

Hadley's primary victory in Pennsylvania sends a signal

by Mel Klenetsky

As the results of the Pennsylvania primaries swept through the newsrooms of the land, one development barely recognized by the national news media was the Democratic primary victory of Donald A. Hadley in the 5th Congressional District. Hadley has been a "LaRouche Democrat" for many years. After the Super Tuesday (March 8) victory of LaRouche Democrat Claude Jones in the race for Houston's Harris County Democratic Party chairmanship, the pattern of voter support for LaRouche Democrats has caused an unparalleled fit of rug-chewing throughout Democratic Party leadership circles.

The Democratic Party leadership and the press, which has so dutifully kept the actual policies of Lyndon H. LaRouche and LaRouche Democrats out of the news, has decided to continue to pretend these LaRouche victories are minor, unimportant events produced by misguided voters.

On the contrary, these victories are the tip of the iceberg. There is growing public awareness of LaRouche's policies, as the alternative to Reagan-Bush and to the policies of Armand Hammer's towel boy, Paul Kirk and the Democratic Party leadership. We are witnessing LaRouche breakouts in many areas, even with intense anti-LaRouche campaigning by news media and top levels of the party in these areas.

The victories are sure signs that there is a "sea-change" occurring in the electorate. First, the LaRouche votes have a definite anti-Establishment character to them, the same characteristic that accounts for much of both Jackson's vote and Robertson's vote on the Republican side. The LaRouche vote, however, comes as part of a growing process of support for LaRouche Democrats across the land, a pattern that goes back to 1982 and before, when the LaRouche candidates' movement started to roll. Voters are fed up with the current leadership of the Democrats and the Republicans, refusing to

believe the lies that we are now in the 67th unbroken month of economic recovery. Low voter turnout, the second characteristic of recent electoral patterns, is another way that the U.S. electorate has characteristically rejected the brainwashing attempts of Washington and the media.

Hadley's opponent in the 5th C.D., Robert W. Houchins, who was backed by the county-level leadership, upon news of his defeat, expressed the exact level of disregard for the electorate that the Democratic Party leadership has shown for the voters from the days of Jimmy Carter on. (The result, of course, was mass defection of Democrats to Reagan during the past two presidential elections.) Houchins lashed out at the voters who had rejected him, saying that they would have voted for Charles Manson, just because they recognized his name. Going even further, he added, "The voters deserved what they got. . . . They have their heads so far up their . . . they can't see the light of day."

Houchins' coarse reaction was in fact no different than the response of the Harris County Democratic Executive Committee, led by defeated former county chairman George Veselka. In March, LaRouche Democrat Claude Jones garnered 53,000 votes, 52% of the vote, in the second-largest electoral county in the country. Veselka and company passed a resolution stripping Jones of his power as a Democratic county chairman, brashly violating the mandate of the electorate, while proclaiming the power-stripping resolution a victory for the Democratic Party. In 1986, when two LaRouche Democrats, Mark Fairchild and Janice Hart, won the Democratic primary positions of lieutenant governor and secretary of state in Illinois, the Democratic candidate for governor, Adlai Stevenson III, refused to run on the same slate. He withdrew, started his own party, and left the Democrats to lose to the Jim Thompson-led Republican ticket. Illinois

Democrats have yet to recover from Adlai's antics. Armand Hammer, Dwayne Andreas, and the Hollywood mafia backers of the Democratic Party, together with Paul Kirk, Adlai Stevenson, George Veselka, and poor Robert Houchins, cannot accept what is going on in the population; they refuse to deal with it.

No fluke

The Hadley victory was not a fluke. This was Hadley's second campaign. In 1986, he captured 34% of the vote in the same congressional district, which lies 30 miles west of Philadelphia. The 5th CD has three cities, Chester, Pottstown, and Coatesville. Chester, population 45,000, is a poverty-stricken, drug-ridden area that was once a thriving shipbuilding and manufacturing center on the Delaware River. Pottstown was formerly a rubber manufacturing center. Coatesville and Phoenixville, cities in Hadley's district, were once centered around steel plants, but are now depressed. The agricultural areas of Hadley's district were once known as the "mushroom capital of the world."

Hadley campaigned door to door, talking up LaRouche's programs for industrial and agricultural recovery. Hadley was not the only LaRouche Democrat to do well. George Elder, a LaRouche Democrat who ran for Senate in 1986, ran unopposed, winning the Democratic Party nomination in the 21st CD. Elder's Republican opponent, Thomas Ridge, also ran unopposed. Elder drew 35,900 votes, more than Ridge's 35,400.

Another LaRouche Democrat, Steve Douglas, running for Senate, came in a strong third out of four, with 145,000 votes. In the 7th CD, Claudia Billington received 20% of the vote, while in the 10th CD, George Eddleston came in with 32.5%.

These kinds of vote totals did not start in 1988. In 1982, Steve Douglas, running for governor, came in second of four, with 155,000 votes. In 1984, LaRouche started his presidential bid in Pennsylvania's April primary flanked by 16 congressional candidates out of a possible 23. (LaRouche refers to these candidates as his running mates.) In 1984, Sarah Phleger of the 17th CD won 49.5% of the vote. Three other congressional candidates, including George Elder, came in with over 30% of the vote. The LaRouche 1984 Democratic campaign got out between 5 and 6 million pieces of literature, saturating the state with LaRouche's ideas.

In 1986, LaRouche Democrats ran in 19 of 23 congressional districts and Hadley and Eddleston both came in with over 30% of the vote.

Nor is the pattern unique to Pennsylvania. Claude Jones's victory in Harris County, Texas wasn't the first there. In May 1986, Donald Varella won a plurality victory of 38% in a five-way race for Bexar County party chairman. That county contains San Antonio, Texas, the tenth-largest city in the country and the third-largest electoral county in Texas. At that time, San Antonio Mayor Henry Cisneros and Texas Democratic state chair Bob Slagle actively pressured Varella

to drop out, which he did after a systematic harassment and slander campaign directed at him and his family, run through his community and church.

The Varella victory at the polls was nonetheless firm, the more so because it occurred after the Hart and Fairchild victories in Illinois. In the aftermath of the Stevenson-Illinois debacle, Bob Slagle, Texas Democratic chairman, had made a personal issue of campaigning against Varella in San Antonio—to no avail.

In 1984, Bert Naranjo, another LaRouche Democrat, had won 42% of the vote for Bexar County chairman, and between 1984 and 1986, LaRouche Democrats received over 30% of the vote in more than 10 county races.

In Illinois, too, the Hart-Fairchild 1986 victories were not the first for LaRouche. In 1984, Marie Anne McArdle won the Democratic primary slot for Will County auditor with 51% of the vote. That same year, Jerry "Laser" Berg, a LaRouche Democrat, won 46% of the vote in the 4th CD, which includes Will County, where the city of Joliet is located. In 1988, Sheila Jones, running for Cook County (Chicago) recorder of deeds, won 116,064 votes.

Fraud against LaRouche himself

The depth of support for LaRouche's ideas is evident. But: When LaRouche himself runs, there is clearly massive vote fraud. In 1984 in Pennsylvania, LaRouche was credited with under 1% of the vote in the Democratic presidential race. He went into court in several precincts, and proved, with sworn affidavits, that more people voted for him than the vote totals that appeared on the backs of the machines. The judge ruled that this was irrelevant, unless LaRouche produced affidavits from more than 15% of the voters, the amount needed to give LaRouche delegates and change the outcome of the election. Proving vote fraud is extremely difficult, but showing a 15% pattern of fraud, with sworn affidavits, is nearly impossible.

LaRouche's 1988 New Hampshire vote total of 179 was equally absurd. He had more campaign workers than that!

LaRouche maintains that his support will surface in a brokered convention, come the July 18 Democratic National Convention in Atlanta. There is not a great deal of support for either Dukakis or Jesse Jackson. In New York, only 12% of the electorate even bothered to show up, and front-runner Dukakis' vote totals, according to ABC News polls, were based on a 37% negative vote factor against Jackson, rather than for Dukakis. In Pennsylvania only 38% of the electorate showed up and 47% of those who voted for Dukakis said they did not stand strongly behind him.

Dukakis will not win a majority in the first round, after which delegates can vote their choice. Should the economic crisis or the other crises that LaRouche has identified on nationwide half-hour television broadcasts break out before July, the convention will be wide open for the Democratic maverick, whose base of support in the party, as just evidenced in Pennsylvania, continues to grow.