

conference where "all aspects of the Eastern threat are analyzed, forward policy is coordinated, and joint defense measures against terrorism and subversion are agreed upon.

*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* Dec. 28—In reporting the competing Central Intelligence Agency evaluations of Soviet strategy, Jan Reifenberg writes that "Just as in 1960, when the fight over the 'missile gap' introduced a basic change in U.S. strategy, so these days Carter's judgment of the background of Soviet rearment can decisively shift the essence of U.S. defense policy. The burned children of 1960—who following Kennedy's takeover found out that the 'missile gap' was a fantasy—will be in power again in January." A "powerful group of hawks," including Schlesinger, Nitze, and Jackson, are trying to influence Carter. Since people like Nitze doubt whether it is possible to reach a new SALT agreement, the question is coming up whether the U.S. President alone should make the final decision on the launching of nuclear weapons.

### London Times Questions Times' Motives

In a Dec. 29 article, London Times Washington correspondent Fred Emery questioned the motivation behind a report "leaked" in the New York Times on Sunday, Dec. 26 that the U.S. intelligence had been won over by "outsiders" to the view that the Soviet Union is seeking immediate military superiority. "The fact that the top secret so-called 'national estimate' of Soviet objectives has reached the New York Times in such a timely fashion," writes Emery, "has raised suggestions here today that the defence hardliners wanted deliberately to ensure as much exposure as possible before the new man took office." This switch in thinking is likely to "precipitate political controversy" and is obviously "the stuff of fierce debate," notes Emery. He sees the key item of contention as the report's conclusion that the Soviets are bent on disrupting fuel and raw materials supplies and on developing first strike capabilities. The newspaper quotes Carter's designated Secretary of Defense Harold Brown as saying in an interview with the Los Angeles Times that "the belief on either side that you can survive a strategic thermonuclear war as a going society—when you cannot—is the worst possible situation for the world to be in."

### London Times Scoffs At Carter's Summity Attempt

Carter's announcement that he will meet with Brezhnev next year should be greeted with "mixed

feelings" writes the London Times in a lead editorial Dec. 29. Mutual distrust between the Soviet Union and the United States "is not going to be removed by handshakes and reassuring words" and even agreement on strategic weapons such as SALT should not be seen as the "end all" of relations between the superpowers, says the editorial. "Their military significance is strictly limited and they become politically significant only if they fit into other arrangements that lower the level of confrontation or lessen the danger of conflict." Carter of course "can make progress... but there is something a little dispiriting about his way of starting." A man-to-man summit is a "familiar routine" which can not really resolve any fundamental differences. Carter "would probably have been wiser to say cautiously that he would be happy to meet Mr. Brezhnev as soon as he was convinced that serious business required the personal attention of both men.

### Venezuela's *El Nacional*: Jimmy Carter: Portrait of a Robot

... This Mr. Carter has a marked vocation for order, discipline and method. . . .

However, being a formidable organizer may help win elections, but I am afraid it does very little for running the United States. We are in the presence of a great executive. . . . But he is not a statesman.

. . . His total lack of humanist education is frightening. He is a reader of briefs and memoranda. . . .

What would this technocrat do when confronted with international crises of the calibre of those of Berlin (1948), the Suez (1956), the Bay of Pigs (1961), or the Missile Crisis (1962)? I suspect that Jimmy Carter, given his psychological makeup, would get along better with the hawks than with the doves. The language of military officers must be more familiar to him than that of politicians.

He will surround himself with technicians, with specialists incapable of thinking in abstractions, with men who have quick answers for extremely complex problems. If this hypothesis is correct, I believe that Mr. Carter's finger will be closer to the trigger than that of Mr. Ford. . . .

Then, supposedly, there is the religious theme. Carter is a believer, but that doesn't change anything. Truman was perhaps the most religious of all American presidents and he did not hesitate to inaugurate nuclear war. Mr. Carter is no monk. . . . His Christianity will be no obstacle in adopting aggressive attitudes.

# AID Population Control Legislation

## Set for Congress

On Jan. 4, the opening day of the 95th Congress, Rep. James Scheuer (D-NY) will introduce a resolution to establish a House Select Committee on Population which explicitly endorses policies of de-population and de-industrialization for most of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

In a Dec. 23 interview with Scheuer (see full transcript below), the New York City Congressman made it clear that he intends to mobilize Congress around legislating the use of food aid as a weapon. Scheuer's "Select Committee" and analogous activities in the Senate are geared to insuring the easy passage of an Agency for International Development (AID) proposal that Congress adopt a "population impact examination" (PIE) proposal which would limit development aid to countries which reduce their population growth rate. AID — the government's primary conduit for overseas development and food assistance — is asking Congress to adopt the triage policies of William Paddock whose "lifeboat ethic" calls for the elimination of 30 million Mexicans as a starter and whose programs have been adopted by top Carter-advisor George Ball. PIE policy is meant to bludgeon debt-strapped developing nations to either pay Wall Street or face starvation.

### *The Scheuer Committee*

Scheuer announced the formation of an 11-member Select Committee to "investigate the problems caused by a worldwide population explosion" in a press statement scheduled for release on Jan. 1. Here he repeated the long-discredited Malthusian warning that "Population growth threatens the world with famine, environmental degradation, unemployment, overcrowded cities, lawlessness, and the prospect of demographic wars in a world where nuclear weapons are proliferating." Earlier, Scheuer, after returning from a State Department-arranged trip to Africa, charged in an op-ed in the Dec. 23 *New York Times* that U.S. food and development programs for the Third World are compounding the problems of the Third World by "destroying nature's balance."

A "Dear Colleague" letter (reproduced below) is being circulated by Scheuer in the House with the intent of getting the support of at least half of all Congressmen. While Scheuer lists the names of 86 as co-sponsors, all but one of more than a dozen Congressmen or their top aides contacted this week disassociated themselves from co-sponsorship; many stated emphatically that they never endorsed it in the first place. About a half-dozen conservative Congressmen, including Representatives Conte, Kemp, Quie and Anderson, flatly denied ever co-

sponsoring the resolution. Others who expressed similar sentiments were Representatives Wright, Udall, Dellums, Badillo, Clausen and Nix. Rep. John Rhodes (R-Ariz), an alleged co-sponsor, said that the Select Committee was against everything he ever believed in. Leading Congressional Black Caucus members, also listed as co-sponsors, have privately disassociated themselves, with the sole exception of Detroit's Rep. John Conyers, a close ally of Carter, who proudly admitted his "enthusiastic" support.

One Carter insider, a spokesman for the Overseas Development Council, admitted that Scheuer had organized support in a purposely unprincipled and devious manner, buttering up colleagues with "sweet talk" and compiling his co-sponsorship list primarily through word of mouth at meetings and by buttonholing Congressmen in hallways. Moreover, Scheuer's "Dear Colleague" letter, dated Jan. 3, 1977, which will be circulated next week with the names of the 86 alleged co-sponsors attached, was written *after* the so-called endorsements were compiled, according to information received from his aide.

These dishonest practices are not simply the actions of Scheuer himself; they are being carried out in cooperation with the Carter transition team's office with full complicity of Carter's designated Cabinet. In a copy of a page from Rep. Scheuer's appointment book for Dec. 22 and 23 (reproduced below), obtained from independent sources, Scheuer lists scheduled meetings on Dec. 22 with Walter Mondale, followed by a private meeting with Carter transition team member Jule Sugarman who, after being head of New York City's Human Resources Administration, was picked to reorganize Atlanta's welfare system and headed up the Atlanta system during Carter's gubernatorial tenure. On the next day, Scheuer met with Joe Onek, head of the Carter Health Policy Task Force. As his calendar for Dec. 22 demonstrates, all of these individual meetings immediately followed an organizing session with various Rockefeller family-controlled population organizations, including Zero Population Growth and the United Nations Association, convened to map out the nuts and bolts of Scheuer's mobilization in Congress.

### *McGovern for Triage*

In the Senate, Scheuer's activities are being complemented by a group of Senate liberals, including Senators George McGovern (D-SD), Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn) and Dick Clark (D-Iowa), who are preparing amendments to PL-480, the AID-administered "Food for