

implications. He expects to see Hua and Teng. He is coordinating this closely with Brzezinski.

Q: It would seem that Schlesinger adding his weight to Brzezinski's "China Card" game would be viewed by the Soviets as quite a provocation.

A: I have had indications of exactly the same thing—that the Soviets are very upset. They have a bit of paranoia about this. They are worried that the U.S., having come off the policy of "containment", is now trying to encircle them.

Q: What's your reading on Schlesinger's tenure as Energy Secretary?

A: You have got to wonder how long Schlesinger will

be around here. But on all these rumors of when he's going and where he'll go, you probably know more than I do. Schlesinger did say recently on *Face the Nation* that if the gas bill fails, which I guess it will, then his usefulness to the President as energy chief will have ended. But in that case—if he stepped down by October—he would probably go to China anyway, as a special representative, a personal envoy, of the President.

Q: Would the President be silly enough to do that, after Schlesinger has failed in everything he tried to do for this Administration, and was then fired?

A: Probably. The Chinese might well wonder, why are you sending us this multi-time loser?

The Intimidation Of A President

The 'September scenario' in operation against the White House

The theme of Carter's political vulnerability has been spreading through the eastern establishment press, daily increasing in savagery as the Camp David meeting draws nearer. One Zionist lobby insider freely admitted the real purpose of this coverage in an off-the-record conversation this week, that "If we can just frighten Jimmy enough about his lack of political support in Congress and with the man on the street, then he won't dare push Begin around at Camp David."

An Aug. 27 *Washington Star* column by veteran White House watcher Hugh Sidey reviewed the Administration's blunders and concluded that Carter just simply isn't fit to be President. But the *Christian Science Monitor* has been most explicit in outlining the City of London's projected "September scenario" for wrecking Carter's presidency over the coming month.

On Aug. 29, the *Monitor* heralded Carter's return to Washington with a front-page spread predicting a string of defeats for a number of top White House legislative proposals during Congress's final session this fall.

"How President Carter handles some 10 pressing issues over the next few weeks will determine ... his prospects for renomination," the *Monitor* said, pointing to the despised natural gas bill, the President's recent unpopular veto of a defense appropriations bill, tax reform, Humphrey-Hawkins, public works water projects, and other pending legislation as "key tests" in "the battle between Carter and Congress (during) what could well be one of the most important months of (Carter's) presidency."

In a companion piece *Monitor* Washington correspondent Godfrey Sperling Jr. portrayed the national governors' conference held in Boston earlier

last week as an unofficial anti-Carter conclave. (For the real conference story, see below.) The Democratic governors are dissatisfied with Carter, wrote Sperling, and so are "Democratic leaders in all areas ... and a growing number of Democratic political activists." All of these groups, Sperling lied, are "saying ... that Mr. Carter is beginning to look like a one-term President ... and that it is about time to find a replacement for the 1980 presidential nomination."

Leaving nothing to the imagination the *Boston Globe* covered the governors' conference as a contest between "favorite son" Sen. Ted Kennedy and Gov. Jerry Brown — implying that Carter simply is no longer in the running.

Meanwhile, outright terror is being utilized to cow Carter. An Aug. 28 assassination threat against the President in Idaho turned out to be a hoax, but the West German *Bild Zeitung* — published by Jerusalem Foundation funder Axel Springer headlined its front page the next day with the ominous prediction: "Carter to be Assassinated Thursday."

"Getting Tough"

Behind this media deployment is the sordid fact that the President is being deliberately and systematically set up by his Vice-President, Energy Secretary and National Security Advisor. While Carter was vacationing, Brzezinski, Schlesinger, and Mondale began collaborating on a 'round-the-clock basis to ensure that the "September scenario" goes off smoothly.

Brzezinski and Schlesinger are focusing on wrecking Camp David and eliminating the possibility held out by the Princeton fusion breakthroughs for a real national energy program. At the same time Mondale has thrown his energies into setting the stage

for a Carter-Congress confrontation when the legislators reconvene in mid-September.

Sperling confirmed in an Aug. 28 article what this news service reported previously: that Mondale "is known to have been a leader" in convincing Carter to "get tough" with Congress. That "get tough" act — which has Carter preparing to "face down" Congress in behalf of proposals (such as the energy bill) that were drawn up by London for the explicit purpose of destroying the United States — is well on its way to ruining the President's relations with Capital Hill.

This is not to say that Carter shouldn't be "getting tough." The question is: *tough on whom?*

Who's Backing a Carter Showdown with Congress

A top aide to Agriculture Secretary Robert Bergland recently elaborated on his boss's role in the President's new hardline posture, publicly associated with Carter image-maker Gerald Rafshoon:

Q: Were the statements that Secretary Bergland made recently against Congress OK'd by the White House?

A: Thank God that I was there so I can answer this.

There is no Rafshoon-Carter conspiracy. Godfrey Sperling of the *Christian Science Monitor* has a regular series of breakfast meetings with officials and he brought this up with Bergland last week. Bergland thinks that this policy should be the policy of the White House. But the White House didn't know about it. In fact, the White House called up and asked us what Bergland said. They noted his comments with interest but that is all they said to us on it.

Q: Do you think that there are people at the White House and in the Administration besides Bergland who support the policy of putting tremendous pressure on Congress?

A: There is a large faction in the White House and Administration, including Rafshoon, which thinks the President should do this. Bergland has been disappointed that the Cabinet has not been more active in supporting the President. He feels that this pressure on Congress is the only thing that Congress understands.

Q: Who in the Administration supports this view?

A: The people with Hill experience understand this. By this I mean such people as Brock Adams (Transportation Secretary), and Califano (HEW Secretary).

Conference Of U.S. Governors Endorses Pronuclear Resolution

U.S. governors firmly closed the door on any antinuclear initiatives within the National Governors Association at its annual meeting in Boston Aug. 29-30. This was accomplished by near unanimous passage of a resolution calling on Congress to rapidly implement all aspects of nuclear fission, including programs for nuclear waste storage and shipment, expedited nuclear plant siting procedures, the construction of more light water nuclear reactors, and most importantly, U.S. development of the fast breeder.

A strong axis led by Gov. Meldrim Thomson (R-NH), Gov. Dixy Lee Ray (D-Wash.) and Gov. James Edwards (R-SC) launched the drive for a U.S. nuclear fission policy. Gov. Ella Grasso (D-Conn.) alone attempted to push solar energy development with a resolution which Gov. Meldrim Thomson termed "inaccurate" in its claims for solar potentials.

The British-inspired deindustrializers among U.S. political leaders have clearly lost their battle against nuclear energy development. Their attacks on the vitality of the U.S. industrial economy, however, continued at the conference with a major "fiscal conservative" cost-cutting push for the federal government, and championing of Proposition 13-style tax-cut proposals for states and cities.

This thrust was launched in the keynote of British-controlled Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass), nominally speaking on his health care bill. However, all of the tax revolt, cost-cutting resolutions in circulation at the conference failed to pass, with the sole exception of a resolution by Gov. Jim Hunt (D-NC) calling for a balanced federal budget by 1981.

Kennedy v. Carter Gambit Flops

Attempts to set up Kennedy in opposition to Carter fell flat. At the opening press conference, rigged questions concentrated on Kennedy's presidential prospects in 1980, and whether governors preferred the Kennedy Health Plan to Carter's. Gov. Michael Dukakis (D-Mass) brought this line of questioning to a close with his comment "Let's cross that bridge when we come to it."

The Caucus of Democratic Governors followed up by approving a resolution of support for Carter, throwing a wrench into efforts to further weaken Carter on the eve of the Camp David Summit.

The political chemistry of the Governors Conference was substantially heightened by the presence of U.S. Labor Party 9th Massachusetts congressional district candidate Graham Lowry. The governors received a