start at the end of March.

## U.S. Treasury Department

Secret Service (202) EX3-6400	Agent Watson	Duty Officer	Jeffrey Steinberg	12-9	"Yes, I know about Hilex 75...."
Int'l Security Affairs (202) 697-1802	Mr. George	Staff member	Ronald Kokinda	12-12	"Yes, I know about it (Hilex)..."

OFFICE	NAME	TITLE	CALLER	DATE	COMMENTS
Assistant Secretary for Trade (202) 964-5163	Robin Cleary	Staff Assistant to the Assistant Secretary	David Goldman	12-8	"I know about these simulations (Hilex) because people here have been talking about this and are standing by waiting for instructions."
Office of National Security (202) 964-2536	Jerry Nensel	Assistant to the Director	David Goldman	12-8	Never heard of Hilex. Extremely alarmed and requested literature.
Office of National Security (202) 964-2536		Secretary to the Director William Morrell	Morrell's Secretary called D. Goldman	12-8	"Mr. Morrell knows all about Hilex and asked me to tell you that he doesn't want to speak with you or see your information."
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Trade (202) 964-5163	Gerald Parsky	Assistant Secretary for Trade	Robert Berkowitz at a NYC press conf. given by Parsky	12-8	Yes, I know about Hilex but I'm not directly involved... Bill Simon (Secretary of the Treasury William Simon) knows all about it."
Dept. of the Treasury (202) 964-2748	Robert Vasteen	Deputy Assistant Secretary for Trade and Raw Materials	Alice Roth	12-11	Denied knowledge of Hilex and Goldman report to State Department recommending a grain embargo. Denied a grain embargo was being considered. Ordered Hilex brief.

## U.S. Federal Energy Administration (FEA)

Regulatory Programs (202) 254-9766	Barry Yaffe	Staff member	Morris Levitt	12-11	Knew about Hilex. Disclaimed involvement.
---------------------------------------	-------------	--------------	---------------	-------	---

## White House

Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations (202) 395-5116	Clayton Yeutter	Special Rep for Trade Negotiations; former USDA Assistant Secretary	Alice Roth	12-11	Denied knowledge of Hilex and Goldman grain embargo report. Said: "This is not to criticize the (Hilex — ed.) scenario, but there is no basis for it..." Proceeded to argue that it was not in U.S. economic interest: grain prices are falling, large crops, etc. Also said Soviets are only momentarily vulnerable. The southern Hemisphere crops are coming in and they will be able to buy grain in Australia and Argentina.
White House Press Office (202) 456-1414	William Greener	Deputy Press Secretary	Mitchell Hirsch	12-8	Unaware of Hilex, asked how to verify, Ran 10-minute check and came back with "I cannot find out anything on this." Official statement from Greener: "I don't believe that there are any operations approved by the President taking place anywhere in the world which would lead to a war or increase the likelihood of a war breaking out. It's my belief that the President would not approve any such operation, exercise or maneuver or series of maneuvers."
White House Office of Wm. Seidman, Econ. Advisor to Ford (202) 456-1414	Mr. Douglass Metz	Assistant	Susan Kokinda	12-8	Unaware of Hilex. Asked detailed questions about Third World debt situation, to understand motivation for Hilex.
Office of White House Chief of Staff, Richard Cheney (202) 456-1414	Peter Russell	Assistant	Kathy Murphy	12-8	Listened to long briefing, unaware of Hilex.

## U.S. Federal Reserve

Office of Contingency Planning (202) 454-3701	Mr. Grimwood	Director	K. Brown	12-11	Denied any involvement with Hilex or NATO, said he "didn't know there were NATO exercises on now and anyway was never involved with NATO, his office was totally domestic." IPS: OK, what about Rex 75, you ran that for the Fed, right? "Yes, Rex 75... that was in March, but that's just domestic, that doesn't have anything to do with NATO, the Federal Preparedness Agency runs that."
--	--------------	----------	----------	-------	---

## Canadian Department of National Defense

Information (613) 992-7469	Col Boulet	Director of Information	Barbara Dreyfuss	12-9	"Hilex is a paper exercise!"
-------------------------------	------------	-------------------------	------------------	------	------------------------------

## Canadian Department of External Affairs

Information (613) 992-1706	Chris Lundy	Wouldn't give title	J. Berg	12-12	Were referred to her by several people who called her "our exercise lady." Knew all about Hilex, or at least some level cover story. "Der Spiegel article has nothing to do with the real Hilex... everything is classified."
-------------------------------	-------------	---------------------	---------	-------	---

## Canadian Department of Agriculture

Emergency Planning	Hugh Gamble	Coordinator of Emergency Planning	Interviewed in Ottawa by Susan Tobin	12-10	"Be careful about what you say (about Hilex): that's a sticky wicket." "I've probably said too much already." "I can't even discuss this with my wife."
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------	---

## U.S. Department of State

Bureau of European Affairs NATO-Atlantic political-military affairs	Douglas Kinney	Staff member	Kathy Murphy	12-9	"Hilex is classified."
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) (202) 632-1192	Robert Cupperman	Staff member	Kathy Murphy	12-11	"Not involved in Hilex but used to be at FPA." Referred calls to Gen. Bray, FPA head.
Intelligence and Research Pol-Mil Theater Forces (202) 632-8857	Gary Crocker	Deputy Assistant	Mitchell Hirsch	12-12	"I'm aware of Hilex but are you saying it's a plan to cause a conflict?"
Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs (202) 632-1341	Louis Nosenzo	Director, Nuclear Policy and Operations	Mitchell Hirsch	12-12	"I'm aware of Hilex but won't say what I know. I'm not privy to NATO war plans."
Intelligence and Research Office of Strategic Affairs (202) 632-2086	Lawrence Finch	Director, Strategic Affairs	Mitchell Hirsch	12-12	"I've heard of Hilex but have not received any instructions."

Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs Office of Maritime Affairs (202) 632-2655	Richard Bank	Director-Chairman, U.S. Delegation to OECD, Maritime Committee Chairman, Shipping Coordinating Committee of IMCO	K. Brown	12-12	"Hilex? I don't know about it! (when pressed) I may have heard about it — but it's nothing to be discussed in the U.S. government at this time... no, no, it's not a sore spot." On connection between NATO and Admiral Hill-Norton's call for integration between military and civilian transport: "There has been for many years a direct connection and tremendous discussion between the private tanker industry and NATO, since the founding of NATO." See Transport section of brief for how OECD and IMCO are provoking the shutdown of the European tanker industry.
Bureau of International Organizations Transportation and Communications Agency (202) 632-7930	Michael Hoyt	Assistant Director and IMCO specialist	K. Brown	12-12	"IMCO has no connection with NATO or these maneuvers... Mr. Bank, Director of Maritime Affairs, and Mr. Grip (Hoyt's Director — ed.) spent the day at an IMCO briefing given by the Commandant of the Coast Guard to discuss the November IMCO Assembly. IMCO's main deliberative body is the shipping Coordinating Committee, which has members from every department of the government. Mr. Bank is the chairman. There are also labor and business members." See Transport brief for full list of SCC members.
Bureau of European Affairs Office of OECD European Community and Atlantic Political Affairs (202) 632-0306	Mike Burner	Acting Director	T. Arsenis	12-12	Did not want to talk about anything, said that he had talked to us three times in the last week which does not seem to be true.
Bureau of European Affairs Office of OECD European Community and Atlantic Political Affairs (202) 632-2604	Ed Casey	Staff Member	T. Arsenis	12-12	Heard of Hilex, when fully briefed asked me to call Holmes at the OECD NATO desk. The group that he heads is what he described as a "backstopping operation where in the context of the North-South Conference the OECD nations can get together and discuss strategy and plans."
Bureau of European Affairs Office of NATO and Atlantic Political-Military Affairs (202) 632-1626	Mr. Lahovitch	Acting Director	T. Arsenis	12-12	"...Look there is only one thing I can tell you, Hilex is a paper exercise, there have been seven of them in the last 12 years, there is nothing to worry about."

## U.S. General Services Administration: Federal Preparedness Agency

Controlled Conflict Preparedness (202) 343-1100	William Baird	Staff member	Joseph Marques	12-10	FPA has a "minor role in coordinating" Hilex, but "This is being handled almost entirely by the Department of State and you should speak to them." Referred caller to State's press office.
Domestic Preparedness (202) 343-4227	Dr. James Pettee	Staff member	Joseph Marques	12-10	"I've heard the name Hilex, but I know nothing about it. Others may but they would be at a higher level than myself."
Philadelphia Office of Federal Preparedness	Mr. Forde	Director	Information made available to IPS by confidential sources	12-9	"Yes, I know about Hilex" but was very upset that as reported, the news agencies were calling the Penn Central about the connection between Hilex and the shutdown of the Northeast railroads: "I'm going to check into this and find out why people are calling you about this."
Controlled Conflict Preparedness (202) 343-1100	William Baird's Secretary	Staff member	James Applebaum	12-10	Talked to stand-in for Baird's secretary who said she was familiar with Hilex because people in the office worked on the documents and she had seen them.



OFFICE	NAME	TITLE	CALLER	DATE	COMMENTS
Controlled Conflict Preparedness	Mr. Baird	Staff member	Information made available to IPS (sources confidential until Rockefeller's police agencies are shut down)	12-10	In response to a request by Douglas Kinney of the State Department Office of European Military Affairs for the titles of the reports that Mr. Baird was working on concerning Hilex, Baird called across the room to a Mr. Splain, saying "do you have those Hilex reports?" Then got back on the phone and said "Mr. Splain has the reports. He'll go back to his desk and call you in a moment. He has your number."
Controlled Conflict Preparedness (202) 343-1100	Mr. Splain	Staff member	James Applebaum	12-10	Briefed him thoroughly on the Hilex operations. Refused to comment, said he was taking notes.
Crisis Management (202) 343-1100	Charles Kise	Staff member	Kathy Murphy	12-11	Claimed no knowledge of Hilex, but said the Conflict Preparedness Division would know about it.
Crisis Management (202) 343-7684	Avery Kohl	Staff member	Kathy Murphy	12-11	Had heard of Hilex but was playing no role in it. However, his staff might participate in it by advising on energy and transportation "problems." Said he would not be surprised if Hilex tested Schlesinger doctrine of limited nuclear war, and that if it did, this would be the first time a Hilex exercise did. Referred the caller to William Baird.
Director's Office (202) 343-5631	Spokesman	Staff member	Kathy Murphy	12-11	Said he knew nothing about Hilex. "That's international business. Call the State Department's press office."
Domestic Preparedness (202) 343-1100	Robert Griffith	Staff member	Joseph Marques	12-11	FPA coordinates IS positions for use in NATO Committees; Mr. Ackersen of the FPA oversees transportation coordination of a part of this, but is currently in Europe.

## U.S. Department of Transportation

Office of Emergency Transportation	Mr. Lettice	Staff member	Information made available to IPS by confidential sources	12-9	"The maneuver has nothing to do with reality, it's mere simulation."
Office of Emergency Transportation (202) 426-4570	George Barryel	Assistant to the Director	Daniel Ciavaglia	12-12	"Yes, I'm familiar with Hilex . it will start in March."
Liaison office to Federal Preparedness Agency, Federal Aviation Administration (202) 426-4000	Richard Reeder	Staff member	Daniel Ciavaglia	12-12	"I work through the Emergency Division of the Department of Transportation... have not heard of Hilex before but I saw a memo that the press would be calling about it."
Emergency Transportation (202) 426-4118	George Barry	Assistant to the Director	Eric Lerner	12-12	Familiar with Hilex, said it would start in March. Had heard of USLP brief on street.

## Think Tanks

Hudson Institute	Donald S. Brennan	Assistant to Director Herman Kahn	Information made available to IPS by confidential sources	12-8	Said he had "heard" of Hilex but knew very little.
------------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------	---	------	--

OFFICE	NAME	TITLE	CALLER	DATE	CALLER
RAND Corporation	Paul Y. Hammond	Member, Strategic Forces Staff	Information made available to IPS by confidential sources		Hammond acknowledged that he had heard of Hilex but didn't know it in detail.
RAND Corporation	Hans Einstein	Head of NATO Strategic Program	Information made available to IPS by confidential sources		Acknowledged that he knew of Hilex.
World Watch Institute	Lester Brown	President	Information made available to IPS by confidential sources		"One of our people was up to West Point last June on Shapex 75" but would not admit connection to Hilex. "There are various scenarios for food control, such as climate and monetary destabilization, these are nothing new."
<b>Central Intelligence Agency</b>					
Deputy Director for National Intelligence for Strategic Programs	Staff member	Staff member	Information made available to IPS by confidential sources	12-12	Said he had heard of Hilex and recommended getting in touch with "J-3," the Department of Operations under the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Department of Defense.