

Establishment fears LaRouche presidential bid

by Mel Klenetsky

The Federal Election Commission (FEC) and various secretaries of state and state Democratic Party chairmen have taken actions to either prevent Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche's access to the ballot or to make it more difficult. At a time when the population has become increasingly angered with the economic policies of the President and Congress, together with its livid reaction at the budget-cutting madness that many state and municipal governments have perpetrated, this blatant, dirty political tactic to hurt LaRouche's ballot access may yet backfire.

The only program to stop the depression

On Dec. 21, LaRouche reiterated his program for economic recovery, calling for creating employment for 6 million people within a year. His program, however, is not what the Wall Street crowd and the Anglo-American oligarchy want. In LaRouche's words, "My recovery program depends upon the initial action of federalizing, nationalizing, the Federal Reserve System. That is, to take away its status as a quasi-independent corporation controlled by bankers, and to make it an institution of the U.S. government, a bank of the U.S. government, the kind of bank that the United States Bank represented under President George Washington. This bank would be a means, not for emitting currency, but for putting federal currency, legal tender, out as loans at very low interest rates to get the economy moving."

LaRouche is planning for about \$300 billion a year of loans for public works, and a comparable amount for the private sector for investment in high-technology and engineering types of activity and employment. This would involve about 3 million people in the public sector working for federal, state, and local infrastructure projects such as railway and water and power system projects, plus another 3 million people, minimally, employed as a result of spinoffs of these public projects.

LaRouche's program to employ 6 million people within a year will involve investment in necessary, long-overdue projects, none of which are make-work programs. Since no one else running for office on the Democratic or Republican side has this kind of approach, and because this approach has been proven to work in the past, under Presidents John Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt, and is the only approach that can revive the economy, the political targeting of LaRouche by the FEC and other entities is not accidental.

For the fourth time in which LaRouche has filed for federal matching funds, the FEC has delayed granting the funds, a blatant political move. Now the FEC is threatening to heed the recommendation of its general counsel, Lawrence Noble, and deny LaRouche matching funds entirely. Noble has shown himself to be an ally of the Anti-Defamation League, which has been running an illegal, unconstitutional political witchhunt against LaRouche and his associates for more than a decade.

This would be the first time in the history of the FEC that a candidate has met the threshold qualifications for matching funds and been denied them. Should the FEC accept the recommendations of Noble, they will open themselves up for massive civil lawsuits, though the damages sought could never compensate for the irreparable harm that FEC delay has already caused.

Ballot access impeded

Every delay not only deprives candidates of hundreds of thousands of dollars of matching funds, but automatic ballot access by the offices of the secretary of state in many states is influenced or in some cases absolutely dependent on FEC matching funds being granted. The "LaRouche in '92" campaign will be on the ballot in at least 20 states. LaRouche is already on the ballot in Mississippi, New Hampshire, Colorado, Minnesota, and South Dakota, and ballot access is expected to be secured in Massachusetts, Texas, Maryland,

Rhode Island, Oklahoma, Louisiana, West Virginia, South Carolina, Kansas, Arizona, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Alabama, Illinois, and Washington State. In addition, there are 10 states in which LaRouche has requested to be put on the ballot automatically by the secretary of state.

Both the Democratic and Republican Party leaderships have put every possible roadblock in the way of LaRouche's presidential efforts. Jeff Masten, the Democratic Party chairman of South Dakota, announced on television that party officials tried to keep LaRouche off the ballot but had no reason to do so. Masten said that the demands of the election campaign were conflicting with his law practice and then announced his resignation.

The secretary of state of Michigan, Richard H. Austin, a Democrat, did not place LaRouche on the ballot. The "LaRouche in '92" campaign had sent the secretary of state evidence to demonstrate high name recognition, showing that LaRouche had appeared in more than 60,000 newspaper articles since 1986; had spoken on more than 1,000 radio talk shows and television spots; had qualified and received matching funds for 1980, 1984, and 1988 campaigns, and had met the threshold qualifications for 1992. Austin was also informed that LaRouche supporters had already distributed more than 7 million leaflets for the campaign in every single state of the union, showing the broad-based machine that LaRouche has.

Austin placed columnist Patrick Buchanan on the Republican ballot and Mario Cuomo on the Democratic ballot. Cuomo had not even announced his candidacy at that time, and subsequently announced that he was not running. Austin's office said that LaRouche would not be automatically placed on the ballot because the national media did not recognize LaRouche as a viable candidate.

Michigan has a very prohibitive petitioning requirement of more than 8,000 valid signatures. Since a campaign would have to gather at least 16,000 signatures to ensure getting on the ballot, the strain on a campaign not granted automatic ballot status is clear.

In Maryland, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, the secretaries of state refused to put LaRouche on the ballot, but the "LaRouche in '92" campaign will be on the ballot through petitioning. In Massachusetts, LaRouche supporters filed 5,900 signatures, 3,400 over the 2,500 required. In Rhode Island and Maryland, there will similarly be signature submissions for ballot access.

Looking at David Duke, one sees the narrowness of his political base, especially compared to LaRouche. Duke is a media creation, as is Buchanan and every one of the so-called main Democratic candidates. Once Duke was not placed on the ballot in Massachusetts, he was not able to muster the 2,500 required signatures.

In Rhode Island, Secretary of State Kathleen S. Connell refused to put both Duke and Pat Buchanan on the Republican ballot. The American Civil Liberties Union intervened on behalf of Buchanan, and she reversed her original recommen-

dation and placed Buchanan and Bush on the Republican ballot, and an array of Democrats including Paul Tsongas, Robert Kerrey, Thomas Harkin, Douglas Wilder, Jerry Brown, William Clinton, Eugene McCarthy, Larry Agran, Thomas Laughlin, and Charles Woods on the Democratic ballot. Duke was left off, as was LaRouche. Do you recognize these last three names? It shows the arbitrary basis of the Connell recommendations.

In 10 other states the secretary of state will make ballot access recommendations. LaRouche was denied access in Florida, where the secretary of state recommendation is the sole criterion for ballot access. The "LaRouche in '92" campaign has asked the ACLU to intervene on its behalf in Florida and Michigan.

FEC twists federal law

Perhaps even more blatant and certainly more dangerous to the Constitution is the attempt on the part of the FEC to deny LaRouche matching funds. On Dec. 19, the FEC made a provisional ruling to temporarily accept FEC General Counsel Noble's recommendation that "LaRouche in '92" be denied matching funds. The FEC issued a press release stating, among other things, that LaRouche could not get on the ballot in many states because they prohibit a convicted felon from running for office.

This is just one small example of the dirty trick tactics of the FEC. General Counsel Noble certainly knows that state law does not apply to federal elections, and LaRouche, therefore, has every constitutional right to run for the presidency. In 1986, Noble and the FEC reviewed a request by Edward Spannaus on behalf of the electoral efforts of Lyndon H. LaRouche. Spannaus complained that the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee were illegally interfering with LaRouche's electoral efforts in violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

Five years later, the FEC and Noble responded to Spannaus's complaint. Noble wrote: "After an investigation was conducted and the General Counsel's and the respondent briefs were considered, on Feb. 6, 1990, the Commission found there was probable cause to believe these [ADL and AJC] respondents violated 2 U.S.C. 441b. In consideration of the circumstances of the matter, however, the Commission determined on Jan. 9, 1991, to take no further action against both respondents, and closed the file in this matter." The ADL has been in the forefront of running a political and legal witchhunt against LaRouche and his associates. Noble admits the ADL *is in violation of law, and yet he refuses to act.*

In 1975, Eugene McCarthy sued to abolish the FEC for fear it would wield unconstitutional power in the electoral arena. In the Oliver Stone movie "JFK," New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison describes the events around the Kennedy assassination as a cold coup d'état that has opened the door for fascism. A look at the workings of the FEC certainly supports that view.