

ces, our strategic deterrent, and above all for the continuing modernization of those forces through research and development. The increased level of spending required is well within our means so long as we insist on all feasible efficiency in our defense spending. We must also expect our allies to bear their fair share of the burden of defense.

From a strong foundation, we can pursue a positive and confident diplomacy, addressed to the full array of our economic, political, and social interests in world politics. It is only on this basis that we can expect successfully to negotiate hardheaded and verifiable agreements to control and reduce armaments.

If we continue to drift, we shall become second best to the Soviet Union in overall military strength; our alliances will weaken; our promising rapprochement with China could be reversed. Then we could find ourselves isolated in a hostile world, facing the unremitting pressures of Soviet policy, backed by an overwhelming preponderance of power. Our national survival itself would be in peril, and we should face, one after another, bitter choices between war and surrender.

IV. In domestic politics, we are independents, Republicans, and Democrats. We believe that foreign and national security policies should be based only upon fundamental considerations of the nation's future well being, not that of any one faction or party. We have faith in the maturity, good sense, and fortitude of our people and in their devotion to our nation.

But public opinion must be informed before it can reach considered judgments and make them effective in our democratic system. Time, weariness, and the tragic experience of Vietnam have weakened the bipartisan consensus which sustained our foreign policy between 1940 and the mid-60s. We must build a fresh consensus to expand the opportunities and diminish the dangers of a world in flux.

We have therefore established the Committee on the Present Danger to help promote a better understanding of the main problem confronting our foreign policy, based on a disciplined effort to gather the facts and a sustained discussion of their significance for our national security and survival.

**Rita Hauser:**

### **Soviets Are Isolated In the Middle East**

*Oct. 25* — Following is the transcript of an interview today with Rita Hauser, presently a member of the Committee on the Present Danger, a former member of the Brookings Institution's study group on the Middle East, and the League of Women Voters' representative in setting up the Ford-Carter debates.

**Hauser:** There will be no Arab-Israeli conflict in the near future. The Lebanon war is winding down and can be solved on an intra-Arab basis. That will facilitate a Syrian-Israeli entente, and Syria will bring the Palestinians to bay. Israel, as you know, is helping the Christians settle into a security band from the sea to Mr. Hermon. I urged that Israel do this months ago, that the Palestinians had to be frozen into an enclave and isolated.

**Q:** Do you think that, in the aftermath of the Riyadh summit, the Arabs will unite against Israel?

**Hauser:** I don't think so. Syria's role has been to wipe out the Palestinians in the battles. If Assad can put down the Palestinians he can settle his troubles with Israel. If there is a sanitized zone created in the south, then there is no need for keeping the Golan Heights. You can walk into Syria from Lebanon! Thus, Israel has an initiative to give up the Golan. A Geneva conference is possible, but it's iffy, could succeed or fail.

**Q:** Do you think that the Soviets, perhaps in alliance with Iraq and Libya, will try to upset these arrangements?

**Hauser:** No. The Soviets have lost their card with the Palestinians, and they have no major influence with Syria. Israel has overwhelming military superiority. I don't think the Soviets would provoke the Iraqis into doing something foolish. What I want to stress is that the opportunity that exists could be lost — but I don't foresee anything at all like a military confrontation. If Carter wins, there will be a dead period before the new administration takes office and gets organized.

**Q:** By the way, I have some material from the American Labor Party on an organization called the Committee on the Present Danger, and your name crops up?

**Hauser:** Oh, yes. I'm an active member of the executive board. We're going public on Nov. 11. We're concerned about a drift in U.S. defense policy and strategic thinking, especially about the growth of the Russian navy.

### **Rostow Pushes For Mideast Regional War**

*Oct. 28* — The following discussion with Eugene Rostow was made available by a staff member of an American Zionist organization. Rostow is a prominent member of the Committee on the Present Danger.

**Q:** We are very concerned about the developments in the Middle East since the Riyadh conference, especially the possibilities of a confrontation over Israel's role in Southern Lebanon. What do you think the views of the two candidates are on this? Do you agree with Zumwalt's statement we should not have backed down in the Yom Kippur War?

**A:** Well it's hard to say now what the candidates' views are. However I myself entirely agree with Admiral Zumwalt. I don't think we can back down now either.

**Q:** But what should we do about the situation. It looks like the Iraqis, Libyans and the Soviets are all very upset about the Israeli action in the South. What if they intervene?

**A:** The Soviets have got a black eye out of the Lebanon situation so of course they want to recoup. But let me tell you what you should do. Your group should, immediately, get out a statement saying that article 51 prohibits armed intervention of one country in another's affairs, and that since this applies to the Palestinians, they have no right to reoccupy southern Lebanon to use as base against Israel and Israel has full right to defend itself against this threat.

## **Traditionalists: Carter Risks War**

### **Pittsburgh Press On Ford Speech**

*Oct. 28* — President Ford addressed the Pittsburgh Economic Club on Oct. 26. The Pittsburgh Press headlined its article on Ford's speech "Carter Risks War" and cited Ford as specifically criticizing Carter's threat to use economic warfare against the Arab nations in retaliation for an oil embargo. The following are the key excerpts from Ford's remarks:

As citizens and voters, you are being asked to decide whether to maintain the great tradition of American foreign policy — a tradition that has kept us strong and at peace — or whether you wish to break from that tradition and venture into the unknown with a doctrine that is untested, untried and in my view potentially dangerous.... The Carter doctrine deviates substantially from the solid principle of bipartisanship of the past. It has a

strong flavor of isolationism. If applied in practice as it has been proposed in campaign rhetoric, there is a significant risk it could lead to a major international crisis.... It will make a fundamental change in the direction and content of American foreign policy.

## **Scranton:**

### **USLP 'Says The Truth'**

*Oct. 30 — U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, William Scranton made the following statement Oct. 28 before a gathering of 20 top Republican Party officials and press in Johnstown, Pennsylvania; Scranton was responding to a statement by a spokesman for the U.S. Labor Party, that a Carter victory means nuclear war.*

I saw Mr. LaRouche (USLP presidential candidate) on television last night. I was very impressed. Although there are things I disagree with, what you say is the truth. I know it. Other people know it. You appropriately refer to Ford's statement in Pittsburgh in addressing just this point. But the way we're doing it is the right way. If you have the truth, the more you repeat it — say it over again and again — the less credibility you get.

*Oct. 27|— The following is the text of a full-page ad in today's Los Angeles Times by Carter National Steering Committee member Herbert Hafif, run under its original headline.*

#### **CAN A MAN NO LONGER TRUSTED BY THE CO—CHAIRMAN OF HIS NATIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE BE TRUSTED BY YOU?**

#### **A PERSONAL WARNING ABOUT JIMMY CARTER**

(The former California State Finance Chairman and Co-Chairman of the Carter National Steering Committee)

Man's hardest act is to admit his mistakes. It is thus even harder for the co-chairman of the Carter National Steering Committee to publicly admit his mistaken support of Jimmy Carter.

I, together with so many of the friends who supported my 1974 campaign for the Democratic California Gubernatorial nomination, gave up our personal lives, our funds, and a good deal of our hearts in a successful effort to get the Democratic Presidential nomination for a man we believed represented a decent new force in responsive government.

Our support was strong enough not to note the mounting evidence that the Carter record and the promises did not quite match the image. We blindly ignored the revelation of Stephen Brill in Harpers, of Carter's traits of ruthlessness and the racist nature of the Georgian's 1970 gubernatorial campaign. Even when fellow Georgian Julian Bond publicly and often said our Jimmy lied, we plowed forward.

We disregarded exposure of the Carter record in Georgia where state employees rose over 30 per cent and spending rose over 50 per cent in a single term. And when the editor of the Atlanta Constitution called our Jimmy "one of the phoniest men I've ever known," we were already too deeply involved in our effort to believe.

We at the top, after all, were being personally reassured by the candidate himself who spoke publicly of never lying, who promised to conduct a campaign of love and compassion.

It was thus a greater shock for us to finally see a slipping Jimmy Carter become a mean, vindictive man, using language and tactics designed to destroy the integrity and person of Gerald Ford, when attacking Ford's policies should have provided target enough.

But lost in the disgust over such tactics lies the real truth about Jimmy Carter, and his campaign, a truth that I now feel compelled to speak to, and that is the real purpose of this open letter.

It is painful to spend over \$8,000 of my personal funds to confess publicly, and in print, that I was wrong, but I now keep thinking that if only one of the high-ranking Republicans who knew what Richard Nixon was really like, had sacrificed their personal advantage and party loyalty, the rest of us might have been spared the taint of the Nixon presidency.

I am a Democrat, and I would like to see a Democratic President, but I am now convinced that it would be a disaster if that Democratic President was Jimmy Carter. The reason of course, is not because he has promised all things to all people, nor is it because I witnessed such things as his private scheming to get farmer's money in California during the primary, only to see his change of position to get the farm worker vote after the primary, but rather the reason is because of one very important fact that most have ignored — independent of character flaws, the man is simply not capable by experience or ability to be President of this country.

Perhaps we have become conditioned to deviousness and deceit in politicians. Perhaps we can now swallow lustful ambition for public office. Perhaps we can pragmatically countenance a hypocritical man who would be our "savior," when all we are looking for is a President, but we can accept the fact that this man and his small Nixon-like crew have neither the knowledge nor the background to run a broad-based, responsible presidency?

It will not be the Democratic Party which runs this country, but rather a small clique of people, even more narrowly motivated and far less experienced than the Nixon crew. Hidden behind the smiles and hangloose joking of the small Carter team is the fact that it is a team experienced in only campaigning with no higher goal, save getting their man the Presidency.

More even than Nixon, here is a man and organization that confuses dissent with disloyalty.

In response to private criticism of staff racism and intolerance, Carter's response is to get rid of the messengers whether they live in California or Ohio. It is no accident that what Time's Hugh Sidney called Carter's "siege mentality" on the press is also applied to members of the Democratic party. Everyone is an "outsider" to these people.

In the same way that Nixon ignored the Republican party, Carter has ignored the Democratic party. Good people like California democratic officials Chuck Manat and Dick O'Neill are given titles but no delegated authority. It is no different for other outstanding Democratic leaders. A man who refuses to delegate even minor authority to good and honorable people, is a man who cannot run a country. Twenty-nine year old "old boys" from Georgia, jealously guarding the palace gates of power are more than reminiscent of Nixon's style, they constitute its substance.

I short, this Country is not being asked to elect a Democratic president, but to elect another imperial president who will promise anything to get elected, but whose words stand in stark contrast to his record and actions.

This campaign threatens tragedy for the future of this country. I now join with such life-long Democrats as Mimi Harris, who was the chief fundraiser for Senator Cranston and Governor Pat Brown, Sr., in saying no to Jimmy Carter.

I apologize to my many friends for my mistake in judgment. I hope this public statement at least partially undoes any damage my prior support may have caused.

(Paid for from the personal funds of Herbert Hafif, 269 W. Bonita Ave., Claremont, Calif. 91711. Permission to reprint this statement in its totality is hereby granted to anyone at his own

expense). This advertisement was not authorized by any political committee or organization.

(About the author: Herb Hafif was selected by the American Trial Bar as the nation's outstanding Consumer advocate in 1972. He formed the first Environmental and Consumer Protection Committees in the history of the California Trial Bar. He set up the first Women's Rights Committees, led by the Los Angeles County Blue Ribbon Committees on Court Congestion. He served as president of the California Trials Lawyers Assn., was co-founder of the first Mental Health groups in the State of California and was a 1974 Democratic candidate for Governor of California.)

### **Der Stern:**

## **"Will A Peanut Farmer Become World's Most Powerful Man?"**

*Oct. 29* — The following is excerpted from the current issue of the West German weekly Der Stern:

... The challenger swore he would never at any time relinquish the Panama Canal; he reviled the Helsinki agreement as "a great diplomatic victory" by the Soviets; he threatened economic war against Moscow in the event of a new Angola. In this connection he let himself be advised by ex-Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, whom Ford had fired because he was too conservative and anti-détente for him....

... His (Carter's) tactic was to state as few clear standpoints as possible and — according to his audience — sound conservative, liberal or left-wing, trapping whole layers of voters. Thus in Illinois during the primaries, 47 per cent of Carter voters

believed he had promised to cut the defense budget, while 48 per cent were convinced of precisely the opposite.

Yet Carter's policy of vagueness, which brought him additional votes, threatens to become a boomerang. Too many voters blame him for being for and against the death sentence, for and against tax increases, for and against abortion. His edge is melting.

... The man who praised himself for never serving others' special interests allowed the aircraft manufacturer Lockheed to finance a South American trip for him, and promised in return to promote the corporation's products.

In addition, a glance at Carter's "brain trust," his advisory corps, shows that the anti-Establishment candidate employs more Establishment figures than his image merits: along with James Schlesinger, there are Dean Rusk, George Ball, Paul Nitze, Averell Harriman, Cyrus Vance, Paul Warnke, Clark Clifford, Theodore Sorenson — the entire foreign- and defense-policy cream of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

Carter's Kissinger, the Polish-born American professor Zbigniew Brzezinski, would even serve as a bridge to David Rockefeller, head of the Chase Manhattan Bank and brother of Ford's vice president, Nelson Rockefeller. Together with Brzezinski, David Rockefeller founded the Trilateral Commission three years ago. It is intended to unify the U.S., Western Europe and Japan into a power-bloc striking force, into a capitalist International against Communism and against the uppity countries of the Third World. The International Herald Tribune has already prophesied that a victory of the Trilateral-influenced Carter could lead to a "new Cuba crisis, a dispatch of troops to some sort of new Vietnam."

# Labor Party Candidates Put U.S. Population On Alert

*Oct. 50 (NSIPS) — The U.S. Labor Party, despite harassment by the Justice Department and Federal Election Commission, has broken through a national press blackout to reach a significant portion of the U.S. population with the threat of nuclear war under a Carter presidency, the scenario for vote fraud in the coming election and the party's proposal for an International Development Bank. The following is a listing of major media coverage of the party's campaign in the period of Oct. 25-Oct. 28.*

**Lyndon LaRouche**, USLP presidential candidate, on his last campaign tour to Detroit, Chicago and Boston received the following coverage:

#### **National Television:**

"Good Morning America" — ABC-TV Oct. 26

"The Tomorrow Show" — NBC-TV Oct. 27

"Paid Political Advertisement" — NBC-TV Oct. 27

#### **Local Coverage**

"Lyndon LaRouche is a Candidate Too" — WETA-TV  
Oct. 27 (National Oct. 31)

Detroit News, Oct. 26

Detroit Free Press, Oct. 26

WWJ-DetroitNews-owned radio, Oct. 26

WRBR radio, Detroit, Oct. 26

Public Broadcasting Television, Chicago, Oct. 28

NBC radio, Chicago, Oct. 26

ABC-TV, Boston, Oct. 28, Oct. 29

Boston Herald American, Oct. 29

KDEN-Westinghouse radio, Denver, Oct. 28

WWRL radio, NYC, Oct. 29

Philadelphia radio, "The Irv Homer Show", Oct. 29

#### **Congressional Candidates' Coverage**

**Michael MacLaurin**, Wisconsin, U.S. Senate

TV debate with William Proxmire, LaCross, Wisc. Oct. 28

Radio Debate with William Proxmire, LaCross, Wisc. Oct. 28

Television interview, Milwaukee, Wisc. Oct. 29

**Peter Signorelli**, Michigan, U.S. Senate candidate

2 Television debates against opponents Esch

and Riegle, Detroit Oct. 25

Television debate, with Esch-Riegle, Detroit, Oct. 27

Televised press conference, Lansing, Oct. 27

Radio interview, Lansing, Oct. 28

Television debate, Detroit, Oct. 28

Public Broadcasting TV, Detroit, Oct. 28

**David Hoagland**, Indiana U.S. Senate Candidate (on tour with Gubernatorial candidate, Sam Washington)

2 TV and one radio news spot, Indianapolis, Oct. 25

Television interview, Muncie, Oct. 25

6 newspaper articles, Fort Wayne, Oct. 28

2 TV and one radio, interview, Fort Wayne, Oct. 28