

tion, had run crack cocaine into the United States, Maxine Waters took the point in deflecting attention from George Bush, and going after the CIA, which was not directly in the line of fire on this crack cocaine operation. So, what she did, is, she actually *protected* George Bush, and covered up for the actual crack cocaine dealers, with this particular tactic, where she *refused*, after being told again and again: “You’re on the wrong track, Maxine. These are not the facts. This was not run through the CIA as such. This was run through George Bush, the Vice President’s so-called Iran-Contra cover.” And the facts, the evidence, is all there.

So, now what happens is this: According to the experts, there is no factual basis for the charge that Ron Brown had a bullet hole in his head, in the course of the plane going down in the Balkans. That is, there’s no scientific evidence which even suggests that that ever happened, even though Richard Mellon Scaife has come out with this, another one of his hoaxes, like the Vince Foster hoax, which he created almost singlehandedly with the guy he pushes.

What is the channel that Maxine Waters is using for this? Its channel is the Republicans! What happened was, as you saw it in 1996: When President Clinton made the stupid mistake of announcing that he was not going to veto the welfare reform bill, the people around Kemp and so forth in the Republican Party, went to work, and *killed* the Democratic Party’s chances for re-winning at least the House of Representatives, during the 1996 campaign.

As part of that operation, the Republicans, including the Moon group, Rev. Sun Myung Moon, moved in heavily on African-American organizations, and began to, in a sense, buy them up, in the usual manner: either direct cash—and cash will buy a lot of people, particularly poor people—and with foundation grants, and this and that, and so forth.

Now you find Maxine Waters, presumably an African-American leader, the leader presently of the House, the Black Congressional Caucasians, as it’s called—taking money, in a sense, by using a Republican anti-Clinton funding operation, a Bush League operation, working for George Bush, Jr.’s Presidential ambitions, running a *fake* campaign on the Ron Brown issue.

This is absolutely disgusting, and it has to be exposed. You know, you can’t say that that’s because these are black people, or African-Americans, that they have their sentiments, and so forth, and they have a right to express. No; they have a right *to tell the truth!* And the trouble that African-Americans face, is that they have a paucity of truth directed against them, in terms of things said about African-Americans. And what we have to do, particularly when we’re the oppressed, is *we have to emphasize the truth and justice, more than those who are not oppressed.* Because that’s our only strength: truth and justice. And Maxine Waters has walked away from the truth, and she’s walked into something which bodes no good for the African-American, including the African-American Black Caucasians in the Congress.

Why the British hated Ron Brown

by Richard Freeman, Kathy Wolfe, and Edward Spannaus

Commerce Secretary Ron Brown was committed to the idea that the mission of the United States should be to assist the developing countries in raising their own standards of living, through U.S. exports of capital goods and industrial equipment. This necessarily included the creation of millions of well-paying, productive jobs for Americans. To fulfill this dream of improving the lives of people around the world, Brown was committed to promoting trade on the basis of government-to-government relations, and was firmly opposed to the British free-trade approach.

The Clinton administration, Brown said on Aug. 29, 1994, “has junked a 12-year tradition of laissez-faire government,” and would now mobilize government funds “to fight for U.S. exporters in the global market.”

The China mission

In August-September 1994, Brown travelled with a large delegation of government officials and heads of American companies to China and Hong Kong. His objective was to realize \$25 billion worth of trade. He proposed that over \$10 billion in U.S. Ex-Im Bank credits be allotted for exports to China—a proposal which Congress later killed; in fact, Republicans in Congress were attempting to dismantle the Commerce Department altogether.

Before departing for China, Brown said: “The U.S. has been lagging behind in the Chinese market, especially in infrastructure. In selecting the 24 companies in the mission, we chose telecommunications, transportation, and power generation. . . . There will be several hundreds of billions of dollars spent on infrastructure and development between now and the year 2000. I certainly am interested in American companies participating heavily in those infrastructure projects; that is clearly one of the purposes of the mission.”

The National Export Strategy

Brown’s trade policy toward China was part of a broader Clinton administration strategy called the National Export Strategy (NES), which had been announced by the President in September 1993. At that time, the Commerce Department designated ten Big Emerging Markets (BEMs), all in the

Third World, of which China is the largest, “offering the greatest opportunity for U.S. trade expansion in the 21st century.”

The idea behind the NES was to pool all the resources of the different branches of the U.S. government, and to hone in on selected objectives. This meant concentrating exports on those markets with high levels of population, and great growth needs. These ten countries constitute about one-half the world’s population (their 1994 population is given here in parenthesis): China (1.19 billion), India (919 million), Indonesia (200 million), South Korea (45 million), Brazil (158 million), Mexico (92 million), Argentina (34 million), Turkey (62 million), Poland (38 million), South Africa (44 million).

Brown’s Undersecretary of Commerce for International Trade, Jeffrey Garten, outlined the National Export Strategy in a June 1994 speech in New York. He stated that in 1992, the United States had exported \$106 billion worth of goods and services to the BEMs, which was one-fourth of all U.S. exports in 1992. Garten said that the idea was to direct the government’s efforts “toward those areas in which Washington could have the greatest impact, the greatest bang for the buck.”

“When we looked to our traditional trading partners in Europe or to Japan, we saw a fairly grim picture in the near future,” with no significant growth projected, he said. But, the BEMs shared a number of important attributes, Garten said. “They were all physically large. They had significant populations and represented considerable markets for a wide range of products. Virtually all had strong rates of growth, or clearly held out the promise of economic expansion in the future. Virtually all had undertaken some significant program of economic reforms and seemed likely to expand on those programs in the future. Virtually all were of major political importance within their regions; moreover, they were what we call ‘regional economic drivers’ — their growth would engender further expansion. . . .

Infrastructure is key

“Consider . . . what I said earlier about where government can help the most. It is in infrastructure—in mega-projects of the type that I was describing—that government and business often form the most successful partnerships. Often the bidding process is done through a government procurement system. Here the intercession of foreign governments in the process is essential and expected. This is where systematic, effective advocacy by Washington on behalf of our firms is critical. . . .

“Many of the big infrastructure projects which constitute the foundations on which these Big Emerging Markets will build their futures, are being bid out now. And if you build today’s Metro in Guangzhou, then you are more likely to get next year’s service contract or sell the additional trains they will need in five years or win the bidding for neighbor-

ing subways. Getting in early will offer returns for many years to come. That is yet another reason why it is essential that we begin implementing that strategy soon.”

Garten said that the United States viewed China as part of a Chinese Economic Area, which includes mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. “Take just one sector—infrastructure—and one market—the Chinese Economic Area. In the next six years, we expect that the governments of the CEA will spend over \$560 billion on infrastructure projects—power generations plants, airports, highways, telecommunications projects, water, sewage. If we get just our fair share of that—the proportion of projects we get today—that alone will create almost the same number of jobs—500,000—as are currently supported by U.S. exports to all ten Big Emerging Markets now. . . .

“Look to Asia more broadly and you see over \$100 billion of infrastructure projects in India—a country with 900 million people . . . and only 7 million phone lines. You will see over \$100 billion more of infrastructure projects in Indonesia—a country that is spread along an archipelago of 13,000 islands, all that must be linked together by telecommunications satellite and power lines.”

The infrastructure figures for the Chinese Economic Area, plus India and Indonesia, would add up to \$760 billion by the year 2000.

The British view

A British view of the perceived threat posed by the Clinton-Brown economic strategy was spelled out by a British analyst, formerly with the (Scaife-funded) Heritage Foundation in Washington, during a discussion about one year ago. He contrasted the Clinton-Brown approach to that of Henry Kissinger. He said that what Ron Brown was trying to do “had very little to do with free enterprise. He was trying to negotiate these state-to-state mega-deals.”

“Brown basically was like Clinton, for big government,” the analyst complained. “He wanted the U.S. to do in the LDCs [less-developed countries], the kinds of things which the old welfare state did for poor Americans, or so he thought. He thought that the old-line Democratic welfare state policies were great for African-Americans, they would be great for poor Chinese. It was just more big government.”

Kissinger, on the other hand, “believes in the private sector,” the British analyst said. “He believes that government connections exist to serve the private sector.”

Asked whether Brown’s plans to build infrastructure in China might have created problems for Kissinger’s business, he replied: “Had a Democratic U.S. government gotten very involved in state-to-state direct deals with China, circumventing the private sector, no conservative businessman would have been delighted.”

While commenting that it’s “a terrible thing to say,” he said that Kissinger was likely “more or less relieved,” when Brown was no longer on the scene.