

## Buchanan victories shake up Conservative Revolution mob

by Edward Spannaus

Pat Buchanan's victory in the New Hampshire Republican Party primary on Feb. 20, following his strong showing in Louisiana and Iowa, has thrown the "Conservative Revolution" crowd, centered around House Speaker Newt Gingrich, into an uproar. Buchanan's outspoken attacks on the dogma of free trade have utterly destabilized the Mont Pelerin Society crowd, which believed that they had a lock on the GOP after the November 1994 mid-term elections.

The Buchanan phenomenon reflects something much broader, which is the dramatic shift away from the "post-industrial society" ideology which has dominated both major political parties for past several decades. What Lyndon LaRouche has been talking about for years—economic stagnation, the collapse of real production, declining real wages—is now being picked up, albeit in diluted form, by political leaders in both parties. Sen. Ted Kennedy's (D-Mass.) speech on Feb. 8, warning that we are in a "Quiet Depression," is one sign of the shift; the initiative by Senate Minority Leader Thomas Daschle (D-S.D.), around the concept of "stakeholder capitalism," is another (see *EIR*, Feb. 23, p. 44, and this issue, p. 69).

All of a sudden, no one is talking about the balanced budget anymore, and almost everyone is talking about "economic insecurity" and the merits of free trade versus protectionism. The terms of discourse of American politics have undergone a fundamental shift over the past couple of weeks.

### Mont Pelerinites go berserk

Buchanan's protectionist proposals, termed "economic nationalism" in much of the news media, have drawn hysterical attacks from the British-run think-tanks spawned by the Mont Pelerin Society, which were the main force behind Gingrich's Contract with America (something that was scarcely

mentioned in the final stages of the New Hampshire primary campaign). For example, Ed Crane, president of the Cato Institute, declares that Buchanan "appeals to the economic ignoramuses that have been the mainstay of the Democratic Party for most of this century." Doug Bandow, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, sputters that Buchanan "has no sense of what makes capitalism work. He would wreck the economy." Ed Feulner, president of the Heritage Foundation, calls Buchanan's proposals "goofy," and intones that Buchanan is "outside the mainstream of conservative economics." John Goodman, president of the Center for Policy Analysis in Dallas, says, "It's scary. It's obviously not traditional conservatism. This is a nationalist agenda that is very anti-free market."

Gingrich himself has been keeping his mouth shut about the Buchanan upsurge. But his number-two man in the House, Majority Leader Richard Armey (R-Tex.), has announced that he will make a major speech at the Heritage Foundation on Feb. 26, to try to redefine the debate in "Buchananesque" terms—but stripped of Buchanan's attacks on free trade. Gingrich's number-three, House Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R-Tex.), labelled Buchanan as being "from another planet," protested that the GOP stands for free trade and open markets, and declared that Buchanan's economic theories are "poison" to most Republicans.

Buchanan himself clearly has some definite ideas about his economic proposals (which, as U.S. history shows, need not be accompanied by immigrant-bashing and isolationism). Not only does Buchanan cite the brilliant 19th-century German-American economist Friedrich List (whose writings, up until recently, were only discussed in publications associated with LaRouche), but Buchanan has also proclaimed that economic conservatives "read too many dead Austrian economists"—a direct hit on the "Austrian School" ideologues

around whom the Mont Pelerin Society was formed: Friedrich von Hayek and Ludwig von Mises.

## What happened in Louisiana

“Pat Buchanan shows that sometimes God works in very mysterious ways,” Lyndon LaRouche observed following the recent primaries. LaRouche, himself a candidate in the Democratic Party primaries, said that a very interesting thing had happened in Louisiana, between the “social conservatives” and the “economic conservatives.”

“Pat was floundering around and, really, not ostensibly getting much of any place, though he was having some impact just from campaigning,” LaRouche said in a Feb. 21 radio interview with “EIR Talks.” “You know, people look owlily at candidates without really committing themselves. And what the candidate says, may, at a later stage, register with the voter, and they may make a decision on the candidate where, previously, they’ve just registered his passing through, like an owl watching the parade of mice at night, or something.”

In Louisiana, LaRouche continued, Buchanan did something which turned things around, in a very significant way. “You had this so-called split between social conservative and economic conservative. And Phil Gramm, ugly as he is, was a paradigm of the so-called economic conservative, sort of the Gingrich of the Senate, who was being pulled down considerably because people did equate him with Gingrich, and *did* consider him somewhat the Gingrich of the Senate. So he was suffering some of the Gingrich blowback.

“But then, in Louisiana, you had people who were persuaded to be economic conservatives—with some degree of reluctance—because they believed that the axioms of free trade, as preached by Milton Friedman and the Mont Pelerin fascists generally, that these things had to be accepted even if you didn’t like them. Like castor oil: You had to take it even if you didn’t like it.

“Then along comes Pat Buchanan, with real drive in his campaign. And what he said implicitly, was that if you’re a social conservative, you don’t have to accept this economic conservative view. That God permits you to reject free trade, in favor of protection, and tariffs, and protecting jobs, and protecting the economy.

“So, at that point, the Christian Coalition type of voter, who was a prominent part of the conservative potential vote in Louisiana, switched away from a Phil Gramm, who had them fairly well in his tent, and they walked over to the next tent, which was Pat Buchanan, where Pat was saying, implicitly: ‘God permits you to reject this economic conservative thesis. You don’t have to live in this kind of economy, you don’t have to live in a Gingrich world.’ ”

This resulted in a sudden mass desertion from the camp of Gramm and a sudden boosting of Buchanan, LaRouche remarked. “He reduced Phil Gramm from Phil Gramm to Milli Gramm, to Micro Gramm and, now, to Nano Gramm—vanishing Nano Gramm.”

## Brits join in

Since his New Hampshire victory, the attacks on Buchanan have intensified. Top Republican Party circles are desperately trying to figure out some combination of Bob Dole, Bush-baby Lamar Alexander, and even Colin Powell, which could stop the Buchanan movement.

From the other side of the Atlantic, the controllers of the U.S. Conservative Revolution are also in a panic. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, the Washington correspondent of the Hollinger Corp.’s *Sunday Telegraph*, warned on Feb. 18 that Buchanan’s “Fortress America” program is being used “to tear down the edifice of economic orthodoxy that has defined the Republican Party for two generations,” and that it “could destabilize the whole international system created after the Second World War.”

Lord William Rees-Mogg, writing in the London *Times* on Feb. 22, denounced Buchanan as “the wrong kind of conservative.” In a column entitled “Merchants of Fear,” Rees-Mogg wrote that “many of my friends are Adam Smith conservatives; their core values are those of Jeffersonian liberalism. . . . Pat Buchanan is not that sort of conservative at all. . . . Pat Buchanan’s constituency believes in national protection behind a slogan of ‘America First.’ ”

Rees-Mogg asserts that the greatest threat from Buchanan is that he could “create a new coalition of forces in American politics, as Franklin Roosevelt did in 1932, by allying depressed industrial workers with the poor white South.” In the course of his diatribe, Rees-Mogg draws parallels between Buchanan and 1930s populists such as Father Coughlin and Huey Long, remarking ominously that the latter, then governor of Louisiana, was only stopped by an assassin’s bullet.

Rees-Mogg has also made only slightly more subtle intimations toward President Clinton, who has been the object of hateful attacks from Rees-Mogg over the past few years. In his Feb. 19 column, Rees-Mogg began: “Steve Forbes is not going to be the next President of the United States. Bob Dole might be, Lamar Alexander might be, Pat Buchanan might be, by the nature of his position, Vice President Al Gore might be.”

The omission of President Clinton from this list is extraordinary, and security analysts are warning that this could constitute a not-very-veiled assassination threat to the President. Particularly when taken in the context of an item in the Feb. 14 issue of Rees-Mogg and James Dale Davidson’s *Strategic Investment* newsletter, which suggests that President Clinton might stage a phony assassination attempt on himself. “In order to gain sympathy with the voters, the rumor goes, Clinton will arrange a staged attempt on his life this summer or fall, an ultimate ‘October Surprise.’ Key Congressional staffers affirm that the Secret Service is now on a state of high alert.” Such a “phony” assassination—staged not by Clinton, of course, but by his enemies—is exactly the type of situation into which a “live” assassination operation can be plugged.