

'Southern Strategy' Sinking, With Gore and Lott's Careers

by Nancy Spannaus and Jeff Steinberg

The fall of "Ole Miss" cheerleader Sen. Trent Lott (R-Miss.), from his perch of power on Capitol Hill as Senate Majority Leader, is just the most dramatic indication that both parties' shift to the political "Southern Strategy" which took off in the late 1960s, is about to come to a screeching halt. Lott's outright racist style perfectly represents the policy Nixon consolidated, of building a permanent Republican majority based on an appeal to Southern racism, so-called Christian fundamentalism, radical states' rights, and libertarianism. But it is not just the Republican Party which is set for a change, but the entire economic and political apparatus which has taken over, and nearly destroyed, the United States over the past 30-35 years.

Taking as a point of reference the analysis of the Southern Strategy which *EIR* published in January 2001, we see that many arms of that political apparatus are nearly destroyed.

Enron, Kissinger, Gore, Lott . . .

First, we have the political party apparatuses, which moved toward Confederate policies at the time of Nixon's 1968 Republican victory, and again, with the election of "Democrat" Jimmy Carter. Increasingly, both parties have been controlled by the Confederate ideology of an abandonment of the general welfare principle of the Constitution, and an appeal to populism of the most degraded sort. Now, the leading representatives of this approach in both parties are headed toward oblivion: from the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC), to Al Gore, to Lott himself.

Second, we have the financial apparatus associated with the take-down of the nation as an industrial power, and industry's replacement by the rentier-financier empire of speculation and real estate, all based on deregulation and cheap labor. Associated with this was the buildup of the New York-Texas

corporate axis. A major symbol of this, Enron, which we exposed in our 2001 story, is now kaputt.

Third, we have the "permanent" government apparatus associated with the Southern Strategy, specifically the protégés of Nashville Agrarian and Harvard Government Department ruler William Yandell Elliott: Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski. As we have seen, Kissinger's baggage was just too much for the current Bush Administration to bear.

What will replace the Southern Strategy? That's the question which pivots on the success of Lyndon LaRouche, the leading representative of the American Intellectual Tradition, in general, and the Roosevelt Democrat tradition in particular, in successfully leading both the institution of the Presidency, and the political process, out of the current maelstrom of economic and strategic crisis. It took geniuses like Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Delano Roosevelt to resolve the other major nation-threatening crises in our nation's history. Right now, it will take the leadership of LaRouche.

Neo-Cons Head for the Exits

Trent Lott has been the personification of the Southern Strategy since he first came to the Congress as an ally of self-confessed "Jacobin" Newt Gingrich, in the late 1970s. Lott's "Southernist" roots go far beyond his remarks at the Strom Thurmond centennial fête. In 1984, Lott gave an interview to the *Southern Partisan* magazine, in which he praised Confederate President Jefferson Davis as a man who personified the "fundamental principles" of the Republican Party. "A lot of fundamental principles that Jefferson Davis believed in are very important today to people all across the country, and they apply to the Republican Party. It is the more conservative party. . . . The platform we had in Dallas, the 1984 Republican

platform, all the ideas we supported there—from tax policy to foreign policy, from individual rights to neighborhood security—are things that Jefferson Davis and his people believed in,” asserted Lott.

As of this writing, the leaders of the Republican Party around the President, seem to have finally cut Lott loose. Following an icy statement of condemnation of Lott’s statements, and the sentiment behind them, from Secretary of State Colin Powell, the President’s brother, Florida Gov. Jeb Bush, came out to say—obliquely, but unmistakably—that Lott was causing an intolerable problem for the Republican Party.

Among the first to desert Lott was the neo-conservative, ex-Trotskyite wing of the GOP. Within hours of the disclosure of Lott’s remarks on Thurmond, a neo-conservative gang-up began, with such syndicated propagandists as Charles Krauthammer (*Washington Post*), William Kristol (*Weekly Standard*), George F. Will (Hollinger Corp.), and William Safire (*New York Times*) all trashing Lott and demanding his resignation from the Senate Majority post. Until the axe began to swing, Lott had been one of the top allies of the neo-conservatives, going so far, during the Clinton Presidency, as to hire arch neo-con Richard Perle as his chief “foreign policy adviser.”

Even as he is now being shown the door, Lott has remained a true ally to the “X Committee” crowd of Sharonists who are conniving inside the U.S. national security establishment. On Dec. 16, the *Washington Post* reported that Lott had rebuffed ex-Senator Warren Rudman as a GOP member of the newly established Blue Ribbon Panel to investigate the intelligence failures leading to the 9/11 attacks. Instead, Lott appointed former Reagan Administration Secretary of the Navy John Lehman, who was then among the leading suspects as a cohort of Jonathan Jay Pollard, convicted of spying for Israel. Lehman is a top official of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, a crucial Israeli penetration front into the Pentagon and retired military circles. He is a former business partner of Perle.

And on the Democratic Side

The Southern Strategy would not have won hegemony, of course, if the Democratic Party had not also capitulated to the Confederate ideology. One leading representative of that thinking on the Democratic side, Al Gore, also bit the dust in mid-December.

Gore was a quintessential representative of the Democratic Leadership Council, the anti-FDR faction of the party, which was founded by organized crime-linked Michael Steinhardt back in 1985. Gore’s anti-technology rants were accompanied by his anti-human policies of deregulation, NAFTA, and technological apartheid toward developing nations. On top of that pedigree, Gore was personally responsible for ripping up the 1965 Voting Rights Act, by insisting that the Democratic Party nullify the votes and convention delegates of Lyndon LaRouche, his rival in the 2000 Demo-

cratic Presidential primaries.

Gore’s Dec. 15 announcement that he would not run in the 2004 elections surprised few, despite the headlines. His lack of popularity with the party leadership was only surpassed by similar lack of sentiment in the population. Those rooting for his candidacy appear to have been primarily based in the top circles of the Republican Party, who saw it as a death knell for the Democratic Party.

Many might expect that Gore’s withdrawal would be primarily a gift to his former running-mate, Joe Lieberman, who has been slaving for the job of Democratic nominee. Indeed, Lieberman immediately announced that he was travelling to meet “the troops” in the Middle East, and would make an announcement in early January. But Lieberman is already “damaged goods,” as a result of the intensive campaign run by LaRouche over the summer months, in which the Connecticut Senator’s intimate ties to organized crime, including Michael Steinhardt and the Cuban right-wing networks in Florida, were widely exposed.

Thus, in LaRouche’s view, the more dangerous option that could be expected is an attempt to revive the “Bull Moose” option, of the team Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Lieberman, as a pro-war threat against President Bush. The LaRouche campaign will escalate its exposure of this duo, and their organized-crime links, accordingly.

Preparing a Radical Shift

None of these changes is surprising when one considers that the post-Bretton Woods monetary policy of floating exchange rates, unbridled speculation and usury, and the looting of the resource wealth of the developing and underdeveloped world, with its post-industrial correlatives, has brought the world to the point of economic and social breakdown. The “Southern Strategy” has been politically discredited—and many of its erstwhile victims are not prepared to knuckle under any more.

At present, however, none of the leading institutions which the Southern Strategy has dominated, have any clear alternative in view. They are dropping their liabilities, but have not come up with a positive approach to rebuilding political or other institutions.

As LaRouche has emphasized, the collapse of these institutions puts the nation at a crucial turning point, similar to that which Germany faced in the early 1930s. Either a leadership comes forward which will mobilize the population around a mission to rebuild the economy, or the nation faces the potential of dissolving into a chaos that will lead toward the emergence of fascism.

Over recent months, it has been demonstrated, by the effectiveness of LaRouche and his movement in “jamming up” an Iraq war, that the institution of the Presidency around President Bush, can respond to proper leadership. The collapse of the Southern Strategy clearly opens up more opportunities, and hope, for such an immediate change.