

founder, James Dale Davidson, shares, with his business partner Lord William Rees-Mogg, a hatred for “wasting” government funds on high-tech infrastructure.

More choice — for the insurers

The GOP plan promises you more choices with HMOs, managed care plans and Medical Savings Accounts (MSAs)—all scams in which the government hands over billions of Medicare dollars to private insurers who structure their cherry-picking plan for the healthiest beneficiaries who cost them the least in care. Such insurers usually refuse to insure mentally or chronically ill elderly or disabled people (which is why the nation began Medicare), so these patients will likely use Medicare’s traditional plan. But remember, the GOP capped these fee-for-service plans: The more the government spends, the sooner the GOP’s automatic \$8 billion in new cuts is triggered!

Gingrich babbles about saving \$70 billion over seven years by getting millions of seniors enrolled in HMOs. But, just last year, his mob opposed managed care in health care reform; their front groups sued the Clinton Health Care Taskforce, in an effort to destroy the Presidency. HMOs have been available to Medicare beneficiaries since 1982, but only 10% of seniors use them. The Medicare Beneficiaries Defense Fund hears thousands of complaints every year from Medicare patients about HMOs that deny or delay hospital care, which sometimes kills patients. The Consortium of Citizens with Disabilities also receives thousands of complaints on how managed care firms are harming the disabled. Yet, the GOP wants malpractice reforms that severely weaken a patient’s ability to attain coverage for HMO injuries. While the GOP gave hospitals and doctors the broad right to establish arrangements to compete with HMOs, their plan also created dozens of exceptions to laws that prohibit HMO-kickback schemes. Yet, Medicare HMOs are well known for a decade of illegal activities!

Despite Blue Cross, Blue Shield’s specious study which alleges that people with serious medical conditions prefer HMOs over fee-for-service plans, two national studies found that even non-elderly individuals with a chronic illness or disability, who are enrolled in HMO plans, have more problems with getting health care services and access to specialist care or diagnostic tests that their doctors think is necessary. Another study found that patients rated managed care twice as bad as fee-for-service plans on many of the same criteria.

Another GOP plan will dismantle a children’s disability program funded by Supplemental Security Income (SSI). The plan cuts payments to 225,000 of the program’s 900,000 children who have significant cognitive, emotional, or physical disabilities. It has eliminated specific medical criteria, set by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1990 in *Zelby v. Sullivan*, to be used with children to determine their impairments. Hundreds of thousands of children will be removed from the program, and thousands more will no longer qualify for help.

LaRouche Presidential effort in new phase

by Mel Klenetsky

The 1996 Presidential campaign effort of Lyndon H. LaRouche has entered a new phase. First, the Federal Election Commission (FEC) is reviewing his application for matching funds, filed on Sept. 15, and second, the CityVote forums begin in Moscow, Idaho at the end of September and continue up to the 18-city straw poll scheduled for Nov. 7—exactly one year before the next election for the four-year term of President of the United States.

LaRouche compares the Gingrich-led federal budget fight and the threats by Conservative Revolution stormtroopers as a comico-tragic re-enactment of the Babylonian king Belshazzar’s feast. House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) would drink to the free market gods of gold and silver, while slashing the living standards of the elderly, the poor, and the average working man and woman to ribbons.

In describing his own candidacy, Lyndon LaRouche does not see any rival candidate who addresses the reality that the whole financial system is about to come tumbling down. “As I’ve said, this is Belshazzar’s Feast re-enacted, but I think this time the script is being produced by the writers for ‘Saturday Night Live.’ It’s a farce. Because these guys aren’t paying any attention to reality,” LaRouche quipped. “When they haul the drunks out in the morning, what they will see is the whole system is coming down, and I am the only one who understands what the new rules have to be after the crash. The party is over. People better start realizing that the Persians are coming.”

The two major parties remain in full battle regalia, fighting out the budget issue. As Oct. 1 neared, the Gingrich Republicans were maintaining their blackmail threat to bankrupt the federal government by not raising the debt ceiling level if President Clinton does not give serious indications that he will vote for measures that will balance the budget by the year 2002. Florida Democrat Sam Gibbons, a World War II veteran, stormed out of the congressional Medicare debates saying, “I fought guys like you 50 years ago. . . . You’re all a bunch of dictators, a bunch of fascists!”

While LaRouche sees Gibbons’s outburst as a useful warming of the debate for the election campaign, he is critical of the lack of policy discussion. On his hour-long “EIR Talks” radio interview show Sept. 27, he defined his role in

the Democratic primary race from the standpoint of shaping the policy debate in the Democratic convention and in the next Presidency.

"It looks as though I'm carrying the other side of the ball of the Democratic Party on the Presidential hustings," LaRouche said. "There is no sign of a qualified Democratic rival to the President in sight, that is, who might win; and the only alternative, apart from what [House Minority Leader Richard] Gephardt [D-Mo.] may perceive for himself four years hence . . . is someone to come out with some ideas which will reorganize the Democratic Party in part, and reorganize a number of these independents who are out there, who hate the kind of stuff that Gingrich is pushing, to come in as a force into the Democratic convention next summer, and to play a role in shaping the politics *within* the Democratic Party, and within the government, come the post-November 1996-January 1997 installation of the new government."

LaRouche pointed out that his campaign will be a decisive factor because the competition is bankrupt in economic and strategic ideas. LaRouche noted that his policies are being seriously debated in Ibero-America, Mexico, Venezuela, Russia, and Ukraine, as the alternative to the complete collapse of the so-called Adam Smith system.

A third party option?

On the heels of the highly publicized book tour of the former U.S. Chief of Staff, Gen. Colin Powell, who is being touted as a potential dark horse for the 1996 Presidential race, Ross Perot announced on Sept. 27 that he would form an "Independence Party" which would field an unnamed Presidential candidate for the 1996 elections. Powell disclosed that Perot, the Texas billionaire who ran a spoiler candidacy in the November 1992 elections and got nearly 20% of the vote, had called him to tell him of his plans. When asked if he would run as a candidate for this party, Powell said he would consider it, although he added that it is very premature to say anything.

In his Sept. 27 interview, LaRouche said, "The independent party is not really an option. It's Republican Party vs. Democrats this year. Now, as in 1992, when Ross Perot played, in his own funny way, a useful part, there was a concern, then, to ensure that a plausibly psychotic George Bush, would not be reelected President. You can't have a raving nut of Bush's homicidal propensities, reelected as President. . . . And so, what they did, is they used Perot to pull off enough votes from Bush, to ensure that Bush was not elected. The result of that, was that Clinton moved in as the Democratic candidate, and succeeded. Now they're out to destroy Clinton. And this is all coming, essentially, from London."

It all comes from London

LaRouche said that the Perot and Powell option is orchestrated by the same British crowd which in the 1950s gave

the United States the Anglophile Dwight Eisenhower, as President. According to LaRouche, it was the British government, through people like Bernard Baruch, who put General Eisenhower in power as President. Tex McCrary, who is on the "Citizens for Colin Powell" committee seeking to draft Powell to run, was one of the younger men then working for Baruch, Eisenhower's "owner" from the 1930s. "He owned his career," LaRouche said. "Eisenhower went over from being a follower of [Gen. Douglas] MacArthur, simply a military man, to becoming a more *political* military figure, at the suggestion of the sponsorship of Bernie Baruch. . . . So this kind of crowd is behind Colin Powell. And it's clearly orchestrated in the British and Canadian press.

LaRouche observed: "What's going to happen to Powell, is another question. But what he's obviously doing right away, is he's drawing off a lot of votes from these crocodiles and other cretaceous figures on the extreme right-wing of the Republican Party. That includes Bush's candidate, Pete Wilson, as well as Bush's discarded candidate, Phil Gramm, and that fellow from the Okefenokee Swamp there, the yet-unclassified Newt Gingrich. . . . One should not think, that there's much likelihood, at this point, of an independent becoming President. There are circumstances in which that could happen, but it's not going to come out of this sideshow."

Straw polls, debates, and matching funds

One hundred days before the Iowa caucuses and New Hampshire primary in February 1996, a non-partisan, non-binding straw poll will be held in 18 cities across the country, on Nov. 7. LaRouche is on that straw poll and will be part of the scheduled nationally televised debates in St. Paul, Minnesota, starting on Oct. 6, on Oct. 22 in Spokane, Washington, on Oct. 29 in Pasadena, California, and possibly on Nov. 5 in Boston, Massachusetts.

On Sept. 15, LaRouche's campaign committee filed for \$146,650 in matching funds in 22 states. In 1992, the Federal Election Commission had denied LaRouche matching funds, but that decision was overturned by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia in July 1993. The appeals court's ruling that the FEC had no authority to deny LaRouche matching funds was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court the following November. LaRouche and his associates have pointed to the political motivation behind that decision, which denied them access to matching funds during the 1992 campaign. They do not expect FEC opposition, this time around, given the court decisions.

The granting of matching funds is important to the LaRouche campaign not just because of the financial aspect. It will also help expand ballot access, since many states require matching funds to automatically place a candidate on the ballot. The CityVote debates and straw poll will help Lyndon LaRouche put his policy alternatives before the American population.