

EIR Feature

Southern fried fascists seize Democratic Party

by Kathleen Klenetsky

The Democratic Party took a giant step closer to becoming an outright fascist entity at its national convention in July. Taken together with a platform that reads like an Americanized version of Mussolini idolizer Giovanni Gentile's blueprint for a corporate state, the nomination of two Southern yuppies, Bill Clinton and Al Gore, signals a phase change in the Democratic Party. No longer does the party even pretend to represent the interests of its former primary constituencies—labor, farmers, minorities, and urban ethnic groups.

Instead, the party has goosestepped right back to its origins as the vehicle for the slave-owning, anti-industrial faction of the early U.S. elite, whose commitment to British-style free trade and antipathy toward the Union ("states' rights") plunged the country into the Civil War.

'New covenant' equals new fascism

Democrat Lyndon LaRouche, who is shortly expected to announce an independent campaign for the presidency, characterized the Democratic convention as akin to Hitler's Nuremberg rallies, as orchestrated by Barnum and Bailey, and described the Clinton-Gore ticket as "a pair of Southern fried fascists who are focusing on the worst element in society and putting people [first] who might be individually salvageable, but who as a group are fairly described as guppies, that is, greedy yuppies." All other significant constituencies "are being essentially ignored by this ticket," LaRouche said.

LaRouche's comments are right on the mark. From former Texas Rep. Barbara Jordan's keynote on the opening night of the carefully staged proceedings, through Al Gore and Slick Willie's acceptance speeches at the end, the entire convention was dominated by demands for austerity, thinly disguised with such euphemisms as "equality of sacrifice."

Clinton, in a rather blasphemous borrowing from the New Testament, centered his acceptance address on what he called a "new covenant." But what Clinton and



Virginia's Attorney General Mary Sue Terry, campaigning with Al Gore, who is now the Democratic vice presidential nominee. Terry likes the death penalty so much that she carried out her 11th execution on July 24, and plans four more in the next two months. This is the Democratic Party's "new breed" of Confederates, wooing the suburban yuppie vote, and modeling their policies on those of Mussolini.

his handlers mean by the term is light years away from what Christ promised his followers.

Devised by that nest of Bush Democrats, the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC, a.k.a. Democrats Longing for the Confederacy or Democratic Leisure Class), Clinton's "new covenant," with its talk of "rights and responsibilities" and a "revolution in government," bears a striking similarity to British liberal John Locke's social contract, which formed the philosophical basis for the Confederate Constitution.

In effect, the new covenant outlines a plan for governing the United States under depression conditions, by mobilizing some parts of the population against others, in a classic divide-and rule tactic, and by using such devices as "community self-help" (the Democratic variation of George Bush's "thousand points of light") to con people into accepting ever-deeper austerity.

Free trade and an end to welfare

As expressed in several recent Clinton statements, and in the grotesque platform adopted at the convention, the "new covenant" includes these key components:

- A U.S. economic system held hostage to the same British "free trade" arrangements against which the American Revolution was fought. Clinton and Gore are both defenders of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and the party platform explicitly endorses these agreements, albeit with a few rhetorical sops about retraining U.S. work-

ers who lose their jobs.

- Draconian cuts in health care. Clinton's watchword is medical "cost containment," as he insists that reducing health care expenditures on a national level is the *sine qua non* of both deficit reduction and infrastructure investment. In this, Clinton reflects the thinking of such Wall Street luminaries as Peter Peterson, chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, investment banker Felix Rohatyn, and "industrial policy" proponent Clyde Prestowitz, who maintain that unless huge chunks of the monies now spent on keeping people alive and healthy are diverted into "investment," the economy is doomed.

- Cuts in entitlement programs, with Medicare the first target, to be followed by an assault on Social Security. The Democratic platform calls for balancing the federal budget through "fair and shared sacrifice of all Americans," which means "putting everything on the table, eliminat[ing] non-productive programs," and "reform[ing] entitlement programs to control soaring health-care costs. . . ."

- The "end of welfare as we know it," as Slick Willie bluntly puts it. This is a particularly cynical gambit, given that the country is gripped by depression and unemployment, which are forcing millions of working people onto the welfare rolls. It is a crass, Willie Horton-style appeal to yuppies and hard-pressed working-class families alike, which is meant both to appeal to, and mobilize, popular sentiment for cutting welfare and other social service programs, throwing the poor and handicapped onto the garbage heap.

- A severely limited infrastructure development pro-

gram, based primarily on some meager investment in the transportation grid, combined with building up U.S. environmental and communications technology—hardly a program for what the United States desperately needs, an industrial renaissance.

The Clinton-Democrat proposals borrow heavily from Felix Rohatyn's "Rebuild America" plan. Like Rohatyn's, financing would come through a combination of hiking taxes and looting pension plans. Although Clinton claims he will raise taxes only on those earning over \$200,000 a year, he has made it plain that his version of the Rohatyn plan also depends for the bulk of its financing on public and private pension funds. However, as LaRouche has recently pointed out, most U.S. pension funds exist only on paper; they were bled dry in the 1980s by investing in junk bonds, leveraged buyouts, etc. Thus, even Clinton's pallid infrastructure development plan is a non-starter.

- A foreign policy which contains no truly substantive differences from the Bush administration's, except, perhaps, its overt pandering to the Israeli lobby, expressed in the platform's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

Regarding U.S. military policy, the platform reads like a script for Bush's "Pox Americana." It says the United States should beef up its "rapid deployment capabilities to deal with new threats to our security posed by renegade dictators, terrorists, international drug traffickers, and the local armed conflicts that can threaten the peace of entire regions." It further states that the U.S. "must lead a renewed international effort to get tough with companies that peddle nuclear and chemical warfare technologies, strengthen the International Atomic Energy Agency, and enforce strong sanctions against governments that violate international restraints."

- Embrace of the radical environmentalist agenda. As the Democratic platform puts it, the United States must "become a leader . . . in the fight against global warming" and agree to "limit carbon dioxide emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000." The U.S. must also engage in an aggressive campaign to bring the "explosive population growth" under control.

- A "newspeak" version of "family values": The Democrats, having become notorious (and to some extent unelectable) during the past 20 years by embracing every perversion under the sun, decided to recast themselves this year as the party of "family values." Even Hillary Clinton has got into the act, distributing chocolate chip cookies to reporters.

Family values? From Clinton, who spent much of the primary season courting the "gay" lobby, garnering the enthusiastic backing of the leading homosexual political organization? And from Gore, who—despite his wife Tipper's highly publicized crusade against pornographic rock lyrics—is a devotee of the pagan goddess Gaia?

What the Democrats mean by "family values" was summed up by Clinton's discussion of abortion in his speech to the convention. I'm not pro-abortion, Clinton told the delegates; I'm merely "pro-choice."

The DLC and the new feudalism

by Kathleen Klenetsky

When Bill Clinton extolled the virtues of his fascist "new covenant" in his acceptance speech to the Democratic Party, he was sounding a theme closely identified with the Democratic Leadership Council. Founded in early 1985 after Walter Mondale's trouncing by Ronald Reagan in the 1984 presidential elections, the DLC was the brainchild of a group of Southern Democrats, who claimed to want to steer the party into a more "mainstream" direction.

The initiators of the DLC included Sens. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) and Chuck Robb (D-Va.), and Reps. Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.) and John Breaux (D-La.). Both Clinton and Gore joined the group; Clinton eventually became the DLC's chairman, and only resigned last year, when he formally declared for the presidency.

It hasn't taken long for what the DLCers meant by "mainstream" to become apparent—and it certainly isn't a return to the pre-McGovern reform period in which the party tended, more or less, to represent legitimate constituency groups, such as labor, urban ethnic machines, farmers, and civil rights layers, and fought to some extent, as John F. Kennedy did, for economic development and scientific progress.

Instead, the DLC, along with its think tank, the Progressive Policy Institute, has established itself as the leading exponent of the view that the Democratic Party can only succeed politically if it abandons these constituencies, and reorients toward the yuppie suburban vote, the lawyers, accountants, stockbrokers, and other parasites who have proliferated as the productive base of the U.S. economy has collapsed.

The Democratic Party's just-completed convention in New York bears witness to the DLC's success. Not only did the party nominate two of the DLC's leading members, but the platform it adopted, with its talk of "rights and responsibilities" and a new social contract, was lifted straight from the DLC's policy pronouncements.

Indeed, the transformation of the Democratic Party into the party of yuppie post-industrialism, can be credited in large measure to the efforts of the DLC.

Writing in the July 1992 issue of the group's magazine *New Democrat*, DLC president Al From calls on the Democratic Party to recognize that "America is going through a political transformation as power shifts from the central cities to the suburbs." "If the Democrats cast their lot with the cities," From warns, "they sharply diminish their chance of winning."

The July issue's theme, proclaimed on the cover, is