

Depression defeated Bush; Clinton will be next

by Kathleen Klenetsky

Slick Willie Clinton has finally fulfilled his lifelong ambition to be elected President of the United States, but unless he can deliver an immediate, substantive improvement in the U.S. economy, he will soon face the same political fate as his predecessor. That is the primary lesson to be drawn from the Nov. 3 balloting, which demonstrated a level of frustration and anger, especially over economic conditions, not seen in the U.S. electorate in decades.

Voters turned out in record numbers (over 100 million people cast ballots), providing further evidence that the U.S. population has been propelled by the collapsing economy to shake off its political apathy, at least temporarily.

While fewer congressional incumbents than predicted were turned out of office, voters approved term-limitation initiatives in all of the 14 states in which they appeared on the ballot, in a further reminder of the rampant discontent apparent in the presidential vote.

What all this means is that if Clinton does not deliver, and fast, on his promise to create jobs and boost incomes, he will find himself facing the same popular wrath that just booted George Bush from office.

No mandate

Though he emerged as the victor, Clinton will be coming to Washington with the support of less than half of the voting population. Despite the claims of the pundits and Clinton's own people, the Arkansan did not beat Bush by a landslide. Far from it. Although Clinton won by a large majority in the Electoral College, he managed to garner only 43% of the popular vote to George Bush's 38% and Ross Perot's 19%, making him the first President elected by a plurality, rather than a majority, since Richard Nixon won in 1968 with 43.4%.

Further, judging by exit polls and other measures, much

of the Clinton vote was in fact a protest vote against Bush, rather than an outpouring of enthusiasm for the Democratic challenger. The key issue which motivated that protest vote was Bush's miserable performance on the economy. Even the Clinton camp was forced to acknowledge that fact. As a sign at its Little Rock, Arkansas headquarters put it, "It was the economy, stupid."

In another sign of the population's displeasure with the two major party candidates—and with politics-as-usual in general—independent candidate Ross Perot won 19% of the popular vote. This was the best showing by any independent presidential candidate since Teddy Roosevelt's Bull Moose run in 1912.

According to Lyndon LaRouche, who waged a vigorous independent presidential campaign from prison, the election outcome amounted to the "political lynching" of Bush, with the economy the key factor behind his defeat. In a radio interview on Nov. 4, LaRouche asserted that Clinton's low popular vote was clear evidence that the President-elect did not receive a mandate.

Noting that Clinton's policies will be dictated by such establishment interests as the investment firms of Goldman, Sachs and Lazard Frères (which engineered Clinton's presidential campaign from the get-go), LaRouche predicted that if Clinton does not reject these policies, and quickly adopt the chief elements of LaRouche's economic recovery program, beginning with the nationalization of the Federal Reserve, his administration will have "a very short honeymoon" before being overwhelmed by a major financial catastrophe.

Another Trilateral disaster

As things look now, that catastrophe appears to be a near certainty. The new administration is shaping up as a

combination of the worse features of the Carter administration, with the addition of a heavy dose of input from the so-called neo-conservative crowd—the Israeli-linked gang, epitomized by Irving Kristol and Jeane Kirkpatrick, that brought us the Iran-Contra fiasco and the Project Democracy destabilization machine.

Clinton, like Carter, was thrust into national prominence by the Trilateral Commission—Slick Willie has been a member since late 1988, when he first toyed with the idea of running for the presidency—and the Trilateral crowd is crowing about their latest presidential coup.

A senior Trilateral Commission figure in Europe gloated in a recent interview that Trilateralists dominate the Clinton advisory team, most notably, Felix Rohatyn of Lazard Frères, “who has been very much on the top of the list as a possible treasury secretary.” Other key Clinton Trilateralists, he said, include trade policy adviser Paula Stern; economic policy adviser Robert Hormats of Goldman, Sachs; and former Carter-era State Department official Warren Christopher. He also cited rumors that former U.S. Federal Reserve chairman Paul Volcker might be made Clinton’s treasury secretary as further evidence of the Trilateralist influence in the new administration, adding only: “The problem is, we’d hate to lose Volcker as the Trilateral Commission’s North American chairman.”

The commission will hold its next annual international plenary in Washington from late March to early April of next year—just two months after Clinton’s inauguration. “We have such a wonderful topic planned for the occasion, since in each plenary, we have a session on the host country,” said a Trilateral source. “Now, with the election results, the discussion will be even more exciting!”

Trouble for Bill

While the Trilateralists may be gloating now, Clinton’s future is hardly assured. Although Clinton will try to jack up the economy by the infusion of some public works funds early in his administration, this can only produce a very minor, short-term increase in jobs, at best. Otherwise, he will be under intense pressure from his Trilateral and Wall Street handlers to ram through a range of domestic and international measures which can only destroy whatever support he may currently enjoy.

Domestically, Clinton will be expected to force through cutbacks in entitlement programs (Social Security, Medicare, etc.), as well as to restructure the U.S. health care system through cost-cutting and restrictions on high-technology medical care. Should he succeed, he will alienate large portions of his voting base.

Former Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wisc.) put it succinctly in a commentary in the Oct. 28 *USA Today*. “Whether Bush or Clinton is elected,” he wrote, “the next Congress can expect . . . the most draconian deficit-reduction program proposed to a Congress by a President in our long history.”

This is particularly true if Clinton becomes President, “and the Democratic Party is given full responsibility to produce” the austerity measures demanded by the establishment.

If the electorate has given Clinton any mandate, it is to improve the living standard of the average American—not to make it worse. But that’s exactly what Clinton has been put in office to do, even if it means the destruction of his own political ambitions.

In the international arena, Clinton can be expected to follow much the same “new world order” policy as did Bush. Both Clinton and Gore were among the few well-known Democrats who solidly supported the Persian Gulf war. And both staunchly back the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) as negotiated by the Bush administration.

Clinton has made it clear in his foreign policy pronouncements of the last year that, unlike Jimmy Carter, he has no qualms about engaging U.S. military forces, especially in Third World “hot spots,” and that he intends to seek a greater military role for the U.N. The Nov. 4 Swiss daily *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* predicted that the Clinton-Gore team would be even more inclined to deploy military force abroad than the Reagan and Bush administrations.

The new administration can also be expected to pursue trade war against Europe and Asia even more aggressively than did its immediate predecessors. Clinton has said he will create a new Economic Security Council, on the model of the National Security Council, which will be charged with coordinating economic policy, and treating trade policy as an aspect of national security.

This has not been lost on potential targets. Much of the immediate post-election coverage in Europe and Asia was given over to warnings about the Clinton administration’s trade policy. The day before the elections, Madrid’s *El País* published an analysis headlined “Europe Fears Trade War with the U.S.,” which warned, “If Clinton gets to the White House, many experts say, tariff wars will break out for certain.” In Japan, Foreign Minister Michio Watanabe predicted on Nov. 4 that U.S.-Japan trade friction could intensify under a Clinton regime, a view echoed by other leaders in Asia.

Israel was about the only foreign nation to greet Clinton’s election with unalloyed joy. That’s hardly surprising, given Clinton’s extensive links with the Israeli lobby in the United States. Indeed, on the day after his election, those ties popped up in the media in a rather embarrassing context. The *Washington Times* reported that the head of the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the premier pro-Israel lobbying group in the United States, was forced to resign after boasting to a potential contributor about AIPAC’s influence in the Clinton camp. “We have a dozen people in [Clinton’s] headquarters,” AIPAC head David Steiner told Harry Katz. Sen. Al Gore “is very committed to us.” Asked whom Clinton would choose as secretary of state, Steiner replied: “I don’t know yet; we’re negotiating.” Whoever is chosen, “we’ll have access,” he said.