

Ford. To keep Ford duped, Rockefeller is even willing to sacrifice his creation Jimmy Carter by having the press shift toward accurate coverage of the non-existence of Carter's synthetic campaign. One high level OMB official, a loyal Ford supporter, was aghast when it was reported to him that Carter was the candidate of Wall Street. "What do you mean," he retorted. "Haven't you read the Washington Post edit on the Draft column, (both castigated Carter-ed.)."

This week's aborted Watergating of Republican Vice Presidential candidate Sen. Robert Dole (Kan.) appears to be part of the same containment operation. As if to show Ford that they meant business about Watergatings, Rockefeller press conduits the New York Times and the Washington Post carried front page stories on information from former Gulf lobbyist Claude Wilde, Jr. that he had slipped Dole's office illegal campaign contributions in 1970 and 1972. Wilde, an associate of Rockefeller cabal member John J. McCloy who has been used to finger several Rockefeller political opponents for "campaign fund" scandals, suddenly did an about face and said that his information was wrong — the day after Ford endorsed Kissinger.

Carter With No Support Watches Campaign Collapse.

Jimmy Carter's campaign for the Presidency is almost a thing of the past. With the public, albeit reluctant, admission of the Labor Party's LaRouche's role as a formidable White House contender by top Wall Street policy circles, the dying Carter campaign has entered the terminal phase. In the same issue of the Times which covered LaRouche columnist Anthony Lewis exposed Carter's California campaign as a total shambles. Citing one Democratic Party analyst to the effect that Ford enjoys a slight margin over Carter in the state, Lewis concludes that if the race is open here, if many natural Democratic voters still feel detached or doubtful about the candidate, the same might be true in Michigan or New York.

The following day an enraged Tom Wicker, the Times' liberal-in-residence, held the corpse of Carter up for all to see. Referencing the "Clockwork Peanuts" numerous flip-flops over the last few weeks, especially his decision to emphasize "inflation" rather than "unemployment," Wicker bitterly complained that Carter has permitted the Republicans "to press

their campaign against him as a man who constantly alters or obscures his positions."

Loyal Wall Street press conduits, including Hobart Rowen, Joseph Kraft and the Washington Post picked up on this theme. Focusing on Carter's failure to heed instructions from his Democratic Party masters while instead following the advice of his Georgia clique of advisors, Kraft asks whether such a synthetic creation as Carter is fit to be President.

Carter's inability to please his masters is attributable to the fact that Carter cannot sell a product that no one will buy — "corporativism." Labor Party members attending a Contra Costa County, Calif. Central Labor Council-sponsored Labor Day picnic sold \$45 worth of USLP literature, including LaRouche campaign buttons, while the featured speaker, Dem Party Vice Presidential nominee Walter Mondale begged an unsympathetic and unattentive audience for support. Meanwhile, Carter was suffering a similar fate in Norfolk, Va., where 10,000 people stood in stony silence as he delivered his sermon. Again Labor Party organizers sold substantial amounts of literature. One worker complained to a USLP LaRouche campaign worker, "Carter didn't say a thing," another said, "After this I've made up my mind, I'm voting for LaRouche." The few Carter supporters were shrieking to the stunned crowd, "Burn your scientists — Down with Progress."

But nowhere was this non-support more apparent than in Chicago yesterday night. In a torch light parade, which Chicago's Mayor Daley claimed would draw 100,000 Carter supporters, only 5000 people showed up and most of these were parents who came to watch their school age children march in the parade. As one informed source reported, "The Daley machine could not turn them out."

Is Jimmy Carter Brainwashed?

NSIPS Special Brief

\$1.00

The Press Goes After Carter

Sept. 10 (NSIPS) — *With little exceptions, the nation's press declared open season this week on Wall Street's Presidential candidate, Jimmy Carter. Even Carter's erstwhile "PR men" at the New York Times and Washington Post joined in the target practice on the hapless Democratic candidate. We offer some excerpts below.*

Anthony Lewis:

Carter "Too Perfect For Comfort"

Sept. 8 (NSIPS) — *The following is excerpted from an article entitled "The Distant Candidate," bylined Anthony Lewis and appearing in the New York Times Sept. 9.*

...I am convinced that, notwithstanding the polls, Jimmy Carter has serious problems among natural Democratic voters of the West and North.

He remains an utterly distant figure to many: That is the

fundamental problem. Over an over, people say they have no feeling for him, no attachment, no emotional connection. On the contrary there is a sense of remoteness from Carter, of uneasiness...

Indeed the debates may not be enough for Carter to close that feeling of distance. Some Democrats will see them as just another staged occasion where a clever candidate can come up with studied answers. And the debates are unlikely to break through the indifference that may be the most serious threat to the Democrats this year — the danger that a majority of potential voters may not bother to vote.

If there is going to be a movement of feeling toward Carter...some now unimagined crisis may be required as the catalyst. It could be a world event or a personal crisis: something to test Jimmy Carter's behavior under strain...I think the doubters will be looking not only for wise judgment on Carter's part but for humanity. For the way they talk about him suggests that they find him too neat, too controlled, too perfect for comfort....

“The Crowds Are Surprisingly Mediocre”

Sept. 11 (NSIPS) — The following article by Charles Mohr appeared in today's New York Times as “news analysis.”

After more than two decades as a member and teacher of the men's Sunday School class at the Plains, Ga., Baptist Church, Jimmy Carter brings some of the mannerisms and methods of a Sunday School teacher to the 1976 Presidential campaign.

In his opening speech Monday morning at Warm Springs, Ga., Mr. Carter told the crowd that President Truman had a slogan on his desk and asked, “Does anyone here remember what it was?”

As a chorus of voices shouted, “The buck stops here,” the Democratic Presidential candidate, smiling happily, said, “That's right,” and went on to accuse President Ford of evading the responsibilities of his high office.

Since then, Mr. Carter has several times asked questions for which there are simple, expected answers, and Mr. Carter has led his audiences in the answers. Sometimes he asked his listeners to raise their hands if a relative is jobless, or even if they know that stock car automobile races occur on Labor Day in Darlington, S.C.

“Southern Baptist dialectic,” an onlooker called it the other day...

Some of the crowds he has drawn have been surprisingly mediocre in size and a few have been positively tiny by the standards of a full-scale national Presidential campaign. This might, in some measure, be the responsibility of his campaign advance people, who lay groundwork and herald arrivals.

Still, it seems strange that a party nominee would draw only a few dozen people at the Slovenian Society club in Cleveland or in the backyard of a Columbus, Ohio, suburban home. It also seems strange, and disappointing, that a Cleveland welcome was small and that his arrival there was noted only with an eight paragraph story on page 14 of a local newspaper.

Response Varies Widely

Moreover, anti-abortion protesters aside, some of Mr. Carter's audiences have been so undemonstrative as to border on being sullen. The response does seem to vary widely — boisterous and affectionate in Brooklyn, tepid in Pittsburgh's Mellon Square and neatly mute outside the gates of the Electric Boat Company at Groton, Conn.

This might be attributed to a starvation diet of political red meat fed to the crowds by Mr. Carter, who, at times, seems to be an understated and low keyed campaigner.

When Mr. Carter is being platitudinous, which his admirers would say is seldom, he is hard to top. At the Slovenian Hall, he said, “I want to be one of you and I want you to be one of me. I can stay close to you, if you stay close to me.” The next day he seemed to have forgotten his geography and referred repeatedly to his visit to a “Slovakian” neighborhood...

New York Times: Ford Holds The Cards

Sept. 9 (NSIPS) — The following are excerpts from a Sept. 7 New York Times article entitled “Contrasting Campaign Symbols” by R. W. Apple, Jr.:

...For President Ford the symbol was the White House. He spent (Labor) day here, discussing developments in China....

For Jimmy Carter, the symbol was Franklin D. Roosevelt. The former Georgia Governor opened his general-election campaign with a speech at Warm Springs, Ga., where President

Roosevelt sought relief from the after-effects of polio...

The campaign will be short...But it could be volatile for numerous reasons....

The three televised debates...appeared to many political professionals to offer the President his best chance to catch up....

Second, Mr. Carter could be hurt in the populous belt of states stretching from Illinois and Wisconsin in the West to Massachusetts in the East, by the seeming aversion of traditionally Democratic Roman Catholic voters in that area to a Democrat who is both Southern and a devout Baptist....

Third, Mr. Carter could be severely wounded if the electorate as a whole decides — as did the Democratic electorate in some of the late primary states — that he is ‘fuzzy’ and ‘shifts’ on the issues....

Finally, the President could benefit from some unforeseen event abroad that would cause the country to rally around him as Commander in Chief. A serious flareup in Korea is one obvious possibility; equally damaging to Mr. Ford would be war in the Middle East or an open conflict in southern Africa in which the United States became involved.

Some Democrats propose that Mr. Ford...will propose a summit meeting with the Soviet leadership before the election.

New York Times' Wicker: Carter Not The Issue

Sept. 9 (NSIPS) — What follows are comments on the 1976 Presidential race excerpted from an op ed by Tom Wicker in the Sept. 7 edition of the New York Times. Mr. Wicker entitled his column “Not Carter But Ford is the Issue”:

Mr. Carter personally will be continually denounced as an inexperienced candidate who neither knows nor will say where he stands on the issues. On the other hand, Gerald Ford will remain ostentatiously in the White House, acting Presidential and experienced, holding news conferences in free prime time and wearing his Commander in Chief's hat at every opportunity. This has a hidden advantage — it leaves most of the overt campaigning to the energetic Mr. Dole, who will thus get far more attention in the press than his opposite number Walter Mondale....

With his party's nomination at last in hand, Mr. Ford may even seem more like a real incumbent to many voter. To some degree, even if he is unelected and President only by the hand of Richard Nixon, he is bound to benefit from the well-known reluctance of Americans to “vote against the President” and perhaps from a factor that benefitted Lyndon Johnson in 1964 — a feeling that it would be “unfair” to deprive him of a term of his own...

All that adds up to a strong Republican campaign and a close election, polls or no polls...

The Republican problem is a dismal record in office — from the corruption of Watergate and the resignation of Spiro Agnew to the worst recession since the 1930s, the biggest budget deficits, the highest rates of unemployment, the gross mismanagement of food programs and a laundry list of other failures....

Washington Post's Rowen: Carter Waffles On Economics

Sept. 10 (NSIPS) — The following are excerpts from a column entitled “Carter's Economics: A Shifting Emphasis” by Hobart Rowen, which appear in yesterday's edition of the Washington Post. Mr. Rowen begins his column with a description of Carter's

waffling on the question of whether unemployment or inflation will be the first concern of his administration:

... But what we are witnessing is an attempt by Carter to alter the image of himself that he fears has been building among the American people. He appears to be having a knee-jerk reaction to the reckless spender tag that the Republicans are trying to pin on him.

Some of Carter's own political lieutenants in the South have been telling him lately that he has acquired too much of a liberal "tinge" and that the South — despite all the evident regional pride — may not in the end be solidly in the Democratic column. . . .

Carter is plainly trying to revert toward the more moderate posture he displayed during the primaries. But the shift is bound to dampen the enthusiasm for him among liberals, and feed the criticism that his real commitments and convictions are not known. . . .

The key question for Mr. Carter is whether unemployment or inflation would be given priority attention.

An alert panel (in the Presidential debates) won't let him finesse the question by saying they are equally important goals. On this issue, the public is entitled to know exactly where Mr. Carter stands.

Washington Post:

Carter Tinkers On Abortion

Sept. 10 (NSIPS) — today's edition of the Washington Post carries a lead editorial entitled "Mr. Carter on Abortion," excerpted below:

We are going to see if we can't summarize, in a short space, Jimmy Carter's views on abortion. Mr. Carter, as he never tires of saying, is personally opposed to abortion. . . . The argument concerns the legal right of women first to decide to have an abortion — for whatever reason — and then to have one. This putative right is what Mr. Carter opposes. . . .

... Mr. Carter has also said the following things: that he would abide by any Supreme Court rulings on the subject, that he would not take an initiative to outlaw abortion via a constitutional amendment, that he would not oppose the efforts of others to do so and that he might support legislation that would have the effect of limiting the performance of abortions.

This last position he would evidently fulfill in two ways. He would encourage programs such as the dissemination of information on contraception. And he would seek to curtail the use of federal funds to finance abortions. . . . Now a couple of things are plain to us from the bare bones of the Carter position outlined above. One is that it is not internally illogical, inconsistent or contradictory. Mr. Carter *is* opposed to free and easy access to abortions; and within the limits of the law and his own prerogatives as President, he would act to limit that access. The other is that this is a position which cannot possibly be expected to gratify those who feel strongly on any side of the issue. The Catholic bishops with whom Mr. Carter met the other day — and whom Mr. Ford meets with today — can hardly be pleased with his refusal to endorse a constitutional amendment or his stress on contraception as an alternative to abortion. Those people — we are among them — who believe individual women should have far greater rights in the matter than Mr. Carter approves, will hardly be thrilled either. . . .

It escapes our understanding how Mr. Carter could have thought this particular complex of views could win him universal friendship. . . . Yet our political guess is that he will lose fewer votes and less support by simply holding to his position than by restlessly and continually tinkering with his presen-

tation of it in ways that he hopes will please all the parties to the debate. . . . Mr. Carter needs to remember that you can't please all of the people all of the time, and that you can displease an awful lot of them — a majority perhaps — by trying.

Columnist Kraft Reviews Carter's Campaign Machinery

Sept. 10 (NSIPS) — In this excerpted Sept. 9 column from the Washington Post, syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft comments on Jimmy Carter's campaign machinery under the title "Carter's Way of Doing Business":

... Still, he insulates himself against advice and regularly falls back on his little band of original supporters.

The littleness of the band was striking even during the primaries. . . .

After the primaries were over, Carter made a point of seeming to integrate his outfit with the establishment of the Democratic Party. . . .

Still the outsiders remain outsiders, fenced off from close touch with the candidate by the well-known device of divide and rule. . . . His foreign policy advisers are split between a Columbia University group, centered around Zbigniew Brzezinski, and a Washington group centered around young comers in such foundations as Brookings and Carnegie. . . .

In a similar vein is the case of the Carter pollster, Pat Caddell. Mr. Caddell's polling service has recently acquired as clients the Saudi Arabian government and several major oil companies. . . .

Carter has a distinct way of doing business. . . . It is a mode of operation that the public should think about, within the general context of whether Carter is sufficiently experienced to be a good President.

Evans and Novak:

Carter Loses Control Of Self, Campaign

Sept. 10 (NSIPS) — What follows are excerpts from today's Washington Post column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak entitled "Carter's Debut: Assorted Mixups":

Jimmy Carter opened his fall campaign emphasizing the unwanted issue of abortion and the irrelevant issue of Clarence Kelley's valances because of blunders by the campaign organization and his own lack of discipline. . . .

... The overriding portrait of Carter during two days in the critical Northeast was a candidate not fully in control of his campaign and sometimes not in control of himself. . . .

... This week's performance by candidate and organization hardly pointed to the victory once taken for granted. . . .

Much worse awaited Carter in Pennsylvania, considered his northern stronghold. Once again the trouble was self-induced. Carter's ill-conceived meeting with the Catholic bishops had aroused anti-abortion forces. . . .

Carter also showed his flexibility this week. With polls indicating disapproval of his leftward drift, Carter moved right. . . . Talking with unemployed workers in Scranton (Pa.), Carter never mentioned the Humphrey Hawkins bill he had endorsed back in primary days. . . .

Organization incompetence that sent Carter wandering through empty streets of Philadelphia and Scranton will presumably be corrected. More worrisome for Democrats is whether their candidate will be repeating his masterful performance of Polish Hill or will lead the campaign into dead-end streets of stridency and irrelevance.