

FEMA to run U.S. war crisis

by Lonnie Wolfe

Spokesmen for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington's crisis management operation, described to *EIR* this week how the agency and National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski will assume emergency powers to govern the United States in a war crisis.

FEMA is a little publicized agency that has been given broad powers by presidential order. It has been involved in crisis management planning since its formation in 1979. FEMA merged the functions of the Federal Preparedness Agency, the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, the Federal Disaster Assistance Administration, the Federal Insurance Administration, and the U.S. Fire Administration. It has handled such crises as the Three Mile Island nuclear incident, forest fires in the Far West, population relocation from the Mt. St. Helens volcano area, and the New York City transit workers strike.

"We are set up to handle any conceivable crisis," said a FEMA spokesman. "But our real responsibility is for implementing the domestic component of our national strategic doctrine."

FEMA derives its powers from a series of presidential directives and the Defense Production Act of 1950, which deals with the management of the economy in a national emergency. On Sept. 28, 1978 President Carter signed PD 41, a comprehensive policy statement on national civil defense goals which calls for the U.S. to develop a capacity to relocate the population in time of "international crisis." Several months ago, Carter issued PD 57, which is a classified "war mobilization" plan giving FEMA and the National Security Adviser broad prerogatives in carrying out such a mobilization.

When the President signed PD 59, which promulgates a limited nuclear war doctrine, he also signed a companion directive, PD 58, to deal with the continuity of government in a war crisis and provides for relocation of government and military command personnel.

A FEMA spokesman outlined the following scenario, stating that planning has been upgraded since the signing of PD 58 and 59.

In the first phase of the scenario the President, acting on recommendations of the National Security Adviser, declares a state of emergency. This is justified by any international crisis which carries with it the risk of war, and invokes the Defense Production Act of 1950 and Presidential Directives 41, 57 and 58, that give FEMA, in consultation with the National Security Adviser, con-

trol over U.S. production. FEMA already has control over U.S. strategic stockpiles and their industrial allocation. According to FEMA, "We control what is produced and how it is distributed."

The second phase of the scenario is activated as the crisis approaches a showdown. The President, on advice from the National Security Adviser, would recommend to various state governors that certain "high risk" population centers be evacuated, to make them less vulnerable to nuclear attack. FEMA sources say that while such planning is classified, their "internal scenarios" have for some time dealt with population relocation from possible targets of a Soviet counterforce strike.

A FEMA spokesman stressed that an evacuation would enter into the crisis bargaining with an adversary and show that the United States is "unwilling to back down or be blackmailed." Further, the spokesman said, this would "give our diplomats and president the upper hand in any confrontation by enabling the U.S. to go all the way to the edge of war. This is the kind of bargaining that the future may hold in store, I'm afraid."

In this way, the FEMA civil defense location—to be carried out after the agency and National Security Adviser are in virtual control of the country—is a critical component of the overall limited nuclear war doctrine enunciated in PD 59. "The key word is survivability," said a FEMA spokesman. "By survivability, we mean that our country will survive a nuclear war, maybe not an all out nuclear war, but certainly a limited one. The key to survivability is advance planning. . . . We have been given what amounts to a blank check to work these things out. Without us there is no reality to PD 59."

The FEMA spokesman refused to rule out the possibility of the United States conducting a counterforce nuclear strike after FEMA had evacuated U.S. population centers. "That depends on the crisis and the judgment of the National Security Adviser and the President," he stated.

The last phase of the scenario occurs right before the actual outbreak of war and involves the relocation to as yet undisclosed sites, the U.S. military command and key members of the government. This decision is made by the National Security Adviser and the President, carried out under plans so secret that the President would not even be informed of their details in advance of the crisis. The list of which government officials will be relocated is also to be kept secret to avoid "squabbles."

The FEMA spokesman reported that all such civil defense options will be in place by the fall. The command system has already undergone major test exercises and is "ready to function."

FEMA said such plans also have applications for "domestic social contingencies involving disasters, both man-made and natural," even though FEMA's primary function is "international crisis management."

FEMA officials outline limited nuclear war plans

In April 1980, a team of EIR investigators uncovered FEMA's secret planning for a nuclear war crisis. A re-evaluation of the information obtained at that time reveals that what FEMA and the National Security Council were planning was to implement the limited war-fighting doctrine now enunciated in Presidential Directive 59. We reprint below relevant excerpts from interviews published exclusively in the April 22 issue of the EIR that exposed FEMA's plans for a crisis management dictatorship over the U.S.

The following comes from an interview with General Frank Camm, FEMA's director of the Office of Plans and Preparedness.

Q: I understand you did a "resources exercise" recently with NATO?

A: Yes, it was of course highly classified but I can tell you this. There was a simulated nuclear exchange between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. We simulated a crisis in which a large group of people from 34 different government agencies and departments moved to another location to deal as government with the new situation. This included DOE, DOI, DOD, DOJ, every department of the government. We coordinated here at FEMA the entire relocation and restructuring because that is our job—coordination at all levels, Federal, state, and local. This occurred during just two weeks. We are still evaluating the results.

Then we had to look at what was left of the country. For example if Cincinnati was hit, wiped out, we had to be able to calculate from the level of blast and radiation envelope how much of the economy was lost—how many machine tools we had left, how much energy resources, how much transport infrastructure, how much of our national microwave communications grid had been wiped out in that area. Certain areas became off limits altogether because of radiation levels. We then had to reorganize the entire national transport and communications grid. . . .

Then regarding the economic rehabilitation of industry we took off the shelf the plans we have to establish in such a situation a new Cabinet-level officer of Defense Resources to organize all resources throughout the economy—that's what we mean by a resource exercise. We reorganized and allocated on a priority basis all financial resources, manpower resources, transportation re-

sources, communications resources. The nucleus for this would be the present Office of Resources of Planning and Preparedness. . . .

Q: How was this handled internationally?

A: Oh, the DOD handled the entire international end, with the alliance (NATO).

Q: What was so highly classified?

A: Oh, what was classified was the solutions to all this. It was a very far out situation. We had a number of dramatic solutions proposed. Their nature is highly classified. Especially classified is just what targets were hit and how much we lost and how much had to be rebuilt where, and exactly how. . . .

Q: What about the energy crisis resulting from a Mideast war?

A: Yes, our next priority is planning for an energy shortage. We don't care if the Persian Gulf shuts down or if every oil field in the U.S. shuts down. We're going to show the DOE how to run a rationing program. They don't have the staff, as I said before, on the field level to coordinate such a thing with local officials. We have the expertise. We have already worked out the plans for an oil blockade in case of general war. . . .

What follows is excerpted from an interview with John Nosita, General Director of Program Analysis and Evaluations of FEMA and "number 2" man in the agency. The "Federal Master Mobilization Plan" referred to by Mr. Nosita is compatible with Presidential Directive 59.

Q: What will be the peacetime application of FEMA's recent nuclear war simulation?

A: Oh, that simulation was only a part of the Federal Master Mobilization Plan—we are continuing a series of such simulations so that we have full emergency legislation on the shelf and ready to go for use in any emergency. The Federal Master Mobilization Plan is being developed over time by a joint task force of the National Security Council (NSC) and FEMA called the "Mobilization Planning and Programming Study" which was set up personally by Zbigniew Brzezinski. When the Master Mobilization Plan is finalized, it goes straight to Brzezinski—that will mean FEMA is fully ready to take over in the event of emergency.

Q: Does that mean that the Plan is applicable to any emergency?

A: Certainly, the plan is totally comprehensive, it contains provisions for mobilization of all resources, industrial resources, financial resources, energy resources. It would be applied to an oil embargo. It has the broadest applications. . . . ■