

volley of an all-out attack on the administrative structure of the House" leading to a restructuring of the House committee structure along the lines of the Stevenson plan by next year.

While not as sweeping as the Stevenson plan, the initial Obey proposals are all clearly geared to facilitate speedy passage of the Carter program by making Congressmen spend far more time in their committees working on the Carter program. To this end, Obey urges that: 1) the House floor schedule be restructured "to provide more time for committee business at the beginning of the session and more time for floor business later on as the House approaches the legislative deadlines imposed by the Congressional Budget Act"; 2) Committees be permitted to meet while the House is in session unless 10 members object. Under present House rules, a single member can prevent committees from meeting while the House is in session. The purpose of this proposal is to make it easier for pro-Carter Congressmen to force committee hearings and thus hasten processing of the Carter legislative package. 3) the House Leadership establish "a firm schedule of Washington and district work periods for the entire session." This proposal, expected to be the most controversial, is a direct attack on the fundamental principles of constituency-based politics, the mainstay of a bourgeois democracy, since it would place official restrictions on when a Congressman could return to his home district to hear the views of his constituents. As such, it is aimed

at keeping Congressmen isolated on Capitol Hill in an environment controlled by the Carter camp, far away from the pressures exerted by the electorate.

#### Battle Over Congressional Leadership

Buttressing the Stevenson-Obey "reorganization" campaign, other Carter cronies, including Senators Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Hubert Humphrey, are fighting to capture key Senatorial leadership posts now in the hands of conservative Democrats of Republicans, or vacant due to retirement or electoral defeat.

The most important Senate skirmish is between Humphrey and Sen. Robert Byrd (D-W.Va.) over the post of Majority Leader. Although ill with cancer, Humphrey has decided to keep Byrd out of this powerful position for fear that it will provide a rallying point for conservative Democrats and Republicans to block the Carter program. Furthermore, since the Majority Leader plays a pivotal role in determining committee assignments, the conservative Byrd could well interfere with the best-laid plans of Stevenson and other Carter rodents.

Also being challenged by their Carterite colleagues are conservative chairman of committees that will continue to exist under the Stevenson proposal, including Sen. Russell Long (D-La.), chairman of the all-important Senate Finance Committee which would have to pass on much of Carter's economic legislation.

## Schlesinger Threatens USSR With U.S. "Aura of Power"

Exclusive to NSIPS

Dec. 4 (NSIPS) — In a three-day lecture series in Princeton, N.J., former Secretary of Defense James Rodney Schlesinger laid out the basis of his military strategy — bluffing the Soviets and using the United States' "aura of power" to terrify European and Third World countries into obedience to American will.

The theme of Schlesinger's first lecture Nov. 29, was that the United States had to develop sufficient will to use military force to terrorize its allies and opponents. Schlesinger first attacked the American population as a whole for believing in a role for morality in international affairs, and emphasized that in the period since the end of the Vietnam war, the U.S. had lost its will to use power. He denied that the main role of armaments was to fight wars, a view he credited to the Brookings Institution. Instead, the primary role of armaments is psychological — to create "an aura of power." "At no time could the Roman Empire have defended all its borders from simultaneous attack, but the empire flourished because it had the aura of power, the ability to strike terror into the hearts of the enemy." It was this aura which the United States must reacquire, the willingness to use force. On this basis, Schlesinger said, the "internal stability" of Western Europe and the Third World would be guaranteed through fear of American arms. "If we still had the aura of power we had in the 1950s the Third World and Western Europe would not be giving us the problems they are now."

Schlesinger made clear exactly what policies he wanted to impose on the rest of the world with the U.S. "aura of power." He insisted that NATO be used to "coordinate European political decision" and dismissed any realignments of Europe away from the U.S. as impossible. "When they yell about their being dominated by the U.S. then the Europeans are happy," he proclaimed. He identified the basic problem which must be solved through this coordination as the "balance of payments questions" and North-South relations. There could be no question of any moves towards a new world economic order, Schlesinger stated flatly. "The new world economic order is nothing — its just a lot of rhetoric. It will never exist."

The prerequisites to reestablishing the desired aura of power,

Schlesinger emphasized, is a massive arms build up and the willingness to use nuclear weapons. In his third lecture Schlesinger again attacked the American people for lacking the "moral enthusiasm" necessary for war, or for a sustained armaments build up. He dismissed fears of nuclear warfare. "There is nothing new about nuclear war," he said, "every war since World War II has actually been a nuclear war since, as in Korea, nuclear weapon use was actively considered. In Korea it may have been a mistake not to use the bomb, but our stockpile then was too small."

Schlesinger analyzed the possibilities for the use of nuclear weapons in the present situation, and particularly pointed to the possible use of "tactical weapons" in wars in the Third World.

In reply to questions on the Soviet response to any U.S. initiated "limited nuclear wars," Schlesinger exposed the basic assumption of his belief that the U.S. can dictate policy to the world — **the incredible idea that the Soviet Union is too weak militarily and too unwilling to use its might to threaten the U.S.** When challenged by an NSIPS reporter as to how he could advocate tactical nuclear war when the Soviets have plainly warned that any war between the U.S. and the USSR would immediately lead to a general strategic nuclear attack on the United States, Schlesinger said flatly that the Soviets were bluffing: "Yes, the Soviets say that if there is war, it will automatically become general, but they don't mean it. What they say in peace and what they do in war are different. In reality they won't attack us even if there is a limited use of nuclear weapons."

Schlesinger was questioned further by NSIPS as to how he can assert the Soviets are bluffing when such items as the recent Boeing report to Congress have shown that in a general nuclear war, Soviet superiority will lead to 160 million U.S. casualties and fewer than 10 million Soviet deaths. Schlesinger replied by dismissing the hard facts of reality by more soothing fantasies. "No matter what any report says, the Soviets know we can blow them to smithereens so they won't dare go to all out nuclear war," he swaggered. "Any Soviet who has had the searing experience of the Nazis at their gates would not launch a preemptive strike."