LaRouche wing of Democratic Party makes ADL toadies tremble with fear

by John Sigerson

On Feb. 8, David Wilhelm, a member of the Democratic National Committee (DNC), presented Illinois party chairman Gary Le Paille with a check for $20,000 which will be used in an effort to prevent 21 members of the rapidly growing LaRouche wing of the Democratic Party from winning in the state's March 17 primary elections and having their names placed on the general election ballot. Spouting slanders manufactured at the headquarters of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL), both Wilhelm and Le Paille have been addressing local party meetings and hitting the air-waves in an attempt to prevent a repeat of 1986, when two LaRouche associates won the primary elections for lieutenant governor and secretary of state.

According to informed sources, state party officials have been told by the DNC in no uncertain terms, that if any LaRouche candidate wins this time, Chicago will not be the site of the next Democratic Party convention.

Harder to beat

Even news commentators who are normally hostile to LaRouche's policy proposals for economic reconstruction, reform of the national banking system, and a serious war on drugs, are admitting that the LaRouche wing will be even harder to beat this time around. The Wilhelm-ADL wing of the party already revealed their weakness by dropping their plans to mount a legal challenge to the LaRouche Democrats' nominating petitions, and instead opting to launch a shrill publicity campaign to "enlighten" voters about which candidates are running on the primary ballot. Spouting slanders manufactured at the headquarters of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL), both Wilhelm and Le Paille have been addressing local party meetings and hitting the air-waves in an attempt to prevent a repeat of 1986, when two LaRouche associates won the primary elections for lieutenant governor and secretary of state.

According to informed sources, state party officials have been told by the DNC in no uncertain terms, that if any LaRouche candidate wins this time, Chicago will not be the site of the next Democratic Party convention.

One of the top mongers of anti-LaRouche hysteria is Illinois Sen. Paul Simon (D), whose fanaticism on this point led to the fracturing of the state Democratic Party back in 1986. LaRouche, asked recently by Chicago talk show host Cliff Kelly to explain the origin of these "anti-Semitic" and "anti-black" allegations, said that he is of course "none of the above" and pointed to the case of Adlai Stevenson III, the Democrats' candidate for governor in 1986, who had originally announced his willingness to run alongside the LaRouche candidates, but then made a sudden turnaround and established an entirely new party for his campaign. "Look at Adlai Stevenson in 1986," LaRouche said. "He was induced to shoot both his feet off, his political ambitions, by some message delivered by Paul Simon, according to his account. I believe it. And what you're looking at with these fellows up there, is someone says they hate this man, and somebody [else] says, 'Why? What's bad about him?' And they don't know, they fumble and fumble. They were told to go out and hate this man, and they say, 'Yassuh, boss,' and that's it.'"

Reality intervenes

In 1994, the same crowd around Simon seems intent on corrupting their own party still further. But the very shrillness of the slander campaign is likely to backfire, for three reasons. First, the current party leadership has already been discredited in the eyes of many Democratic voters because of the leadership's refusal to oppose the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Second, the LaRouche candidates have been conducting their campaign with such dignity and coherence that Wilhelm and Le Paille may well end up looking like the real "extremists." And third, efforts to inform voters about which candidates are running on LaRouche's program can help disgruntled Democratic voters to identify which candidates represent an alternative to the present corrupt leadership.

Nowhere has this sense of dignity been more evident than in the flagship campaign of Sheila Jones, a former schoolteacher and civil rights activist who is running for governor. "Lyndon LaRouche and our wing of the Democratic Party have stood firm on the ground of integrity and principle," reads: "Heritage Foundation senior policy analyst: 'The wild-eyed fanaticism you see in the eyes of his followers certainly to me seems cult-like.'"

One of the top mongers of anti-LaRouche hysteria is Illinois Sen. Paul Simon (D), whose fanaticism on this point led to the fracturing of the state Democratic Party back in 1986. LaRouche, asked recently by Chicago talk show host Cliff Kelly to explain the origin of these "anti-Semitic" and "anti-black" allegations, said that he is of course "none of the above" and pointed to the case of Adlai Stevenson III, the Democrats' candidate for governor in 1986, who had originally announced his willingness to run alongside the LaRouche candidates, but then made a sudden turnaround and established an entirely new party for his campaign. "Look at Adlai Stevenson in 1986," LaRouche said. "He was induced to shoot both his feet off, his political ambitions, by some message delivered by Paul Simon, according to his account. I believe it. And what you're looking at with these fellows up there, is someone says they hate this man, and somebody [else] says, 'Why? What's bad about him?' And they don't know, they fumble and fumble. They were told to go out and hate this man, and they say, 'Yassuh, boss,' and that's it.'"

Reality intervenes

In 1994, the same crowd around Simon seems intent on corrupting their own party still further. But the very shrillness of the slander campaign is likely to backfire, for three reasons. First, the current party leadership has already been discredited in the eyes of many Democratic voters because of the leadership's refusal to oppose the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Second, the LaRouche candidates have been conducting their campaign with such dignity and coherence that Wilhelm and Le Paille may well end up looking like the real "extremists." And third, efforts to inform voters about which candidates are running on LaRouche's program can help disgruntled Democratic voters to identify which candidates represent an alternative to the present corrupt leadership.

Nowhere has this sense of dignity been more evident than in the flagship campaign of Sheila Jones, a former schoolteacher and civil rights activist who is running for governor. "Lyndon LaRouche and our wing of the Democratic Party have stood firm on the ground of integrity and principle,"
Jones said at a debate sponsored by the Women’s Majority of Illinois Association. “We do not participate in evil, ugliness, or dishonesty. Nor do we participate in Gestapo tactics of political correctness,” she said, in reference to the attempts to exclude her entirely from the forum. “We are the only credible candidates because we have disdain for those who would use genuine concerns, which relate to human and civil rights, for the purpose of brokering grants and moneys from the corrupt institutions of genocide.”

The audience shared Jones’s outrage when she announced that just as she had been approaching the podium to speak, the moderator had whispered to her: “Some friends of mine in Uptown want to know what’s the difference between the LaRouche Party, the U.S. Labor Party, and the Nazi Party.” “In the last hour or more,” Jones stated, “I have been molested, assaulted, and disrespected. This is supposed to be a women’s group. But the disrespect just shown me is an example of what is wrong with the entire question of so-called ‘feminist liberalism.’ Everyone wants to know what’s behind ‘black-on-black’ crime, domestic violence. Well, just this kind of disrespect and lack of integrity. . . . I don’t believe in any closet or back-alley discussions or debates. Why would you whisper this to me just before I am to speak, after you rudely disrespected me with changing the program order without consultation or apology? What is wrong with you?”

Even the jaded reporters were impressed. “I was just at a campaign forum with Sheila Jones,” a reporter said later on a local news broadcast. “She’s not as crazy as she sounds. She’s engaging, and has charisma. We’re going to have to take her seriously.”

At another gubernatorial candidates’ debate, sponsored by the African-American Leadership Forum, Jones won the respect of even her enemies, because of the way she entirely turned around an attempt to exclude her from the debate. Although she had been told that only the four other Democratic gubernatorial candidates would be allowed on the dais, Jones strode to the stage and sat down next to the others. Following some minutes of frantic backstage consultations, during which the debate’s sponsors were deciding on the political merits of creating a scene in which the dignified Jones would be unceremoniously dragged away, the debate’s moderator finally walked to the podium and announced: “Ladies and Gentlemen! I am proud to announce that a decision has just been made, that our fifth Democratic candidate for the office of governor, Mrs. Sheila Anne Jones, will now speak!” The announcement was met by applause, with even warmer applause to come after her brief address.

On top of her campaign activities, Jones is also collaborating with the Schiller Institute on a project to bring moral and aesthetic beauty into the most downtrodden parts of Chicago, by staging “Through the Years,” a play written in 1936 by civil rights leader Amelia Boynton Robinson. In late January, Jones’s work preparing children to sing the many spiritual songs called for in the play was featured in a report on National Public Radio.