

In 1968, in Coup d'Etat, I postulated that the creation of conditions and situations that would lead to vigorous protest, confusion and violence were a means by which an authoritarianism could achieve majority acceptability. Cause of and refusal to correct these situations and conditions were federal. Authoritarian reactions to them was federal and local (example, vs. Panthers).

It has long be apparent that Nixon and his gang are, for whatever reason, duplicating this. Policies are guaranteed to cause distress, confusion and anxiety. The could not be more of this nature if they were designed to be.

The energy crisis is an example. Despite Nixon's pontifications, there is nothing new about it. The fact is that it was forecast years ago and was upon us a year ago, when there were gas shortages. Doing nothing for at least the past year was guaranteed to create the current ~~crisis~~^{crises} and there are more than one, more than the domestic crunch.

(One I've not seen mention is what a continuation of the Arab boycotts will mean in those industrialized countries that are dependant upon Arab oil. The Arabs are overloaded with US money, which gives them added leverage against the US, enables them to ride out a major reduction in their income form which they lose nothing and gain, the in-ground oil not disappearing. In a relatively short time they can precipitate an international depression, not just a mere repression in the economy. They can, in fact, throw the entire world into chaos.)

It is obvious that of all the unpleasant ness inevitable when there are acute shortages two things are necessary: fair distribution and holding down the inflationary potential. There is only one way in which this can be done with energy spurces, and that is by a system of rationing. There has not been any that did not work well enough. And there is no system, rationing or any other, than is not capable of being abused. The major complaint against the US system of rationing is that it prevented runaway price increases and thus denied the robbery potential for the larger interests. It prevented any real suffering.

All the anti-rationing talk is not because rationing can t be depended upon to do what is necessary. It serves two purposes: to create distress and turmoil and to enrich the overly-rich, who happen to be among those to whom Nixon can turn in extremity. Or the military can.

The weekend's leaks about Nixon's dumping of his own energy expert because he urges what will work can't be from other than official inspiration and does mean that there will be an official resistance to rationing, which can prevent it. The alternatives will work serious hardships, escalate inflation, stir t he country up and away from The Watergate, and make the rich a helluve lot richer. Last years Exxon's profits were 1.6 billion higher than the profitable year before.

The long-touted alternative is raising the price of gas. This merely assures the richer that they can have all they want without feeling pain. It will cause major personal, industrial and economic suffering and it will create a dangerous situation that, for example, could be used as justification for a coup, against Nixon and possibly by him.

Meanwhile, it is not possible for Jaworski to retreat from what had been done under Cox. Nor is it possible for him not to take the next steps already prepared, those things that caused Nixon to fire Cox. He can do other things and under most circumstances could be expected to. This includes sitting on new investigations. But he can't do anything about the past and he can't live except with it. Unless he wants to precipitate another crisis. This means that there is a certain amount that has to be too much that at some point in the near future Nixon is going to have to face. Under normal conditions, he should not be able to survive it. Therefore, this and the other economic and political problems for which he is really responsible, regardless of cause or how caused, create a combination that can't be resolved peacefully and can be the justification for a coup. A coup is openly talked about in Washington, although it is never reported.

Of all the situations that can lead to one, this gross, deliberate and I think intended mishandling of the deliberately caused energy crisis is the most immediate and the most likely trigger. Or, we are close to a decision.

All this official leaking has to be the preparation for firing "ove and making policy that is contrary to that he espoused. Beginning with it, anything can happen.

add, Coup notes 12/3/73

Here also the non-solution in SEAsia can become inflammatory. This non-solution was really guaranteed to leave a situation that could be enflamed at any time whether or not Thieu's survival needs require him to set the fire. If VN is most likely, it is not the only place there it can all start up all over again.

This could entail putting the military on an entirely different and more active footing, a basis of activation more useful in a coup.

It would also cause faster use of scarce fuels.

There seems to be absolutely nothing in the entire Nixon regime that does not in some way lend itself to a coup, whether or not he visualized it, whether or not those around him did.

Nor does there seem any likelihood that the military is not fully aware of the situation and the uses possible.

Any action that can lead to reaction can set it all off again in VN. Thieu can be depended upon for this has been his course from the outset of the "peace with honor" and the only possibility he had for survival.