

project. Long under attack by environmentalists, this project would permit huge offshore rigs constructed inland (near Morgan City) to be floated into the Gulf of Mexico. Senator Bennett Johnston (D-La) has called the cut "unwise and unjustified." Sen. Russell Long's (D-La) administrative assistant, James Guirard, called the project critical to the nation's offshore drilling program. The project is already underway. \$5.1 million is slated for cuts earmarked for dredging the Atchafalaya River.

In all, more than 2 million acres of irrigated land scheduled to come into use over the next few years as the projects are completed will be eliminated if these cuts are allowed to stand. This land would produce more than 6 million tons of food. By comparison, total U.S. wheat

production is about 60 million tons. This \$250,000 cut will waste the more than \$5 billion dollars already invested in the projects and cause losses in food production of more than \$1 billion a year.

The policy initiated by Carter means the destruction of U.S. agriculture. More than 15 percent of all U.S. crop land is currently irrigated and yields on irrigated land are typically three times higher than on adjacent unirrigated areas: more than a third of all U.S. food production is directly attributable to the effect of irrigation. To allow the destruction of this productive capacity is to ensure mass starvation in every country now dependent on the U.S. for grain exports.

EXCLUSIVE

The Next Ten Years As Seen By Brookings

The Brookings Institution, a self-styled Washington, D.C.-based think tank founded in 1927 to define foreign and domestic policy for the U.S. government and dictate public opinion, has recently released a so-called "policy" blueprint for the Carter Administration entitled "Setting National Priorities, The Next Ten Years." The Brookings' perspective for the next decade celebrates the "aura of power" doctrine espoused by former Defense Secretary and current Carter energy czar James Rodney Schlesinger. The 600-odd pages of ponderous pronouncements by Brookings braintrusts all boil down to the following formula: the United States will maintain its leading position in the world by conducting a Schlesingerian global chicken game whose outcome will be determined by whether the U.S. or Soviet Union flinches first.

The Institution subsumes all discussion of the U.S. role in the world economy, the organization of government, and U.S. domestic policies in the decade ahead under the umbrella of America's military posture. In the opening sections, "Peace or War," and "Toward a New Consensus in U.S. Defense Policy," authors Henry Owen, Brookings director, and Barry Blechman, Brookings military expert, contend that all foreign policy should be predicated on step-function escalation of superpower confrontation in which traditional military strategy is supplanted by psychological warfare. Direct military action is to be undertaken by the U.S. at critical junctures to "convince" the Soviet Union that the United States "means business." Such military confrontations are to be strategically staged within an overall context of U.S. destabilizations against friend and foe alike.

This said, the authors identify the Middle East, southern Africa, and Europe as the immediate targets for disruptions leading to war — a road Carter and his associates have faithfully followed since taking office January 20. Aside from covert interventions in the political life of these areas by the National Security Council, State Department, and Central Intelligence Agency, Blechman proposes a sweeping redeployment of American troops from the Pacific Command theatre and

elsewhere to Europe, the Mediterranean, and the Persian Gulf. Direct American military intervention in southern Africa is not possible, the author argues, because the American population would not sit still for it. Therefore, Carter must wage war in the region through surrogates like Rhodesia's Ian Smith and South Africa's John Vorster.

Key excerpts from the Brookings national security and military posture statement follow:

"In recent years, discussion of U.S. defense policy has tended to focus more on the political role of the armed forces than on their military functions. The military establishment helps to set the image of the United States as a great power. The mere existence of large military forces is evidence of the nation's ability to play an important part in international affairs. That the United States has chosen to allocate a significant portion of its resources to the military demonstrates its ability and its willingness to underwrite its announced role in the world. Thus by their existence alone, the armed forces serve important purposes.

"By their location, military forces can be directed to specific ends as well....Consequently, overseas deployments make it more likely that the United States will live up to its announced policies. Moreover, during crises or at critical times in negotiations, changes can be made in the location, activity, or readiness of military units to buttress specific demands, to reinforce protests, and to make threats or promises more plausible.

"Obviously, accomplishment of these purposes is not automatic — the credibility of the announced aims of military deployments sometimes must be tested by confrontation, if not violence. The point is that the main purposes of the military are political or psychological. A large military establishment is maintained not so much to provide for the direct defense of the United States as to affect the perception of leaders in foreign nations, prompting them to see things in such a way that they will make decisions that will help avoid the necessity for direct offense." (emphasis added-ed)

The Middle East

First, Blechman proposes "a one-fourth reduction in the U.S. Pacific force posture" to be redeployed into the Mediterranean and Persian Gulf "in order to protect more important and more threatened U.S. interests in Europe and the Middle East effectively."

"The most dangerous international dispute now is that between Israel and its Arab neighbors...Arab-Israeli tensions...will create a continuing risk of conflict...(which) will intensify in the coming decade. The credibility of the U.S. commitment to defend Israel depends on U.S. ability to defeat, if necessary, any Soviet military intervention in a new Arab-Israeli war. If Soviet leaders believe the United States has such a capability and that it will be used if needed, they are likely to be deterred from assuming any overt role in the fighting. Moreover, if the local actors share that belief and doubt Soviet threats (or promises) to intervene, U.S. influence in the region in peacetime is likely to be enhanced and U.S. attempts to bring the Arab-Israeli conflict to a peaceful settlement.

"U.S. forces must be able to create a secure environment in the eastern Mediterranean, in which the United States could undertake whatever military operations it deemed necessary but the Soviet Union could carry out only those operations that the United States did not try to prevent...

"The Sixth Fleet is certainly capable of prohibiting Soviet military use of the Mediterranean. If the United States chooses to oppose it, effective Soviet intervention in an Arab-Israeli conflict is not likely to be militarily feasible.

"Opinions differ on the feasibility and desirability of U.S. military action to restore a flow of oil if it were interrupted for political reasons. But one thing is clear: it is useful to sustain a healthy uncertainty in the Arab oil-exporting countries about whether military action might be taken. This requires maintaining a U.S. military capability for effective action."

Owen seconds Blechman on this point enthusiastically in "Peace or War." "We should not go out of our way to allay any fears of the oil-exporting countries about U.S. military action. The threat of that action cannot be ruled out by them, if only because of our deployments in the Middle East and neighboring areas."

Overall, the Brookings assessment on the Middle East: "In short, a long period of turbulence is ahead." Not content with the dangers of the Arab-Israeli conflict, U.S. threats to invade the oil fields, Brookings also moots an intensifying Iranian-Indian "rivalry" which will provide "opportunities for introducing nuclear threats into local disputes."

The Third World

"Generalization about the Third World is difficult because of its diversity, but one thing that can safely be said is that the prospects for conflict are substantial."

Asia

"The record suggests that there are likely to be periodic upheavals within Southeast Asian countries and occasional clashes between them."

Africa

"Africa's future will be shadowed by racial struggles south of the Sahara. The Soviet Union and other communist countries are likely to provide weapons to black guerrilla groups and governments that wage war on the white government of Rhodesia....The communist countries will also offer help to militant groups and governments willing to challenge white rule in South Africa....But the white majority is large, well-organized, and well read; it will continue to hold power in the Republic of South Africa for at least the next decade.

"The racial conflict in Africa will have a powerful and somber effect on U.S. domestic opinion...Some will be alarmed by the prospect of growing Soviet influence and will feel empathy for beleaguered whites; others will resent white domination and be anxious to promote majority rule...Any U.S. policy will be attended by violent internal debate and dissension; it is highly doubtful a consensus could be secured for a policy that involved either use of U.S. armed forces or provision of military assistance to any of the warring parties."

While implicitly acknowledging that the U.S. will act through surrogates in the region, Brookings runs through the now-familiar scenario in which racial conflict in Africa can be utilized to fan the flames of racial tensions at home.

Latin America

"Large-scale wars have not occurred in Latin America for many years..., although major tensions will persist—notably between Argentina and Brazil in the east and between Peru and its neighbors in the west."

In summing up Henry Owen remarks: "In the third world we will also face novel threats that do not arise solely, or even largely, out of interstate relations. Terrorism is likely to grow. Even if it does not involve nuclear theft, it could powerfully influence events — if, for example, it led to the assassination of major political figures or to increasingly large scale terrorist raids and Israeli retaliation against Arab countries that aid terrorists."

Europe

"The potential for conflict in Europe results from the interaction of two possible trends: toward weakness in Western Europe and toward upheaval in Eastern Europe."

Because of the economic difficulties and a political lack of will on the part of most Western European nations, e.g. France, Italy, and Britain, NATO and "the defense of the central front will increasingly devolve on the United States and Germany." Admitting that the prospects for the Atlantic Alliance are hardly bright, Brookings takes comfort in self-serving fantasies such as: "The Soviet Union has been unable to reconcile most East European peoples to its hegemony" and "Nationalist pressures in Eastern Europe have overthrown two empires, Turkey and Austro-Hungary, in this century; and the death throes of each of these empires triggered major wars. Nationalist pressures will continue to threaten the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe; and this process, too, could be marked by substantial violence."

To bolster the flagging European enthusiasm and

commitment to NATO, Blechman proposes a major U.S. military buildup to prepare the Europeans for a "short war." The rationale presented is that "The Russians are doing it."

"Soviet forces in Europe (and those of its Warsaw Pact allies) are organized primarily to fight a very short; intense conflict, one that might involve the use of tactical nuclear weapons from the outset."

To ready NATO forces for battle, Blechman advises:

1) "A further shift of U.S. army personnel in Europe from support to combat units," with the logistical slack picked up by West Germany and other NATO members — "it might promote military integration in the alliance."

2) "Commonality in NATO weapon acquisition programs and interchangeability among NATO equipment should be emphasized."

3) "Shift some U.S. forces now in southern Germany to the north," or force German military forces to beef up "the defense of the likely northern invasion route...added expenditures and political costs in Germany will have to be incurred if this potential vulnerability is to be reduced."

4) "Better use of reserves in planning for a war of short duration."

5) "A shift in U.S. aircraft procurement away from large, long-range, multipurpose, and hence very expensive aircraft...toward less expensive aircraft."

6) "A shift in Navy planning away from the defense of peacetime civilian shipping levels in the Atlantic and Pacific...the Navy's main mission should be to gain control of restricted seas, notably the Mediterranean and the Norwegian Sea, to enable it to project U.S. power on the flanks of NATO and to deny the Soviet Union access to these now vulnerable regions..."

The overwhelming concern in Europe reflected by the Brookings report is how the U.S. can manipulate its West European allies into supporting and participating in a NATO war against the Warsaw Pact which would inevitably destroy America's European allies. In order to suitably terrify the United States' reluctant partners, the Brookings report repeatedly emphasizes "Soviet military doctrine, which stresses rapid advance into enemy territory; and Soviet military exercises, which usually feature nuclear strikes in conjunction with rapidly advancing armored offensives."

Soviet Union

"Having surveyed possible U.S. policies toward sources of conflict in specific regions, we now turn to our relations with the one power that could transform any one of these conflicts into another world war: the USSR." Clearly concerned about the growing Soviet military capability, Brookings advises Carter et al. to wage a vigorous psychological warfare campaign against the Soviet leadership to keep the Kremlin off-balance. The dangers of such warfare are minimized by the self-serving assessment that "Soviet leaders can be expected to proceed with caution, constrained by the fear that large-scale war would destroy everything they have built up since the revolution...so that they will be anxious to avoid direct confrontations with the United States."

"It is too early to tell whether the recent shift in U.S. public opinion in favor of more defense and less détente

has registered in the Kremlin and if so, with what effect.

"It is probably U.S. determination that is most in question in the Soviet leaders' minds. The debate in the United States about our alleged defense weakness must be of interest to them. If they believe that Americans doubt U.S. military strength, they may expect that perception to moderate U.S. responses in future crises. On the other hand, if American statements and actions reflect self-confidence, aggressive Soviet action may seem less attractive to them."

Despite such posturing, the Brookings report betrays considerable fear about actual Soviet military capabilities. The technological innovations in Soviet defense systems prompts Henry Owen to write:

"The more important risk is that it (the arms race) will trigger the deployment or introduction of weapons that threaten stable deterrence, such as weapons whose vulnerability might invite attack in a first strike, whose accuracy might make a first strike appear feasible, or whose defensive power might persuade leaders in one country that it could launch such a strike and survive the other's retaliation...There is no advantage in returning to a situation in which one side or the other might believe that it could build up sufficient defensive capabilities to make a first strike rewarding."

"If one fears that the American people are unwilling to pay the price necessary to match Soviet conventional military capabilities, it may be possible to secure deterrence cheaply by making it clear that any super-power confrontation could result in nuclear war. If one fears that small states, like North Korea, no longer find U.S. threats credible, perhaps raising the stakes will make them unwilling to challenge the United States...And if one fears that allies are beginning to doubt the commitment of the United States, perhaps demonstrating its ability to look squarely at the possibility of nuclear war will reassure them."

Once the Brookings report leaves the realm of national security and defense policy, the flight from reality is total. All so-called discussion of America's international economic policy, nuclear non-proliferation, the organization of government, and domestic policy boils down to setting up Trilateral Commission supranational bodies through which the U.S. would rule the world through its top-down control over critical resources, strategic stockpiles, credit, and so on. A few samples should suffice.

Nuclear Proliferation

Brookings advocates what has become Carter policy: no export of nuclear power plant facilities to non-nuclear nations because of the danger of nuclear terrorism and the use of such facilities to manufacture nuclear weapons. Instead: "The alternative suggested by the United States to a proliferation of sensitive national facilities is the establishment of multinational centers for reprocessing and perhaps other fuel cycle operations..."

"Nonproliferation commitments would be more definitive if non-nuclear-weapon states did not have independent national capabilities of this kind but had instead to rely on external (perhaps multinational) facilities."

Economic Policy

The overriding concern expressed on both the international and domestic fronts is how to reduce consumption, particularly of energy. Again, supranational structures are invoked as the most effective way of reducing the worldwide standard of living.

Charles Schultze, Carter's Council of Economic Advisors director, targets federal spending for maintaining standards of living in the U.S. "Developments in three major types of program explain almost nine-tenths of the growth in the ratio of domestic federal expenditures to

GNP between 1955 and 1977. (1) The rapid expansion of retirement, disability, and unemployment compensation was responsible for slightly more than half of the growth. (2) The introduction of new low-income assistance programs providing food, medical, and housing benefits to the poor, and the subsequent increase in both those benefits and the older cash welfare payments, accounted for 14 percent of the growth. (3) The introduction and the rapid expansion, especially between 1965 and 1970, of new social service and social investment programs contributed about 18 percent of the growth."

EXCLUSIVE

Blackmail Campaign Against Potential Carter Opposition In Congress

From its controlling position in the Carter administration the Trilateral Commission has already launched an extensive blackmail operation against a nascent grouping of conservative Congressmen from the South and Southwest who constitute its potential opposition. The campaign is being conducted through the Trilateral Commission's agencies in the Justice Department and Federal Elections Commission, and by self-styled "public interest" groups led by Common Cause with the aid of an experienced crew of Watergaters in the national press corps.

Under the rubric of a debate on the phony issue of "ethics", centering on the Obey Commission recommendations, such leading figures and key committee chairmen as House Majority leader Jim Wright (D-Tex.), conservative leader Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) (current minority leader in the Senate Intelligence Committee) and Sen. Russell Long (D-La.), (chairman of the Senate Finance Committee) have been targeted for political blackmail. Already during this session, Rep. Robert L.F. Sikes was successfully ousted from his post as chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on Military Construction, through the efforts of Common Cause.

The Congressmen under attack represent a grouping of constitutional forces representing industries such as oil and aerospace who could pose a serious threat to Carter were they to form as an organized bloc against de-industrialization. Evidence of their potential to wield power as a bloc is clear in the recent outcome of bi-partisan moves from conservatives in the Senate to "pack" key committees including Armed Services, Appropriations, Intelligence, Finance, Commerce and Judiciary, leaving only the Foreign Relations, Interior, and Banking committees to the control of known Carter backers.

Last week, the Justice Department signalled the new phase of attacks by leaking a story to the Washington Post detailing a meeting between Attorney General Bell and President Carter, where Bell allegedly assured Carter that "at least four to six indictments of past and cur-

rent Congressmen" would result from the Justice Department's investigation into Congressional dealings with the South Korean lobby. Bell's office subsequently issued a denunciation of the Post article, yet refused to deny its specific charges.

This method follows precisely the modus operandi of blackmail and innuendo used by the Justice Department since the investigation started; no fewer than 90 names of Congressmen under investigation have found their way into the press, yet the Justice Department denies releasing the information and refuses to clarify the situation. The objects of the mud-slinging campaign in this case include Rep. Edward Derwinski (R-Ill.), Rep. Clement Zablocki (D-Wis.) and Rep. William Broomfield (R-Mich.), as well as members of the Mississippi and New York delegations.

The House Ethics Committee, recently authorized to begin a similar investigation of Congressional ties to South Korean lobbyists, is itself under pressure to become an official watergating tool. After a raucous fight last session, the Pike Committee singled out House Ethics Committee chairman John Flynt (D-Fla.) for not having secured indictments against any Congressmen in the entire history of the committee. Flynt has since succumbed to pressure by hiring former Special Watergate prosecutor Locovara as chief counsel for the South Korean investigation. The Ethics Committee submitted an extraordinarily large budget for the current session — \$535,000 — which staff members predict will be used for several additional investigations.

The campaign launched against House Majority leader Jim Wright is the clearest attempt to bribe and blackmail Congressmen into accepting Trilateral control of its activities. As the Dallas Press points out in an article entitled "Might Makes Wright Target of Reporters," the Texan, who represents industrial interests including oil, was virtually unknown by the press until his surprise election to the top leadership post in the House. Almost immediately, the Washington Post and other Watergate