

Unfit to stay in Congress

From Washington, Ronald and Susan Kokinda identify certain powerful legislators on Capitol Hill who deserve to be ousted by the voters.

Robert Byrd (D-W. Va.): More than any other individual in the U.S. Congress, Senate Minority Leader Robert Byrd is responsible for the interest-rate-led depression gripping the U.S. Throughout 1981, as bipartisan initiative to lower interest rates, Byrd defended Fed Chairman Paul Volcker and blamed Reagan for his policies. Now with the depression in full swing, Byrd—on orders from the international financiers who ultimately pull his strings in the Rockefeller plantation of West Virginia—has coopted the interest-rate issue with a phony “Monetary Policy Act,” which will only provide Volcker with a different mechanism for destroying the economy. If re-elected, Byrd promises to continue his economy-wrecking in 1983 by pulling Democrats behind a fascist Reconstruction Finance Corporation, whose purpose will be to bail out the banks, while cutting off credit to cities, farms, and industry.

Byrd played a critical role in railroading Senator Harrison Williams out of the Senate in the Abscam frameup which effectively destroyed the U.S. Senate as an institution capable of defending itself or its constituencies.

Opponent: Rep. Cleve Benedict (R).

Orrin Hatch (R-Utah): One of the boy wonders of the crop of conservative Republicans elected in 1976, Orrin Hatch has settled into a comfortable alliance with Ted Kennedy and Robert Byrd in their effort to destroy the functioning of constitutional government with organized-crime run “Watergate” operations. Despite his stated belief that Senator Williams was guilty of nothing, and his early intention to lead the floor fight on Williams behalf, Hatch’s superiors caused him to think better of that, and he joined the cacaphony of those demanding Williams’s scalp. Hatch did not restrict his treachery to Democrats; he teamed up with Ted Kennedy in orchestrating the attempted political lynching of Reagan Labor Secretary Ray Donovan. Under his chairmanship, Senate Labor Committee staffers—in particular the Israeli Mossad-connected Frank Silbey and organized crime tainted Walter Sheridan—have been given free rein to attack Donovan and expand from there into “Reagate.”

Opponent: Ted Wilson, mayor of Salt Lake City (D).

John Heinz III (R-Penn.): First-term Senator John Heinz, who bought his seat in 1976 for over \$3 million as heir to the H. J. Heinz Co., is simply a spokesman for the Mellon banking family of Pittsburgh, a specimen of the American oligarchy who openly championed Adolf Hitler during the 1930s. As chairman of the International Finance and Monetary Policy subcommittee of the Senate Banking Committee, Heinz has promoted the restructuring of American banking demanded by the European oligarchy to place it more firmly under their control, and has backed escalations of international trade warfare as part of sponsors’ efforts to knock out the American steel industry.

Heinz introduced the Senate amendment to the 1982 tax bill which entitles “death with dignity” hospices to receive federal health care payments. Designed to eliminate tens of millions of dollars in hospital care, the bill, Heinz told the Senate July 22, “emphasizes supportive services such as home care and pain control, rather than cure-oriented institutional treatment.”

Opponent: Cyril Wecht (D).

Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.): Kennedy’s years-long support for every anti-technology proposal to pass through the Senate in either domestic or foreign policy form is summed up by his support of the genocidal and racist *Global 2000 Report* in a letter to President Reagan in 1981. Kennedy also authored and shepherded the racist “Immigration Reform Act” during the 97th session. A belated concern for the 1984 Hispanic vote caused Kennedy to finally disassociate himself from the legislation, which Kennedy could have halted at any step of the legislative process.

Kennedy was a charter member of Byrd’s Paul Volcker protection racket and only “discovered” the problem of high interest rates after the political damage had been done to Reagan and the economic damage done to the U.S. workforce and agroindustrial base. Chappaquidick aside, Kennedy’s morality is summed up by his support for “recreational drug use,” marijuana legislation, and his back-stabbing of long-

time colleague Harrison Williams in the Abscam affair.

Opponent: Ray Shamie (R).

Daniel P. Moynihan (D-N.Y.): As a long-time protégé of Democratic Party “senior statesman” and Anglo-Saxon racist, Averell Harriman, Moynihan’s career in the Senate has been a continuation of his earlier genocidal pronouncements about “benign neglect” for the black population and racial slurs against Third World populations. Now Moynihan has become the Senate’s leading proponent of economic “restructuring” proposals which will triage sections of the U.S. economy and bail out those portions still useful to his political masters, proposals identical to those instituted in Nazi Germany. Moynihan is playing a key role in getting the “trigger” for economic crisis and restructuring with his legislation to force the Polish government into debt default and provoke an international financial blowout.

Opponent: Florence Sullivan (R, C, Right to Life)

Malcolm Wallop (R-Wyo.): The only blood relation to the Queen of England in the U.S. Senate, Wallop has played a sophisticated and effective role in subverting the institutions of constitutional democracy. As Chairman of the Senate Ethics Committee, Wallop oversaw the railroading of Senator Williams, and during the floor debate on Abscam made clear that his purpose was the severing of the constituency basis of U.S. constitutional government. While maintaining a “pro-growth” image on issues of nuclear development, infrastructure development, and space-based lasers, Wallop is functioning for the “H. G. Wells” faction of the British aristocracy which seeks to maintain a certain technological base under their own carefully guarded control.

Opponent: Rodger McDaniel (D).

The House of Representatives

Richard Ottinger (D-N.Y.): Ottinger is a leading proponent of population control policies and zero economic growth, and is a carrier of a particularly virulent strain of cultural pessimism. Ottinger not only endorses the *Global 2000 Report* and outlook, but is the primary sponsor of H.R. 907, legislation to establish an official government office in the United States to deal with the “danger” of overpopulation.

Ottinger is an across-the-board opponent of nuclear and other advanced energy-intensive technologies, an opponent of infrastructural investment projects such as water development, and a fervent backer of “soft” or low-density energy forms such as wind and solar power. Ottinger has cosponsored legislation to “decriminalize” marijuana, and voted to allow the District of Columbia to adopt a “Sexual Reform Code,” which would have legalized homosexuality, including between adults and children as young as 16 years of age.

Opponent: Assemblyman Jon S. Fossel (R).

Ron Paul (R-Tex.): Paul has earned a reputation, even on Capitol Hill, for being a “kook.” A firm disciple of the Libertarian philosophy, Paul has acted and voted as if there

should be no federal government in the United States, and certainly no involvement of the U.S. government in foreign affairs. Every program that requires government spending, regardless of its merits, gets a negative vote from Paul: nuclear energy, water projects, farm programs, export programs, the space program, etc. In foreign policy matters, one Paul aide commented that “Mr. Paul would not urge [a specific matter on the President], because he doesn’t feel that the United States should be involved in the Middle East.” Yet Paul co-signed the letter by Rep. Larry McDonald (D-Ga.) calling for the elimination of nationalists in the Mexican government at the earliest opportunity.

Paul’s advocacy of a return to a gold standard is as dangerous as was the Specie Resumption Act in 1879. Paul intends his gold policy as a means of constricting the creation of the new credits the economy desperately needs. This approach would take any means for credit policy and credit creation out of the hands of the U.S. government, leaving the country at the mercy of the international financial oligarchy.

Opponent: Nicholas Benton (D).

Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.): Gephardt is being groomed as an up-and-coming leading figure for that wing of the Democratic Party which the Rooseveltian Democrats have termed the “Atari Democrats,” and which the National Democratic Policy Committee calls the “Mussolini Democrats.” For the last two years Gephardt has sabotaged efforts to mount attacks on Paul Volcker and high-interest rates from within the Democratic Party, arguing that budget deficits, not Volcker, are the problem. Gephardt told *EIR* that he works closely with the St. Louis Federal Reserve Board, and said openly that wages and living standards must fall.

Gephardt’s voting record confirms his orientation to a post-industrial policy for the United States. He has voted against the breeder reactor, the Tennessee-Tombigbee water project, and almost all water development or farm support programs. He has endorsed the *Global 2000 Report*.

Opponent: Richard Foristel (R).

Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.): From first glance at Gingrich’s voting record, which appears traditional, (such as his advocacy of an expanded space efforts,) one could get the mistaken impression that he is a normal American—little realizing that Gingrich is from “inner space.” Gingrich is one of the leading figures of the Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future, an outfit that was set up to propagate the outlook of the kooky “Aquarian Age” and post-industrial society into the U.S. Congress. Similar to the futurist groups working on such projects as using brain waves to stop incoming ICBMs, the Clearinghouse on the Future has aspects of a cult.

One of the “down to earth” examples of Gingrich’s evil orientation is his co-sponsorship of New York Rep. Jack Kemp’s “Free Enterprise Zone” legislation, (see below), and his co-signing of Rep. Larry McDonald’s letter calling for the removal of the nationalists from power in Mexico.

Opponent: Jim Wood (D).

Leon Panetta (D-Calif.): Panetta is another major promoter of cultural pessimism and the “death culture” into U.S. society. Panetta was the primary sponsor of the legislation to set up the hospice movement in the United States. Panetta has explicitly endorsed the *Global 2000* perspective for population reduction, and votes in a similar way on matters key for continued economic growth: consistently opposing nuclear energy, voting nearly consistently against water development projects, voting against funds for capital goods exports from the United States, and has generally supported deregulation approaches that will undercut key sectors of the economy.

Opponent: G. Richard Arnold (R).

Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.): A House Foreign Affairs Committee subcommittee chairman, Solarz represents no policy interest of the United States, but those of the Anglo-Americans and the Socialist International. In the Malvinas war between Britain and Argentina, Solarz pushed a resolution through Congress calling on the United States to ignore the Monroe Doctrine and to side openly with the British, providing unlimited military assistance to London. Solarz has been part of the Socialist International group that has challenged the more traditional orientation of Chairman Clement Zablocki and succeeded in voting out two higher-ranking members from subcommittee chairmanships.

Solarz has endorsed the *Global 2000 Report* for population reduction, and votes in a similar way on domestic programs: opposes nuclear energy, opposes water development, takes a “consumerist” view against farm programs, and co-sponsors legislation to decriminalize marijuana.

Opponent: Dr. Leon Nardowski (R).

Sidney Yates (D-Ill.): Yates is a consistent proponent of an “environmentalist” perspective in the Congress, and has consistently opposed nuclear energy and water development (unless backed into a political corner). Yates votes anti-farm, and supports the deregulation efforts that are ruining the U.S. trucking-transportation system.

Yates demonstrates his moral unfitness to hold public office with his support for programs of general cultural degeneration. As a member of the Board of Trustees of the National Endowment for the Arts, Yates has promoted through government funding the most swinish “popular culture”—like the racist “Jump Street” program, jazz, rock and roll, and so on, and has slashed funding for the classical arts. He voted for the proposed D.C. “sodomy bill.” He has also proposed such measures as one that would provide financial benefits to any family whose elderly ill members sign a contract to “die with dignity” and “consume” no medical care except for pain-killers.

Opponents: Sheila Jones (I); Katheryn Bertini (R).

Robert Edgar (D-Penn.): Edgar is the chairman of the Northeast-Midwest Coalition, a position from which he has promoted the deindustrialization of that region. Edgar has

endorsed a commission report which would force workers to pay directly into a fund that would be used to finance their “relocation” as up to 15 million industrial jobs are eliminated. He has co-sponsored Rep. Jack Kemp’s “Free Enterprise Zone” legislation.

Edgar is one of the House’s leading opponents of water development, and is pushing legislation which would allow the triage of basic infrastructure to occur in a more orderly way.

Opponent: Steve Joachim (R).

Larry McDonald (D-Ga.): If there ever were to be an “Assassination Committee” established in Congress, Larry McDonald would be its chairman. McDonald was picked up early in his congressional career by the network of British intelligence which sent triple agent Kim Philby into the Soviet Union. McDonald’s role is to flood the *Congressional Record* and conservative networks with painstaking analyses of KGB-infiltration into the left, conveniently avoiding the higher-level British control of both left- and right-wing terrorism. Exemplary of McDonald’s true colors is his chief associate in the Roy Cohn-connected Western Goals, Inc., John Rees—a man who was responsible for the creation of Newark rioter Leroi Jones and who was in part responsible for the 1967 Newark riots.

McDonald’s latest atrocity was the authorship of a two-page ad in *The New York Times* which called for the “elimination” of Mexican nationalists, led by President José López Portillo, who was responsible for the recent banking nationalization in that country. That bloodthirsty intention as well as his association with gangster Roy Cohn put McDonald high on the list of suspects in the current assassination threat against Lyndon and Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Opponent: Dave Sellers (R).

Jack Kemp (R-N.Y.): The former professional football quarterback, is the darling of the international banking cabal that controls the Bank for International Settlements and the International Monetary Fund. He is widely acknowledged to be the inventor of the anti-dirigist tax-cut program which bears his name, the Kemp-Roth bill, and is a longstanding spokesman for the discredited monetarist, “supply-side” economic theory. Kemp has repeatedly proposed a gold-based monetary system, not as a way to provide cheap credit for industrial development projects, but to further discipline the economy, as demanded by his masters at the BIS.

The “true conservative” Kemp, has lifted the centerpiece of his urban program—his free enterprise zone legislation—from the British Fabian Society. Should Kemp succeed in pushing this disastrous piece of legislation through Congress, it would turn the nation’s ghettos into sweat-shop economies, explicitly modelled on the dope-infested Hong Kong economy. Kemp, who professes to be a friend of working people, would use this legislation to bust union wage scales, especially in the municipal sector.

Opponent: Jon Fossil (D).

Senatorial candidate: 'Volcker is a disaster'

Anna B. Bourgois is the independent National Democratic Policy Committee-endorsed candidate for the U.S. Senate from North Dakota. She faces a three-way Nov. 2 election against incumbent Democrat Quentin Burdick and Republican Gene Knorr. Bourgois talked with EIR's Frank Bell on Oct. 9 from her farm near Bismarck.

EIR: What sparked your decision to run for the U.S. Senate?

Bourgois: When Gene Knorr (the candidate who stunned GOP traditionalists when he bought the Republican nomination) said that he was a friend of [Federal Reserve Chairman] Paul Volcker's, and that Volcker was a nice family man, that sent terrible shocks through my system. When I called people in the state legislature who initially told me about the Federal Reserve and told them of Knorr's comments, they said, "Don't worry, he'll never get the nomination."

When I announced my candidacy, it was like a bomb that hit North Dakota. Republicans called from all over saying, "You are going to be taking votes away from Gene Knorr." There has been a lot of pressure for me to pull out of the race. The Republicans had what they called a "head honcho" meeting to try to stop me from getting my signatures (to qualify for the ballot as an independent candidate).

Then when I put out a statement on the platform the Democrats adopted at their Philadelphia mid-term convention, the Democrats thought that Knorr had hired me to run. But I'm independent. That's why I have been involved with the NDPC and support its four-point program, the Anti-Drug Coalition, and the Fusion Energy Foundation.

EIR: What do you see as the outcome of this election?

Bourgois: Anything can happen. The two other candidates are not presenting any issues whatsoever; they are just fighting over who has the most money to spend to attack each other.

The primary issues are development, the high interest rates, the farmers and small businesses that are being foreclosed on, and the building industry collapse. I've been to farm rallies for people who have been foreclosed on and they tell you that they are going hungry.

I've asked the governor [Republican Allen Olson] to get off his laurels and declare a moratorium like Bill Langer did in the 1930s. When I put out that news release it was covered for two days. The press asked his office, but he refused to

comment. I said he should implement a moratorium or resign. He went to Red China. But I call it a hoax. What farm products is he going to be selling from North Dakota, when the farms are being foreclosed on?

EIR: Tell our international readers what has happened to North Dakota in the recent period.

Bourgois: North Dakota is a Midwest state on the Canadian border with a population of just over 650,000 people in an area of more than 70,000 square miles. It is mostly an agricultural state. It has suffered a real blow. We have lost more than 10,000 farms since 1967. From Oct. 1, 1981 to July 31, 1982, North Dakota lost about 20 farms a month just on Farm Home Administration foreclosures alone.

The cost per acre for planting spring wheat—the break-even—is \$3.20 a bushel. That does not include the cost to farmers for labor or debt payments. The price paid this year was \$3.20 per bushel. So most farmers worked for nothing and went further in debt. Last year's price was \$3.90.

The break-even cost for sunflowers is 7 cents a pound. This also doesn't include the cost of labor or debt payments. The price paid this year was \$8.50 per hundred weight. Last year it was \$11.

Dairy products have a parity support this year of \$12.50 per hundred weight. Last year it was \$13.25. Beef steers' price last year was 80 to 85 cents a pound. This year it is 70 cents a pound. But we sold a young steer not too long ago for only 45 cents a pound.

EIR: Why hasn't the Garrison water project, which you support, been completed?

Bourgois: Well, we have the Audubon Society and the Committee to Save North Dakota that have been trying to block it. This project includes one of the world's largest earth-filled dams. Its reservoir has a water capacity of 24.5 million acre/feet in a lake 200 miles long. It's a multi-purpose project. The canal is supposed to go over into eastern North Dakota from its start on the Missouri River.

EIR: What do you think of the integrity of the people who define themselves as the leadership of the right-to-life movement?

Bourgois: They compromise. For example, the right-to-life movement and the Catholic Conference in North Dakota are involved in the hospice movement.

I sent information to the national headquarters of the American Life Lobby about my campaign. They have not even called. If they are looking for a strong, pro-life candidate, I'm the only one. They've shown themselves to be another false front.

They are planning to put out an attack on Lyndon LaRouche in the next issue of their publication. This is another hypocrisy. They have been using information from the NDPC without giving the NDPC credit, and now they are planning a slander of LaRouche.