National News

'No preference' wins 11 percent in Fla.'. primary

Faced with a choice of Kennedy, Carter or Brown in the Florida Democratic primary, over 100,000 voters turned out to give a colossal "thumbs down" to all three by voting "None of the above." The vote was solid statewide, with the counted no preference votes over 10 percent in Dade County, and 12 percent or more elsewhere in the state. Local media has called the "no preference" rejection vote "perhaps the most significant result of the election."

One Democratic Party official from Dade County commented: "I can't ask people to vote for Carter, he is an idiot. And there is a groundswell of people calling Kennedy an evil lunatic. This 'no preference' vote is a sign of dissatisfaction."

Meanwhile, in Alabama, a huge anti-Carter conservative Democratic vote went to Reagan, with the total Democratic turnout falling down to less than 50 percent of what was expected, while the GOP turnout increased by 400 percent from 1976. Then the Democratic Primary turnout was 450,000. This year it fell to 200,000. The Republican statewide turnout soared from 54,000 last time to over 200,000 Tuesday.

In precinct caucuses nationally, the "no preference" rejection vote ran even higher than in Florida. In Oklahoma, the rejection vote was 15 percent, coming in second, ahead of Kennedy who polled 10 percent. In Delaware, "no preference" polled 16 percent, securing 28 delegates. In Washington State, the rejection vote was 20 percent. Finally, in Alaska, "Uncommitted" won the primary with a smashing total of 52 percent of the vote, crushing Kennedy with 38 percent and Carter with 9 percent.

The dismay this voter rejection of Carter and Kennedy has caused among leading circles in the New York Council

on Foreign Relations was expressed clearly in the March 13 New York Times. In its lead editorial, the Times warns: "President Carter's support, despite his winning streak, appears fragile. And that fragility does not, outside Massachusetts, translate into support for Edward Kennedy. ...Just 48 percent of Democrats approve of the way Mr. Carter is handling his job. Fully 45 percent disapprove. How many of the latter turned to Senator Kennedy? Only two in five. Fertile ground for None of the Above to look forward to."

Aspen: end American democracy

America has too much democracy, when what it needs is an elite to hold things together, according to Douglass Cater, the head of the Project on Governability at the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies. The Aspen Institute is a thinktank whose membership is drawn from the top ranks of the British intelligence community, the Trilateral Commission and the New York Council on Foreign Relations.

Cater told a reporter on March 12 that he and other such "select citizens" should constitute a new elite to control the American population. According to a paper he is now preparing, he said, "constitutional reform" is required. "Things are getting way out of proportion. There are political currents that threaten the existence of the country as we know it. The key thing is to regain control, exercise self-discipline."

Cater referred to Walter Lippman. Lippman, who founded the New Republic magazine in the United States as an unofficial organ for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, British intelligence headquarters, "identified the problems of the current period in his last work," said the Aspen executive. "People didn't like his ideas; they were afraid because he said that the U.S.

government didn't work. The idea is that we need constitutional reform, without a constitutional amendment."

Cater argues that the "average citizen" has "too much power." "I propose that we create a new federalism, a new internationalism based not on these poor stupid people, but on an elite that imposes reality. I think the idea is to act like Walter Lippman, to create a brain trust... People are frustrated and sick of the powerlessness they feel about America's ability to act... The election this year will create a new basis for it. People are getting sick of the electoral process... It is the responsibility of handfuls of people to take charge. It will not be done overnight, but a new America will emerge and the old America will finally die... It only depends on whether we get a consensus on these issues from the key leaders, an elite. ...'

Trilateral Commission sounds the alarm

Alarmed by the impact of the attacks on the Trilateral Commission which have been unleashed by the LaRouche and Reagan campaigns, leading press spokesmen for the country's Eastern Establishment have stepped forward to publicly demand that these attacks be brought to a halt. One such demand came in an editorial entitled "Trilateral Who?" in the March 12 Christian Science Monitor: "Whatever else happens after yesterday's primaries, the conspiracy theory of membership in the Trilateral Commission ought to be retired a a campaign tactic. It exploits fear and ignorance among the voters in a manner any candidate should repudiate." After lamenting the attacks on George Bush, the Monitor defends the Commission by mentioning other Republican members, including John Anderson and Bill Brock. "Such a sample hardly suggests the Trilateral Commission is the liberal cabal of the conspiracy theory fielded

by the right, or the nest of imperialists decried by the far left....The appearance may be that there was a design to employ Trilateral members, even as anti-Bush campaigners have suggested an appearance that Trilateralists are supporting him in order to have both a Republican contender and the Democratic leader in tow. But think about it. Would the people above be enlisted in government because they were Trilateralists, or were they Trilateralists because they were part of the same pool from which officials are likely to be drawn?...lets not see conspiracies where none exist."

Draft Ford option starts and stumbles

This past week saw the rapid rise and fall of a "Draft Ford" bandwagon. The "Draft Ford" campaign, an up-front stop Reagan effort, was launched in the wake of the failure of the New York Council on Foreign Relations' Bush campaign to snatch up the GOP primary and caucus votes.

The Draft Ford drive began promisingly enough, with a well-publicized press conference March 10 announcing the formation of a committee endorsed by such notables as Henry Kissinger, Thomas Reed, Edward Levi, and Rita Hauser, However, by March 12, Ford's candor in naming Kissinger as his designated Secretary of State had already set off a "stay away from Ford" sentiment throughout the GOP. Several key Republican leaders, such as House Minority leader John Rhodes and Ohio Governor James Rhodes, who had been expected to back Ford, refused to do so and instead issued statements of neutrality.

The liability of Ford's statements on Kissinger were belatedly recognized by the CFR. A member and columnist, Joseph Kraft, expressed in his midweek column complete agreement with Ford's

choice of Kissinger, but bemoaned the fact that Ford had been so inept as to announce it. "I agree Kissinger's the best man for the job, but Ford doesn't have to announce it now. He only further alienates the Reaganites." Kraft concludes: "The maladroitness that did so much harm has not disappeared."

Teamsters demonstrate against Kennedy

On March 12, 220 members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters armed with picket signs and 40 semitrucks draped with banners massed in front of a \$100 a plate fundraiser in a Detroit suburb for the flagging presidential campaign of Edward Kennedy who was the featured speaker.

With all the state press and national wires present, Robert Lins, president of Teamsters local 299 announced that with this demonstration against Kennedy, a well-known advocate of trucking deregulation, the Teamsters union was beginning a campaign of more intensive involvement in the 1980 presidential race.

The demonstration, said Lins, had the full backing of the International and is a tactic the Teamsters will be taking to Illinois and Wisconsin.

The Teamster members distributed leaflets asking: "Why does Kennedy want to destroy our trucking industry? An industry that has made our country the worlds' foremost powerhouse. Why does Kennedy want to destroy the IBT? A union that has fostered high technology, high wages, smart workers, and high productivity. Why does Kennedy want to unleash death and drugs on America's highways? We in the Teamsters union see this movement for deregulation as undermining the national economy and will not stand by while Ted Kennedy and Alfred Kahn conspire to destroy our great nation and our great union."

Briefly

- UNITED AUTO WORKERS President Douglas Fraser says there is a "possibility" that he might support a non-Democrat for President this year for the first time. He said GOP candidate George Bush was "a possibility, but a lesser possibility than Anderson." Fraser has been an active supporter of the Citizen Labor Energy Coalition and the Progressive Allaince, which provide the base for Barry Commoner's Citizen's Party. The Citizen's Party is expected to be Anderson's third party vehicle in the postconvention period.
- SENATOR EDWARD KEN-NEDY'S deteriorating presidential campaign has begun to experience major financial difficulties. Several key staff members have resigned because they are not being paid including Finance Chairman Martin Katz and special assistant James Flug. The campaign has resorted to using "original" works or pronography as collateral for loans to buy TV time. The "originals" are being donated by Studio 54 "artist" Andy Warhol.
- JEREMY RIFKIN of the Institute for Policy Studies and the People's Bicentennial Commission terrorist front see many parallels between Islamic Fundamentalism and the Khomeini revolution in Iran, and American evangelical nd charismatic religious movements. "The only difference is," he said in an interview_March 13, "in Islamic Fundamentalism, we are witnessing a response to the early stages of modernization and the destruction of the traditional culture. The charismatic movement in the U.S., in particular, is a response to the end of science that is setting in now. Rifkin is authoring a book entitled Entropy which will attack the notion of scientific development.