

SPECIAL REPORT

Nuclear War Development: High Sources Confirm Rockefeller Searching for Immediate Confrontation

On the basis of cumulative intelligence of the past 72 hours, the Executive Committee of the International Caucus of Labor Committees has arrived at the following evaluation of the international political and military strategic situation: the supranational Rockefeller group, thrown off balance by the rapidity of the deterioration of the international financial situation, encountering increasing factional opposition from significant bourgeois forces in Western Europe, and hurt severely by the worldwide strategic offensive of the Soviet Union, allied Communist Parties, and ICLC forces — is now moving to launch a nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union at the first opportunity. The ICLC Executive has therefore declared a propagandistic and agitational alert for the entire international organization, stressing the need for full immediate exposure of such insane nuclear brinkmanship policies and for

enactment of the ICLC's International Development Bank proposal as the only realistic world-political alternative.

"MC 14/4"

The ICLC has developed in detail and on several occasions since early 1974 when U.S. Secretary of Defense Schlesinger first announced his "counterforce" and "limited strategic warfare" conceptions in public, that the notion of a "limited nuclear exchange" or of a combination conventional/tactical nuclear weapons confrontation in Europe is significant only from a psychological warfare standpoint. If the Soviet Union acceded to such notions, this would amount to the de facto surrender of Soviet forces in Eastern Europe without, however, acquiring at any point the status of a real military option. A step-by-step escalation in actual combat between NATO and Warsaw Pact forces from "local conventional"

to "full-scale conventional" to "conventional/tactical nuclear" to "strategic nuclear" with various additional steps in between and attempts at "limiting negotiations" every step of the way is pure fantasy. It defines no real "war-fighting" options at all and will be regarded as utterly amateurish by anyone who is at all conversant in military strategy. In reality, any incursion into Soviet or Warsaw Pact territory or any area representing the vital strategic interest of the Soviet Union will lead to rapid exponential escalation and the assured destruction of both combatants. The specifics of this were developed by us in the "end game scenario" three weeks ago. Since then both the Soviet Union (in an article in the army paper Red Star April 8, 1975 by L. Semeiko of the Marxist-Leninist Institute) and East Germany (Heinz Kessler, Deputy Defense Minister and Chairman of the "Hauptstab" of the National

Army, in *Einheit*, April 5, 1975) have directly attacked all such "limited strategic warfare" conceptions and emphasized the international character of the Soviet Union's military efforts and the high degree of preparedness of the Warsaw Pact forces — a clear warning to anyone contemplating military provocation of the Soviet Union and her allies. Simultaneously, as will be detailed below, Soviet military deployments and maneuvers over the past few weeks serve as a forceful reminder of Soviet ability to launch a devastating pre-emptive strike against Western Europe (involving both conventional and tactical nuclear forces) which would annihilate NATO forces stationed in West Germany, the Low Countries and northern Italy.

Under these circumstances, information just received by ICLC intelligence from highly-placed West German sources is of the greatest immediate significance. According to these sources, at NATO headquarters in Brussels, under heavy pressure from the United States, a new strategic doctrine, "MC 14/4," redefining NATO strategy on the basis of the Schlesinger Doctrine, is now "taking on shape." ("MC" stands for "Military Committee," the highest military body of NATO, made up of the Chiefs of Staff of the membership countries; "MC" followed by a number code refers to basic strategy documents comparable to the National Security Council documents in the United States.) As our source correctly perceived, adoption of the Schlesinger Doctrine as basic NATO strategy would amount to the abandonment of "Mutual and Assured Destruction" (MAD), and of

necessity turn Western Europe — West Germany in particular — into a battlefield, and significantly increase the overall "crisis probability." Twenty years after the 1955 "Carte Blanche" NATO air exercise, when 350 tactical nuclear warheads were "dropped" on West Germany, "killing" 1.5 million people and "wounding" millions more, the impact of conceiving of densely populated Western Europe as a nuclear battlefield is still the same as it was at that time when it seriously endangered the political feasibility of stationing nuclear warheads in West Germany. Our source's report of almost daily embittered confrontations between U.S. and West German NATO officers is ample testimony to that effect.

More directly, in light of our above remarks on "limited war" and the overall political strategic situation, U.S. heavy-handedness in pushing its NATO allies to develop a wide range of "war-fighting options" admits of only one interpretation: that behind such amateurish nonsense the desperate Rockefeller group, through their agents Alexander Haig (former Kissinger aide) and Luns, is rapidly moving toward full-scale nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union. This confrontation policy is guided by the insane belief that the Soviets, despite their repeated and entirely unequivocal statements, will ultimately back down when directly confronted with force.

We received first indications of this in a brief IPS interview on April 4, 1975 with Eugene Rostow (brother of former National Security Advisor Walt Rostow), who tried to give an historical proof of how the Soviets have always backed down in situations involving high risk. Our above cited West German source now has broadly confirmed this analysis. Agreeing that the United States had "lost the strategic initiative worldwide" and consequently was now "ready to take greater risks," our source stated that "the crisis probability had increased significantly over the past months," even though "certain people in Bonn didn't want to believe that." He fully and explicitly confirmed that the line of a "wider range of war-fighting options" and "increased readiness to take risks" was pushed by individuals such as George Ball, Cyrus Vance, and Rockefeller, stating simultaneously that "the Pentagon is much more careful in these matters" seeing that "a limited war easily gets out of control."

Summary of World Military Situation

Aside from the evidence developed so far, Soviet military maneuvers and deployments on the one hand and proposed U.S. strategic redeployments on the other provide further direct evidence that the Rockefeller group has now definitely embarked upon a nuclear confrontation course, which, if not stopped, will lead to an early doomsday exchange with the Soviet Union. We first cite the Brookings Institution proposal, delivered recently before the Senate Armed Services Committee under the sponsorship of Kentucky Senator Sam Nunn by Jeffrey Record, whose October 1974 study, U.S. Weapons in Europe — Issues and Alternatives, identifies him as an enthusiastic proponent of "limited nuclear warfare" and as a serious competitor, along with Herman Kahn of the Hudson Institute and James R. Schlesinger, formerly of RAND, for the award of most amateurish and simple-minded of "great U.S. strategic theorists." Record's proposal amounts to transferring 130,000 U.S. military personnel (both tactical air force and ground units) from Southeast Asia to Western Europe — north Germany in particular — where they would be deployed to counter a Soviet thrust across the north German plain, which would otherwise outflank U.S. troops in south Germany and cut them off from their main supply base at Bremerhaven. While presumably aimed at establishing conventional parity in Central Europe, the move, in light of tremendous Soviet superiority in armored divisions and tactical air force units, would, of course, achieve nothing of the sort. It would, however, amount to further serious provocation of the Soviet Union, which demonstratively — in the context of their largest worldwide naval exercises since World War II — conducted (along with East German units) massive combined naval and landing maneuvers in the Luebeck Bay right under the nose of NATO forces and at one of their strategically most sensitive points.

We reiterate here our warning, developed more explicitly in the endgame scenario, that the Soviet Union, on the basis of its crushing conventional superiority in Central Europe, has the strategic option — and must be assumed to be ready to exercise it — of delivering a debilitating first strike against NATO forces; continued deliberate provocation will bring about precisely that consequence.