

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,

but he will have to wait and see if he develops the charisma and forceful image necessary to carry the election. If he doesn't, then we will have to go with John....

There's a great possibility that Kennedy will not get the nomination. His character is very weak and there's nothing to indicate it's changed. I just don't trust him. I would hate to see the country run by Kennedy....

The GOP candidates will be unified behind Volcker's policies. If Volcker can stay with us on his stand, the situation can work out. I'm a believer in Volcker. ...Admittedly, it will take deft handling and good public relations for the Republicans to handle their support for Volcker so that it doesn't alienate the voters. After all, there will be a good deal of unemployment if Volcker's policies succeed....

'Democratic Party is not viable'

In a recent interview, Russell Hemenway, the chairman of Citizens for an Effective Congress and a cofounder with Common Cause's John Gardner of the Federal Election Commission, described the effect of a Democratic Party split on the presidential race.

Well, Reagan should get it. ...On the Dem side, it will be a dirty, lousy, rotten campaign, terrible fighting. ...The people will vote for him, not the party leadership. There is no party leadership. The national party does not exist, the National Committee is broke, provides no leadership, provides no services to candidates, provides no back-up to the state parties whatsoever—as a matter of fact, the state leaderships are not even functional—there are no state parties to speak of, look at New York, California—totally broken down. Did you ever go to a New York Dem meeting? They can't raise a cent there—in the nation's Dem stronghold! The national party's been bankrupt since Humphrey bankrupted it with his campaign.

The party is not viable. Of course, I don't think he'll lose—he might, the race will be tighter than hell, of course—but if he doesn't, then there will be a major restructuring of the party. There's probably going to be a third party—not with Adlai Stevenson, he's washed out—but led by Doug Fraser of the UAW and the other trade unions, Jesse Jackson and the Black Congressional Caucus, and the youth led by the Clamshell Alliance and other environmentalist groups. They'll pull out and establish a viable third party responsive to the needs of the left of the party....

The party machinery as it exists isn't viable. Jane Byrne? Who's she? She couldn't deliver her brother or her husband for Kennedy. ...Carey in New York will endorse Kennedy, but no one would ever vote for Kennedy because of that...it's irrelevant. The masses of the people will listen to the mass media and then make up their own minds....

'The Democrats will not win'

Following are excerpts from an interview with Midge Decter of Commentary magazine.

To be sure, the Coalition for a Democratic Majority is a small group, but the kinds of positions we take are those taken by people in the party majority.

Nobody believes Carter any more. No matter what he says, people will interpret it as political opportunism. If the campaign is between Carter and Kennedy, there will be a lot of homeless Democrats. ...Baker or Bush will get a lot of Democratic votes, or even Reagan. ...Off the record, I don't see the Coalition as a bloc formally going for a GOP candidate, but many of its individual members will. There are a lot of us in the CDM who will go Republican. I very much see the Democrats not winning....

'The same as 1968'

Following are excerpts from an interview with Ben Wattenberg, one of the heads of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority.

A lot of our guys, given the choice between a dovish Dem and a hard-line Republican, will vote Republican in the presidential election. We don't like bowing down to the Ayatollah....

A person like Bush or Baker would be an attractive candidate....

'A real bloodletting'

The following are portions of an interview-statement made by Max Kampelman, partner in the prestigious law firm of Fried, Frank, Shriver, & Kampelman.

It's too late now, there's nothing you can do—it's going to be a real bloodletting, a big fight; Kennedy is going to announce for sure. There's nothing to be done but just sit back and wait, go through the experience. It will be a real cathartic experience for the party—a big fight. But it's too late. I really have no advice to give...

Of course my first love is the Democratic Party, but can we win this time? It all depends on who the Republicans nominate. I couldn't live with Ronald Reagan, but I might consider George Bush....

'Omen in the wind'

The following statements were made by Michael Novak during a recent interview. Mr. Novak is one of America's leading Jesuit political activists. He is currently resident at the American Enterprise Institute, and was a leading figure in Robert Kennedy's 1968 presidential campaign.

I'm not totally surprised about the *Times* attacking Kennedy. It is an omen in the wind. When I was watching Roger Mudd's interview with Kennedy, I

could not believe Kennedy. It is one thing to forget or forgive a coverup 10 years ago but when he says that now, that he can't believe himself, how he acted then, well... The question then looms: what happens if a special prosecutor is appointed to investigate Chappaquiddick if he is elected. This would be worse than an assassination. The question is if we want a crippled President. Those are the questions in people's minds...

I doubt any of us will announce support for a Republican ... The Kennedy legend is moving to fact quickly. There is tremendous discontent. Suppose if facts that were unknown before came out about Chappaquiddick now, if Kennedy thus gets hurt. Carter is already being hurt. Then if someone steps in—I am doing wishful thinking but—if someone, Moynihan, for example, then says he is available as a candidate...

'No enthusiasm, no unity, no spirit'

The following is part of an article by David Axelrod, "Divided County Dems endorse Ted Kennedy," appearing in the Chicago Tribune Nov. 8.

Whatever it is, the Democrats' central committee wasn't acting much like a team at all Monday when it met to endorse the Democratic presidential candidate of its choice. Timid and cautious, they argued among themselves.

Enthusiasm, there was none. Unity, none. And spirit was a word that didn't exist among this group of veteran pols, who couldn't even get up the energy to applaud the name of the man they will support from now on—Sen. Edward Kennedy.

'Camelot McGoverned'

The following is selected from the column of Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, entitled "Camelot McGoverned," appearing in the Washington Post Nov. 7.

The Coalition for a Democratic Majority (was) born out of hostility to McGovern and closely associated with Sen. Henry M. Jackson. ...

How much difference CDM could make in a Carter-Kennedy race is doubtful. But enough Democrats share CDM's views to take seriously Wattenberg's newsletter warning: "If the Democratic Party candidate turns a cold shoulder on CDM principles, (he could lose) millions of American voters ... who determine the victor in a presidential contest." Carter's presidential record and Kennedy's early McGovernization mean those millions may vote Republican next November.

'Rerieved by 'Jaws' "

The following are excerpts from Tom Wicker's column, "Rerieved by 'Jaws'," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 25.

...Those who passed up "Jaws" to watch Mr. Kennedy being toughly interviewed by Roger Mudd saw another man—one who cannot or will not yet explain what happened at Chappaquiddick, or rectify the numerous inconsistencies in his 10-year-old account of the matter. Perhaps as important, viewers saw a man who, when questioned on this and on his alleged relations with women other than his wife, seemed not only embarrassed and uncomfortable but inarticulate—and occasionally incoherent ... What Mr. Kennedy demonstrated in his responses—rather, his lack of them—to Mr. Mudd was anything but leadership. He could not even define it.

'Another 1912 ...'

The following is excerpted from the "Opinion and Commentary" column of the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 6, 1979: "Another 1912 election?" by Joseph C. Harsch.

... It seems reasonable to assume that the political fight inside the Democratic Party will become increasingly bitter, personal, and damaging to what prospects there might otherwise be for a united party. There is already a good deal of passion involved. The Democratic left wing sought the candidacy of Senator Kennedy with much the same enthusiasm which marked the demand of Republican Progressives in 1912 for a Roosevelt candidacy. They feel betrayed by the Carter administration. They are determined to get rid of Mr. Carter, just as the Republican progressives of 1912 were determined to get rid of President Taft, even to the point of dividing the party and handing the election to the Democrats.

'A terrible thing...'

The following statement was made by Justice Averte Cohen, a prominent figure in the Michigan Democratic Party.

This is a terrible thing. There's absolutely no way of telling what will happen in Michigan; the state's split down the middle. The Attorney General, Speaker of the State Legislature, as well as Mayor Coleman Young, are for Carter; everybody else is for Kennedy—that's about 50-50—and the UAW is in the middle, uncommitted. Emotionally, they're close to Kennedy, but their highest priority is Chrysler and just between you and me, Carter is holding this over their heads politically.