

## Democrats nominate a New Age ticket

by Kathleen Klenetsky

With the nomination of Bill Clinton and Albert Gore, the Democratic Party has completed a profound transformation that has been in the works since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Over the course of the last three decades, the party has moved further and further away from its principal constituencies, including labor and minorities, and turned itself instead into the party of “post-industrial” yuppiedom, a shift that has returned it to its roots in the feudal, Confederate South.

Rather than fight the U.S. economy’s collapse into the low-wage, no-growth “service economy,” the Democratic elite—Trilateral Commissioners like Clinton controller Warren Christopher and British oligarch Pamela Harriman—has opted instead to throw its base to the wolves, and to position itself as the champion of the very policies that threaten the survival of those whom it has so unceremoniously disenfranchised.

This year will be the first presidential election in recent history in which the party powers have not even made a pretense of caring about the concerns of the party’s traditional base. Not only do standard-bearers Clinton and Gore both hail from the South—a slap in the face to the ethnic urban layers which comprised the party’s grass-roots support since the 1930s—but they were both founding members of the Democratic Leadership Council, the key “Bush Democrat” grouping in the party.

Moreover, both Clinton and Gore have independently backed policies verging on fascism, ranging from both men’s support for George Bush’s genocidal war against Iraq, to Clinton’s vow to get rid of welfare, and Gore’s embrace of radical environmentalism.

The ticket reflects the cynical calculus upon which the party’s leadership is now operating: Since the political power of labor and minorities has been drastically reduced by the

collapse of the U.S. industrial and agricultural base, the party should concentrate on wooing the “new constituencies,” primarily the yuppie suburban vote, along with a motley assortment of homosexuals, pro-abortionists, greenies, etc.

### Dems say ‘yes’ to death penalty

The actions of Clinton and his handlers concerning the death penalty point to the drive toward barbarism underlying the party’s orientation. The death penalty issue threatened to blow apart the party’s carefully orchestrated mid-July nominating convention, and to undercut Clinton, whose cynical use of executions in his home state of Arkansas sickened many loyal Democrats.

In the weeks leading up to the convention, supporters of Democratic candidate Lyndon LaRouche spearheaded a campaign to get the party to reject capital punishment (see *EIR*, July 3, p. 62). Three hundred delegates had signed a petition calling for the party to reject the death penalty. Many other non-delegates, including members of European parliaments and prominent Americans, had also signed an anti-death penalty resolution. A minority plank that would have put the party on record opposing the death penalty had been introduced, prior to the convention, by Jerry Brown delegate Robert Fitrakis of Ohio.

Faced with this challenge, the Democratic National Committee pulled out all the stops to prevent the death penalty question from even being raised on the convention floor. Prior to the convention, party hacks had used strong-arm tactics to squash Fitrakis’s plank, and, during the midst of the convention, succeeded in turning back a last-minute court challenge to its undemocratic tactics.

The same viciousness dominates the party’s platform. As *EIR* reported last week, the platform, taken together with

Slick Willie's ludicrously titled "Putting People First" economic policy statement, calls for levels of austerity even beyond what the Bush administration has called for—at least publicly. In addition to support for the jobs-destroying North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which both Clinton and Gore support, despite labor's opposition, the two policy documents call for getting rid of welfare, cutting back entitlement programs (Social Security, Medicare, farm price supports), abortion on demand, and lethal health-care cost containment.

Keynote speaker Barbara Jordan, a former House member from Texas, struck the same theme in her address to the opening night of the convention. Asserting that the Democrats should "change from a party with a reputation of 'tax and spend' to one with a reputation of investment and growth," Jordan said that the way to achieve this is for the party to "frankly acknowledge our complicity in the creation of the unconscionable budget deficit—acknowledge our complicity—and recognize, painful though it may be, that in order to seriously address the budget deficit, we must address the question of entitlements also."

Jordan called for "equity in sacrifice," defining this to mean that "all will sacrifice equally," including "the person who is retired on a fixed income" and "the day laborer," as well as the "corporate executive."

## Blood and Gore

The choice of Al Gore as Clinton's running mate further certifies that the Democratic Party has gone back to its Confederate origins. If anything, the Tennessee native, who idolizes Andrew Jackson, is worse than Slick Willie, in his espousal of an environmentalist ethic that is not only rabidly anti-growth, but pro-pagan as well.

Gore's selection has drawn rave reviews from the environmentalist movement, including from Britain's malthusian Prince Philip. According to an aide, the prince was "delighted" that Gore was named to the ticket. During his congressional career, Gore has compiled a record that reflects an unalloyed commitment to the entire gamut of neo-malthusian policies. He is the leading spokesman on Capitol Hill for the "ozone hole" fraud, and has lobbied for a host of extremist measures to "save the environment." Earlier this year, Gore published a manifesto on the environment, entitled *Earth in the Balance: Ecology in the Human Spirit*, in which he outlines a "Global Marshall Plan" whose number-one priority would be "stabilizing human population" (see *EIR*, April 3).

Gore headed the U.S. congressional delegation to the U.N. Earth Summit in Brazil in June, and has vowed to introduce legislation to make the global climate treaty signed there legally binding on the United States.

Moreover, he has played a pivotal role in the project, associated with the British royal family's Prince Philip and Prince Charles, to bring about a pagan revolt against the Jewish and Christian concept that man is made in the image

of God. Gore collaborated with Prince Philip on a "religion and ecology" conference which took place in Washington in May 1990, at which Philip gave a speech praising paganism for its nature worship.

Last May, Gore sponsored a meeting of U.S. religious leaders who voted up a declaration which asserted that religion "has an essential role to play" in promoting an "environmental consciousness" and called for "concerted efforts to stabilize world population."

Ironically, the Gore family wealth comes largely from Occidental Petroleum—the company responsible for the notorious "Love Canal" chemical spill in upstate New York. Gore's father, Al Sr., who also served in the U.S. Senate, made a tidy fortune as head of Island Creek Coal, a Kentucky-based coal company owned by Occidental, the multibillion-dollar company founded by the late Soviet agent of influence, Armand Hammer, who financed Al Jr.'s abortive 1988 presidential bid.

## Bush on the ropes

The Bush-Quayle team is making political hay out of the Democratic ticket, but they've hardly got the election wrapped up. Indeed, for weeks, the word from high-level British sources has been that Bush will be forced to withdraw from the presidential race due to ill health. British banking sources began to circulate the report several weeks ago, and it has now begun to hit the media. The London *Observer* picked up the story on the eve of the Democratic convention, and British journalist Christopher Hitchens declared on a U.S. cable television talk show that the real, but still largely unnoted, story of the 1992 elections is that Bush is too sick to fulfill his presidential functions.

With or without Bush, the Republicans could not count on keeping the White House. A slate headed by Dan Quayle—or even Jack Kemp or James Baker—could hardly be called a winning ticket, particularly given the economy's persistent slide.

As for the Democrats, the Clinton forces may have succeeded in choking debate at the convention, but it could prove to be a Pyrrhic victory. Democratic strategists assume that the constituencies they've disenfranchised—labor, civil rights layers, farmers—couldn't possibly vote for the Republicans, at least not in numbers, so they'll have to stick with the Clinton-Gore ticket. Some may reckon that Ross Perot's July 16 announcement that he won't make an independent run for the presidency, bolsters the Democrats' bid to be seen as the only "force for change."

But there *will* be an independent presidential candidate this year—Lyndon LaRouche. Perot's quitting underlined what was true all along: that LaRouche, the one opponent Bush feared enough to put behind bars, has an actual industrial policy that can revive the nation's economy and morale. Whether voters' anger will rise to the level of playing the "LaRouche card" in November is a question the political pundits of the two parties have no ability to calculate.