

New Hampshire: the vote against Trilateralism

by Konstantine George

The New Hampshire vote on Feb. 26 represents a defeat of the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations and its spin-off, the Trilateral Commission. The results: Reagan's overwhelming 2:1 romp over Trilateral Commission member, George Bush, and the acquisition of between 20 and 25 percent of the Democratic primary vote by conservative Democrat Lyndon LaRouche—although there was a defrauding of that vote around a Carter-Kennedy deal, that left a trail of criminal vote fraud evidence “as wide as an interstate highway.” LaRouche received an “official” 2 percent of the vote. Taken together, the turn-out for Reagan and LaRouche constitute a clear voter mandate against not only Trilateral Commission austerity, economic and foreign policy debacles associated with the Carter administration, but a rejection of any continuation of Trilateral government under George Bush or other commission candidates.

There is no doubt that the New Hampshire vote was a referendum on the question of the Trilateral Commission's policy. The word referendum is not arbitrarily chosen. The LaRouche campaign through a heavy, paid media effort and the largest organizational presence of any Democratic campaign organization in the state, made Council on Foreign Relations-Trilateral policies and candidates the leading issue of the campaign, recognized—and bemoaned—by the *Washington Star* newspaper subsidiary of Time, Inc.

LaRouche's campaign against the Trilateral Commission indirectly provided Reagan with the margin of his election victory in New Hampshire. The relentless exposure of Bush, the “blue blood,” as a CFR-Trilateral liberal propped up by nothing more than media hype, and as one committed to a version of Nazi economics worse than Carter's, ended the short-lived status of Bush as the CFR's front-runner. For that matter, it ended his chances for the nomination.



Photo: NSIPS

The New Hampshire vote has already led to a significant alteration in the CFR's electoral strategy. The Carter-Bush deal that was operative till that point is now a thing of the past. The new CFR "perspective" is as follows.

The Democratic scenario

On the Democratic side, the carrying out of the wholesale defrauding of LaRouche means short term, the original Carter-Kennedy deal arranged last fall to counter LaRouche's declaration of candidacy in the Democratic Party is still operative. Under that arrangement, Kennedy—the only personage in the party and the country hated more than Carter—would agree to announce, providing a foil against which Carter would campaign.

To date, as any honest poll of Democratic local and state officials, as well as the public, would attest to, anti-Kennedy sentiment is the major prop holding up Carter.

It is useful in this regard to examine the chronology of events that occurred between the third and the fifth of November 1979, which tell the story.

The taking of the hostages in Teheran occurred on November 3. This publication has amply documented that the Carter administration set up the Teheran hostage crisis deliberately. On November 4 Kennedy declared his candidacy, following months of a saturation media barrage in adulation of "Ted and Camelot." The day Ken-

nedy announced the same controlled media opened fire with Chappaquidick, beginning with CBS's "60 Minutes" program. A day later, Chicago Mayor Jane Byrne—the most hated politician in Illinois history—endorsed Kennedy. The Byrne "Kiss of Death" ensured the outcome of the Illinois primary months in advance.

The maintenance of this CFR Democratic primary script will be determined by ability of the New York crowd to contain, through media blackout and defrauding, the momentum acquired by the LaR

The Republican scenario

On the GOP side, the CFR is reduced to two possible options. The first and preferred one is preventing Reagan from acquiring the nomination by deadlocking the convention; they will attempt to throw the vote to a "figure around which the party can unite." In this light, the Gerald Ford option has surfaced. The second option, should Reagan prove unstoppable, is the saddling of Reagan with a CFR designated running-mate. Inside Wall Street investment banking circles, Kissinger's protégé, former NATO commander, Alexander Haig, is the preferred choice for the No. 2 slot.

Any choice under the deadlocked convention option, Ford included, would ensure a de facto Henry Kissinger presidency. Ford has already been quoted in *Newsweek* that if he were President, he would appoint Henry

Kissinger, Trilateral Commission Executive Committee member, as his Secretary of State.

If the choice of candidate were left exclusively to Republican voters, the fact that only Reagan has a base and the capability to create party volunteer organizations would settle the convention question as of this moment.

The Anderson facade

Such, however, is not the case, as the Massachusetts primary demonstrates. In Massachusetts Reagan won an absolute majority of GOP voters in a state where he is traditionally weak. Behind the media garbage concerning Anderson's vote, the facts are that Anderson received most of his votes from liberals, primarily students who are registered as "independents," but including Democrats. Anderson will also receive the vote from this anti-mainstream layer in Illinois, Connecticut, and New York this month, being the unique beneficiary of the CFR decision to keep Jerry Brown out of the running in the March primaries.

Anderson's bankrollers are the California and New York liberal Democrats in the media world, like Stanley Sheinbaum and Norman Lear, who in the past helped bankroll Jerry Brown into the governorship, and also bankrolled the disastrous McGovern radical-liberal candidacy in 1972, the effects of which Democratic political machines have yet to recover from.

The Massachusetts GOP primary was anything but that. One statistic proves the case. There are 421,000 registered GOP voters in the state. The turnout for the "GOP" primary was 390,000; 93 percent.

In every state where the crossover rules apply, the liberal Trilateral GOPers and liberal Democrats will attempt the same vote pattern. That, plus the huge media play accorded Anderson, is the only way he can stay around with the convention.

As shown elsewhere, Anderson's other designated CFR purpose (Anderson himself is a member of long standing of the CFR, the Trilateral Commission and the "one worldist" Bilderberg Society) is through his standard "New Citizens Coalition" speech and theme, to use his candidacy for the active promotion of a zero-growth fascist movement in the U.S. Anderson is Jerry Brown in Republican clothing.

The key to wrecking the CFR electoral strategy is the continued demonstration in the campaign of *the reality principle*. That is, as demonstrated in the New Hampshire campaign, Reagan and LaRouche are the two best vote-getters. If the Reagan local machines mobilize through statewide volunteer organizations, and if the votes cast for LaRouche are actually tallied in Illinois or Wisconsin, then the media constructed "candidates," Carter, Kennedy, Bush, Anderson, etc., are untenable.



Trilateral will meet to choose next President

by L. Wolfe

Some Americans think that they choose their presidential candidates through party primaries, caucuses, conventions, etc. In 1980, as it was in 1976, the next American President is being chosen among the boys in the back room at the New York Council on Foreign Relations and its offshoot, the Trilateral Commission.

A subsequent issue of this journal will detail the ugly truth about the way the Trilateral Commission and its minions control U.S. policy. Let us focus here on what the Commission has in store for the 1980 election, using information recently obtained from sources close to executive director George Franklin.

According to Franklin, the Commission meeting scheduled for London March 23-25 will have two agendas. The public one will discuss crucial international policy questions, including discussions on global security questions, the crises in the Mideast and Persian Gulf, the international economic crisis, with special emphasis on its effect on national governments and international institutions. Significantly, the Commission will receive major input from what are called "Empire People."

The "British model"

This refers to the leadership of the Royal Institute for International Affairs, the International Institute for Strategic Studies, Oxford and Cambridge University and the royal family itself. Special input will be provided by the relevant controllers of the current Thatcher regime in Britain, including the Prime Minister and her Svengali, Sir Keith Joseph. Sources report that the economic policy discussions will be framed around a discussion of the "British model" for austerity as administered by Joseph and company. The plan of the Commission, these sources indicate, is to export the model in workable form into the United States.

This provides the context for the "private agenda," a