

# Rockefeller Seen Chafing in Harness

By Jack Anderson  
and Les Whitten

The outwardly ebullient Nelson A. Rockefeller, according to close friends, is suffering from the vice presidential blues.

This is a malady which afflicts normal, healthy politicians who wind up in the void of the vice presidency.

Theirs is not the ennobling power to shape bold national policies or the awesome authority to make great decisions. It is their unhappy fate to wait in the White House wings for a tragedy they pray will never happen.

Woodrow Wilson's running mate, Thomas Marshall, described the malady best. The Vice President, he said, "is like a man in a cataleptic state. He cannot speak; he cannot move; he suffers no pain. And yet he is conscious of all that goes on around him."

Vice President Rockefeller apparently has come down with this occupational disease. He tries not to show it, his friends say, but down deep, he is frustrated.

Rockefeller, who is accustomed to exercising power, now occupies a position without power. Friends say he is chafing over his new political impotency.

The friends agree that Rockefeller also has a combative, competitive streak. He became rankled, for example, over some recent cracks attributed to President Ford's campaign manager, Howard H. (Bo) Callaway.

Rockefeller had agreed it would be good political strategy to keep the vice presidential nomination open. But Callaway was quoted in the newspapers as calling Rockefeller a problem and hinting he might be dumped.

"This got Rocky's dander up. It started his adrenalin flowing," reported one intimate.

The Vice President put through a call to Callaway and told him coldly that his newspaper statements "had gone way beyond" the agreed strategy. Callaway protested that he had been misquoted and invited him to check with former White House aide Bill Timmons, who had been present at the press session.

"I don't have to ask Timmons. I am talking to you," snapped Rockefeller.

He also protested to White House staff chief Donald Rumsfeld and finally to the President. Mr. Ford not only reaffirmed his support of Rockefeller but suggested that they fly in a helicopter to the airport together to dramatize it.

The Secret Service cautioned against it, pointing out that the President and Vice President aren't supposed to fly together. But Mr. Ford overruled the Secret Service, and Rockefeller accompanied the President to the airport for the Helsinki departure ceremony.

The little triumph, according to friends, buoyed Rockefeller's spirits.

Footnote: A spokesman acknowledged that the Vice President has his "ups and downs," but denied that he is depressed over his job. On the contrary, the spokesman claimed Rockefeller was enthusiastic. "I'm having a ball," the Vice President recently told an interviewer. It is Rockefeller's nature, explained a friend, to maintain a cheerful front.

**Pentagon Faring**—Some 47 liberals in Congress, who have their own ideas of how to slash government spending, asked the like-minded Institute for Policy Studies to review President Ford's budget.

The six-month study won't be submitted to Congress until next month, but we have obtained an advance draft.

It calls for a severe \$40 billion reduction in defense spending.

Institute Director Mark Raskin explained: "The presence of troops in a country is a sign of weakness. It shows that we have

no other way of influencing countries. Something is wrong when we spend \$1.6 trillion since 1945 on the military."

What would such a drastic military cut mean? States the study: "It would mean no American forces or bases west of Guam. It would mean no military assistance to Asian clients. It would mean phasing out all military alliances and defense commitments—to be replaced, in some cases, with nonmilitary treaties establishing various forms of cooperation and formulas of mutual trust.

"It would mean the end of declaratory statements of policy that commit us to intervention or the threat of intervention in the defense of asserted interests in East Asia."

In short, the study contends that the massive military reductions would change our foreign policy "to more self-restraint," which would help "shed America's global pretensions."

As for America's allies, the study suggests: "They must be self-sufficient and must consequently be allowed to operate independently in their foreign policies even to the point of accommodating the present adversaries of the United States."

Proponents describe the institute's solution as "sanity"; critics call it "surrender."