

As Belgrade Conference Opens

Soviet Pressure Forcing Turning Point

The Belgrade conference to follow up the 1975 treaty on European Cooperation and Security today convened amid a flurry of diplomatic signals and actions from Western European nations, including Italy, France, West Germany and Britain, which indicate that those nations have either passed or are about to pass the breaking point in their relationship to the Rockefeller financial empire.

The highpoints of this plethora of signals and activities since last weekend include:

- * A Franco-Soviet agreement on cooperation in development of fast-breeder reactor technology, open for West German participation and designed to encourage Third World acquisition of nuclear technology;

- * An Italian proposal by Trade Minister Ossola for the formation of European Export-Import Bank whose purpose will be to expand European technological and industrial exports towards both the Third World and Eastern Europe;

- * A proposal reportedly made by the socialist sector's Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) for organizational ties to facilitate trade and financial cooperation.

- * Announcement in Mexico of a major program of "technological assistance" by Finland and three Eastern European countries to the Mexican agricultural sector; this followed a rash of interventions in the Mexican economy by Western Europeans, including Italian investment in capital goods production and British technological assistance for Mexican development;

- * The establishment of a Franco-Yugoslav Bank for joint projects in Africa; and

- * Proposals in Britain, Denmark and Sweden to vastly expand the role of government backing for credit applied for the regeneration of domestic industries through exports.

Such measures have been accompanied by specific proposals geared towards the Belgrade conference itself. The Italians and Yugoslavs have separately proposed that participation in the conference be broadened to include the nations of Mediterranean and eastern Mediterranean littorals. In fact, Yugoslav Foreign Minister Milos Minic had stipulated in the week before the conference that his country would insist that such questions be adopted as the first agenda item of the proceedings. As the conference opened, the Cuban wire service Prensa Latina reported that Belgrade was rife with rumors that the Spanish delegation would formally propose the participation of non-European Mediterranean area nations.

Michel Jobert, the Gaullist leader and former Foreign

Minister of France, wrote in *Le Figaro* June 15 that "European countries" need to orient toward "the Mediterranean, Africa, and North-South exchanges, which express the economic reality of liberation and progress." All these concerns were echoed in a June 15 interview by the West German daily *Frankfurter Rundschau* with Yugoslav Prime Minister Djuranovic, who stated that the countries of the Mideast have to be involved in the CSCE procedures, if those procedures are to mean anything. He insisted that the conference has to be expanded to include participation of nations from "unstable areas."

Such widespread European convergence on the adoption of an open anti-Rockefeller political fall-back option has, on the surface of events, at least, been catalyzed by a relentless diplomatic and political counteroffensive by the Soviet Union. The Soviets have dispatched delegations all over Europe and beyond to inform governments that they now have to choose between war and peace, and that if their choice is for the latter, they must make political economic commitments to ensure that peace will be maintained.

Soviets: "Before It's Too Late"

That policy has been made clear by the Yugoslavs and by the Soviets themselves. On the eve of the opening of the conference, Yugoslav Central Committee Secretary Stane Dolanc informed West German television viewers that, if détente is to be maintained, there must be fundamental progress at the Belgrade talks. Soviet intentions were clarified by the call of Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to an unscheduled visitor, Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher of West Germany, that West Germany must use its "great weight" to achieve progress "before it is too late." Genscher had arrived in Moscow to deliver a message from U.S. Secretary of State Vance to the effect that the U.S. does not want a real confrontation over the insane human rights question.

There is no doubt but that Gromyko's public concerns, as otherwise expressed in *Pravda* coverage of U.S. inflammation of the Mideast hot spot and related matters, have been echoed by the myriad Soviet and East European delegations that have been dispatched to Western European capitals in recent days.

More fundamentally, however, the Carter Administration has left such European governments and nations with no alternative but to pick up on such optional selections as the Soviets have provided them. It is David Rockefeller's absurd policy of debt-collection-at-all-costs from Third World and advanced-sector nations which has brought the world to the point at which the Soviets stipulate: "choose now before it's too late."

Brezhnev, Czechs Warn: Nuclear War Could Erase The Issue Of 'Human Rights'

Just before the Belgrade conference on European cooperation and security opened, the Czechoslovak weekly *Tribuna* accused National Security head Zbigniew Brzezinski of organizing "counterrevolution" in Czechoslovakia in 1968. "In June 1968," wrote the paper, "Brzezinski came to Prague as a professor to give the leaders of the counterrevolution last minute instructions and advice on how to continue in the disruption of the Communist Party and the entire society."

Czechoslovak officials have made no secret of their conviction that Brzezinski is directly responsible for organizing and instigating the escalation of "human rights" propaganda and dissidents' activities under the Carter Administration. In a guest article in the Soviet government daily *Izvestia* June 9, Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Boguslav Chnoupek situated "Basket Three" of the Helsinki Accords ("human rights", exchange of men and information) in perspective.

"The problem of the 'Third Basket' can absolutely not be approached or interpreted in a one-sided fashion. In each concrete case, we must proceed from the fact that there exist two social systems. We definitely are not going to call an ideological truce, as the ruling circles of certain capitalist countries have sought. In this connection I want to stress our viewpoint once again: while without doubt the three sections of the Final Act (of the Helsinki con-

ference—ed.) are of equal weight, nevertheless special importance belongs to questions of political and military security (Basket One—ed.) and economic cooperation (Basket Two—ed.). What kind of progress there will be in the area of cultural and humanitarian relations depends, naturally, on progress in these areas. The movement of people and ideas is extremely difficult between the icebergs of the Cold War. And in the epicenter of atomic blasts, neither people nor their ideas can exist."

Soviet President and General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev echoed Chnoupek in an interview he gave for the Paris daily *Le Monde* June 15:

"The ideological struggle must not...be used as a means of interference in the internal affairs of states and peoples or lead to a political or military confrontation. Otherwise, the ideological struggle could turn into a catastrophe in which millions of peoples as well as, so to speak, their ideas could perish...."

"We are convinced that the development of international economic relations on the basis of equality and mutual benefit and rejection of discrimination will conform to the interests of each people and the interest of reinforcing international peace and security...."

Rocky's Breaking Point

This month of June sees, or has already seen, the breaking point in David Rockefeller's debt-collection policies. There is more than \$20 billion worth of Third World paper outstanding either for collection or for rollover. The nations of Peru, Mexico, Turkey, Zaire and Italy spring immediately to mind in this regard. Those nations cannot pay, nor can their obligations be rolled over again. Without a war, Rockefeller's bloated financial bubble will begin to burst through the end of this month, threatening to lead into a 1931-style "Kreditanstalt" chain reaction collapse of international banking institutions by the end of the summer.

Under such circumstances, the political signals and activities emanating from Western Europe will rapidly converge during the next weeks on the creation of the institutions for a new world monetary system based on hard-commodity credit extensions — institutions capable of bringing Europe, the Third World and the Comecon nations under the shelter of new, viable production and trading agreements, as specified by U.S. Labor Party Chairman Lyndon LaRouche in his International Development Bank proposal. Such developments under the necessity of the impending unravelling of David Rockefeller's dollar system is already implicit in recent

Italian government official proposals for the establishment of a European Import-Export bank.

Such proposals will not necessarily be the subject of overt discussions at the Belgrade Conference itself. However, it is certain that, during the course of semi-official and backroom discussions preparatory to Belgrade, the elaboration for implementation of Labor Party-initiated agenda items will be among the most urgent issues. Moreover, the way the world political economic system will look by the end of this summer will itself be largely conditioned by the velocity and determination with which such Labor Party-initiated proposals are implemented.

In short, the world is about to demonstrate forcefully that it can get on quite well without the Rockefeller's bankrupt dollar monetary system. This, in turn, means that the U.S.-based skilled and semi-skilled labor movement has to assist political, industrial and related institutions in this nations to get their own accounts straightened out very rapidly. Otherwise, assuming we avoid the present dangers of war, the nation as a whole is going to get badly screwed as the rest of the world does away with the international legacy of the Rockefellers.

To survive through the upcoming process as a viable technological progress-oriented industrial power, the

U.S. needs a rapid return to the hard-commodity economic policies pioneered by Alexander Hamilton and spelled out in the USLP's Third National Bank proposal. Agreement must quickly be reached on the establishment of such a hard commodity-based national banking system to increase the nation's industrial and related export capabilities. Political and economic measures

must be taken to minimize and contain the potential for uncontrolled damage to the national economy which will ensue if the accelerating European motion towards a new monetary system is not met by resolute and appropriately compatible political action from this side of the Atlantic.

— Christopher White

Euro Press Agrees Carter Is Losing Europe

Les Echos, June 15, by Michel Garibal:

...Mr. Brezhnev does not want the balance to be drawn up in Belgrade for the two years that have elapsed since the signing of the Helsinki agreements.

Paradoxically, Mr. Brezhnev could well receive some rather significant support from several European countries that are right now uneasy over some uncertainties in U.S. foreign policy. France and West Germany do not want to make the Belgrade Conference a tribunal where the Soviet Union would be the No. 1 defendant. Paris and Bonn have already warned Washington that the U.S. is running the risk of provoking an ideological war with Moscow that would bring about effects contrary to those pursued by the agreement. The two capitals consider that the finality of the Helsinki agreements has not been to reform the world morally but foremost to strengthen detente....

West Germany is urging a strengthening of the economic ties (between East and West) as a result of its traditional policy....But on this question also, the BRD has received some support from France and the other western countries....

New York Times, June 15: column by James Reston, written in Bonn, West Germany:

Jimmy Carter didn't think much about the German problem when he started his human rights campaign, but he is running into problems here he didn't expect and, despite his serious discussions with Chancellor Schmidt at the summit meeting in London, didn't resolve....

President Carter helped this process by dramatizing "human rights" at the beginning, officials here say, but they add that maybe he's pushing it too far, at least in Germany. He's creating tension and even fear in Eastern Europe and Moscow, they say, and the more tension, the less chance of getting people out of East Germany....

What may be much more important is that Chancellor Schmidt discussed this dilemma between the principle and the practical with President Carter at the summit and thought they had come to an agreement. The press reported they had resolved their differences, but that's not what I have been hearing in Bonn....Officials here say, President Carter seems to be in the headlines every day proclaiming his allegiance to the Western alliance but provoking the Soviets.

Obviously, there is either a serious problem or a misunderstanding between Mr. Carter and Mr. Schmidt. Their London agreement had broken down, not only on human rights but on consultation over arms control and

the Middle East. Washington and Bonn are the heart of the NATO alliance, and for the moment, if I hear the melody, they are clearly out of touch.

President Carter would probably be startled to hear the doubts being expressed here. They say that Chancellor Schmidt, President Giscard d'Estaing and Prime Minister Callaghan are Carter allies who believe in his objectives, but that he has disappointed them and particularly Mr. Schmidt, since they met last month in London.

Sueddeutsche Zeitung, June 11, editorial by Josef Riedmiller, "An Aspect of Helsinki":

...Carter's truly missionary determination to help human rights become valid all over the world, and especially in the East bloc, is not meeting with unlimited approval in either the United States or among the allies. The reason for this is not any doubts about the truth or legitimacy of Carter's demands, but doubt about the success of his actions....

Carter's advocacy of human rights is giving civil rights advocates the feeling that their cause has now become a negotiating point of international politics, and that they are standing on firm foundations, which cannot be undermined by their opponents without endangering detente and the increasing the economic advantages to the East bloc which come from detente. This may be a correct assumption, so long as the eastern regimes consider the civil rights movement a transient and peripheral phenomenon, which cannot become dangerous to the existing power. But if this dissent between the governing and the governed assumes a form of "destabilizing" the East bloc, then these leaders would not hesitate to take a firm grip on their societies — just like before the detente phase.

Financial Times, June 15, "The Human Rights Time-Bomb Set for Belgrade", by Malcolm Rutherford:

...It is perfectly possible, however, that far from fostering detente, the conference could make existing tensions worse, the Russians could walk out. In that case, a situation like the Cold War could occur. There might also be a much more serious danger — from the western point of view — of a rift between Western Europe and the U.S. as the Europeans blamed the Americans for excessive zeal in the cause of human rights. A few weeks ago, the possibility of such drama would have seemed remote. The western participants in the Belgrade meeting had been quietly drawing up their negotiating position. The Europeans among them thought they had