



Haig, Kennedy: a rigged choice

The same political circles who foisted the muddle-headed Jimmy Carter upon the nation in 1976 are well on their way to insuring that a far greater threat to U.S. national interests is in the Oval Office in 1980. The Council on Foreign Relations, in collaboration with such British-affiliated networks as the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, is committed to a scenario for the 1980 presidential elections whose principal elements are the following: First, a rapidly deteriorating global economic and political situation; second, an incumbent U.S. President (Jimmy Carter) who, increasingly unable to handle these mounting crises, is to be unceremoniously dumped by his own party in favor of a Ted Kennedy candidacy; third, a deadlocked Republican Party convention, split by multiple candidacies, leading to the nomination of Tory-sponsored General Alexander Haig; and fourth, a phony presidential election campaign pitting Haig and Kennedy — both hand-picked by the same British intelligence networks — against one another, with Haig — aided by media-induced hysteria about the “collapse of the West” and massive vote fraud — the ultimate winner.

The other major element of this scenario is a no-holds-barred political and financial warfare deployment against U.S. Labor Party candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., whose potentially determining influence over the outcome of the 1980 election is perceived by British-allied circles as the single most important obstacle to the otherwise successful realization of its gameplan for 1980.

With Haig — a stand-in for Henry Kissinger — safely enconced in the White House, the CFR crowd will be strategically situated to carry out its “unfinished agenda” for the world, with sabotage of the recently initiated European Monetary System — through a series of Iran-type crises accompanied by regional wars and widespread economic collapse — the first priority.

How the scenario will work

The Democratic Side: The main countours of how the “1980 scenario” will evolve are identifiable even at this relatively early stage. Beginning with the mid-December (1978) Democratic Party mid-term convention, Carter has come under increasing attack from both the “right” and “left” wings of his party. Blamed by one side for rising inflation and a failure to cut government spending enough, and by the other for cutting spending *too* much, Carter has taken the bad advice of Gerald Rafshoon and other political strategists and opted to carve out a “middle of the road” non-policy which fails to address any of the fundamental questions facing the United States.

Carter’s 1980 budget, released January 22, and his January 23 State of the Union address, only serve to confirm that his attempts to play up to both sides of the CFR’s controlled debate is a losing gambit (see below), providing Kennedy with a ready-made opportunity to launch his most open challenge to the President to

date. In a statement issued to the press Jan. 23, the Senator from Massachusetts blasted Carter’s budget for asking “the poor, the black, the sick, the young, the cities and the unemployed to bear a disproportionate share of the billions of dollars of reductions in federal spending that are necessary if the target, which I support, of a budget deficit below \$30 billion is to be reached.”

At the same time, the gentlemen of the Eastern Establishment press are seizing on the dissatisfied reactions to the President’s two major documents this week as proof that he has become a very lame duck indeed.

Carter’s two main Democratic opponents — Ted Kennedy and California Guru Governor, Gerry Brown — have been playing their parts with equal aplomb.

Brown — whose unofficial candidacy is reliably reported to be personally run by Robert O. Anderson, a top-level British operative who chairs the Aspen Institute, the Atlantic Richfield Co., and the *London Observer* — is being fielded by the CFR for two principal purposes. The first is to create a political climate within the country amenable to London’s “New Dark Ages” gameplan (see *EIR*, Vol. VI, No. 2), a job for which Brown, an open advocate of Zen mysticism, drugs and “small is beautiful” ideology is preeminently qualified. Brown’s recent call for a constitutional convention to adopt an amendment prohibiting deficit spending (a move authored by Robert O. Anderson, according to the Jan. 24 *New York Daily News*) is one of the more blatant elements of the New Dark Ages strategy.

The second purpose of Brown’s candidacy is to provide both a foil and a stalking horse for Teddy Kennedy. According to informed sources, the Kennedy strategy is to let Brown embarrass and weaken Carter in the early primaries, at which point Kennedy will move in for the kill in much the same way Robert Kennedy used Eugene McCarthy to soften up Lyndon Johnson before officially entering the 1968 presidential race.

By counterposing his own genocidal policies (especially his highly controversial national health insurance bill) to Brown’s more openly medieval ones, Kennedy can make them appear comparatively less unpalatable than they are in reality, while at the same time consolidating a liberal-fascist constituency around them.

Daily Telegraph endorses Haig

The Toriest of Britain’s Tory papers, the Daily Telegraph, delivered an outright endorsement of General Alexander Haig’s presidential candidacy in a Jan. 7 editorial. The endorsement, titled “Haig Advances,” read:

General Alexander Haig’s decision to resign from the Nato command with a view to making a bid for the Republican Presidential nomination is welcome, since his breadth of experience would make him a valuable contender for the White House. Not only did he prove himself a deft and decisive politician in the days of the Nixon debacle — when he was the only aide left on the burning bridge — but also subsequently an outstanding soldier-diplomat in Brussels. With such a Republican standard-bearer, the next American election would really take fire.

The Republican Side: Despite their decision to give Kennedy the Democratic Party nomination, the CFR-London crowd has no intentions of letting him near the White House. Still smarting over the way John F. Kennedy — faced with the imminent prospects of nuclear holocaust — aborted their Cuban missile crisis scenario at the last minute, the Anglo-American elite has instead chosen someone who will have no last-minute qualms about the implications of “playing chicken” with the Soviet Union. That someone is chain-smoking General Alexander Haig, currently Supreme Commander of NATO, formerly Henry Kissinger’s top aide on the National Security Council and protégé of the same British intelligence circles which promoted Kissinger to political power in the United States.

Jay Lovestone, a leading Zionist lobby spokesman and AFL-CIO foreign affairs advisor, explained why his circles favor Haig over Kennedy in an interview last month: “Scoop Jackson won’t be running for President in 1980, he’s got no heart for it anymore. Moynihan’s a great guy, but he can’t run. But we’ve got an ace in the hole — Alexander Haig. He’ll run as a Republican. Haig’s a great hero because he forced Nixon to resign. The British and our people at NATO headquarters know that Haig can save the U.S. Kennedy’s strategy is wrong, he’s too soft on the Commies, but we won’t attack Kennedy, he’s doing Carter a lot of damage. . . .”

Given Haig’s pedigree (see below), it is no coincidence that

the first mootings of his candidacy appeared in the Tory-controlled press in Britain. Shortly following a very private, mid-November dinner hosted in London by the Aspen Institute’s Anderson, at which former Conservative Prime Minister Harold Macmillan accused Carter of perilling the continued existence of the west by failing to confront the “Soviet threat,” the *Daily Telegraph* and the London *Economist* began promoting Haig’s “presidential qualities.” By the time Haig announced his resignation from NATO (effective in late June) on Jan. 2, the British press was brimming with pro-Haig PR hypes. Within days, favorable news commentary blossomed into outright editorial endorsement of a Haig presidential bid in the Jan. 7 *Daily Telegraph* (see box).

Obstacles to Haig

The admiration expressed by the British press for Haig does not mean that the paper-clip general can sail straight into the White House. Quite the contrary. Haig has no constituency within the Republican Party — except for what GOP operatives tied into the CFR-London networks can pull together. His long and intimate association with Kissinger, his notorious inside role in the Watergating of Richard Nixon, his well-known military incompetence and complete lack of political experience, coupled

A profile of London’s choices

If the Council on Foreign Relations succeeds, the U.S. electorate will be forced to choose between Democratic candidate Ted Kennedy or Republican candidate Alexander Haig in the 1980 presidential elections, two contenders who wear the same British policy brand and who — by slightly different strategies — will drive the U.S. toward depression and thermonuclear war.

A review of their credentials as presidential candidates reveals their common parentage.

Ted Kennedy

Beyond the known Kennedy family connections to the British oligarchy’s Cecil family and various Rothschild branches, the Kennedy boys were educated under direct supervision of two of British intelligence’s most notorious agents: John Wheeler-Bennet and the Harvard-based William Yandell Elliott. (Likewise, Elliott was also instrumental in Haig’s career.)

Kennedy’s programs are a direct read-out of Britain’s public wishes for the collapse of the U.S.:

His health care plan, simply put, means forcing U.S. citizens to pay insurance premiums (to London-connected companies) for care they won’t be able to get when he finishes “cost-cutting” medicine right off the map.

On another front as new chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Kennedy plans a revision of the criminal code to, among other horrors, decriminalize marijuana.

To win deregulation of the trucking industry, he is riding under the banner of “free enterprise” to target the core strength of U.S. industry — a centralized, efficient method of production and distribution.

On energy, he is an ardent proponent of conservation, with the notable strategic exception of wooing Mexican oil to bust OPEC.

Alexander Haig

Haig was picked out of obscurity by Fritz Kraemer, a top-level, publicity-shy British agent who, from a position at the U.S. Department of Defense, also engineered

the careers of James Schlesinger, Henry Kissinger, and other traitors.

Haig was sent to the Naval War College and Georgetown University (both British intelligence bastions) for training, and through the intervention of Kennedyite Joseph Califano, was assigned to then Defense Secretary Robert McNamara’s staff.

In 1968, after completing a stint as a Military Fellow at the New York Council on Foreign Relations, Haig was introduced by Califano to Henry Kissinger. Kissinger in turn had promoted Haig to a two-star and then four-star general over the heads of more than 240 top-ranking candidates.

Nowhere is Haig’s disloyalty to the U.S. more evident than his role in Kissinger’s Watergate operation against President Nixon. In the process of finally convincing Nixon to resign, Haig elevated himself to the role of “Acting President.”

As Kissinger’s right-hand man, Haig helped plot Kissinger’s Middle East and Africa destabilizations.

Former White House speechwriter William Safire once said, “Al Haig wouldn’t go to the bathroom without first raising his hand and asking Kissinger’s permission.”

with the fact that he is, at least on the surface, a military man, all pose real obstacles to his candidacy.

Haig Scenario

The CFR crew is relying on two main factors for overcoming these stumbling blocks. First and foremost is their overall "New Dark Ages" strategy of wars and massive economic dislocations — e.g. Iran — in which a Haig candidacy could be foisted on a semi-hysterical U.S. seeking some kind of "order." This scenario was spelled out in a recent interview by a close personal friend of Haig's, Bob Richardson of the American Security Council (a Washington-based, defense-oriented think tank, with heavy Tory input): "Haig understands that he really isn't a viable candidate at this point," Richardson said. "However, if there are a series of crises, say, for example, if Iran really goes down the tubes and there's an oil cut-off to the U.S., then the man in the street will get scared and say 'We need a military man... an officer... to come in and take charge.' That's when Haig's candidacy becomes real, and when people will start laughing at the Phil Cranes..."

Secondly, the CFR is attempting — thus far successfully — to promote a slew of GOP candidates, hoping that a crowded field (heavily sprinkled with its agents and dupes) will hopelessly muddle policy debate, detract attention from any potentially viable

candidates, and lead to a deadlocked convention in which Haig can offer himself as a "neutral," "unifying" candidate.

So far, other probable Republican candidates include Ronald Reagan, John Connally, New York Congressman Jack Kemp, former CIA director George Bush, Senator Lowell Weicker of Connecticut, and Illinois Congressman Phil Crane. Of these candidates, only Kemp at this point has indicated that, if he runs, he might campaign on an issue not determined by the CFR: the European Monetary System, which he supports (see above). Although Connally has taken strong positions on behalf of U.S. industrial and technological growth in the past, more recently he has been successfully pixied by a group of tory-linked economists operating out of Harvard University. Connally testified to this control at his Jan. 24 press conference announcing his candidacy, declaring his support for Gerry Brown's "constitutional convention" proposal, and calling, in Haig-esque terms, for a military buildup. Phil Crane, another "honest" Republican conservative, is under the thumb of the American Security Council and Richard Viguerie, and is hewing strictly to the CFR-dictated line for "conservative" candidates. Unless Connally or Kemp is prepared to break fully with the CFR-London crowd, the U.S. electorate will face two choices come November 1980: the Labor Party's LaRouche or the CFR's Haig.

—Kathleen M. Murphy

London's Scenario for 1980

