

vote they have gotten so far. . . . To the extent that the new party rules give more power to office-holders, it makes it more rather than less difficult for groups like LaRouche's to make progress. . . . Right now, the Democratic Party ought to be putting forward economic alternatives. We ought to start with energy, with an acceleration of our efforts to develop alternative energy sources and conservation. We should call for an oil import fee, which will raise revenues and decrease consumption. . . ."

Ann Lewis, political director of the Democratic National Committee, reached at DNC headquarters:

"I am very familiar with LaRouche, but it is impossible for me to assess the importance of the vote for Douglas in Pennsylvania. I don't know what it means. I don't have the data yet."

Steve Glaser, deputy chairman of Jerry Brown for Senate campaign, reached at Brown campaign headquarters.

"We are polling for [NDPC-endorsed challenger to Brown, Will] Wertz, and he has less than a percent. I don't think the same thing will happen here as did in Pennsylvania. Are you trying to predict a trend?"

"You know, LaRouche and his people harrassed Governor Brown in New Hampshire in 1980?"

"Did Douglas have a lot of TV time? Where did he get his votes?"

Jack Leslie, executive director of Ted Kennedy's Fund for a Democratic Majority, reached at the PAC's headquarters.

"I don't see them as a significant force in Democratic Party politics. . . . I don't know where they get their funds from. They appear to be well-financed. But they are a fringe organization that won't have any real appeal."

Kurt Wiley, executive director of Walter Mondale's Committee for the Future of America, reached at committee headquarters:

"What's the big deal about this Pennsylvania vote? I do not think it is significant. It is not significant. That's the bottom line. Good-bye."

Amy Isaacs, deputy national director of the Americans for Democratic Action, reached at the ADA's Washington, D.C. office.

"I heard about the Douglas vote, and I don't think it has any significance, at least not outside Pennsylvania."

"I automatically discount everything they say. But if I were in their position, I'd be saying exactly the same thing. We have to see what happens in a few more primaries. You know, we've had a lot of the one-election phenomenon in American politics, where a candidate made a real strong showing and then disappeared."

Interview: Democrat Hulan Jack

'NDPC can bring equal opportunity'

Hulan Jack was born in the British West Indies and came to the United States in 1923. He was active in the formation of the National Democratic Policy Committee, and continues in its efforts to revive mainstream American politics. He served in the New York State Assembly from 1941 to 1953, and again from 1968 to 1972. In 1953 he was elected the first black borough president of Manhattan, in which office he served for seven years. His autobiography, Fifty Years A Democrat, is scheduled for publication later this year.

He was interviewed by EIR on June 4.

EIR: What do you see as the goals of the NDPC for the Democratic Party?

Jack: Who represents the Democratic Party? Who portrays the kind of life where a person feels security, where the education of his children is something he can look forward to, where there are some kinds of standards? The NDPC has for its purpose re-establishing the kinds of programs that mean everyone will be given equal opportunity to develop within the framework of a healthy family life.

EIR: How would you size up the political leaders of today compared with 20 or 30 years ago?

Jack: In the past the Democratic Party was always concerned with the welfare of the people. Now we seem to be imposing certain penalties on the poor. . . . We have turned our backs on the development of technology, on the farmers. . . . There is no reason—with the vastness of America, the technical know-how, the magnificent productive ability of America—why anyone should be without employment, without the opportunity of getting a job.

EIR: The NDPC played a major role in Harrison Williams's defense against Abscam. What do you think was the significance of this effort?

Jack: I too have had my Abscam. I came to these shores many years ago, and I am proud to be an American. But I am vigorously opposed to any segment of the government—particularly our FBI or any division of our Justice Department—violating the law in order to crucify a person. I think that is what happened with Senator

Williams, and with a number of individuals in Abscam. . . . You can trap anybody; you can trap the President of the United States under those circumstances. . . . I was extremely happy to have had the opportunity to travel around the country fighting for justice for a man whom I not only believe was being persecuted, but who showed the kind of spirit that our democratic institutions should be proud of.

EIR: How do you think Ronald Reagan should handle America's economic and foreign policy crisis?

Jack: I believe that there is a vast vacuum between Ronald Reagan and the men who are responsible for the various areas of government, such as Volcker. It seems to me that the President ought to assert himself, that as long as the U.S. keeps its high interest rates, we're going to have trouble, and we're inviting a collapse. . . . We have no budget either. Mr. Reagan has been fighting for a budget for a long time, and now he's going to Versailles . . . to try to bring about some sort of understanding among our allies. If he has failed in the business of adjusting the economy of the United States, what kind of leadership can he offer to those countries?

It's almost shocking to recognize the struggle that's going on in his cabinet. . . . I don't think that the President knows all of the implications of what we were getting involved with in the Malvinas. . . .

Our credibility had been tarnished by the Malvinas situation where Latin America has been pitted against us. . . . I shall never forget that England has been the greatest trademaster in slavery, in denying other than Anglo-Saxon people their rights and ambitions.

EIR: Looking ahead to 1984, what kind of leadership can the NDPC provide?

Jack: Come 1984, both the Democratic and the Republican Party are going to be in serious trouble. . . . I want every American who goes to the polls and votes to recognize that he is a King and she is a Queen in this democracy, for without their votes no one can be elected to the high office of President.

Neither the Republican Party nor the Democratic Party—as it is constituted now—will be able to produce. I say that the NDPC offers the best program for the development and redevelopment of the economy of our nation. I frankly believe that we have a good candidate to offer to the people, and that is Lyndon LaRouche.

EIR: Do you think that your political autobiography, which will be published soon, will help the voters?

Jack: I hope that my book will help establish within each of us the pride of citizenship, the importance of being a participant—remembering that you play an important role in the continued existence of the best government on the face of the earth.

Will the Democratic Party survive its midterm session?

by Freyda Greenberg

On June 25, the Democratic Party will hold its midterm convention in Philadelphia, the party's first national meeting since the 1980 election of Republican Ronald Reagan. Although the "mini-convention" is billed as a consolidation point for a Democratic alternative to the Reagan administration, a tactical split within the party leadership, and strong constituency pressures for specific policy solutions to the intensifying political and economic disorder in the United States, threaten to turn it into a battle royal.

Potential flashpoints

Private and public clashes can be expected to arise at the convention around the following issues:

Party accountability: The Democratic National Committee (DNC) voted at its May 28 meeting to introduce a controversial resolution into the midterm convention that "elected Democrats must be held accountable not merely in rhetoric but in action to the principles of this party and its leadership."

The defeat of incumbent Rep. Ron Mottl in the June 8 Democratic primary in Ohio sets a precedent for efforts to purge elected representatives who diverge from DNC positions. The national AFL-CIO and the state and Cuyahoga County Democratic Party mounted a campaign to defeat Mottl because of his opposition to Paul Volcker's high interest rates, and support for Reagan's tax and budget. Mottl introduced a resolution in January 1981 stating that the Federal Reserve was not autonomous, and that interest rates should be held below 10 percent. Although the national leadership, including House Speaker Tip O'Neill (Mass.), gave lip service to defending Mottl, as an incumbent, the policy of Lane Kirkland and Democratic National Chairman Charles Manatt to divert anti-Volcker sentiment to opposition to Reagan's budget prevailed. O'Neill called Mottl's defeat an "important lesson" for incumbents.

Party platform: Votes on specific political policies at the convention are being strongly discouraged by the congressional incumbents and an increasingly nervous DNC, who are concerned to avoid any major policy splits prior to the November 1982 elections. If anything,