

November election will mark watershed in U.S. politics

by Nancy Spannaus

An initial review of the results of the election primaries during 1986 would have to conclude that their most significant characteristic was the lack of interest of the electorate. Fewer citizens voted in these primary elections for national, state, and local offices than in any primaries in recent history.

Two examples dramatize the point. In New York state, about 500,000 individuals voted in the Democratic primary, as compared to over 1 million in 1982. In Houston, Texas, where there was a bit more competition allowed by the local machines, only 6% of eligible Democrats voted in the primaries.

Overall, surveys show that the percentage of eligible voters participating in the most heavily contested races during 1986 hovered around 10.3%!

To thereby conclude that the 1986 elections will go down in history as a "non-event," however, would be erroneous. For the reality of the matter is that the established political parties are so thoroughly disenfranchising the majority of the U.S. population, that they are creating conditions for a popular political explosion. And the winner will be the one national political force which is seen as anti-establishment: the LaRouche movement.

The Illinois turning-point

When the 1986 election year started, it was quite a different story. Nearly 1,000 candidates with the endorsement of the LaRouche-supported National Democratic Policy Committee entered the primaries, campaigning heavily around the issues of Gramm-Rudman, the Strategic Defense Initiative, the AIDS crisis, and the War on Drugs. Most of the campaigns were being run within the Democratic Party. The overall theme of the NDPC campaigns was to "take back Congress" from the liberals who were selling out the nation to the Soviets.

The potentiality that many of these candidates, 157 of whom were running for Congress, could be successful, was

underlined by the result of the year's first primary, in Illinois. There, on March 18, LaRouche Democrats Mark Fairchild and Janice Hart shocked the nation by winning the Democratic nominations for lieutenant governor and secretary of state. In one-on-one contests, they both polled over 50% of the vote.

To knowledgeable insiders of both the Democratic and Republican parties, this event was shocking, but not a total surprise. The Democratic Party had had polls at its disposal for more than a year to indicate that the voters were disenchanted with its policies, and were quite receptive to the anti-drug, anti-austerity, and pro-defense policies of the LaRouche candidates. They knew that LaRouche Democrats had the potential support of at least 15-25% of the voters. Now, with the density of candidates being run by the NDPC, the party thugs apparently had difficulty fixing the vote in all the races. They concentrated on keeping down the vote of the congressional and senatorial candidates, and two victories on the state level "slipped through."

The national Democratic Party leadership was terrified. Now that the LaRouche candidates' movement had some winners, how was it to be stopped from picking up all the supporters who had previously failed to vote for them only because it seemed "impractical"?

The Democratic Party responded in typical thug fashion. The hacks came out and pledged themselves to prevent any more LaRouche victories. National tours were made, press conferences called, slanders commissioned and retooled. Some of the senior members of the liberal establishment, like Daniel Patrick Moynihan, even called for abolishing primary elections altogether.

Equally importantly, the Democrats ensnared the Republican party establishment in the same campaign. Joint Democratic and Republican party press conferences were held in Maryland and California, and that's just the tip of the iceberg of activity. Both committed themselves to the wild assertion

that the Illinois primary results were a “fluke,” and that the LaRouche Democratic movement was “outside the political mainstream.”

Short-term ‘success’ . . .

From the short-term standpoint, the Republican and Democratic thugs could argue that they were successful. They have indeed, as they have bragged *ad nauseam*, succeeded in preventing any more absolute victories by LaRouche-endorsed candidates in the primaries. They have also driven people out of the parties!

It took a lot of work on their part. In southern California, the Democrats put up a write-in candidate to defeat the LaRouche Democrat, who was the only Democrat to file for the Orange County congressional seat, and he lost! It must have cost a pretty penny for the Hollywood Democrats to arrange the “finding” of several hundred votes for their candidate Judge Bruce Sumner, during the recount. But as a result of the threats, arm-twisting, and bribery, they were able to get LaRouche Democrat Art Hoffmann thrown off the ballot, and replaced by Sumner.

In New York state, the Democratic thugs also had an uphill battle. The Cuomo machine was so worried that it might not be able to control the vote, that it put all its efforts into preventing the LaRouche candidates for state office and senator from qualifying for the ballot. At the beginning, the state party officials had bragged that they were going to have the LaRouche Democrats thrown out of the party, by applying a 1950s exclusionary rule. Having thrown the major candidates off the ballot on a technicality, however, they didn’t have to try.

Let’s look a little more closely at what the organized-crime clique called a Democratic Party leadership calls “success.” One could more accurately call it, getting by—by the skin of their teeth.

In the Indiana primary, the leading LaRouche Democrat, running for Senate, polled 25%.

In Texas, the best-known LaRouche Democratic candidate in the state polled over 16%.

In Oklahoma, the LaRouche Democrat running for Senate was credited with 33% of the statewide vote.

In at least 10 other states in which LaRouche Democrats ran for office, the vote totals were clustered solidly in the 15-25% range, with some going as high as 40%. If this had been Jesse Jackson’s political machine, the national press would be screaming that he was taking over the Democratic party!

The remaining LaRouche candidates in the Nov. 4 elections, are few, but potentially significant. In Texas there are three: Susan Director, 22nd C.D., for Congress; Harry Kniffen, 7th C.D., for Congress; and Lester Dahlberg, for State Assembly. In Ohio, Clem Cratty is running for Congress in the 4th C.D. In Idaho, Marvin Sawyer is running for State Assembly; and in Michigan, James A. Green and William Goff are on the ballot for State Senate. And in Illinois, there are not only Mark Fairchild and Janice Hart, but also a

congressional candidate in the 13th C.D., Dominick Jeffrey.

With only 10 LaRouche candidates left on the ballot, can the Democrats claim that they’ve wiped out LaRouche?

. . . But medium-term backfire

What is most important to realize about the 1986 elections, is elections of 1988. With the Democratic and Republican parties under their current leadership, a shift in the balance of power in the House or Senate is not likely to make too much of a policy difference. What will matter is the momentum toward the 1988 contest.

From this standpoint, what will determine the import of the 1986 elections are the results in two places: California and Illinois.

In California, the fight is not between the two political parties, but over the ballot initiative which LaRouche supporters helped to organize for. While the Democratic Party was busy congratulating itself for wiping out the Hoffmann victory, and keeping LaRouche Democrats to under 50% of the vote, supporters of LaRouche’s policies gathered 700,000 signatures to put an anti-AIDS initiative on the ballot. This initiative, which would mandate public health measures to be taken on AIDS, has totally polarized the population of California. The line-up is instructive. On one side are *both* political party leaderships, with their commitment to liberal constituencies and saving money, no matter what the cost in lives. On the other side is a large majority of the remaining non-kook portion of the California population, who want a solution to the AIDS crisis.

The established parties cannot win in this situation. If they succeed in defeating the initiative, they will be held responsible for the escalating public health crisis. If the LaRouche-backed initiative wins, they will be facing immediate defeat.

The Illinois results of Fairchild and Hart will also help define the momentum of LaRouche movement after the elections. Recent polls show increased support for Hart, and her Stevenson-allied opponent getting less than 10%. As for Fairchild, even his enemies declare him to have won his debate with his two opponents.

Then, as we enter the countdown, corrupt sections of the government have started a new onslaught against LaRouche. As to the effect of that, we quote a Chicago CBS radio editorial of Oct. 10:

“Perhaps judgments are warranted, but to have 350 or so federal agents, the postal service, the IRS, SWAT teams, the FBI, all descend upon that office building—probably the marshal was there too—is simply *overkill!* The publicity the LaRouche people are getting across to the nation on this can only help the campaigns of their two people, whom I will not mention by name. . . . Stevenson and Jane Spigel have enough problems already. But they [the unnamed candidates] can only benefit from what happened in Leesburg Monday. . . .”