

the Carter-Volcker credit and industrial production base destruction policies will be perpetuated, thus causing a world depression worse than the 1930s, or else reversed quickly enough.

The Volcker depression policies operated in tandem with the wholesale restructuring of U.S. industry and transportation. Much of the restructuring and triaging of sections of the economy has occurred through the Carter policy of economic "deregulation." Under Carter, airlines, trucking, and rail have been deregulated.

Next year, no matter who's in office, further moves in this direction are scheduled. Banking deregulation and related schemes such as repeal of the McFadden Act, which prohibits the major commercial banks from operating in more than one state, will definitely be on the congressional calendar. Ditto with the question of whether the communications industry will be "deregulated" and hence transformed.

3) Continued U.S. adherence to a neo-Malthusian policy perspective, such as that endorsed by the Carter administration in its "Global 2000" report which calls for radically reducing world population levels in the next 20 years.

Whether this perspective, explicitly endorsed by both Secretary of State Muskie and President Carter, is to be shelved or not, will be demonstrated almost immediately. For starters, the next U.S. President will be faced with a decision whether to continue to "look the other way" and allow hundreds of millions of Africans to die of starvation—causing the greatest genocide to date in human history—or fashion the necessary emergency aid measures required.

In fact, the entirety of U.S. agricultural policy, with direct consequences through the mid-1980s, will be decided on in 1981. The Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 expires in 1981. A new act embracing agricultural policy for the next four years will be debated and voted on in 1981. The percent of parity-level federal funding decided on, the provisions for federal aid on crop acreage allocations, and so on will shape the key parameters of U.S., and hence, world agricultural production.

Parallel with the production decisions, the most important agricultural export decision of the decade will occur in September 1981, with the expiration of the five-year U.S.-Soviet grain export treaty, which set a mandatory minimum of 8 million tons annually of grain exports to Russia—a "floor" level which has been maintained through the embargo, which does not effect the treaty.

The renegotiation period represents an excellent opportunity to not only end the embargo, but utilize expanded trade to move superpower relations out of the mode of cynical "sphere of influence" deals, and the deception games embedded in the arms control charade.

With equal rigor, an acid test for the retention or

abandonment of the neo-Malthusian outlook will occur in the domain of energy policy. In 1980, Congress passed, and Carter was forced to sign, the McCormack fusion legislation, which mandates the nation to develop and commercialize fusion energy in the next 20 years. This holds the promise of eliminating scarcity for centuries to come, and ending the genocidal policy dictates of neo-Malthusianism.

The year 1981 is the litmus test. The fusion bill, though passed, requires yearly committee and floor fights to appropriate the money that will give the mandate teeth. The coming year will mark the first and most important such appropriations fight.

Thus the many fronts and numerous battles, all key, are shaped around the fundamental fight coming to a head in the next year: policies conducive to world industrialization or to global neo-Malthusianism will predominate.

Bob Komer and forward bases

Robert Komer, undersecretary of defense for policy, the number-three man at the Pentagon, recently delivered an outline of Carter administration proposed defense posture for the 1980s to an audience at Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, D.C. Komer is the acknowledged architect of the Carter administration's so-called Rapid Deployment Force (RDF), the melange of U.S. Marine Corps and Army Airborne divisions with apportioned naval and air support that is earmarked for "crisis contingency" deployment to regions such as the Middle East or the Persian Gulf.

Komer summarized the Carter administration's defense posture in five points.

(1) The U.S. and the NATO allies are to rearm in a "conventional build up," to use Komer's phrase, "regardless of who wins the presidential election." The NATO allies and "Japan in particular must take on a much greater burden in this rearmament process."

(2) "Whoever is in office" must be committed to "arms control and the SALT process," because it "is cost-efficient and saves money."

(3) "We must adopt a two-front policy . . . and commit ourselves to making China less vulnerable to [Soviet] attack." This, according to Komer, is to be done by "bolstering China's defensive capabilities in whatever way necessary."

(4) The U.S. must establish a “credible force in the Persian Gulf,” Komer said. The “European allies must accept a division of labor and responsibilities by doing more in Western Europe,” he declared.

(5) “Immediate military readiness is more important than longer term modernization,” with procurement and modernization to be sacrificed for “readiness.” Komer concluded, “It is impossible to do both at this time.”

Under the Carter-Komer posture, the larger body of the Armed Forces are cannibalized through slashing of modernization programs and force levels, to prop the “Rapid Deployment Forces” up at “high readiness.”

Bluff and confrontation

As the RDF military commanders now publicly admit, actual functioning of the forces’ deployment is to act as the nuclear tripwire in the Persian Gulf.

Army General Volney F. Warner, Commander of the U.S. Readiness Command headquartered at McGill Air Force Base, Fla., stated this week, “And if somebody says we’ve got to commit the 82nd [Airborne Division] or that Marine brigade right now—it’s in the national interest—that’s not too big a force to lose.”

The emphasis by the Carter Pentagon on confrontation in the near term is equally documented. “I would be more inclined to do it now than later,” General Warner said. The RDF troops’ deployment would “say to the Soviets” in Warner’s words, “Okay guys, if you do, that’s going to be a big bump, because we’re in the area, and all that implies when you bump up against the United States.”

Komer’s remarks on SALT II have been seconded by Defense Secretary Harold Brown in campaign speeches. Brown has gone further to quantify the amount he “projects” can be shifted to “readiness” and creation of confrontation/trip wire-purpose conventional forces, at “from \$30 to a \$100 billion” over the coming decade. At the same time outlays in strategic forces would be reduced.

The third point of Komer’s address, the military development of China, is the false axiom upon which the “slash force levels and modernization” premise of point five is based. China is incompetently—and with potentially fatal consequences for us all—developing as “the prime surrogate [non-NATO] land power.”

The Chinese army, in this projection, forms an ostensible “substitution” for what U.S. Army Chief of Staff General Edward C. Meyer has aptly termed “our hollow Army.”

The obvious problem with Komer, Brown, et al., is that the more their “readiness” or cannibalization posture is implemented, the more their “surrogate” policy forces them to move deeper into Peking’s embrace. The United States is becoming ever more dependent on Communist China.

Brilab acquittals: a turning point?

by Scott Thompson

A federal jury Oct. 22 acquitted Texas Speaker of the House Billy Clayton and his two codefendants, Austin law partners Randall Wood and Donald Ray, of all the charges the Justice Department brought against them for its Brilab “sting.”

At a press conference held right after their not guilty verdict was read, Wood and Ray said that they would work to assure a full congressional review of the Justice Department’s gross misconduct and total disregard for the constitutional rights of its targets in Brilab-Abscam.

“I am going to pull every wire,” said Ray, “to have a U.S. Senate investigation to probe the FBI’s actions in Brilab. There is a great deal that must be said about the FBI’s actions to avoid the travesties of justice that have occurred here.”

With these strong statements Wood and Ray have joined a growing number of victims of Justice Department “stings” who have spoken out about departmental abuses.

Among them are: Cong. Michael Myers (D-Pa.) who has scheduled appearances on the three major networks after the unprecedented showing of FBI videotapes of his entrapment on nationwide TV; Cong. John Jenrette (D-S.C.) who is reportedly preparing a call for a full congressional review of Brilab-Abscam; and, Rep. John Murphy (D-N.Y.) who this month filed separate suits against NBC and the *New York Times* for reporting unverified “leaks” from the Justice Department’s Abscam team.

It is not only the victims of Brilab-Abscam who are speaking out. A key force mobilizing the mounting anger at Brilab-Abscam abuses is the Committee Against Brilab and Abscam whose advisory board includes many leading trade unionists, entrepreneurs, and regional political leaders.

In Texas, the extent of the anger at the Justice Department’s unconstitutional methods was shown in events which followed the day after Speaker Clayton’s acquittal. Both Texas governor Clements and Houston Mayor McConn called upon the department to cease its use of Brilab-Abscam tactics. And, a poll taken by a leading Houston radio station showed two-thirds of the