

Ford from Republicans mobilized by the Labor Party to fight the coup, and to issue directives forbidding contact with the USLP.

Finally, although it is not known exactly what was said to Ford during the critical hours, it is probable that he was told any attempt to overturn the fraud would provoke a constitutional crisis, a situation of "ungovernability" in the U.S.; not least due to the fact that Carter was ostensibly rolling up a million and a half vote plurality in the popular vote. Thus even if Ford successfully contested the electoral college vote, it could be argued he had no popular mandate nor right to continue in office. It is common knowledge in Republican circles that in 1960 when Richard Nixon threatened to contest the vote in Illinois, which could potentially have swung the election away from John F. Kennedy, he was threatened that "civil war would follow" and backed down. White House adviser William Seidman hinted at a

similar scenario Nov. 3 in an interview in which he reported that he and others had counseled the President not to contest New York or other states because the Carter forces could in turn contest states which had fallen to the GOP by a slim margin, and perhaps even prolong the election past the January 20 inauguration date.

Finally, the President or members of his immediate family may well have been threatened directly or indirectly with assassination. Given the known capacities of the Carter-Rockefeller party of international terrorism, and the history of the previous attempts on Ford's life, it would be foolish to discount such a possibility. Ford appeared for his morning press conference with the demeanor of a man with a gun to his head. The President was apparently so emotionally and physically drained that his wife read his concession statement.

## Carter Backers Proclaim War Policy

**Howard K. Smith:**

### Carter Must Eyeball Soviets In New Cuba Missile Crisis

*Nov. 5 (NSIPS) — The following is the text of the commentary delivered on last night's ABC-TV 7 p.m. national news broadcast by Howard K. Smith.*

In preparing his policies, Mr. Carter should put one foreign item high on the agenda. Russia will want early to take the pulse of a President they don't know. Mr. Carter should prepare to make sure they get an accurate reading.

When Khrushchev took Kennedy's measure in their Vienna meeting, it was nearly disastrous. The Russian got such a low opinion of the newcomer, he promptly intensified the Berlin crisis and prepared the Cuban missile confrontation.

The likelihood Brezhnev will want to try Carter out soon is based on two developments. One, Carter's terrible blunder in announcing that if Russia invades Yugoslavia on Tito's death, the U.S. will not act militarily. As it is known that Stalin failed to invade when Tito first declared independence because he was ignorant of and afraid of what the U.S. would do, Carter, in fact, invited a Russian invasion. As Tito may go at any time, Brezhnev will want to know soon if Carter is that soft-headed.

Second, Russia is now vastly more powerful and able to give us a test — now having a Navy that outnumbered ours on the scene in the last Arab-Israeli war, and three or four times our power in some areas of land warfare.

Some kind of test is sure to come, soon. The President-elect should be prepared to erase every trace of the impression created by the most absurd error of an error-ridden campaign — his un-asked-for surrender of Yugoslavia.

### Carter Talks of 'End of Détente' Over Yugoslavia

*Nov. — The following exchange between a reporter and Gov. Jimmy Carter occurred at Carter's press conference in Plains, Ga. yesterday.*

**Q:** In the heat of the campaign things are sometimes said hastily, and as you often stressed, you answered questions based on the knowledge that you had at the moment. On the subject of Yugoslavia is it conceivable that once you've studied that

question further, you might reserve your option as President concerning action by the Soviet Union there?

**A:** That's a possibility. I have made my position on Yugoslavia clear: that if the Soviet Union should invade Yugoslavia, that this would be an extremely serious breach of peace. It would be a threat to the entire world, as far as a peaceful world is concerned. It would make it almost impossible for us to continue under the broad generic sense of détente. And whether or not we actually committed troops to Yugoslavia, with the — the conjecture of my opinion is that that would be unlikely — but I would have to make a decision on a final basis at that point. I might add that my information from Yugoslavia has been that the nation is strong militarily, very highly united, very deeply committed to independence and that the chance for a Soviet invasion would be extremely unlikely.

Yes sir.

**Fritchey:**

### Must Dump Gen. Brown

*Nov. 2 — The following column by Clayton Fritchey, "Gen. Brown's Turn," appeared in today's New York Post. Brown, a military traditionalist opposed to confrontation with the Soviets on military grounds, was defended by President Ford and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld against watergating attacks by the Carter forces in the closing weeks of the campaign.*

When the election fever abates this week, and matters that seriously affect the nation's security can once more be debated in a less partisan climate, the question of Gen. George Brown's fitness to continue as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be reopened — regardless of who wins the presidency.

It's not so much a question of punishing Gen. Brown (that is of no great moment) as deciding whether, in the light of his recent blundering, intemperate, unbalanced statements it is prudent to leave the security of the United States in the hands of an officer who has demonstrated that he is not the right man in the right job.

...Brown asserts that Israel, our stoutest ally in the Middle East (and a winning one at that), is a "burden," although Israel has cost us no casualties whatsoever...

As chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Brown is the principal policy-maker of the armed forces and also principal military adviser to the President, to whom, by statute, he has direct access. Is it

wise to keep in this crucial position an officer who openly attacks another true ally (Britain) and who intimates that the American people haven't got the guts to defend themselves?

Brown now denies that in a meeting with Britain's First Sea Lord, Admiral Ashmore, he confessed to doubts about the American will to fight. He says he was misunderstood. The transcript, however, pictures Ashmore as raising "the prime problem in the world...the big question mark about the United States," and saying to Brown: "Has the United States really got the stomach for this? Are they going to see it through?" Brown's answer was, "No, we haven't."

It's hard to see how there could be any misgivings over American resistance to Communist aggression after the Berlin airlift, the war in Korea, the Cuban missile blockade, the war in Vietnam, the bombing of Russian ships in the Haiphong Harbor and our efforts to break the Soviet foothold in the Middle East.

Brown says he can't see the strategic value of Israel to the U.S., even though it is now our only dependable ally in the Eastern Mediterranean, the area which constitutes the southern flank of NATO. While we have poured countless billions into Turkey and Greece since World War II, they are today shaky NATO allies, but Gen. Brown seems to have no complaints about their being a burden to the U.S.

All in all, the general has exhausted his usefulness at the Pentagon.

**Brzezinski:**

### "We Must Reconsider The Post-War World Balance"

*Nov. 4 — The following are excerpts from an interview with Zbigniew Brzezinski, Carter foreign policy advisor, in today's Quotidien de Paris.*

... Our foreign policy today lacks imaginativeness, preoccupied as it is above all to maintain the balance of powers and taking care more of our enemies than of our friends. That policy is a dangerous claim against the future and contributes more and more to isolate the U.S. on the world scene.... In our relations with the USSR, for example, we give the impression of not paying attention to our own ideals and roots. We manipulate, as in Cyprus, and envisage only in the short term. This is true of our policy towards South Africa. We based ourselves on unjustifiable premises. Because we have envisaged our whole foreign policy in the East-West perspective that was the postwar one and because we have refused to understand the North-South dichotomy, we did commit ourselves to the wrong camp in Angola.

We share the view, and Mr. Carter is entirely favorable to this idea, that we must reconsider our medium and long term policy, taking into account a restructuring of the world system. This is a complex agenda, a challenge similar to that which we had to face in 1945.

**Q:** What would the attitude of the Carter Administration in the event of CP assuming power in Western Europe?

"It goes without saying that we do not favor the presence of communists in government offices. But this being said, it is obviously ludicrous to accept on the one hand to talk with Mr. Brezhnev and to refuse on the other all contact with Mr. Berlinguer. Moreover, were the PCI to join the government, it would be bound to the democratic system. That would be an opportunity for it to draw away from its Stalinist, or even Leninist, roots. In adopting a contrary position, one gives the Europeans the impression that it is the CPs which are the sole representatives of national independence. Last, and this is

important, the possible participation of communists in a Western European government is first and foremost a problem that concerns the Europeans themselves.

**Sulzberger:**

### China, Too, Is U.S. Nuclear Adversary

*Nov. 3 — The following column by C.L. Sulzberger in today's New York Times represents the first public acknowledgement among Atlanticist circles that the current anti-Maoist shake-up in China has destroyed the Atlanticists' "Chinese Second Front" strategy for a nuclear attack on the Soviet Union.*

...it is perfectly clear that no matter who is chosen to start things off at the State and Defense Departments next January, major shifts in actual policy goals will gradually become identifiable.

Growing interest in third-world relationships that became increasingly marked in Washington from 1973 on will unquestionably have to take a major leap forward. It would be sound for the Administration to contemplate the wisdom of Peking's long-term policy of cementing Chinese relationships with developing nations everywhere.

For much too long a time we have been tardy in that respect. The only things that really woke us up were the energy crisis following the OPEC embargo in 1973 and southern Africa's crisis following the Portuguese empire's dismantling.

Democracy, as we know it, is a dwindling form of government on this crowded earth. If we wish to invigorate the system we so fervently prefer, we must take the lead in facing international problems such as population, food, distribution, cheap financing of poor lands, etc. To date we have talked more than we have acted in these domains.

Finally, it is high time the architects of our defense strategy should reconsider the appalling lag behind the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic with respect to passive nuclear defense programs such as mass evacuation plans and anti-fallout shelters.

Ignoring this facet of implicit danger in our contemporary world is stupid — as both Moscow and Peking openly acknowledge by their actions. In an emergency, as things are, we might find ourselves in the position of a family that spent the insurance money for a new house only on filling it with finer furniture.

### Nunn In Europe To Put NATO In 'Forward Defense' Posture

*Nov. 2 — The following article, "Nunn in Europe to Persuade NATO to Drastically Alter Defense Strategy," by Charles Corddry, appeared in today's Baltimore Sun. Sen. Nunn's views on defense are those of the Rockefeller's Brookings Institution, whose Jeffery Record, a "utopian" pro-war strategist is on the Senator's staff. Nunn's touring companion, Lt. Gen. Hollingsworth, was forced out of the U.S. Army in the spring of 1976 for his advocacy of using nuclear weapons in Korea.*

Washington — Senator Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), a key Armed Services Committee member, flew to Europe over the weekend with a satchelful of controversial proposals for drastically changing allied defense strategy, to deter the kind of blitzkrieg he believes the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact forces now are designed to fight.

Far from envisioning reduced defense costs, Mr. Nunn will be urging on United States and allied officials a need to undertake large redeployments of ground troops to more forward positions, and to increase substantially their arms stockpiles.

Failure to consider such changes in strategy and forces in light of Warsaw Pact readiness for "short, sudden war," Mr. Nunn says, "would be nothing short of irresponsible." He says the present dispositions of North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces "virtually invites an unimpeded Pact advance to the Rhine."

The Georgia freshman senator, who is 38, has a way of producing substantial changes in allied defense plans following his European forays, and both the Pentagon and European defense ministries are keenly watching the present two-week expedition.

Senator Nunn is accompanied by Lt. Gen. James F. Hollingsworth, USA (Ret.), who has proposed in a detailed study, with 90 recommendations, that U.S. Army and other NATO forces be positioned and equipped to fight on about two days' notice and to prevent Warsaw Pact forces from breaching a defense line at the inter-German border.

The Hollingsworth report, presented just before the general retired, has caused a large stir in the Pentagon and apparently is considered too hot to make public, at least thus far.

Essentially, it is understood, General Hollingsworth argued — convincingly to Senator Nunn at any rate — that forces in Europe should be prepared to go to war on no more than 48 hours' warning instead of the 30 days' warning assumed in allied defense planning.

This would involve large-scale movement of NATO ground forces, including those of the American Army, to new positions in North Germany and elsewhere on the defense line and extensive upgrading of weapons supplies.

One well-informed source said the Hollingsworth plan effectively would put NATO forces on a higher state of alert than those of South Korea and Israel.

Senator Nunn's argument is that there is no choice, given the Warsaw Pact's ability to knife into central Europe in a blitzkrieg — "A short, sudden war of unprecedented violence." There is no point in being able to bring full defensive weight to bear in 60 days if a force can not survive the first 20, he says.

### **Agnelli:**

#### **Carter 'A Good Choice'**

*Nov. 4 — The following is excerpted from a front page interview with FIAT chief and Trilateral Commission member Gianni Agnelli, appearing in today's Corriere della Sera.*

**Agnelli:** ...I think Carter is a good choice...it seems to me that America was in front of a simple alternative: On one side there was a president whom I would not call a mediocre personality, but who surely was not exciting. And on the other side there was the new protagonist. The fact that a great power like the United States could choose the new alternative is a sign of courageous initiative. In summary, it is a vital turn for the entire West...I think Carter will try to give more responsibility to the Western Europeans in the context of the Western Alliance...

(Economically) Carter will have an expansionist policy...at least in the beginning Carter can concede what he promised...

As for Italy, we don't have too many illusions. We can not allow the expectation of a strong recovery in the USA to become an alibi for avoiding austerity. We must pay the ticket for the crisis anyway...Robert Roosa at the U.S. Treasury should not change

anything given that the same ideas are held by different economists...but on the other hand, what is important for Italy is political order...

It seems to me that during the campaign, by differentiating himself from Ford, Carter declared himself to be against the PCI entering the government. He aligned with West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's statements in Puerto Rico on this. I don't know if he can change his position, as he changes from a candidate to being President in the White House...

Yes, I saw Carter one and a half years ago, in Japan at a meeting of the Trilateral Commission. We all viewed him with great curiosity because it was known that he could become one of the men running for the White House. I had breakfast with him a couple of times.

Yes, he was sympathetic to me. I immediately judged that he was a major political figure because of his spontaneous capacity to be convincing and fascinating, typical for a man from the South.

**Interviewer:** Is Carter an invented character?

**Agnelli:** Carter is the symbol of the struggle of a large part of America against the party establishment and Washington itself. His election marks, in my opinion, the great victory of the liberal dailies like the New York Times and the Washington Post. This intellectual world wanted to prove — and they succeeded in doing this — the great force that culture and freedom have. First they destroyed Nixon, then they invented a candidate for the White House, and finally they imposed him on the public opinion of the country.

**Interviewer:** This is a good lesson, but who is behind Carter?

**Agnelli:** I particularly know that Brzezinski and Vance are, both of whom I consider first class men. And let's be clear, it is not that Kissinger, Simon and Rumsfeld are not. The fact is that in the USA, there is a leading class with excellent qualities among the Democrats and the Republicans, that's the primary gist of that country....However, I think that Carter's expansionist policy will pull everybody on his side, perhaps not so many bankers, but surely some industrialists...

### **Carter To 'Help' Britain With Strong Dollar**

*Nov. 4 — The following excerpted op-ed by Carter campaign staffer Peter Bourne entitled: "Don't Worry About Jimmy—He'll Be Britain's Best Friend" appeared in today's London Daily Express.*

"Jimmy Carter knows people worry about him. But Britain's and America's other allies will find in Jimmy Carter one of the best and most powerful friends they ever had.... Jimmy Carter has some strong ideas on Britain. He supports the mechanisms now being used to help the pound. But he feels that the stability of the international currencies is inexorably tied to the strength and stability of the dollar. So he believes that his best help for Britain will be to get the dollar stronger and steady by getting his own economic house in order...."

"He will make some drastic changes in American foreign policy. He will not jeopardize established commitments, but he will break away from the old stereo-type that since the Second World War the world is divided into Russian and American spheres of influence...."