

LaRouche campaign brings reality to 1996 election

by Mel Klenetsky

In a half-hour televised address to the nation on Jan. 27, Lyndon H. LaRouche, a candidate for the Democratic Party's Presidential nomination, developed an analysis of why the current discussion of balancing the budget, which Newt Gingrich and company are spearheading, is totally irrelevant and incompetent. LaRouche's prime-time, paid political address was a wakeup call to the American people, with the global financial edifice on the verge of total collapse. The television broadcast was excerpted from the candidate's Martin Luther King Day speech, which is printed in full in this week's *Feature*.

With LaRouche's sharp message on the airwaves, the LaRouche campaign reached a new level of intensity. According to campaign headquarters, this is the first of a series of half-hour broadcasts. The LaRouche campaign is now on the ballot or has now filed in 21 states and will wind up on the Democratic primary ballot in 27-30 states. LaRouche has indicated that the purpose of his campaign is to shape the policy discussion leading up to the Democratic Convention, after which he plans to back President Clinton in the general election.

Despite the clear indications from the LaRouche camp that his campaign will lead the drive against the Gingrich fanatics, thereby contributing to setting the stage for a Democratic victory in November, there are those in the Democratic National Committee (DNC) who are trying to close down primaries and stifle debate. The week of Jan. 15, Arizona Democratic State Chairman Sam Coppersmith joined with the Libertarian Party in a lawsuit to try to cancel the Arizona primary. According to newspaper accounts, Coppersmith feared that LaRouche could be the top Democratic vote-getter, since Clinton is not on the ballot. Their efforts, to date, were turned down by the courts, and there will be an Arizona

primary, with LaRouche's name on the ballot.

Arizona and Delaware have primaries on Feb. 27 and Feb. 24, respectively, both in violation of a Democratic National Committee ruling that no Democratic primary should occur before March 5, except for New Hampshire. This ruling was designed to preserve the uniqueness of the New Hampshire primary, and Clinton, respecting the party ruling, was not to be on the Arizona and Delaware ballots. In Delaware, when Democratic Party Chairman Gary Hinds saw that LaRouche was the only person on the ballot, Hinds, on the last day of the filing, hastily gathered signatures to put Elbert Carvel, the 85-year-old former governor, on the ballot as part of a "stop LaRouche" effort. More recently, a new primary law was rushed through the state legislature which places all candidates with federal matching funds on the ballot, allowing Clinton's name to be added. LaRouche has qualified for matching funds.

More importantly, Donald Fowler, the head of the DNC, has sent out a letter saying that LaRouche delegates will not be seated at the Democratic Convention, should he win any. The Fowler letter maintains that LaRouche is not a "bona fide" Democrat, falsely accusing LaRouche of being racist and anti-Semitic. LaRouche responded that Fowler's letter was scurrilous, based on pure lies (see *EIR*, Jan. 19, p. 54).

The CityVote experiment

The DNC, starting with their lack of support for CityVote—the experimental urban straw poll and forum for open political debate, organized for a score of cities last fall—has demonstrated a foolish and potentially disastrous tendency to avoid all discussion. In the case of the CityVote straw poll, Clinton came out the clear victor, and could only have benefited from whatever exposure CityVote would have provid-

ed. Harold Ickes, of the Clinton campaign, and his close associate Fowler, led the charge to close CityVote down.

LaRouche commented: "You see what the Democratic National Committee did, for example, with CityVote. Here, the mayors of most of the cities of the United States wished to have a nationwide, free, primary look-see at all the candidates . . . and to have these candidates face questions from people who are representative of urban communities. . . . That was an excellent idea. I participated in the CityVote process. What I saw was excellent . . . better than most of the primary events which are broadcast on television. . . . But the Democratic National Committee took the lead in crushing it. The DNC is doing everything possible to prevent the President, who is a fairly good campaigner, from getting out and talking to people! In a sense gagging the President. . . . Now this bunch up there in the Democratic National Committee, around Fowler and Ickes—I think Dodd's all right—but the apparatus, the bureaucracy in the DNC, which is dominated by only one section of party interests, is wrecking the party from within and is doing about everything you think could be done, to sabotage the effectiveness of the President's re-election campaign."

The State of the Union

Newt Gingrich's Conservative Revolution has proved an effective foil for Clinton's Presidential re-election efforts. The latest *New York Times*/CBS polls show that 60% of the public disapproves of Congress's performance. Forty-seven percent of those polled said they would vote for a Democratic congressman, compared to 40% saying they would choose a Republican, should the elections be held today.

LaRouche's upcoming broadcasts will continue to present an antidote to the unreality that pervades this election year, and will further demonstrate the insanity of the policies of Gingrich and his Red Guard, thereby adding to the public awareness demonstrated in this last poll.

In an interview with this reporter on the weekly "EIR Talks" radio program on Jan. 24, LaRouche commented on the President's State of the Union speech of the night before: "Well, of course, the opening of the address was most unfortunate; but this is what some people think is politics, as opposed to policy. The President indicated a successful condition of the economy which is *absolutely not true*. But maybe he felt obliged to say that.

"You can see, when you look at the State of the Union as a whole, it was a Christmas tree. Probably, vis-à-vis the Republicans, the speech will work; and I think that, perhaps, was the intention. It offers a bit of something to almost everyone; had a couple of highlights which were good; and had a lot of also-rans. But these are Christmas gifts to various constituencies and individuals which would be classed around the White House, I believe, as 'political in character.'

"So, I was not entirely displeased with the short-term result of the address; but, certainly, the President is not yet

saying what has to be said. And perhaps that will have to be done under different circumstances, on a different occasion.

"I think it largely is up to me, *personally*, to do something to get this across. There's the reality of the situation. So, it was not the State of the Union, it was the State of the Election Campaign."

Bloody toll of the Contract with America

LaRouche has emphasized, in a number of recent statements, the murderous effect of the Contract with America. In his speech at a Schiller Institute press conference mobilizing opposition to the Gingrich Revolution (see article, p. 70), he compared Gingrich's program to that of Adolf Hitler. This theme was drawn out further in an open letter to the governor of Delaware, dated Jan. 24 and titled, "Contract Also Sentences Many Seniors to Die." In the letter, LaRouche wrote, in part:

"It appears now that the state of Delaware will hang Billy Bailey tomorrow. Billy, who was convicted of the 1980 shotgun slaying of two senior citizens, has been turned down by the Delaware Board of Pardons and the U.S. Supreme Court. Billy, the court decided, killed the two seniors; Billy says he did it while he was drunk. When I hear about Billy, I ask myself: 'What about Newt Gingrich's crime?' Will Newt also claim that he was drunk at the time he acted to cause the death of many senior citizens?

"Newt Gingrich's 'Contract with America,' unless stopped, will kill many thousands of senior citizens, and other innocent victims. Do citizens have any moral grounds for objecting to our comparing Newt Gingrich's crimes with that for which Billy Bailey was convicted? Not according to the post-war Nuremberg courts which tried the Nazi officials.

"Remember, during the post-war trials of Nazis at Nuremberg, U.S. Justice Robert Jackson successfully argued that government officials or relevant professionals, who either knew or should have known their decisions would lead to the wrongful deaths of others, were as guilty as had they killed those victims themselves. I know of no case in which Adolf Hitler slew any person while he was Chancellor; had Hitler lived to be tried at Nuremberg, he would have been tried for the murders caused by his policies. Which is worse: the hired killer, or the person whose policy the hired killer carries out? Which is guiltier, Gingrich, or Billy Bailey? . . .

"The rock upon which civilization depends, is the recognition that all individual human life is sacrosanct. It is the law of civilized nations, that one may kill in the course of justified warfare, but may not kill a prisoner in one's custody. Until the middle of the 1970s, Americans had come to recognize that that principle of life applied to all prisoners, not only prisoners of war. . . .

"The worst human swine are of the self-righteous variety.

"When you think of Billy Bailey hanging by a rope, think of our civilization hanging by a thread."