

# Elephants & Donkeys

by Kathleen Klenetsky

## Candidates agree to defend Fed at all costs

There may be differences among the three major presidential candidates, but when it comes to kowtowing to the gods of international finance, they couldn't agree with each other more.

That became undeniably obvious during the first presidential debate on Oct. 12, when George Bush, Bill Clinton, and Ross Perot all vowed to protect the independence of the Federal Reserve.

Asked by a panelist whether they would consider adopting a proposal to bring the Fed under some small measure of control by elected officials, the three morons replied, "no":

**Clinton:** "I don't have to worry, I don't think, in the near term about the Federal Reserve. Their policies, so far, it seems to me, are pretty sound."

**Bush:** "I don't think the Fed ought to be put under the Executive branch. There's a separation there. I think that's fine."

**Perot:** "Keep the Federal Reserve independent."

With these answers, "All three of the candidates showed that under them the U.S. depression, the general economic situation, would do nothing but become worse," charged independent presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, in a statement issued immediately following the debate.

"They all vowed virtually in the blood of your grandmother and grandchildren to stick to the independence of the central bank—the Federal Reserve System," said LaRouche.

LaRouche stressed that the reason the United States is in a "mess" today, is "because the Federal Reserve System has been key to ripping off the U.S. economy." The "leading prob-

lem" during the 1980s, he said, has been "that neither Reagan nor Bush were willing to take on the Federal Reserve System, but quite the contrary, Reagan made it very clear in the spring of 1981 that he was supporting [Federal Reserve Chairman Paul] Volcker, and Bush, of course, is a super-enthusiast of the same policies."

LaRouche, who has aggressively advocated nationalizing the Fed, transforming it into a pro-development national bank along the lines laid out by Alexander Hamilton, commented that if voters want to do something to "cure the sickness" brought about by Fed policies, "you ought to remove the cause of the disease and that is the Federal Reserve policy."

"We ought to go back to the direction in which President Kennedy was thinking back in 1963 and that is to federalize the Fed, bring it into conformity with Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, which the Fed presently violates," LaRouche said. Instead of going into debt, "the United States should use the issuance of U.S. currency, as specified under Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, to fund at long-term low interest rates, infrastructure-building projects and businesses."

## Clinton to take 'Jewish vote'?

It seems certain that, no matter what the outcome of the presidential elections, Bill Clinton will wind up taking the lion's share of the Jewish vote.

"Right now, the Jewish vote, like the election, is Clinton's to lose," writes David Twersky, in the Oct. 12 issue of the *New Republic*, under the

headline "Jews for Bill."

Although Jews make up a small minority of the American electorate, their political activism and concentrated presence in key areas make them a potent voting bloc.

Twersky, the Washington bureau chief of the Jewish *Forward*, noted that even a shift of 10-20% of the vote from Bush to Clinton in such crucial industrial states as New York, Florida, and Maryland could ultimately swing the election to Clinton.

Most of the leading Jewish organizations—which enjoyed close relations with Ronald Reagan—have deserted his successor in favor of Clinton. For example, Morris Amitay, a Washington lobbyist who formerly headed the powerful American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), told Twersky that he has a "comfort level" with Slick Willie that he hasn't had with any Democratic candidate since Hubert Humphrey.

According to Twersky, Clinton started aggressively courting the Jewish vote at the very beginning of his presidential bid. Clinton "recognized the importance of the Jewish vote" and proceeded to recruit some of his top campaign staffers and advisers from AIPAC and Americans for Peace Now, reported Twersky.

He noted that both AIPAC and Americans for Peace Now signed off on the Mideast section of the Democratic Party platform, working with Clinton foreign policy aides Samuel Berger, Stu Eizenstat, and Michael Mandelbaum of the New York Council on Foreign Relations. Twersky also reported that Clinton's Mideast policy advisers work closely with Martin Indyk, the director of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, who "has close ties to senior [James] Baker aide Dennis Ross."