

Will the Democratic Party take the winning road in 1980?

The assembled evidence surrounding Ted Kennedy's formal declaration of his presidential candidacy establishes that the intent of his candidacy is to split the Democratic Party, in order to throw the 1980 election to the Republicans.

All Republican candidates are on record in full support of Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker's depression policies. In the last two weeks, Kennedy's wreck-the-Democrats scenario has been detailed verbally by a score of political strategists linked to the New York Council on Foreign Relations and allied Anglo-American policy institutions, who are smugly predicting that the Democratic Party "will be torn to pieces" in the upcoming presidential primary campaign, as a result of the Kennedy candidacy. A Republican "who can continue the policies of Volcker," will win.

The ability to execute a projected fragmentation of the Democratic Party in this manner is contingent upon a Carter-Kennedy two-man race for the nomination. Should that not be the case—should there be a strong third Democratic candidate, then all bets are off on the CFR scenario.

A Carter vs. Kennedy two man race would split the Party irrespective of who takes the nomination in the following manner. Neither of the two candidates is capable of putting together a winning coalition of voters drawn from northern white ethnics, blacks, southern Democrats, independents, let alone GOP crossovers.

Assume a Carter convention victory following a "tear-the-party-to-pieces" primary fight with Kennedy. Carter would have a narrow voter base in the 1980 presidential election. Given the painful record of the Carter administration's support for the depression policies of Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker, its unbroken record of failures on foreign policy, and other features that have earned it consideration for the title of worst administration in American history, the outcome of Carter's nomination would be a voter flight, in "lesser of two evils" fashion, into the waiting arms of the CFR's preferred Republican candidate.

As insurance for the GOP option, the Kennedy radical-liberal hard-core minority of the Party would bolt from supporting Carter, probably taking the form

of a "third party option.." The analogy cited by CFR-linked columnists such as Joseph Harsch of the *Christian Science Monitor*, is the 1912 election, when "the other Teddy"—Teddy Roosevelt, split the Republican Party by forming the "Bull Moose" Progressive Party, and threw the election to Woodrow Wilson. Wilson won with a mere 42 percent of the vote.

Should Kennedy by some fluke, take the nomination, a split is equally assured. Kennedy and his radical-liberal environmentalist base are anathema to broad sections of the party base, to say nothing of independents.

Media plan the campaign

The track record of the major media on the Kennedy candidacy—national television, the East coast press, the *New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, in particular—confirm beyond all doubt the use to which the CFR crowd is putting Kennedy. Anyone who watched television over the course of the past months, up till the eve of Kennedy's actual announcement, could not fail to conclude that one was witnessing an unprecedented media build-up for the candidate. Kennedy was being egged on by widespread, highly favorable coverage to declare as soon as possible. The original Kennedy timetable was moved forward from December to early November.

But then, on the eve of his declaration, an equally massive wave of television broadcasts, press coverage, editorials, and columns appeared attacking Kennedy (see below). The Chappaquiddick "time bomb" was unleashed by CBS television, the *New York Times*, and the *Washington Post*, to name but a few. The CFR panning of Kennedy is to ensure that his candidacy succeeds in splitting the party, but, even by nominal yardsticks, advances no further.

The mood in the country's electorate is quite different, however. As shown in the pattern of the 1979 election results to date, and by the momentum of anti-Volcker and anti-Kennedy sentiment, a Democratic Party majority exists in the United States, a voter base that wants neither Carter nor Kennedy. This majority would rally behind a third candidate, if he were an anti-Volcker/Carter Democratic candidate, and an anti-

Kennedy Democratic candidate. This fact is shown by the Illinois State legislature's unanimous adoption of a resolution demanding that Volcker either reverse his policies or resign; it is shown in the outcome of the Cleveland Mayoralty election, and the Cook County Democratic Party's backlash against Chicago Mayor Byrne following her railroading of an early endorsement of Kennedy's candidacy over loud protests.

The actual status of the bulk of the Cook County Democratic politicians, accurately reflecting the mood of the population, is to support neither Carter nor Kennedy. How meaningless the Cook County endorsement of Kennedy was, is evidenced in the fact that two days later and one day after Kennedy's declaration, Kennedy, arriving in Chicago for a "mass rally," received almost no turnout. The expected thousands were instead counted in the hundreds—almost entirely city workers on "overtime" who were turned out for the occasion; even many of this paltry crowd exited from the scene before Kennedy had concluded his speech.

On the question of reversing the Volcker policies, recent events reflect if anything a de facto agreement with Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche's call for a national mobilization to force President Carter to fire Volcker and reverse his policies to avert "a depression worse than the 1930s."

LaRouche's call was issued in mid-October, and widely circulated throughout the country. On Nov. 1, Illinois State Rep. Larry Bullock (D-Chicago) introduced a resolution into the Statehouse demanding that Paul Volcker either immediately lower interest rates or submit his resignation. That resolution passed both houses in Springfield unanimously, signalling the depths of opposition to the Volcker-Carter administration policies from urban and rural America alike. The vulnerability of every GOP candidate, on record as supporting Volcker's measures, is clear. Rep. Bullock, moreover, said that he thought "America should get to know Mr. LaRouche and his programs better."

The anti-Volcker movement that took off in Illinois is spreading throughout the country. A similar resolution was introduced in the City Council of Baltimore. In Newark, where a vote was taken, a fire-Volcker resolution again passed unanimously.

How a Democrat can win

The Cleveland election (see below) proved the fragility of the GOP-victory scenario. The fact is that while a Republican was elected Mayor, this was accomplished through a mobilization against Kennedyite Kucinich by Democratic ward machines in Cleveland. These Democratic machines emerged greatly strengthened, as shown in the City Council results, where anti-Kucinich Democrats maintain a strong majority.

Upon hearing of the Cleveland results, LaRouche declared; "I'm delighted ... the results prove that the alliance of white ethnic and black political machines is

the winning combination. This anti-Kennedy combination won in Cleveland. It can win in any location in the nation."

Democratic Party professionals well acquainted with the actual pulse of the party organizational structure, and who never ignore the evidence produced by solid voter trends, have drawn definite conclusions from the anti-Kennedy backlash exhibited on Nov. 6. The consensus is that, given the Kennedy fragmentation effort, and the obvious nature of voter trends, the Party can win in 1980, provided that a non-liberal Democratic candidate who has simultaneous, demonstrated support from minorities is nominated at the Party's convention. "In short," said one professional, "we need a candidate whose vote-getting power will square with the anti-liberal wave sweeping the country, like we've seen in the blue collar/white ethnic wards in all the cities, while holding the blacks and minorities. That kind of candidate, working off this base combination, will just sweep into his fold Independents and Republican cross-over voters in the millions. In plain English, he's a winner. He gets the White House."

—Konstantine George

What they're saying about the Democrats

'Party will rip itself to shreds'

In an interview made available to Executive Intelligence Review, Hoyt Ammidon, a member of the board of directors of the American Ditchley Foundation and chairman of the board of the U.S. Trust Company, gave his views on who will win in 1980 and what will happen to the Democratic Party between now and the November presidential elections. Mr. Ammidon's comments follow.

The Republicans are probably going to be fairly well united this election. The Democratic Party situation is a different story. It's very open. ... It's perfectly possible that the Democratic Party will rip themselves to shreds. We Republicans are rather counting on this. ... There will be a pretty bitter fight between Carter and Kennedy. ...

I wish we could nominate our Presidents, rather than electing them. In that case, Bush would be the ideal choice. He's a man of experience and he would surround himself with the right advisors. My choice? Either Bush or Connally. ... Bush will come on strong,