

National News

Is Harold Brown nuts?

Testifying before a House Appropriations Subcommittee on the proposed MX missile program, Secretary of Defense Harold Brown was asked by Rep. Gunn (D-Vt. (whether the program was in fact necessary. Shouldn't the U.S. simply inform the Soviet Union that if it detected a Soviet launch against the U.S. we would shortly launch a full strike against them, asked Rep. Gunn, the chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee. "Wouldn't this make the MX program a waste of time?"

Brown replied that it is absolutely not U.S. policy to "launch on warning." Said Brown: "That would be going to war by computer and that is a mistake."

A spokesman for the subcommittee said that it was his knowledge that Brown had altered U.S. strategic doctrine last year, in the policy memorandum codenamed "PRM-32." The spokesman stated that contrary to actual Soviet military doctrine, it was Brown's view that the Soviets "might not" launch all or most of their missiles and that the U.S. should be prepared to meet such a challenge with a "measured response."

It was also Brown's view that the "president needed more than a few moments to decide" about a response. The Pentagon feels that current U.S. detection and surveillance systems, as well as computer response programs, are inadequate.

The subcommittee spokesman said that it was Brown's strategic doctrine of "limited or measured response" that makes the MX or some similar program "militarily feasible and necessary."

In his testimony, Brown claimed that the MX program, which will, if approved by Congress, not be deployed until 1987 at the earliest, would prevent the Soviets from launching a "first strike." The Soviets, said Brown, will realize that the "U.S. will have the ability no matter what" to strike back.

Another source on Capitol Hill

pointed out that U.S. doctrine, according to PRM-32, does not rule out a first strike against the Soviets. This source said that Brown's MX program is "useful in a first strike," so cuts both ways. Brown has also stated that the Soviets can't be sure that the U.S. won't launch on warning. U.S. doctrine is apparently based on giving the Soviets the appearance that it has no doctrine.

Reuss proposes Volcker takeover U.S. industry

Wisconsin Democrat Henry Reuss, chairman of the House Banking Committee placed in the March 10 *Congressional Record* a proposal that the President create a new Department of Industry and Trade which would use the staff of the Federal Reserve to direct the reorganization of U.S. industry. Reuss specifically proposed that the new Department "rationalize" the auto industry, the steel industry, and the transport and food industry. "Reuss has a broad restructuring of the economy in mind," declared his aide.

Reuss's proposal on the trade department combined with the omnibus banking bill that passed the House March 27 would give Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker control over all U.S. banks and corporations.

In his statement to Congress and in a letter sent to President Carter, Reuss proposed that Carter establish the new Department of Industry and Trade by executive fiat, using the authority of the Government Reorganization Act. The bill allows presidential reorganizations to become law 90 days after proposed, if not stopped by Congress.

The Department would operate through the nationwide apparatus of the Federal Reserve System. "The new productivity increases, the structural reforming, the reindustrializing activities of the Department of Industry and Trade could be enhanced by drawing on the expertise of the 40,000 Federal Reserve employees now at work in Washington, D.C. and in the 12 cities housing

the Federal District Banks and in their 26 branches and 46 centers," says Reuss. Thus the Federal Reserve, which is already rationalizing the United States economy through a policy of tight, selective credit allocation, would be able to directly reorganize U.S. industry.

Reuss specifically proposed that the rationalized industries operate in the context of overall austerity, a balanced budget, tight credit, wage and price controls, and gasoline rationing.

The White House is now considering the Reuss proposal, watching for signs of opposition.

CSIS calls for trade warfare against Europe

At a March 26 conference, Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies announced the release of two monographs on U.S. export competitiveness, which touched off demands that the United States initiate trade warfare against its continental European allies. The Center's directors of the Export Competitiveness Project at Georgetown, Drs. Robert Kilmarx and Michael Samuel, denounced Europe for its extensive trade with the Third World, and warned that the U.S. was not in control of these trade patterns.

Declared Robert Kilmarx: "We are living in a dream world concerning our allies. They are self-serving, nationalistic and jingoistic with respect to their subsidy policies. We have to recognize that outside of NATO they have limited commitments with us in the rest of the world."

Similarly Samuels attacked "our so-called allies" for "behaving in their own national interests." The reports that will be released March 31 by the Center on export policy echo this same idea. Asked what should be done to stop the independent European trade policies, Drs. Kilmarx and Samuels demanded an aggressive U.S. export policy, that would break the European effort. They endorsed the legislation sponsored primarily by Senators Heinz (R-Pa.), Stevenson

Briefly

(D-Ill.) and Javits (R-N.Y.) for export trading companies for the Export-Import Bank to expand U.S. exports. At hearings March 7 and 19 on the Export Financing Act of 1980, a proposal to increase funding for the Eximbank, Senator Stevenson specifically singled out France for attack. He denounced the French government policy of low interest rate credit to former colonies as merely a "guise under which France gives export credit below the rate of the gentlemen's agreement."

Carter fails D.C. petition challenge

Who will Jody Powell vote for on May 6, the date of the Democratic primary in the nation's capital? Because he won't be able to vote for his boss, Jimmy Carter.

Citizens for LaRouche, the principal campaign committee for Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. has mounted a legal challenge to President Carter's petition signatures which were turned in to qualify the President and his slate of delegates for the District of Columbia's primary ballot. Carter's signatures numbered only 1,370. A total of 1,000 signatures in each of two Congressional Districts is required.

Doing a line-by-line scrutiny of Carter's petitions, CFL disqualified 650 Carter signatures. CFL representatives also found numerous cases where Carter campaign workers who had circulated petitions "padded" the number of signatures by signing their own names two or three times.

The validity of the CFL challenge was tested by over 17 frantic Carter/Mondale campaign representatives who poured over the petitions for two days. Observers on the scene report that the CFL challenge was found to be 90 percent valid.

The Democratic Central Committee petitioned the Election Board for a "review" of the signature requirements at their March 19 meeting.

Democratic State Committee chairman, Robert Washington, in a written affidavit presented to the Election Board meeting, claimed that only 1,000 total signatures were required for ballot status in both Congressional Districts. Two months earlier, brochures were mailed to every Democratic voter in Washington, D.C., which clearly stated that 2,000 signatures were required. Those brochures bore the signature of Robert Washington.

Attorneys for the Carter campaign have filed a motion to dismiss CFL's challenge on the grounds that the challenge does not specify both the President's and his delegates' place on the ballot. If this motion is successful the President would be on the ballot but his delegates would not.

FEC comes under fire

The Federal Election Commission came under fire last week as it went before the Senate Rules Committee to ask for its 1981 budget.

Strong attacks were made against the Commission by a spokesman for Citizens for LaRouche, the campaign organization of Democratic candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, and Senator Mark Hatfield, Republican of Oregon, for harassment of honest citizens seeking to participate in the political process.

Felice Gellman, Treasurer for Citizens for LaRouche, informed the committee that the the FEC press office was providing certain press "targets" among LaRouche's contributors. These contributors were then "harassed" by reporters who called them trying to concoct anti-LaRouche stories.

Senator Hatfield attacked the FEC for its prosecution of a Long Island, N.Y. taxpayers group which had spent \$135 to circulate the voting record of a particular candidate. The group had not filed a report with the FEC. If the FEC could provide no better information as to what FEC attorneys intended to do with their requested additional \$450,000 Hatfield called on Congress to deny them funds.

● **THE NEW YORK** Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) will meet this week at its New York City headquarters. The meeting's agenda will deal solely with "Implications for the Superpowers" of recent world developments and will be attended by past and present members of the U.S. National Security Council, including Zbigniew Brzezinski, Winston Lord, William Highland, Richard Burt, Fuada Agami, and Michael Oksenberg.

● **ED KOCH**, New York's mayor, thinks a transit strike might not be so bad for the city. "I would like to see New York start looking more like Peking," Koch said. "In Peking every morning thousands of people ride to work on their bicycles."

Koch, who also created a small furor by saying that he thought the Chinese school system was "more effective" than the American, was recently "re-educated" during a two week stay in Peking.

● **RONALD REAGAN**, the leading contender for the GOP presidential nomination, is even less popular in oil-giant Saudi Arabia than James Earl Carter, according to an informed source who quickly added, "if such a thing is possible." The Saudi princes, the source continued, "have identified Reagan's advisers and they won't come near him." It appears that disillusionment in Riyadh with Washington's current policies has spilled over into "total disenchantment" with what the upcoming U.S. presidential elections hold in store. The Saudi ruling family thinks George Bush is "a jerk." And, the source added, "they despise Carter only a little less than they despise Ted Kennedy."