

# The unraveling of Jimmy Carter

## *Cartergate threatens to split Democratic Party, GOP, opens way for LaRouche*

The impact of the LaRouche presidential campaign on a U.S. political environment shaped by hatred of the bankrupt Carter White House has forced the Council on Foreign Relations to inaugurate the complete unraveling of Carter's administration.

Unparalleled in U.S. history, this situation is producing, through bloc splits in the Democratic and Republican Parties, the early demise of the two-party system just as Lyndon LaRouche predicted Jan. 15, 1979, when he announced his presidential candidacy. LaRouche forecast on that occasion—and subsequent events have more than borne him out—that the United States would be in the Republic's gravest crisis, creating the political preconditions for a LaRouche presidency in 1981.

Since the beginning of June, the White House has been hit with one blow after another:

- A U.S. District Court judge ruled that Carter's voluntary wage-price guidelines and sanctions are unconstitutional.

- House Democratic leaders turned down Carter's invitation to a Camp David "summit" between Carter and the House Democratic leadership. Declaring themselves "too busy," Majority Leader Jim Wright and House Speaker Tip O'Neill instead convened a series of meetings among top House Democrats to discuss relations with the White House. O'Neill went so far in humiliating Carter as to hold two meetings with Senator Edward Kennedy after turning down Carter's invitation.

- O'Neill and Wright then issued a statement declaring, "There's just no support... Congress has turned a deaf ear to Carter's energy policy."

- Carter's request that Rep. Morris Udall, chairman of the House Interior Committee, endorse him for reelection, was turned down. Udall, a well-known environmentalist fanatic and protégé of Averell Harriman, who funded Udall's 1976 bid for the Democratic nomination, also refused to attend the Camp David meeting.

Plus, the CFR-controlled media were flooded with Carter obituaries. Two examples suffice: wrote Joseph Harsch in the *Christian Science Monitor*, "The time is not in sight when the American population will heed him ... A Kennedy, however, would improve relations with Congress ... and with his cabinet." The *Baltimore Sun* editorially called Carter what everyone knows him to be, a "lame duck."

These series of stinging, humiliating snubs are occurring in tandem with the burgeoning Cartergate, as—phase-by-phase—Lancegate unfolds in preparation for Carter's preconvention demise.

The "two floodgates" question, in a thinly disguised form, has become a major topic of commentary throughout the CFR-connected media, as the excerpts which follow illustrate.

But, it is more than the subject of commentaries. Democratic Party National Chairman, John White, in three press conferences in 10 days, denounced the draft Kennedy momentum on precisely the fear of the collapse of the party. White did not mention LaRouche directly, but, from his own words, no other explanation for his fear is plausible:

"Kennedy would not approve of a third party or an independent candidacy, or of some folks taking advantage of Carter's unpopularity to build opposition to Carter..." The *Washington Post* was no less direct in summing up the implications of dumping Carter, "too fast," and splitting the Democratic Party now. "Democratic National Chairman John C. White warned June 6 that the movement to draft Senator Edward Kennedy for the 1980 nomination might lead to an independent presidential candidacy that could cost the Democrats the White House."

Leading Kennedy backers and controllers are now issuing statements demanding that Kennedy issue a formal statement now declaring himself not to be a candidate, and stop the anti-Carter momentum, threatening to go out of control in opening the floodgates.

The *Baltimore Sun* urged Kennedy to declare

himself not a candidate now, but noted that Kennedy would definitely get the nomination by draft in 1980, once it is clear that Carter cannot be renominated: "Let the mavericks like Ayatollah Jerry Brown ... run as candidates," and knock out Carter.

Douglas Fraser, United Auto Workers President, told the press in Detroit he will have no part of a draft Kennedy movement "unless and until Kennedy makes his plans clear." Alexander Barkan, the director of the ALF-CIO committee on Political Education, echoed Fraser.

This seeming indecision indicates the CFR's general fear of dumping Carter too fast, and allowing the LaRouche campaign to weld the disaffected elements of labor, industry and the major parties into an electoral machine that could win.

### **The labor question**

The demise of Carter opens two floodgates at once. Despite the intentions of the CFR directors of Cartergate to pave the way for the presidential candidacies of Alexander Haig and Edward Kennedy, it also opens a floodgate for the LaRouche presidential campaign—as the CFR is well aware.

An examination of the context of the court decision throwing Carter's wage guidelines out the window illustrates the point. That decision, signaling the relaunching of Cartergate, happened in the midst of a national pattern of trade union officials polarizing around the LaRouche question.

Since the formation of the Teamster Committee To Elect LaRouche, and the endorsement of LaRouche by Teamster Central States General Organizer Rolland McMasters, more than 1,000 workers have been involved in the distribution of bulletins by the Teamster Committee, and the bulletins have already reached nearly 200,000 more. The bulletins were also widely distributed at AFL-CIO headquarters, the White House, and the halls of Congress.

This is already having a powerful impact on the Teamsters and the whole labor movement around the LaRouche candidacy. Around the country, meetings have been set up with local union representatives to discuss endorsing LaRouche.

The CFR networks responded by jettisoning the wage guidelines, if only for the time being, at Carter's humiliating expense. The CFR media, typified by the *New York Times*, suddenly embarked on a big publicity campaign, "informing" one and all that Meany, Kirkland, et al. of the Zionist lobby in the AFL-CIO national bureaucracy were responsible for a "big victory for labor."

Looking behind the rhetoric of the *Times's* coverage reveals that the court decision declaring Carter's plan "unconstitutional" without congressional consent" will be used by Meany and company for congressional

imposed mandatory controls on the "equality of sacrifice" plank. However, if the LaRouche campaign becomes the determinant in the labor movement, the old rules and tricks no longer apply.

### **The CFR's dilemma**

The internal convulsions within the CFR camp on the Cartergate question epitomize the dilemma. By accelerating the unraveling of the administration, the CFP crowd has been forced in less than a week to overrule their own hesitations about going too far, too fast. The CFR forces are now gambling, taking what they know to be a tremendous risk that the very process identified and warned against by the *Christian Science Monitor* and the *New York Times* is now beginning—namely, a split in the Democratic Party provoked by destroying Carter and launching Kennedy now, a split which in turn will fragment the GOP, as Republican layers move to make deals with "breakaway" anti-Kennedy Democratic machines.

And Cartergate has only begun. Sources close to both the National Security Council and Haig are getting the word out: "Expect a wave of resignations, not only from the NSC, but from the cabinet as well." As one such source put it, "Usually, at about this time in an administration's life, it's the President who makes the changes in the cabinet, and fires people. In this administration, you're going to see cabinet officers quitting."

—Konstantin George

### **Warning against panic**

*The Christian Science Monitor editorialized on May 25 to slow the pace of Cartergate. Here are excerpts.*

No one ought to be tempted or be amused by the disarray now evident in the Democratic Party. This is symptomatic of a crisis of government following the tortured years of Vietnam and Watergate. LBJ left office ... Nixon was forced out, Ford lasted two years and now Carter is being challenged from the Democratic Party ... and this is occurring while the GOPers have yet to pull themselves together...

Are we no longer operating within the traditional two-party system? How do Americans replace it? With what? Everyone is disenchanted with the President.... A contagion of criticism is rampant across the land ... there is a tendency to get carried away with hypercriticism and make the President the scapegoat. A presidential panic is being caused. It is sufficient perhaps to deny warranting him a second term, but ... not to destroy the President's ability to act ... and further unsettle an already strained situation....

## 'What Mr. Carter could do'

*Again on May 31, the Christian Science Monitor urged restraint, but nonetheless betraying a bias for a Kennedy presidency. Excerpts follow.*

The two main causes of President Carter's difficulties in Washington are things he cannot do anything about effectively. Yes. He can make speeches in which he can carry on the slow and painful process of educating the Congress and the American public in the causes of inflation and of declining supply of cheap gasoline.

... None of those activities is going to solve the inflation or gasoline problems. If Mr. Kennedy were to replace Mr. Carter in the White House tomorrow the inflation would go right on and gasoline would continue to be in short supply at rising prices. Mr. Kennedy could not solve those problems overnight anymore than Mr. Carter can.

But there is one thing a Kennedy in the White House would certainly do and Mr. Carter himself could do which would produce an appearance of improved effectiveness. A Kennedy would act at once to improve relations between the White House and the people on Capitol Hill.

More than that. A Kennedy would surround himself with people who would be personalities and centers of power in themselves. And so at least in theory, could Mr. Carter.... I have watched and reported on every President beginning with Herbert Hoover. None of the administrations from that one down to this one was so overshadowed by a single personality as is this one headed by Mr. Carter.

... What names stand out in the Carter Administration?... There is James Schlesinger at Energy, taking some of the abuse for gasoline shortages off the President, but doing nothing else the public knows about.

... By and large it is a lackluster bunch. Either they lack power in themselves, or are not allowed by Mr. Carter to take the initiatives which would allow them to show what they might be able to do if given a chance. As for the White House staff itself, except for Zbigniew Brzezinski at the National Security Council, most of them are Georgians who seem never to have quite risen to the national level as Real Washingtonians....

The May 26 issue of the *Economist* (London) notes an "intellectual narrowness and a lack of historical sense in President Carter's White House, which produces on occasion an effect resembling stone deafness."

... Style, tone and performance, particularly in foreign policy, could surely be improved by bringing to the White House more people who know more about

the world, and even the United States itself. It would reduce the appearance of the country being run by people who are still mentally in Atlanta.

## 'If all this sounds familiar ...'

*Syndicated columnist Richard Strout, writing under his pseudonym of TRB, praised Sen. Edward Kennedy at the expense of the Carter Administration but warned of his moving too fast in the Washington Post June 4. Here are excerpts of the article.*

"We are heading toward the most acute shortages of energy since World War II," he said, "it will affect the lives of each and every one of us. It will require some sacrifice by all Americans...."

Yes, it was Richard Nixon speaking on the evening of Nov. 7, 1973. ... I took the Nixon speech home to read after Carter's press conference last week. They were almost interchangeable. Three presidents for six years have made the same appeal....

America elects presidents as father figures, praises them if things go well, denounces them if they go ill; ignores the fact that they often don't control the result. In prosperity, Harding and Coolidge were immensely popular; the unfortunate Hoover was ruined by the sequel to their acts. Now Mr. Carter has three extraordinary intertwined problems: energy, inflation and the strategic arms limitation....

Senator Edward Kennedy is an enigmatic figure in all this. He is one of the best political speakers in the country; I have found him again in Congress articulating the liberal sentiments I like. He has the name, the flamboyance, the allure that Mr. Carter lacks as the President struggles with his intractable problems. Mr. Kennedy constantly says he's not a candidate, and he laughs about it: he will tell any group he's not running, he says—as large a group as you can get together.

I think Mr. Kennedy currently is on the wrong track on two issues and is doing harm to Mr. Carter, himself and his party. He favors universal mandatory health insurance.... The other problem of decontrol of oil is a more difficult issue.

My own guess is that Mr. Kennedy doesn't want to run; in fact won't run. Not in 1980 anyway.... Do the Democrats realize what kind of a campaign it would be? They would first repudiate President Carter, then replace him with a vulnerable substitute. Ten years ago Sen. Kennedy conceded his "indefensible" behavior. The whole sorry story would be out again if he ran. What a gift to the GOP.