

## Eye on Washington by Nicholas F. Benton

### Looking to 1988: Choose your poison

For those who've had their fill of "survival of the fittest" economics and renegade Rambos running foreign policy from the NSC basement the last six years, the Democratic Party machine is not planning to offer any alternative in 1988.

This was the message brought in appearances at the National Press Club on March 11 by Democratic National Committee chairman Paul Kirk and presidential contender Bruce Babbitt, former governor of Arizona.

First, Kirk devoted his speech to laying down a set of eight dictatorial conditions for anyone seeking the Democratic presidential nomination. These rules, which Kirk himself called "policing mechanisms," degrade everyone seeking the presidency to a functionary of the governing Democratic Party apparatus. Kirk has already made certain that his control over that apparatus was tightened up, with new party rules set in 1986 that give the Democratic National Committee new powers over the party base.

When one reporter suspected that the rules were designed to muzzle black leader Jesse Jackson, Kirk began to slobber with condescending remarks. "Oh, no," he insisted. "My remarks today are addressed to all candidates, and I am not pointing a finger at any single candidate."

Not discriminating against any

single candidate? I asked, "How about Lyndon LaRouche? Will you invite his representative, along with all the rest, to attend your monthly meetings to ensure your reforms are implemented?"

"LaRouche! No. I will not invite Lyndon LaRouche," Kirk said, grimacing.

So much for non-discrimination.

Kirk is operating on behalf of the Eastern Liberal Establishment, to contain and control the great social upheavals that are expected to convulse the nation over the next couple years, due to the effects of economic collapse and the AIDS pandemic, in particular.

For this reason, all Kirk's policing initiatives have only one objective, really—to keep the lid on LaRouche's candidacy. LaRouche is the only candidate who has addressed these issues at all, and has gained significant national support on that account.

### The 'fix' is in

Kirk is conspiring to take the process of selecting the Democratic nominee completely out of the hands of Democratic voters. The nominee for 1988 has already been selected by the party bosses—he is Jimmy Carter's cousin, Sen. Sam Nunn (Ga.).

No one in Washington thinks that because Nunn said he is not planning to run "anytime soon," that it means he is out of the race. Nunn confirmed that he was the only "contender" to show up at the recent National League of Cities meeting to have himself photographed, shaking hands with Democratic mayors from all over the country. That's a heck of a way not to run for President!

Kirk plans that, with the help of his policing rules, the primaries will be unbearably boring, frustrating the

voters, and pitting "front-runner" Gary Hart against a pack of young, no-name candidates eager to gain national recognition. Babbitt, for one, will peddle a "futuristic" agenda of corporatism (the social and economic policy of Mussolini's Italy).

The only goal of these primaries will be to ensure that the debt-strapped Hart does not walk into the Democratic nominating convention in Atlanta next summer with enough delegates locked up to win it.

Hart may survive Iowa and New Hampshire, but never the March 9 "Super Tuesday" primaries, involving most of the southern states. With Jackson in the race to draw off the black vote (enough to win a plurality in a large field, in some states like Louisiana), Hart will fall on Super Tuesday, and this means that the Democratic nominee will have to be brokered at the convention. That is when the bashful Senator Nunn will be coaxed into accepting the nomination.

Only a ferocious demand to break the suffocating rules of the game imposed by Kirk, will prevent this scenario from being played out.

And what will the nation get for a President if they let Kirk have his way? They will not get Babbitt (this time). But they will get a lot of his policies.

"The time has come to restructure the American economy," Babbitt said at the Press Club. "The adversarial fight between labor and management is an antiquated luxury. We must have a 'gain-sharing' economy in which two-thirds of American workers share in the profits or losses of their companies."

When I asked if this wasn't corporatist, Babbitt said, "I prefer to call it 'futurist.'" He added, "The only reason I don't say corporatist, is because I'm not sure what the word means, so I am running from it."