

tion to 128 among the public and key policymakers, since only the committee made clear that Propositions 128 and 130 were, in fact, *eco-fascism*—fascism with an ecological face—that would “shut down our farms and factories, and cut your family’s standard of living.”

The critical role of LaRouche’s associates in communicating this message was underlined perhaps best by Tom Hayden himself. When confronted by a “Stop Eco-Fascism” representative at a debate on the initiative and asked if he weren’t in fact trying to set up “an eco-fascist police state, with you [Hayden] as the eco-Führer,” Hayden could only blurt out: “At least it won’t be with Lyndon LaRouche!”

Vote against taxes, depression

Virtually every California ballot proposition which had a substantial price tag attached to it went down to defeat, including bond measures for prison construction, public schools, and the “war on drugs.” Despite the shallowness of the campaign waged by the industry-sponsored “No on 128, the Hayden Initiative,” their campaign did stress that there would be massive costs associated with Proposition 128. The developing Mideast war crisis also appears to have played a role in the defeat of Proposition 128, as well as the fear of higher gas prices due to so-called global warming and the carbon dioxide reduction sections of the measure. The *Sacramento Bee* published an analysis piece on the proposal several weeks before the election which noted that the crisis in the Gulf meant “rough going” for Big Green.

While it would be an exaggeration to argue that the overwhelming defeat of Proposition 128 indicates a complete repudiation by voters of radical environmentalism and malthusianism, it is clear that the election outcome does mean that voters are increasingly associating environmental measures with job loss and cuts in their standards of living. And as even California sinks into the depths of the onrushing depression, this is the beginning of the kind of political awakening necessary to reverse the past 25 years of environmentalist sabotage of productive agriculture and industry.

But eco-fascists never learn

Far from abandoning its anti-growth, malthusian, “environmental protection” program, the environmentalist movement plans to continue pushing the same garbage contained in Proposition 128, although in a piecemeal, issue-by-issue fashion, through the legislature and with the signature of the new Republican governor, Pete Wilson. The tip-off to this orientation was an editorial in the Oct. 29 *Los Angeles Times* opposing 128 as “bad environmental science.” The *Times* argued that the machinery was already in place, *without* 128, to impose the environmental agenda, and referenced the Clean Air Act, the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s draconian air pollution control program, and recent actions by the state’s Air Resources Board.

The process by which the zero-growth environmental

agenda is already being imposed in California is exemplified by the ongoing takeover of key public and private utilities by hard-core malthusians. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, the nation’s largest public utility and historically one of the bastions of pro-nuclear, pro-water, and pro-development outlooks, has been taken over from the top by environmentalists. Over the past several months, Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley has orchestrated a coup at DWP, by appointing several environmentalists to the board of directors of the utility; the environmentalist faction now controls a majority of the board. One key appointee is Mary Nichols, formerly a staff attorney with the Natural Resources Defense Council. At the same time, the new chief executive officer of Southern California Edison, the largest private utility company in the nation, is John E. Bryson, an attorney who co-founded the NRDC. Albert Meyerhoff, another attorney for the NRDC, was one of the authors of Hayden’s Proposition 128.

Depression shows no incumbent is safe

by Webster G. Tarpley

The Nov. 6 midterm elections were a serious defeat for George Bush, and at the same time a barometer of the rising mass-strike mood of large sectors of the U.S. population as war approaches and depression deepens. But while voters humiliated Bush, they did not inflict such massive damage on Republican candidates as to paralyze Bush and reduce him to undeniable lame-duck status: That would have required far more than the GOP’s net loss of one Senate seat, nine House seats, and one governorship.

The clearest repudiation of incumbents came in the governors’ races, where 14 of 36 state executive posts changed hands from one party to another. Governors were targeted by anti-establishment, anti-incumbency voters because it was they who, during most of this year, have personified the budget crisis of government in the depression. Not one governorship was uncontested. The majority of the population became aware of de facto national bankruptcy on the federal level only in October.

The biggest concentration of these gubernatorial turn-overs came in the Northeast, where the economic depression is the deepest, and where state budget crises had already forced a number of governors to give up their plans for reelection last spring. In Rhode Island, Democrat Bruce Sundlun

defeated Republican incumbent Edward DiPrete by a 74-26% margin. In Connecticut, independent Lowell Weicker, a liberal Republican retread, was elected, and the Democrats, who had been in power longer than in any other state, garnered only 21% of the vote. In Massachusetts, police-state figure William Weld takes over from the discredited Michael Dukakis machine, while in Vermont, Republican ex-governor Richard Snelling returns that party to power. In Maine, GOP Gov. John McKernan was shocked by his narrow margin of reelection.

In New York, much-touted presidential contender Mario Cuomo was embarrassed by his 53% winning margin against four weak opponents. "This is a blow for the governor," said former New York Mayor Ed Koch. "At the very least he should have gotten 60% of the vote." Cuomo failed to break the Republican hold on the New York State Senate, and failed to secure voter approval for an environmental bond issue he had campaigned for. In New Jersey, the tax revolt against Democratic Gov. Jim Florio very nearly brought about the defeat of another presidential hopeful, Sen. Bill Bradley (D), who eked out 51% over Christina Todd Whitman.

A similar tendency to vote out the incumbent governor irrespective of party label was visible in the Great Lakes rust-bucket, where Democrats had long had the upper hand: Democrat James Blanchard lost in Michigan, while Republican George Voinovich bested Democrat Anthony Celebrezze in Ohio in the race to replace Democratic incumbent Richard Celeste. By contrast, Democrats captured previous Republican strongholds in the Sunbelt, winning the governorships of Florida and Texas from the GOP to control the redrawing of new congressional districts there on the basis of the 1990 census. The Texas defeat was a special humiliation for Bush, who had campaigned for three whole days for Clayton Williams in the last days of the campaign, joining the Republican phone team to urge individual voters to vote for the GOP. Bush has thus been repudiated in what he considers to be his home state. In Florida, Jeb Bush, the President's son, was the campaign manager of defeated Republican incumbent Gov. Bob Martinez, for whom the President also campaigned heavily.

Signs of discontent multiplied in the Midwest and the farm belt. Minnesota was the most anti-incumbent state, turning out Democratic Gov. Rudy Perpich (despite a last minute GOP switch to Arne Carlson for governor), and Republicans Sen. Rudy Boschwitz and Rep. Arlan Stangeland. Boschwitz had campaigned on the basis of his support for the Bush deficit reduction package. In Nebraska, Democrat Ben Nelson scored a surprise win over Republican Gov. Kay Orr. In Kansas, Republican Gov. Mike Hayden, who had raised taxes, was turned out in favor of Democrat Linda Finney. In Oklahoma, Roman Catholic Democrat David Walters defeated a former U.S. Attorney to replace retiring Republican Gov. Henry Bellmon. In Alaska, Warren Hick-

ell, Nixon's secretary of the interior, won the governorship as the candidate of the Alaskan Independence Party. Hickell and Weicker are the first third-party governors to be elected since 1974.

Bush, the kiss of death

Bush's campaigning proved to be the kiss of death for candidates in numerous instances. Bush intervened in 18 contested races, and in 14 of these the Democrats were victorious. Republicans had encouraged House GOPers with safe seats to run for the Senate, but were only able to retain the seat of retiring Sen. Gordon Humphrey in New Hampshire while losing in five other states (Bill Schuette in Michigan, Claudine Schneider in Rhode Island, Lyn Martin in Illinois, Tom Tauke in Iowa, and Pat Saiki in Hawaii). Unlike the Reagan years, this time all Democrats ran against Bush as the champion of the plutocrats. Many Republicans followed the advice of Ed Rollins, the head of the House Republicans' campaign committee, and distanced themselves from Bush by calling for no new taxes. Others, like Republican Sen. Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, saved themselves in close races by espousing the Democrats' "soak the rich" populism and repudiating Bush's positions.

Some Republican seats may have been lost as a result of the vindictiveness of Bush's embattled White House chief of staff, John Sununu, who is thought to have engineered the defeat of New Hampshire GOP Rep. Chuck Douglas, who had bucked the White House line on taxes. Sununu may be the author of the defeat of Vermont GOP freshman Rep. Pete Smith, who had criticized Bush to his face during a campaign appearance. Here the beneficiary will be Socialist Bernard Sanders, whom Sununu may see as a potential embarrassment to House Democrats, with whom he will ask to caucus.

The House has become the branch of government most remote from the people. Here about 65 incumbents had no opponents whatsoever. In the House races, the average incumbent had eight times as much money to spend as his hapless challenger. Even so, 21 seats changed hands, and 15 incumbents were turned out, including 9 Republicans. A sub-threshold revolt against incumbents was registered in a number of close calls for incumbents like Reps. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), Guy Vander Jagt (R-Mich.), Tom Downey (D-N.Y.), Gerry Studds (D-Mass.), and Vic Fazio (D-Calif.), whose votes were around or below the 55% level that makes a House member vulnerable.

While three senators—Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), David Pryor (D-Ark.), and Thad Cochran (R-Miss.)—had no opposition, 31 incumbents spent a total of about \$135 million on their campaigns for an average of over \$4 million per incumbent, while challengers had about \$1 million each to invest. The New Jersey and Minnesota races, especially, show that as the crisis deepens, money alone cannot make an incumbent invulnerable.