

LaRouche sees Terry defeat as sign of cultural shift

Imprisoned statesman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. heralds the landslide defeat of former Virginia Attorney General Mary Sue Terry in the Nov. 2 election for governor of Virginia as one sign of a “cultural shift in the mood” of voting populations, “against the trends of the middle 1980s through the very early 1990s.”

The Democratic nominee Terry lost, by a historic 17% margin, to the Republican George Allen after having tried to build a political career for the past seven years around her record as a persecutor of the LaRouche political movement. It was the widest margin of any loss for a Democrat in the governor’s race in the 20th century. Terry’s independent rival, longtime LaRouche associate Nancy Spannaus, picked up significant support in traditional Democratic Party constituencies in the last weeks of the campaign, including endorsements by trade unions.

In an interview with Webster Tarpley on the radio program “EIR Talks” on Nov. 4, LaRouche pointed out that “as of the first of October, it was pretty obvious that Mary Sue Terry was an electoral disaster as well as another kind of disaster.

“This was picked up by the London press a couple of weeks ago,” he continued. “Within about six days after that, it was picked up by some of the U.S. press, *Washington Post* et al., indicating that we had a pattern here, which we can sum up as, say, Liz Holtzman in New York, Kim Campbell in Canada, Mary Sue Terry in Virginia; that these women, who had represented a certain kind of trend apparently into 1992, were all flopping over and going down to defeat, one after the other.

“This means in part, as some other developments around the edges indicate, that there is an international turn—we might say almost a paradigm shift, a cultural shift in the mood of circumstances and of voting populations, and of other parts of the population, against the trends of the middle 1980s through the very early 1990s, through the Bush period.” He explained, “Bush of course and his friends were

taking over from about 1985 on in the Reagan administration, so that the second Reagan administration became no longer a Reagan administration but became a Bush administration supervised by Reagan.

“So this whole period—the Bush period—has bitten the dust; and with it, irrational figures, madwomen, of the type of Liz Holtzman, Kim Campbell, and Mary Sue Terry; the fact that these madwomen are being defeated, is indicated, of course, by the victory of Christine Whitman in New Jersey, even though it’s a narrow one and she made a number of mistakes. Nonetheless, it’s not *women* who are being voted against, but rather it’s *madwomen* of the type of Liz Holtzman, Mary Sue Terry, and Kim Campbell.”

The image “of a madwoman being an automatic winner” is over, and “that reflects something much deeper in the population,” he underscored.

A vote against outcome-based education

“Around the country there’s a rising revolt against what’s called generically outcome-based education or World Core Curriculum, or whatever they call it,” LaRouche said, responding to a question from Tarpley about the role of the education battle in the campaign. “Parents are terrified at the brainwashing of their children. A child comes home, and gradually there are changes, even in young children; strange changes. And then one day the child blurts out something: ‘Well, I don’t have to listen to you, you’re not my real parents, my school is my parent,’ and so forth and so on.

“Then the parents begin to compare notes with other parents and find out that it’s coming from the schools. Then they find out, with confirming information, that it’s the guidance counselor. Then they begin to look more suspiciously at what’s being taught in the schools; and they’re *horrified*.”

Further investigation, LaRouche said, shows that “if you look at competent textbooks as against the *incompetent* textbooks that are going into the schools . . . you find that school boards will not buy available, good textbooks, but are buying

this absolute New Age rubbish.

“So what we are seeing is the destruction of our children; and this was a very significant factor early on in the fall election campaign, from the late summer, August-September on. Mary Sue Terry obviously sided with the OBE education in Virginia—the brainwashing of children—whereas [Gov. Douglas] Wilder came out forthrightly, and said he’s suspending it.”

Instead, “Mary Sue Terry continued to waffle, and it became obvious to everyone that she was for it, that she is the New Age candidate.” Her refusal to disassociate herself from that, LaRouche said, was one of the key issues that brought about her defeat.

The LaRouche factor

The OBE issue was raised by independent gubernatorial candidate Nancy Spannaus, a close friend and political collaborator of Lyndon LaRouche. “She has been given about 1% of the vote in the official tallies but undoubtedly had a tremendous impact on making the defeat of Mary Sue Terry as big it was,” Tarpley commented, and went on to discuss results in other elections which were held on Nov. 2. In New York City’s mayoral race, Rudolph Giuliani narrowly defeated incumbent David Dinkins. Richmond County (the Borough of Staten Island) voted to secede from the City of New York, and in some other elections, gay rights bills were voted against in Cincinnati, Ohio, Lewiston, Maine, and Portsmouth, New Hampshire. “Do you see any pattern in these other results?” Tarpley asked.

LaRouche observed that “the two conspicuous losers in the Tuesday elections, were Dinkins as mayor in New York, and Mary Sue Terry as gubernatorial candidate in Virginia. Apart from the other features of Mary Sue Terry’s campaign, which made her unpopular with so many Virginians, is the fact that she devoted the last seven days of her campaign to attacking me. This was her desperate effort to recover lost ground at a time when she had estimated that she was 17 or so points behind the Republican front-runner. It didn’t work at all. But she said that I was her principal enemy; and went as far as to say, in her own voice on a radio actuality in part of her campaign, that I was behind her gubernatorial Republican opponent. But she said in Alexandria, at a major event there, capping the campaign, that I was the major target of her politics, and that her qualification for office, was her opposition to me.

“Now Dinkins, in the primary campaign, did something similar. Dinkins used *me* as the principal issue in the debates with his competitors in the Democratic primary campaign. So we find an interesting pattern of people who go after me, opportunistically, as being defeated in these elections.”

The imprisoned former candidate for the U.S. presidency and Congress added, “I think there are several things going on. First of all, I’m very well known among the public. The public is afraid because of the attacks on me by the news

media. But the public at this point has had its bellyfull of these attacks on me. It views me as clearly a political prisoner; and views these kinds of attacks on me, by this indecency by Dinkins, and by the indecency and disgusting character of Mary Sue Terry on the issue,” with disgust. “They say, ‘You put the guy in prison, you framed him up, you railroaded him, and now you’re gloating over it; we don’t like you. Because you’re also gloating over *our* conditions of life, which are becoming worse. We don’t like you.’

“And the result is, that they alienate people who otherwise might tend to tolerate them on issues because the Bush policies, of course, are not very popular these days; and the Republicans suffer from the Bush problem. But they alienated their voters with that kind of immoral tactic. So Dinkins went down; I think that his attacks on me, really helped to bring him down. He alienated a whole section of the voters who would look upon such remarks of his, particularly since they were the featured part of the last phase of his primary campaign, with disgust.”

‘Clinton is avoiding the real issues’

Tarpley interjected, “The morning line from the pundits is that this is also a problem for President Clinton, who had campaigned for Dinkins in New York as well as for Governor Florio in New Jersey. Governor Florio’s defeat, of course, is very narrow. Is there anything to this?”

“Yes, there is,” said LaRouche. “Look, Clinton is not addressing anything so far; he started to, with his growth pattern, even if it was only token. That was shot down; and Clinton reverted to a pattern he had in Arkansas earlier as governor: to avoid defeat, he would drop an issue, and go over to the opposition side.

“For example, in his first term of governor, he was opposed to the radical use of the death penalty and did make a number of clemency decisions. These clemency decisions were then used to defeat him in his reelection run. And after that reelection run, he came back again, was elected, but became a firm advocate of the death penalty.

“Now this is what’s happened with Clinton: You don’t use the word growth, economic growth, around the White House at present. It’s a banned word—even though it was the word that was being used by Clinton during his presidential campaign, ‘to grow out of our problem,’ ‘put some growth in the economy’—now he doesn’t dare use it around the White House.

“Clinton’s avoiding real issues; he refused to face up to the Bosnia question, even though he articulated what the problem was, in part; he blundered in Somalia, or allowed it to blunder; he blundered in Haiti, up to the recent point, now he’s backing off from it a bit; and he’s confined himself to a couple of issues: NAFTA, which is a loser, a job-losing loser; and he is playing with a health care program which he now has to realize, the way it’s being planned is to the benefit of the insurance companies and not the American people.”