

Christianity was, and is the twofold enemy of the pagan Roman Empire and its Romantic legacy. It is the enemy of Romanticism, for reason of the importance of Classical Greek culture's contributions to science, art, and statecraft. It is the enemy of Romanticism, because it insists upon the universality of the Mosaic principle that men and women are made in the image of the Creator, and set apart from and above all other living beings and things, as given the power to willfully increase mankind's power in and over the universe. It is that Mosaic legacy, delivered from the lips of Jesus Christ, which implicitly defines Christianity, and, thereby, in defiance of John Locke, Bernard Mandeville, Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, and Friedrich von Hayek's Mont Pelerin Society, implicitly defines the conditions of service to promotion of the general welfare, under which governments may lawfully rule.

Gore's Fascism

There should be no objection to identifying Gore as a fascist, on account of his policies concerning population and general welfare. His and "Dick" Morris' collaboration with "Newt" Gingrich, on "welfare reform," in 1996, and since, exposes the fascist essence of Gore's economic and related doctrines. His push for "globalization" is purely and simply a drive for "universal fascism," as Michael Ledeen and others have documented these connections by name. However, in what sense is Gore also a racist?

Frankly, I do not know what passes through Gore's thoughts when he is confronted by a person he identifies as African-American, for example. I would not insist that he is a co-thinker of President Woodrow Wilson's revived Ku Klux Klan, for example. I know that his economic, social, and criminal-justice policies, like those of the Bush-baby collation, are racist in practice. Watching his knee-jerk responses on such issues, one might say that he is a racist by instinct of practice, if not of the variety predominantly motivated by simple racial prejudices. The kindest we might say of him, is that his racism is of the same mint-julep variety as the Nashville Agrarians, such as Henry A. Kissinger's former mentor, Professor William Yandell Elliot; he does not object to the existence of African-Americans, as long as they do not threaten the utopian perfection of a Nashville Agrarian's sense of the way things ought to become.

In these and other matters, we must hold people responsible for that which they should have known to be truthful and just. No one has the right to hold to a so-called "sincere opinion," in disregard for those standards of truthfulness and justice which Plato presents in the famous dialogue among the characters Socrates, Thrasymachus, and Glaucon. On this account, one might wish to say, truthfully and justly, that Al Hitler, as I have described him here, is, in practice, the kind of fascist Plato presents in the mouth of his character Thrasymachus—even if it is a rather stupid sort of parody of Thrasymachus.

Republicans' Staged Media Event Will Drive Sane Voters Out

by Nancy Spannaus and Jeffrey Steinberg

Abraham Lincoln wouldn't have recognized the Republican Party that took over the city of Philadelphia on July 31 to Aug. 4, with its Presidential nominating convention. In virtually every aspect, this convention was a media show of bread and circuses, run with a not-so-secret iron fist, aimed at crowning George W. Bush, the avenging heir of the vanquished President George Bush. On top of the \$70 million admitted to have been spent, informed sources report that an additional \$100 million was put out to throw lavish parties—anything to keep the delegates from missing the serious political discussion which historically is part of a political convention.

To anyone with a brain in his head, it was clear that nominee Bush's slogan of "compassionate conservatism" was just that—a slogan. The activist base of social conservatives in the party were told to toe the line, and to console themselves with the fact that the Republican Party Platform sticks with the "all power to the rich and greedy" Social Darwinist ethic which has dominated the GOP over the last 20-30 years. Perhaps the most honest, insightful evaluative statement was made by President Ronald Reagan's son Ron, who was quoted in the Aug. 4 *Washington Post*, saying about George W. Bush: "What is his accomplishment? That he's no longer an obnoxious drunk? . . . The defining moment for me was his Karla Faye Tucker smirk, joking about a woman he would put to death."

Now, with the parties over, the election war will start in earnest. True, it will be interrupted by the Democratic National Convention, which is set up to be equally, if not more tightly controlled, with more bread, more circus, and the identical absence of substantive policy content.

After the circuses end, then the real question will be posed: Have the two "traditional" parties so disgusted their base, by vacuousness and police-state measures, that the electorate will turn to a Third Party option?

Compassion With an Iron Fist

The Republican convention has to be seen in the context of the "take-no-prisoners" way in which George W. Bush and

his father's political machine took this nomination. Bush had smashed all opposition by the March 7 "Super Tuesday" primaries, and, contrary to his alleged compassion, he gave no quarter to his opponents, unless they grovelled before him. Thus, Alan Keyes and Malcolm Forbes were given absolutely no role in the convention, and Keyes was not even told who his delegates were.

Yes, both John McCain and Elizabeth Dole were permitted to address the convention. But their speeches—as those of all others—had to be submitted to the Bush campaign for approval. Anyone who saw the usually feisty McCain delivering his stilted remarks, could see that the man was acting as if he had been put into a straitjacket. His encomiums to the character of his "friend" George W. Bush were as phony as a \$3 bill.

Nor was it just the speakers who had to stick to a script. Every precaution was taken to ensure that there were no unauthorized demonstrations on the floor, or even unauthorized signs. Hand-printed placards, filled with acceptable slogans, were placed on the chairs of every delegate—just in case. There was no discussion from the floor of the convention, only the ritual casting of votes for the nominees by state chairmen. And even these were cut off if they went "too long."

To keep up the media appearance that there is a new, expanded party base, the Bush team brought in what some would call a "Rainbow coalition" of speakers: African-Americans, Hispanics, even a homosexual. The speakers' main job was to praise George W. Bush. Otherwise, the content was irrelevant to the party's platform or direction.

Numerous newspaper articles reported on the discontent of the Republican delegates, both with the array of speakers, and the stage-managing. Why bring in a black minister from Texas, when the party could have heard Alan Keyes? one asked. The reason was obviously that Keyes's speech could not be controlled. The only place where the delegates could blow off steam was at adjunct events, such as Pat Robertson's Christian Coalition meeting, which drew 5,000 people, but nearly zero media coverage, or at the food orgies and rock music bashes.

Is There Any Content Here?

In general, it would be a mistake to try to analyze the political content of the Convention speeches, even those of George W. Bush and his running mate, Dick Cheney. Everything was being said for public relations effect. The platform pronouncements are a bit more honest, but they too should be evaluated in light of what the Republican "hands and feet" have been doing in Congress, in Texas, and elsewhere. The policies of Bush-Cheney are, in fact, the policies of the senior Bush's Presidency—with a vengeance.

It is no surprise, then, that the 2000 GOP Platform touts "a reduced role for government, greater personal liberty, economic freedom, reliance on the market, and decentralized

decision making," as the "central values of our party." Like lemmings, however, the Platform Committee does not dare admit the truth about the bubble economy, the truth which the Bank for International Settlements, the New York Council on Foreign Relations, and senior Wall Street officials know. Rather than even mention the likely financial shocks coming before the election, the Platform writers chose to take credit for the current *prosperity*.

The "2000 GOP Platform" states: "Inspired by Presidents Reagan and Bush, Republicans hammered into place the framework for today's prosperity & surpluses. We cut tax rates, simplified the tax code, deregulated industry, and opened world markets to American enterprise. The result was the tremendous growth in the 1980s, that created the venture capital to launch the technological revolution of the 1990s. That's the origin of what is now called the New Economy: the longest economic boom in the 20th Century."

The only thing the Platform complains about is taxes.

But will that mantra be sufficient to mobilize the party base behind a candidate as stupid and venal as George W. Bush, in the middle of the economic and financial storms ahead? That is a big question.

Buchanan and Nader

On Aug. 10-13 in Long Beach, California, the Reform Party will hold its national nominating convention, and sources in the leadership of the party report that the likely victor will be Pat Buchanan. This, despite efforts by a collection of wackos, grouped around African-American Marxist lesbian Lenora Fulani and Natural Law Party transplant John Hagelin, to hijack the nomination, through dirty tricks. The national media have, in recent weeks, attempted to portray the party as deeply divided, with founder Ross Perot pitted against Buchanan.

There is good reason for *both* the Bush and Gore camps to wish to see the Reform Party sink into the Pacific during its convention. Voter rage at the two "major party" candidates, Gore and Bush, and the potential for large-scale defections by party grassroots activists, could make the 2000 Presidential elections "the year of the third party."

Both Buchanan and Green Party nominee Ralph Nader have slammed the Democrats and Republicans for having "morphed" into effectively one party, dedicated to free trade, and to serving the interests of the wealthiest 20% of the population—the rest be damned! They happen to be right, and, along with Democrat Lyndon LaRouche, who is dedicated to rebuilding the Democratic Party from the ashes of the Gore disaster, could force *real* policy debate into the limelight in the months leading up to the November vote.

Were that to happen, particularly were Buchanan and Nader to force their way into the nationally televised Presidential debates, all bets would be off, and both Bush *and* Gore could wind up on the scrap heap—where they belong.