

Campaign 1980 by Kathleen Murphy



Kennedy: A NATO for energy

With Teheran mobs enthusiastically chanting "Teddy for President" in Farsi following the Senator's attack on the Shah last week, Edward Kennedy has unveiled his policy for dealing with the Iranian crisis: cartelization of world energy resources and distribution.

Citing the possibility of a Mid-east oil shutdown developing out of the situation in Iran during a campaign speech in Chicago, Dec. 10, the Democratic presidential contender called for the United States and its allies to form a "NATO" energy alliance. "Just as we have a NATO to defend Europe," Kennedy said, "we must also forge an alliance for collective energy security." According to the Massachusetts Senator, a longtime proponent of slashing energy use, this new alliance "should provide for more effective conservation [and] increased oil-sharing" on an international basis.

Kennedy's energy adviser Jim Kubie told a reporter that the senator decided to issue his proposal now because he is "extremely dissatisfied" with current levels of cooperation among the Western nations in cutting their energy consumption and believes that only a new "transnational institution" can enforce the necessary cutbacks.

Bush uses 'who lost Iran' theme

Republican presidential hopeful George Bush has kicked off a campaign to win the White House based on charges that the Democratic administration of Jimmy Carter deliberately lost Iran for the United States. On Friday, Dec. 7, Bush declared that as soon as the immediate crisis around the hostages cools down, investigations should begin into the Shah's charges that the Carter administration deliberately undermined the Shah by refusing to allow his military to put down the Khomeini opposition.

The following day, Bush told a campaign rally in New Hampshire "I have already made my criticisms of American policy in Iran as early as May. I was right. People will understand that and make the appropriate decision on the election."

When pressed on this in private discussion, Bush was forced to admit that his "national security estimates" when at the CIA did indeed show that the Muslim Brotherhood was the dominating force behind the destabilization of the Shah.

A Reagan-Haig ticket?

Amid endless media reminders that Republican presidential contender Ronald Reagan is a vulnerable 68 years old, the London *Economist* is suggesting that Alexander Haig's best route to the presidency might be, literally, over Reagan's dead body.

In its Dec. 8 issue, the Rothschild-owned financial magazine, among the earliest boosters of Haig's presidential aspirations, concludes a favorable story on the

armchair general with this scenario: "It is hard to imagine that the general might actually be nominated by the Republican convention. ... and he does not seem a probable compromise nominee in the event of a deadlock. General Haig could, however, hope to be someone's—almost anyone's—vice-presidential candidate. If the nominee is of Mr. Reagan's age and uncertain health, that job might be worth having."

Of pots and kettles

John Connally has decided to grab for the Presidency by portraying himself as a true American patriot defending the country against "Eastern Establishment insider" and fellow GOP contender, George Bush. Big John, who, not two months ago claimed to this news service that he'd "never heard of" the New York Council on Foreign Relations, is now loudly asserting that Bush is not qualified for the Presidency because of his membership in the CFR and the Trilateral Commission.

True enough, Bush is a silver-spoon member of the east coast anglophile blue bloods who, under London's direction, run U.S. policy; and was, until recently, a member of the CFR's board of trustees and the Trilateral Commission.

But for Connally to play to Americans' gut distrust of the CFR gang is truly a case of the pot calling the kettle black. Bush may have been a Council member, but Connally is on the board of directors of the Mellon Foundation which supplied the principal funding for the Council's *Project 1980s*.

The only difference between Bush and Connally is that where Bush is one of the Council's insiders, Connally is just run by them.