

# How the FEC pleased Moscow

by David Wolinsky

In an action which Federal Election Commission chair Lee Ann Elliot characterized as lacking "objective standards," Democratic National Chairman Charles Manatt's allies on the FEC Jan. 26 rammed through a motion denying Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.'s eligibility to receive federal matching funds in LaRouche's campaign for the 1984 presidential nomination of the Democratic Party.

LaRouche's response was swift: "In recent Moscow newspaper reports, and through other channels, the Soviet government has identified LaRouche as 'Moscow's enemy number one in the U.S.A.,' and Moscow has been pressuring Democratic Party circles in the U.S.A. to dump LaRouche and LaRouche's policies," said a campaign release issued the same day. "Meanwhile, the Minnesota state Mondale political machine has been collaborating openly with top Soviet KGB officials in planning tactics for pushing the Soviet 'Nuclear Freeze' line in the United States. Mondale is properly identified as part of the Henry A. Kissinger wing of the Democratic Party, as the list of Mondale's official advisors shows. Manatt's firm has important business connections to Moscow. At the same time, the Harriman wing of the Democratic Party has also been collaborating actively with Moscow against President Ronald Reagan, as well as deploying its forces against LaRouche."

"The pretext for the FEC's action was one of the wildest abuses of bureaucratic procedure openly exhibited by any Washington agency. After the FEC's audit had qualified LaRouche to receive campaign matching funds, FEC General Counsel Charles Steele issued a report recommending denial of eligibility. The grounds included a list of false statements by Steele, plus Steele's insistence that LaRouche 'has no intention to fulfill' his signed candidate's agreement with the FEC.

"The willful falsehoods in Steele's recommendation are matters of record in federal court-actions still in progress. Yet, despite this evidence of his lying, Steele refused to withdraw those false allegations. He pressed ahead with his insistence that LaRouche intends to repudiate his signed agreements with the FEC at some future time.

"Such outrageous behavior toward LaRouche by the FEC is not without precedent. Earlier, the FEC was denounced by a federal judge for its unprecedented and discriminatory abuse of bureaucratic procedure against LaRouche. FEC vice-com-

missioner Tom Harris, former associate general counsel to the AFL-CIO of Lane Kirkland, has figured prominently in these matters during the past. NBC-TV's Brian Ross, reputed to be an FBI stringer, bragged of an FEC plot against LaRouche even before LaRouche's legal representatives were informed that Steele's proposal existed. NBC-TV has been implicated as conspiring with the Playboy Foundation-backed High Times drug-lobby and the former owners of the Chicago Sun-Times in a multi-million-dollar dirty-tricks operation against LaRouche, the subject of a federal court action in Chicago. Currently, NBC-TV's 'First Camera' is working with the same drug-pushers' lobby, spending many millions in preparing a fraudulent, libelous twenty-minute feature on that NBC-TV broadcast. The evidence is that FEC General Counsel Steele is complicit in these drug-pushers-lobby-linked operations.

On January 27, The LaRouche Campaign filed an emergency appeal with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The campaign is seeking, *inter alia*, an injunction mandating FEC certification of LaRouche's eligibility and expedited consideration of a motion for summary reversal of the FEC's illegal actions.

## The FEC's destructive history

The Federal Election Commission was created by act of Congress in 1974, a few days after the resignation of president Richard Nixon. It was created by the same forces involved in destroying much of the independent labor leaders through racketeering charges, and later brought congressmen and others low through the Abscam and other frameup operations. But these were watershed victories in a campaign to both discredit and increase control over, above all, the presidency of the United States; the FEC was the handiwork of an oligarchic policy-shaping institutions network dedicated to the destruction of U.S. constituency politics. This network features the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, the (London) International Institute for Strategic Studies, the Twentieth Century Fund, and the Club of Rome. These and related institutions are Moscow's favored collaborators in the more fundamental project of creating "post-industrial society"—in the West.

These forces have recognized for years that their greatest enemy in the attempt to undo the work of America's founding fathers is the influence of Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

• After stalling for three months on the claim of LaRouche's 1976 campaign committee, CTEL, for matching funds, the FEC sent its agents into Wisconsin, Delaware, and Massachusetts for three days of surprise visits to CTEL contributors and their employers, some of these interrogations—attempts to confuse and coerce contributors—were conducted at 6 a.m. CTEL was not notified, but on Feb. 10 the FEC announced that LaRouche had not qualified for matching funds because of insufficient campaign contributions in three states: Wisconsin, Delaware, and Massachusetts. A week later, highly placed Washington sources informed CTEL and

the U.S. Labor Party—LaRouche's short-lived attempt to create a third party in the American Whig tradition—that the Jimmy Carter-controlled National Security Council had launched a 60-day program to bankrupt the LaRouche organization, using FEC investigations as one of its chief instruments.

● In February of 1980 Citizens for LaRouche, CFL, filed a watertight submission for matching funds, which was approved by the FEC. Lyndon LaRouche was contesting the Democratic presidential nomination, and the press organs of the Eastern Establishment went wild. *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Philadelphia Inquirer*, etc. all howled in rage that a "fringe candidate" had made it through a "loop-hole" in the law. The FEC launched ten simultaneous "investigations" that were still going strong two years later, with no end in sight. CFL's books were put under a microscope and contributors again raked over the coals—only this time they had to be subpoenaed first.

One Baltimore CFL volunteer described in a court deposition why she had "seriously considered dropping out of the LaRouche campaign as a result of this investigation": "This was not because of anything the campaign did or did not do. I just did not want the hassle when I was starting a new job of having marshals at my house . . . and having to explain to my employer that I was being questioned by the federal government as a result of my political activities." Since the FEC was legally required to expedite such investigations, they were all prolonged by the ruse of calling them "preliminary" investigations.

## FEC 'Star Chamber'

Patricia Dolbeare, as Treasurer of CFL, sued the FEC. On March 9, 1982 Federal District Court Judge Charles Brieant issued a preliminary injunction against the FEC, in a landmark decision in an area—chastising a federal investigation—which the judge himself called "an uncharted sea."

"It would be hard to imagine a more abusive visitation of bureaucratic power," said Judge Brieant of the FEC's methods in his *Dolbeare vs. FEC* ruling. "We doubt that the congressional sponsors in enacting this supposedly remedial legislation ever expected or intended that a volunteer political group would become so enmeshed in governmental red tape and bureaucratic nitpicking as to be visited with as many MURs [FEC investigations] as have been visited upon these plaintiffs, without prompt conclusion. . . . These MURs are not, nor should they become, a Star Chamber Proceeding. It is not a crime for someone such as LaRouche, clearly not a part of the mainstream of the Democratic Party . . . to seek its nomination."

As a result of Brieant's injunction, the FEC's investigation and the CFL suit were settled through voluntary "conciliation" proceedings. When this settlement became unglued, CFL and FEC went back to court again, where they still are: it is this defense of LaRouche's rights under law and the Constitution to which FEC General Counsel Charles Steele objects. The payments in dispute from the FEC's 1980-82 vendetta against LaRouche are what Steele cites as his basis for claiming that LaRouche doesn't qualify for matching funds this time around.

## Why the FEC denied LaRouche matching funds

*FEC General Counsel Charles Steele's "Statement of Reasons" accompanying the FEC's rejection of the LaRouche matching fund submission, contains falsehoods patently designed to inflame the Commissioners against LaRouche.*

*We present a few of counsel Steele's "reasons" below:*

On Jan. 13, 1984, the Office of the General Counsel submitted a recommendation to the Commission that Mr. LaRouche be denied eligibility to receive matching funds. On January 14, 1984, after this recommendation was made public, Mr. LaRouche's counsel contacted the Office of the General Counsel to discuss what Mr. LaRouche could do to satisfy the stated concerns. In addition, prior to the Commission's meeting of January 19, 1984, Commis-

sioners and staff persons reported receiving harrassing, threatening and obscene phone calls, at home and in the office, from persons identifying themselves as LaRouche supporters. They are continuing to receive such calls. During the morning of the Commission meeting, persons identifying themselves as LaRouche supporters picketed outside the agency, accusing the Commission, named Commissioners, and staff of a variety of activities, including being biased, Nazis, and controlled by the KGB, as well as homosexuality.

The Commission has determined that the arguments raised by Lyndon LaRouche . . . as well as his failure to make the repayment which has been due and owing to the U.S. Treasury for more than a year . . . demonstrate that he has repudiated his undertakings in his 1979 letter. . . . The Commission finds that the repudiation of his obligations under the 1979 candidate agreement provides strong evidence that the promises made by Mr. LaRouche in his Dec. 30, 1983 letter are not made with a good faith intention to fulfill those promises.