

employees was the 1978 Civil Service Reform Act; and the process by which it was developed and considered could not be more different than what we see today. Months prior to submitting his proposal to the Congress, President Carter established a working group to study personnel policies. The group heard from more than 7,000 individuals, held 17 public hearings and scores of meetings, and issued a three-volume report. Upon subsequent introduction of the legislation, House and Senate Committees held 25 days of hearings. . . .

This thorough, open, and fair process resulted in civil service reform legislation that garnered near-unanimous bipartisan support in both chambers.

The contrast to the current process could not be more clear. This measure was conceived by a handful of the President's closest advisors without any public input; regrettably, not a single Federal employee group was consulted. Since introduction of the legislation last week, the House has scheduled a couple of hearings; a handful of witnesses will provide testimony; and it will likely be attached to the Defense Authorization bill and approved by the full House prior to the Memorial Day recess. But why the urgency to enact such sweeping reforms? . . .

But this bill is even more objectionable for what it does than for how it came to be. This proposal will have the chilling effect of undoing decades of some of the most important worker protections enacted by Congress. Among its most egregious provisions, the legislation grants the Secretary of Defense the authority to strip Federal workers of their collective bargaining rights, deny employees their right to appeal unfair treatment, grant supervisors complete discretion in setting salaries and determining raises, and abolish rules requiring that reductions-in-force be based on seniority and job performance.

#### **Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz to the May 6 Government Reform Committee hearing:**

As we have seen so vividly in recent days, lives depend, not just on technology, but on a culture that fosters leadership, flexibility, agility and adaptability. To foster these qualities and bring DoD into the 21st Century, we need legislative help. One of the key areas in which we need your help, is in transforming our system of personnel management so that we can gain more flexibility and agility in how we handle the more than 700,000 civilians who provide the Department vital support, or to deal efficiently with those who don't. The ability to do so is nothing less than a national security requirement, because it goes straight to how well we will be able to defend our country in the years to come. . . .

In an age when terrorists move information at the speed of an e-mail, money at the speed of a wire transfer, and people at the speed of a commercial jetliner, the Defense Department is still bogged down, to a great extent, in the micro-management and bureaucratic processes of the industrial age, when the world has surged ahead into the information age.

---

## U.S. Military

---

# Rumsfeld & Co. Force Behind-the-Scenes Revolt

by Edward Spannaus

"Rumsfeld conducting war on Army," read a headline in the May 7 *Baltimore Sun*. In fact, Donald Rumsfeld's denigration of the Army and its infantry forces has been a hallmark of his entire reign as Defense Secretary, with Rumsfeld and his top deputies, such as Paul Wolfowitz and Steven Cambone, clashing repeatedly with top Army leaders over the past two years. This has now, according to knowledgeable sources, given rise to a full-scale, behind-the-scenes revolt against Rumsfeld, and in opposition to his attempts to wreck the traditionalist military and officer corps.

The latest affront was the disclosure that Rumsfeld had not only fired Secretary of the Army Thomas White—a former Army General—but had sent his deputy Paul Wolfowitz to White's office a few days after this, to order unceremoniously that White clear out by May 9. "The Army is in a state of belligerence over this latest insult," an Army official told the *Washington Times*. "The issue now is, when does this attack on the Army stop? When does President Bush put a stop to this?" the official asked. "We Republicans did not come into this building to experience a Stalin [purge]."

Syndicated columnist Robert Novak (who has frequently served as a voice for institutional opposition to the neo-conservative takeover of Bush Administration policy), recently wrote that Rumsfeld is now in a position to put his handpicked people in the three top Army positions. "Rumsfeld is forcing a thinner Army, and he does not want a service Secretary allied with 'dinosaur' generals backing their heavy forces with plenty of armor and artillery," Novak said. The dumping of White, the pending replacement of Chief of Staff Eric Shinseki, and the announced retirement of Vice Chief of Staff John Keane, "clears the board for Rumsfeld to pick generals who will not oppose reducing Army strength by the equivalent of two divisions."

### A 'Transformational' Army Secretary

A high-level former military source told EIRNS that what Rumsfeld wants to do is to eliminate all heavy divisions, leaving only light, mobile divisions to serve as an imperial rapid deployment force. The same source said that Keane had let it be known within the Pentagon that he is stepping aside, because he does not wish to serve under Rumsfeld.

And, in what is taken as yet another slap at the Army,

Rumsfeld has reportedly chosen the current Air Force Secretary, James Roche, to replace White as Army Secretary. The appointment is regarded as unusual in several respects, including that Roche has no Army experience, but was a career Navy officer. Roche is closely associated with the anti-Army “transformation” group centered around Andrew Marshall—who has been a principal architect of the utopian “Revolution in Military Affairs” (RMA) for 30 years. Roche was Marshall’s chief military assistant from 1975-1979, and then worked with Wolfowitz in the State Department policy-planning office in the early 1980s. Roche has remained close friends over the years with both Andy Marshall and Wolfowitz.

Prior to the invasion of Iraq, there were indications that Rumsfeld might have been on his way out. Senior Republicans in the Senate were reported to be furious at Rumsfeld’s arrogance and his failure to keep them informed about the Administration’s Iraq war plans.

Then, a week into the Iraq invasion, retired and active uniformed military officers began talking to the news media about Rumsfeld’s personal interference in the military’s war planning, which had left U.S. troops dangerously exposed, with long, vulnerable supply lines. The highest-ranking active-duty officer to speak out was the V Corps Commander in Iraq, Gen. William Wallace, who made the now-famous comment: “The enemy we’re fighting is a bit different than the one we had war-gamed against.”

At a Pentagon press briefing on April 1, Rumsfeld and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Richard Myers were asked about these criticisms; Myers jumped in, very agitated, and said that these “bogus” and “false” criticisms were causing “harm to our troops who are out there fighting very hard, very courageously.”

But, nevertheless, on March 7, General Wallace reiterated his criticisms. “I make no apologies for those comments,” Wallace said. “The enemy that we fought in al-Samawa, the enemy that we fought in An Najaf, the enemy that we fought in Al Hillah and in Karbala, the enemy that we fought to some extent in An Nasiriyah when the 5th Corps first seized Tallil Air Base and the first intact bridge over the Euphrates River, was much more aggressive than what we expected him to be, or at least, what I expected him to be. He was willing to attack out of those towns toward our formations, when my expectation was that they would be defending those towns and not be as aggressive.”

Various media reports had interpreted Myers’ April 1 denunciations as a “shot across the bow,” on Rumsfeld’s behalf, directed at officers who were voicing their criticisms. It was also reported that colleagues of General Wallace wondered out loud if Wallace’s head was on the chopping block.

It was. On May 6, Rumsfeld dumped Wallace, replacing him as the head of the V Corps in what the Pentagon took pains to describe as a “normal rotation.”

# ‘Doomsday’ Budget For New York City

by Mary Jane Freeman

Fire! It’s blazing in your Brooklyn neighborhood. It’s 7:00 at night. Four and a half minutes later the New York Fire Department (NYFD) company arrives, the fire is brought under control, and no lives are lost. You were lucky. By the end of May, under the announced budget cuts of New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg, your local fire company will close. Response time for a company farther away will be longer and lives will likely be lost.

On April 3, Bloomberg issued a two-tiered 2004 budget. The first immediately cuts \$600 million. Thousands of layoffs of city workers have begun, along with the closure of eight firehouses, and cuts to health, education, and seniors programs. The second tier, dubbed a “doomsday” contingency plan, slashes \$1 billion if promised state aid fails to materialize and/or new tax revenue streams devised as a temporary fix, fall short, which is likely in these depression times.

The bursting of the stock market bubble has hurt the city’s revenue base, as it became heavily dependent on the Wall Street speculative economy after its 1970s fiscal crisis. (In 1975, a bankers’ dictatorship, known as “Big MAC”—the Municipal Assistance Corp./Emergency Financial Control Board—took over the city, and imposed a policy called “planned shrinkage.” Shrunken was the city’s productive workforce, especially its manufacturing sector, and city services.) Bloomberg, raising the specter of Big MAC, warned, “We must not . . . surrender our destiny to the Financial Control Board.” So, instead, he will impose the austerity himself. His cuts will include immunization programs and sanitation jobs, the loss of which will expose citizens to potential epidemics, amidst collapsing physical and social infrastructure.

Over a year ago, the city had a \$7.5 billion deficit. To “fix” it, the Mayor slashed the budget, streamlined services, and raised property taxes by 18.5%. Still, revenues kept falling, and so the deficit hole grew again. By January it grew another \$2.9 billion, and as of March 30 it was \$3.8 billion. This shortfall is fueled by steep unemployment, which is now at 8.8% citywide, 2.8% higher than the official national rate; it is up to 11% in the Bronx and 9% in Manhattan!

## Public Safety and Health Care Jeopardized

Bloomberg blames the labor unions for the new cuts because they failed to capitulate to his demand for \$600 million in concessions. The \$600 million plan will: lay off 194 Fire Department positions and reduce fire marshals by 25%, down