

accumulation" tactics which were so successful for Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.) in the Bert Lance affair.

The Washington Post takes the opportunity to inflame the situation, and tries to use the House Ethics Committee investigation as a battering ram against those networks in the South Korean government, U.S. intelligence agencies, the Carter Administration, and Congress that want to fight the British economic warfare against the U.S. Fueling the fire is the paper's Jan. 18 editorial and editorial cartoon. The cartoon depicts a frantic Carter and Bell surrounded by a number of boiling-over pots — labeled "Tong Sun Park Situation," "Marston Issue," and "FBI Cases." The caption reads: "You got any way of lowering the thermostat, Griffin?"

The editorial is excerpted below:

...This is the monkey on Congress's back. It is a diplomatically embarrassing fact, but a fact no less, that Congress can't get rid of that monkey unless Seoul cooperates. Congress has the power — in its direct control over aid funds and its indirect control over the whole climate in which Korean-American relations are conducted — to bargain for further testimony by other Koreans, even by present officials, if that proves necessary. We read Mr. Jaworski's complaints not so much as an attack on the Justice Department as a signal to South Korea that it can't get away merely by producing Tongsun Park.

Schlesinger, Rand To Use Budget Issue To Force Pentagon Shake-up

Secretary of Defense Harold Brown has asked Brookings Institution official Henry Owen to accept the recently created post of Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, according to the *New York Times*. Simultaneously, Brown has established three task-forces, one headed by Rand Corporation president Donald Rice, to study and produce recommendations for the reorganization of the Defense Department and the military command structure.

So far, the reorganization proposals that have been mooted in the Eastern press echo those of the notorious Trilateral Commission Report "Remaking Foreign Policy" drafted by Kissinger associate Graham Allison and former Rand official Peter Szanton. Szanton is now chief of the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) reorganization task force and the man to whom Brown will submit the results of the three Department of Defense studies for review and presidential action.

The *New York Times* leak was a "sneak preview" to prepare the way for Carter's call for "civil service reform" in his State of the Union address. Civil service reform was the centerpiece of the Szanton-Allison report which, among others, called for mass transferrals of seasoned Pentagon and State Department personnel into such other executive departments as Interior or Agriculture — presumably to be replaced by Ralph Nader's minions.

According to the *New York Times*, "the appointment (of Owen) cements Mr. Brown's control over the military and enables the Defense Secretary to place a civilian in a ranking job overseeing national security objectives and the military forces needed to meet them."

By way of explanation, the *Times* emphasized that Brown's reorganization plans harken back to the 1960s when Robert S. McNamara and the Rand Corp. completely overhauled the Defense Department through a not-so-clever budget reorganization; later Rand assumed direction and reorganization of the Bureau of the Budget which finally became the Office of Management and Budget during the Nixon Administration under the direction of Acting Budget Bureau head, and former

Rand official, James R. Schlesinger. This 1960s Rand initiative, led by future Rand president Henry Rowen, instituted "programmed budgeting" and with this began the 17-year destruction of U.S. research and development capabilities. Thus the *Times* asserts that Brown's reorganization offensive "could lead to an overhaul of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and has placed tighter control on spending by the armed forces" (already). "With the creation of an Under-Secretary for Policy, Mr. Brown has clearly taken the initiative for Pentagon planning and programs out of the hands of the military hierarchy and placed it in the control of civilians."

Brown first proposed the creation of the undersecretary post on the eve of the Carter Administration's assumption of office last year. As a result of strong public opposition to his attacks on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and military services at the time, he quietly dropped the issue only to conduct a lobbying effort for passage of legislation creating the undersecretary post, an effort that succeeded two months ago.

The outrage last year over Brown's proposals was fueled by an *EIR* exposé on the Graham-Allison report and how it paralleled Brown and other administration officials' actions. The report called for reorganizing Defense by dismantling the Joint Chiefs and replacing it with a "single chief military officer" who would have access to the President, where presently all the Chiefs have such access.

Now Brown is making another push, in the wake of the appointment of G. William Miller to the Fed. Miller's Textron collaborated with McNamara by "asset-stripping" private research and development firms.

The undersecretary will have authority over the Defense International Security Agency (ISA), the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), the National Security Agency and the department's Net Assessment branch, which evaluates Soviet military strength. The *New York Times* reports that "what has stirred the most attention" is the undersecretary's authority over the ISA. This is only partially true, since the ISA is riddled with old appointees of the Schlesinger period at Defense.

Just as critical will be any move by Brown or Owen, should he accept the appointment, to reorganize the Defense Intelligence or National Security agencies, which represent bulwarks of institutional strength for prodevelopment, R and D oriented conservatives throughout the country. Reorganization of these agencies and the Net Assessment branch would give nearly complete control over America's intelligence capabilities to the Anglophile cabal of Schlesinger, Brown, Mondale, and embattled CIA head Stansfield Turner.

Owen, a Trilateral Commission member and co-author of Brookings's "Setting National Priorities," has reportedly delayed final acceptance of the undersecretary position "pending assurances that he would have firm jurisdiction over the Pentagon agencies that deal with policy and planning," says the *Times*.

It is precisely such a waiting period that Brown has

desired all along. After having seen the elimination of the B-1, naval shipbuilding, and many other programs in the past year, the military services have been offered the prospect of planning their own demise and writing the epitaph for American military intelligence and R and D. Besides the Rand study on "Resources Management," they are participating in two other studies, "National Military Command and Control" and "Headquarters and Management." As much as they hope to win concessions by giving up their institutional strength, the old-line military will find that all final decisions will be reviewed by the OMB's Szanton.

Harold Brown's crocodile tears over a torn-up "deal" with the chiefs will be no consolation.

—Robert Gallagher

U.S. Labor Party Announces 1978 Congressional Slate And A Strategy For Victory

Last week, the U.S. Labor Party announced its first slate of six candidates for congressional offices up for election in November 1978. Executive Intelligence Review in New York City at the party's national headquarters obtained this interview with a spokesman:

Q: The U.S. Labor Party announced a slate of congressional candidates last week. Who are they and who are they running against?

A: We announced a slate of six candidates who are challenging six incumbent members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. What characterizes each and every one of these incumbent members of Congress is that they have time and again lobbied and legislated against the American System and for the British Fabian programs of slave labor, low-energy dense technologies, and fascist institutional reorganization.

For instance, the Labor Party's Illinois State Chairman, Gerry Rose, has announced against Illinois's Republican Senator Charles Percy who is at this moment sponsoring the Senate's "Nonproliferation of Nuclear Energy" bill. That bill is designed to halt nuclear energy development here in the U.S. and deny advanced nuclear technologies to the European nations and the developing nations of the Third World.

Massachusetts State Labor Party Chairman Lawrence Sherman will run against Rep. Tip O'Neill, the Democratic Speaker of the House who rammed Energy Secretary Schlesinger's energy legislation through the House last year with little more than a whimper from the bill's opponents.

New York State Labor Party member Michael Billington will take on Rep. Richard Ottinger. Ottinger and 101 fellow Democrats banded together last fall to oppose the Energy Development Corporation which Senator Russell Long was proposing as part of the

Senate's energy package. The EDC would have channeled government monies into all phases of energy research and development.

Maryland Labor Party member Deborah Hannania has declared against Rep. Parren Mitchell who has endorsed every proposed slave labor legislation ever introduced in the House under the pretext that slavery, like CETA make-work jobs, is good for the black community.

Wisconsin State Labor Party Chairman Paul Greenberg will campaign against Rep. Henry Reuss, who is best known for his authorship and sponsorship of the fascist national banking reorganization bill known as FINE.

The last announced candidate is Michigan State Chairman Kenneth Dalto who will run against Rep. John Dingle. Dingle is owned and operated by the UAW and he pushed Schlesinger's energy bill through very abrupt hearings in the House Commerce Committee last year.

This slate of six is just the first round. The Labor Party is looking at the more than 70 federal, state and local offices up for election this year.

Q: How does the Labor Party determine what offices it will run candidates for?

A: The Labor Party's electoral campaign will be the opening salvo of an all-out offensive against the post-Watergate Fabian infiltration of the U.S. government. That is clear in the case of the six incumbents the Labor Party had already announced against.

In the first nationwide election after the Watergate coup, there was a 25 percent shift in the political makeup of the House alone — from Republicans or old-line Democrats to "liberal" Democrats. That same phenomenon occurred during Senate and the governorship races of that and subsequent years.