

1981 issues start with foreign policy

by Konstantin George

Regardless of the outcome of the Nov. 4 presidential election, 1981 will be a decisive year to the nation, and, by direct implication, the world. Issues stand on the agenda that require urgent policy answers from both the executive and the legislative branches.

In this issue, *EIR* inaugurates a feature of our pre-inauguration coverage that will present the major issues facing America and the new administration in the coming year. We will inform our readership during the transitional weeks ahead about the major problems, opportunities, and proposals in the spheres of foreign, domestic, and national security policy.

We begin with a scan of what will be decided in 1981 in some of the crucial areas, focusing on the question of war or peace. Given the international concern continually manifested on this question, we include the following summary of the essential facts concerning what U.S. defense posture and strategic doctrine for the 1980s will be, should the posture recently enunciated by Defense Secretary Harold Brown, and his assistant secretary of defense Robert W. Komer, prevail in any administration, and how such policy will at some point in the '80s lead to war.

* * * * *

There are three intersecting elements capable of engendering the type of superpower strategic miscalculation which could produce general war. Policy debate and decisions directly relevant to the causes of general war

will be occurring throughout 1981.

1) The attempt at consolidating a doctrine of "geopolitical encirclement" of the Soviet Union, through a combination of U.S. forward bases in the Middle East and Indian Ocean, promoting and aiding insurrectionary destabilizations along the Soviet rim, as in Afghanistan and China, and the dispatch of arms and military technology to Communist China.

Carter has acquired U.S. base rights for Berbera, Somalia; Mombasa, Kenya; Ras Banas, Egypt; and Oman; with possible extensions in the near future into the key oil-producing states themselves. The make-or-break congressional funding decisions for these facilities will come during 1981.

The central question will be whether U.S. policy will be shaped in cooperation with our allies to prevent any superpower military stationings in the highly flammable Middle East, or on the contrary, toward militarily occupying Europe and going for Japan's oil jugular.

Under Carter, the United States, under the guise of a "dual technology transfer" program, began active military assistance to the People's Republic of China. The levels of both sustenance and expansion of that program, crucial to the war-causing dynamic, will be debated and decided on next year.

2) The pursuance of depression policies in the industrialized nations, and the extension of IMF-dictated austerity conditions to the developing sector.

The cardinal question on the 1981 agenda is whether

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."