



U.P.I.

What To Expect From Mondale On FOREIGN POLICY

Gary Allen is author of *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*; *The Rockefeller File*; *Kissinger*; *Jimmy Carter/Jimmy Carter*; *Tax Target: Washington*; and, *Ted Kennedy: In Over His Head*. He is an AMERICAN OPINION Contributing Editor.

■ **WALTER F. MONDALE**, the Democratic candidate for President of the United States, long ago sold himself to that ultimate special-interest group known as the "Liberal" Establishment. Not only is he a member in good standing of David Rockefeller's elitist Council on Foreign Relations, but he was also a charter member of the notorious Trilateral

Commission founded by David Rockefeller and Rockefeller lieutenant Zbigniew Brzezinski. Mondale has also attended at least one of the secret confabs of the shadowy Bilderberger group of world planners. Such credentials suggest that, if elected President, he will continue to follow the disastrous initiatives of this foreign-policy elite.

Walter Mondale (C.F.R./Trilateral Commission) was instrumental in the Panama Canal sellout, giving away strategic U.S. territory (and paying Panama a cash bonus of over \$2 billion) in order to bail out the Big Bankers. In fact, Mondale personally surrendered U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone (right).

Created in 1921 by J.P. Morgan and other major banking interests, the Council on Foreign Relations has dominated U.S. foreign policy for more than forty years, regardless of which political party held the White House or controlled Congress.* Today, this foreign-policy establishment serves the worldwide interests of the

*The declared goal of the Rockefeller-C.F.R. establishment is a "New World Order," a code phrase for a One World socialist government under its control. As John D. Rockefeller learned so well, when you control an interventionist government, you can control the economy by arranging for that government to run interference for your operations and provide special privileges to keep down your competition. The Rockefellers have been working for six decades to dominate our economy through control of the American government. This is the opposite of private enterprise; it is, instead, *privileged* enterprise. Government intervention is the enemy of market competition. And socialism — the ultimate in government interventionism — results in the ultimate system of monopoly.

But most of the Rockefeller wealth is now located *outside* of the United States. The family has assets and does business in some 125 countries all over the world. As a result, the Rockefellers long ago recognized their need to control U.S. foreign policy — regardless of whether the Republicans or the Democrats are in the White House.

The center of the Eastern "Liberal" Establishment, the Rockefeller-dominated Council on Foreign Relations (C.F.R.), constitutes what Dan Smoot has called "the invisible government" of the United States, and its members dominate high finance, the major universities,

Rockefeller family, the international bankers, and their allies in the multinational corporations. That influence has been entrenched in the U.S. Department of State since before World War II. Its purpose is to control and conduct American foreign policy on behalf of those special-interest groups which seek polit-

commerce, the tax-exempt foundations, politics, and the communications media. As John Franklin Campbell put it in *New York* magazine of September 20, 1971:

"Practically every lawyer, banker, professor, general, journalist and bureaucrat who has had any influence on the foreign policy of the last six Presidents — from Franklin Roosevelt to Richard Nixon — has spent some time in the Harold Pratt House, a four-story mansion on the corner of Park Avenue and 68th Street, donated 26 years ago by Mr. Pratt's widow (an heir to the Standard Oil fortune) to the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc. . . .

"If you can walk — or be carried — into the Pratt House, it usually means that you are a partner in an investment bank or law firm — with occasional 'trouble-shooting' assignments in government. You believe in foreign aid, NATO, and a bipartisan foreign policy. You've been pretty much running things in this country for the last 25 years, and you know it."

The C.F.R. has provided the key men, particularly in the field of foreign policy, for the Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan Administrations. The Chairman of the Board of the C.F.R. is David Rockefeller, the master potentate of industry and banking who personifies the Establishment elite.



ically secured markets, taxpayer-underwritten deals with socialist and Communist regimes, and (eventually) One World Government and One World Monopoly.

Walter Mondale is a willing tool of these Establishment elitists. They can count on him to do what they want and never to pursue policies contrary to their goals. He has long served Establishment interests both as a United States Senator and as Jimmy Carter's Vice President. A prime example was his role in pushing through the Panama Canal Treaties, which were a thinly disguised bailout of the Big Bankers. Let us briefly recall some of the relevant special-interest considerations which were behind these transactions.

Establishment Looting

Despite the fact that the United States had paid billions of dollars to build the Panama Canal and maintain legal sovereignty over it, a tremendous propaganda campaign during the 1970s told Americans that new treaties were urgently needed to transfer ownership and control of our Canal to the Government of Panama. While pressures to give away our Canal in Central America had been applied during previous Administrations, it was Jimmy Carter and Walter Mondale who consummated the shameful act.

As our colleague Alan Stang has demonstrated in these pages (see the November 1977 and October 1983 issues of *AMERICAN OPINION*), the two Panama Canal Treaties handing control over the Canal to the Leftwing military dictatorship of Omar Torrijos were not only subversive to American interests, but were also completely *illegal*. One of the treaties even makes the Canal "neutral" and allows passage through it of military vessels of *all* nations

in times of war. This means that the Canal and its Zone would legally be available to Communist ships and troops seeking to attack or surround the United States. It constitutes an incredibly bold invitation to further Soviet- and Cuban-backed expansionism in the whole region. The subsequent dramatic increase in Communist insurgency in Central America was one result.

Today, the former U.S. Naval Air Station at Coco Solo in the Canal Zone is operated by the Soviets. Although the Reds claim to be using the facility as a "vehicle distribution center" to house their *Lada* automobile exports, expert observers report that arms and munitions are leaving this center via the Trans-Isthmian Highway, to the PanAmerican Highway, and on to guerrillas and terrorists in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and El Salvador. The Carter-Mondale treaties have allowed the Reds to use the Canal Zone as a base for covert operations all over the Caribbean and Central America.

How did we part with the American Canal and its surrounding Zone? Did we sell it to the Government of Panama? No, it was not a "sellout"; we *paid* Panama to take it! Why?

Not only did the U.S. Senate vote under pressure from Carter and Mondale to give away part of the United States to the corrupt Marxist regime in Panama, but along with this deal the American taxpayers have been forced to pay another \$70 million a year to the Government of Panama. The treaties even pledge the U.S. to a five-year aid program to Panama which includes \$200 million of Export-Import Bank credits, \$75 million of Agency for International Development credits, and at least \$20 million in loan guarantees from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation — all agencies of the U.S.

Mondale played a major role in the foreign-policy disasters of the Carter Administration which encouraged the Communist takeover of Nicaragua. Now he is blaming President Reagan for the resulting problems in Central America, and has even voiced disapproval of the Reagan rescue move to liberate Grenada.

Government. These taxpayer-guaranteed subsidies amount to nearly \$300 million over five years in addition to that approximately \$70 million *per annum*. Quite a boodle!

A product of advanced Yankee technology and American capital, the Canal is worth an estimated \$7 billion. Yet, we are paying Panama a cash bonus which will eventually amount to over \$2 billion — all in addition to surrendering the territory and the complex installation itself! This amounts to handing your wallet over to a stranger — and giving him a bonus for the trouble of taking it.

We suspect that most of our veteran readers already know why such seemingly absurd conditions would be agreed to by men sworn to protect the interests of the United States. The reason, however, bears repetition.

During the go-go years of the late 1960s and 1970s, when the international bankers were with promiscuous abandon lending money to deadbeat Third World dictatorships, Panama's Leftist regime was accumulating huge indebtedness to the bankers. According to a report issued by the Library of Congress in 1977, Panama's external debt was well beyond its ability to pay:

"[A] source in the Federal Reserve indicated that foreign branches of U.S. banks had claims of \$1.886

billion on Panama at the end of 1976, while the March 1977 Treasury Bulletin indicated that domestic offices of U.S. banks had \$886 million in short- and long-term claims against Panama as of this date. Of this amount, only 13 percent were long-term claims. Adding the two figures results in \$2.772 billion in claims on Panama by U.S. banks and their foreign branches."

This huge debt is even more staggering when one considers that Panama has a population less than one-fifth that of New York City. By 1977, Panama's creditors were becoming anxious about getting their money back. Under Panama's corrupt socialist regime the economy had all but ground to a halt as the Torrijos policies pushed public spending into the stratosphere and made labor costs so high that Panamanian products were priced out of the world market. Panama's socialist Department of Planning noted with alarm at the time that nearly forty percent of annual revenues would be needed just to pay the debt service. Creditor bankers realized that to save their loans they had to get more cash to the regime.

One of Panama's main creditors was Marine Midland Bank of New York. A leading member of a consortium of international bankers and

corporations which had invested \$115 million in Torrijos, Marine Midland's share of that investment came to about eight million dollars, most of which would soon come due. In addition, Inter-Union/Paris, of which Marine Midland owns forty-five percent interest, held some two million dollars in claims against the Panamanian state. Other major creditors included Citibank, Chase Manhattan, Bankers Trust, Bank of America, the First National Bank of Boston, the First National Bank of Chicago, the Republic National Bank of Dallas, Pan American Airways, and several American exporting firms which have extensive trade deals with Latin America. These powerful vested interests needed a well-camouflaged bailout.

Enter (stage Left) one Sol Linowitz, who was quickly put in charge of negotiating treaties with Panama. Like Walter Mondale and Jimmy Carter, Linowitz was a member of the Rockefeller-dominated Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission. He had served as chairman of the national council of the radical Foreign Policy Association and as director of the socialist National Planning Association. He had even been a member of Nelson Rockefeller's aborted Presidential springboard — the National Commission on Critical Choices for Americans.

As Alan Stang reported here in his 1977 article, Linowitz was strictly a Rockefeller. He had chaired the Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations, established by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. Called the Linowitz Commission, it advocated relinquishing U.S. sovereignty over the Canal and discontinuing aid to our anti-Communist allies in Latin America. Linowitz had also been closely associated with such

Castroite activists as Richard Fagen and Soviet K.G.B. operative Orlando Letelier. Sol was even revealed to have been a registered foreign agent (Number 2222) of the Communist Government of Salvador Allende of Chile!

Most important of all in our present context, however, is the fact that Sol Linowitz — the main negotiator of the Panama Canal Treaties — was a director and member of the executive committee of (you guessed it) the Marine Midland Bank. He also served as a director of Pan Am.

You might find it startling that Walter Cronkite and the other moguls of the Establishment media didn't mention this enormous conflict of interest. Perhaps the mediacrats felt that Linowitz's position with Marine Midland was not significant enough to warrant troubling the heads of the public. It is likewise interesting that the Carter-Mondale Administration did everything possible to avoid public scrutiny of Linowitz's position with Marine Midland. President Carter appointed him as U.S. co-negotiator* of the treaties for a six-month period — long enough to work out the details of the treaties, but not long enough to require Confirmation Hearings by the U.S. Senate.

*The other U.S. treaty negotiator was Ellsworth Bunker. Bunker is a former director of Bankers Trust, and his brother, Arthur Hugh Bunker, has been a long-time director of Lehman Brothers. Both Bankers Trust and Lehman Brothers had important investments in Latin America in general and Panama in particular. Ellsworth's other affiliations include membership in the World Affairs Council; honorary president of the Foreign Policy Association; and, director of the American-Russian Institute for Cultural Relations with the Soviet Union, which was cited by the Attorney General as "Communist," and as "Communist-controlled" by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. A member of the Council on Foreign Relations, Ellsworth Bunker is (like Linowitz and Mondale) another Rockefeller.

Despite this fast shuffle, some Members of Congress did raise embarrassing questions. Senators Jesse Helms and James McClure and Representatives Ron Paul, George Hansen, and Lawrence McDonald did everything they could to expose the game.

Carter-Mondale Coverup

On September 12, 1977, Representative George Hansen of Idaho called to the attention of the House some of the disturbing special-interest connections in the Linowitz appointment: "First, Mr. Linowitz represented the Republic of Panama over the Panama Canal issue to President-elect Carter in late 1976 . . . Panama boasted of the fact. Two months later, Mr. Linowitz began representing the United States on the same issue between the same parties. By its terms such a situation is a conflict of interest . . .

"Second, Linowitz was negotiating the treaty while Linowitz's law firm, from which he had not resigned, remained a registered agent for South American governmental interests — perhaps an oversight; but the fact that Linowitz himself and his law firm have represented South and Central American interests for at least two decades is not an oversight. Panama and Chile sugar interests all have been represented by Linowitz and his firm and all are interested in one way or another in a resolution of the canal issue favorable, in their lights, to Panama. Linowitz could not be so insensitive to the realities of international interests as to be ignorant of the obvious interconnection of all these issues . . ."

Noting that Sol Linowitz was a stockholder of Marine Midland as well as serving on its Executive Committee which approves foreign

loans, Senator Jesse Helms declared: "It is a grave error to have a banker who is in bed with the Torrijos regime to negotiate the proposed treaty."

On April 20, 1977, Congressman Hansen and Senator James McClure (R.-Idaho) filed suit for a temporary restraining order against Linowitz as treaty negotiator. Linowitz now resigned his position with Marine Midland. But the details of the treaty had already been worked out. In fact, the Carter-Mondale agreement was completed only four hours and forty minutes before Sol Linowitz's temporary appointment was officially terminated. Obviously, Panama knew how its bread was buttered.

The evidence clearly suggests that the Wall Street banks and their allies engineered and promoted the Panama Canal payaway with their man Linowitz negotiating the details. They would be the major beneficiaries of the treaties and U.S. subsidies which would pull Panama out of its financial woes and bail out the investment of Marine Midland, Chase Manhattan, and the rest.

As the negotiations proceeded, the special interests had organized lobbying activities in favor of the treaties. In *The Power Peddlers*, authors Russell W. Howe and Sarah H. Trott reveal that then-Senator Gale McGee — the radical Democrat from Wyoming — held a pro-treaty meeting of powerful business interests at the State Department in late October of 1975. Among the lobbyists represented at this gathering were agents of Chase Manhattan, the Bank of America, Marine Midland, Gulf Oil, Rockwell International, and such Rockefeller organizations as the Council of the Americas. At that meeting a lobbying kitty was collected which amounted to almost half a million dollars. Subsequent meetings brought in lobbyists and

Fritz Mondale's record reveals him to be bent on reducing America's military strength. He supports the "freeze" movement; opposes the MX missile, the B-1 bomber, the M-1 tank, and nuclear-powered aircraft carriers; and, promises to slash at least \$30 billion from defense spending his first year in office.

representatives of other major banking firms and corporate members of the Establishment, including Pan American. Pan Am was concerned about many interests it has in Panama, including protection of its headquarters there for Latin American operations.

As we have noted, Sol Linowitz resigned his position with Marine Midland only after Conservatives in Congress began asking questions. This was merely a symbolic act, and a lame one at that. It certainly did not reduce his personal interest in putting together the Panama Canal Treaties which were written of, by, and for the Wall Street bankers and their corporate-socialist buddies. As the distinguished economist Murray N. Rothbard pointedly observed in 1977: "Linowitz . . . insisted on keeping his high positions at Pan Am while negotiating and arguing on behalf of the Canal Treaties. Pan Am's connection, while intriguing, does not seem as direct as Marine Midland's. Pan Am has for decades been within the Rockefeller financial ambit, as is indicated by James S. Rockefeller's presence on the airline's board of directors. Other directors are Frank Stanton of CBS and Donald Kendall of PepsiCo — both of whom are directors at Atlantic Richfield Company, whose presi-

dent, Robert O. Anderson, is a member of the board of Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank. Until he became secretary of state, Cyrus Vance was also a director of Pan Am. While too much should not be made of a list of corporate interconnections, the above establishes a clear pattern of Linowitz-Rockefeller community of interest and action."

Not surprisingly, all the principals involved in this gigantic ripoff of America are members of the Council on Foreign Relations. And there is much more that could be reported about this scandalous affair. Suffice it to say that without the Canal Treaties the bankers would not have been able to get either interest or principal on the loans they had made to Panama.

And what was Walter Mondale doing during all of this? He was involved up to his ears. As Vice President of the Carter Trilateral Administration, Mondale used the considerable power of his office to twist the arms of key Senators. Relying on the powerful network of connections and political favors he had amassed during his Senate career, Mondale was a crucial player in this special-interest venture. Despite overwhelming opposition to the treaties by the American people, Minnesota Fritz brought enough influ-

ence to bear on enough key votes to squeak the illegal concords through the United States Senate by a margin of only one vote.

This whole episode has been recounted here to drive home the crucial message: In the Great Canal Robbery, Walter Mondale was an important accessory to larceny on a mind-boggling scale. Now, here is the clincher: Mondale's top choice for Secretary of State, should he win the fall election, is said to be none other than Sol M. Linowitz.

A Quintessential Case

The quintessential "Liberal" in the mold of Hubert Humphrey, Mondale has always been in favor of schemes to do good in the world with other people's money. The Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, and the notoriously radical Agency for International Development are just a few of the many "Liberal" foreign-policy programs which have received his enthusiastic embrace. He is, of course, a staunch defender of the United Nations and even wants to strengthen that Communist-dominated institution through the creation of a permanent U.N. "peace-keeping" army. All in the interest of world peace, brotherhood . . . and the international bankers.

Throughout his stint in the U.S. Senate, Mondale voted the interests of the Rockefeller Establishment and its corporate-socialist empire. Take foreign aid, for example. Walter Mondale is an ideological supporter of the New International Economic Order and its notion that the poverty of the Third World is the result of the affluence of American capitalism. The solution, according to orthodox "Liberalism," is to take from Americans who have "too much," and hand it out to the socialist dictatorships that have "too lit-

tle." That is boob bait. Foreign aid is not to help poor people in foreign countries, but to benefit Establishment-connected interests in our own country. The money is plundered from the taxpayers and then funneled by the U.S. Government to foreign recipients who, in turn, spend it to buy selected U.S. exports from the megacorps.

Is it any wonder that, when David Stockman tried to get a cut in Export-Import Bank funding, he was stifled by powerful opposition from both the corporate establishment and the "Liberals" — including Mondale — who now push for ever higher taxes to support ever escalating federal spending? We should not have to add that such thinly disguised subsidies of special interests do not benefit America as a whole by "simulating the U.S. economy" as Mr. Mondale alleges. This merely compels some people (taxpayers) to bankroll other people (the special-interest exporters) while goods flow out of the U.S. to socialist and Communist regimes. It is like trying to prevent starvation by drinking your own blood!

The same is true of Mondale-backed "protectionism" — high tariffs and import restrictions. Reducing the freedom of American consumers to buy foreign-made products results in higher prices within our borders and reduces our standard of living. Who gains? Why, special-interest producers who need not operate more efficiently. To institutionalize this, Walter Mondale is advocating a National Industrial Policy. Under the guise of "promoting" American industry, he would fasten corporate and union socialism on the whole country.

Mondale gets at least some of his ideas for central planning in America from Harvard Professor Robert

B. Reich, who has come goose-stepping around Washington to demand a National Industrial Policy and a quantum leap in import restrictions to "protect" American industry from foreign competition. A Rhodes scholar and a graduate of Yale Law School, Reich calls for the establishment of government-financed "regional development banks" which would grant low-interest loans to companies needing capital to retool their factories. We may be sure that companies receiving any such aid would be friends of the Rockefeller Establishment. The cost would come out of the hides of hard-working Middle Americans as taxpayers and consumers.

Back in 1973, Senator Mondale tried to have enacted another such measure called "The Full Opportunity And National Goals And Priorities Act." Among other odious reforms, that one would have set up something Mondale called a "Council of Social Advisors" and an enormous socialist bureaucracy empowered to snoop into every area of our lives, while adopting and technocratically implementing various "national goals" based on "social reports" issued by the central-planning council. All for the general welfare, of course.

Nicaragua Betrayed

Not only has Mondale vigorously promoted mammoth federal programs and sinister plans for social engineering, but he has in foreign affairs demonstrated a strong tendency toward accommodating and appeasing the Communists. The sell-out of Nicaragua to the Cuban-backed Sandinistas was largely implemented through his office.

Showing immense hypocrisy and gall, Walter Mondale is now blaming all the problems in Central America on the policies of the current Admin-

istration. As the *New York Times* of June 20, 1983, reported: "Former Vice President Walter F. Mondale said today that he believed 'it is inevitable that American troops will be sent into Central America' because President Reagan's policies are 'failing.' Mondale accused the Reagan Administration of 'widening,' 'Americanizing,' and 'militarizing' the war in El Salvador, and added, 'If I hear what they're saying, where they're going now will lead to the introduction of troops in any event.'"

Consider William P. Hoar's response in the July 11, 1984, issue of *The Review Of The News*.

"We have heard *chutzpah* defined as a politician who runs for re-election against the record of the incumbent. And, incredibly enough, Democratic candidate Walter Mondale is even now running against Ronald Reagan on the basis of disasters in Central America which directly resulted from the sellout of Nicaragua arranged by the Mondale-Carter Administration! . . .

"Incredible! Why is El Salvador and much of the rest of Central America a tinderbox? Because Nicaragua is a Communist base, armed by Cuba and the Soviet Union to the point that it has more troops than all the rest of Central America combined, and the Communist regime in Managua is determined to set the region ablaze. As acknowledged by the Democrat-controlled House Intelligence Committee, the revolution threatening El Salvador 'depends for its lifeblood — arms, ammunition, financing, logistics and command-and-control facilities — upon outside assistance from Nicaragua and Cuba.'

"Why then has Nicaragua become such a threat, after having been pro-America for many decades? In *Nicaragua Betrayed* (Western Islands,

Throughout his time in the U.S. Senate, Walter F. Mondale voted for the interests of the Rockefeller Establishment and its corporate-socialist empire. Under the guise of "promoting" U.S. industry he seeks to fasten socialism on the country, subsidizing Big Banks and megacorps at the expense of the taxpayers.

1980), former President Anastasio Somoza detailed how the Mondale-Carter Administration got rid of 'that son of a b****' Somoza, as the duly elected President of Nicaragua was called by a personal representative of the White House. The Mondale-Carter methods of installing a Communist Government in Nicaragua to replace President Somoza included cutting off of all U.S. military assistance and sales of military hardware needed to fight the Communist Sandinistas; preventing sales and shipment of ammunition and hardware from our allies; a series of economic sanctions designed to overthrow the Somoza Government; and, negating solemn treaties which bound us to help prevent Nicaragua from being captured by the Communist Sandinistas. Even after the takeover, Mondale-Carter bolstered the Sandinista regime with U.S. aid."

Yet when President Reagan ordered the invasion of Grenada, successfully liberating the island from Communist control, Mondale deplored the action, claiming that it undermined "the high moral ground this nation needs as a leader in the world in discouraging other nations, such as the Soviet Union, from doing what they are doing in Afghanistan, Poland, Cambodia, and elsewhere."

Does Mr. Mondale really believe that merely having the U.S. set a "good example" will persuade the Soviets to abandon their worldwide revolutionary activities? Does he really equate the U.S. liberation of Grenada with the brutal Soviet invasion of Kabul? The mind boggles. Sounding even more naïve about Communism than his former boss Jimmy Carter, Walter Mondale has admitted publicly: "I cannot understand — it just baffles me — why the Soviets these last few years have behaved as they have. Maybe we made some mistakes with them. Why did they have to build up all those arms? Why did they have to go into Afghanistan? Why can't they relax just a little bit about Eastern Europe? Why do they sprinkle their influence around Ethiopia? Why do they try every door to see if it is locked?"

This suggests that Mondale would be just the sort of Chief Executive who might back us into a serious confrontation with the Reds, perhaps even World War III, because of his ignorance of the Communist purpose. To prove that he can be tough, and is not a wimp after all, he might overcompensate by engaging in some precipitous action that could lead to global calamity. He would certainly continue the policies he had pursued

as Senator and Vice President — programs which have made the Soviets the military threat they are today.

Walter And The Reds

Fritz Mondale has long been in the forefront of those seeking to provide the Communist dictatorships with aid and trade. He has been quoted on many occasions as favoring closer cultural, economic, and political ties with the Soviets and their satellite governments. "In my opinion," Mondale is quoted in the *Dallas Morning News* of February 27, 1983, as saying, "we should sell the Russians anything they can't shoot back at us."

Keep in mind that trade in even non-military goods is strategic when it allows the Reds to divert their slaves and resources to military production. Also keep in mind that this "trade" is not trade at all. It is subsidized giveaways of American goods and technology on long-term credit at low or no interest, made possible by such taxpayer-subsidized federal agencies as the Export-Import Bank, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Agency for International Development, and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. Soviet economic development — and the tremendous growth of its military-industrial complex — have been made possible by vast infusions of American technology and capital.

Walter Mondale has long supported this aid and trade with our avowed enemies. He is one of those responsible for the fact that the Soviet Union has the military capability to threaten world peace and American security. But does he now call for a concerted effort to increase and strengthen America's defenses against this threat? Just the opposite! He is the darling of those who push unilateral disarmament.

Mondale's record reveals him to be just another New Left fanatic bent on weakening America's military position in relation to the Soviet war machine. He has repeatedly reaffirmed his support of the "nuclear freeze," which would guarantee the Soviet Union a large and permanent strategic advantage over the United States. And this man from Minnesota has meanwhile opposed the MX missile, the B-1 bomber, the M-1 tank, and nuclear-powered aircraft carriers. He would gut America's military budget, promising to start by slashing between \$30 billion and \$40 billion from defense spending during his first year as President. What sort of signal would that send to the Kremlin leaders? You can bet that it would look like we were waving the white flag.

How kooky is he? Even though the proposed High Frontier would be completely defensive in nature and would not endanger the life of even one individual, Mondale strongly resists development and deployment of any defense for America against incoming nuclear missiles. The very idea of defending a hundred million American lives from nuclear destruction is somehow "provocative" to Mr. Mondale.

Never mind that the earlier Mondale-Carter weakening of America's military posture only encouraged Soviet imperialism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Building up the power of our avowed enemies is no way to avoid war. Disarming in the face of a deadly threat is not a rational policy. The argument isn't a question of being pro-war or anti-war; it is concerned with the best means of avoiding war while assuring our values of individual freedom, private ownership, and free enterprise. After all, there is only one sure way to
(Continued on page eighty-seven.)

FOREIGN POLICY

avoid war with the Reds, and that is to surrender.

What of our anti-Communist allies around the globe? Are they to be sacrificed to the mythology of Walter Mondale's "Liberalism"? Not content with the "Liberal" sellout of the millions now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain and in Red China, Mondale and the "Liberal" Democrats would continue the process of appeasement by refusing to fight Communism when it invades small and vulnerable nations. Not only did Mondale bitterly oppose the U.S.-led rescue of the tiny island of Grenada, but he has urged a complete end to our aid to anti-Communist Freedom Fighters in Nicaragua and other parts of Central America. He opposes U.S. military aid to the Government of El Salvador, and would as President end U.S. military exercises in Honduras that are needed to resist Communist-backed aggression in the region. Mondale has even spoken out against helping the Republic of China on Taiwan to secure its defense against possible attack from the Communist mainland. And it was the Mondale-Carter Administration which set up the whole Iranian Crisis by destabilizing the Government of the Shah in favor of that of the Ayatollah Khomeini.

Something very ugly has happened to the Democratic Party. While never seeking all-out victory over Communism, at least the old Democrat foreign policy claimed to be seeking "containment" of Red expansionism. This is what we were told Vietnam was all about. John F. Kennedy believed that the U.S. might alleviate human suffering in poor nations, but he was never so naïve as to contend that poverty and hunger

are the sole causes of Communist revolution. In 1960, for example, Kennedy declared: "The enemy is the Communist system itself — implacable, insatiable, and unceasing in its drive for world domination."

The Democratic Party has since been McGovernized. Consider the following from "What's The Matter With Democratic Foreign Policy?," a Report published by the Republican Study Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives:

"The American Democratic Party today, almost everywhere outside the South, is led by people with a worldview that is defeatist, drenched in pessimism and incompetent when applied to the real world. Containment — the willingness to use or finance force to bolster friendly governments under communist attack — is dead in the Democratic Party."

Frank Gregorsky, the author of this Report, summarizes the foreign-policy view which now predominates in the Democratic Party:

"1. There are no evil ideologies or governing systems in the world except for South Africa. Communists are at heart reformers who are too rough in their means. They're not inherently bad, but the U.S. is so clumsy and paranoid in its dealings with communists that we facilitate or give them excuses for their excesses.

"2. Left-wing totalitarianism is caused by right-wing authoritarianism, and the U.S. makes both worse. We finance the rightists and make the leftists worse by competing with the Soviets to finance them. There's always hope that Nicaragua, Vietnam, the USSR, Cuba, Angola, *et al.* will behave, if we only treat them as sincere and respectable nations run by people not that different from Americans.

"3. Foreign-policy conflicts are worse off when America plays

world policeman. The lesson of Vietnam is that we cannot impose our will anywhere; neither can the Soviets in the long-term. What Presidents sometimes say are 'vital interests' are not worth fighting for in any event. To ease world tension the U.S. should maintain a low profile in whatever area it wants to keep influence in.

"4. American military force is only proper to defend the U.S. and (perhaps) a few of its democratic allies against an attack that has already commenced. Threatening force to prevent a feared attack is too risky in almost all circumstances. Force never really settles anything, *and if it does, it shouldn't*. Even when a victory for freedom is quick and relatively cheap, as in Grenada, it's still wrong, evil, a violation of some principle (usually labeled 'non-interventionism').

"5. Political negotiations and military force have nothing to do with each other; Clausewitz, U.S. Grant, and Henry Kissinger were wrong. In fact, negotiating and force are mutually exclusive. Presidents who subsidize or threaten force prove that they don't want to negotiate. Members of Congress and peace activists who forswear force make the best negotiators because the other side knows no harm will come to them from the United States."

The Gregorsky Report goes on to demonstrate why this "radical worldview" does not work in the real world — and why those who hold it don't seem to care. Richard Viguerie has stated the problem succinctly and perceptively: "Like Peter Pan, the liberals refuse to grow up. Nothing that the communists do — sometimes it seems nothing they could *ever* do — seems to convince them that communism is evil Today, many of the nation's most prominent liberals are unable to distinguish between in-

vading a country to impose tyranny, as in Afghanistan, and invading a country to rescue freedom, as in Grenada. They are quick to malign small anti-communist nations where many citizens are denied their rights, such as South Africa, South Korea, and Chile. But they are reluctant to criticize communist countries where no one has any rights and only communist party officials have power."

Principles Vs. Pragmatism

In contrast to the containment policies of Harry Truman, J.F.K., and Lyndon Johnson, the Democratic Party is no longer even mildly anti-Communist. Walter Mondale personifies the transition between the old J.F.K. "Liberalism" and today's McGovernist pacifism. Once comfortable with the "containment" approach to Communist aggression, Mondale has now embraced the McGovern retreat. Why the transition?

It was virtually inevitable, given the One World premises upon which the old Democrats (and the later Republicans) operated. What the "old" Democratic leaders and the "new" Democrats have in common as One World collectivists is more important than the differences upon which the Gregorsky Report dwells. It is the principles held in common by these factions within the Democratic Party which have led to the fatal McGovernite triumph. You cannot defeat Soviet Communism with American "Liberalism" because both are constantly pushing Leftward.

Contrary to the discredited notions of Hegel, Marx, and Michael Harrington, this is not the consequence of "historical necessity." There is no mysterious force which draws mankind fatalistically into the abyss of Communism. The power which moves the history of the world — and of a political party — is the

awesome power of principles, of the fundamental ideas which dominate our thinking. This power is "mysterious" only to those savages who have been taught that honor is not important and ideas have no consequences. Walter Frederic Mondale is such a man. The American people perceive that, and it explains why Mondale will lose.

As the Bert Lance controversy has so recently illustrated, Walter vacillates like a tower of Jello. But it is a tower that wobbles always to the Left. To illustrate this, let us return to the Gregorsky Report:

"Only once in the 1984 nomination campaign did Mr. Mondale make a serious effort to sound less than radical on foreign policy. Still desperate for votes after his March 13 victories in Alabama and Georgia allowed him to escape being driven out of the race by Gary Hart, Mondale picked a fight with Hart in the Illinois primary. The issue was troops in Honduras.

"Mondale said Hart's stance, identical to McGovern's in pledging to stop all U.S. military action in Central America, meant 'pulling the plug' and showed lack of foreign-policy experience. He said in Chicago on March 14 that U.S. troops in Honduras might be a 'bargaining chip' to get Cubans out of Nicaragua.

"Hart hit back a week later (after blowing his lead in Illinois and losing to Mondale by 6 percent) with a commercial designed to rally the Vietnam generation in Connecticut and New York. It showed a fuse burning away, leading inexorably to another Vietnam:

"When President Reagan sent our troops to Central America, he called them advisors. Remember Vietnam? Our troops now serve as bodyguards to dictators and are a slow-burning fuse to war. Vice Presi-

dent Mondale agreed with President Reagan and said he too would leave some of the troops there as bargaining chips with Nicaragua. And he attacks Gary Hart for forcefully saying *get them out*. Our sons as bargaining chips . . . Will we never learn?"

"The Hart ad was judged even by conservative observers to have been powerful. Hart was pushing panic buttons deep in the psyches of Democratic voters in the 25 to forty age group. Mondale quickly sensed this, and did just what one would expect: He caved.

"In a televised debate six days before the April 3 New York primary, Mondale challenged Hart to remove the ad. Mondale stressed how dangerous he thought the Reagan stance in Central America was, and went on to spell out how he agreed with Hart. In the end, Mondale's only difference with Hart was over U.S. troops in Honduras; Mondale called Honduras a democracy that could use some American help. The issue faded from the Democratic campaign. A week later Mondale resumed his attack on Hart for not endorsing the nuclear freeze early enough."

In other words, scratch a Mondale and you will find a Gary Hart or a George McGovern underneath. There is simply no anti-Communism left in the Democratic Party. Moderates praying for the rise of an anti-Communist "Liberal — even one in the image of John Kennedy — will be waiting a very long time. As the Gregorsky Report concludes:

"Now, Mondale has put far more blame on Reagan than on the Soviets for the absence of an arms-control breakthrough. He dodged Barbara Walters' questions on defending the relatively pro-U.S. status quo in Western Europe and Mexico. He's eager to admit that supporting the

Kennedy-Johnson Vietnam policy was 'the worst mistake of my political life,' and has no serious complaint about anything that has occurred in Southeast Asia since 1975. In short, Walter Mondale doesn't come across as a hawk in any part of the world or on any major defense issue."

A Mondale Presidency would continue the "Liberal" policy of appeasement of Communism — sacrificing and betraying one anti-Communist ally after another. That is not the way to avoid nuclear war! It is, as Tom Anderson says, akin to feeding your family to an alligator — hoping he'll eat you last. As the late Ayn Rand warned: "In any compromise between food and poison, it is only death that can win. In any compromise between good and evil, it is only evil that can profit."

The Candidate

Now that the National Democratic Convention is but a stale recollection in the minds of most Americans, Minnesota Fritz is concentrating on the best strategy to use in his campaign against President Reagan, a chief executive who is widely perceived as a staunch Conservative and a tough-minded anti-Communist. It will not be easy. Remember those 1980 debates with Jimmy Carter? Even with the prestige of the Presidency going for him, Carter suffered from an acute charisma gap. Mondale has the same problem — squared! Cognizant of this image weakness, Walter Mondale has made discernible attempts in recent speeches to be more forceful and even to sound more patriotic. Using words like "tough" and "fight," Tiger Fritz is out to seem as "macho" as Lyndon Johnson.

"We've been running up the white flag," declares the "new" Mondale, "when we should be running up the American flag!"

Of course, merely waving the American flag — without a knowledgeable commitment to the principles that made America great — is a hollow and cynical act. The American people are not likely to vote for this pigeon in an Uncle Sam suit.

Also concerned about his (well-deserved) reputation as a statist, Mondale is attempting to soft-pedal his Far Left background in public, while maintaining his contacts with Leftist leaders in the feminist, black, homosexual, and union factions of the tenuous Democratic coalition. Have the American people forgotten Mondale's "Liberal" Extremist background and his active participation in the disastrous Carter Administration? If some have, the fall campaign affords an opportunity to remind them of the details.

Americans tend to have short memories — especially without prompting by the Establishment media, which wants us to forget the foreign-policy disasters in which Walter Mondale has been involved. So let us remember the sellouts of Iran and Nicaragua; the giveaway of the Panama Canal; the aid and trade programs to allow our Establishment megacorps to profit from subsidies of socialist Third World governments and strengthening of the Communists; the bailout of non-performing loans made by the Big Bankers; the stripping of the American military; and, even the calls for unilateral disarmament. All of this and much more should now be chalked boldly on the Mondale scoreboard. Lest America forget. ■ ■

CRACKER BARREL

■ The sun is three million miles closer to the earth during winter than summer.