

A Debate of Two Empty Suits Called Bush and Gore

by Our Special Correspondent

Every viewer of the Oct. 3 debate between Al Gore and George W. Bush noticed one thing: The two candidates wore identical outfits — the same dark suit, the same red tie, and the same white shirt. Picture only the suits — without the heads — bobbing and gesturing at the podiums, as two robotic voices, possibly generated by computer, repeat the same canned campaign phrases over and over, as if they were not at a debate, but at two separate, canned focus group events.

Possibly, their negotiators had agreed on the costume, so as not to allow anything to create an advantage for one man over the other; the smallest weight would unbalance the two feathers. Possibly, they agreed to smile at the same time, to wink at the same time, and so forth.

The general effect was that of two candidates for a job as a clerk, both listing all their experience as clerks. In short, the news is that they did both wear the same suit. The “chosen two” came across as perfect twin Wall Street puppets. Except for mild theatrics on taxes and Social Security, the “interchanges” were often totally interchangeable. It was a unique demonstration of the intellectual and political bankruptcy, of the establishment circles behind the two candidates. In the face of warnings throughout the world of an imminent U.S. financial crash, the puppets claimed “unprecedented prosperity.” They told the same lies about the causes of the oil and energy price hyperinflation.

Wall Street Scenario Turns Real

At only one point did a hint of reality intrude upon the stage. That came when moderator Jim Lehrer, of the Public Broadcasting System, the sole questioner, surprised the candidates with a query about a *possible* financial crisis. Then, the full scope of the establishment’s bankruptcy, before the *actual* financial crisis, became evident.

Turning to Bush, Lehrer asked: “There can be all kinds of crises, Governor — a question for you. There could be a crisis,

for instance, in the financial area. The stock market could take a tumble. There could be a failure of a major financial institution. What is your general attitude toward government intervention in such events?”

Bush immediately replied: “Well, it depends, obviously, but what I would do, first and foremost, is I would get in touch with the Federal Reserve Chairman, Alan Greenspan, to find out all the facts and all the circumstances. I would have my Secretary of the Treasury be in touch with the financial centers — not only here, but at home. I would make sure that key members of Congress were called in to discuss the gravity of the situation, and I would come up with a game plan to deal with it. That’s what governors end up doing. We end up being problem-solvers. We come up with practical, common-sense solutions for problems that we’re confronted with, and in this case, in the case of a financial crisis, I would gather all the facts before I made the decision as to what the government ought or ought not to do.”

Lehrer then turned to Gore, who at first totally changed the subject, and then said the following:

“On the international financial crises that come up, my friend Bob Rubin, the former Secretary of the Treasury [and current Citibank executive], is here. He’s a very close adviser to me and a great friend in all respects. I have had a chance to work with him and Alan Greenspan and others on the crisis following the collapse of the Mexican peso, when the Asian financial crisis raised the risk of worldwide recession that could affect our economy, and now, of course, the euro’s value has been dropping, but seems to be under control.”

Then the Vice President changed the subject, back to the “prosperity” drum he had been beating throughout the debate.

In following up, Lehrer let Gore off the hook, and addressed himself to Bush: “So, Governor, would you agree there is no basic difference here on intervening — the Federal government intervening in what might be seen by others to

be a private financial crisis, if it's that severe?"

Governor Bush responded: "No, there's no difference on that."

The identical response from the puppet twins, that they will "call Alan Greenspan," is a mandate of the London/Wall Street financier oligarchy. It is one that was graphically laid out in a "financial blowout war-game" scenario played at the New York Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) conference on financial vulnerabilities in July 2000. The conference featured discussion of the startling event the CFR Project had undertaken on Jan. 22, 2000: an eight-hour war-game simulating the simultaneous breakdown of major financial markets around the world during the year 2000 (see "Exposed! CFR Bankers Plan for Financial Crash," *EIR*, July 28, 2000).

What had been simulated, was to respond to a hypothetical blowout by pumping huge amounts of liquidity into the financial system by the Federal Reserve, but "all the public would see, is that the Fed volume of loans to banks had gone up." The CFR itself revealed at the CFR conference, that the simulation had begun with *a coup against the President of the United States*.

With a President Bush, or Gore, a coup would not be necessary to put Greenspan, and Wall Street, in control.

At one point, Lehrer said that the President has to deal with unexpected crises, and asked: Can you tell us about unexpected crises you've dealt with? Bush cited fires and floods in Texas, and claimed once to have embraced a Texan who had lost his home in a flood. (Fortunately, the man survived.)

Gore cited Kosovo, claiming that it was he who had sent former Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin and Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari to Belgrade, to negotiate an end to the Kosovo war with Slobodan Milosevic in 1999. But the reality is, that Gore was key in making sure that Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov was not involved in the mediation efforts to avert the impending U.S. bombing attacks.

Later, almost in unison, the puppet twins said that military force should not be used "in this case" to oust Milosevic from power.

Gore's Lies

Much of the action during the seemingly interminable 90-minute debate, consisted in Gore bashing Bush on the latter's tax-cut plan, with statistic after statistic about "the wealthiest 1%." Gore's trick was an attempt to create a "19% versus 1% conflict," in order to not talk about the real issues of income disparity in the United States: between the upper 20% and the rest.

As Lyndon LaRouche, Gore's opponent in the Democratic primaries, repeatedly emphasized, 80% of Americans are in deep financial trouble, sinking deeper into debt, while the upper 20% of income brackets make more money than the lower 80% taken all together.

That disparity was the issue that Gore had to avoid, substi-



PBS broadcaster Jim Lehrer, the only individual who mentioned reality during the first Presidential debate.

tuting phony populism against the "wealthiest 1%." This is typical of the sort of hoaxes by which Gore and the Democratic Leadership Council have dealt with LaRouche during the campaign—including the outright theft of 53,000 votes and at least eight delegates from LaRouche in the Arkansas primary.

Viewers noted that Gore had clearly spent days trying to train himself to sound less like a robot—apparently by watching tapes of President Ronald Reagan. Bush also broke profile: Neither Daddy nor Mommy Bush was present in the hall, and little Bush managed to avoid mentioning either of his parents, during the entire debate.

But the extreme paranoia of the puppet twins, and the totally scripted nature of their encounter, was exposed with the expulsion of Presidential candidate Ralph Nader from the debate premises: On his show the morning following the debate, television talk show host Phil Donahue gave a detailed report on the expulsion of Nader from the debate premises: Nader showed up with an official pass, to watch the debate on a monitor, in a different room. But, as soon as he arrived, he was met by a representative of the debate and three police officers, and told that he was not allowed on the premises. Nader called the exclusion an "affront to democracy," and "the beginning of the end of the Debate Commission monopoly that is obstructing millions of Americans from access to the Presidential candidates in a multi-candidate forum."