

SPECIAL REPORTS:

COUNTERTERROR OPERATIONS IN EUROPE AND THE USA

French Oil Magazine:

**A Connection Between Ecology Terror
And Carter Energy Policy**

The following are excerpts from the Bulletin de l'Industrie Pétrolière (Bulletin of the Oil Industry), Aug. 8:

And what if the recent Parisian bombing aimed against M. Marcel Boiteux, General Director of Electricity of France and foremost proponent of nuclear plants (including the Super-Phenix), the murder of M. Jürgen Ponto, director of the Dresdner Bank and as such the most directly tied to the German nuclear plant construction companies (he sat on the administrative or over-seeing councils of KWU, Siemens-AEG, RWE and various Krupp interests), the riots of Creys-Malville, the trip of M. Cyrus Vance to the Middle East, and the energy program of President Carter were intimately related events? At first glance this question may seem absurd. But nonetheless certain American political circles, of course with limited scope, but not necessarily badly informed, believe it very strongly.

If we take the liberty, under exceptional circumstances, of invading the highly dangerous ground of American internal politics, it is because in this special case, everything is related. One cannot speak of the future of the oil industry today without taking into account at the same time, the nuclear question. One cannot deal with OPEC policy without taking American diplomacy into account. The oil savings, zero-growth, deflation, the sudden and incomprehensible decline of the dollar, the sudden turnabout of Iran in Stockholm (another event that appears incomprehensible) — here are a certain number of givens which are enough to intrigue even the oil circles accustomed to backroom actions of the diplomatic sphere and seasoned in the exercises of the Kriegspiel (war games) of geopolitics.

Thus, in the face of strange facts which lack rational basis at first sight we do not intend to listen to certain agencies from the other side of the Atlantic, whose game and agents are hard to sort out. However certain allegations appear sufficiently disquieting for us to report on them.

What struck us particularly is the financing of the ecology movements, the American ones to begin with, then the international ones, through certain "foundations." There the facts are indisputable since they are written in the accounts of the latter: The two foundations of the Rockefeller family (Chase Manhattan Bank), the

Ford Foundation and the Kaplan Foundation, have spent considerable funds over the past years to finance ecology organizations. It is disquieting and especially surprising if one knows — something well known on the other side of the Atlantic — that certain of those institutions with philanthropic aims (but allowing 'big families' to avoid paying certain taxes) have 'sprinkled' organizations whose participation in CIA networks has been more or less known, while others subsidized subversive activities with the goal, it is said, of dividing the opposition (opposition groups — ed).

All of this obviously looks very much like James Bond, SAS or other fiction novels and movies well-liked during summer vacations, but Rockefeller effectively seems strongly implicated in Carter's energy policy when Gerald O. Barney, director of Rockefeller Brothers Fund, during a recent press conference, did not hide that his Task Force Report, "The Unfinished Agenda," has inspired the present guest in the White House. It is the masterpiece of a group called the Environmental Agency Task Force, set up by the Fund, which has advocated a considerable reduction in U.S. energy consumption combined with a five-fold increase in domestic prices of the different energy sources. Of course it eliminated every thing concerning nuclear energy. Further it agrees with the Club of Rome and its advocacy of zero growth. This program has not only gotten the support of certain members of the Carter Administration, it has also gotten that of several Senators and members of the House of Representatives.

What's the goal? On a broad level, evidently a greater independence of the U.S. with respect to energy, and in this area the advice is the same as that of the American oil industry which obviously advocates an increase in the prices of oil and gas as well as a reduction in energy consumption. Knowing the links of the Rockefeller family with the big oil groups, this would thus be hardly surprising. But in fact, things seem to be much more complicated. In part because Rockefeller also supports Senators Church and Javits notably, which are not at all allied with oil companies as is well known, as well as different ecology organizations which, as for them, are even more hostile towards oil and nuclear which the U.S. oil companies want to develop.

If one is to believe the American observers mentioned earlier, the objective of the whole of the operations in-

volving the terrorist actions against proponents of nuclear energy in Europe and, against all the efforts aiming at developing nuclear energy on this side of the Atlantic, this objective would be to help out the oil producing states in their task and thereby channel their revenues towards the United States and most particularly the big banks like Chase Manhattan. If one knows that most of the OPEC countries incurred very heavy debts with the U.S. banks before the oil crisis, it would obviously be a roundabout way to allow them to pay back in due time the credits thus granted.

At the same time, the goal would be to end the attempted efforts by the Europeans to counter the American stronghold, and, in this respect, West Germany begins to play too much of an independent role which would worry Washington much more than the flirtations of M. Giscard D'Estaing with the Arab world. Is it for this reason that M. Ponto was on top of the list of men to be eliminated?

What happens to Creys Malville in all that? Isn't it in the logic of things that M. Carter, hostile to fast breeders at home, cannot allow their development elsewhere? There we are again getting back into the domain of political-fiction. Those who inspire the ecology movement in France as well as Germany are well known. Their financing comes, there too, from the United States and their grand theoreticians are Messieurs Alain Touraine, Serge Moscovici, and André Gorz (collaborator of the publication *Le Nouvel Observateur* under the name of Michel Bosquet), all three professors very involved during the May 1968 movement, and, at the time, in close touch with Daniel Cohn-Bendit.

Of course one should not take the effects for the cause and their positions are probably not born out of an alleged collusion with certain more or less suspicious American agencies. It is nonetheless true that the other side of the Atlantic is trying to take advantage of the situation. It is also a fact that the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (EPHE 6) (Practical School of Higher Studies — ed.) which is on top of the ecologist networks, gets its funding from the Ford Foundation and the Council on Cultural Freedom which — simple coincidence? — occupies the same building. The last mentioned organization would have been set up by the OSS since several of its founders come from the OSS. M. Moscovici who helps out Brice Lalonde is in charge of the Social Psychology Department at EPHE 6 and M. Touraine is the head of the Industrial Sociology Laboratory.

For some very influential U.S. political circles, support for leftist movements is a "basic" thing. It is often practiced in the United States itself on the principle that the best way to compromise an opposition movement is to divide it through the creation and the support of deviationist grouplets and organizations of the same tendency. It is thus that the CFDT would have received American 'encouragement' because (it was) competing with the Communist CGT. And the position taken by the CFDT on the ecology question is — as is well known — very close to that of the ecology movement which is the European transplant of similar initiatives on the other side of the Atlantic.

Everything mentioned above, though it makes certain

activities suspicious and makes one wonder about the close and bizarre cooperation of all the leftists and anarchists and — as Creys Malville demonstrated — terrorist grouplets and groups, is, however, not the most essential thing. What is much more important is the curious outcome of the ecology demonstration which pretended to be 'peaceful.' What are the facts?

A gathering of a few tens of thousands of persons — let's say about 30,000 where the organizers announced between 50 and 100 thousand (e.g. Michel Bosquet in *Le Nouvel Observateur*) — is it a success or a failure in a country of 50 million inhabitants? Was the impossibility of coming onto or even approaching the construction site a success or a failure?

One can wonder to what extent the violent confrontations which occurred on this occasion did not precisely aim at giving more publicity to a demonstration whose essential objective was to "strike" public opinion. The complacency of a certain press in this regard could be indicative of the success of such a strategy.

Since when can the action of a tiny minority, manipulated to top it all off, impose its will on a whole country? Is it to please the United States which, engaged in an anti-nuclear and especially anti-fast breeder policy, would be only too pleased that Europe be unable to show too much inclination toward independence by tightening the straitjacket of its ... dependency upon foreign energy resources?

French Press United Vs Ecologists

Le Figaro, Aug. 8, editorial by Serge Maffert, of the editorial board:

After describing the ecologists' aims and conduct Maffert comments that: "All this leads to perfectly reactionary behavior, in the proper sense of that term, and to the refusal of any social organization, of any economic or social progress. It is difficult to forget that the ancestor of this behavior in Europe, Charles Maurras who condemned all forms of science and technology, as well as national socialism whose philosophy, if one may call it that, notably preached a mystical return to nature."

L'Aurore, Aug. 9 editorial by Dominique Jamet:

"Everything is happening as if the anti-nuclear summer has discredited itself through its own excesses... It is the CGT (CP trade-union federation — ed.) and the French Communist Party which prefer the risks of progress to the certainties of shortages.... It is the European Economic Community which solemnly declares itself in favor of the fast breeders. The referendum suggested by Mr. Mitterrand (head of the Socialist Party — ed.) is after all, taking place daily already."

Le Monde, Aug. 7-8, free opinion column by professor and former student leader Edouard Labin:

"Do our leftists know that for Marx the essential task of the revolution was to retake the productive forces from

the faltering hands of the capitalists, so as to bring them to the highest level of development?... Believing that they fight for universal joy, the ecologists will only bring back universal frustration.”

L'Aurore science and technology column, Aug. 9, "Polluted man lives twice as long as the savage."
Interview with Roger Dumon, Director of R and D for the Heurtey Company, and scientific advisor of the governmental Agency for Energy Savings.

"Modern man, for example the Parisian, is described by our advocates of nature as a slave of industry, poisoned by the pollution of the town which makes him die prematurely. On the contrary the good savage in the large natural forest, has an easy life, without pollution and without restraints, which leads him to a happy and long old age. But when one looks at the statistics one realizes that the poor Parisian, the industrial man, has a life expectancy of over 72 years, while the man living in the tropical forests lives 32 to 37 years on the average... In another area the ecologists' struggle against chemical fertilizers is certainly one of the most beautiful examples of mystification. If the specter of famine has been able to definitively disappear from our industrialized countries, it is first of all thanks to chemical fertilizers."

Le Figaro, Aug. 10, "The Nation and Nuclear Energy," by Michel Debré:

"...Do you realize that a few months after the conquest of Austria, after Munich, a few weeks after the Prague coup, the Memel coup, hundreds and even thousands of people, among whom I do not doubt that there were many sincere ones, were demanding that a free hand be given to Hitler? Thus, in the few years which preceded the war, the infamous Fifth Column, which was active in the press, in the antichambers, in certain industrial circles, which insidiously penetrated political and higher administrative circles, found apparent popular support in a small passionate and naive group. It is not because the mediocrity of the political and military command led us to disaster in 1940 that it is opportune to forget or excuse a state of mind whose nefarious propaganda, today erased by the reaction of Free France and the Resistance, symbolized capitulation to tyranny and abdication to enslavement. Pacifism, under the noble pretext of avoiding war, was inviting us to embrace immediate dishonor, then, anyhow, war and slavery. Because this movement was uncommon, and in many respects scandalous, would we have given it the publicity presently awarded the adversaries of any national energy policy?"

"Let us not be fooled, indeed. Among the many wars which we are living through without being conscious of them, ideological war, economic war, war over wealth and strategic positions, the energy war is a capital war, not only for the destiny of the nation, but for the freedom of Frenchmen.

"It is easy to state that our civilization, through the excesses of science and technology, stupefies man. It is easy to seem brilliant by deploring that industry, through pollution of the atmosphere, is the curse of humanity. It is easy to become well-known by decrying a civilization which, through the excesses of comfort and the abuses of

advertising, disconnects the human mind from moral values or, more simply, from its natural milieu. This mixture of refusal of national progress, inspired by certain pre-war retrogressive movements, and of a return to the land, a panacea presented by Vichy to conceal humiliation, enslavement, and misery, is in itself somewhat insane. Without science, without technology, without industry, where would we be?

"...Ecologists, beware! Your respect for nature deserves to be approved!... Thus your action, in its principle, is highly reasonable. But watch out, such and such nuclear power, such and such oil power applauds the obstacles which you throw up to delay the development of national energy sources. Who can assure us that the cohorts of foreigners who come to support disorders here are entirely made up of pure and peaceful spirits?..."

L'Humanité, Aug. 4, "The Trap", by Jean Le Lagadec:

"...It is obvious that organized violence helps the designs of those who precisely want to avoid democracy and a debate.

"Terrorist attacks against EDF (the national electrical utility in France — ed.) are multiplying, and graffiti go as far as to compare the employees of the national utility with the SS.

"The seriousness of these actions must not escape the democrats of our country. All that feeds in this way the government's operations demands an unequivocal condemnation by all democrats, by all political formations which refuse to see the people's aspirations nullified by the complicit action of various forces.

"The trap is visible. We have warned against it from the beginning. To set foot in it, to let oneself be dragged into it or to let it function without a vigorous reaction is, in the final analysis, to make oneself an accomplice of it.

"Everything indicates that the Malville strategists are going elsewhere to set up their machine for new provocations."

L'Humanité, Aug. 4, "Why tension is deliberately kept up"

"Let us recall that before the Malville demonstration the Socialist Party had adopted a position marked by ambiguity, announcing that it would participate in it, then reversing itself and organizing on the same day a separate gathering in the area.

"Such ambiguities — as we have already stressed — are the basis of attacks against the supporters of the Common Program. Thus, Mr. Carrignon, a member of the RPR Central Committee (Chirac's Gaullist Party — ed.), thinks he can say that "the supporters of the Common Program have just demonstrated the real goal of their action which aims, in all circumstances, at ruining the authority of the Republican state, discrediting its representatives, pressuring the judicial system and public opinion by misrepresenting facts and saying bare-faced lies..."

"The administrative offices of EDF-GDF in Le Havre were bombed on the night of Aug. 3. The fire partly destroyed the archives room.

"Denouncing these violent actions, the CGT, GNC, CFDT, FO, and UNCM trade-union organizations present at Le Havre EDF-GDF "condemn with vigor such aggressions which represent an attack against our nationalized firms, an integral part of our national patrimony, and can jeopardize human lives."

"...Enough leniency for the authors of these attacks.

The unions are calling on the personnel to remain vigilant so useful measures can be taken in case new violent acts should occur."

(All these trade-union organizations decided to hold a one-hour protest strike against terrorism Aug. 11, following the bombing of another EDF facility in eastern France on Aug. 9.)

Sweep Up West German Anti-Nuclear Rabble

In a quick and efficient police action, the West German state of Schleswig-Holstein last week successfully dispersed an environmentalist "hamlet" outside a fission reactor construction site outside the small town of Brokdorf. The decision to remove the 500 occupants was made by Gerhard Stoltenberg, the state's Prime Minister and the most active contributor to the growing momentum within the country against the terrorist-linked saboteurs of the government's nuclear energy development programs.

Because of the success at Brokdorf — the scene of a bloody battle last February — pressure is mounting on the neighboring state of Lower Saxony to remove a more well-established hamlet around another nuclear site near Grohnde. The Lower Saxony government has continued to stall on the issue because of its furtive support of the Carter Administration's anti-nuclear stance. State Interior Minister Rötger Gross insisted this week that "We will act, but only when we think it is tactically correct."

For the overwhelming majority of industrialists and trade unionists, that "tactically correct" moment already arrived July 29, when a terrorist hit squad murdered the banker Jürgen Ponto, a prime mover in nuclear and heavy industry. Thanks to Ponto's death, the organizational link between the anti-nuclear movement and the "Baader-Meinhof Gang" has now become apparent to all. Adolf Schmidt, head of the Mining and Energy Trade Union, declared that the very existence of the Grohnde hamlet is an attack "similar to the cowardly murders of (judge) Drenckmann, (federal prosecutor) Buback, Ponto and many others." These anti-nuclear groups are nothing but "activists programmed for violence." The conservative paper *Rheinische Merkur* noted that the Grohnde village is named after Georg von Rauch, a terrorist shot in West Berlin in 1972.

Ironically, the most prominent saboteur of the government's energy expansion program is the government's own Minister of Research and Technology, Hans Matthöfer. Matthöfer was originally installed by former

Federal Chancellor Willy Brandt, who today publicly advocates a "thinking pause" for all nuclear construction activity. In a recent interview, Matthöfer prescribed a full dose of Jimmy Carter's deindustrialization for the country: He will support a Social Democratic Party resolution calling for a 3-5 year moratorium on all nuclear construction, and claimed that if the SPD votes in favor of the resolution at its national congress this fall, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and Economic Minister Hans Friderichs will have no choice but to carry it out. In the true Carter tradition, Matthöfer's "energy savings" proposals included "wartime measures" such as turning off city street lights at night.

While the Schmidt wing of the government has maintained an embarrassed silence, pro-industry conservatives have been issuing a cascade of abuse against the technology minister. Christian Democratic Union (CDU) chairman Helmut Kohl called the interview "a declaration of total bankruptcy," and asked "What's he still doing in office anyway?" Friedrich Zimmermann, parliamentary leader of the Christian Social Union (CSU) said that "Matthöfer has two options. Either he supports the government's program as it stands, or he resigns.... The job of the (Christian Democratic) opposition parties is to make sure that Chancellor Schmidt's energy program is upheld."

The global implications of a failure to develop a strong nuclear-based economy have been grasped by the best of these conservative spokesmen. Regarding the Carter Administration's attempts to stop the celebrated nuclear deal between West Germany and Brazil, the newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* wrote that "the united front which emerged then was a big surprise to the Americans. But now the front is crumbling, and Matthöfer is waving a white flag." Heinz Riesenhuber, energy spokesman of the CDU, bluntly warned that "If the Third World is not developed by nuclear energy, then countries will be fighting each other for energy supplies by 1980."