

Editorial

Call Him Pinochet; Call It Fascism

A definite upshift in the combativeness of the Democratic Party opposition to George W. Bush's policies took place during the last week of January, with Democratic Senators' decisions to hold Condoleezza Rice and Alberto Gonzales responsible for the Administration's bad acts. But Bush's own drive for outright fascist economic policies won't be stopped, unless he is beaten thoroughly on his attempt to "privatize" and loot America's number-one social insurance program, Social Security.

What will it take to beat Bush? Lyndon LaRouche has made his method clear: He named Social Security privatization "the Pinochet plan," and has put in circulation 600,000 copies since Christmas of a pamphlet proving that. LaRouche has insisted that to treat the move to dismantle Social Security as a pragmatic "issue," on which White House false claims could simply be countered by true facts from the Democrats, would not work. The policy had to be given its right name, the "Chile model" of 1970s-80s fascist looting of economies. It had to be made clear that this kind of looting is an existential threat to the United States, *and an international phenomenon* which could only be stopped in the United States. The mission, LaRouche said, is to bring down Bush, by beating his attempt to impose the fascist "Chile model" on the American republic.

This strategy broke through at the end of January. The Jan. 27 *New York Times* front-page story on the Chile model of Social Security privatization, and its disastrous failure in Chile over the past 25 years, was described accurately by ABC News that day as "borrowing a page from Lyndon LaRouche." The primary promoter of privatization is dictator Augusto Pinochet's former Labor Minister, José Piñera, and the voluble Piñera suddenly turned mum and, stung by the spread of LaRouche's exposé, refused to talk to the *Times*. By the next day, the *Times* article and the LaRouche PAC pamphlet were both circulating in Congress as ammunition against the Piñera circle's attempt to sell Bush's privatization plan.

The Chile privatization has hornswoggled and impoverished millions of now-retiring Chileans, yet it is

Bush's avowed model. Three years ago, he told the visiting President of Chile: "I think some members of Congress could take some lessons from Chile, particularly when it comes to how to run our pension plans. Our Social Security system needs to be modernized." And Bush has repeated this claim since.

The same day the *Times* broadside appeared, Democratic strategist James Carville dramatically raised the "Chile model" on CNN's "Crossfire" television program. Carville shocked right-wing commentator Robert Novak and turned the whole program around a single question: Choose! Do you want a Social Security program designed by President Franklin Roosevelt, or one designed by General Pinochet, an international criminal?

On Jan. 28, the scene shifted to Congress, with the Senate Democratic Policy Committee making the attempt to privatize Social Security the first topic of its series of oversight hearings. Again the "Chile model" came out from witnesses' testimony, along with the second Social Security privatization disaster—the one foisted on 1980s Britain by Margaret Thatcher. One witness added a grisly detail: In the 1990s when the Chilean stock market had tanked (and the "personal retirement accounts" with it), Chile's government told older workers not to retire: "Keep working until the stock market recovers!"

This is the way the fascist grab for Social Security has to be fought. This is dramatic confirmation of LaRouche's unique leadership role, the powerful activity of the LaRouche Youth Movement, and circulation of hundreds of thousands of the LPAC pamphlets. LaRouche has made the failure of the Pinochet fascist model of Social Security privatization the leading edge of the whole fight.

By the end of January, the White House was letting on that Bush and his advisors had decided on a very modest Social Security privatization plan, modelled—they said—merely on the existing Federal employees' retirement plan. This was a pure deception in itself, but an indication of fear of the potential strength of the opposition, as LaRouche's strategy gets abroad.