

highest military rank, joining CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, who was appointed Marshal last spring. Ustinov's promotion makes the Soviet leadership officially a war-time command staff.

Pointing to Atlanticist moves in Europe, Brezhnev personally denounced the U.S., France, and West Germany for their economic blackmail of Italy in a rare interview in Pravda yesterday. "Certain circles are aiming to grab Italy by the throat," Brezhnev stated. At the same time, a widely circulated Tass release this week referred to West Germany as the "weapons factory for NATO."

In the Third World, the Soviets underscored their vital interests in the Middle East with a major peace initiative in Pravda. The statement emphatically restated Soviet commitment to defend the Palestine Liberation Organization. The East bloc press also reported that Iraqi President Bakr has sent a personal message to Brezhnev warning that the Lebanese situation is grave and requires urgent action. The Soviets also this week denounced U.S. destabilization moves in the Caribbean.

The determining issue over whether there will be war in the immediate months ahead is whether the Atlanticists are successful in stopping the Third World push for debt moratoria. They may yet win that battle, but it will be the last battle they live to fight.

## Carter Advocates "First Strike"

*July 29 (NSIPS) — Following are excerpts from Democratic Presidential candidate Jimmy Carter's remarks to Hearst newspaper interviewers where the candidate stated, for the first time in U.S. presidential politics, that a U.S. pre-emptive nuclear first-strike would be an element of U.S. defense posture in a Carter Administration. These excerpts are taken from the Boston Herald Advertiser, under a full-column front-page banner headline, "Carter: I'd use nuclear weapons" under the kicker, "If U.S. security is threatened...."*

**Mr. Smith:** Do you foresee any circumstances in which we would be justified in resorting to a first strike with nuclear weapons, strategic or tactical?

**Governor Carter:** I don't know the answer to those questions. I think it would be inappropriate to spell out precisely what circumstances might prevail that would cause me to use atomic weapons. The only general response I can give is that if I was convinced that the security or existence of our own nation was threatened, under those circumstances I would use atomic weapons.

"If there was a massive invasion in Europe by the Soviet Union, I think the likelihood would be that atomic weapons would be used. My own belief is that limited nuclear war would be unlikely. I have read some of the statements made by Soviet leaders, and I think their commitment to limited nuclear war is very doubtful.

"We have predicated a lot on our new weaponry acquisition on the premise that we need to have both first-strike and retaliatory capability with a presumption that massive strategic attacks on population centers would not follow. That certainly is a possibility, but I think a doubtful one.

"Pre-emptive strike, again, would only be used, to keep my answer deliberately in very general terms, if I was convinced that the existence or the security of our nation was threatened."

*The July 27 Red Star, the Soviet Army paper carried a Tass news agency dispatch which reported on a U.S. press interview with "Democratic Presidential candidate J. Carter:"*

...answering a question about his opinion concerning the possible launching of a U.S. first strike with strategic or tactical nuclear weapons, J. Carter stated that he does not exclude the

possibility, but only under one condition — if circumstances should arise which threaten the security of the United States or its very existence."

### Exclusive Interview

#### State Department Advisor: "First Strike Should Only Be Used In Retaliation!"

*July 30 (NSIPS) — The following interview with Barry Blechman of the Brookings Institution, a State Department advisor, was conducted two days ago by a reporter friendly with NSIPS, and who passed it on to us.*

**Q.** Mr. Blechman, what is your reaction to Jimmy Carter's recent statement that he would utilize a NATO "first strike" thermonuclear capability against the Warsaw pact? The statement was reported in the Washington Post, and attacked strongly by the Soviet Union in their party paper, Pravda.

**Blechman:** Well, let me see. It was maybe 1974-75 — I cannot remember but, anyway about two years ago — (Former Secretary of Defense James) Schlesinger and even President Ford made statements on "first strike" with nuclear weapons. The reasons are clear. Vietnam was falling apart and the U.S. has to reassure the Koreans when that sort of thing happens. And part of the statement refers to that. This is what Carter was getting at.

**Q:** Well, then under certain conditions, Carter is for a nuclear first-strike?

**Blechman:** Actually most of the advisors were and are against this view, and were for more conventional weapons. Oh no, Carter is not for first-strike. In fact, the way the Washington Post reports it, Carter is opposed to it. Where did you see this statement?

**Q:** It was in the Post, and in Pravda.

**Blechman:** Yes, well, the promise is that you can fight a limited nuclear war, but shouldn't rely on first-strike. It's very difficult and Carter is more for conventional weapons trying to keep a favorable balance. First-strike must be used for security retaliatory use (sic); they can devastate any country and should be used as a deterrent.

**Q:** First-strike in retaliation?? I'm not sure I get that. In any case, given Soviet first-strike capabilities, it seems the U.S. wouldn't stand a chance.

**Blechman:** (laughing) No, we wouldn't. But the second-strike is what both the U.S. and the Soviets accept.

**Q:** Well, isn't all this talk of first and second strike, like Carter's statement, pretty provocative for the Soviets?

**Blechman:** (laughing) Yes, indeed. A first-strike might be taken as a warning and a threat. But a second strike statement is not provocative. No matter what you're doing, it's not threatening at all.

### Exclusive Translation

#### Revival Of War Hysteria In West German Press

*July 29 (NSIPS) — The following press excerpts from the Federal Republic of Germany — a macabre throwback to 1944-45 myths about wonder weapons and "national spirit," an editorial calling for the food weapon to be used against the Warsaw Pact, and a fat Bavarian fascist's déjà-vu that this period reminds him of the middle 1930s again — are full confirmation that the FRG press is being unleashed by its Atlanticist masters to create the war propaganda that will lead to nuclear war with the Warsaw Pact by no later than 1977.*

*The first excerpt, taken from the July 29 Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, comes from an article by Adelbert Weinstein, a former Major on the World War II Nazi General Staff, presently specializing in NATO and military affairs. Any "good German" reporter who ever got a midnight call from Goebbels's Propaganda Ministry appreciates what Adelbert Weinstein went through when NATO Supreme Commander Alexander*

*Haig, the Atlanticists' paper clip general, ordered Weinstein to rework material that originally appeared in the Sunday July 25 The Stars and Stripes, the U.S. Armed Forces paper. Weinstein's re-editing follows Haig's order that no U.S. service-man is allowed to discuss nuclear war with reporters. Instead of honestly reporting on the justified fear in the U.S. 7th Army of a nuclear war, which was the reason for Haig's "cover-up" order, Weinstein speaks of vaunted new anti-tank wonder weapons and NATO fighting spirit against a Soviet tank attack. Weinstein, like Haig, is fighting World War II. As any competent nuclear strategist knows, a World War III would start with a thermonuclear first-strike by Soviet forces against the U.S., Canada and the population and the military centers of NATO countries; only after that would Warsaw Pact forces cross into Western Europe.*

*Weinstein's image of the Seventh Army is of an army which does not have the intellectual capability of conceptualizing a war fighting strategy, and it knows it. As Weinstein shows, this debilitating lack of military strategy has forced the Seventh Army into reaction formations about their prowess in fighting World War II tank battles with wonder weapons and "raw spirit."*

*The second excerpt, an editorial by Herr Maetzke in the July 29 Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, provocatively demands the use of the "food weapon" to force the socialist sector to its knees. Maetzke has forgotten that Eastern Europe had successfully dealt with such a de facto blockade until major grain sales began in the 1960s.*

*The third excerpt is by Franz Josef Strauss, the chairman of the Bavarian Christian Social Union (CSU), section of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) conservative party. The Bavarian fascist claims, like Hitler before him, that history always gives Germany "another chance"; which is at least partially accurate — save one significant detail. This time, as with the last war, the Atlanticists are giving a renewed fascist Germany "another chance," to help lead Europe to war with the "East." If successful, Germany and W. Europe will be turned into a radioactive trummerfeld. The excerpt appeared in the July 28 Bayernkurier, a paper owned by Strauss.*

#### **Attack From the East: "We Would Answer With A Hell of A Fight"**

They (the Seventh Army) respect the possible opponent, whether it be the German Democratic Republic's People's Army, or the Soviet Army. However, the weapons and armaments which they have "over there" to not impress American soldiers... They (the Americans) themselves are convinced that they possess the best weapons, and that, with the high fighting morale of the Seventh Army, an aggressor would not have a chance of breaking through into the West. (Weinstein then lists American weapons) ... one can readily understand the American troops' self confidence and their assured composure.

U.S. Major Dean Stanley says in Stars and Stripes, "We would answer them with a hell of a fight if the Warsaw Pact troops invade West Germany." Other officers say, "In the shortest amount of time, an attacking army from the East would be turned into an army of obliterated military vehicles." The Red Army would have to end up in the position of the Egyptian troops at the Mitla Pass. (the Israelis trapped the Egyptian Army at the Mitla Pass in 1967 - ed.)

A tank officer says, "We would also want to attack the enemy from the rear, and our tactical experience tells us, and our new military doctrine makes it possible so that we can — or at least we believe we can — operate in an extremely successful fashion. We hold it to be entirely possible from the projections scored in which an opponent would lose 16 tanks while we would only lose one vehicle in comparison.

Another officer, "I don't doubt that in a Warsaw Pact attack, our men will wipe out the enemy at the first confrontation. We will transform the battle field into a cemetery for those others.

So goes the American military conception. It might be somewhat distorted in detail, but, such spontaneous expressions are necessary as a counter image to mythical Soviet military mythical images. The possible enemy may be strong. However, our western partners are also strong. The Seventh Army produces deterrents.

#### **Editorial: "Six Thirsty Brothers"**

The drought has caused a lot of problems on this side, but what about over there?... The press of the German Democratic Republic is publishing very precise details about the damage done... Can the Soviets do anything in a year when they are just coming out of a bad harvest? Poland and the German Democratic Republic will press for help, but it will be a miracle if this happens. Most likely, the East German leaders will have no other choice than to go to Western agricultural markets... They will be concerned with getting credits. And from whom?

The entire theme of inner-German relations will have to be re-evaluated and reconsidered in light of the consequences of the drought in the German Democratic Republic. Their (the DDR's) leaders are going into a winter in which they are threatened by an enormous lack of surplus as a result of the drought, in addition to everything else. A situation could arise which would take far reaching developments to reverse. However, no one is predicting any similar kinds of difficulties for the BRD. It is in a favorable situation."

#### **"The FRG in the Power Field of World Politics"**

The German question is a European question... "History has always given us, in Germany, another chance: after the World War I, after the World War II,...when the announcement came at that time, that American and Russian troops had stretched their hands across to each other, on April 28, 1945, at Torgau on the Elbe, and thereby stamped a priori the capitulation of the German Wehrmacht, we had every reason to ask whether not only German — but also European — history had reached its end; whether the Europe of the future would be nothing more than a crossroads of the power interests of the non-European world powers. As the FRG, first partially, and then totally, re-achieved its sovereignty... The CDU-CSU made its contribution, so that Europe would not only have a past... but rather, new hope in life and a future...

We ask ourselves once again: where do we stand today?... I sometimes have the uncomfortable feeling of standing in the middle of the 1930s, not in terms of economic, social, or financial structures, but in terms of the shifts in foreign policy. If the expansion of Communist imperialism cannot be halted via the unity of the of the Europeans, the fault will be on the next generation and on our own... Despite wordy summit conferences, the unification of Europe has slowed down in the past couple of years... The essential interests of our citizens are: security against foreign countries, full employment, a stable currency, and secure raw material, energy and sales markets.

#### Exclusive Translation from Izvestia

#### **"Detente Has Deep Roots"**

*July 29 (NSIPS) — The following are excerpts from an article bylined A. Grigor'yants and published July 24 in Izvestia, the official daily of the Soviet government.*

The shifts towards mutual understanding and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany is one of the major and most significant events in world politics in the postwar period. Detente on the most "nervous line" in the world — in central Europe, the watershed between two social systems and military-political alliances — has made it possible to achieve a substantial improvement of the political climate in all of Europe. And the winners have been both the USSR and the Federal Republic (BRD); the winners have been