

Armed Services: Senator John Stennis (Mississippi)
Finance: Senator Russell Long (Louisiana)
Foreign Relations: Senator John Sparkman (Alabama)
Rules: Senator Howard Cannon (Nevada)
Judiciary: Senator James O. Eastland (Mississippi)

The most hotly contested chairmanship post was the Finance Committee. Russell Long retained his chairmanship by a vote of 42 to 6 despite a vigorous lobbying effort and series of watergating attacks by Common Cause. Majority leader Robert Byrd, in a move to force those administration allies who opposed Long's reelection to the Finance post to publicly declare themselves, called for an unusual roll call vote of all Democrats on the question, and Long was overwhelmingly re-elected.

The decision of the Republican Policy Committee to appoint three conservatives to the Judiciary Committee allowed GOP conservatives to secure the minority leadership of the committee while at the same time maintaining their strong position on the Armed Services Committee. The Policy Committee placed Senators

Hatch (Utah), Wallop (Wyoming), and Laxalt (Nevada) on the Judiciary Committee, giving conservatives the clout to block Senator Mathias' (Maryland) from becoming the committee's minority leader. Strom Thurmond (S.C.) took over as ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee, yielding his minority leadership position on the Armed Services Committee to his Texas ally John Tower. At the same time, Arizona's Barry Goldwater was elected minority leader of the Senate Intelligence Committee, the base of last year's Wall Street attack on traditionalist layers in the intelligence community.

Mathias' defeat for the Judiciary post is especially significant as he had been vigorously opposed by the independent oil and gas industry. The Judiciary Committee has been used in the past as Rockefeller-allied liberals' forum for so-called "divestiture" hearings into the energy industry, aimed at destroying the non-Rockefeller-controlled companies. Committee staffers now reveal that in light of the changed composition of the committee, the conservatives are considering using the upcoming divestiture hearings planned by Senator Edward Kennedy to go after the Rockefeller oil empire.

EXCLUSIVE

Opposition To Warnke Mounts In Washington

Since the U.S. Labor Party's testimony last week before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee opposing the confirmation of Trilateral Commission member Paul Warnke as director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and SALT negotiator (see Feb. 15 EIR), opposition to Warnke's appointment has grown rapidly in the defense community and among Congressional conservatives.

The growing recognition in these layers that Warnke's disavowal of U.S. research and development efforts and his dishonest denial of Soviet technological advances constitute a fundamental national security risk has spilled over into so-called "liberal" ranks, where the first defections among Warnke adherents are already occurring. On Feb. 16, Senator Richard Schweiker (R-Pa) announced at a press conference that he was withdrawing his support from Warnke and would appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee later this month to urge his colleagues to reject Warnke's appointment. Defense Department sources had told him, Schweiker said, that President Carter intended to make Warnke a virtual czar over arms control matters, much as he has made former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger a dictator on energy. Schweiker revealed that Carter will appoint Warnke to direct the National Security Council interagency panel on SALT verification, once he is confirmed as ACDA director and SALT negotiator. In this capacity, Schweiker charged, Warnke would establish arms control policy, carry out negotiations, and review his own work, without any outside independent check on his power.

In an interview with NSIPS, Schweiker's office pre-

dicted that the Senator's defection will be the first of many liberal Republicans and Democrats to desert Warnke, torpedoing the fiction that the controversy over his appointment is a "dove" versus "hawk" contest.

Defense and national security circles are equally concerned about the Warnke nomination because of the mounting evidence of the Carter Administration's determination to phase out nuclear power development beginning this year, a decision which has devastating effects on the nation's defense capabilities. In effect, spokesmen for these circles have acknowledged, Carter's decision to close down basic scientific research and development removes the cordon sanitaire which Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman General George Brown drew around the nation's basic industrial infrastructure in his military posture statement this year. Brown had maintained that defense of this sector was vital to national security.

Already Pentagon officials are conferring with members of the Senate Armed Services Committee to ensure that the upcoming Warnke hearings before that Committee address the central issue of technological development versus Carter deindustrialization for the U.S., against the backdrop of widely recognized Soviet technological breakthroughs. This week an MIT physicist got the ball rolling by bluntly telling the House Science and Technology Committee that Carter's announced budget cuts for nuclear power development "is a national security issue."

In the face of such level-headed thinking, both "dove" and "hawk" apologists for Carter's Schlesinger Doctrine of "reciprocal" bluff and bluster, are scurrying to cover

the tracks of their infamy, while escalating their hard-soft destabilization operations aimed at keeping the Soviet leadership off-balance. Fully cognizant of Soviet capabilities, veteran Cold Warriors associated with the Committee on the Present Danger, such as Eugene Rostow, are publicly agitating for a speedy arms agreement to halt further Soviet technological development. In a letter to the New York Times this week and in private conversation, Rostow admitted he was terrified by the Soviet laser capability, which is "operational," and confided that an early SALT is America's only hope.

Simultaneously, the octagenarian "soft-cop" globe-trotter of U.S. foreign policy, Averell Harriman, was invited out of retirement by the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, an amalgam of peace groups clustered around the Carnegie Endowment for Peace, to join forces with Institute for Policy Studies founder Richard Barnet in a stirring defense of Warnke and his "quick SALT" policy. At a Congressional symposium Feb. 17 organized by the "dovish" Senator McGovern and Rep. Rosenthal, Harriman launched into an emotional plea for Warnke, predicated on the hysterical contention that the Soviet Union would never go to war, no matter what the stakes.

A Coalition spokesman reported that when Harriman

was invited to speak at the symposium on detente, he reacted like a fire horse leaving the station, yelling, "If there's anything I can do to support Warnke, I'll be there. I'll go anywhere." At the seminar, Harriman went so far as to identify Warnke's opposition as the "Emergency Coalition Against Unilateral Disarmament," mystifying his Coalition hosts and observers, who had never before heard of any such organization. It is not listed in the Washington, D.C. telephone directory.

Less honest than Rostow, and certainly more senile, Harriman and Barnet vigorously denied that the Soviets have a marginal technological edge, much less a war-winning strategy, to their symposium audience. Nonetheless, like Rostow, they strongly advocated a total test ban treaty to limit the development of qualitative new weapon systems.

Harriman's fantasies aside, the phony "soft" gang vs. "hard" countergang controversy over Warnke has been transformed into a substantive debate between the advocates of industrial progress and scientific development as the lynchpin of national security and peace and the apologists for deindustrialization and a foreign policy based on bluff, psychological warfare, and nuclear holocaust. The vehemence with which Harriman et al. denied the obvious is testament to that transformation.

Eugene Rostow: Soviet Weapons Strides Make Total Nuclear Ban "Only Meaningful Negotiations"

In an interview this week Eugene Rostow, a member of David Rockefeller's Council on Foreign Relations and a leader of the ultra-hardline Committee on the Present Danger, warned that the Soviet Union's work on developing weapons technologies means that "the only meaningful arms negotiations" now are those "to totally ban nuclear weapons." The text of the interview, made available to the Executive Intelligence Review, is excerpted here:

Q: What is in store for SALT and arms negotiations that you would say will be meaningful?

Rostow: Apparently from what the administration is saying, we will institute the Vladivostock accords as the basis of the SALT agreement. Now this will be like hanging fire. If you remember, parts of the Vladivostock accord were withdrawn and never replaced. If anything, the result will be a formal agreement. Carter is using the same tactics of ignoring the most important issues as Kissinger did. The cruise missile and backfire are not even going to be discussed if they present any problem. Will the Russians buy the Carter policy? I don't really know. They tend to just be as greedy as can be in these kinds of things, and they'll take all they can get as long as they can get away with it. There won't be any real issues in the negotiations, however — the signing is going to be a purely cosmetic appearance.

Q: The substantial issues are being ignored, then, while the already surpassed Vladivostock numbers are going to be the question?

Rostow: Yes. This is a continuation of Kissinger's policies of ignoring Soviet military growth and their real intentions. You know, the Soviets are now mounting their ICBMs on trucks, on mobile platforms. This was one of four items which was to abrogate the Vladivostock and SALT I accords, but nothing was done about it. You remember when there were charges that the Soviets were not complying with the strict nature of the treaty numbers? Well, here you have — by their own admission — their use of mobile platforms, and there is no response from our government.

The same sort of thing took place in the Non-Proliferation Treaty talks. Back when I was in the government (as Undersecretary of state for political affairs, 1966-1969 — NSIPS), Rusk and Rogers tried to get this across and through the Senate. The Soviets simply didn't buy aspects of the treaty and didn't play the game. They do what they want and get no response. In terms of public opinion, I think the orientation there is to wage a campaign to say "no" to the SALT treaty as it now shapes up. We can only lose from it.

Q: What about these new weapons — lasers and rays and so on. If the Soviets have such things, would there be any way of getting these weapons into the treaty?

Rostow: I doubt it. This thing goes back to the McNamara days, when he believed that any significant progress on anti-ballistic missiles systems would wreck the "mutually assured destruction" posture. Now experts tell me that the Soviets have an operational system that could be damaging to our missiles. The problem is that