

The candidates assess the state of the union

by L. Wolfe

We present below excerpts from the three "states of the union" speeches delivered last week by the major contenders for the Democratic presidential nomination—Jimmy Carter, Lyndon LaRouche and Sen. Edward Kennedy.

Of the three, President Carter's address, delivered before the customary joint session of Congress, received the most attention in the national media. For all practical purposes, the address was delivered by Carter National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was the guiding force behind the main content of the speech, the so-called "Carter Doctrine." As observers in Washington noted, the blustery tone and manner of Carter's throwing down the gauntlet to the Soviets was pure Brzezinski.

While the Congress applauded Carter's drawing of the line in the Persian Gulf, knowledgeable sources in the U.S. military and intelligence community shuddered at the prospect of an actual confrontation. If the Soviets were to cross Carter's imaginary line in the Persian Gulf, the U.S. would have no real capability to respond—short of nuclear war. As one source in the military confided, "Carter is bluffing and the Soviets know it. The Europeans know it and the Arabs know it. The problem is, what if someone calls his bluff. Then we have World War III."

Carter's speech lacked precise formulations on domestic policy, but the direction he proposed was clear. The U.S. will spend more on military production and simultaneously impose continued credit restrictions and drastic reduction in energy consumption. The two policies work at cross purposes—tight credit, energy cut-

backs, especially cutbacks in the nuclear program, are incompatible with a real program to improve U.S. military capability.

It was these issues that LaRouche emphasized in his nationally televised address Jan. 27. LaRouche termed the Carter Doctrine borne out of "immorality, hypocrisy and fraud." The Democratic candidate likened the situation of the nation's commander-in-chief and his advisors to that of a soldier who cracks under the strain of battle. "The Carter administration, which has been outgunned, whose policy has been a failure, is responding by going into a flight-forward assault against the forces of the Soviet Union."

LaRouche's address, which reached more than 15 million Americans including most of the leadership of the Democratic Party, the military command and intelligence community and key corporate leaders, was the trigger for a regroupment among the ranks of his Democratic opponents.

While Carter may get the Democratic Party nomination, most political insiders view him as unelectable in November. The same is true of Ted Kennedy. No one takes Jerry Brown, the governor of California, as a serious candidate. If Carter is renominated, many Democratic Party regulars say that the party is staring in the face a potentially broad rout of the type experienced by the Republican Party in the 1964 Goldwater debacle.

The talk in the circles of the New York Council on Foreign Relations and its adjunct, the Trilateral Commission, the same people who put Carter into office in

1976, is that a GOP victory in November is the preferred policy option. They name George Bush as their preferred candidate. To such circles, which include the policy advisors who shaped the Carter Doctrine and who "control" Brzezinski, the Carter speech lays the basis for a future policy debacle which will hasten his defeat in November.

LaRouche represents the wildcard in this situation—with a chance of changing the entire game plan.

The White House, in particular Brzezinski, viewed with alarm LaRouche's national address, report sources in Washington. They reportedly went so far as to secure an advance copy of the tape for White House viewing. Prior to that, the White House, under advice from certain New York CFR circles, moved to minimize the effect of the LaRouche broadcast among national political circles.

The White House turned to Edward Kennedy. The Massachusetts Senator was called in for a series of policy briefings to shape a calculated response to LaRouche. Kennedy's campaign can best be described at this point as a kamikaze mission; Kennedy has no chance of securing the nomination which, despite his protestations, his close advisors say he acknowledges. It was arranged between the Kennedy and Carter camps that Kennedy would mount an attack on Carter from the left.

That is precisely the secret behind Kennedy's Georgetown speech which reaffirmed his "liberal" dogma on foreign and domestic policy. According to the way the gameplan is slated to proceed, the Carter camp will now stage a "fight" between "liberal" Kennedy and the "conservative" Carter. Carter can then carry out the charade of a presidential campaign while avoiding a direct reply to LaRouche's charges.

The content of the Kennedy speech is made to order for this tactic. On the one hand he attacks the Carter foreign policy, but offers no specific recommendations. At points he appears to be saying Carter is too tough, too militaristic; at other points he says that he wavers. On domestic policy, Kennedy proposes to do Carter's austerity policies one better: another higher level of sacrifice.

This staged debate is slated to be well underway before the New Hampshire primary on Feb. 26. That primary, like last week's Iowa caucuses, is already being played as a "referendum" on the Carter policy and Carter people are arm-twisting "patriotic Americans" to fall in line behind the President. Kennedy, of course, has fallen behind in recent polls.

But here again, LaRouche represents the wildcard. He has the best campaign organization in the state and a chance to pull off an upset.

LaRouche made a direct appeal to party regulars in his broadcast. The Democratic Party, he stated, is threat-

ened with a political disaster by Carter's policies. "I'm working to bring together what might be considered conservative Democrats and independents ... to recreate the Democratic Party as an effective force in national life."

The Democratic National Committee and local party leadership were already deeply divided before the three speeches. The press is trying to play the dispute as "partisan politics," but as several DNC members indicate, it goes much deeper. One said after hearing Carter and Kennedy, "I feel like I'm on the deck of a sinking ship. It is awful. I hope there is someone else [other than Carter and Kennedy] around."



CARTER

The president presents a policy 'doctrine'

President Carter delivered his State of the Union address to Congress on Jan. 24. Here is what he had to say on foreign strategic and domestic issues.

On the Soviets. We now face a broader, more fundamental challenge in the [Mideast] region because of the recent military action of the Soviet Union.... Since the end of the Second World War, America has led other nations in meeting the challenge of mounting Soviet power. This has not been a simple or static relationship. Between us there has been cooperation—there has been competition—and there have been times of confrontation. ... We superpowers also have a responsibility to exercise restraint in the use of military power. The integrity and the independence of weaker nations must not be threatened... The implications of the Soviet invasion of