

President Ford's aides showed some stirrings of life this week by adopting the attitude of ignoring the now openly obscene Nelson Rockefeller. The New York Post yesterday reported that Ford's aides are doing their best to ignore Rockefeller's repeated suggestions that Ford is less than devoted to the Republican platform. Rocky's moves, which are clearly aimed at fostering a split between Ford and former Reagan supporters, have forced the Ford people to finally respond — if only to keep Rocky from completely destroying the Republican

Party campaign. But the decision to "ignore" Rockefeller's sentiments falls far short of what is actually required. Ford's continuing insistence on maintaining an attitude of criminal compromise was in fact pathetically demonstrated yesterday at the press briefing given by Press Secretary Ron Nessen. Weakly attempting to defend Rocky's "fuck you" gesture of the day before, Nessen said: "Well, maybe he meant to indicate that the Republican Party is Number 1."

Brookings Pushes Military Buildup:

Endorses The 'Strumble Into War' Perspective

The Brookings Institution's just released document "Setting National Priorities — The Next Ten Years" is a clear signal from that bastion of Atlanticist policy formulation that the Rockefellers' drive for war and fascism is successfully pushing broader layers of the Wall Street cabal into line. In the Brookings report's section marked "Toward a New Consensus on U.S. Defense Policy," authored by Barry Blechman (a Carter advisor), Robert Berman, Martin Binkin and Robert Weinland, Brookings breaks precedent and for the first time in five years calls for a sizeable increase in the U.S. defense budget. The report ominously concludes "it must be recognized that the process of reducing the share of U.S. resources devoted to defense has more or less run its course. Additional savings are possible in some areas, but other sectors of the defense budget should receive more emphasis. In general, this means that defense spending will have to increase in real terms for at least the next five years...."

The Brookings call for an intensification of the arms race follows by one week a stinging denunciation of Brookings by columnists Evans and Novak, supporters of the Schlesinger counterforce doctrine. In their syndicated column Evans and Novak charged that Brookings, representing the majority of Carter's defense and foreign policy advisors, were advocating both softness on the defense question and the reduction of the defense budget.

Reflecting the intense faction fight in Democratic Party advisory layers and in the Atlanticist camp as a whole on the war question, Brookings turned right around and in its defense recommendations called for a 1977 defense budget which will outstrip the Administration's projected budget by some \$7 billion. The Brookings recommendations were immediately commended by Democratic candidate for U.S. Senate from New York Daniel Patrick Moynihan, also an advocate of the Schlesinger doctrine.

The Brookings call for additional funds to finance a major conventional military build-up parallels the demands made by Rockefeller puppet and NATO Supreme commander Gen. Alexander Haig and the Western European Atlanticist think tank the Institute for International Strategic Studies over the past week and a half.

Estimating that the prospects of general war are remote but not out of the question, the Brookings report focuses on an immediate period of massive conventional build-up aimed at vastly enlarging NATO forces and arms in Western Europe; bolstering the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean; and beefing up North Sea naval forces. Emphasizing that "expensive competition in arms will maintain an uneasy peace at best," the Brookings report isolates the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and Western Europe as the regional areas where crisis is most likely and U.S. armed intervention may be required.

The report offers as its excuse for massive rearmament the bogeyman of a massive Soviet troop and arms build-up in

Eastern Europe combined with an alleged shift in Soviet doctrine in which the Soviets now see a European conventional or tactical nuclear "short war" as possible. The report suggests that portions of U.S. forces in East Asia and their support forces be shifted to Western Europe and the Mediterranean. This is to be done in conjunction with additional troops, streamlined coordination of NATO forces and increased arms aided by a NATO arms standardization procedure for Western Europe to counter. It suggests that NATO forces be so organized as to address a European short war. Through a build-up in the naval shipbuilding program the Sixth Fleet would be built up to control the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East region. The increased capabilities in Western Europe and the Mediterranean would augment present U.S. naval forces in the Indian Ocean to be used as a threat or a reality in lieu of another Arab oil boycott in the Persian Gulf.

This "stumbling into nuclear war by '77" perspective is to be augmented by the modernization of strategic forces. The report suggests the full transfer from the Poseidon-Polaris submarine-based weapons system to the newer Trident. It follows by proposing that either the B-1 bomber program be implemented or that the cruise missile be added to the present B-52 bomber forces.

The report, however, hedges on a call for immediate war by attacking efforts to implement the Schlesinger counterforce-first strike doctrine. It also refers the proposals for a land based mobile system put forward by former Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Nitze and for a massive civil defense program in the U.S. to the hopper. Brookings also stipulates that a failure to secure a new SALT arms limitation agreement would push U.S. military doctrine and allocations in the Schlesinger-Nitze direction. If that occurs, Brookings admits, the global situation would heat up to the brink of nuclear war.

The wavering Brookings report concludes its section of "Strategic Forces" by stating, "In a nutshell the danger of adopting a high-rise defense policy (first strike-ed.) that relies on nuclear options is not that such a strategy would not work but that it might work too well — that it would by raising the stakes of virtually any conflict involving the U.S., introduce new uncertainties into the calculations of decision makers around the world. Uncertainty might, in some cases, cause foreign leaders to behave more prudently, but would also raise the cost of failure to terrifying heights."

But the report also offers this apology for the insane Schlesinger doctrine: "Essentially Schlesinger only reaffirmed but made more explicit what had been a continuing theme in U.S. defense policy. This nation never had foreclosed the possibility of using its nuclear arsenal first if pressed to the wall in a conventional conflict.... The new emphasis on the possible first use of nuclear weapons was evidently an attempt to halt a perceived erosion of U.S. influence in world affairs."

Carter Adviser Rostow: A Moynihan Victory Would Help U.S.

The following is an interview with Utopian right-winger Eugene Rostow, a Yale University political advisor to Jimmy Carter:

Rostow: Moynihan's victory (for Democratic candidate for New York senator-ed.) would be delightful. It is hoped that it would have an effect on the national campaign.

President Ford was absolutely right when he attacked Carter, saying that Carter supports a policy of massive retaliation. I'm sure Carter has never mentioned that he supports such a policy but Ford was absolutely right. Carter saying that he would reduce troops in Korea and elsewhere leaves him with only one option if U.S. strategic interests are violated — massive retaliation. What we need is to strengthen our forces overseas not weaken them. That way we can respond with options less drastic than Carter would leave us. Carter has been going after the McCarthy vote and that has moved him to adopt the defense policy he has. A Moynihan victory could help in changing Carter's current policy.

No First Strike, Just Tactical Nuclear War, Says Carter Aide

Sept. 17 (NSIPS) — The following interview with Paul Warnke, Jimmy Carter's advisor on military affairs, was conducted by a Manhattan Republican club weighing Mr. Carter's and Mr. Ford's candidacies without prejudice. They passed the transcript on to NSIPS.

Q: Mr. Warnke, we have some questions about Mr. Carter's stand on several things, and especially his recent statement advocating U.S. use of its "first strike" nuclear capability. What is Mr. Carter's position on "pre-emptive strike."

Warnke: This is confusion. Mr. Carter never said he favored "first strike." The confusion resulted after a press conference he gave in Plains, after a foreign policy meeting among his advisors. He actually said that neither side had anything to gain from a first strike, which is a very different statement.

Q: I see what you're saying, but the press reported...

Warnke: Well, let me assure you, Mr. Carter's foreign policy on military questions is the same as NATO's current policy. If the Soviets launched an all-out attack on Western Europe, then the U.S. would retaliate, not against the Soviet Union, but with battlefield tactical nuclear warfare.

Q: Do you consider Mr. Carter really qualified on international economic matters? Where does he stand on such questions?

Warnke: The important thing is that, when dealing with highly technical and highly expert problems like international economics, when dealing with the Third World, is that a President surround himself with experts. Simon and Greenspan just don't make it. Gavinski, Summers, Charles Schultz and Beckman will advise Carter.

Q: Mr. Warnke, the press reports that Italy is going for a gold standard and has the support of other European nations who want to change the international monetary system. Where does Mr. Carter stand on this issue?

Warnke: Under these circumstances, it would not be good to go on a gold standard. The U.S. benefits more from floating exchange rates. If that should change, maybe, but not right now.

Q: If I may return to international economic matters, there are currently talks going on between the advanced industrial nations and Third World nations...

Warnke: The problem here is that Kissinger and Ford have focussed on East-West relations to the exclusion of North-South relations, and the Third World, where the greater risk is evident. As their expectations rise, we must satisfy them or they will continue to have regional wars and there will be terrorism and world instability. The steps laid out by Moynihan last year at the United Nations, commodity indexing, transfer of technology, and so forth, were correct and the problem is that they haven't been implemented.

Q: Was this the same plan set forth by Mr. Kissinger in Nairobi?

Warnke: Yes, as a matter of fact. Kissinger is correct, but he only discovered Africa three months ago. He has good ideas but they haven't been implemented. This is very dangerous, because the Third World expects much more from us than they do from the Soviets. That is to our credit, but if we don't do something, there is a danger of regional wars. Terrorism will continue. But I thought as far as ideas, Mr. Kissinger's speech on these problems in September 1975 was very good.

Q: Democratic Presidential candidates have traditionally relied on labor support. There is some question however, whether Mr. Carter can actually count on much support from the labor movement.

Warnke: Well, I think things are getting better. You see, McGovern was unacceptable to most of labor and as a result, many people broke loose from their traditionally Democratic allegiance. Then, when Carter first started out he was an unknown. In the past week, I've seen signs that labor support is picking up. Of course, Mr. Woodcock supported him very early, Meany has endorsed him, and the selection of Mondale helped a lot. I think things are beginning to move.