

Trilaterals demand defense cuts and triage of U.S. elderly

from our Washington bureau

For three days beginning April Fool's Day, the Trilateral Commission met in secret session in Washington, D.C., at the Mayflower Hotel to plan how to carry out their latest blueprint for one-world government. Their new report, entitled "Democracy Must Work: A Trilateral Agenda for the Decade," bore the names of British Social Democrat David Owen, Japanese Maoist ideologue Saburo Okita of the Club of Rome, and Jimmy Carter's former National Security Adviser, Zbigniew Brzezinski.

The report and the Trilateral sessions, dominated by Henry Kissinger and chaired by David Rockefeller, were hosted at a White House reception April 1. Rockefeller reported that President Reagan "gave a brief but excellent talk" approving the commission and its goals.

"Democracy Must Work" is an ultimatum from the Kremlin's collaborators to the nations of the West to 1) give up any attempt to counter the military threat of the Soviet Union, and 2) impose crushing hardship on both the underdeveloped debtor countries and the "taxpayers of the OECD."

The report complains that "technology itself is changing at breakneck speed," and demands that the West counter this "menace." In the concluding section, titled, "Tasks and Trade-Offs: The Trilateral Response," the Commission presents a six-item "action agenda." Three items involve cutting the U.S. defense budget, which would guarantee Soviet domination of the "Trilateral countries" (North America, Western Europe, and Japan).

Trilateral author David Owen is also a leading figure in the Palme Commission, whose proposal for a "nuclear-free Europe" (excepting the Warsaw Pact) is now revealed to have been written by KGB Colonel Arne Treholt of Norway. The military strategy presented in the Trilateral report is identical to that proposed by Soviet agent of influence and Trilateral executive board member Henry A. Kissinger—that the United States withdraw from Europe, leaving it to defend itself using conventional weaponry against the Soviets' nuclear arsenal.

The report demands that the United States get used to the idea of Soviet domination of Europe: "Americans must come to appreciate that European history and geography means that their complex relationships with Russia should not be automatically labeled as neutralism or characterized as 'Finlandization.'" This demand was seconded by Secretary

of State George Shultz, speaking on behalf of the Kissinger-controlled Reagan administration (see excerpt below).

The Trilaterals propose to extend unemployment and the triage of the sick, helpless, and aging. "A particular problem is posed by the very old—those aged 80 and over—since the proper care of this age group is very expensive in terms of medical treatment and residential accommodation," the report says. "People must be encouraged to make greater provision for themselves against the contingencies of unemployment, sickness, and old age." They also propose that labor adjust "flexibly" by foregoing "traditional hours" and sharing "leisure time" between the currently employed and the unemployed. How people can "make greater provision for themselves" while permanently underemployed they do not explain.

Conspiracy

The three-day meeting, which included addresses by Soviet agent of influence Kissinger, International Monetary Fund director Jacques de Larosière, and Mexican Finance Minister Jesús Silva Herzog, was held in secrecy. Although Shultz released a version of his prepared text to the press, his dinner discussion with the Trilaterals was completely private. Other public figures speaking, including de Larosière and Silva Herzog, refused to report publicly on their discussions with the Trilaterals at all. The Commission held three short, carefully policed "press conferences" in the course of the meeting, which included over a hundred notables, many of them former cabinet ministers and parliamentarians. Only reporters considered politically reliable by the Trilaterals were admitted to these sessions or provided with copies of the conference schedule or reports. NSIPS was able to obtain information on the Commission's proceedings only by other means.

On the last morning of the Trilateral meeting, Kissinger addressed the assembled patricians and viziers including Rockefeller, Gianni Agnelli of FIAT, Lucy Wilson Benson of the League of Women Voters, Lane Kirkland of the AFL-CIO, Carlo Bonomi of the Propaganda-2 Lodge, former Ambassador to Italy Richard Gardner, Marina von Neumann Whitman of General Motors, Glenn Watts of the Communication Workers of America, Father Theodore Hesburgh, Sir

Michael Palliser, Elliot L. Richardson, Warburg chairman Lord Roll of Ipsden, Viscount Sandon, Lord Shackleton of Rio-Tinto Zinc, arms controller Gerard C. Smith, and Robert McNamara.

During Kissinger's speech, Lyndon LaRouche's presidential campaign committee held a loudspeaker rally outside the Mayflower Hotel and leafleted passers-by and conference participants with LaRouche's campaign statement "The Known and Alleged Soviet Connections of Henry A. Kissinger." Again the Trilaterals demonstrated the sincerity of their commitment to democracy, calling the police, who informed David Rockefeller's bodyguard Walter that the U.S. Constitution still prevails in the capital of the United States.

Excerpts from "Democracy Must Work":

On economic questions: For the first time in history, a truly global world system is emerging. Jet travel, communications satellites, and computers have shrunk the planet to an extent scarcely imaginable only a few decades ago. The opportunity for an entirely new system of global cooperation is there to be seized. Yet, also for the first time, dangers of a truly global dimension now confront mankind. Broadly speaking, these dangers are derived from the unprecedented scientific-technological capacity now available for inflicting worldwide devastation and death, and from the risk that regional social and economic breakdowns will overload a still rudimentary structure of international cooperation, prompting mass suffering, political conflicts, and eventually global chaos. . . .

A particular problem is posed by the very old—those aged 80 and over—since the proper care of this age group is very expensive in terms of medical treatment and residential accommodation. . . .

A high rate of unemployment which represents short spells out of work for a large number of people is not necessarily to be deplored: it may be a reflection of a society adapting rapidly to change. . . . The hard choices that must be made are often electorally unpopular and are, therefore, not being made. Agricultural and industrial subsidies which should have been phased out years ago are still being paid. Declining industries which should have been allowed to die are being kept alive. . . .

Increasingly . . . solutions are being sought in ways of making labour markets more flexible, encouraging workers without skills, or with skills that have been rendered obsolete by technical progress, to be trained or re-trained. . . . What must be changed is a situation in which a majority of the population—though a decreasing one—works traditional hours for a traditional working lifetime, while a minority of the population—though a decreasing one—does not work at all. Instead the aim should be to devise arrangements which offer some opportunity for work, and more opportunities for leisure, to all. . . .

[T]he case for selectivity is becoming overwhelm-

ing. . . . At the same time, people must be encouraged to make greater provision for themselves against the contingencies of unemployment, sickness, and old age. Governments can help significantly to achieve this aim, for example by gearing the tax system in ways that encourage earning and saving and discourage spending.

. . . [O]ur view is that the problem of international debt is containable provided that sensible macroeconomic policies are pursued by the trilateral countries, and particularly the United States. . . . [But] all three parties [to the debt] will have to bear some of the costs of putting the situation to rights: the developing countries, some degree of austerity; the banks, some writing-off of loans; the taxpayers of the OECD countries, increased funding of the international financial institutions. . . .

On political and military questions: Americans must come to appreciate that European history and geography means that their complex relationships with Russia should not be automatically labeled as neutralism or characterised as "Finlandisation." . . . [M]ajor regional unrest is to be expected in the geopolitically sensitive regions of the Middle East, Central America and East Europe . . . greater consultation and cooperation [among Trilaterals] is clearly to be desired. . . . The Arab-Israeli conflict may be reaching the point of no return.

In the interests of both the American economy and the global economy something has to give: either the rapid growth of U.S. defence expenditure must be cut back through its burden being more equally shared . . . or as a result of negotiated conventional and nuclear arms reductions. . . . The United States must take urgent action to reduce its budget deficit. . . . Another [element in a desirable package] might be some reduction in the real value of the federal entitlements where they go to people who are far from being the neediest members of the population.

Excerpts from Secretary of State George Shultz's address to the Trilateral Commission:

Over 20 years ago, President John Kennedy pledged that the United States would "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty." We know now that the scope of that commitment is too broad. . . . [W]e as a nation are perpetually asking ourselves: how to reconcile our morality and our practical sense, how to pursue noble goals in a complex and imperfect world. . . . Perhaps because of our long isolation from the turmoil of world politics, Americans have tended to believe that war and peace, too, were two totally distinct phenomena. . . . [I]n the 1980s and beyond, most likely we will never see a state of total war or a state of total peace. We face instead a spectrum of often ambiguous challenges. . . . We cannot "pay any price" or "bear any burden." . . .