

One of the striking features of the race has been the Hughes campaign tactics. Hughes has made an issue of Chappell's accepting PAC contributions for his race. Yet Hughes, a multi-millionaire through Hughes Developments has personally financed almost his entire campaign effort, with a few contributions from Texas oil-related interests thrown in.

Hughes has also insinuated that Chappell is for nuclear holocaust because of his support for the "Broomfield resolution" which passed the House, endorsing the achievement of nuclear weapons parity between the United States and Soviet Union before implementing a nuclear weapons freeze. The alternative called for an immediate freeze. Hughes outlines, to *EIR*, his support for 15 percent cuts in advanced weapons systems and a conventional warfare buildup "so we can fight a conventional war which we can't do today." This orientation not only eliminates the "science driver benefit" of military spending, but has been condemned by the NDPC as oriented toward fighting genocidal wars against the developing sector nations.

Who's supported by 'big business'?

Hughes, while claiming that the DNC is "technically" neutral in his race, refers to the destruction of Mottl to *EIR* as having been "we" who "got him." Aside from employing regular DNC pollster Pat Caddell as his own, Hughes is explicit on his business connections and professional associations with the notorious Charter Oil Co. Charter Oil was intimately involved in the organized crime, drug, and dirty money networks involving Billy Carter and Libyan madman Muammar Qaddafi.

It is one of the ironies of this race that while Hughes is accusing Chappell of being supported by "big business," Hughes is being backed by the ultimate "big business," the international financial and political networks currently controlling the DNC who are promoting policies that will end the role of the United States as a world power, and are leading to the deaths of hundreds of millions of people in the developing world.

Interview: Opponent Reid Hughes

'We must control world population'

From an interview with Reid Hughes, challenger to incumbent Rep. Bill Chappell (D-Fla.) in the Oct. 5 Democratic primary runoff in the Fifth Congressional District, which includes part of Jacksonville and the area to the south of it:

EIR October 5, 1982

EIR: Your campaign reminds me a bit of the campaign won against Ron Mottl in Cleveland some months back. You have AFL-CIO support, backing of three major newspapers. . . .

Hughes: From the National Education Association, the Sierra Club, League of Conservation Voters. . . . This will be the first boll weevil in the South to be defeated. Mottl wasn't really a full-blown boll weevil at the time we got him.

EIR: How is the Democratic National Committee orienting toward your campaign?

Hughes: Neutral.

EIR: You have Pat Caddell as your pollster.

Hughes: Right.

EIR: That would tend to indicate they're not exactly neutral.

Hughes: I'd say they're technically neutral.

EIR: One of the issues you are interested in is education.

Hughes: Right. Education, the economy, the environment, social security, and senior citizens' protection.

EIR: What do you see as the biggest need in education?

Hughes: First of all, restoration of education cuts. And secondly, some innovative concepts including the emergence in the training of technical skills as well as languages and other skills that would provide people the opportunity to get into new areas of endeavor.

EIR: Do you mean areas like computer technology?

Hughes: The technological as well as the service-oriented industries.

EIR: Do you say that because that is the way the economy is shifting?

Hughes: Sure. I think we're having a change into the new era of service, technological orientation in industry.

EIR: Have you addressed interest rates?

Hughes: We think interest rates are obviously directly attuned to the huge deficits and we're proposing deficit reductions through plugging the tax loopholes that benefit higher incomes and corporate entities, as well as reduction of the nuclear controversial hardware thrust in the military budget.

EIR: There have been several initiatives over the last year that criticize Paul Volcker directly for the interest rate problem. Would you endorse that type of action?

Hughes: Yes, I would.

EIR: What do you think Volcker should be doing that he's not?

Hughes: I think Volcker has made statements that he is

totally autonomous, that he's not working in concert with the administration and the Congress and I think that is obviously not a good policy . . . and that's not a way to be responsive not only to the economy but to the needs of the American monetary system.

EIR: You mentioned defense spending. What do you propose?

Hughes: I would recommend a 15 percent cut in some of the more sophisticated controversial and unproven weaponry and a reinforcement of our conventional warfare: smaller warheads, smaller tanks so we can fight a conventional war which we can't do today.

EIR: That sounds like the military reform caucus in the Congress. Are you familiar with that?

Hughes: Right. A modified version.

EIR: Have you discussed this with Senator Hart?

Hughes: Yes. I have his position papers and subscribe more or less to Gary Hart's positions.

EIR: How do you view abortion, birth control and the broader question of population?

Hughes: I'm pro-choice. . . . Of course, I look with a great deal of caution on making a blanket statement on how you control population growth. We obviously have a worldwide problem of family and population control which I think is being addressed in many countries. I don't know that the congress could do a whole lot in that respect. My philosophy is we must control world population.

EIR: Are there any particular associations or institutions that could be supported?

Hughes: At this point I don't have a position on that.

EIR: The Carter administration did draft a specific policy. . . .

Hughes: I'm aware of that and I'm not at this point in a position to other than philosophically endorse that proposal.

EIR: But you do see that as a significant problem?

Hughes: Absolutely. No question about that.

EIR: I'd like to ask you about your business career. . . . You started your business back in 1954, now I understand that that business did not succeed.

Hughes: It did succeed. . . . I've always been successful.

EIR: I understood that you abandoned that business and went out to California for a number of years. . . .

Hughes: No, untrue. I've always been in the oil business. I've been successful in other business ventures; financial reversals but nothing significant. If you do enough things you're going to have ups and downs.

EIR: What other types of business ventures have you been involved in?

Hughes: We've been in commercial development, shipping centers, hotels, grocery business, car wash business.

EIR: Is that through a particular entity?

Hughes: Investments through our corporate entities. Hughes Developments . . . these are development businesses, commercial leasing . . . shopping centers, Country Convenience, Inc.;

EIR: Have you ever had any business connection to Charter Oil?

Hughes: I bought supplies from them, I buy from about 14 suppliers. Of course, I know Raymond Mason very well. We served on the board of the Development Commission, come to speak of governmental experience. In the early 1960s I served on the Florida Development Commission.

EIR: Have you had prominent individuals come into the state to campaign for you?

Hughes: As far as supporters? . . . former speaker of the House . . . I have others but we'll leave it there.

EIR: How about prominent supporters from the Democratic Party nationally?

Hughes: Since this is a Democratic Primary most want to remain anonymous. You know how that goes.

EIR: Is there any move in Florida to legalize gambling?

Hughes: Oh there are moves, nothing significant.

EIR: Would you support that?

Hughes: No, I would not, I'm opposed to any additional legalized gambling.

EIR: What do you see as the most important priorities for development in the state?

Hughes: Industrial development and preservation of the ecology.

EIR: You mean industrial development along the lines you described earlier?

Hughes: Right.

EIR: What's your prognosis for the election? Have you taken any polls lately?

Hughes: I think we're ahead. And will be elected.

EIR: What was your most recent poll?

Hughes: This week, middle of the week.

EIR: Do you have the results?

Hughes: Yeah. Favorable. I'm not going to give you the percentages.