

would withdraw their support from the President.

Leaders of the black community who gathered to hear Carter defend his urban policy were equally hostile. "I don't agree with his budget," NAACP national director Benjamin Hooks said after Carter's speech. "I still think his budget has impacted on the poor."

On the first stop of his tour, Miami, Carter was greeted by hundreds of booing demonstrators carrying placards which read: "Hey, Mr. Peanut Man, we need more peanuts." Recently torn apart by violent riots, Miami officials, too, were not in the mood to hear Carter self-righteously warn, "It would be a very serious mistake to think the federal government would pick up the entire tab for riot relief." Miami Mayor Maurice Ferre publicly termed Carter's tight-fisted aid offers "bland pabulum, a Gerber's delight," while the city's major newspaper, the *Miami Herald*, carried a lead editorial titled "Carter's Visit Short, Empty." Comparing it to a golf trip to the city by President Warren G. Harding in the 1920s, columnist Charles Whited wrote: "As the dust settles Monday night following Jimmy Carter's quick blitz of riot-shaky Miami, one's first reaction was that Harding's visit had more substance. At least he had a score."

While Carter's next stop, the annual Mayors Conference in Seattle, netted him an endorsement by the Democratic attendees, reports from the conference indicate that Carter's aides had to resort to federal funds cutoffs in order to secure it. The mayors, to his obvious discomfort, sat on their hands when Carter unveiled a new youth jobs program in his speech.

Anybody-but-Carter

While it is clear that most Democrats are lining up in the anybody-but-Carter column, the real unresolved question is who will replace him as the party's nominee. Every candidate mooted in the major press so far is unacceptable to one or another of the important Democratic Party interest groups.

Spokesmen for conservative Democrats are saying that the two options most favored by the East Coast liberal elite, Muskie and Mondale, are out of the question. As one insider put it: "There are people who want Carter out . . . but their strategy is to work out a deal. Mondale is being backed by the same people as Carter, as is Muskie. We can't accept either because it means the same policies and the same general danger of war." Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.), another potential contender, is unacceptable to the liberal wing of the party.

This closed-circuit personnel search within the Democratic Party has done little to bring the nation face to face with the critical economic and foreign policy issues that must shape 1980 presidential politics if the nation is to recover from the Carter debacle. Just now, the boys in the back room at the Council on Foreign Relations are trying to keep things in the back-room.

Congress hits Carter on military policy

When Senator John Tower told a nationwide television audience June 8 that the Senate Armed Services Committee on which he sits should investigate the false alarms sounded last week by the U.S. air defense network's computer system, Capitol Hill was already abuzz with rumors that the computer's behavior was no accident. The alarms indicated falsely that a Soviet nuclear attack was underway, U.S. forces being placed on high alert until the report was "corrected."

The computer "errors," June 3 and again June 6, came as the administration was drastically foreshortening the timetable on its "China card" policy by publicly wining-and-dining the chief of the Chinese People's Liberation Army—and announcing sales of military equipment to Peking for the first time. Some of that equipment is considered an aid to Chinese "nuclearization," which the Soviet Union has repeatedly indicated it will not tolerate, as a matter of Soviet national security.

Speculation that the computer-errors were actually "simulations" ordered by administration officials were fueled when General David Jones, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, declared they had served a "useful function," because they showed the Soviet Union that the United States is prepared to take action if necessary.

But elite Eastern Establishment policymakers are worried about the fact that, contrary to Jones' unsettling statement, the United States absolutely is not prepared to take action if necessary—U.S. military capability is very badly eroded, and under Carter military and defense-spending proposals, will only get worse. On cue from the Eastern press, Congressmen began to attack the administration's defense policy—with Senator Tower's computer-investigation demand only one of a series.

The first flank against Carter was opened up June 5, when a "top secret" report on the Iran-rescue operation, commissioned by the Senate Armed Services Committee during hearings begun in April, was suddenly leaked to major news media. The report disclosed "major errors" in the operation, including inadequate training of personnel and inadequate equipment maintenance, poor contingency planning and execution, bad intelligence and "fragmentation of command responsibilities." The mission commander was the wrong man, and component

commanders “operated in isolation,” while “no one at the desert site was responsible for making decisions.”

A second flank was opened by the same committee, when it launched a concerted fight in Congress to block the renomination of General Jones as Joint Chiefs chairman. Senators Helms, Goldwater, Tower and Garn have accused him—accurately enough—of “rubber stamping” administration proposals, and failing to strengthen the country’s defense adequately.

Similar criticisms were leveled in the press against Robert Komer, Defense undersecretary for policy. The May 31 *Washington Star* called him incompetent, as proven in his disastrous Vietnam “pacification” program in the 1960s. The *Star* cited one critic on Komer: “He is like the piano player in the whorehouse. You know, tell me what you want and I’ll go play it.”

The All-Volunteer Force, meanwhile, has come under attack in the House of Representatives, whose Armed Services Committee rejected Army attempts to white-wash the scandal over its lack of qualified manpower, and recalled Secretary Clifford Alexander for a round of hearings on the issue.

Particular attention is drawn to the Navy, where critical shortages of trained personnel have forced ships to remain in port. Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Thomas B. Hayward pointed to the decline in a recent *Christian Science Monitor* interview. “You can have a decline for a while and not really have a dramatic impact,” he said. “It is now reaching a point where the impact is dramatic.”

In Europe, a different revolt

The problem is: No one of Carter’s critics has yet proposed a competent alternative—and that includes the Council on Foreign Relations press, like the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*. An added contradiction in this military reassessment is that the “China card,” which threatens to provoke pre-emptive Soviet military action in Asia and immediately display American weakness to the world, has yet to come under attack from any significant quarter in the United States.

The reason is clear: both American military weakness and the “China card” are related features of those Malthusian economic policies with which Carter’s critics—like Carter—have yet to break. The foundation of military strength is strong development of scientific research capabilities, and a strong civilian industrial foundation. Moreover, as Carter’s government has drastically curtailed both American research programs and industrial strength, it has pursued the “China card” as a proposed substitute for the sort of economic policies that would actually provide the United States with an in-depth strategic advantage over the Soviet Union.

By contrast with the criticism in America, our European “allies” have not hesitated to attack the “China

card” as a threat to peace in the immediate future. Europe has rejected Malthusian “controlled disintegration” economics, and the lunacies in geopolitical strategy and military policy that accompany it.

Exemplary was the statement by the West German defense minister Hans Apel to an election rally in Hamburg last week. Referring to America’s alliance with Peking, Apel spoke of America’s “incredible adventures in Vietnam,” and stated bluntly: “Whoever decides to do that [ally with China—ed.] is unable to grasp what the international situation really is today.” The White House should put itself in the place of the leaders in the Kremlin, he continued, The Soviet Union “feels they are being encircled.”

Apel also scoffed at America’s cutoff of military aid to Turkey when that nation invaded Cyprus. “They should rather have given more development aid, like we did.”

The West German army’s Inspector General, Jürgen Brandt made equally sharp statements about the “China card” and NATO posture more generally. He told a meeting of the Rheinland Pfalz state legislature: “The China card can only lead to war. We must keep channels open to speak to the Soviets after a crisis, which would become impossible by playing the China card.” The same official later told an interviewer that American military preparedness was extremely poor: “The IQ of a drafted army is always higher than that of a volunteer force. The American problem . . . is that behind any American soldier there is absolutely no one to be the reserve, since the U.S. abolished the draft system. The U.S.A. cannot reach the end of this century without finding some other way of creating reserves.”

What distinguishes European from domestic criticism of Carter policy is the Europeans’ simultaneous attacks on Washington’s military follies, economic follies, and geopolitical follies. They are, in fact, inseparable.

But meanwhile, back in the United States, the criticism of Carter has the same ring of incompetence and outright lunacy as Carter policy itself. So, Senator Henry Jackson and other “hawks” accuse the administration of not really increasing defense spending at all. However, Jackson and his like do not go beyond what Carter purports to seek—an expansion of U.S. forces in width, but not in depth. One may speak of rebuilding American military strength—if one also speaks of restoring the health of American scientific research and development programs, restoring science-oriented education, and launching an economic recovery based on high-technology capital formation in basic industry. If one chooses to oppose or omit such economic revitalization from consideration, one chooses Carter military and geopolitical policy, too—whatever contrary notions one may enjoy entertaining in private fantasy.