

fighting against organized crime, international drug traffic, and dirty money laundering.”

From words to deeds?

Even though the general trend of the document is interesting, how can anyone seriously believe that the government of Jospin will move to realize such policies? The fine phrases are not concretized by any specific proposal. A closer study of the measures announced by Jospin in Strasbourg aimed at penalizing companies which abuse labor flexibility laws and which do not create jobs, shows that the proposed reforms do not go very far. In fact, most of them have still to be negotiated with the company owners themselves, or among the different government ministries.

Typical of the “anti-liberal mood” of the Socialist Party is an interview given by Finance Minister Dominique Strauss-Kahn, known as a “social-liberal,” to *Nouvel Observateur* of Oct. 13, run under the title, “No, We Are Not Liberals!” Here, Strauss-Kahn develops the new credo: The new name of the game is “new forms of regulations,” as Jospin told the Strasbourg assembly. But when Jospin was questioned about the fact that “governments, by relinquishing traditional instruments of control, have . . . created a situation where ‘monetary policies’ are no longer defined by the governments, but by the ‘central banks,’ ” he replied, “False, totally false,” and argued that “the creation of the euro constitutes a gain in sovereignty for France.” What do words about “regulation” mean to such a person? When questioned about what the state can do in the case of Michelin, Jospin thinks it sufficient to say that 1) “the state must declare . . . that it is infinitely shocking that a company can” fire all those people; and 2) the state must promote 35-hour-week negotiations with the company and threaten the company with increasing its social security payments, if it does not contribute to reducing the layoffs.

Just as Jospin was speaking out against too much labor flexibility, Martine Aubry, the Economics and Social Affairs Minister, was defending her 35-hour-week bill at the National Assembly. There was massive opposition to this even from the Socialist deputies, because although the 35 hours will be paid the equivalent of 39 hours, those 39 hours come out to 4,831 francs per month—less than the minimum wage, which is 5,453 francs. The Socialist Party deputies and others feared, with good reason, that companies would take advantage of this loophole and immediately have everybody who is presently employed at the minimum wage, rehired at the costs of the new 35-hour contract, leading to significant cuts in the actual minimum wage. Aubry, however, was adamant in refusing to establish the new 35-hour week at the level of the present minimum wage, because that would be too heavy a burden on employers.

If the anti-Blair document represents a real shift in the current situation, it will take a lot more pressure to get the present government of France to go fully in the direction outlined by that memorandum.

The Devil’s triangle: Bush, Gore, and ‘Dirty Dick’ Morris

by Michele Steinberg

The treasonous financier oligarchy that Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche identifies as the British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) faction in the United States, is in quandary over the Year 2000 elections. Despite this oligarchy’s determination to ram a choice between Gore and Bush down the throats of the American voters, the strategy has not worked. And, as the panic grows over the disintegration of the international financial markets, moves by George W. Bush in recent weeks reveal that his policies are a mirror image of the “Third Way/triangulation” policies that have doomed Vice President Al Gore’s bid for the Presidency.

Gore, like his other “Third Way” allies, is going down the tubes. And if the Gore candidacy is ended, the Bush potential is in trouble—George W. Bush, possibly the dumbest candidate to be fielded in recent history, according to observers such as *U.S. News and World Report*, would lose to any serious candidate. The way is open for a miracle, especially with LaRouche, campaigning as the true bearer of the Franklin D. Roosevelt tradition, on the scene.

On Oct. 5, the London *Financial Times*, one of the flagship newspapers of the BAC and the British Empire, signalled the end of Al Gore. Quoting extensively from unnamed officials of the British Foreign Office, the *Financial Times* takes a swipe not only at Gore, but at British Prime Minister Tony Blair for supporting him. Blair is already under fire for his increasingly erratic behavior which includes, sources say, plans to send some of his own election experts and polling officials to help out Gore. The *Financial Times* warns:

“‘We cannot repeat the mistake Major made with Clinton,’ said an official [from the Foreign Office], referring to former British Prime Minister [John] Major’s endorsement of George Bush, Sr., when he ran against Clinton.

“‘If Blair backs Gore, and Bush (Jr.) wins, it would be a disaster. But the more Gore appears to be in trouble, the more the Prime Minister seems to want to help him.’ ”

On Oct. 9, just after Gore announced he was moving his campaign headquarters “back home” to Nashville, Tennessee, the Anglophile *New York Times* echoed the *Financial Times*: “Mr. Gore finds himself in a harrowing battle for his party’s nomination.” The *New York Times* says that Gore



Gore's new campaign strategy

began the campaign with more insider backing and “more institutional advantages than any candidate in modern times,” but it then comes very close to announcing that Gore won’t get the nomination. The *Times* quotes Roy Neel, a Gore confidant who had served as the Vice President’s first Chief of Staff, saying, “We have to stop the bleeding,” and campaign workers are described as “unnerved, if not panicked.”

Bush pushes the ‘Third Way’

As Gore’s fortunes were plummeting, George W. Bush grabbed headlines anew, allegedly “shocking” the right-wing Republican Congressional leadership by criticizing them for trying to “balance the budget on the backs of the poor.” Gingrichite House Majority Leader Dick Armey (R-Tex.) and his cronies were, indeed, trying to force through a hare-brained scheme to steal back a poor- and working-class tax rebate, by spreading out the payments over an entire year, instead of giving, as promised, a lump-sum payment—the usual tax refund Americans look forward to, and which poor Americans depend on. In a speech on education at New York’s Manhattan Institute, Bush knocked the Conservative Revolution’s pessimism, claiming that America is not “slouching toward Gomorrah” (which also happens to be the title of a neo-con best-seller by former Federal Judge Robert Bork).

Bush’s statements caused an outcry from the ultra-right yahoos like yesteryear’s media rage, Rush Limbaugh, but astute political observers called Bush’s statement a “brilliant” move that distanced him from the hated right-wing Republicans in Congress, and helped build his image as a “Washington outsider.” But, these political observers said, the Bush move was contrived, “phony as hell . . . [and] smacks of the kind of strategy that Dick Morris pushes.”

In fact, the statement by Bush was a political move, not a policy fight, and it immediately drew high praise from “Dirty Dick” Morris, in an Oct. 12 commentary in the BAC-owned *New York Post* entitled “Why Not Victory for the GOP,” Morris lets slip the truth: George W. Bush is a “Third Way” politician.

Morris praises Bush for being a “new” Republican, saying, “[American] political debates are not endless and perpetual. We come to conclusions and move on. Triangulation is simply a willingness to embrace those decisions, implement them, and go forward. . . . It is a strategy that moves to a higher place, a third place, above either of the two parties.

“When Bill Clinton advocated both capital punishment and gun control, he articulated a realistic strategy to cut crime which worked. When he said ‘balance the budget and also strengthen Medicare,’ he transcended the sterile, repetitive debates of the past and reached new ground. . . .

“Now George W. Bush is reaching for the same wisdom from the right. He learns from history that when the rich get tax breaks, they spend the money on yachts and villas and that when the government gets money, it squanders it on the bureaucracy and the unions. So he calls for a third way: tax credits to encourage charitable donations to mobilize the voluntary and faith-based sector to step into the breach and help the poor.

“Bush realizes that a rising tide does not lift all boats. . . . Our national life has seen an oscillation between periods of debate and those of consensus. When we face a new threat . . . we polarize and debate. . . . Then we triangulate and come together over a common solution. . . . We veered left with Clinton and right with Gingrich until we triangulated, balanced the budget, cut welfare, reduced crime and catalyzed a decade of prosperity. . . . It’s the genius of our system and George W. Bush seems to get it.”

Gore and ‘Dirty Dick’ Morris

To appreciate just how much of a stampede *away* from Gore this Morris statement reflects, look at Morris’s column from January 1999 when, at the height of the impeachment proceedings against Clinton, he urged the President to step down, and let Gore finish out the remainder of the term. This, said Morris, would “put VP Gore in the Oval Office with the head start a two-year run-up would give him to a race in 2000. If he were then re-elected in 2004, he would be the second-longest serving President in history, after FDR’s 12-plus years.”

At the time, Morris, the embittered former consultant to the Clinton-Gore campaign, was not just a columnist. As a witness and adviser to both special prosecutor Kenneth Starr and to the House Managers who prosecuted Clinton in the impeachment, Morris was trying to oust the President, as part of the BAC coup.

Gore had been Morris’s key ally in implementing the “Third Way,” as *EIR* documented in its January 1999 article,

“Al Gore and Dick Morris: The Unholy Alliance ‘Behind the Oval Office.’ ” *EIR* reported: “During the 1996 Clinton reelection campaign, Lyndon LaRouche, then a candidate in the Democratic Presidential primary elections, warned President Clinton to purge the White House of so-called political consultant Richard ‘Dirty Dick’ Morris. Morris, the cousin-once-removed and protégé of the late gangster attorney and closet homosexual Roy Cohn, slithered between the White House and his clients among the President’s arch-enemies, the Republican Confederates, collecting and passing on bits of gossip and compromising information on Clinton.

“. . . For a time, Morris was President Clinton’s chief reelection campaign strategist—to the tune of \$20,000 a month in ‘consulting fees.’ Some of the President’s men labelled Morris a ‘GOP double agent’ and a ‘Republican mole.’ In a June 27, 1995 Knight-Ridder story, Sandy Grady wrote that ‘some Clinton loyalists compare Morris to Rasputin, the 19th-century Russian mystic and faith healer who led the Tsar’s family to destruction.’

“Morris was ousted as a campaign adviser in August 1996, during the Democratic nominating convention, when details of his affair with a call girl, and his foot fetish—especially sucking the toes of his sexual partners—broke in *The Star* supermarket tabloid and was then reported on the front page of the *New York Post*.

“Morris blamed his ‘enemies’ in the White House for leaking the information that led to photographs and tape-recordings of his trysts. Morris . . . is still trying to get even.

“In two interviews . . . Morris made a remarkable revelation: While he had a lot of opposition in the White House, he also had an ally—Vice President Al Gore, Jr.

“**Fact:** Gore and Morris ran a ‘Mutt and Jeff’ routine against President Clinton, to force him to break with the ‘liberal wing’ of the Congressional Democrats, who were engaged in something like hand-to-hand combat against House Speaker Newt Gingrich and his Conservative Revolutionaries. Gore and Morris’s message was: Scrap the ‘general welfare’ clause of the U.S. Constitution, and chart a ‘New Democratic,’ ‘Third Way’ course, which Morris described as ‘triangulating,’ between the embattled Congressional Democrats and the Newtzis.

“**Fact:** Gore and Morris teamed up to ram through the 1996 Welfare Reform Act, over White House and Cabinet objections, in order to ‘out-Gingrich Gingrich.’ It was President Clinton’s capitulation to this deal, which jettisoned the Franklin Roosevelt coalition of traditional Democratic constituencies, and . . . kept the Gingrichite fascists in power in the Congress in both the 1996 and 1998 elections.”

Gore’s campaign is collapsing

Gore’s devotion to the “Third Way/triangulation” policy is the very reason that he is unelectable, but neither he nor anybody else in his Democratic National Committee-domi-

nated campaign will change direction.

The polls on Gore’s troubles are more devastating every week: A *USA Today/CNN* poll released on Oct. 11 showed a dramatic leap in support for Democratic candidate Bill Bradley. The new poll shows that Gore is now ahead of Bradley by only 12 percentage points (Gore at 51%, Bradley at 39%). A month ago, Gore led Bradley by 33 percentage points (Gore’s 63%, to Bradley’s 30%).

This latest collapse in Gore’s support came *after* Gore “reinvented” his campaign, maybe for the last time, and moved back to Tennessee. Some people compare Gore’s campaign shakeup as “rearranging the deck chairs on the *Titanic*.” National media mock the campaign fiasco. In the Oct. 11 *New Yorker*, reporter Jane Mayer wrote, “A close associate of Gore’s compares the Vice President to ‘the guy who gets a divorce, and decides he wants to change his whole life, so he paints every room in his house blue. It may make him feel better, but is it really what matters?’ ” According to Mayer, even President Clinton is expressing his doubts about the viability of Gore’s campaign more openly. “President Clinton suggested to a confidant that the only reason Gore ever sought the Presidency was to please his father, Tennessee’s Sen. Al Gore, Sr. . . . ‘The President . . . thinks that ‘a lot of Gore’s baggage is his father.’ ”

Predictions of a defeat for Gore are now common. “The Gore candidacy is in collapse in the Northeast,” is the quote from McCormack Institute director Lou DiNatale, from the University of Massachusetts, reported in the Oct. 8 *Boston Globe*. The *Globe* headline reads, “Surging Bradley Dominates Mass. Poll.” The article reports on the just-released McCormack Institute poll, which shows Bradley running eight points ahead of Gore among Democratic primary voters (43% to 35%). The survey marks an “11-point shift in Bradley’s favor since a University of Massachusetts poll in June showed Gore leading 38-35%.”

DiNatale says, “This poll confirms that at the very least there is a race to the convention, it could even be a March knockout by Bradley.” There are some two dozen 20-25 primaries and caucuses in March, with half of these on March 7, “Super-Tuesday.”

But national polls show that the Democratic Party had better wake up. The *USA Today/CNN* national poll, and indeed every other poll taken this year, shows that George W. Bush, with his \$50 million war chest and major BAC support, still has a devastating lead over both Gore and Bradley. Yet, the Gore-controlled Democratic National Committee is still applying pressure to muffle the LaRouche campaign, and keep LaRouche out of candidates events and debates. Some top Democrats are beginning to wake up to the fact that not only would a Gore ticket lose the White House in the Year 2000, but the coattails will drag the Democratic Party to lose the Congress, again, as well. This state of affairs could be the very crisis that opens the way to the “LaRouche miracle.”