

the 1976 Iowa caucus and that it gave his campaign a big boost. Most people think he came in first, but that's not quite correct. Jimmy Carter finished second to Mr. Uncommitted.

This time around people are trying to squash an uncommitted vote. People at the Democratic National Committee are telling people to go one way or another, or at least were telling people that around here. But I can tell you that no matter what the DNC says, no matter what Carter says, or Kennedy says, people are going to vote uncommitted.

A few weeks ago, I gave this story to someone at the *Los Angeles Times* and they ignored it. Now as the caucuses approach, people are going to have to cover it so they won't look stupid when the votes are counted.

What do I attribute the uncommitted vote to? Well, I think that many Iowans just don't trust any of the candidates. Kennedy is in trouble, but that doesn't mean that Carter is doing well. Brown isn't really a factor. There is little enthusiasm for anyone and this means votes for Mr. Uncommitted. It could be a real shocker. And it's not that much of an organized movement, so you can't make predictions. Who knows, the way things are going it could go even higher than 35 percent.

'Most think both Carter and Kennedy are losers...'

A spokesperson for the Maine Democratic Party, which holds its caucus on Feb. 10 stated:

Uncommitted? That's going to be a pretty sizeable vote. I'm not much for giving percentages, but it's well over a quarter. It could be much more. I was at a pre-caucus meeting the other night and they took a straw poll. I don't say that these things are all that accurate, but more than half the people voted uncommitted. That will change some by Feb. 10, but not all that much.

Carter's and Kennedy's people are quite upset by it. It means that voters here in Maine don't really care all that much for either candidate. We are right next door to New Hampshire and this could have an effect on the vote there.

It makes the caucus more interesting and I'm sure it's going to mean that Carter and Kennedy will be sending in more troops. Maybe I shouldn't say this, but I think a lot of people think that both Carter and Kennedy are losers. The problem is that they don't see anyone else who has a chance for the nomination. Brown doesn't come across very well here. I really don't know what this means for the convention.

'The best and brightest'

A secret meeting

by Barbara Dreyfuss

A top secret breakfast meeting was held last Wednesday, Jan. 9 at the White House. Over 40 leaders of the Anglo-American establishment gathered to plot out the response of the United States to the Iran crisis and the Soviet Union's move into Afghanistan. Three eyewitnesses to the meeting, not reported in any of the U.S. media, revealed that one after another participant stood up to denounce Soviet activities in Afghanistan and demand that President Carter take tough measures to confront Moscow. After several hours of teeth gnashing, the "Carter Doctrine" was born.

A top figure at Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies divulged that it is now a matter of days before the final decision will be made on whether the new "Carter Doctrine" will be merely a "statement of intent—have Carter get on television and say something bellicose"—or actually include military actions such as "seizing Kharg Island in the Persian Gulf or mining the Gulf."

Notably absent from the discussions was any sense of strategic reality: Why did the Soviets move into Afghanistan? There was no mention that the Carter administration, through the visit of Defense Secretary Harold Brown to China, has committed the United States to a strategic alliance with Communist China directed against the Soviet Union. Equally absent was any sense of fundamental military reality. The participants urged a confrontation over Afghanistan—whose affairs have no bearing on U.S. national security. The participants, after all, were among the same liberal "best and the brightest" crew—Rostow, Fowler, Schlesinger, etc.—whose policies since the '50s have systematically undercut America's industrial-military capability.

Should the U.S. now enter a strategic confrontation with the Soviet Union, assuming no war by miscalculation, the guaranteed outcome is the humiliation of the U.S.—a complete strategic debacle. This is the context in which to view the statements and "recommendations" of those present, and the susceptibility to this madness of a

plots the 'Carter Doctrine'

president who is preoccupied with re-election.

Carter, desperately flailing about for some gimmick that will keep his ratings up in the polls, has seized upon the "Doctrine" idea, *EIR's* source reports. "Carter wants something dramatic, something tough before the Iowa caucuses. He can't wait for the State of the Union speech Jan. 23. He needs to make his Carter Doctrine speech, make himself as famous as Harry Truman."

So, the world totters on the brink of war with President Carter hoping the fallout will be more votes for him.

The men who met behind closed doors last week include the elite of the U.S. foreign policy establishment, the men who have run the White House since Franklin Delano Roosevelt, under both Republican and Democratic Presidents. The bipartisan meeting included John F. Kennedy's National Security Council advisers McGeorge Bundy and Walt Rostow, LBJ's confidant Eugene Rostow, JFK's undersecretary of state George Ball, Lyndon Johnson's defense secretary Clark Clifford, Paul Warnke, LBJ's assistant defense secretary, Nixon's treasury secretary Henry Fowler, Nixon's CIA and defense chief James Schlesinger, Ford's defense secretary Donald Rumsfeld, AFL-CIO head Lane Kirkland, Franklin Roosevelt's key policy man, banker John J. McCloy, and former ambassador to Moscow, Gov. Averell Harriman and his protégé, George F. Kennan.

For over thirty years, these men have orchestrated every international crisis, from Cuban missiles to Vietnam to the 1973 Middle East "oil hoax" war. These crises were aimed as much at continental Europe and the U.S.A. itself as at the Soviet Union. In order to protect the unique Anglo-American political position, they have consistently employed crises to sabotage collaboration for economic development between Western Europe and Eastern Europe.

For example, George F. Kennan and Clark Clifford in 1947 authored the "Truman Doctrine," which is being promoted now as the model for the "Carter Doctrine." The Truman Doctrine, warning of creeping communism,

committed the U.S. to a military buildup and global anti-Soviet military alliances. It marked the death knell of Roosevelt's stated determination that post-war U.S. policy would be aimed at dismantling Britain's empire and collaborating with the Soviet Union to technologically develop the Third World.

But these men, who run Carter policy, have concentrated so long on their confrontation scenarios that they have not noticed that the world has changed markedly in the last three decades. No longer is the U.S. an overwhelmingly superior military power which can merely flex its muscles to impose policies—the "environmentalist" prejudice of these blue-blood cold warriors has undermined high technology research and development and the industrial base necessary for qualitative U.S. military developments. But, oblivious to such strategic considerations, they have proceeded to a "Carter Doctrine."

Vance opens the meeting

After the aging men had settled down to breakfast Secretary of State Cyrus Vance began the policy meeting by outlining a bleak strategic situation. He charged that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan differed from their moves into Czechoslovakia and Hungary, that it was a much more serious move because it was outside the East bloc. Pakistan and Iran are now threatened, he claimed.

Whether Vance resorted to "pounding his fist on the desk for emphasis," as he did a week later in an interview with the *New York Times* to show that the U.S. was really committed to "a sharp and firm response," is not known. Vance admitted in the interview that he sees "black spots" before his eyes. Many believe these were not just caused by the tennis ball that struck his eye at Christmas time.

President Carter then walked into the meeting and, according to participants, echoed Vance's analysis. Several weeks ago the President announced that he had been

“reborn” yet again, and had finally seen the light in regard to the Soviet Union’s global intentions. The President reflected his conversion at the breakfast meeting, declaring that Soviet actions in Afghanistan were the most serious since World War II.

After the President and Secretary Vance had finished their assessments, the floor was opened up for discussion. One after another, the participants jumped up to declare that the Carter administration’s remedies were not strong enough. According to one insider’s report, Eugene Rostow criticized Secretary Vance for merely proposing consultation with our allies on economic and political measures that should be taken against Moscow. “Rostow proposed an all-oceans navy, the development of the Minuteman III and restoring the draft.”

Rostow’s cold war rhetoric set the tone. “Then an interesting thing happened,” declared one leading policy-maker attending the meeting. “Jim Schlesinger, Henry Fowler, Donald Rumsfeld, George Ball, Lane Kirkland, all supported what he had to say. The most interesting thing was that George Ball spoke twice and with a great deal of force about the Soviet actions and stopping them. Schlesinger, and Rumsfeld also spoke with a great deal of emotion, Rumsfeld even attacking those who had in the past said that detente had to continue. And here was Jimmy Carter wrapping himself in the mantle of all this.”

One after another the planners demanded that the U.S. play its full deck of policy cards against the Soviet Union. One proposed emphasis on the China card—although even the Chinese indicated to defense secretary Brown their fears that if China invaded Vietnam again, the Soviet Union would assault China, regardless of U.S. posture. Another tossed out the arming of Pakistan—although Pakistan is very nervous about becoming a funnel for U.S. arms to the Afghan rebels. The Soviets might well attack the rebels’ sanctuaries inside Pakistan. Others proposed Middle East bases and treaty arrangements. One after another they tossed out their “cards,” and nobody seemed to notice that they were jokers. Instead of admitting that the Soviet Union’s Afghanistan move has called the bluff on U.S. provocations, the policy makers planned bigger and better bluffs. A policy, that of encircling the Soviets with a rearmed Europe, a rearmed China, and a chain of “Islamic” destabilizations, has failed; but the “best and the brightest” only raise their voices louder in demanding that the U.S. government commit all to a continuation of the failed policy. Declared one player of this flirtation with world war, Paul Warnke, “I think the Soviets must recognize that if they continue to do things which challenge our vital interests they are risking military confrontation.” Asked about Soviet warnings in Pravda and Tass against U.S. military moves in the Persian Gulf, he declared, “it is a hollow bluff and I’m sure the West will face up to it.”

And then he added: “I hope the Soviets don’t miscalculate.”

The ‘Carter Doctrine’

“George Ball used the word consensus to describe the meeting,” said one participant. “There was a very striking comment on the consensus in the group—that is, that a new policy was needed, the Carter Doctrine. This would be like the Truman Doctrine.”

The Carter Doctrine will be a unilateral declaration by the United States of its commitments to militarily rescue any nation the U.S. designates as threatened by the Soviets, and to effect a rapid, land-and-sea conventional-arms buildup, according to Joseph Sisco, former Secretary of State Kissinger’s right hand man, and now President of American University in Washington. Sisco stood in for Kissinger at the policy meeting. The following day Kissinger met for one hour with Vance.

“I said after the meeting that there had been a general consensus,” declared Sisco. “The President supported rebuilding U.S. policy. What I made clear at the meeting was that the basis for a new doctrine had to be a statement that, first, stressed the areas of vital interest to the U.S. and our willingness to use whatever means are available to protect our interests; second, that it was essential for the U.S. to have sound, conventional capabilities in these areas, both naval and other facilities, and third, that we must protect the survival of Israel and our oil interests by a U.S. presence in the area.” In his interview with the *New York Times* Vance agreed that “increased presence of American forces in the Indian Ocean, assistance to nations which are threatened, and negotiations for regional peace such as the Arab-Israel negotiations,” would be the basis for the “new” administration policy.

The meeting adjourned and the cold warriors scattered to begin policy implementation. By Sunday, Jan. 13, the *New York Times*, whose editors are very close to their former board member Cyrus Vance, ran a front-page lead story revealing that the administration was considering announcing a new Truman Doctrine. Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher was then sent to Europe with the new policy, to persuade European leaders to join the U.S. anti-Soviet tirades.

On the day the *Times* revealed the doctrine, two leading spokesmen for the Anglo-American establishment began trying to build public support for it. On Sunday, Henry Kissinger, appeared on Meet the Press and called for a “national consensus” on “how to stop Soviet expansionism.” “We need a long-range strategy to curtail Soviet moves.”

Almost simultaneously, the 88 year-old Averell Harriman appeared on CBS’ Sunday morning show. The U.S. has to stand firm and let the Soviets know that there are things the U.S. won’t tolerate, declared the man once considered the architect of U.S.-Soviet detente.