

Bush Democrats emerge in Virginia electoral campaign

When the excitement calmed down after the Virginia Democratic Central Committee meeting in Richmond Feb. 10, there stood on the political landscape a new political phenomenon. Ruling the Virginia party with a style reminiscent of East German and Soviet communists were the Bush Democrats.

Under the leadership of the Bush Democrats, the Central Committee made a series of decisions aimed at guaranteeing the re-election of Bush Republican incumbent U.S. Senator John Warner. Lest one think that this is an ordinary event, it should be noted that Virginia Democrats have never let a Republican senator have a free ride before in this century.

Even more outrageous was the fact that the Democratic Central Committee decided to declare the only declared Democratic opponent of Warner a "non-person," and deny her the right to address any official body of the state party. While highly embarrassed by LaRouche Democrat Nancy Spannaus's demand that she get the right to speak, the party leadership nonetheless went right ahead to endorse rule changes that virtually guarantee that she, or any other Democrat, will not be nominated without the blessing of the Democratic Party *Nomenklatura*.

The significance of the Bush Democrats' decision was underscored by the fact that it was covered throughout the nation, and in some international press as well, as a concession to Senator Warner. One of the most pungent commentators on the event was noted consumer advocate Ralph Nader, who saw the move as the sign of a disturbing political trend.

"It looks like there will be a higher turnover in the Soviet Parliament than there is going to be in the U.S. Congress," Nader said. "If the Democratic Party cannot field a candidate against an incumbent senator in the state of Virginia, this has to be considered a serious abdication of a public obligation

by the opposing party to provide adequate competition and choice for the voters in a very important election."

The Virginia Democrats' decision not to challenge Warner reflects an alarming consensus within the U.S.'s political elite, to proceed with economic and strategic policies which have led to the dramatic decline in the United States. Indeed, Democratic Party policy differs little from that of Kissinger Republicans like Warner.

Warner, who announced his bid for a third term as senator on Feb. 5, is best known for his erstwhile marriage to Hollywood witch Elizabeth Taylor. As the minority leader on the Senate Armed Services Committee, the former Secretary of the Navy has dutifully followed the line of the Kissinger men, all the while putting himself forward as "pro-defense." Next to defense issues, Warner is most vocal in fighting for "tougher environmental laws," laws which have already bankrupted several industries for no other reason but the demands of the environmental lunatics.

Warner apparently would not be caught dead taking a moral stand. He voted against the Chinese students, at the President's demand; adamantly refused to take a stand on abortion; and claims that the Constitution condones the spread of Satanism in the military.

The Bush Democrats of Virginia apparently have no problem with these policies of Senator Warner. They claim that he is overwhelmingly popular in the state, and that it is not worth spending the money to challenge him. Some even argue that keeping Warner in is a good deal, since he has promised to mitigate the defense budget cuts for the Commonwealth. Others point to a deal between Warner and the party because the senator refused to back Republican Marshall Coleman's legal challenge to the election of Democratic governor L. Douglas Wilder.

The Spannaus challenge

By deciding not to challenge Warner, however, the Democratic Party is in fact turning its back on the vast majority of the party's base in the state. Labor, family farmers, and the black population have been under devastating assault by the policies of usury and the post-industrial society being implemented by the federal government. Due to these insane policies, the new Democratic administration of the Commonwealth is being forced to announce severe budget cuts against the very people who voted it into office.

It is among these layers that Nancy Spannaus, a LaRouche Democrat and editor of *New Federalist* newspaper, has conducted a vigorous campaign for Senate from February 1989 onward. Local party officials, as well as unionists and civil rights organizations, have expressed intense interest in the LaRouche program for emergency economic recovery, and have indicated an intense distrust of, if not animosity toward, Senator Warner.

Spannaus's program is identical to that of Lyndon LaRouche, who is running for the Democratic nomination in the 10th Congressional District of Virginia. That program calls for a drastic shift in policy back to that evinced by Presidents John Kennedy in 1963, and Franklin Roosevelt in the 1930s: adoption of government credit policies that would pour billions of dollars into infrastructure construction, and a turn away from environmentalist destruction of U.S. productive investment.

Communist tactics

Aware of the appeal of the LaRouche program to the party base, the Bush Democratic Committee was determined that Spannaus not even get a chance to address the Central Committee meeting, much less win the nomination. Party chief Paul Goldman ducked all contact with Spannaus until immediately before the session began. At that point he told her point blank: "You will not address the meeting."

Thus when Goldman began his report on how it was the "unanimous opinion" of the "search committee" that "there was no Democrat who wanted to run for the Senate and there was no viable candidate," Spannaus challenged him. "That's a lie," she said, touching off a chorus of demands that she be permitted to speak. When Goldman attempted to proceed without recognizing her, Spannaus and campaign workers Alan Ogden and Jerry Belsky, went to the front of the room to seek to address the meeting. Goldman, too terrified even to pound his gavel, simply dissolved the meeting—leaving chaos to reign for at least 10 minutes.

During the chaos, Spannaus and Ogden confronted the Central Committee. "Why won't you listen to her? What are you afraid of? You're like the Communists in East Germany. . . . John Warner and George Bush are destroying this country," Ogden shouted.

Spannaus's point was underlined by a statement that had been distributed at the meeting from one of East Germany's

revolutionary leaders, Peter Albach. Albach, a leader of the Demokratische Aufbruch (Democratic Revolution) in Thuringia, said: "I have learned with great dismay, that the party apparatus of the Democratic Party in Virginia, U.S.A., intends to use shady tactics to prevent 'LaRouche Democrat' Nancy Spannaus from running for office. We in the G.D.R. know those tactics from our own situation very, very well. If the will of the party base is betrayed, then not only does democracy inside the party get destroyed, but democracy in general. . . ."

"For me and my countrymen, who right now are engaged in overthrowing the hated SED regime and are fighting for freedom from communism, it is alarming to see, that such shady SED practices are also used in the country which we, up to now, have considered the essence of democracy and freedom."

Virginia's 'Article 6'

After Spannaus and some supporters were escorted from the meeting, the Central Committee proceeded to vote up the Bush Democrats' equivalent of Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution. That article, which enshrines the Communist Party as the dominant party in the state, is now echoed by Virginia's Article 10, which permits the party to cancel citizen participation in choosing a Democratic candidate, and leave it to the Central Committee.

Article 10, listed under "General Provisions," reads as follows: "If a majority of delegates elected to the State Convention have prefiled a preference that no candidate be nominated by the Democratic Party, or if no candidate has received the commitment of at least 20% of the delegates to the convention within one week after the mass meeting, the State Party Chairman may cancel the convention and declare that there shall be no nominee of the Democratic Party unless the Democratic State Central Committee nominates a candidate by two-thirds majority vote."

What that means, in fact, is that a candidate must get *over 50%* of the delegates precommitted to him or her, in order to prevent the party leadership from canceling the convention allegedly set up to find a candidate against Warner. Conventions, compared to primaries, are usually easy for the party hacks to rig. This one is set up to be rigged so that there is either no candidate, or one picked by the *Nomenklatura*.

In a statement released Feb. 15, congressional candidate Lyndon LaRouche noted that the Bush Democrats of Virginia seem to be going through self-destructive contortions trying to prevent him and his associates from running in the election.

"It's as if they were afraid that in the 1990 Virginia elections, that we might sweep the state. I hadn't calculated that, and maybe they know something I don't know, but they certainly are running very afraid that I'll take over this state, whether they have a basis for this fear or whether they're paranoid, I don't yet know."