

## Establishment designates Clinton as front-runner

by Kathleen Klenetsky

The primaries for the 1992 U.S. presidential elections have not yet begun, but the move is on to designate Gov. Bill Clinton of Arkansas as the front-runner of the Democratic pack.

Ever since Clinton was invited to attend the Bilderberg meeting last June, it has been obvious that the U.S. establishment was seriously considering installing him in the White House. Over the past month, Clinton has been the subject of a concerted effort by the major media and various pundits to present him as virtually unstoppable. Reportedly, Democratic National Committee chairman Ron Brown is leading the effort to get the Democratic presidential nomination wrapped up as soon as possible, arguing that the more united the party is early on, the better the chance of defeating Bush in November.

Clinton has been picking up significant institutional support from various factions within the Democratic Party. Senate Armed Services Committee chairman Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) departed from his traditional policy of no early endorsements to put his stamp of approval on Clinton in December. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, of the Kennedy clan, has endorsed Clinton, and Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-N. Y.), according to his aides, is on the verge of giving him his official backing as well, which will open up a lucrative pipeline to pro-Zionist lobby money sources.

Although Clinton is widely viewed as anti-labor, partly for his staunch support of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) which will cost U.S. workers hundreds of thousands of jobs, several key labor unions, including the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees and the American Federation of Teachers, are moving behind his candidacy.

Clinton can also count on the political and financial backing of the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC), a group of "Bush Democrats" founded by Sam Nunn and others in

1984 to steer the Democratic Party in a more "centrist" direction. Clinton served as DLC chairman until he announced his candidacy, and the group has been busy lining up support around the country for their former leader.

Campaign strategist James Carville, who helped engineer Harrison Wofford's stunning upset of Richard Thornburgh in last November's special Senate election in Pennsylvania, has signed on as a strategist with Clinton's campaign.

Perhaps even more significant, Clinton received a tentative imprimatur from the Dec. 30 London *Financial Times*. In an analysis of the U.S. elections entitled "Mr. Bush and the Churchill Syndrome," Michael Prowse effectively dismissed all the other Democratic presidential candidates, but called Clinton "the most substantial candidate" who, as a "former Rhodes scholar and Yale Law School graduate," is "intellectually sharp" and someone who could conceivably defeat Bush.

### Closing down the debate

According to one scenario that is receiving wide circulation, Clinton will do better than previously anticipated in the Feb. 18 New Hampshire primary—possibly edging out Paul Tsongas who, being from Massachusetts, has a home-town advantage—and with that achievement, will be well-positioned to sweep the 12, mostly Southern, primaries which take place March 10. These "Super Tuesday" primaries will select 869 of the 2,142 delegates needed to secure the presidential nomination.

Should Clinton perform as expected March 10, the scenario goes, then the other remaining Democratic candidates will accede to the inevitable, and either bow out of the race or run only nominal campaigns thereafter.

From the establishment's standpoint, the scenario outlined above has several virtues.

First, it would effectively eliminate the possibility of any

serious discussion of foreign and economic policy from the Democratic primary process.

This idea is not new. Indeed, Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan (D-N.Y.), a sworn enemy of LaRouche, wrote a commentary for the *New York Times* several years back, calling for turning the primaries into showcases, robbing them of all power over the presidential nomination. But the current crisis afflicting the U.S. electorate has made its implementation more urgent.

Given the depression, and the concomitant political unrest among the population, there is an intense desire within the U.S. elite to avoid the kind of *uncontrolled* national debate which could give exposure to proposals that have heretofore been suppressed or successfully smeared as “extremist,” especially those associated with Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche.

Allowing the primaries to unfold as in the past would expose the current pack of “mainstream” Democratic hopefuls for the sorry excuses for political leaders that they are, unable to propose intelligent, workable solutions to the current crises.

By locking up the nomination for Clinton early on, and manipulating public perceptions of him through orchestrated media coverage, the intent is to cut off any serious discussion of the measures needed to solve the country’s profound crises.

### **The blow-dried technocrat from Oxford**

Second, for an establishment that has settled on bone-crushing austerity at home and trade war abroad as its response to the depression, Clinton is just what the doctor ordered. “He’s a lot like George Bush, except he’ll do what he’s told,” is how one observer describes Clinton.

Clinton typifies the “new generation” Democrat—a technocrat with fascist leanings who has proven himself “pragmatic” and ready and willing to toss aside traditional Democratic concerns and constituencies for the sake of bankrupt financial policies and institutions. Incapable of formulating an economic policy that would increase U.S. industrial and agricultural output, Clinton has opted for populist versions of the same basic policies advocated by George “Herbert Hoover” Bush.

Although Clinton claims that he wants to solve the United States’ economic woes by boosting economic growth, the reality is that most of his concrete proposals involve slashing social spending.

Clinton constantly touts the fact that, as governor, he cracked down on “welfare cheats.” In one of the most impoverished states in the Union, where incomes still hover about 25% below the national average, Clinton managed to slash Arkansas’s relief rolls by 7%—an accomplishment he claims shows his ability to run the country. He vows at every opportunity that, if elected, he will implement a national program to put welfare recipients to work, but he never answers the question of where those jobs will come from when unemploy-

ment is zooming.

In a similar vein, Clinton boasts that he initiated an aggressive program to trace fathers who do not provide child support, and claims that by implementing the same program as President, he will be able to bring down the budget deficit. The real problem, however, is that there are simply not enough jobs available that pay enough to support a family.

The same mentality can be seen at work in many of the other key policies he promoted in Arkansas, and in the pathetic excuse for a platform his campaign is now circulating. For example: Clinton strongly supports right-to-work laws and, according to a new report by the Arkansas state AFL-CIO, reneged on an opportunity to do away with the tax on food in Arkansas—one of the few states which imposes such a regressive tax.

Clinton has also emerged as one of the leading Democratic defenders of the death penalty; several Arkansas prisoners have been executed during his watch.

His purportedly positive proposals for dealing with the depression are a joke: One of the highlights of his economic program calls for taking the two-year funding for the new highway bill and spending it all in the first year, as though that will take care of the unemployment crisis. And he’s also proposed a middle-class tax cut, which will amount to a piddling \$400—about a dollar a day—for the average family.

Clinton has had little to say about foreign policy, although he strongly supported George Bush’s war against Iraq—the only Democratic presidential candidate to do so. He made his most specific statements on foreign and strategic policy in a speech at Georgetown University on Dec. 12, in which he declared himself fully in support of free trade, including the NAFTA agreement. “I believe the negotiations on an open trading system in the GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] round are of extraordinary importance, and I support the negotiation of a North American Free Trade Agreement,” including giving “fast track” authority to the Executive branch.

### **The best laid plans**

If the boys in the back room have in fact decided that they want to make Clinton President, or, at least, the Democratic nominee, they still face an uphill battle selling him to the public.

Rumors of extra-marital affairs have plagued his political career, and have burst into the national media.

It is extremely telling that even though George Bush’s popularity continues its precipitous decline, the latest polls reveal that neither Clinton, nor any of the other four media-approved candidates, can beat him at this time. The person the polls show *is* able to beat Bush is someone who the pollsters label the “unknown” Democrat.

That must send shivers up the spine of those who have tried every possible tactic, including a lengthy jail sentence, to prevent LaRouche’s influence from spreading.