

Why John Anderson is the perfect Trilateral candidate

by Kathleen Murphy

Unlike the two major parties, John Anderson doesn't have any constituencies to speak of. Therefore, he can call for the hard sacrifices the American people are going to have to make without having to worry about constituency pressure or his own popularity.

—Bob Walker, chief domestic adviser, Anderson-Lucey National Unity Campaign, in a Sept. 15 interview with *EIR*

With the 1980 presidential campaign as a backdrop, a core group of institutions led by the New York Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission have declared war against the U.S. Constitution and the American political system. The objective is straightforward: to destroy those remaining institutions—the trade unions, farm organizations, urban machines, sections of Congress, minority groups, and so forth—that might mobilize political resistance to the economic regime that is already being imposed on the United States, the CFR's "controlled disintegration" policy.

Burying their mostly superficial differences, spokesman for the Carter, Reagan and Anderson camps have all found themselves publicly agreeing that the principles and institutions that have served the Republic for the past 200 years are somehow no longer viable.

To a man, these spokesmen argue that the United States has entered an era of limited growth and finite resources. To make the government capable of imposing the austerity they deem necessary, they call for severing

all links between it and the constituencies it is supposed to represent. They propose to do this by amending the Constitution—which has been the target of British-directed subversion since its adoption in 1787—in such a way as to permit the introduction of the outmoded, anti-republican British parliamentary system into the United States.

It is in this context that the Justice Department's Abscam-Brilab witchhunt must be viewed. With the possibility that 5,000 indictments may be handed down over the next six months, the U.S. faces the immediate prospect of having every remaining vestige of traditional constituency politics dismantled.

The leading Democratic Party spokesman for this anti-Constitution position is Lloyd Cutler, a trustee of the New York Council on Foreign Relations who is now ensconced in the White House as chief counsel to Jimmy Carter. In the Fall 1980 issue of the CFR's quarterly *Foreign Affairs*, Cutler calls for sweeping changes in the U.S. Constitution so that harsh austerity can be imposed.

Speaking for the Republicans is William Simon, the former Secretary of the Treasury and now a top adviser to GOP presidential candidate Ronald Reagan. In a mid-September speech to the Mont Pelerin Society, Simon proclaimed that the real cause for inflation is the unfortunate fact that American elected officials still tend to represent the groups that elected them. Simon intoned, "the realities of the political process still dominate the course of economic events and historically have forced the growth of money and credit needed to accomodate

inflationary pressures to contribute to the reelection of incumbent officials.”

Simon, like Cutler, also suggested that the Constitution be altered, specifically proposing a one-term limit on certain government offices so that public officials will no longer feel constrained by reelection considerations from carrying out the budget-slashing that he calls an anti-inflation program.

The Anderson difference

The vehicle through which the CFR-Trilateral group intends to achieve this radical transformation of the American political system is the “independent” presidential campaign of John Anderson. A member in good standing of both elite organizations (he’s scheduled to address the CFR on Sept. 24), Anderson is ideally suited to play this role. With virtually no chance of being elected, Anderson is an entirely media-made creation. He has no base to speak of, as his aide Bob Walker noted, except perhaps for the “Chablis and Brie” circuit of aging left-liberal activists like Stewart Mott.

In his own program, Anderson makes no secret about his commitment to revamping the way American politics has traditionally worked. In the platform section, entitled “How an Independent Can Govern,” Anderson and his running mate Patrick Lucey state that “The major parties have proved unequal to the task of formulating a realistic post-New Deal public philosophy. . . .” Charging that the Democrats and Republicans are still too “consumption-oriented,” the platform says that “The traditional parties were reasonably effective mechanisms for distributing the dividends of economic growth. But during a period in which the central task of government is to allocate burdens and orchestrate sacrifice, these parties have proved incapable of making the necessary hard choices. We are prepared to tell the American people what we must do, and allocate the burden in a manner sensitive to both economic efficiency and social equity.”

Anderson is on record as favoring a parliamentary form of government for the U. S.

One of his top campaign advisers is Robert Bowie, a former CIA executive who worked with Samuel Huntington on the Trilateral Commission study, “The Crisis of Democracy,” advocating that severe limits be placed on representative government.

The Anderson program: no more growth

His vice-presidential choice, former Wisconsin Governor Patrick Lucey, said on NBC-TV’s “Meet the Press” Sept. 14 that Americans must “bite the bullet on energy by paying higher prices” and then went on to call for a “national convocation on federalism” that would reinstitute states’ rights.

Getting Americans to bite the bullet is precisely the motivation behind the current assault on the Constitution. The Anderson-Lucey platform is a blunt statement of the CFR-Trilateral Commission’s policy of eliminating basic sectors of the country’s industrial and transportation infrastructure, siphoning off what credit exists into a few select industries such as semiconductors and certain limited forms of military production. Thus, in the midst of zero-growth platitudes we find Anderson advocating a revitalized space program.

On energy, the platform asserts that “a healthy economy and a high standard of living for all citizens are not dependent on a given quantity of energy consumed but on maximizing the services or benefits derived from consumption.” Castigating Americans for giving in to their “thirst for a cheap and reliable source of energy,” the platform calls for drastically reducing energy consumption by pushing energy prices through the ceiling, partly through a 50-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline, phasing out nuclear power, and relying on conservation as “the most important method of providing the energy benefits we need over the next decade.”

In the same spirit, Anderson and Lucey come out in favor of stringent controls over the exploitation of natural resources on public lands (Anderson cosponsored the Alaska Lands Bill which would prevent huge portions of that resource-rich state from being developed, in order to “protect the environment”); and against most waterways projects because they “jeopardize America’s wetlands.”

Anderson would have opposed the Erie Canal.

On the other hand, the platform staunchly favors a huge federal investment in synthetic fuels projects—uneconomical and far more dangerous to the environment.

Creating a ‘multi-party system’

Although Anderson’s role as a publicizer of policies and programs which neither Carter nor Reagan can freely advocate because the weight of their constituencies cannot be underestimated, the most important feature of his candidacy is its potential to provoke a political crisis—or at least the appearance of one—to create conditions under which the American political system can be turned to dust.

The most widely discussed possibility is the so-called House of Representatives scenario, which goes as follows: If Anderson succeeds in winning one or more states in the November elections, this could cause the Electoral College to deadlock, especially in a close Reagan-Carter contest. In the event that no presidential or vice-presidential candidate gets a majority of Electoral College votes (the electors vote on Dec. 15; the votes are counted Jan. 6 before a Joint Session of Congress), the Constitution mandates the following procedure: The

House of Representatives is instructed to choose a President from among the top three Electoral College vote-getters while the Senate is mandated to choose a Vice-President from among the top two vice-presidential candidates. The deadline for both houses is Jan. 20. As various scenario writers have stressed, it is theoretically possible for the House to become deadlocked since each state delegation receives one vote regardless of size. If the Democrats and Republicans each control equal numbers of state delegations, which could happen if the GOP scores significant gains in the Congressional elections, then the House could become hopelessly deadlocked as well. If the House cannot choose a President by the deadline, then the Vice-President chosen either by the Electoral College or the Senate would become Acting President.

But if the Senate also fails to fulfill its mandate (assuming that the Electoral College was unable to select a Vice-President) then the United States could face the worst constitutional crisis in its history, since Congress is left to its own devices to adopt an appropriate course of action.

Under conditions of political paralysis and rapidly declining economic conditions, this could well lead to the imposition of a crisis-management government operating entirely outside the bounds of the Constitution.

Although it is highly unlikely that this scenario will be played out to its endpoint, there are ample indications that partial implementation is under serious consideration by the circles behind Anderson. During the first two weeks of September, several key decisions were made that effectively thrust Anderson's flagging candidacy back into the political spotlight.

The League of Women Voters decided that Anderson should be included in their nationally televised presidential debates, giving the Illinois Congressman tremendous exposure and "major candidate" status. The Federal Elections Commission vastly boosted Anderson's fundraising abilities by deciding to consider him a "third party," thereby making him eligible for federal campaign financing. And the Liberal Party voted to place Anderson on its ballot line in New York State together with incumbent Sen. Jacob Javits, which could well produce a significant number of votes for the Anderson-Lucey ticket in the state.

The Liberal Party decision caused some political analysts to add New York to the list of states where an Anderson-Lucey victory is possible. Others include Oregon, which has a strong environmentalist faction; Wisconsin, Lucey's home state; Massachusetts, where a decision by the Kennedy forces to bolt from Carter could put the state in Anderson's column; and Rhode Island. An Anderson win in any of these states would ultimately depend on two factors: whether the CFR launches a full-scale media campaign on Anderson's

behalf, and how it decides to deploy its vote-fraud capability.

Even if Anderson fails to win any states, thus voiding the whole deadlocked election scenario, he still could prove a potent factor in the assault against the Constitution. The very existence of his candidacy is cited continuously by media commentators and political scientists as "living proof" that the Constitution must be overhauled and that the two-party system is dead.

Anderson campaign aide Bob Walker recently commented that "the parties must reorganize themselves. If you have candidates like Anderson who aren't afraid to tell it like it is, who aren't afraid to demand hard choices of the American population, and they come off with a respectable showing at the polls, this will provoke a fundamental revolution in the way the parties work. . . . It will help free them from their traditional constituencies. . . ."

Austin Ranney, a political scientist who works with two ongoing programs to rewrite the Constitution sponsored by the American Enterprise Institute and the Brookings Institution, has commented at length on the ramifications of Anderson's campaign for the entire political process. In remarks published in the June 8, 1980 *New York Times*, Ranney opined that Anderson's candidacy "is a very good thing if you don't like political parties. . . . A successful Anderson candidacy—not in the sense of winning but in the sense of having a real impact on the outcome of the election—will make them even weaker than they are today. I think we'll see more and more candidates like John Anderson in the future because the parties are so much out of it now."

It is reliably reported that networks affiliated with Averell Harriman see Anderson's candidacy as a vehicle for establishing a multi-party system in America.

In an editorial Sept. 14, the *New York Times*—one of the Eastern Establishment's propaganda organs that publicized Anderson's candidacy into existence—gloated about the damage which his campaign has already wrought. Entitled "Running Against the Television Party," the editorial argued that Jimmy Carter agree to debate Anderson on the following grounds:

"John Anderson is the first presidential candidate of what might be called the Television Party.

"Forty years ago, even 20 years ago, what he is doing would not have been imaginable . . . he wouldn't even have been laughed at, just ignored.

"Parties were once the exclusive instrument of communicating a candidacy to the public and exciting the faithful. . . . There was no other way. But television has now become an alternate instrument, another way of communicating candidacy to the public, another way to excite support.

"For Mr. Anderson, television is not secondary. It's the only vehicle he's got. . . ."