

EXCLUSIVE

# The 'Spirit Of Camp Pocantico'

*The following statement was issued on June 9th, 1977 by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. U.S. Labor Party Chairman and Presidential candidate:*

Reports and vibrations picked up during the past week from key points around the world indicate that all the world's forces are moving into next week's Belgrade conference with various combinations of first-line and fall-back positions. The most significant of these developments, apart from a consolidation of the new Soviet postures, is the centrifugal motion among British and American financier circles centering around a high-level meeting in Tokyo and another held at the Rockefellers' Pocantico Hills estate.

The most up-front of all the current operational postures for Belgrade is the Carter Administration's effort to disrupt the conference with a great howling and shrieking over what are called "human rights." The announced object of that nonsense is to attempt to align Western Europe against the Soviets on this issue, and to force the Soviets to retreat in the manner of a kicked dog. All indications are that that Carter tactic will not work. If it does not work, that signals that the Soviet leadership is unbluffable; it signals that a continuation of the Carter confrontationist policy leads to absolute certainty of general, intercontinental thermonuclear war.

In such a case, most probably, out goes Brzezinski's policy and so-called "style." Out goes Schlesinger's "aura of power" (bluff). Both the Rockefeller-centered and British-centered financier-political factional alignments are then faced with the choice between pushing ahead to a certain thermonuclear war or rushing into a fall-back position. Fall-back positions are being visibly developed all around. Some of the options are clear; there are undoubtedly others, hidden beneath thick veils of deception.

## *The Rockefeller Shift*

It has been the developing position of British and financially-allied interests over months that something like the U.S. Labor Party's International Development Bank proposal was probably an included feature of any workable solution to the impending general collapse of the monetary system. High-level reports indicate that just such an option was mooted behind closed doors at a recent Tokyo meeting. In brief, if present "bail-out" options fail, let the Rockefeller and allied interests go under and save the rest of the banking system along lines converging on the U.S. Labor Party's proposals.

More recently, it is apparent that the Rockefeller family made a countermove, a shift highlighted by a recent shindig at the Pocantico estate. On the basis of results, one would tentatively judge that Nelson

Rockefeller has temporarily prevailed in family war-councils over Chase Manhattan's David.

The first sign of the shift in Rockefeller postures and alignments occurred immediately following the Memorial Day weekend. During the weekend, this writer had issued an alert warning, proposing that special watch be maintained for possible military and allied moves by Carter Administration forces, on the basis of the strategic judgment that the Rockefellers had their backs to the wall and would not let much time pass without a countermeasure to improve their position. They moved: *on the policy front*, obviously consolidating a variety of preparatory efforts of the immediately preceding period.

The first signal of a backroom deal came in the form of an abrupt, post-weekend shift among Republicans. Up to the beginning of the weekend, the debate over General Singlaub's evaluations signalled a rallying of forces to close in on the Carter Administration on the war issue. After the weekend, Senator Robert Dole of Kansas led a broad and profound shift in Republican postures, making peace with the Carter Administration. Subsequently, there came the news of impending revival of the B-1 bomber program and a Schlesinger turn-about on the nuclear energy question. Later, we unearthed information concerning the Pocantico estate shindig and correlated discussions.

Look at the problem from the Rockefellers' standpoint for a moment. If Brzezinski falls on his face at Belgrade, if the continuation of the gigantic bluff clearly means intercontinental war, what are the options of the Rockefellers *as a political interest*? Fundamentally, they have the same option as the British-centered financier-political interests: to adapt *to some version* of the Labor Party's International Development Bank proposal.

The problem works out as follows. The strategy of the Carter Administration to date has been an immediate thermonuclear showdown with the Warsaw Pact. Since Carter's labor-intensive austerity package and his "energy policy" means that the United States would tend to become a third-rate economic and military power relative to the Warsaw Pact over the several years ahead, with previous Carter policies a 1977 thermonuclear showdown with the Soviet leadership is a now-or-never proposition. If the Rockefeller forces decide that a 1977 showdown is out of all reasonable considerations of risk, then they must dump the labor-intensive austerity and "energy policies" and go for an economic policy agreeable to a sustained U.S. military build-up.

However, such an economic policy cannot work within the context of the austerity bail-out policies of the IMF's Witteveen or the World Bank's Robert McNamara. In

order to maintain U.S. economic strength, and to hold the NATO alliance together, the U.S. must accept widespread "freezing" (debt moratoria) of unpayable developing-sector external financial debt. If the developing sectors cannot increase their imports, then the USA's exports will continue to drop catastrophically. That means a U.S. depression worse than that of the 1930s.

The only way in which the Rockefeller-centered financial interests could be saved from collapse would be the use of the U.S. national debt to fund vastly expanded exports into the developing sector, giving the U.S. dollar the degree of relative "hardness" needed to carry forward a mass of "frozen" non-performing holdings of the Rockefeller and related interests.

There are many profound reasons why such a Rockefeller package is not in the interests of the United States and would not work in the long run. However, we are considering the Rockefellers' point of view, and therefore must limit our attention for the moment to short-term and intermediate-term effects. The next three to four years are what we must consider in appraising *their* point of view.

#### *The Conflict*

The situation is one of war between allied forces, an effort by the British-centered and Rockefeller-centered forces to outmaneuver one another while maintaining a kind of alliance on the main points of currently operational policies. This is complicated by the fact that when a financial interest is engaged in attempting to unload bad paper he does not spoil the seller's market by spreading about his true opinion of bad paper. (Does a used car salesman spread the word that his offerings are clunkers on the verge of collapse?) Smiling faces keep up pretenses in favor of knife-in-the-back operations.

On the monetary front, the British-centered financial-political combinations have the relative advantage in a showdown. Thus, to survive under fall-back-option conditions, the Rockefellers are obliged to resort to their potentially powerful advantage against the British-centered interests: the potential industrial power of the U.S. economy. If they do not, the British-centered interests will emerge from any fall-back maneuver with David Rockefeller's financial head stuck on the wall of City of London trophy-room display. To make such an option work, the Rockefellers have to turn to the American industrialist factions.

#### *How It Was Set Up*

Up to the week preceding the April 28, 1977 Pittsburgh Fusion Energy Foundation conference, the U.S. forces allied politically with the British-centered perceptions were keeping an option in the pro-industrial camp. Excepting the turn of British policy in Africa around Foreign Minister Owen and the turn in France, the major financial-political combinations opposed to the Rockefellers had the option of aligning with the American Whig forces. During that week, the British-centered forces sold out the flank of the American Whigs. Manifestly, the Rockefellers took advantage of the cupidity and stupidity of the British-centered forces. Now, for the moment, the majority of the Republican

Party leadership and what it represents, is back in Nelson Rockefeller's fold.

This creates a number of byzantine alternatives. The only option remaining to the British-centered forces is to sabotage the Carter Administration's Belgrade caper. If the British-centered forces "get there first" in securing Middle East peace and Mediterranean security, they have the option on OPEC-linked hard-commodity reserves and the T-ruble connection, and can build a new monetary system around the Mediterranean as its center-of-gravity. Then, Rockefeller takes the plunge. If they do not, then Rockefeller has the advantage, and ends up picking the British-centered interests' pockets amost at leisure.

As noted before, the Rockefeller caper has the ring of Nelson, and not David. Unless Belgrade goes pretty much according to Brzezinski's script, David Rockefeller's strategic game is stuck in an impasse. Bug brother Nelson then steps in to rescue David from the mess. One can almost hear Nelson's key spokesmen sadistically instructing David's boys: "Political muscle is what makes paper powerful." David has attempted to dictate political power from a monetary position; Nelson's style is to dictate monetary advantage from a standpoint of political power.

Those may not yet be conscious Rockefeller perceptions, but they represent the asymptotes upon which Rockefeller *pragmatic* perceptions are obliged to converge.

This does not mean that Nelson has gone over to a large degree of agreement with the Labor Party proposals. Rather, it echoes the way in which monetarist and industrialist interests were slammed together under the Nazi regime. Austerity is Rockefeller policy — Nelson's or David's — but the model now emerging around the B-1 package echoes the way in which the Rockefeller-linked monetarist interests in Hjalmar Schacht's Germany bought off the anti-Hitler industrialist forces by offering them military contracts in place of "Rapallo"-style trade with the Soviet Union.

A retreat from Belgrade to a Nelson Rockefeller-conservative alliance only, at best, postpones rather than ends the danger of thermonuclear war.

A Rockefeller policy will tend intrinsically to be modelled upon the Nazi example. There will be a massive input of capital into military spending and development, and a nuclear energy policy consistent with the scale of military spending expected. There will, however, be a military-economy style of economic recovery like that of post-1933 Nazi Germany, with massive austerity, rising tax burdens and consumer commodities inflation and union-busting. As occurred in Nazi Germany by 1936-1937, the austerity side of the package will impel the internal U.S. economy toward breakdown, and, then, at best, the same impulse that drove Hitler to war from 1938 onwards, will govern the ruling political forces in the U.S.A.

#### *Strategic Stupidity*

If that scenario is played out, then, instead of thermonuclear war in 1977, we would have a thermonuclear war by about 1980 — which the United States would lose. The B-1 bomber is symptomatic of that fact.

Anyone who takes the \$100-plus billions B-1 program seriously as a military capabilities program is, as the saying goes, some kind of a nut. The new series of weapons being developed in the Soviet Union are converting all bombers of the future into the equivalent of targets for a captive duckshoot. In terms of military technology, the bomber and the tactical-support aircraft (as a form of artillery) are on their last legs — rendering the interceptor similarly almost obsolete.

Bombers and tactical-support aircraft are, in terms of military history, an intermediate phase in the evolution of artillery, a way of delivering artillery fire over longer distances and with greater accuracy than by existing modes of artillery as such. As rockets are freed from fixed-launch positionings and increase their accuracy, and as yields of warheads are qualitatively augmented toward the 100-megaton range by Soviet and related advances in plasma physics, all the advantages of manned, surrogate forms of aerial artillery platforms vanish, and the aerial artillery-platform is distinguished as a target for the new generations of counter-measures available.

The manned aircraft does not vanish. As existing forms of manned aerial artillery-platforms become obsolete means, the military aircraft of the future supplements the principle of mounted shock-infantry and brigades of armed personnel carriers as a means for delivering shock-infantry brigades to their fighting positions. The military aircraft of the future will be an arm of the mounted infantry and cavalry, not the artillery.

A manned aircraft is a manned aircraft. When it flies low or high, fast or creeping, whatever confetti and armament it carries, whether its artillery is a gravity-bomb, a fired projectile or a rocket, the basic principle of killing such a craft remains the same, as the principle of killing a sub or tank also remains constant. Contrary to Warner Communications' "super-hero" comic features for infantile masturbators, there are no invulnerable miracle-weapons. The principle of killing a manned aircraft is that *it moves in the sky*, whether at low, high, or middle altitudes, and therefore inherently the most eminently detectable and targetable of all military instruments! Since we have entered technologically into a new range of means for detection (at all altitudes), and entirely new means of killing such a craft upon detection, the flying artillery platform is on the verge of joining the massed-cavalry charge in the military museum.

The fact that flying personnel carriers will still be useful follows from the way in which wars of the present and immediate future would be fought. The infantry assaults follow the massed artillery "sanitization," at a point at which the initial capabilities of principal forces have been expended. Ground warfare is the second phase of modern thermonuclear warfare, the war-winning phase, in which the infantry once again asserts its fundamental position in war. The aircraft deployed as part of the *first phase* of warfare will shortly become principally targets of little net effectiveness. After the first phase has ended, the effects of the first phase will leave holes in the adversary's anti-aircraft defense capabilities into which surviving personnel carriers can deploy with a militarily tolerable degree of risk.

The related problem is that the U.S. strategic establishment has been saturated to the ears over a period of 30 years with the utopian perversion of the old World War II "air-power" doctrine. They are operating on the Kissinger-McNamara doctrine of programmable escalation options within the asymptotic limits of maximum deterrent capability.

They have the two phases of war backwards. With or without an accompanied measured "counter-force" launch against an adversary's strategic first-line capabilities, their strategic scenarios are all premised on the imbecilic, 18th-century-modelled assumption that adversaries will attempt to seek a winning decision rather than winning an actual war. That is, as in chess, the player who sees his future game is lost, gives up — acknowledges that he has lost the decision — without playing out the game to the end. This is based on the assumption that to win a military decision at the lowest relative risk of invoking the adversary's total "deterrent capability," forces will fight slightly ABC-escalated conventional wars first, before going to the decision for full deterrent deployment.

This foolish conviction has been reenforced by a gross misevaluation of the Vietnam War. It has been assumed that Soviet strategic response to the U.S. involvement in Vietnam is a model for a direct confrontation with Warsaw Pact forces' basic strategic capabilities. They overlook the gist of Soviet Vietnam policy: to avoid beginning a direct encounter between Warsaw Pact and NATO forces, because such an encounter begins with a total Hour-One deployment of intercontinental ABC capabilities.

So, in consequence, a weapon, the B-1, was put up for consideration on the basis of a war-fighting scenario which will cease to exist before the first flight comes off the runway.

The related economic-policy problem is this. The ability of a nation to develop a realized war-winning capability depends upon its realization of developed technological and cultural advantages in depth. It is the broad economic base of a society which determines its strategic potentialities in all respects. The strategic folly of the recent alliance of Rockefeller and some conservative forces is that they are committed to a loser's strategic economic policy, and are attempting to salvage a war-winning military strategy within a loser's overall policy.

#### *Culture is Decisive*

There are three distinguishable levels of culture in the so-called industrialized nations.

The highest level of culture in the world today is represented by the leadership of the U.S. Labor Party and its circles of scientific collaborators. This is a culture based on a positive conception of non-linear, negentropic processes as the fundamental ordering of nature.

The next highest-level of culture is represented by Soviet science. Soviet ideology in general is inferior to the Labor Party's culture because it clings to a mechanistic conception of the lawful ordering of nature. However, within that crippling ideological flaw, Soviet theoretical-empirical science is overall between two and four years ahead of the prevailing level in Western Europe and North America.

On the lowest level is the monetarism-dominated empiricist-nominalist or pragmatist culture dominant in the United States and British leading circles.

This configuration is not accidental. We of the Labor Party are the most advanced, modern continuation of the Erasmian tradition in European culture, the tradition exemplified by Descartes, Leibniz, and the faction of French Freemasons who become the followers of Benjamin Franklin. Opposite to us, representing the Lowest relative level of moral and intellectual culture are the heirs of Franklin's enemies, the heirs of Pitt, Hume, Bentham, and Marat: the monetarist faction against which the American Revolution was fought. In between, historically semi-Erasmian humanists who have compromised intellectually with nominalist ideology, are the Soviets.

Otherwise, as I have developed this in my *The Case of Walter Lippmann*, the skilled American trade-unionist, the black worker who wishes to become a skilled trade-unionist or professional, and the hard-core of our industrially oriented population, our high-technology farmers are also Erasmians *by instinct*, the heirs of Benjamin Franklin *by instinct*.

At the moment, you face a Hobson's choice: Do you wish to die in thermonuclear war during 1977 because of the Carter Administration's presently operational policy, or do you wish to die of thermonuclear war about 1980, because of the Rockefellers' fall-back position for the case the Belgrade caper fails?

Your alternative is the Labor Party. Can you, at last, begin to get it through your stubborn heads that you have no other real alternative?

## Nelson Rockefeller Eyes The Vice-Presidency

*The following statement was released on June 11 by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., U.S. Labor Party chairman and presidential candidate:*

There is more than a hint in the wind stirred up by Henry Kissinger's current travels, that Nelson A. Rockefeller might be president of the United States by early 1978. The boys in the backroom have had it with the bungling incompetence of the Carter Administration and Nelson is heading up one of the major combinations planning the process of making replacements.

The urgent practical question this places before the nation and the world is: What sort of a policy will emerge from the process of Cartergating? A critical look at preliminary indications of Nelson's and Henry Kissinger's policy-changes is a useful way of defining all the major options for the period immediately ahead.

The fact that Nelson is now back in the ranks of contenders for the Presidency is important. Whether he is actually nominated as Walter Mondale's replacement — clearing the way for the subsequent Carter resignation — is not in itself the issue. The fact that he must now be considered a contender forces attention to the kinds of policy questions to be faced.

### *David Rockefeller's Big Fumble*

On performance, one must conclude that the heirs of John D. Rockefeller II operate as a family council in making the governing decisions of the family forces as a whole. Until most recently, David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission and its Institute for Policy Studies "left CIA" sidekick have obviously had the upper hand. Chase Manhattan was the center of policy-interest perceptions, and David's Zbigniew Brzezinski expressed the "new style" to replace that of Nelson's Henry Kissinger. Under Brzezinski and Brzezinski's puppet Carter, things went rapidly from bad to worse on all fronts. At the point

of imminent chaos, the family had, so to speak, another council meeting, bringing Nelson out of his semi-retirement.

It would be extravagant to suggest that the family has decided to put Nelson into the Presidency by way of the Vice-Presidency. Such possibilities may have been discreetly mooted, but that is not the primary purpose of the game presently afoot. The primary concern is to bring the family out topside of the looming monetary collapse. It is that primary concern which dictates going after the other crowd's boy, Walter Mondale. Not only does Mondale belong to the other crowd, but under present law, dumping the incumbent Vice-President first is the necessary preparatory step for replacing a President between elections. Nelson, who has never despised the ambition to become President, can not have overlooked the implications of the situation.

The central issues are the interconnections between the economic and military strategic situations. The Trilateral Commission's approach to the monetary problem was to impose a drastic form of Schachtian super-austerity on both the OECD and developing nations, a project which depended upon a Soviet leadership capitulation to a gigantic thermonuclear bluff. As the Carter "energy policy" exemplifies, the Trilateral austerity program meant that the NATO countries' industrial potential — and hence their war-fighting potential — would rapidly deteriorate during the 1977-1980 period relative to the Warsaw Pact. Furthermore, as long as some OECD and developing countries had the backing of Soviet economic cooperation, their political structures would resist the Trilateral Commission's hyperinflationary super-austerity package. Thus, unless the Soviet Union backed off from all cooperation with the "outside world," and also gave up a major part of its military potential during 1977, the Trilateral Commission package was a total failure.

With this thought in the background, consider each of