

## Eye on Washington by Nicholas F. Benton

### Dem insiders defend blackout of LaRouche

Two peevisish American University professors presented an "insiders'" view of the 1988 U.S. presidential campaign to a roomful of foreign reporters at the Foreign Press Center here May 21. Insignificant pimples on the Washington political scene themselves, they nonetheless presented an interesting picture of how the Republican and Democratic leaderships are currently thinking.

Their comments on the Democratic side especially reflected the views of the top levels of that party, notably on the question of maverick Democratic candidate Lyndon LaRouche.

This reporter asked the two to comment on why the major U.S. media have refused to include LaRouche's name in any of the polls now being conducted, despite the fact that a poll published by *Time* magazine over a year ago showed LaRouche with 38% name recognition (higher than any other announced candidate except Jesse Jackson, now that Hart is out) and a 9% "favorable" rating.

The two professors easily could have deflected that question by some comment like, "You should ask the pollsters, not us." That would have sufficed for someone who did not have a personal stake in the process described.

But instead, the professors went into a diatribe against LaRouche. The more this reporter called their slanders and lies into question, the deeper they dug themselves in. Here's roughly how the exchange went:

**Prof. #1:** There are flakes on the far right and on the far left. LaRouche is on the far right, and he's under indictment [false]. The American people are not interested in someone like that.

**EIR:** That is contradicted by the strong showing LaRouche made in the polls a year ago.

**Prof. #2:** All the polls I've seen show Jackson, Dukakis, and Gephardt in the lead, in that order.

**EIR:** That's because LaRouche's name is being excluded from the lists that pollsters use. A year ago, *Time* magazine showed him ahead of everyone but Jackson for name recognition. Why isn't his name included now?

**Prof. #1:** I suppose Adolf Hitler had a high name recognition, too. Besides, a lot has happened in the last year.

**EIR:** Yes, such as two supporters of LaRouche winning a statewide primary election in Illinois.

**Prof. #2:** Those candidates were running without identifying their association with LaRouche.

**EIR:** That's disputed.

**Prof. #1:** It's obviously a case that the editors of newspapers and magazines have simply decided people aren't interested in LaRouche.

**EIR:** Again, that contradicts the *Time* magazine poll.

**Prof. #2:** Well, so what does name recognition mean, anyway? It doesn't really account for anything.

**EIR:** So, why are there any polls being done at all, then?

The foreign press corps watched the heated exchange in awed silence. For them, the issue of a candidate who has a 9% favorable rating on a reputable poll is a matter of major significance. In most nations governed by a parliamentary system, 9% is more than enough to cause governments to rise or fall.

### Brokered Democratic convention forecast

This reaction was a tip-off that these two men were peddling the line of the ruling faction of the Democratic Party. Among the things they said:

- There is not going to be a decisive winner in the Democratic primaries, resulting in a "brokered" convention next summer. The primaries, then, will turn out to be a major exercise in futility, with the net result that the candidates will all spend too much money and the voters will be disenfranchised—totally removed from the actual decision on who their candidate will be. This will raise the cry for government financing of campaigns and a single super-primary, both key steps down the road toward a fascist system in which the "party," rather than the "people," will govern.

- They denigrated the entire pack of current Democratic candidates (besides LaRouche), calling them "the Seven Dwarfs," adding that "the best candidates" are not in the race, and will wait to be drafted at the convention.

- A "womanizing" scandal will take Jesse Jackson out of the race the same way it felled Gary Hart. Other candidates, they added, are "also frightened of the specter of scandal." Of Hart, they said he'd had fallen from favor with the party elites prior to the fatal scandal—noting that "not a single fellow senator supported him for President." Therefore, as they are trying now to assert in the LaRouche case, the roles of the party apparat and the media will be paramount over the will of the people in candidate selection.

- As a final straw, one of the professors said he favored a structural change in the U.S. Constitution to a parliamentary system. It figures.