

What Harriman has in store for Democrats

by Barbara Dreyfuss and Kathleen Klenetsky

The big question facing the Democratic Party as it enters its midterm 1982 convention in Philadelphia is whether there will be anything "democratic" left of America's largest political party.

W. Averell Harriman, the former New York governor and promoter of Anglo-Saxon racial supremacy, is attempting to dictate to every Democratic office-holder and candidate the same "Global 2000" policies that U.S. voters rejected in disgust when they turned Jimmy Carter out of office in November 1980. His wife Pamela Harriman's political action committee (PAC), Democrats for the '80s, headquartered at the Harriman mansion in New York, designed the issues papers which will be given to delegates arriving at the convention June 25. The papers were then written by a group of nominally separate PACs and think-tanks whose key figures circulate interchangeably. This Harrimanite brain trust, described by a Democratic congressional staffer as "incestuous," was behind the resolutions on policy sent out earlier to convention participants.

According to Peter Fenn, director of Democrats for the '80s, the Harriman PAC "realized a few months ago that the Democratic National Committee was not prepared to do the briefing book for the midterm convention, so DNC chairman Charles Manatt told us 'go ahead, you have my blessing.' In January we pulled together the leading experts in the Democratic think-tanks such as the National Policy Exchange, Brookings, the Center for National Policy, and some former Democratic office holders. We met with them and delegated them to draw up, on 20 issues, a list of options."

Fenn continued: "We ran them by Cyrus Vance and others. Governor Harriman went over them."

Charles Manatt, the Democratic National Committee chairman, is understandably nervous about charges that he is forcing Democrats to swallow austerity policies which will be catastrophic to the party's traditional base. "These drafts are not party dogmas," he told a reporter, "nor an attempt to rewrite our party's platform. They are part of the continuing dialogue about our future now going on among Democrats across the country."

But excluded from this "dialogue," if Manatt and Harriman get their way, will be the one significant PAC that has denounced the Harrimanite proposals as "Anglo-Saxon racist" and offered alternative resolutions. As we go to press, Lyndon LaRouche's 15,000-strong National Democratic Policy Committee has been denied convention credentials, and LaRouche, who ran for the Democratic presidential nomination in 13 state primaries and catalyzed opposition to Carter at the 1980 Democratic convention, has been denied the right to speak.

In June, the NDPC formally submitted to the Democratic Policy Council a draft convention program, titled "Halting and Reversing the New 'Herbert Hoover' Economic Depression." The 25-page document outlines LaRouche's anti-depression program and hits hard at the necessity for the United States to recover the "American Century" outlook developed at the close of World War II by Franklin Roosevelt for replacing British colonialism with high-technology industrialization of the underdeveloped sector.

The NDPC is urging delegates to fight for a resolu-

tion that the policies of "population control, immigration restriction and the blockage of the Third World's just aspirations to technological progress and full economic equality with the advanced sector nations" endorsed by the Harriman nexus are "totally incompatible with the principles of the Democratic Party." The resolution calls on Averell Harriman to renounce his associations with such racist policies, or resign from the party.

Particularly at the site of the convention, Philadelphia—where NDPC-backed gubernatorial candidate Steve Douglas polled 35 percent of the vote in the May 18 Democratic primary—Manatt's attempted shutout of the NDPC is an explosive move, with the potential of becoming a party-wide scandal. Much of the Douglas vote came from black and Hispanic voters who will be disenfranchised by the Manatt-Harriman policies of reducing dark-skinned populations, to be enforced in the developing sector by NATO conventional wars, and in the U.S.A. by the high-interest-rate regime of Paul Volcker, whom the Democratic National Committee refuses to attack. These policies, the NDPC points out, are all an outgrowth of the now-notorious *Global 2000 Report*, commissioned by the Carter administration, which suggested that the alleged problem of limited resources could be solved by reducing population by 2 billion people by the year 2000, particularly in the part of the world below the Tropic of Cancer.

In addition to Pamela Churchill Harriman's Democrats for the '80s and the PACs named by Peter Fenn, the Global 2000 cabal can be found in the Democratic National Committee's National Strategy Council and the party's Economic Opportunities and Growth panel. Charged with pushing the program in the Senate are Democrats Gary Hart of Colorado and Bill Bradley of New Jersey, and in the House, Tim Wirth of Colorado and Richard Gephardt of Missouri.

A survey of these groups reveals that they are all Harriman fronts. One name that shows up often is former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, the Harriman protégé whose State Department prepared the *Global 2000 Report* and who helped the Ayatollah Khomeini into power in Iran, in order to implement a "dry run" of the Report's recommendations. Others include Trilateral Commission member and AFL-CIO president Lane Kirkland; Representative Gephardt, who recently told *EIR* he works in close coordination with Volcker's Federal Reserve; Felix Rohatyn, the investment banker responsible for gutting New York City's industrial base; Stuart Eizenstat, who designed Carter's economic policies; and Gary Hart, whose economic adviser is a member of the "limits to growth" Club of Rome.

Carter veterans including Vance, his successor Ed Muskie, former Treasury Secretary Michael Blumenthal, former Labor Secretary Ray Marshall, and former White House counsel Lloyd Cutler (now out to junk the U.S.

Constitution), who created the Center for National Policy. "These people do a lot of different things under different hats," said an aide to Gephardt. "They are like bees flitting from one group to another."

After the midterm convention, the DNC plans to inundate Democrats with policy papers and forums, as do the numerous Harrimanite front groups. "We hope by 1984 to have a consensus on policy which can then become national policy," gloated Ted Van Dyck, director of the Center for National Policy. But a scan of the resolutions submitted by the Harrimanite cabal reveals a policy around which no consensus could possibly develop unless party members are brainwashed en masse or driven out.

The Harrimanite resolutions

The **foreign policy** document to be voted on at the convention adds up to an unqualified endorsement of transforming U.S. and NATO military capabilities into an instrument for massacring the populations of developing nations. "Internationally we are faced not only with Soviet military power, but also with intensified economic competition, resource shortages and cartels, spread in nuclear weapons capabilities, starvation or poverty of half the world's population, and burgeoning demands upon the environmental heritage of humanity. . . . All of these are threats to our national security and explosive challenges to our way of life. . . ."

"America's foreign policy must address as well the global problems of environmental deterioration, hunger, and rapid population growth. . . . America's long-standing leadership in confronting the population threat should be maintained."

Other DNC resolutions call for:

Legalized murder in the name of **health care**. The DNC draft resolution on "Investing in Our People" proposes that "The problems of our health care system pose continuing challenges to the Democratic Party and to the nation as a whole. We must find new, creative incentives to reorient health care instead of treating sickness. We must pursue an aggressive program for restraining costs." These solutions, whose leading spokesman is Senator Ted Kennedy, involve denying medical care to the elderly, poor, and handicapped and restraining costs by inflicting "death with dignity," on the Nazi model of doing away with "useless eaters."

Labor policy can be summed up as sacrifice. "In every period of national challenge in our history, the American people have been willing to sacrifice for the common good so long as they understood the sacrifice would be fairly shared. We must launch a national commitment, building on a partnership among government, business and labor to invest in our future growth and productivity." Securing labor's cooperation through a Mussolini-modeled corporatist apparatus,

the Harrimanites intend to impose drastic cuts in real wages, give-backs in benefits, and other sacrifices.

Various proposals are being circulated on how to restrain wages:

- James Tobin, Nobel economist and co-chairman of the National Policy Exchange's policy advisory board, advocates "getting rid of Davis-Bacon, zoning and building codes, and continuing deregulation, particularly in transportation and trucking."

- Barry Bosworth, Director of Carter's Council on Wage and Price Stability, suggests in a Center for National Policy study issued last fall, in addition to mandatory wage controls, eliminating multi-year union contracts and cost-of-living escalators; outlawing strikes; and abrogating existing contracts.

- Several Democratic "experts" are promoting a tax-based incomes policy (TIP), which would penalize wage hikes above a certain level by imposing additional taxes on both employer and employee.

- Paul Jensen, executive director of the National Policy Exchange, is one of many DNC advisers who advocates setting up a national tripartite board to coordinate wage restraints.

Investment policy is devoted to the post-industrial era. The draft resolution acclaims "industries like computers, communications, electronic components, aerospace, pharmaceuticals, fiber optics, and data base management." This section of the DNC's economic policy resolution is a declaration of war on the country's basic industrial infrastructure, which is to be replaced by a post-industrial "information economy." In this respect, the resolution mirrors the "National Agenda for the Eighties" issued by the Carter administration.

Lester Thurow, also a member of the DNC's Economic Priorities Panel and a favorite spokesman for the Center for National Priorities argues against attempting to prop up what he calls "dying industries" such as basic steel, on the grounds that the props "will only prolong the pain. *Whatever government does, they will in the end die.*"

The **energy policy** is "conservation, insulation, retrofitting factories, and power plants; through production and development of our coal, oil, and natural gas resources; through the creation of new industries for synthetic fuels; and in the technological miracles that American genius can create in solar power; geo-thermal energy, wind power, biomass and other new forms of energy. Energy conservation is the people's energy source," says the DNC draft resolution, ruling out nuclear and fusion energy. Already, an estimated 115 million people in the developing sector have died since the 1960s because the advanced sector, especially the United States, has put the brakes on nuclear-power development. Calling conservation "the people's energy source" is like saying that hunger is the people's food.

Editorial Comment

Hinckley decision is license for assassins

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

John W. Hinckley, Jr., a highly-trained assassin apprehended in the shooting of President Ronald Reagan and others, has just been awarded a legal slap on the wrist. He has been exonerated on a plea of legal insanity.

This is not merely a monstrous miscarriage of justice. It is, plainly and simply, an invitation to every pot-smoking scoundrel with a mental-illness-treatment-record to make himself a national celebrity by taking a pot-shot at some prominent political figure.

I am not interested in what the jury did or did not think. The jury was, overall, a typical street-corner audience standing fascinated, watching a shell-game run by the federal prosecution. The jury guessed where the pea was hidden; naturally, as the decision shows, the suckers bet wrong, as usual.

How the shell-game was rigged

From my knowledge of the Hinckley case, the prosecution and defense teams in the court case were both effectively orchestrators of Hinckley's "insanity" defense, with the principal psychiatric witnesses for both sides drawn from the same orbit: the interconnection of the World Health Organization, National Institute of Mental Health, and directly or indirectly interfacing the same Walter Reed Hospital at which one among the jurors was a psychiatric researcher.

More important than the "dog and pony show" features of the courtroom-debate on psychiatric interpretation was the manner in which that sideshow was rigged. Hinckley was presented by the prosecution as a "lone assassin," and therefore the jury was not given the mass of facts indicating that Hinckley was a highly-trained potential assassin and that strong indications of a "Manchurian candidate" case had been developed during the investigations.

Especially significant is the fact that Hinckley's psychiatric treatment in Colorado tracked him through institutions which are known in the psychiatric literature as authorities on the subject of techniques for creating "Manchurian candidate" varieties of assassins. This is especially significant when compared with the fact that a number of persons constituting a "threat-potential" against the President during the same period as Hinck-