

GOPers say Bush is 'demented'; Dems desert Gore's sinking ship

by Michele Steinberg

Anyone who thinks he or she can predict the outcome of the primary contest, much less the general election, in the U.S. Presidential elections at this point, should be certified as insane. A look at the turmoil within the Republican Party, the abstention by the core constituencies of the Democratic Party, and the rise of Third Party operations, shows a splintering of political institutions that means a wide-open situation. And this is *before* the full brunt of the financial breakdown crisis has hit the United States.

The only candidate speaking to that situation right now, is the "third" Democratic candidate, Lyndon LaRouche, whom the establishment media are determined to suppress. But the dramatic upheaval that can be expected in the immediate months ahead in the political realm, is beginning to emerge. The controls that seems solid today, are about to disappear tomorrow.

Trashing George W.

George W. Bush is "crude," "cruel," has "beady eyes," gets a "demented look" about him on the campaign trail, and uses the "f—" term frequently (though much "less than before") in dealing with reporters and staff members, especially when he is angry. Are these the slanders from critics? Not exactly, at least not from Democratic Party critics. These are quotes from long-term insiders in the Republican Party, and reports from an interview in *Talk* magazine done with reporter Tucker Carlson, who fawns all over "Dubya," in the piece done for the magazine, which premiered in September.

Ask Bush a direct question about his wild younger days, as Tucker Carlson did, and you will get a string of paranoid profanities. For example, the question about the photos of George W. dancing naked on top of a bar:

Carlson writes: "Bush stops grinning. His eyes narrow . . . he thrusts his face toward mine. 'People are spreading this garbage,' he says angrily. 'They think its like a high school election, where if you beat up your opponent enough you can win. They've lost their f—ing minds.' "

Who are "they"?

Every other Presidential candidate, answers Bush.

Then, in a nasty essay called "Boy Bush—Another Perpetual Adolescent," which appears in the Sept. 13 issue of the old-line conservative Republican magazine *National Review*, Bush is described as the kind of kid who might have tortured small creatures. Author Richard Brookhiser implies that he's not the kind of man who you would want with his hand on the nuclear trigger.

To illustrate the point, Brookhiser says, take the example of Bush's mocking imitation of Karla Faye Tucker, the death row inmate in Texas, whom Governor Bush killed last year after she appealed to him for clemency. According to *Talk* magazine, " 'Please,' Bush whimpers, his lips pursed in mock desperation, 'don't kill me.' " The reporter says that Bush was getting even with the dead woman, executed when he rejected the clemency, because she had suggested that he was succumbing to election-year pressure from the pro-death penalty lobby.

And in the *Times* of London on Sept. 13, columnist Lord William Rees-Mogg, one of the most avid of the British Clinton-bashers, writes, "There are some reasons for thinking that George Bush could conceivably be beaten. He, like Michael Portillo (former British Defense Minister, who recently confessed to homosexual encounters), has faced the delicate task of confessing to youthful indiscretions. He has not quite admitted, as yet, to using cocaine, but his denials are so qualified

in terms of time *as to amount to an admission*. . . . In Texas, drug users are locked up for a first offense” (emphasis added). Lord Rees-Mogg points out that Portillo would be in much worse trouble politically if he had thrown first offenders in jail for homosexual acts, while covering up his own affairs. Such political trouble could be in store for George W., since Americans “are deeply concerned about drugs.” George W. has a real problem “whether to admit to his own cocaine use,” repeats Rees-Mogg, with an air of certainty.

A monster with two heads

From London, to New York, to Washington, the word is beginning to seep out that even with the \$50 million in campaign funds lined up by Daddy Bush’s friends, George W. could be losing it. According to insider Republican circles, Bush is derisively known as “the Anointed One,” and while he might still be capable of buying the Republican nomination, he’s facing serious obstacles.

First of all, George W.’s lie that he is “independent” from his father’s administration and record is a joke, and the attempt by the Bush circle to use the “Russian” corruption scandal against President Clinton (and tangentially against Al Gore) is about to backfire (see article in this issue on George W.’s foreign policy advisers, p. 75).

Secondly, the Republican leadership is desperately attempting to avoid a strong “third party” candidacy that would split the Republican Party by drawing away the conservative vote. Recent reports reveal that in 1992, when President Bush sought reelection, an informal coalescing of the Patrick Buchanan forces inside the Republican Party, and the supporters of the independent candidacy of H. Ross Perot, sunk the older Bush in November.

But this time, there is a serious process of discussion under way, in which top officials of Perot’s Reform Party, such as Pat Choate, Perot’s 1996 Vice Presidential candidate, are anxious to formally sign up Buchanan as the Reform Party’s 2000 Presidential candidate.

On Sept. 14, *Washington Post* reporter David S. Broder takes up Buchanan’s potential as a threat to Bush, in an op-ed titled “Patrick Buchanan: Third Force?” Broder doesn’t like Buchanan’s politics, but says, “My gut tells me that . . . the opening for a third party candidate is large, and likely to grow larger.” Broder says that he doesn’t believe the *Washington Post*-ABC polls purporting to show that “62 percent of the people surveyed would be satisfied” with a choice between Gore and George W. Bush.

British observer Rees-Mogg reports a similar hunch—that American voters aren’t such a happy lot. There is an “anti-establishment” current brewing. He says, “Hollywood and the Internet tell Americans that there is really only one establishment, a monster with two heads, one Democrat and one Republican.”

Indeed, the biggest trouble for George W. comes from the fact that he *needs* Al Gore, Jr. to have any serious chance at

the White House. Bush depends on Gore, the Democrats’ own “Anointed One”—at least until recently—to silence any opposition in the Democratic Party.

Over Labor Day weekend, the Democratic Party’s third candidate, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., fielded questions from about 1,000 attendees at a conference organized by the Schiller Institute and International Caucus of Labor Committees (see last week’s issue). LaRouche highlighted the paradox confronting voters, especially in the African-American community, who have to stand up to Gore’s bully tactics, or face the reality that Gore getting the Democratic nomination means that Bush will win the White House. The Democratic Party regulars are being driven by “public opinion,” said LaRouche, the disease by which the American people destroyed themselves. Going against such majority “public opinion,” and going with the truth, in true self-interest and true national interest, means defeating Al Gore and George W. Bush. In Bush’s case, he will be defeated by the “sins of the father,” said LaRouche. Ironically, the same fate can befall Al Gore, Jr.

At the same conference, LaRouche collaborator Dennis Speed detailed the overt lies told by Gore about his father, Sen. Al Gore, Sr.’s, civil rights record, in an effort to gain support from the NAACP and African Americans. Speed, a prominent African-American leader, exposed how Gore’s father had, in fact, voted *against* the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which was written to hasten the end of segregation (see *EIR*, Sept. 10).

A turning point

Earlier this year, LaRouche forecast that by September, Gore’s nomination would be in question, if not out the window. The anti-Gore bandwagon is getting bigger, as more top Wall Street figures defect; Edgar Bronfman, a chieftain of the Zionist Lobby, is leading a fundraiser for Bush in New York next month. Earlier, Maurice Greenberg, head of the AIG insurance group, and one of Gore’s earliest Wall St. backers, moved over to Bush.

The voters are getting the message. The first week in September, for the first time, Democratic Party challenger Bill Bradley was closing in to a few percentage points of Gore’s voters in New Hampshire, according to a WMUR/CNN poll. This poll has Gore with 46%, against Bradley’s 41% (with a large part of the remaining voters supporting unidentified “other candidates”). Last May, Bradley only had 23% in a poll by the same organization.

And one of the biggest setbacks for Gore is major opposition from the labor movement. According to Democratic Party insiders, Gore desperately needs an early endorsement from the AFL-CIO, which is holding its national convention in October in Los Angeles. But three of the major industrial/manufacturing unions won’t touch Gore because of his policy of free trade, and specifically his forcing through of the North American Free Trade Agreement.