

Obama Makes Radical Change, By Shifting to the ‘Right’

by Nancy Spannaus

“I’ve been struck by the speed and decisiveness of his move to the center,” said Will Marshall of the “centrist” Progressive Policy Institute of presumptive Democratic Party Presidential nominee Barack Obama, as reported in the June 28 *Los Angeles Times*. Marshall’s Institute is a spinoff from the nearly defunct Democratic Leadership Council, the de facto Republican wing of the Democratic Party epitomized by Joe Lieberman, and now generally spent.

What is Barack Obama doing to win the praise of these has-beens, and why?

Indeed, the pattern has been stunning. In the weeks following Hillary Clinton’s suspension of her Presidential campaign, Obama has changed his positions on a range of issues on which he had seemed to stake his political identity as a man of principle and of the common people—from Constitutional issues like the FISA law and the death penalty, to the matter of public campaign financing. While such shifts are not uncommon in American political history, Obama had staked a large portion of his reputation on the assertion that he represented a different kind of politics, a politics based on principle, not the prevailing political winds. Now, however, one could say that his very traditional political roots are showing—that of going where the (big) money is.

In the mid-phase of the Presidential primary campaign, after Clinton had won the Texas and Pennsylvania contests, Lyndon LaRouche reached out to the Obama campaign, pointing out that a large portion of his constituency came from the lower 80% of income brackets, and that their interests should be the primary consideration in the conduct of the Presidential campaign.

LaRouche wrote: “Therefore, let us now choose this moment of crisis to affirm that the constituencies associat-



barackobama.com

Barack Obama’s July 1 announcement of his own “faith-based initiative,” shown here, was made in Zanesville, Ohio. It could not have failed to remind people of George Bush’s religious pitch.

ed recently with the cause of Senator Obama’s campaign will be assured, by all of us—at the least, most of us—of the promotion and protection of those citizens’ interest in our Presidency, more than the special considerations which might be sought as the rewards of a successful candidate for the Presidential nomination and Presidency. Most of those citizens, like the rank and file of the supporters of Obama’s and Senator Hillary Clinton’s candidacies, have inherent rights which must be protected by the institution of the Presidency. It is those rights, especially those of the lower eighty percentile of our family income-brackets, which must be served as a commitment to be expected of

all of us who care.”

Yet, in the current moment of apparent victory, it is the interests of these forgotten men and women, which Obama appears to have decided to ignore. In the midst of the current intensifying economic and social crisis, such a turn, as LaRouche points out in the accompanying statement, augurs disaster not only for Obama’s campaign, but for the nation as a whole.

The ‘Issues’

The two most prominent shifts which Obama has made came on what were previously his signature issues: campaign finance, and the illegal warrantless wire-tapping program of the Bush Administration, which would be enshrined in the revisions to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA).

Obama had promised, both his constituents and the McCain campaign, that he would take public financing for the general election, allegedly as a symbol of his commitment to being responsive to the people, and not to big money. The excuse for changing that position? Behind all the gobbledygook, the only explanation is that it will permit what is already a quarter-billion dollar campaign, to grow even larger.

What has been more alarming to Obama’s constituency, was his shift on the FISA issue, toward support for a compromise with (i.e., capitulation to) the Bush Administration’s program of warrantless wiretaps, and immunity for telecom companies that violated the Constitution at the Bush-Cheney regime’s demand. MoveOn.org, the George Soros-backed Internet operation which played a crucial role in building Obama’s campaign in the first place, is enraged, and flooding his offices with demands that he back a filibuster of the bill. There is no indication that that will happen.

But these are not the only issues where Obama has shifted to the right. On July 1, Obama announced his own “faith-based initiative,” in an obvious copy-cat of the Bush Administration’s “buy-up-the-pastors” program. On July 2, *ABC News* reported that Obama had aired a television ad in which he praised the 1996 welfare “reform” which “slashed the rolls by 80%.” This notorious “Contract with America” program, sold to President Clinton by Dick Morris and Al Gore, is anathema to most unionists and low-income Democrats—as it previously was to Senator Obama.

Obama’s foreign policy shifts have been less pronounced, but the fact remains, as *EIR* has previously reported, that his key foreign policy advisors, Anthony Lake and

As of Now, Obama Would Lose!

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The LaRouche Political Action Committee issued this release on July 1, 2008.

Unless there is an early, and sudden, end to the change in recent direction of his wildly shifting campaign postures, London-steered Senator Obama is destined to lose his effort to win the November U.S. Presidential election. His double-crossing of the core of those many Democrats who had supported his earlier campaign for the Democratic nomination, especially in his recent, open turn to radically right-wing, London-steered allegiances and campaign postures, has the hall-marks of a man who has been pre-programmed for political self-destruction by, chiefly, his own hand.

At this time, he should fear no adversary more deadly than himself. It is time to change the baby; either he changes his own diapers, so to speak, or the stench from the dia-

pers will change his candidacy.

The root of the problem is, that Obama, like most of the current pre-election campaigning to date, has been controlled, like the present leaderships of the U.S. Congress, from imperial London, with the principal control exerted, so far, by the Fabian gang associated with the late Tony Blair and Brown on whom Blair dumped the occupation of Blair’s own dirtied political diapers. Now, with the faltering of what had seemed to be the careening juggernaut of the fascist Lisbon Treaty package, and with the greatest financial crisis in all modern history now in a new, more awfully advanced phase of coming down on the world as a whole, the only way the Fabian fascists’ scheme could prevail in the way they have intended would be something like a massive air attack on Iran, by surrogates acting for the current Bush Administration.

This is not to say that McCain could not blow his chances. What is certain among the uncertainties of today, is that most things are about to change radically. The choice of change which will occur, remains uncertain, except that those who are the wrongest among us all, are those who refuse to accept the fact that, the kind of change which they refuse to expect, whatever that might prove to be, is the only certainty in the world’s present situation.

Susan Rice, are in total agreement with Republican Presidential candidate John McCain's advisors on a confrontation strategy against Iran, which includes "preventive military action."

Fundamentals

The core problem with Obama's shift to the right, however, is that he is abandoning the key Democratic constituencies on the most fundamental issue of all, their standard of living. Obama and any intelligent advisors *know* they cannot win the Presidential race without winning the loyalty of Hillary Clinton's core committed base—the unionists, Hispanics, and other representatives of the lower 80%, who gave her her

overwhelming victories in key states such as Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania.

But Obama has done *nothing* in the direction of taking up Clinton's fighting stance, in favor of stopping home foreclosures, smashing the oil cartels and speculators, and suspending the free trade agreements which have devastated the U.S. standard of living. Instead, he went so far as to praise the post-industrial Carnegie-Mellon Institute of Pittsburgh, as representing a great future—when, in fact, it stands upon the graveyard of the previous productive heartland of America.

It's as if Obama were pre-programming himself to lose. Democrats had better ask themselves, just whose idea is that?

The Dirty Operation Against Zimbabwe: Soros, Abramoff, and British Africa

by Anton Chaitkin

The British empire's effort to overthrow the Zimbabwe government is run through the political apparatus of billionaire speculator George Soros, via the U.S. government-based National Endowment for Democracy (NED), and the NED's London partner organization, the U.K. government-funded Westminster Foundation.

The Soros Open Society Institute's southern Africa operations are, in effect, directly co-owned by the NED.

These arrangements were put in place in 2000-05 by British strategists and white plantation owners from Southern Rhodesia (the name of Zimbabwe before its 1980 independence from Britain), renewing an imperial partnership in Washington with the gangster grouping around Jack Abramoff and the NED machine. This partnership stems from the earlier British-steered covert action initiatives of the 1980s Reagan-Bush Administration, which involved Abramoff and the current NED leaders, working in the service of the South African apartheid regime, including in its assassinations, white supremacist propaganda, and spying apparatus.

George Soros himself got into the business of manipulating African governments in the 1990s, when he was already heavily invested in British imperial African plantations and mining. His current push to topple the Zimbabwe government is given clout and critical resources by the NED, through the person of its international chief David Lowe. Lowe is Abramoff's political partner, and the man who earlier hooked

the South African gestapo into an illegal U.S.A.-based spy network.

Soros and NED: On the Ground in Zimbabwe

Soros's Johannesburg-based Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa operates in ten countries. Throughout the recent agitation against the Zimbabwe regime, Reginald Matchaba-Hove has been the chairman of that Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa; he was, simultaneously, the chairman of the Zimbabwe Election Support Network (ZESN)—an anti-government "non-partisan, independent group of 38 non-governmental organisations."

On June 27, 2006, the NED presented its annual Democracy Award to Reginald Matchaba-Hove and three other African recipients. The British Broadcasting Corporation, BBC, reported on June 29: President "George Bush met the award winners from Africa for about an hour ... in the Oval Office. ... 'You could almost feel the power radiating from the Oval Office,' our reporter said. ... Mr. Bush [praised the NED's activists] for their 'courage and fortitude and strength in promoting freedom. ... My spirits are enriched by talking to freedom lovers and freedom fighters.'"

On the public record, the NED paid Matchaba-Hove's ZESN tens of thousands of dollars in 2005 to train election monitors, who were to feed the media clamor against the regime and to supply the NED machine with a database on ac-