

# National News

## Carter speech evokes nationwide attacks

Carter's war course, defined in his State of the Union speech, has come under widespread attack in the United States. Leading figures or their spokesmen in the Republican Party are correctly charging Carter with having embarked on a superpower confrontation which can only result in nuclear war or a humiliating strategic backdown for the United States.

Republican Acting Senate Minority Leader, Ted Stevens of Alaska, stated that Carter had no right to declare a general area like the Persian Gulf, "vital to U.S. national security interests." He then elaborated by saying that "had Carter made the same speech before the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, we'd already be in World War III."

The roundup of prominent figures issuing similar denunciations of Carter runs as follows:

House Minority Leader, John Rhodes of Arizona: "Carter's rattling the scabbard without anything in it."

GOP Rep. Robert Bauman of Maryland: "It was one of the most incredibly meaningless displays of political pap that I've ever seen."

GOP Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon: "Carter's proposal is a call to war."

A spokesman for the Bush presidential campaign: "Carter has destroyed our military establishment by gutting key R & D programs ... now he has panicked. His whole policy is that of a shopkeeper who thinks he can pull complicated weapons systems off the shelves. It doesn't work that way... This pantry shelf approach is crazy... How do you fight in depth in the Persian Gulf?... You don't. Carter has a policy based on sand... It is not credible to our allies or our adversaries... The Soviets won't be fooled. They are logistically and militarily superior in the region... Carter is heading us for a confrontation ... but it shouldn't happen, because we'll lose. This is a real mess.

"As for doing anything against Cuba, it's nuts. You're talking about war—nuclear war, likely. The Soviets are clear on that."

The Bush camp was joined by John Connally: "We don't have the conventional forces to back up a red line concept in the Persian Gulf. Thus, if the Russians cross it, we have to go to nuclear war, which we'll never do. We need a real military buildup."

The same theme is played page one of the *Washington Post*, in an article by Pentagon correspondent George Wilson, entitled "Harsh Realities." Wilson states flatly that the U.S. has neither the forces nor the ability to deploy them that would make the Carter doctrine stick, while Carter has also made no specific proposals as to how this situation could be corrected.

What the *Post* points out prominently, is echoed in a lead editorial in the *Baltimore Sun*: "But his doctrine is so sweeping that it must be examined and cross-examined by Congress, an institution that not so long ago passed the War Powers Act to restrain the kind of Presidential actions that landed this country in Vietnam. ... If Congress believes the Carter doctrine to be wise and justified, then it must provide the U.S. armed forces with the wherewithal to make this historic commitment credible."

Carter may have drawn the line, but as the reactions demonstrate, the American population is beginning to draw their own line—on Carter.

## Carter deals China card

The Department of Defense has announced that it has cleared non-military equipment for sale to Communist China. A DOD spokesman said that this would include shipments of military trucks, early warning radar systems and sophisticated telecommunications systems. It is now up to the Chinese whether they will accept the Carter administration's gracious offer. They had reportedly refused to ask Secretary of Defense Harold Brown for anything on his

recent trip to China, preferring to wait to see what the White House was prepared to offer.

Meanwhile, Congress is falling head over heels to rush through an administration proposal to give the Chinese Communists most favored nation status. On the eve of Carter's State of the Union speech, the House Rules Committee cleared the way to get the proposal on the floor. It was expected to pass.

These developments, especially the DOD announcement, have prompted cries of outrage from certain House Democrats who are calling for caution in playing the China card. Rep. Lester Wolff (D-N.Y.) ripped into the administration for its failure to consult Congress, for its refusal to demand that China pledge support to Pakistan and Iran, and for Carter's refusal to consult with the Japanese on such an important policy matter.

## Kennedy abruptly cancels New England tour

In a sudden announcement that has caused widespread speculation over the future of Senator Kennedy's candidacy, Kennedy has canceled his scheduled tour of New England, that was to have begun this Friday. Kennedy headquarters, when contacted as to why the sudden decision had been taken, offered no explanation. Reeling from the rout he suffered in Iowa, and the feeble national support his candidacy has mustered, Kennedy equally abruptly announced that he will deliver what's being billed as a "major policy address" on Monday, Jan. 28. Some observers view the speech as a desperation bid to salvage a floundering candidacy.

## LaRouche placed on Georgia ballot

On Jan. 22, the state of Georgia placed Democratic presidential candidate Lyn-

don LaRouche on the ballot. The move follows LaRouche's ballot status in New Hampshire and Illinois. The Georgia move, taken by that State's Secretary of State, occurred in recognition of the national stature that the LaRouche candidacy has acquired. A Georgia Democratic Party leader, contacted following the Secretary of State's decision, stated that the LaRouche campaign met the criteria required for automatic ballot status; qualified for federal matching funds, and the presence of a "serious organization in the State of Georgia."

## Kennedy collapsing in Minnesota

Minnesota holds its Presidential caucus on the same day—Feb. 26—as the New Hampshire primary and the Kennedy campaign has announced that the Senator will make but one appearance in Minnesota, for a Feb. 16 fundraiser, and will have but one TV spot between now and the caucus.

Kennedy backers in Minnesota are discussing abandoning the campaign. One key backer, George Mische of St. Cloud, has told the press, "We're in favor of new alternatives. ... We're optimistic about uncommitted delegates. ... Kennedy may get beat worse here than in Iowa."

## Lloyd Cutler— Secretary of State?

White House Counsel Lloyd Cutler got his name in the news twice this week—for different reasons.

James McCarthy, in a syndicated article, said that Cyrus Vance was on his way out as Secretary of State. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, says McCarthy, would appear to be the most likely candidate to replace Vance in a second Carter administration. There are many people who doubt that Brze-

zinski, whose hardline policies against the Soviet Union are now in vogue, has the finesse to be a Secretary of State. The man who could fill the job, says McCarthy, is Lloyd Cutler, whose name is reportedly making the rounds of the Washington rumor mills.

Cutler, who last week called for the total rewrite of the U.S. Constitution is a speech at the University of Maryland, this week reportedly made the decision that the White House should refuse to intervene on behalf of Mr. Earle Spring, a Massachusetts senior citizen whose kidney dialysis treatment was cut off by a State Court order. Cutler did this knowing full well that Mr. Spring would die without the treatment and that he was being "sentenced to death" against his will, charged spokesmen for Citizens for LaRouche, the campaign organization of Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche. Candidate LaRouche had made an urgent appeal to the White House on Mr. Spring's behalf.

## Connecticut State selects 13 candidates for primary

Officials in the state of Connecticut have placed four Democrats and nine Republicans on the ballot for the state's first presidential primary, scheduled to be held March 25. Barbara B. Kennely, the Secretary of State who made the announcement Jan. 25, stated that the listed candidates represent "A very wide divergence of opinions and beliefs.

The Democratic candidates include President Jimmy Carter, Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., a New Hampshire "favorite son," and Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Jr. of California.

In addition to the leading Republican candidates, Bush, Connally, Baker, and Reagan, the Republican ballot will include John B. Anderson of Illinois, Rep. Philip M. Crane of Illinois, former President Gerald Ford, Senator Robert Dole of Kansas, and Benjamin Fernandez, a California businessman.

## Briefly

● **ROBERT STRAUSS**, former Democratic Party chairman and the current chairman of President Carter's re-election committee says that Carter's handling of the Iranian and Afghan crises have eliminated "leadership" as an issue in the 1980 presidential election. His remarks were made before Carter's State of the Union address, causing many Washington insiders to note that Mr. Strauss must have received advance copies of a different speech.

● **WILLIAM LOEB**, the outspoken publisher of the *Manchester Union Leader* and a staunch backer of Ronald Reagan's bid for the GOP presidential nomination, has called for the ouster of Reagan campaign guru, John Sears. Reagan, said Loeb in one of his editorials, allowed himself to be "searscumcized" in his Iowa caucus defeat by George Bush. "We would recommend strongly that Reagan get rid of the Sear Catalogue of Jaded politics, ..." Loeb said.

● **JOHN CONNALLY**, the Republican presidential hopeful whose campaign has yet to catch on, thinks that the U.S. should be tough with the Soviets—but not in the Persian Gulf, in the Caribbean. "Big John has gone a little nuts," said a spokesman for another GOP candidate. "He thinks he can get into the White House by sounding like Teddy Roosevelt charging up San Juan Hill. This is 1980 not 1890."

● **JERRY BROWN**, the California governor and self-professed presidential candidate, apparently is an eternal optimist. Brown claims to be extremely satisfied by his showing in the Iowa Democratic Party caucus. He received no votes and told his few supporters to vote "uncommitted." Senator Edward Kennedy, Brown explained to the press, took a real beating and now he was the only viable alternative to Carter.