

## NEW SOLIDARITY INTERNATIONAL PRESS SERVICE

U.S. Political Newsletter



# Rockefeller Retools Carter As He Prepares For War

WASHINGTON, D.C. Sept. 17 (NSIPS) — Wall Street this week unveiled a new retooled model of its Presidential stalking horse, Jimmy Carter. Dropping all pretext of liberal rhetoric, Carter criss-crossed the country calling for a tougher military posture and asking the nation “to show a willingness too use its might to defend freedom around the world.” At the same time, the Democrat endorsed a scrapping of the U.S. Constitution and attacked “welfare chiselers” and “freeloaders.”

What had caused Carter’s rebirth, this time as a fascist ultra-right winger?

Last weekend, some of the Rockefeller cabal’s top policy coordinators and international terrorist controllers were dispatched to the Carter home in Plains, Ga. for strategy meetings. The list was impressive: New York Times editorial board member William Shannon, Rothschild banking interest-linked Democratic Party chairman Robert Strauss, Institute for Policy Studies terrorist controller Anthony Lake, and Rockefeller family foreign policy specialist Richard Holbrooke. The decision which these members had brought to Plains from the Wall Street “war faction” was to discard Carter’s liberal facade and use him to keynote a mobilization of every element of the Atlanticist political machine behind a policy of domestic fascism and a build-up for war.

With a new set of lines to parrot, Carter was sent on the campaign trail West and South. He performed as well as could be expected, raving about the need for “a masculine U.S. fighting force,” calling the Vietnamese “outlaws,” praising “southern patriotism” calling for “old-fashioned law n’ order.”

The Sept. 14 New York Times dutifully reported that at Carter’s Birmingham, Ala. appearance, “Gov. George C. Wallace smiled and nodded approval from his nearby wheelchair as Mr. Carter stirred his audience with refined echoes of familiar Wallace themes.”

“The South has always been extremely patriotic...has (always had good) patriotic instincts,” said Carter. “(The South) supports so many military installations....this is good and as President I would not allow any threats to national security.”

Carter went on to endorse efforts by the Supreme Court to dismantle the U.S. Constitution — indicating that they had not gone far enough. He called upon the Burger Court to remove “technicalities which obviously prevent conviction and punishment of those who are guilty.” The Supreme Court has only begun moving back in the proper direction,” said Carter about a court that has recently reinstated the death penalty and about a Chief Justice, Warren Burger, who recently spat on the U.S. Constitution, calling it “outmoded” and “nothing holy.”

Aside from the forementioned skull session in Plains last week, there are other indications of a policy shift implied by the Carter retooling.

The Rockefeller faction has clearly entered into war mobilization, as evidenced in the publication of a Brookings Institution study and in publicity for the Vienna meeting of the London-based International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS).

Brookings, Carter’s “official” think-tank, reversed its previous longstanding position and called for a massive increase in the defense budget over the next five years — and at least \$7 billion more than the Ford Administration is asking for fiscal 1977. In addition, the Brookings document (see below) called for an immediate U.S.-NATO military build-up in the “European nuclear theatre.” It supported these nuclear war provocations with a reminder that “great power wars” were by no means a thing of the past and that they could follow a “social catastrophe (see accompanying analysis).”

The IISS planning document termed regional or local theatre wars of the type that U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger is presently stirring up in southern Africa and the Mideast, both likely and possible. Continuing this line of reasoning, the IISS chucks aside all sound strategic thinking, arguing that so-called theatre war — either conventional or nuclear — could take place without a general thermonuclear war.

Such arguments are apologies for the insanity of the Rockefeller war clique. The documents are ex post facto justification for a policy decision that has already been made — a policy that calls for a nuclear showdown at the first available opportunity. The cabal group led by the Committee for Present Danger members Eugene Rostow and former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger is behind this push for massive arms build up, including military intervention into the Third World.

A Times Op-Ed by Foreign Affairs magazine editor James Chace gave away the effects that the Colombo conference of the Non-Aligned and subsequent developments have had on Rockefeller’s “strategic thinking.” “If wars of attrition and massive nuclear exchanges are improbable,” says Chace, “the so-called decisive stroke of intervention could seem most appealing. Such interventionism...almost always will be dangerous. Yet there seems to be a certain inevitability to it...the United States might find intervention desirable in order to tame the dangerously expanding power (of the Third World).”

The Carter shift and pressure from various other Rockefeller quarters has an important secondary effect of boxing President Ford into taking a strong “pro-defense” posture and prevent him from concluding a new Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II). Rockefeller operative and NATO Secretary General Joseph Luns was dispatched to Washington to push Ford in the appropriate direction. Following a White House meeting Sept. 15, Luns told the press that he didn’t see a SALT agreement as being possible in the immediate future.” “The Soviet Union’s

intentions are not to commit aggression toward Europe — but heir intentions can change," Luns added.

National Security Council-linked syndicated columnists Evans and Novak warned Ford that he is giving hardliners on arms control "nightmares" and wondered whether Jimmy Carter can possibly be any worse on SALT than the Ford-Kissinger team.

The Rockefeller decision to push for war has met opposition within the cabal, in the U.S. primarily from the "left liberal fascists," many of the Fabian persuasion. One section of the New York cabal, led by Wall Street Carter advisor Cyrus Vance, while totally agreeing that the debt must be paid, have warned the Rockefellers against "immediate confrontation" pointing out the Rockefellers' tactics could force the Third World into a bloc solidarity position unless the U.S. indicates that it will be reasonable at some future date.

But the Rockefellers perceive they have no other way out. The U.S. population has not bought the Fabian attempt to "soft peddle" war and fascism through the inept Carter campaign and the Democratic Party platform. America rejected Humphrey-Hawkins fascism and rejected Jimmy Carter with it, as the Atlanticist-controlled press has been quick to point out. As even the rigged Harris and Gallup polls show Carter steadily losing ground, the New York Times admitted Sept. 13 in an editorial, "The Nonvoters," an "alarming disenchantment" with the major political parties and candidates among "nearly half of the eligible voting population."

The Times' James Reston stated Sept. 17 that Carter's Wall Street backers are "getting a little edgy" after low voter turnout made the primaries a "spectacular dozer" and the Democratic voter registration drive has been a "major disappointment." "Something is holding him (Carter) back," writes Reston, "the Democratic Party leaders are not quite sure what it is — but something about his personality, his manner of speaking, his thin trailing voice, and his switches on major policy issues, are hurting his campaign." Evans and Novak Sept. 15 state that Carter will not carry the major industrial states, and back this up Sept. 17 showing Ford out in front of Carter in key areas of Pennsylvania. But the Fabians, not yet willing to admit defeat, muddled on. In-fighting broke out between the warhawk Sulzberger family and Fabian Oakes supporters in the editorial offices of the New York Times over the paper's endorsement of "warhawk" Daniel Patrick Moynihan against Fabian Rep. Bella Abzug for the Democratic Party nomination for U.S. Senate in New York. In an unusual and perhaps unprecedented move, the Times was forced to print a letter from former editorial page editor John Oakes dissenting from the Moynihan endorsement.

The Moynihan-Abzug race is of clinical importance from the standpoint of what we have just indicated: the unusual bitterness between the two and the effort which was put in the otherwise unimportant campaign is reflective of Fabian-Rockefeller factional dispute. In the end the Rockefeller "muscle" prevailed — but just barely — as Moynihan won the nomination. While the race was of enormous interest to the nation's Atlanticist press, the voter turnout among New Yorkers for the primary was one of the lowest in history. The final outcome was determined by who held gainsay over the vote fraud apparatus — and everyone knows that Rockefeller runs New York.

#### **Democrats Find Carter a Liability**

Jimmy Carter has become a liability to the Democratic Party, especially those members of the party who are up for election this year. His new right-wing facelift is likely to make him even more of a liability among those Democrats with working-class districts to worry about.

Carter was publicly attacked by a demoralized Democratic Party chairman Strauss as being behind the collapse of the party's fundraising operation. What is really perturbing Strauss, however, is the effect Carter is having on the party

apparatus at important, lower levels: the Democratic Party is flaking apart like an old stale pie crust, with pieces of it heading for the U.S. Labor and Republican parties.

In Philadelphia, Democratic Mayor Frank Rizzo has threatened Carter and Rep. Green (D-Pa) that if they don't support him against a legal move to have him re-called as Mayor, he intends to throw his entire machine, as he did for Nixon in 1972, behind the Republicans.

In Pittsburgh, the traditionally Democratic United Mine Workers Union has given its endorsement to the Republican U.S. Senatorial candidate, Rep. Heinz (R-Pa).

Similarly, in Chicago, where the Teamsters have contributed \$10,000 to the President Ford Committee, Carter is so weak that Mayor Daley is concentrating on winning local elections and Carter only secondarily.

Then today, Carter campaign spokesmen revealed that they plan to have neither Carter nor his running mate Sen. Fritz Mondale campaign in the state of North Carolina. The decision, which leaves the state to the Republicans and the Labor Party, was attributed to two revealing factors: the failure of the Institute for Policy Studies "Operation Big Vote" to register enough tombstones and other eligible voters to provide the credible basis for vote fraud in the November election, and to yesterday's defeat of the Carter-backed candidate for Lt. Governor, Howard Lee, the former mayor of Chapel Hill who was decisively defeated in a run-off election.

With his southern strategy falling apart, Carter further crawled out on the limb by begging for an endorsement from two of the most reactionary southern political figures, Sen. Eastland and Sen. Stennis of Mississippi. A reporter attending a Biloxi, Miss. rally, also attended by Carter, pointed out the stupidity of the candidate's appeal: he reminded his readers that Stennis is most famous for the remark: "The Negro race is an inferior race."

#### **Rockefeller Goes Berserk — Publicly**

Vice President Nelson Rockefeller this week publicly showed all the emotional stability appropriate to a man who has initiated a nuclear "end-game scenario," launched a worldwide wave of assassination and terror, and faces the imminent loss of his political powers (see International Terror Report).

Rockefeller "appeared and acted crazed," in the words of several observers, in a one-day campaign tour across New York State with Republican Vice Presidential candidate Sen. Robert Dole. Several times Rockefeller launched into nearly unintelligible tirades at hostile audiences, while a shocked Dole stood by.

In Syracuse, Rockefeller interrupted Dole after a member of the U.S. Labor Party had briefed the audience and the national press corps. "They represent a foreign Marxist ideology," the Vice President screamed. "They shouldn't be confused with the AFL-CIO, they (the USLP) only use the name Labor. ...Let them try and speak in the Soviet Union. Solzhenitsyn left the Soviet Union and came here so he could speak freely..."

In other campaign appearances, he proudly announced that President Ford "disagreed with the Republican Party platform," leaving Dole to try to explain his way out of that problem.

At one stop, Rockefeller broke into loud applause and shouts of "Good! Great! Good!" when Dole answered a foreign policy question from the audience by defending Secretary of State Kissinger. No one else clapped.

On another occasion, with Dole standing nearby, he told a reporter that he, Rockefeller, "was not interested in being stand-by equipment, which is what the Vice Presidency is."

He capped his performance by giving the "finger" to student hecklers in Binghamton, NY — not once, but three times.

"I love it," Rocky told the reporters." This is what American politics is all about...

His obscenities made the front page of several major newspapers around the country.

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."