

## Voters flirt with fascism in mid-term elections

by Mel Klenetsky

The passage of California's Proposition 187, which denies education, hospital care, and basic state and municipal services to illegal immigrants, typifies a surly mood in the American electorate that was also expressed in support for harsher crime bills, increased calls for welfare "reform," and angry rhetoric that barely cloaked the racist, nativistic, fascist sentiments that were encouraged in the Nov. 8 elections. California Gov. Pete Wilson demagogically used the fear of immigrants and crime to engineer his electoral victory, as Americans gave in to passions that one day could easily become the mainstay of an outright, Mussolini-style fascist movement. Some 59% of those Californians who voted, favored Proposition 187.

The new Speaker of the House for the next U.S. congressional session, Newt Gingrich, and his followers, including Texas Sen. Phil Gramm's wing in the Senate, using the Republicans' "Contract with America," also stoked the flames of fascism to power their party to victory. The passions and fears that the Gingrich-Gramm-Wilson crowd is playing on, are not all that different than the ones that Russia's Vladimir Zhirinovskiy and France's Jean-Marie Le Pen played upon; nor are they different from the ones that Barry Goldwater and George Wallace fed during the late 1950s and 1960s.

In the first 100 days of the 104th Congress, Gingrich will try to implement ten bills proposed by the Republican "Contract with America." The proposed bills include term limits, a balanced budget amendment, the line item veto, welfare "reform," reforming product liability, lowering the capital gains tax, tax credits, restoration of defense spending, fighting crime, etc. This combination of eliminating the deficit, tax cuts, and other measures requires knocking out

\$200 billion a year out of a \$1.5 trillion budget.

The Republicans have indicated that they won't touch the \$200 billion federal debt payments, the \$350 billion for Social Security, the \$280 billion defense budget, \$70 billion for pensions, and most of Medicare's \$200 billion. This means that \$140 billion—the deficit reduction needed to balance the budget—would be cut out of the remaining \$450 billion.

Gingrich and company want to take the \$140 billion out of the hides of the nation's poor, plain and simple. If they could get away with it, they would gladly take it out of Social Security and other entitlements; but they fear the strength of the senior citizen lobby. Former drug-running operative Oliver North, for example, during his senatorial campaign in Virginia, let it slip out that he would make Social Security voluntary. The ensuing senior citizen mobilization against him cost him dearly, contributing to his defeat.

### A mean-minded clique

The Gingrich-Gramm clique sinks to the depths of mean-spiritedness. Texas Rep. Bill Archer, the Republican who is expected to take over the chairmanship of the House Ways and Means Committee, said he would call for eliminating the federal income tax replacing it with a consumption tax. Such a levy would equally tax the rich and the poor, unlike the progressive income tax, which taxes the wealthy at a higher rate. Thus, the burden of government would be more heavily shouldered by the middle and lower class. The proposal to lower the capital gains tax on stocks and bonds heavily favors the affluent.

Gingrich has announced that one of his top legislative

priorities for the new Congress will be to "reform" the welfare system. Just how he intends to do so illustrates the brutality of this "Conservative Revolution" program, which moved the the U.S. Catholic Bishops Conference to issued a strongly worded statement on Nov. 14, criticizing this and other aspects of the "Conservative Revolution" agenda.

As enunciated in Gingrich's "Contract with America," his welfare overhaul would institute: a two-year cap on welfare benefits for all recipients; prohibiting all welfare assistance to minor mothers; and denying benefit increases to mothers for any additional children they may have while on welfare—a sure-fire recipe for fostering abortion. Furthermore, this great defender of "family values" wants children of minor mothers taken away from them and placed in orphanages. Asked what would happen to welfare recipients unable to obtain employment after two years on the rolls, Gingrich has said that "private charity" should step in as a substitute for government's social safety net.

Gingrich says, "We have to replace the welfare state with the opportunity state," yet he hypocritically calls for cutting the successful Head Start and Job Corps programs.

Gingrich's public policy ruthlessness extends into his personal life as well. "Mr. Family Values" dumped his first wife, Jackie, in order to marry his young secretary. Gingrich presented Jackie with divorce papers the day after she underwent uterine cancer surgery. After that, he behaved like your typical New Age deadbeat husband: Jackie Gingrich's pastor had to take up a collection for her in order to help her balance her family budget. Last year, she had to haul Newt into court to force him to cough up his alimony payments.

Gingrich and Gramm see the dismantling of all social services as a virtue. They would also destroy the productive base of the economy by knocking out farm subsidies and privatizing all areas of the government—state, local, and federal. They are backed by such think tanks as the Reason and Atlas foundations, which call for privatizing trillions of dollars of "unnecessary" government infrastructure, ranging from prisons and schools, to waterways and airports.

### 'Conservative Revolutionaries'

Economist and 1996 presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche has described the Gingrich-Gramm wing as fascists who trace back to the 19th-century "Conservative Revolution." In a Nov. 16 radio interview with *EIR*, LaRouche said, "First of all, Gingrich and Gramm, like North, and like George W. Bush down there in Texas, the governor-elect, are fairly described as fascists. That is not a slangy term the way the communists in the United States used to use the term fascist, but it's a *technically precise* term. Back during the 1920s and the 1930s, there arose in Europe, out of the bowels of the ideologies of the 19th century, a movement which was called the 'Conservative Revolution.' "

"This was essentially the idea of reverting back to a more or less feudal society, combatting industry, combatting

modern society and education, which made every man equal politically, implicitly; back to a society which was structured, where everyone knew you had a ruling class, everyone knew you had a middle level—a *Mittelstand*, so-called, in those days—and you had a lower class which you didn't educate too well, and which you used only for menial labor, either as serfs or slaves."

LaRouche pointed out that at the end of World War II, Winston Churchill personally intervened to continue the Conservative Revolution, with the establishment of the Mont Pelerin Society, founded by the late Friedrich von Hayek. This tradition carried into the present period with the efforts of Milton Friedman and Phil Gramm. While the Friedman-von Hayek tradition had been kicking around for years, LaRouche maintains that it has come together in a genuine fascist social formation around the "lunatic fringe" of the Republican Party, typified by North, Gramm, and Gingrich.

LaRouche said he expects that over the next 12 months, American politics will explode, and will be completely reorganized. While the Gingrich crowd itself will not last long, and will not establish a dictatorship in the United States, it nevertheless can be expected to cause considerable damage.

### Voting patterns

If the Gingrich-Gramm crowd thinks it has won some sort of mandate, they are quite foolish. After all, 60% of all registered voters voted with their feet by staying away from the polls. Should "conservative futurist" Newt Gingrich attempt to actually implement the austerity programs he is trumpeting, he will run into the ire of this 60% of the electorate, plus many of the "Perot Democrats" and "Perot Republicans" who voted for Clinton over Bush in 1992, but were too frustrated with the Democratic Congress to vote for Democrats in 1994.

The actual cause of the revolution at the polls worldwide, is the 20-year-plus protracted collapse of the world economy. More than \$36 trillion in speculative derivatives, plus tens of trillions in debt overhang, are squeezing every ounce of real physical production out of the world economy. In the United States, mean family income dropped \$300 last year, and has dropped every year for the last five years. Hourly wages for private workers, adjusted for inflation, have steadily declined from 1973 to the present, from \$8.50 in 1973 to \$7.40 in 1994.

More than 1 million were added to the poverty list last year. (The poverty line is just under \$15,000 per year for a family of four.) Some 3.9 million American children are living in severely distressed environments, with poverty rates above 27.5%, male unemployment above 46.5%, and high school dropout rates above 23.3%. Almost one-half of these children are in Michigan, New York, Texas, Ohio, and California. What will Gingrich say to those among these states that have Republican governors who depend on federal subsidies?