

Gore, Bush Choose Interchangeable Veeps

by Jeffrey Steinberg

On Jan. 11, 1995, in the immediate aftermath of the so-called “Gingrich Revolution” that gave the Republicans control of the U.S. House and Senate for the first time in nearly 50 years, Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) delivered a warning to his fellow Democrats. Speaking at a press conference at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., Senator Kennedy demanded, “Democrats must be more than warmed-over Republicans. The last thing this country needs is two Republican parties. If we fall for our opponents’ tactics . . . or engage in a bidding war to see who can be the most anti-government or the most *laissez-faire*, we will have only ourselves to blame. As Democrats we can win.”

Kennedy continued, describing the Democratic Party of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his late brother John F. Kennedy: “We are, without apology, the party that believes in assisting the poor and the disabled and the disadvantaged—but not to the detriment of the working class, which is justifiably frustrated and angry. They . . . know they are losing ground. They see the wealthiest Americans becoming wealthier. . . . The majority of Americans are working harder and making less.”

Kennedy’s warnings have now been proven right. With the Democratic Party nominating convention just days away, and with apparent Presidential nominee Al Gore having already named Sen. Joseph Lieberman (D-Conn.), the chairman of the neo-conservative Democratic Leadership Council (DLC), as his running mate, the Democratic Party has completed its “morphing” into just what Senator Kennedy warned against: a second Republican Party, with a platform indistinguishable from that of the GOP, and a Presidential slate with a track record of spitting on the interests of the core constituencies of the Democratic Party of FDR and JFK.

It is no wonder that even the whiff of dissent from within the rank-and-file of the Democratic Party has been met with Gestapo tactics, including the overt use of the Department of Justice and the FBI, to bring the labor movement and key minority leaders into lockstep with “Adolf” Gore’s march to the nomination. The theft of Lyndon LaRouche’s delegates to the nominating convention, disenfranchising more than 53,000 Arkansas Democrats, who cast their votes for him in the June primary, was perhaps the most egregious police-state move by the Gore/Democratic National Committee apparatus, but it was far from an isolated incident. Thus, Gore goes into the nominating convention, having earned the animus of

a growing number of core Democratic voters, without whose enthusiastic support he cannot even come close to winning in November.

What is worse, as LaRouche has recently observed, *both* party leaderships shut down the election process on Super Tuesday, when George W. Bush and Albert Gore purportedly vanquished all their opponents and locked up their party nominations. The life-and-death issues that *ought* to be dominating the policy debate, during a vital Presidential and Congressional election year, have been eliminated from the campaign process—beginning with the looming global financial crash, which is as likely as not to begin here in the United States, with the bursting of the Wall Street bubble.

Instead, both Bush and Gore have engaged in an insulting display of lying to the American electorate, by each claiming responsibility, on behalf of their parties, for the so-called American economic boom, which, in reality, has temporarily fattened the pockets of the upper 10-20% of the population and severely driven down the real living conditions for the vast majority.

Cheney and Lieberman

Nothing symbolized the “morphing” of the two major parties more than the selections of Dick Cheney and Joe Lieberman as the Vice Presidential running mates of Bush and Gore, respectively.

After a long career as a Washington insider politician, first as an underling of Donald Rumsfeld in the Nixon and then the Ford White House, next as a six-term Congressman, and finally as George Bush’s Secretary of Defense, Cheney moved into the oil business, as the president and chief executive officer of the Halliburton Corp. The fact that Cheney was Defense Secretary during Operation Desert Storm sat well with the wealthy oil sheiks of the Persian Gulf, and Halliburton, plying on Cheney’s name, emerged suddenly as the dominant firm in the oil service industry, selling diagnostic, drilling, and refining equipment all over the world. In return for these door-opening services, Cheney received an annual salary of \$1.3 million, and amassed an estimated \$9.8 million in Halliburton stock.

The *Wall Street Journal* and Reuters have described Bush-Cheney as the oil industry’s “dream team.” Others see the Cheney nomination as the final certification, that a George W. Bush administration would be a re-tread, in almost every respect, of the 1989-93 George H.W. Bush Presidency. If you liked “Desert Storm,” the Panama invasion, the “new world order,” and economic policies “made on Wall Street,” then the Bush Crown Prince is for you. But, as Lyndon LaRouche observed, “The Presidency is not supposed to be a hereditary office.”

The Republicans’ ‘Favorite Democrat’

Unfortunately, the “alternative” offered by the Democratic Party, with the selection of Joe Lieberman, is no

alternative at all.

Lieberman has been described by arch-conservative Sen. Sam Brownback (R-Kan.) as the Republicans “favorite Democrat,” whose voting record is to the right of many GOP members of Congress. Brownback wrote a tribute to Lieberman in the Aug. 9 *New York Times* headlined “Lieberman, My Ally,” in which he recounted his collaboration with the Connecticut Democrat and Sen. Dan Coats (R-Ind.) on a school vouchers bill for the District of Columbia, and their work to overthrow the Sudanese government. “On many issues, including Social Security reform, missile defense, and tort reform,” Brownback wrote, “Senator Lieberman has followed his conscience across party lines.”

Indeed, up and down the line, Senator Lieberman has lined up four-square with the policies of the Bush Republican gang, which in most instances, is also the policy of Gore. The differences between Bush-Cheney and Gore-Lieberman are all style and no content.

Since entering the U.S. Senate in 1988, Lieberman has been one of the architects of the wrecking of the “FDR Coalition” that was the hallmark of the Democratic Party from 1932. Not only does Lieberman chair the Democratic Leadership Council, since 1995, but also, in 1996, he and Sen. John Breaux (D-La.) launched the New Democrat movement, which aimed at transforming the Democratic Party into a party of big business, free trade, and a “tough-on-crime agenda,” including broad use of the death penalty, which has targeted African-Americans and other minorities.

New York Times political columnist David Broder captured the picture, when he described Lieberman as “an embodiment and an apostle of a Democratic philosophy that incorporates market-oriented thinking of the Reagan revolution and a muscular defense and foreign policy.” Indeed, Lieberman likes to boast that he broke the Jewish Sabbath restrictions against working on Saturday, to cast his vote for the Gulf War Resolution, which he personally co-authored, on behalf of President Bush and Cheney.

While the establishment media were singing Lieberman’s praise as a deeply religious man of impeccable morality, they had to admit, paradoxically, that he is the leading recipient of campaign funding from the insurance industry and health maintenance organizations, and is among the biggest cash recipients from the pharmaceutical industry. This is hardly a mark of “morality,” at a moment when poor people and senior citizens are being literally murdered by the takedown of quality, affordable health care, by Lieberman’s money-backers — with his complicity.

Most of all, the selection of Lieberman as Gore’s running mate, barring some disastrous blunder by George W. Bush, almost ensures that the Republicans will be occupying the White House in January 2001. This reality has not sailed over the head of Lieberman — who is still pursuing his re-election to a third U.S. Senate term, even as he campaigns for Vice President.

Europe Waging War vs. U.S. Death Penalty

by Marianna Wertz

The European Union (EU) is waging an unprecedented, almost full-time political war against the death penalty in the United States, a war that has intensified with France’s assumption of the rotating EU presidency in June, and with the fact that both major-party U.S. Presidential candidates are avid supporters of capital punishment. In a recent statement, the EU called on all U.S. Presidential candidates to endorse a moratorium on the death penalty and support the universal abolition of capital punishment.

The EU, which maintains a fully staffed office in Washington, D.C., is the treaty-based institutional framework that defines and manages economic and political cooperation among its 15 European member-countries. In 1983, the EU abolished the death penalty for its member-countries, and required abolition as a precondition for new members to join the association.

France’s presidency of the EU coincides with an aggressive policy by leading French officials, in opposition to Anglo-American “human rights” policy abroad (see “French Foul Up Albright’s ‘Democratic’ Fascist Scheme,” *EIR*, July 7, 2000). With their offensive against the death penalty in America, the French and their EU allies are now extending that opposition into questions of “human rights” in the United States.

On the EU’s American website (www.eurunion.org) is prominently listed “Action on U.S. Death Row Cases.” The associated statement explains: “The EU is deeply concerned about the increasing number of executions in the United States of America, all the more since the great majority of executions since reinstatement of the death penalty in 1976 have been carried out in the 1990s. Furthermore, in the U.S., young offenders who are under 18 years of age at the time of the commission of the crime may be sentenced to death and executed, in clear infringement of internationally recognized human rights norms.”

Executing the Mentally Retarded

In addition to executing minors, the United States also stands out as the only “civilized” nation that executes the mentally retarded. The latest démarche from the EU, dated Aug. 8 and issued from the Embassy of France, called on Texas Gov. George W. Bush, the Republican Presidential candidate, to commute the sentence of Oliver David Cruz, 33, who was mentally retarded, with an IQ that has tested as low