

EIR Special Report

Why Carter must go

by Criton Zoakos, Editor-in-Chief

The proposition of electing a Democratic Congress in 1980 and dumping Carter at the same time, has been attractive to Democratic elected officials for over a year now. Since Oct. 15, this widespread sentiment became the basis for a series of intensive political campaigns around the country based on the simple slogan: "Elect a Democratic Congress *and* Dump Carter!" This is the electoral strategy of the influential and fast-growing National Democratic Policy Committee, a party body formed after the Democratic Convention last August. The most influential figure within the Policy Committee, Lyndon LaRouche, the former candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, now serving as Advisory Committee chairman at the NDPC, recently issued a recommendation to influential Democrats to do everything in their power to remove Carter from office. Mr. LaRouche, principally proceeding from concerns over matters of foreign policy and national security policy, reacted to Soviet president Brezhnev's recent endorsement of Carter with a call to "dump Carter" and, "in the interests of true peace, teach President Brezhnev a lesson about American politics."

The underlying point that Lyndon LaRouche and the National Democratic Policy Committee make on the matter of war danger is that, given that no intentional, premeditated launching of war is likely or feasible during the nuclear era, the one serious cause for world war would be the domestic and international economic and monetary policies of "austerity" and "IMF conditionalities." These monetarist policies are currently responsible for the political and military destabilization of large regions of the world and these destabilizations in turn are increasingly serving to feed further frictions, conflicts, and miscalculations in the already tense relations between the two superpowers.

If LaRouche considers Carter's economic policies to be the cause of disasters in foreign policy, millions of voters and thousands of Democratic Party officials share with him the sense that Carter's economic policies are the cause of all the domestic disasters they have had to put up with in the last



four years. Whether this sentiment will produce a strong Democratic Congress *and* dump Carter will be seen in a few days at the polls.

Long-time observers of electoral politics are virtually unanimous in their agreement that such a dramatically skewed election result, if it occurs, will be a historical turning point. It will also be a well-deserved revenge of the congressional Democrats against what has been done to them between 1970 and 1980 by the (nonelected) party leadership. This damage to Congress is documented elsewhere in this issue of *EIR*. For the first time since 1968, this year's election presents the possibility for reversing the dominance of McGovernism and the oppressive McGovern reforms. A defeat of Carter and a Democratic victory in Congress next Tuesday would virtually guarantee the end of McGovernite rule.

Party constituencies versus Carter

The bitterness and hostility toward Carter from the traditional party constituencies has been assuming massive proportions in the last 18 months, and it has been mutual. From the beginning of its term, the Carter administration dedicated its efforts to undermining the influence of popular constituencies over national policies, especially economic policies. Carter came in for the purpose of "educating," or conditioning, the American people to the idea that the age of prosperity, the age of unlimited opportunity and the American Dream was forever over. His policies resulted in a large-scale and growing wave of bankruptcies of American farming;

In this section

This Special Report was prepared under the direction of Editor-in-Chief Criton Zoakos and National Editor Konstantin George.

Why Carter must go

- I. Carter's deal with Brezhnev
- II. The Carter family's trashy record
- III. The record of economic sabotage
- IV. Carter's drug record: the Inferno
- V. Billygate: the real record
- VI. Carter vote fraud: 1980 prospects
- VII. How Carter stole the 1976 vote

The issue of Congress

- I. The unholy transformation of the U.S. Congress
- II. The rise of the Democratic caucus
- III. The post-Watergate change in congressional committees

the collapse of the construction industry, whose activities and employment have been reduced by over 20 percent; the shrinking of the auto industry by 25 to 30 percent; similar levels of collapse in steel and virtually all other traditional mass industries, the historical constituency base of the Democratic Party; well before any resistance could be organized against Mr. Carter's Friedmanite economic policies, the Carter administration launched a large-scale terror and intimidation program through the Justice Department, the series of Abcam, Brilab, Pendorf and other entrapment and slander operations which have targeted over 100,000 people, each an important member of the regional and local constituency machines that make American politics (and economics) work.

So, a war has been going on between Carter and the traditional party constituencies for four years. As a result, this year's Democratic National Convention was attended by less than 10 percent of the party's congressmen and senators, with most of those who did show up departing after the second day of the convention when it became evident that it would not be possible to have the convention delegates released and thus have an "open convention."

Meanwhile, most Democrats up for reelection made it clear that not only they would not campaign for Carter, but they would prefer it if he did not campaign for them. A rarity has occurred: party candidates are refusing to ride on the coattails of their presidential candidate—who happens to be the incumbent. Virtually all the Democratic congressmen from the South are refusing to campaign for Carter, but only a few of them, such as Mayor Ferrer of Miami, have said so publicly.

Up until the National Democratic Policy Committee opened fire against Carter publicly, the Democratic opposition to Carter was conducted quietly and privately. Expressing that sentiment at the time was a spokesman of the House Democratic Campaign Committee who preferred to remain anonymous: "Most congressmen will keep their distance from Carter and hope that people will remember their congressman and take out their frustration on the head of the ticket. Many senators up for reelection also believe that close association with Carter will hurt them."

NDPC focus

Given that 10 days before the election Carter was lagging four percentage points behind Reagan, the strategy adopted by the Carter campaign organization is pivoted on two efforts: a dramatic augmentation of vote fraud capability, euphemistically code-named "Operation Big Vote," and a frantic attempt to get the hostages home either by means of capitulation to Khomeini or by the risky application of some sort of violence. A return of the hostages before Election Day

was calculated by Carter campaign strategists to be worth two percentage points at the opinion polls. Any remaining vote advantages of Governor Reagan are expected to be taken care of by outright vote fraud operations, especially focused in the critical swing states of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida, Michigan, Illinois, Texas, New Jersey, and New York.

If Carter carries even four of these states, it is then possible that under certain circumstances he may win the election despite Reagan's overwhelming superiority west of the Mississippi. Ironically, recent days have indicated increasing electoral activity, sponsored by the National Democratic Policy Committee, under the slogan "Elect a Democratic Congress and Dump Carter," in the cities of Philadelphia, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and Houston.

This sort of deployment is probably the most classic case of "minimum effort for maximum result." The postwar patterns of every presidential election year have shown that no Democratic presidential candidate can carry the states of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and Texas unless he secures pluralities ranging from 150,000 to 300,000 votes in the particular cities mentioned above. If the NDPC succeeds in keeping Carter's pluralities below these threshold levels while electing Democratic congressmen, Carter will lose the election.

The Carter deal with Brezhnev

Excerpts from Contributing Editor Lyndon H. LaRouche's Oct. 16 policy statement, "Why Does Brezhnev Wish Carter Back Into the White House?":

The Soviet leadership has reached a rotten accommodation with the Carter administration, selling out the United States's principal allies of both the Arab Middle East and continental Western Europe. Brezhnev's endorsement of President Carter's reelection is a product of that agreement.

This development represents a breaking point for every honest member of the Democratic Party and the national government. The issue is not merely that President Brezhnev has endorsed Carter's reelection, but that this endorsement is the reflection of a rotten agreement between the Carter administration and Moscow.

In a certain ironic sense, the Democratic Party as a constituency party will have a better chance of surviving a Reagan presidency than it will of surviving a second Carter administration at this point. Many trade union officials, farm leaders and congressmen interviewed and consulted by *EIR* have expressed grave concern that if Carter gets reelected, the top two items on his domestic agenda will be a) take revenge against those Democrats who either opposed him or failed to support him and b) escalate dramatically the Abscam and Brilab operations of the Justice Department. The combined effect will be the terminal gutting of the party as a constituency-based organization.

A possible Reagan administration on the other hand, is displaying ironies of its own. In a nutshell, those ironies can be summarized as follows: if Reagan wins, there will immediately follow a rather large factional explosion within the broad and diverse coalition that now constitutes the "Reagan camp." The following principal constituency-based forces are now heavily represented in that camp: the grass-roots nationalist movement which secured the governor's victory during the primaries; farmers and export-oriented agricultural interests; local and regional power machines threatened by Abscam and related operations; traditional ethnic minorities frustrated with Carter's various foreign policies; the Teamsters, overtly, and other organized labor

power centers, covertly, who are trying to fight back against Carter's Brilab; and a large straightforward anti-Carter component which has no particular sympathy for many of Governor Reagan's current policies, most notably his known commitments to Milton Friedman-style monetarism and his tight-credit inclinations.

The mix of constituency sentiments behind Governor Reagan is thus explosive. It is highly unlikely that the Kissinger-Bush-Max Fisher grouping of advisers, dominant in the Reagan camp since the nomination of George Bush, will be able to ride this particular tiger should Governor Reagan become the President-elect. The key issues that will come to the surface for resolution will be, first of all, the matter of credit policy, export policy, industrial revival, effective national security, and the areas in which these concerns overlap. The constituencies' clamor for bold advances toward a perspective for prosperity, will place Governor Reagan's allusions to Franklin Delano Roosevelt into a perspective that it is doubtful he himself intended.

Under such circumstances, a Democratic majority in Congress, elected on the basis of opposition to Carter and based on the large constituencies' opposition to Carter's programs, has a better chance of doing the nation some good and keeping the Democratic Party alive, than under any possible circumstances in a second Carter administration.

As allied forces of Iraq, the exiled Iranians, and other Arab countries have moved to bring about the removal of the Khomeini obscenity in Iran, the Carter administration shamelessly moves to conduit strategic support to a Khomeini regime still perpetrating what are tantamount to acts of war against the United States. Moscow is also supporting Khomeini. Libya, Syria, and North Korea, as well as the Carter administration client government of Zia's Pakistan are conduiting military aid to the beleaguered Khomeini "Jacobin terror" regime.

Moscow's relevant policies are currently being directed with prominent involvement of the Soviet Communist Party's foreign intelligence "think tank," IMEMO, and the Soviet KGB of General H. "Kim" Philby. Philby's father was a founding field executive of the Arab Bureau, and the younger Philby conducted an important operation for SIS's Arab Bureau in the Lebanon-Syria region immediately prior to his leap into Moscow. Philby's known policies today are congruent with those of British SIS's desired deployment of the Soviet Union to the present date. IMEMO, which created the U.S. Communist Party-linked

U.S.A.-Canada Institute, is a British intelligence and policy-making center, shaped to its present form in association with Philby associate Maclean.

What is presently occurring is a headlong rush toward a "controlled confrontation" between U.S.A. and Soviet forces in the Middle East, as prearranged in effect under the terms of the rotten agreement between Moscow and the Carter administration. The included objective is cutting of substantial portions of the world's Middle East petroleum supply.

This is not to imply that Mr. Carter is allied otherwise with Mr. Brezhnev. It is an adversaries' partnership, a deal whose understood objectives include imposing economic disaster upon U.S. allies of continental Western Europe and elsewhere, as well as the most massive petroleum hoax against the American economy and people to date. Mr. Carter's and Mr. Brezhnev's administrations have strongly differing reasons for participating in the rotten agreement for "controlled confrontation." The agreement is operational nonetheless, and is downright evil as well as violently contrary to the most fundamental interests of the United States and its allies.