LaRouche in '92 files for matching funds

The 1992 primary campaign committee of Lyndon LaRouche, Democrats for Economic Recovery—LaRouche in '92, filed $575,338.99 in matching funds submission with the Federal Election Commission on April 1. The committee had first filed for matching funds in November 1991. The FEC denied the campaign matching funds status, while admitting that it had met all requirements, based on wild allegations about LaRouche’s previous presidential campaigns that had been circulated by the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith. The FEC action caused LaRouche to be denied ballot access in many states.

The FEC had, in a separate action, determined that the ADL’s earlier campaigns against LaRouche’s presidential efforts violated election laws, but chose to take no action. Such ADL political activities does violate its tax-exempt status.

The matching funds decision was overturned only in July 1993 by a U.S. court of appeals in Washington, D.C. whose majority opinion states that the FEC has no “authority to impose comparatively subjective criteria for assessing candidates’ promises. The conceded authority is to engage in a counting exercise; the authority now claimed is to evaluate a candidate’s character.” The Supreme Court refused to hear the FEC appeal of this ruling in November, and only on Feb. 17, 1994 did the commission authorize the release of the initial $100,000 in already-submitted matching funds, and allow the campaign to complete its submission for the remaining $475,000.

Farrakhan dispels myths in Kean College speech

Nation of Islam Minister Louis Farrakhan addressed some 900 students at Kean College in New Jersey in late March, as several hundred people demonstrated “against hateful speech” outside. Last November, remarks by a Nation of Islam member to Kean students were blown up into an international attack against Farrakhan by the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith.

Farrakhan told the students that he, too, protests hateful speech. What people fear about him, he continued, is ideas whose time has arrived. Hating people because of the color of their skin or their faith is insanity. To say he hates Jews is ridiculous. You cannot be a Muslim without believing in all the prophets. So what his opponents fear is ideas.

Turning to more recent allegations that he had been involved in the 1965 murder of Malcolm X, Farrakhan said the charge would be laughable, if it were not serious. The day Malcolm X was killed, every newspaper blared, “The apostle of hate is dead.” Who cleaned up his image and for what reason? Did you know Malcolm was a leading anti-Semite, according to the ADL? he asked.

Farrakhan also affirmed that there were orders from Nation of Islam leader Elijah Muhammad not to harm Malcolm X. He also pointed out that an individual recently came forward with new evidence, naming five people involved in the killing, but the government has refused to reopen the case.

Mfume blasts ‘three strikes and you’re out’

Congressional Black Caucus head Rep. Kweisi Mfume (D-Md.) denounced legislation that would imprison so-called violent offenders for life after the third conviction, known as “three strikes and you’re out” laws, in a commentary in the April 3 Washington Times. “Throwing billions of dollars more into [building] jails will not solve the crime problem; it will only temporarily relieve overcrowding,” he wrote. “It is the equivalent of spending AIDS prevention dollars building graveyard.”

Mfume recapitulated some objections that have been raised by the nation’s federal judges, that stricter sentencing guidelines, mandatory minimum sentences and, now, “three strikes” laws take away “the discretion of the judge to evaluate the crime and the circumstances of each individual in determining a fair sentence. That is why both liberal and conservative judges have denounced this idea as counterproductive.”

The congressman insisted that emphasis should be placed on crime prevention, including expanding “Head Start programs, not the death penalty,” and “safe schools, not unsafe, overcrowded prisons.”

Kissinger stumps for Wilson in California

On March 23, Mark Calney, candidate for the Democratic nomination for governor of California, unleashed a political barrage at Gov. Pete Wilson, denouncing the Republican for inviting Henry Kissinger to address his fundraiser, which was held that evening.

In a press statement, Calney asked Wilson how he could invite Kissinger, “whose hands are dripping with the blood of those murdered at the recent massacre in the mosque at Hebron,” and also pointed to Kissinger’s complicity, as an International Advisory Board member of the Hollinger Corp., in pushing the Whitewater affair.

“Kissinger and his cronies are out to destroy the constitutional office of the U.S. presidency,” Calney charged.

“American voters who don’t wish our country to be treated like a banana republic ought to send these London thugs, such as Kissinger, and their neo-conservative stooges a message at the election polls. Next time, Pete, invite someone to dinner who possesses a bit more honor and moral stature than Henry Kissinger—perhaps next time you should invite Charles Manson!”

Newsweek admits blooper on Whitewatergate

Newsweek magazine on March 28 acknowledged that an article it had printed in its April 4 issue about Hillary Clinton was based on a “misunderstanding” with the primary source and that Newsweek would publish an editor’s note saying it now accepts the source’s contentions, according to the Washington Post of March 29. Both publications are owned by Katharine Graham.

The source, Columbia law Prof. Martin
A. Chirelstein, denounced the article as “false and irresponsible.” Newsweek compounded their problem by failing to call the White House for comment before trumpeting its “exclusive” in a March 26 press release.

Chirelstein was one of four tax experts asked by the White House to examine the Clintons’ 1977-79 tax returns and respond to media inquiries. Newsweek’s article claimed that he said the returns contain clear evidence that Hillary Clinton made a financial killing in a sweetheart deal in cattle futures and that she had never put up any of her own money for the venture. Chirelstein was reported to have said that her investment could be considered by some to be a gift.

Chirelstein said that he was “simply outraged and humiliated” by the “biased” article and the conclusions attributed to him. “I never said it was a sweetheart deal. I never said it was a gift.” Newsweek reporter Rich Thomas had asked if he had seen any documents showing whether Mrs. Clinton risked her money in the commodities market. “When I said no, I merely meant that was evidence I had no responsibility for gathering,” Chirelstein said.

Livermore Labs director forced to resign

John Nuckolls, the director of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, submitted his resignation on April 4 in the face of growing criticism of his management from the University of California which oversees the laboratory. According to the Oakland Tribune, had Nuckolls not stepped down he could have been fired by the university regents at a special meeting on April 6. Regent Glenn Campbell, a supporter of Nuckolls, is quoted by the Tribune saying that the meeting “would have been a public hanging.”

Nuckolls had been coming under attack from the university for not moving quickly enough on converting the lab to civilian research. As EIR pointed out in its April 1 editorial, the lab was a leader in Strategic Defense Initiative research. Nuckolls recently warned in congressional testimony that defense research not be neglected and had told the San Francisco Chronicle, “My personal opinion as I read world events is that events are trending in a direction that makes it imperative to maintain our weapons research—particularly in the field of nonproliferation.”

Jeremiah Hallisey, a former regent and San Francisco lawyer, pointed out to the Tribune that for years Nuckolls’s management skills were highly praised, and now we are told he is incompetent. “It sounds like something political here,” he said. “The future direction of the laboratory is loaded with political implications.”

Teachers union exposes school privatization hoax

The American Federation of Teachers held a press conference on March 30 in Washington, D.C., where the union released a report on “Private Management of Public Schools.” Joining the press conference was Loretta Johnson of the Baltimore Teachers Union, where Education Alternatives, Inc. (EAI) has taken over nine schools, to run them on a for-profit basis.

The report’s analysis of EAI expenditures shows that staff cuts (reducing the number of special education teachers by one-half and a substantial increase in the certified teacher/pupil ratio) financed corporate overhead, project administration, and increased expenditures for maintenance of the physical plant. Student achievement declined in almost every EAI school, sometimes by substantial amounts. In EAI’s 1992 proposal to Baltimore city schools, they promised to begin immediately producing measurable increase in student achievement using specific measures of academic performance. EAI failed in all schools in both math and reading.

An examination of financial records shows that EAI cut instructional staff and spent these resources on lawyers, accountants, project administration, corporate travel, improvement of physical plant, and profit. Salaries and benefits for staff comprised more than 65% of Baltimore’s school budget, while instructional staff salaries and benefits made up only 44% of the EAI contract.
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