

Activists call for 'covenant of good will' to stop 'Contract on America'

On Jan. 19, the Schiller Institute sponsored a press conference in Washington, D.C., for prominent political figures who were calling for the formation of a coalition to stop Newt Gingrich's murderous efforts to "balance the budget." Speakers included Dr. Benjamin Chavis, national convenor of the National African-American Leadership Summit and national director of the Million Man March; former Rep. John Dow (D-N.Y.); and Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Presidential pre-candidate (D). Much of Mr. LaRouche's remarks were a summarized form of his more extensive discussion which appears in our Feature. Messages to the press conference were also sent by former congressmen Clare Callan (D-Neb.), Byron L. Johnson (D-Colo.), and Jeffrey Cohelan (D-Calif.). Excerpts from the three speakers appear below.

Dr. Benjamin Chavis

It is time that those of us in America who recognize the utterly destructive impact of the Republican Party's "Contract with America," call the people of the nation together in town meetings and citizen assemblies, to arrive at an alternative. We must say, in no uncertain terms, that the Contract with America has failed. The "Contract with America" has been nothing less than a contract *on* America, and the time has come to tear up that contract.

America needs a covenant of good will, so that citizens are able to strive for a more perfect union. . . . America needs a third force, an independent force that is not for sale. Since the time of the Million Man March, progressive forces from throughout the country have been on the move. When they saw, last October, close to 2 million African-American men come together in a spirit of atonement, without violence, and responding to the call by the Honorable Minister Louis Farrakhan to take leadership, these forces took heart.

Organized labor has begun to move against the Contract. Senior citizens have begun to move. The Hispanic community is considering the initiative of a "million man march." These efforts need to be combined, to liberate the people from this immoral and ungodly contract.

We must now move to implement the registration of at least 8 million unregistered African-American voters. Further than that, we must hold citizens' hearings, and town meetings across the country, to hear from those who offer an alternative to the Contract with America. All points of view that offer a real alternative must be heard. We will hear from anyone—doctors, labor leaders, educators, religious leaders, community

activists, elected officials, candidates, youth—that wish to form a united front to eradicate the Contract. . . .

When Republican representatives, such as Rep. Dick Army, state they *expect* 25% of all hospitals in the U.S will close as a result of cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, that affects all Americans, and especially African-Americans; when 1.5 million Americans, most of them African-Americans, sit in our jails, and privatization of the prisons creates a new cheap labor pool that returns us to the days of slavery, that affects all Americans, especially African-Americans. When a national campaign to privatize schools tries to loot the \$800 billion in the budgets simply to turn a profit, and not provide education, that affects all Americans, and especially African-Americans. When 40 million Americans officially live below the poverty line, but the Contract with America seeks to give tens of billions of dollars in tax cuts to the rich, that affects all Americans, and especially African-Americans. When senior citizens are forced to eat dog food, while the funds are allowed to run out of Social Security that they were assured would "see them through the hard times," that affects all Americans, and especially African-Americans. . . .

Former Rep. John Dow

. . . We have in this country an oligarchy. . . . Now, when it comes time to do something, they think of cutting down the poor people. In ancient times, when there were troubles in any community, it was generally a case where the affluent people were the target of the "have-nots," the "haves" versus the have-nots. We have that confrontation now; but the peculiar thing about the present one, is that the haves are taking the initiative to put down the have-nots, which is kind of tragic. It's against history. . . .

The present budget negotiations cover a desire of the Republican Party to cut out the, you might say, the best parts of the budget, as it was figured by the Congressional Budget Office, cut \$1,111 billion, out of the budget. . . . Of that, the Democrats have agreed to \$698 billion of cuts. . . . And that's where they're at, and I'm rather sorry that the Democrats, and President Clinton, have listened to the idea of cutting more than half as much as the Republicans. I'm a little bit disappointed in that, although I admire the fact that he is confronting them, and standing up, and I hope he'll continue to stand up. If they have a compromise between \$1,111 billion on the Republican side, and \$698 billion on the Democratic side that he's willing to concede, if they have a compromise, that will



Dr. Benjamin Chavis speaks at the Schiller Institute press conference on Jan. 19: "We must say, in no uncertain terms, that the Contract with America has failed." To Dr. Chavis's right are Lyndon and Helga LaRouche.

give the Republicans *nearly all*, about 80% of what they want. And that's tragic. . . .

I think that the President should climb into his bully pulpit, and make a stand, and say that we're not going to have any more of these concessions. I don't think he should concede any more. I think he ought to stand up and say, "We've had it, no more! We're at the 'No!' point," he should say, in these negotiations.

And, in order to support that, if I were he, I'd get into the bully pulpit, and I'd tell the nation what I'm telling you. . . .

Lyndon H. LaRouche

. . . First of all, the moral issue: Now, suppose that Hitler had lived at the end of World War II, and we brought him to trial, say, at Nuremberg. Of what would we have accused him? We would not have accused him of killing people individually, of shooting them. We'd have accused him of launching policies which killed millions, murdering millions. At that time, Robert Jackson, the Justice of the Supreme Court who represented the United States at Nuremberg, proposed a doctrine which was generally accepted at Nuremberg. And it was the United States' position: That any public official, or a person in a learned profession, who took actions which he should have known would result in the death, the wrongful death of persons, is accountable as a criminal.

Now, what we're faced with, with Gingrich, is we have the effort of a group which is called, sometimes, the "Red Guard." . . . What they're proposing to do, is to gut the budget

of a substantial amount, to give tax concessions to people who need it least. And they propose to obtain these sums out of Medicare and other programs which are essential to our senior citizens, the poor, and others who are vulnerable.

These measures, if taken by the Congress, will result in the increase in the death rate among poor people, among the senior citizens, among the chronically ill, and so forth. Therefore, those who propose these policies, like Hitler, are guilty of causing the wrongful death of those who die as a result of accelerated mortality rates.

Therefore, *on no moral grounds* could anyone compromise and accept what Gingrich and company are demanding. It is an immoral act, tantamount to the actions of an Adolf Hitler, particularly since it was laid down by the United States, with Justice Jackson at Nuremberg, that if someone *caused* the increase in wrongful deaths, that person was guilty of mass murder. And therefore, Gingrich is attempting to perpetrate, from an official position as Speaker of the House, the mass murder of millions of Americans, as a result of these programs.

When you're faced with a problem like this, a budgetary problem, you say, "Well, if the policy that Gingrich is proposing results in an increase in deaths which is not acceptable to us, morally, then there has to be an alternative." . . .

We need a budget which promotes growth in the country, to rebuild the tax revenue base, to employ the unemployed, to cure the sicknesses which are rotting our economy. We have to go in directly the opposite direction to that these fellows are doing. . . .