

Crazy for Kennedy?

In the same week that the *New York Post* proclaimed that "Draft Kennedy fever" is sweeping the country, more reflective pundits warned that Kennedy will not win the Democratic nod unless he sheds his "ultraliberal" image. And the political aspirations of former NATO supreme commander Alexander Haig were crumbling in Western Europe, where the prospective man-on-a-white-horse was testing his campaign strategy with the aid of Henry Kissinger.

As we enter the fall gear-up for the 1980 campaign, both of the presidential choices of the New York Council on Foreign Relations crowd, Kennedy and Haig, are looking like liabilities. The boys at CFR are not accustomed to setbacks, either in the major party nominations or the November vote. One imagines frantic meetings behind closed doors.

The Council and its elder sister, London's Royal Institute for International Affairs, miscalculated on two counts. One, they overestimated the ability of London and Washington to muscle the Third World and Western Europe into acceptance of a world depression. Two, they underestimated the moral commitment to progress embedded in the majority of the American population, that can be mobilized against a Kennedy "right to die" candidacy.

As reported in our cover story, the Nonaligned Summit at Havana delivered the first shock to the Anglo-American elite. By majority decision, the 96-member movement gave full backing to Cuba's Fidel Castro in unseating Kampuchea's Pol Pot regime for genocide against its own population, and in condemning the Camp David war part. These signal rejections of the "Dark Age" strategy were crowned by the final

document's ringing challenge to developed countries to foster economic progress in the Third World or face catastrophe.

Responding to the courage of the Nonaligned, Western Europe also showed some backbone. Hysterical statements to the contrary in the Anglo-American press cannot hide the fact that the European Monetary System is alive and has captured enormous leverage through the upvaluing of its gold reserves. This paves the way for a European Monetary *Fund* intervention into the International Monetary Fund's turf, Third World credit.

Likewise, Haig's "confront the Soviets" show seems to have closed after a one-night stand on the continent, panned by even the London critics.

That leaves Kennedy. But in the Sept. 12 U.S. primaries, Teddy's supporters fared badly. Take Hartford, Connecticut, described as "Kennedy country." There a strong alliance of white "ethnic" trade-union and minority voters turned back a bid by

the city's Deputy Mayor Nicholas Carbone to defeat incumbent George Athanson in the Democratic mayoral primary. Carbone, a Kennedy man, was plugged as the "favorite" despite his advocacy of methadone maintenance and legalized gambling. Athanson had officially endorsed the Connecticut Anti-Drug Coalition, one of a national grouping of such coalitions initiated with the aid of presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

It is really LaRouche's name that is making the 1980 campaign a new ballgame already in September 1979. The Nonaligned's intervention into advanced-sector policy, and Western Europe's moves toward "Phase Two" of the European Monetary System, are directly modeled on the concepts developed by LaRouche, such as his "Theory of the European Monetary Fund," published last October by this review. Here, the motion of international developments and domestic ferment in the U.S.A. come together.

—Nora Hamerman

The Week in Brief

Fame is fleeting. A week after Henry Kissinger told a Brussels meeting of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) that the U.S. nuclear umbrella over Europe is no longer credible, given the shift in the balance of strategic forces in favor of the Soviet Union, his view has been repudiated by another former U.S. National Security Advisor, McGeorge Bundy.

Speaking to the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies, termed "the most presti-

gious strategic research center in the world" by the Italian daily *La Stampa*, Bundy said that the "effectiveness of the American nuclear umbrella for Europe will be just as great in the foreseeable future as it has in

"The long-term effectiveness of the U.S. umbrella," said Bundy, "is not derived from strategic superiority; it is derived from two other factors: the visible deployment of conspicuous American military forces in Europe, and the highly evident risk that any large scale conflict between