

slate and gives him added leverage in cleaning out his opposition in Congress and the government bureaucracy.

Warnke and Turner both sailed through their Senate hearings. The phoney debate surrounding Warnke's nomination was acted out superbly by Sen. Jackson who before the debate claimed that he would give Warnke a hard time. On cue, Jackson asked vague questions on the theme, "Are you going to negotiate away everything we have to the Soviets?" Warnke answered with a simple "no" and "Scoop" politely did not pursue the point, essentially giving the nominee a forum for his views on disarmament. Even the Washington Post complimented the way in which the hearings helped, not hurt, Warnke's chances for Senate confirmation.

An additional lightning rod for conservative opposition to the Trilateral Commission member was provided by the hastily put-together Emergency Coalition Against Unilateral Disarmament which circulated murky statements about Warnke "selling the U.S. out to the Soviet Union" in an effort to keep conservatives' minds off their worries that Warnke's—and the Trilateral Commission's—stated policy would mean the end of American research and development and the destruction of the country's high-technology defense-oriented industries.

Although the conservatives did not, by and large, get sucked into the "Emergency Coalition" fiasco, they were unable to do much positive. "They just didn't get themselves together," said one leading Republican. Most probably, this disarray was directly contributed to by the lobbying of the "Emergency Coalition" personnel—most of them "right cover" stringers for Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission including Morton Blackwell and Richard Viguerrie of the Buckley family's National Review circle and some of the more rabid members of the American Security Council like Jack Fisher.

There are, however, indications from several sources within Congress that the tactical losses represented by the successful nominations have begun to galvanize a fight around the real issues that stand behind Carter's proffering of his two nominees. A number of Washington figures are reportedly showing a heightened awareness of the U.S. Labor Party's analysis that Warnke's ap-

parently "soft" line on arms control is both a psychological warfare feature of the Trilateral Commission's plans to engage in a thermonuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union, and a cover for Wall Street's deindustrialization of the advanced sector.

The latter point was recently underscored for these political forces by recent Carter statements on defense posture — statements mirrored by Warnke — that would wipe out huge sections of the country's research and development capabilities and bankrupt several aerospace companies — companies now devoted to wasteful production but nonetheless representing the most advanced technological applications in U.S. industry.

Central to the elimination and scaling down of companies such as Hughes Aircraft, LTV Aerospace, Rockwell International and so forth, is the targeting of Carter opposition in the Congress and industry represented by southern and western politicians whose backbone is provided by these and other high-technology corporations.

Turner to Intelligence

Significantly, the U.S. Labor Party was the only organization to testify against the nomination of Stanfield Turner for director of the CIA. As with the case of Warnke, Turner's nomination is part of the opening salvo in Carter's war on his opposition—the U.S.L.P. and its trade union and conservative industrialist allies. One of Turner's supporters, John Marks — the "former" intelligence operative who has helped the terrorists of the Institute for Policy Studies arranged slander campaigns and covert operations against the U.S.L.P. — testified that the areas which Turner would immediately investigate are: 1) the Hughes Aircraft Company; 2) the China Lobby, which includes E-Systems, Inc., a giant electronics firm from Texas and, 3) the connections of the Shah of Iran to Rockwell International, another defense contractor.

The Marks testimony, coupled with Turner's already stated promise to allow "dissenters" from the Vietnam era to criticize CIA policy, are proof positive that Turner will attempt to go ahead with a policy to wreck the traditional alliance between the conservative sections of the CIA and high technology-oriented industrial layers.

Carter's Budget-Cutting Spree: Will He Cut His Own Throat Too?

Carter's unveiling of his Domesday budget early this week has evoked such bitter opposition among all but the administration's most ardent Congressional supporters that the possibility of a Carter Watergating is being openly mooted on Capitol Hill.

Carter's newest bout with Congress erupted in earnest over the weekend. As soon as news of his proposal to axe federal funds for eighteen water projects became known, Congressmen, Senators, governors, and other state officials representing the affected areas began publicly

venting their "outrage" and "shock" over the proposed cuts. Symptomatic of the reaction were Arizona Republican Rep. Bob Stump's statements that the cuts were "shocking, incomprehensible." Senator Milton Young (R-ND) bluntly told reporters that "If the work is stopped on these projects, they will have little or no value. This is one of the most shocking things that has ever happened to North Dakota in my memory."

The wave of outrage reached an initial peak on Tuesday, when the House Interior Committee hauled

Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus before it to present an accounting. Led by chairman Rep. Moe Udall — a liberal Democrat from Arizona (whose Central Arizona Project is on Carter's hit list) who has thus far been a loyal Carter backer — angry committee members raked a shaken Andrus over the coals, demanding to know exactly who over in the White House had dreamed up the dam cutbacks.

Udall opened the committee's interrogation of Andrus by asking "Who the hell did you consult with on these cuts?" I certainly wasn't consulted and neither were any of my colleagues....I'm holding you personally responsible." An equally angry Rep. Kazen (D-Tex.) then queried Andrus on how the administration would respond if Congress refused to deauthorize funds already appropriated for the water programs. "Would you impound the funds?" When Andrus sat dumbly in his chair, Kazen said, "Well, let me rephrase my question a little. Would the President impound the funds?", pointedly noting, "The Nixon Administration tried that, and you know what happened to *them!*"

The round of questioning concluded with Rep. Rudd (R-Ariz.) calling the Carter administration the "Imperial Presidency" — the epithet used widely against Nixon — and accusing it of proposing a budget that shows "a callous disregard for human beings." At this point, informed sources are predicting that the Congress will block the proposed cuts, although there is evidence that Carter is trying to fracture the opposition by promising to save a few of the projects in a "case-by-case" review.

A similar fight is shaping up around Carter's proposed energy budget, particularly the cuts in nuclear research. Aides to all but one member of the House Appropriations subcommittee on Public Works — which will begin hearings on the nuclear budget early next month —

expressed adamant opposition to any reductions in federal funds to nuclear R and D when polled by the U.S. Labor Party this week. An aide to chairman Rep. Tom Bevill (D-Ala) summed up the subcommittee consensus that "nuclear energy is necessary to the development of our country." The administrative assistant to another subcommittee member was far more outspoken. "The country needs capital investment and jobs," the aide said, "not these environmentalist creeps, these devotees of zero-growth who want to flush the country down the sewer for the sake of a few fish."

The battle against Carter's assault on nuclear energy intensified Thursday when three members of the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) transformed House Science and Technology committee hearings on the administration's energy program into a promotional session for fusion power. Testifying one after the other, ERDA's overall fusion program director John Kintner, Laser fusion program head Stickney and Robert Hirsch of the Solar, Geothermal and Advanced Systems department all testified that rather than be cut back, funds for fusion R and D must be greatly expanded. Pointing to the recent major breakthroughs at MIT's Alcator Tokamak, the ERDA officials stressed that with proper levels of funding, commercially-applicable fusion could be developed by the 1980s. (See *Science and Technology*.)

It was reported late Thursday that the House Public Works subcommittee had already voted to reject an initial \$10 million of Carter's proposed cuts in the fusion program. The question now is whether the rest of the population — from industry through the trade unions — will shape the battle against the budget cutbacks into an open fight for an energy policy befitting the greatest industrial power in the world."