

energy sources. . . . The federal government should undertake a much larger effort to promote research and development, improve consumer confidence in solar technologies, remove institutional barriers, and make a substantial commitment in solar energy for its own use. [We should] attain the goal of meeting 20 percent of our energy needs from renewable resources by the year 2000. . . .

There are several technologies, including wind and biomass energy systems, which require no major technical breakthroughs for their introduction. In the longer run, large quantities of energy from ocean power, geothermal resources, and nuclear fusion may be forthcoming, providing technical and economic hurdles can be overcome.

While greater reliance on these alternatives will occur eventually, critical decisions should be made now to speed the timing and reduce the costs of this transition. . . .

FOREIGN POLICY

The Anderson program demands "human rights" in the Soviet bloc, calls for Europe to shoulder a greater share of the allied defense burden; encourages provocative Israeli actions, and approves an enhanced role for the International Monetary Fund.

Europe: We must recognize that the Alliance must be a union of equal partners. . . . Each must be prepared to share fairly in the burdens of our joint endeavors, and to justify these sacrifices to its own people.

Soviet Union: We must attend the second Helsinki review conference in Madrid, and we must insist upon a complete assessment of the degree to which the Soviet Union and the Eastern European nations have complied with the Helsinki Accords.

Middle East: An Anderson administration will not label Israeli settlements as "illegal" and as "obstacles to peace". . . . At the conclusion of the peacemaking process, the Anderson Administration will recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and move the U.S. embassy there.

International Economy: We pledge: . . . the full use of facilities provided by the International Monetary Fund and the OECD; continued efforts to enhance the effectiveness of IMF exchange rate surveillance; . . . further refinement and extension of the Special Drawing Rights, rather than reverting to an anachronistic and rigid gold standard. ■

Abscam's purge of U.S. leadership

by Vin Berg

At the end of August, Congressman Michael "Ozzie" Myers was convicted on Federal "corruption" charges in a Brooklyn court.

In the same trial, Camden, N.J. Mayor Angelo Errichetti, also a state legislator, was convicted of "bribe-taking."

On Sept. 5, opening statements were made in a corruption case against Congressman John W. Jenrette of South Carolina, accused of receiving a \$10,000 "bribe" from an FBI undercover operative.

On Sept. 8, the trial of Texas House speaker Billy Clayton commenced in Houston, and a Federal Appeals Court virtually destroyed his defense by suppressing testimonial evidence from an indicted labor leader that would reportedly have proven Clayton innocent of taking a "bribe" in the name of a campaign contribution.

On Sept. 15, Philadelphia City Council President George X. Schwartz and Councilman Harry P. Jannotti were convicted of accepting a pay-off, despite the judge's statement that nothing had been clearly proven.

The list goes on. Week by week, important and influential leaders at every level of the American political system are being removed from positions of influence. Week by week, political leaders, labor leaders and business leaders responsible for the welfare of tens of thousands of Americans are being tried and convicted, in the courts or in the press. Week by week, constituency-based political machines throughout the United States, in the middle of the worst economic and social conditions they have ever faced, suddenly find themselves leaderless, or with a leadership compromised by accusations or pending "corruption trials."

In the press, it is called "Abscam" or "Brilab," or more generally, "the battle against white-collar crime," in which attorney general Benjamin Civiletti's Abscam/Brilab "sting" operations are only the latest. What it adds up to is the largest *political purge* in the history of any nation in recent times.

Prior to 1975-76, "white-collar crime" convictions were at most a few hundred a year. Since the Carter administration has come into office, it has averaged

4,000 per year or more, totalling 17,000 to date.

Most of these convictions are for offenses that would not have been considered crimes in an earlier period.

The scale of the deployment that has culminated in Abscam ("Arab scam"), Brilab ("Bribe labor") and Pen-dorf ("Pension Dorfman") is changing the political face of America, in a way that makes the scope and impact of the 1930s Moscow purge trials pale by comparison. What comes to mind is the famous Hitler "Night of the Long Knives," in which every organized form of opposition to rule by the Nazi elite was crushed.

The latter comparison is more than apt. Abscam and Brilab have proceeded on the basis of what many sources acknowledge to be a Carter "enemies list." But it has not been directed against individuals as such. A Congressman here who threatens to block trucking or maritime deregulation; a city mayor there who wants a local nuclear plant opposed by the administration; a labor leader or farm banker who has denounced Carter-Volcker tight money measures—these are the targets, but not simply because of their position on this or that policy.

What the victims of Carter and Civiletti's "long knives" have in common is political machines and constituency organization. The fundamental policy behind Abscam-Brilab is the destruction of those urban-labor-farmer constituency machines that, at the local, state and regional level, have been the foundation of the American constitutional republic for the past 200 years. Left intact, constituency machines will not accept the "age of scarcity" that is the objective of every policy provided to the Carter administration by the Trilateral Commission and related institutions of the Eastern Establishment and British elite. So, the "long knives" have been brought out against the American form of democracy.

Violations of Constitutional rights

To date, the American purge trials have proceeded without judicial restraint, although the flagrant violations of the Constitutional rights involved have left some presiding Federal judges chafing.

Federal Judge Robert O'Connor, presiding in the Texas trial of Billy Clayton, as well as Philadelphia's Judge John P. Pullam, who presided in the Sept. 15 convictions of Councilmen Schwartz and Jannotti, stopped just short of accusing the FBI of deliberately violating the defendants' rights to due process.

The Philadelphia conviction in fact came as a complete surprise. Schwartz and Jannotti, as well as Councilman Lewis C. Johanson and lawyer Howard Criden who have been given a separate trial, were accused of accepting a large sum of money in an alleged political pay-off. A guilty verdict was thought impossible by observers given the flimsy character of the evidence. Accepting

money is not itself a crime. Judge Pullam, clearly disgusted with the prosecution, warned the jury that a guilty verdict required proof that the defendants had "accepted money with the intent of committing a crime." At no point had such evidence been presented.

In the Clayton trial in Houston, Judge O'Connor

The railroad of Billy Clayton

expressed "grave concern" over government misconduct. He berated FBI agent Michael Wacks in a pre-trial hearing: "You understand the due process rights, don't you, to be free from government-induced criminality? It seems to me that you sort of unleashed [FBI informant] Hauser without any guidelines. . . . Did it ever occur to you that perhaps you were violating the Speaker's due process rights by going forward with the con and thrusting the money on the Speaker [Clayton]?"

Apart from FBI informant Hauser "thrusting" a \$5,000 campaign contribution on the speaker, which Clayton repeatedly states he will have to report, there is no evidence of any wrongdoing whatsoever.

Hauser claims the Prudential Insurance policy which he represents will save Texas \$1 million in comparison to the state's current contract. Hauser asked Clayton for an opportunity to present his Prudential policy's merits.

Review of the tapes reveals the following. After the details on how to arrange a hearing for the Prudential offer are discussed, the following exchange concludes the meeting:

Clayton: Our only position is we don't want to do anything that's illegal or to get anybody in trouble and you don't either. . . .

Hauser: No, no, God no. That's the last thing in the world that I need.

Clayton: . . . This is just as legitimate as it can be because anytime somebody can show me. . . how we can save the state some money, I'm going to go to bat for it.

Moore: If we can save a million dollars that ought to be enough, shouldn't it?

Clayton: You bet. . . .

O'Connor granted limited immunity to defendant L.G. Moore, head of the Operating Engineers Union in a five-state area including Texas, so that he could testify in Clayton's defense that he had been merely bragging about his ability to influence Speaker Clayton. But in an almost unprecedented move, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals overruled O'Connor and denied Moore the immunity that it appears would have ensured Clayton's acquittal.

The incredible speed with which O'Connor's ruling was reversed is suggestive of heavy pressure on the Appeals panel from very high places.

A trial is one thing. A political purge is another.