

Scandinavian institutions. But after the Carter-Brezhnev agreement on the SALT negotiations, everything was frozen on the Euroruble question, and the Soviets have returned to insisting on credits."

LaRouche says furthermore that he is in a position to explain, at least in broad outline, the terms of the agreement: the USSR withdraws from all areas of direct friction with the U.S. They agree furthermore not to publicize the results reached by scientists in Novosibirsk on matters of fusion energy, lasers, etc, and not attempt to disturb the role of the international monetary role of the dollar. This is a policy of moderation which, according to LaRouche, is dictated by the terror which the Soviets feel about nuclear confrontation and which has met with notable opposition from among certain Eastern countries as well as circles in the Soviet Union itself.

LaRouche's conversation is a sort of flood of lucid monomania which leaves very little room for the listener. There is no choice but to listen to what he has to say. "The only solution," he affirms, "is an alliance between the working class and industrialists in order to neutralize this problem of the 'lazzaroni'." (He says precisely that, using the Italian word, and by "lazzaroni" he means both the groupuscules as well as the rising

mass of lumpenproletariat and unemployed which constitutes, and not merely in Italy, an explosive mix).

"We have furthermore to force the USSR to make a monetary agreement. Brezhnev (LaRouche calmly gives advice to Brezhnev himself...) has to allow SALT to be lost" (the agreement for missile reduction) "and move with the MBFR" (agreement for mutual balanced force reduction). "Europe ought to demand of the Soviet Union that at the Belgrade conference there be included an economic agreement on the world monetary system and a reduction of the forces in Central Europe. My view," LaRouche underlines, "is coherent with that of the Gaullists, that of a Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals." Certainly, he concludes, all this would generate an immediate and definitive monetary crisis in the West. But, he adds, it would neutralize the risk of thermonuclear war.

In sum, we must jump from the frying pan of the monetary crisis in order to avoid finishing up in the thermonuclear fire. One almost wants to say: let the astrologer burn instead. But an annoying doubt remains: that at bottom, freed from all instrumental and contingent exhortations, rather than an astrologer LaRouche is a Cassandra.

Concorde A Sore Point In Europe's Relations With Carter

SPECIAL REPORT

Casting aside the environmental flap surrounding the issue of New York City landing-rights for the supersonic jetliner Concorde, France and Britain have identified Wall Street's attempts to impose its bankrupt economic policies on Western Europe at the expense of technological development as the real issue involved. The most explicit denunciation in a March 8 editorial in *Le Monde*, following the decision by the board of the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, known to be closely identified with former New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, to delay its judgment on the application for landing rights for the Concorde until after the close of British Prime Minister James Callaghan's visit to Washington this week. Said *Le Monde*: "How easy it is to take refuge behind the protection of the environment if one wants to defend the interests of U.S. companies. But what then should be said about the monetary pollution spread around the world by Washington which receives petrodollars and, instead of recycling them into investments, uses them to flood the short-term market."

This is precisely the alternative offered the Europeans by Wall Street, and the point could not have been made more explicitly. The *New York Post* and French finan-

cial daily *Les Echos* of March 8 both reported that French authorities have been informed that New York may reconsider its decision if France buys \$500 million worth of worthless long-term New York City bonds to help bail out the Rockefeller banks! As if this request were not enough of an insult to the intelligence of European leaders, the *New York Times* weighed in with a lead editorial March 9 which said that the SST is good only for "ego trips." The *Times* accused the French and British governments of "appalling ignorance of the American federal system and a revealing cynicism about environmental concerns." French and British threats of retaliation against U.S. airlines and commerce are "disgraceful," the *Times* huffed.

The Concorde battle has emerged as a leading edge of the confrontation taking shape between Western Europe and the Carter Administration on other major issues which will be stressed by Callaghan, including the financial shakiness of New York banks weighed down by Third World debt, Carter's confrontation policies with the Soviet Union over "human rights" — which have been denounced as "agent provocateur" by British Foreign Minister David Owen — and the daily escalating war tensions in southern Africa. Callaghan will give Carter "an undiluted dose of the area's mounting uneasiness about almost everything," in the words of the *Wall Street Journal*, and is expected to be more blunt with Carter behind closed doors than he has been so far in public.

France's Gaullists are giving Callaghan lots of encouragement. Former Minister of Foreign Affairs Michel Jobert has called on France to pull out of the Atlantic Alliance in retaliation for continued U.S. efforts to ensure technological domination over Western Europe. French Prime Minister Raymond Barre first stated politely that "we do not understand how an advanced achievement by European technology does not find on the overseas market the same access which Europe reserves for U. S. equipment," but then went on to warn that "if the Concorde is denied landing rights in New York, no one should doubt that the relations between our two countries will suffer from it."

Trade unions in both Britain and France are warning

that if the Concorde is banned from New York's John F. Kennedy Airport, they will refuse to refuel or service American planes landing in Paris and London, while highly placed French officials are threatening to refuse Pan American and TWA jets landing altogether.

The Europeans took their appeal straight to the American people's belief in progress when Jean-Claude Decaux, a leading spokesman for the French aerospace industry, purchased a full page ad in the *New York Times* to explain that "The French People cannot understand why the leading country on the path to free enterprise, the country that gave the world Charles Lindbergh and fantastic space achievements, would bar the fastest bird in the world, Concorde, from landing in New York."

Why The U.S. Does Not Have An SST

Following the Soviet launching of the first Sputnik in 1957 and other Russian advances in space technology, tremendous pressure was applied upon first the Eisenhower and then Kennedy Administrations by lobbying groups representing the advanced sectors of U.S. industry, to begin large-scale funding of a Supersonic Transport program. It was as a result of massive pressure and scare tactics deployed by the Rockefellers and environmental groups — similar to those used today against the development of the nuclear energy industry — that that effort was finally killed completely in 1971. The French and the British however, who signed the Concorde agreement in late 1962, successfully carried through their effort with tremendous spin-off effects in advanced techniques like electron beam welding, electrochemical and numerical control machining and others.

In 1963, Senator William Proxmire (D-Wisc), now Rockefeller's faithful head of the Senate Banking Committee — mounted the first challenge against Federal funding of the SST. Using the argument that such funding went contrary to the "capitalist ethic," Proxmire oversaw the sabotage effort until the project was finally killed.

President Nixon inadvertently gave the go-ahead for the Rockefellers to move in for the kill after his election when he set up an ad hoc committee to

review the status of the already floundering Boeing SST program. The committee's March 1969 report warned that the SST would never become enough of a commercial success to repay large government investment, that the technological fallout from the program would not be as great as that predicted, and added that if the U.S. was to abandon its program, the joint French-British project could not possibly be allowed to go through. The tactic now being used to prevent Concorde's landing at JFK was suggested: "U.S. noise standards could conceivably bar Concorde from access to the principal U.S. airports which would undoubtedly doom the Concorde program." The report claimed that pregnant women should not fly in the SST, that flights "could cause fractures in unrestrained persons(!)" and that the jet may have catastrophic effects on the weather and herald in another Ice Age.

Meanwhile, the Nader-like "Citizens' League Against the Sonic Boom" founded by Harvard Professor William Shurcliffe in 1967, in conjunction with the *New York Times*, were orchestrating the anti-SST campaign on the public opinion level, using completely irresponsible and unestablished reports of major catastrophies which would be unleashed by the jet's sonic boom.

President Nixon threw his full personal weight behind the SST in the final stages of the lobbying in 1971 and when the Senate, led by Proxmire, voted against SST funds 49 to 47, he warned that this "could be taken as a reversal of America's tradition of staying in the vanguard of technological advance."