

Congressional Closeup by Ronald Kokinda and Susan Kokinda

Why is Africa food aid still delayed?

The influence of Henry Kissinger on the Reagan administration is apparent in a cynical tug-of-war which has developed between the administration and Capitol Hill over emergency food aid to Africa, and to Mozambique in particular.

While some 40,000 people, mostly children, die each day in Africa, the administration has chosen to tack its request for \$150 million in emergency food aid onto the controversial appropriations for emergency military aid to El Salvador, thus delaying the necessary immediate consideration.

Meanwhile, a grouping of liberal Democrats and Republicans—almost all supporters of the quota-increase bill which allowed the International Monetary Fund to keep imposing economic and social destruction on these countries—has taken the floor of the House and Senate to attack the administration for its “callousness.”

The hypocrisy reached its height in the House March 14 when Vic Fazio (D-Calif.), Ted Weiss (D-N.Y.), and Byron Dorgan (D-N.D.) attacked the administration’s linkage of food aid to the Central American controversy.

Fazio and Weiss have been unabashed supporters of the IMF. As *EIR* pointed out (Feb. 7), the paltry aid requested by these congressmen “can be wiped out with the stroke of a pen by the international financial and economic policies of the IMF, since, if the currency of one African country is devalued by 1%, more human beings die as the result of such a decision” than would be saved by the aid debated in Congress.

As of March 16, the Senate had attached \$80 million of the aid to a fuel assistance bill which has already passed the House, and which will now

be dispatched relatively quickly in conference committee.

DeLauer boasts about the ‘back channel’

Undersecretary of Defense for Research and Engineering Richard D. DeLauer, who the week before had tried to sabotage the U.S. beam-weapons defense program in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, told the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on March 12 that the Reagan administration was “making overtures to establish a back-channel dialogue with the Soviets.” Heretofore, administration officials have carefully avoided public use of the term “back channel.”

The subcommittee’s chairman, Ted Stevens of Alaska, is one of the Senate’s leading advocates of Western Europe’s “decoupling” from NATO; his staff is drafting legislation based on Henry Kissinger’s March 5 *Time* magazine proposals for black-mailing Europe.

DeLauer also stated that the emphasis in the FY1985 research and development appropriation is shifting toward conventional systems, now that strategic modernization is well on its way.

This time, rather than attacking the beam-weapons effort, DeLauer merely outlined the President’s funding request.

Subcommittee member Warren Rudman (R-N.H.) told DeLauer that, on the basis of current budget-cutting talks between the administration and Congress, the undersecretary would have to be prepared to cut his portion of the defense budget.

Rudman declared: “I am saying that this is political reality. These demands for cuts in your budget are not based on any assessment of the level

of threat facing the United States, you understand.”

Elaborating on this remarkable approach to defense needs, Senator Stevens suggested that DeLauer’s budget take cuts by mothballing any “new starts” during FY1985.

DeLauer said that such cuts, which would postpone work on a new submarine and a new cargo transport plane among other things, would be easier to absorb than cuts in ongoing programs. He pointed out that Congress had cut more from his RDT&E (research, development, technology, and engineering) budget in FY1984 than in most other areas.

Daniel Moynihan disrupts Mideast policy

A bill introduced last October by Sen. Daniel Moynihan requiring the United States to move its embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to the illegally annexed city of Jerusalem is picking up steam in the U.S. Senate.

The bill, S.2031, seeks to force U.S. recognition of Israel’s making-Jerusalem its capital.

Moynihan openly and correctly argues that U.S. recognition of Jerusalem as Israel’s capital would mean de facto acceptance of Israel’s policy of occupation.

“Our refusal, after 35 years of Israel independence, to send an Ambassador to Israel’s capital city and seat of government, as we have done with virtually every other established government in the world, is necessarily understood in the world to be a sign of American distance from the Israeli government and nation.”

At a time when U.S. relations with Arab allies such as Jordan and Saudi Arabia are most strained, and U.S. influence in the region is evaporating after the pullout from Beirut, such a

transfer of the embassy would be inflammatory in the extreme. Moynihan has over 30 Senate co-sponsors.

Feckless steel bill introduced in House

Sixty-one members of the House introduced protectionist legislation for the U.S. steel industry on March 8, entitled the "Fair Trade in Steel Act of 1984," H.R. 5081.

Several members, led by Joseph Gaydos (D-Pa.) and including Henry Gonzalez (D-Tex.) and Alan Mollohan (D-W.Va.), took the floor March 13 to claim that the act was not protectionist but simply designed to promote fair trade practices vis-à-vis competition from foreign steel imports.

While the disastrous state of the American steel industry and its implications for U.S. national security were pointed out, the proposed solutions were ludicrous.

Promoted as legislation backed by both industry and labor, the bill would limit the foreign share of the domestic U.S. steel and iron-ore market to 15% instead of the current 26% for five years or as long as the Secretary of Commerce determines that "plans are in place to utilize substantially all of the cash flow from the steel sector for reinvestment in, and modernization of the steel sector, including investment in new facilities, steel-sector working capital, and payments on debt and capital invested in the steel business." If the industry refused to modernize, the quotas would supposedly be lifted.

Two hundred steel production facilities and 270,000 steel worker jobs have been triaged since 1974—nine million tons of capacity and 25,000 jobs in the past two years alone. United Steel Workers of America members have taken \$3 billion in compensation cuts to help the industry, all without

visible return. The legislators' proposals scarcely seem tough enough to force steel management to modernize and produce.

Representative Gonzalez hit closest to the mark by attacking the Federal Reserve Board for "misallocation of credit resources, all of that made possible by the fact that these creditors' speculative interests have taken over control of the allocation of credit resources of our nation.

"And this is the reason why some of us have been advocating the reform . . . of the Federal Reserve Board, whose laxity and abdication of its responsibilities has resulted in this kind of speculative venture by the bankers. . . ."

The high point of Gaydos's remarks came on the national-security question. "If we were thrust into a war tomorrow," he said, "we could not produce enough steel to take care of our war needs, let alone our domestic peactetime needs. . . ." From there, however, he launched into an attack on U.S. allies including Japan, South Korea, Brazil, Canada, Argentina, Spain, Mexico, Sweden, and Australia.

The congressional Steel Caucus effort has avoided any discussion of how to expand world demand for steel, confining itself to tactics to gain more of a shrinking market.

Gaydos praised local self-help retraining groups, food banks, worker buy-outs of ancient plants, and similar 1930s-style efforts.

A new version of immigration bill

Representative Edward Roybal (D-Calif.) introduced H.R. 4909 on February 22 as an alternative to H.R. 1510, the long-stalled Simpson-Mazzoli bill. Roybal is asking the House leadership

and the chairmen of the relevant House committees, including House Judiciary Committee chairman Rep. Peter Rodino (D-N.J.), to allow hearings on the bill before the House takes up immigration reform again. Roybal has 30 co-sponsors.

Backers of Simpson-Mazzoli have tried to bring it to the floor during the past two years and are hoping to try again soon; they have been unable to get a firm commitment for floor action.

The Roybal approach rejects the most blatantly destructive features of Simpson-Mazzoli, but has many dubious features and contains no policy measures based on the fact that a properly growing U.S. economy would welcome labor from abroad. The decision to launch an alternative to Simpson-Mazzoli was made at a "Latin summit" held under the auspices of the Aspen Institute, which is openly committed to reducing population and eliminating industrial commitments. Roybal's office denies that the Aspen Institute initiated his ideas.

The new bill drops employer sanctions for those who hire illegals, and thus eliminates the much-attacked plan for national worker identification cards.

Instead of direct sanctions, the Department of Labor would more strictly enforce existing labor laws. The stated aim is to better protect the pay and working conditions of American workers, and lessen employers' incentives to hire undocumented workers.

The H-2 temporary foreign worker program would be eliminated. Existing immigration quotas would remain largely the same.

The Roybal bill would mandate the Immigration and Naturalization Service to establish a program to "sensitize" agents to special problems of ethnic backgrounds, and undertake expanded "community outreach."