

As scandals hit Gore, will Clinton name LaRouche?

by Edward Spannaus

Vice President Al Gore now finds himself in the middle of the swirling controversy around Democratic campaign fund-raising in the 1996 elections — with many commentators now, for the first time, suggesting that Gore is more threatened than is President Clinton himself by the fund-raising investigations.

With the possibility of the appointment of an independent counsel now looming, reports are circulating that Gore is no longer a shoo-in for the Democratic nomination for President in the year 2000. Indeed, some are saying Gore may not even make it until the next elections.

Veteran White House correspondent Sarah McClendon reported recently in her newsletter that there is an escalating rift between the President and Mrs. Clinton, on the one side, and Vice President Gore, on the other. “This has proceeded to the point,” writes McClendon, “where the Clintons are talking about who should succeed Gore if the vice president should be scandalized extensively enough to cause him to resign.” McClendon, a long-standing harsh critic of Gore, reported that the President has conferred with Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) about the possibility of his replacing Gore as vice president; other names mooted include Sen. John D. Rockefeller (D-W.V.).

Clinton’s smart move

In a radio interview with “EIR Talks” on Sept. 9, economist and declared Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche remarked that, in light of the rumors that Gore might have to resign, “some wags in Washington have suggested that the President appoint *me* to replace Al Gore, as a nominee to be his vice president.” LaRouche pointed out that one of the arguments to be made in support of this, is “that if I were the President’s vice president, no one would *dare* organize an assassination threat against the incumbent President.”

“I think that from the standpoint of the personal interest of President Clinton, it would be much wiser of the President to support me,” LaRouche said. “That is much more interesting. I don’t think that Ted Kennedy wants the job anyway. You know, there have been people in this country who’ve been out to kill as many Kennedys as possible over a period

of years, and I think that the perception of Mr. Kennedy would be that if he did that, were to take that kind of position, that the threat of assassination against him, as against his older brothers, were a likely prospect.”

The President’s smart move in this case, LaRouche said, “would be to appoint *me*.” He explained that, of course, “there would be a real, screaming ‘freak-out’ from coast to coast, inside the Democratic Party, as well as elsewhere,” if Clinton were to do this. But then, the President would have to say: “What are you screaming about? This guy was the victim of a frame-up, of which he’s perfectly innocent — crimes of which he is perfectly innocent.” This would cause a very interesting effect, LaRouche pointed out, because, of the 51% or so portion of the voting-age population which didn’t bother to vote in the 1996 elections, a significant portion of these voters would respond positively, even enthusiastically, to Clinton’s naming of LaRouche; this would demonstrate the President’s concern for these disaffected sections of the citizenry, and would consequently increase popular support for the President and, as a by-product, would certainly also boost the Democratic Party’s fortunes in the 1998 mid-term elections and beyond.

Washington Post hits Gore

The current escalation around Gore came with the publication of a front-page article by the *Washington Post*’s Bob Woodward on Sept. 3, which reported that more than \$120,000 in campaign contributions personally solicited by Gore for a “soft money” account had instead gone into “hard-money” accounts earmarked for individual candidates. That same day, the Department of Justice announced that it had commenced a preliminary review of the allegations, which could ultimately lead to the appointment of an independent counsel. The issue, according to a DOJ spokesman, is supposedly whether Gore illegally solicited campaign contributions on Federal property. If, at the end of the current review, which can run for 30 days, the DOJ decides that it is warranted, then it will conduct a formal preliminary investigation for the next 90 days, to determine if there is enough evidence to warrant the Attorney General asking for appointment of an independent counsel.

In her press briefing on Sept. 5, Attorney General Janet Reno acknowledged that the first she had heard of the “hard money” allegations was from the *Washington Post* article. This led Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa.) to remark on CNN’s “Inside Politics Weekend” on Sept. 6: “I think if Bob Woodward worked for the Department of Justice, we would have had an independent counsel a long time ago. I think Woodward ought to go to law school and be a permanent independent counsel.”

Gore’s fund-raising activities were then the principal focus of the hearings held on Sept. 10 by the Senate committee investigating campaign fund-raising, when the Democratic National Committee’s general counsel was the primary wit-