

LaRouche receives 162,000 votes in California Democratic primary

by EIR Staff

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. continued to receive a substantial vote in the Democratic Party Presidential primary elections on March 26, receiving 7% of the vote in the California primary in a two-way race with President Clinton. With 100% of the precincts reporting, LaRouche received 162,656 votes out of a total of 2,338,843 votes cast in the Democratic primary, which amounts to 6.954% of the vote. LaRouche received over 9% in 14 of the state's 52 congressional districts and over 10% in 8 of the 14. In the 2nd CD he received 11.2%, in the 3rd CD 10%, in the 19th CD 10.4%, in the 21st CD 12.6%, in the 25th CD 11.3%, in the 39th CD 10%, in the 40th CD 11.3%, and in the 52nd CD 10%.

LaRouche's campaign committee had distributed, statewide, nearly 2 million copies of a campaign document, "Summary of Relevant Evidence on the Record Demonstrating the Innocence of Lyndon LaRouche and Co-Defendants."

LaRouche's vote greatly outpaced Green Party candidate Ralph Nader and was the same as Republican Steve Forbes, both of whom have received massive media coverage, in contrast to the LaRouche candidacy, which has been systematically blacked out.

Previously LaRouche's highest vote totals came from Ohio (63,677) and Oklahoma (46,392). Altogether he has now received approximately 370,000 votes in the primaries. LaRouche's most significant vote totals thus far are as follows: Delaware 9.6%, North Dakota 34.5%, Colorado 11.1%, Louisiana 11.69%, Oklahoma 12.65%, Mississippi 7.6%, Ohio 8.25%, and now California 7%.

Strange goings-on

Throughout election night, the LaRouche vote was reported to have been far greater by the Secretary of State. The LaRouche campaign intends to investigate the circumstances surrounding a significant drop both in the total votes and in the percentage he was receiving, which drop occurred some time after midnight Pacific Time. Throughout the evening, LaRouche was reported to be receiving as much as 11% of the vote statewide and to be winning as many as 8 delegates. The next day's *Los Angeles Times* reported that, with 50% of the precincts reporting, LaRouche received 11% of the vote.

At midnight on March 26, the printout produced by the Secretary of State's office reported that with 50.6% of pre-

cinets reporting, LaRouche was receiving 10.6% with 139,000 votes. As late as 1:15 a.m. on March 27, the Secretary of State's office reported that LaRouche was receiving as many as 8 delegates from the 43rd CD in Riverside (near Los Angeles) and in the 8th CD in San Francisco.

In the 43rd CD, with 92% of the precincts reporting, at 1:15 a.m., LaRouche had 18,000 votes or 61.6%, and President Clinton 11,500 votes or 38.4%. However, at 2:05 a.m., with 100% reporting, the totals were 29,697 for Clinton or 92.2% and 2,525 votes for LaRouche, or 7.8%.

In the 8th CD, with 58% of the vote counted at midnight, LaRouche was receiving 31,000 votes or 68.6%, and Clinton 16,100 votes or 31.4%. There were no updates on the 8th CD after midnight from the Secretary of State's office. But, when the final results were given, President Clinton received 75,377 votes, or 97.5%, and LaRouche only 1,977 votes, or 2.5%.

Statewide, at 1:15 a.m., with 86% of the precincts reporting, LaRouche had 9.6% of the vote and 193,000 votes. However, at 2:05 a.m., with 95% of the precincts reporting, President Clinton was given 2,027,000 for 91.5% and 358 delegates. LaRouche was given 190,277 votes with 8.5% of the vote and 5 delegates from the 8th CD. When all of the precincts had reported, the totals for LaRouche had dropped to 7% with only 162,000 votes.

The disappearance of the vote for LaRouche in both the 43rd and 8th CDs, thus the loss of delegates and the reduction of the percentage of the LaRouche vote to below 10% statewide, reflects a pattern which conforms to the orders given by Democratic National Chairman Donald Fowler to prevent Lyndon LaRouche from getting any delegates to the National Democratic Convention.

The candidate responds

Lyndon LaRouche commented on the California events in an interview with "EIR Talks," on March 27.

EIR: Mr. LaRouche, we're discussing the California elections. Why is Don Fowler taking this whole approach?

LaRouche: Well, Don Fowler has, since January of this year, has "come out of the closet," so to speak, as national

chairman, in issuing a scurrilous letter in his capacity as national chairman, charging that I am, among other things, a “racist” and “anti-Semite.” And therefore I’m not a candidate, and shall not be allowed to have delegates at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. That’s what the letter says. There are a few other things in there, but that’s the gut of the thing. I issued a response to Fowler, saying that . . . the statements he makes against me are lies. And the letter is written in reckless disregard for truth.

Now that letter was sent out, and most of the Democratic committees in the states around the country preferred to ignore the letter, because it was a scurrilous, nasty piece of work. And they just hoped it would go away.

But more recently, Fowler and people around him in the Democratic National Committee, probably in the campaign, Democratic campaign organization in particular, have been putting heavy pressure on a number of states to run dirty tricks against me, with the specific purpose that I shall not have delegates. And the Fowler dictum that I shall not be allowed to have delegates at the convention, comes up prominently, of course, when you look at the California printouts, that is, the computer printouts of the actual vote tallies, because they use computer tallying out there. *And somebody took and threw away votes!* They threw away over 30,000 votes, probably 50,000 votes, of mine. . . .

Now, you look where they threw them away, and you go down to the congressional district, and you find out that they threw them away in a couple of districts . . . where I had won delegates by margins of about 60% of the vote. . . . And if Fowler didn’t do it, certainly the results *accord with his instruction*, and with the dirtiness of the instruction.

Now, what’s at issue here? The issue is as raised by Senator Kennedy in January of 1995, after the disastrous loss of the Congressional vote in the 1994 federal elections. And Kennedy said, as I had been saying, as we knew in Virginia, the Commonwealth of Virginia Democratic Party case, that we have two Republican parties in this country. One Republican Party flies the flag of the Republican Party. . . . We know that we have, in the Democratic Party, a *second* Republican Party.

Now, what Fowler is representing is that second Republican Party. You know, for Fowler to accuse me of being a racist—compare our two records (laughs). . . . But what he represents, is those, including the Anti-Defamation League, who are moneybags and who have a very significant influence, as Republicans, in the Democratic Party. That is, the Anti-Defamation League is a *professedly neo-conservative organization*, as typified by Irving and Bill Kristol, for example. They’re typical neo-conservative Republicans of the Dick Arme or Newt Gingrich type. Maybe not as flamboyant as Newt Gingrich, but that’s where they belong.

Commentary magazine typifies their ideology. They are tied to Likud, which is a right-wing organization in Israel. They don’t belong in the Democratic Party. *They’re Republi-*

cans. They’re Richard Arme-type Republicans. But they’re in there, manipulating the Democratic Party from the inside, to cause their friends in the Republican Party to win elections, as in 1994, when that’s exactly what happened.

They also happen to be racist. The ADL officially has a racist doctrine put forth on its behalf some years ago, by Leonard Dinerstein, at an ADL conference in Montreal, discussing the ADL’s campaign against African-Americans, especially African-American prominent figures and elected officials. . . .

But this group has a very strong influence inside parts of the Democratic Party, influence on Don Fowler, and influence around, for example, someone like Ann Lewis, who’s sort of acting chair or something of the Democratic campaign organization. *That’s* where the problem comes from.

But that’s only the aspect of the problem: The underlying issue is that we’re now staging a fight for the soul of the United States. . . . We have to go back to being a great nation again. We have to care about our citizens. We cannot kill people in order to balance a budget or presumably balance a budget. That sort of thing. We have to go back to being the kind of nation that FDR mustered us to be, in the context of the Depression and World War II. We have to be what Kennedy tried to muster us to be, before he was shot. . . .

We also have the second aspect of this. We have the worst financial crisis in modern history now erupting, about to engulf all the banking systems of the world. We also have, as I said, this zooming relationship between parasitical growth of incomes in the top 10%, which is what the Arme ants represent as a constituency. . . .

. . . Not only is the AFL-CIO reactivated as a social force in the United States; but its voter registration efforts parallel those of many African-American voting groups in the Democratic Party, which have been turned down for financial assistance for voter registration, from the treasury of the Democratic National Committee, which has essentially written off the southern states. And the way they can write off the southern states, is to make sure that the African-American vote doesn’t get any support, and is totally alienated, and that will ensure the Democratic Party loses the southern states. And that is what the Democratic National Committee is doing.

Now, again, you take the African-Americans. Take the case of the AFL-CIO. Take the case of the Hispanic-American organizations, who were a significant part of the vote I got in California. You take the other hyphenated-American groups which feel and sense the same issue. Then you take the retired people, who have been threatened mortally by Newt Gingrich and the Arme ants. So these are the natural voting constituencies which could ensure a Democratic victory. And these voting constituencies *require that kind of Democratic Party victory*, to save their very lives, at least the lives of a large number of people among them.