

Stop Rockefeller's Energy Policy Before It's Too Late

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., U.S. Labor Party Chairman, issued the following statement on Jimmy Carter's April 18, energy message to the American people:

Americans in their fifties or older immediately recognize Carter's energy policy as a demand that they relive the agonies of the Great Depression of 1929.

The Congress ought to publish the collection of governmental and industry reports concerning the problems faced by the war mobilization — effort during the 1940-1941 period. Those reports on the collapsing condition of industry, and loss of skills by our grey-faced labor force of 1940-1941, wipe away in one blow the drivellings of energy czar Schlesinger and others and Schlesinger's fraud: "There is no connection between rising energy consumption and growth in the real GNP."

Although the 1929-1939 bitterness of the Great Depression is the U.S. precedent for Carter's proposed program, the Carter program goes far beyond even the cruel winter of 1932-1933 in its specified goals. There is only one modern precedent for the savagery of the "labor-intensive" austerity Carter proposes: Hitler's Germany.

Only in Hitler's Germany, and especially the nazi "labor-intensive" and deindustrialization policies in the occupied territories, is there a precedent for the magnitude of energy cuts which the Carter-Schlesinger-Bundy package demands.

Energy Supplies

Carter's Administration is lying when it asserts that we face an objective energy shortage. Let this be underlined: *The Carter Administration is not honestly mistaken, it is lying.*

With combined fission-energy programs and high-technology extraction and use of fossil fuels, the world would face no necessary energy-shortage into the twenty-first century. However, to expand our energy resources adequately to maintain technological and economic progress, we must begin the process of converting the world into a fusion-based energy economy during the next decade, the 1980s.

Take the most basic facts about energy point-by-point, and then turn attention to the hard truth, the real reasons the Carter Administration is proposing its fraudulent, and indeed criminal energy program.

The world has massive fossil fuel supplies — petroleum, coal, and natural gas. The potential shortages we might face during the 1990s would occur only if we failed to make progress in technology of extraction and combustion.

Petroleum: The difficulty of defining petroleum reserves is the fact that *accessible reserves* and *total reserves* are two different quantities. The problem is getting to the oil, and getting it out economically. Both of these problems are problems of technology.

If we draw a line at the present level of exploration and extraction technologies, if we stop advances in technology, then *accessible reserves* fall automatically way below *total reserves*. conversely, if we make it a policy to accelerate the development of exploration and extraction technologies, we will expand the quantity of accessible reserves by very large amounts.

This is an old story. During the sixteenth century, England was running out of forests because of use of wood and charcoal as basic fuels. Tudor England launched a major effort to develop coal as a fuel and the problem was solved. Any time the progress of technology is stopped, humanity faces a potential resource shortage. If technological progress is pushed properly, the primary resource shortage disappears.

Coal: We have coal reserves adequate for an estimated 200 years. Here, the policy problem is both the technology of extraction and the technology of combustion.

The Rockefeller and related interests have bought heavily into coal reserves — "cornering the market", so to speak — and are demanding that the taxpayers *pour out hundreds of billions of dollars* to make the Rockefellers rich through use of an insanely incompetent technology called "coal gasification."

There are two points at which we can reduce energy costs: extraction and combustion. To reduce the energy-cost at the point of combustion means to increase the efficiency of combustion. There is only one basic way in which to increase the efficiency of combustion by significant ratios: Operate the combustion process at much-higher temperatures.

We should be burning fossil fuels and running large-scale combustion processes generally at no lower than 3,000 to 5,000 degrees, and up to levels of thousands of degrees higher for more sophisticated processes. In large-scale combustion of fossil fuels, in utility power and industrial applications, we should be committed to rapidly developing combustion efficiencies in the order of from 40 percent to 60 percent, and aiming upward toward the 90 percent levels potentially available with MHD techniques.

More efficient combustion means less thermal and chemical waste-product, and permits us to burn high-sulfur fuels without putting pollutant by-products into the atmosphere.

These points cover the gist of our fossil fuel energy policy. Now, turn to the basic facts of nuclear and thermonuclear energy policies.

The future energy-source of the human race is fusion energy. For practical purposes of illustration, we can say that we must begin fusion-energy production on a pilot-scale during the 1980s, and reach a full-scale fusion economy during the early decades of the coming century. To all intents and purposes, that covers the human race's foreseeable energy needs fully for at least a thousand years to come. The way to get into a fusion-energy technology and economy is to push immediately ahead with forced developing of existing and on-line fusion-energy technologies.

The need for forced development of fusion energy *now* is not essentially because of energy shortages which might otherwise be faced during this century. With a fast breeder technology, the world could move comfortably into the twenty-first century on the basis of early-twentieth century rates of overall technological progress. What we most urgently require from thermonuclear energy programs are the by-products of fusion-energy production.

We need high-energy plasma technology. Once we have such plasma technologies the human race no longer faces a primary resources problem on any front. With high-energy plasma technology, the lowest grades of ore, including basalt and granite become economical mineral sources.

With fusion energy, we can solve major problems the world needs to solve, which we could not solve with a fossil-fission energy technology.

The points just made are merely basic scientific and engineering facts, the common property of every authoritative source to which any government of the United States could turn for advice on energy and related questions. Therefore, it is clear that the Carter Administration's policy is not merely a mistake, but an outright lie.

Why

Carter's effort in behalf of his proposed policy is in itself a major impeachable offense of every officer of the Administration, including Jimmy Carter, responsible for this proposal to destroy the most vital interests of our nation.

Rockefeller's multi-hundred-billion dollar coal gasification swindle illustrates the point that the Carter energy proposals have nothing to do with concern over (in fact non-existent) energy problems. It has exactly the same motives as the Hitler Germany "labor intensive" (*primitiv bauarbeit*) austerity program, the program on which the Carter proposals are directly modeled.

As a result of the Versailles Treaty, Weimar Germany had an insoluble foreign and domestic debt problem. This was temporarily rolled over by the 1923-1924 negotiation and implementation of the Dawes Plan. A second try, the later Young Plan, failed. From 1928 on, under the guidance of Hjalmar Schacht, the unworkable Young Plan was abandoned in favor of savage cuts in wages and capital development, scraping the flesh, blood, and steel out of the German population and industry in the effort to

roll over Germany's cancerously self-expanding debt-structures.

This 1929-1932 effort, the Schacht pilot-model for the Carter Administration policy, produced a social crisis in Germany. Hjalmar Schacht, during 1932, warned the financiers in London and New York City that Hitler was beginning to lose his influence, and that Schacht required their support for putting Hitler immediately into power if Germany's debt structure was not to collapse.

With the aid of the Nazis, Schacht transformed Germany into a war-economy, including the recruiting of the unemployed into the "labor-intensive" *arbeitsdienst* program upon which the Humphrey-Hawkins bill and related legislation are directly modeled.

The Schacht-Hitler 1933-1936 version of Carter's proposal didn't work. By 1936, even top Nazis were complaining to Hitler that Schacht's "Carter energy policy" was leading to an early breakdown of the economy's industries and labor force. The industrialists agreed with these warnings. The accelerating looting of Germany to save Schacht's debt-structure could no longer be tolerated without destroying Germany's ability to produce.

As a result of the 1936-1937 crisis produced by the initial Hitler-Schacht model of Carter's program, Germany turned from increasing the looting against its own population and industries *to looting its neighbors*.

Schacht's problems of 1928-1933 were identical with those of David Rockefeller today. That is the "why" of David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission Carter Administration, and that is the "why" of Carter's domestic and foreign policy capers. The "energy package" is nothing but the effort to push down a savage fascist economic-austerity, modeled upon Hitler's, upon both the United States and the rest of the countries presently under the monetary control of the bankrupt International Monetary Fund.

The Alternative

The crushing of the vital interests of the United States in the interests of a foreign power — the International Monetary Fund and the Eurodollar swindle — is nothing but treason against the United States according to the clear intent of the U.S. Constitution on this point. Carter's energy program and its auxiliary packages must be stopped cold.

Yes, the United States must indeed mobilize as if for war — against the deadly adversary in whose interests Carter is acting.

In stopping this treasonous Carter policy, we must also be responsible in understanding the immediate consequences of such a successful defense of our nation. Defeating Carter's energy policy and preventing Carter from starting up a new Vietnam in central and southern Africa means the end of the financial power of the Rockefeller interests.

We must be prepared to deal with that situation. We must immediately enact legislation which will protect essential banking and related institutions of credit and deposit from chain-reaction collapse as David Rockefeller and company go under. We must establish quickly a new, hard currency source of credit to pour capital into

high-technology job-creation in manufacturing, utilities, mining, transportation, and construction, and into both agriculture and research and development programs.

What will be required is the establishment of a national bank, for which local banks act as correspondents, to get the credit into the places where it will bring our production back up toward capacity levels and get us out of this

deepening depression.

We need a government that can do that job. Impeach the Carter Administration and quickly install a new President and Administration, dedicated to act in concert with a mobilized Congress, to get us out of this depression.

Lyndon H. LaRouche

Congressional Stampede Against Carter's Energy Package

Less than 48 hours after Jimmy Carter's April 21 presentation of his Administration's energy program to Congress, the *Baltimore Sun* reported the Democratic leadership in Congress was scrambling "to prevent a stampede of opposition" from the President's own party. Both Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd (D-W.Va.) and Speaker of the House Thomas O'Neill (D-Mass.) were described as "hopeful" the President's package could be passed "in September or October" before Congress adjourns; Deputy House Majority Whip Rosentkowski (D-Ill.) observed more honestly "That program is going to be difficult if not impossible to get people to vote for. People up here have to get reelected, but Carter doesn't seem to realize that."

As Democrats, particularly those from industrial constituencies, scrambled to disassociate themselves from energy package, Republican leaders Howard Baker (Senate Minority leader), John Rhodes (House Minority leader) and Republican National Committee chairman Bill Brock issued statements condemning the Carter plan as "not the American way" and stressing expanded energy production and high technology development of alternate energy sources as the solution to the USA's energy needs.

It was a Democrat, however, who most accurately assessed the content of the Administration's energy package. "It is treasonous," said Rep. Jack Hightower of Texas.

In this atmosphere, even such dependable allies of the Rockefeller interests as Senators Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) and Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) were forced to voice "reservations" about aspects of the program, notably the gasoline tax proposals, which Kennedy complained "hit the average worker too hard."

The explosion of opposition has been so violent that the Administration's lieutenants in Congress are telling the press that the first hearings on the Carter package will not occur for nearly a month, to give the situation a chance to cool down.

While the Administration house organs, the *Washington Post* and *New York Times*, are striving to picture the program as passable after a "tough fight," press in West Germany flatly reported it doesn't have a chance. Barring the creation of a "national emergency" in the USA through war or terrorism, that assessment is undoubtedly correct.

The Carter team is presently pursuing a "divide and conquer" strategy, attempting to channel the population's anger against the gas tax proposals in particular, generally seeking to play the program as a series of "constituency" issues subject to negotiation with individual interest groups; and attempting to pit fuel producing states in the south and southwest against the industrial northeast and midwest.

This "profiling" of Congress promises to be no more successful than the Administration's recent SALT II gambit with the Soviet Union.

First of all, the AFL-CIO organized labor-Democratic Party apparatus on which Carter depended to put him in the White House, and on which his congressional majority rests, is becoming convinced that American workers will not tolerate the energy program. Following Carter's nationally televised April 18 preliminary sales pitch for the Rockefeller energy policy, U.S. Labor Party lobbyists in Washington, D.C. found a mood of rising panic, particularly among Democrats from industrial areas, alerted to the devastating impact of the plan on the U.S. economy. A score of such Congressmen contacted early in the week were privately questioning the entire "conservation is our best source of energy" premise of the Carter program, ready to discuss a comprehensive alternative energy policy — all the way up to the USLP's Third National Bank proposal for reorganizing the U.S. financial sector. Most were extremely inquisitive about the Administration's motivations for putting forward a "Pearl Harbor" package which offered nothing but "sacrifice," and listened respectfully as representatives from the party which is well-known as the most vocal and hard-hitting opposition to Carter since his nomination as the Democratic candidate last summer unraveled the fascist "logic" behind the Carter proposals. "I've never heard opposition to the program expressed so cogently and forcefully. You could be right on down the line," was the way a staffer for a top Democratic policymaking body in the Senate expressed a general mood.

Highly placed labor officials in Washington are now reporting that the AFL-CIO union bureaucracy is split with a section of the leadership "wanting to hold the line and not go for the jugular against Carter, others know that if we don't go for the jugular, we're going to get killed." In the Building Trades, United Steelworkers,