

LaRouche builds 'third force' in Democratic election fight

by Mel Klenetsky

While announcing the political defeat of two factional enemies in the Democratic Party, Lyndon LaRouche declared war, at a conference of the Schiller Institute and the International Caucus of Labor Committees (ICLC), in Reston, Virginia on Aug. 31. The war that LaRouche declared was for the heart and soul of the nation and the Democratic Party, in the two months leading up to the Presidential elections. The two LaRouche foes defeated during the week of the Chicago Democratic convention Aug. 26-29, were President Clinton's former campaign adviser Dick Morris, and the current chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Donald Fowler.

LaRouche had repeatedly charged that Morris and Fowler were sabotaging the President's re-election efforts, by attempting to make the Democratic Party into a second Republican Party. LaRouche said that Morris was a dangerous, Rasputin-like figure, whose political pedigree tied him to the networks implicated in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Morris is the cousin and protégé of the late Roy Cohn, the notorious lawyer and dirty-trickster for Sen. Joe McCarthy and the New York mob.

On Aug. 29, LaRouche discussed Dick Morris's demise, in a radio interview with "EIR Talks." Morris has "about the moral appeal of activated sludge. But, he is not an insignificant figure," LaRouche said. "He comes out of the Roy Cohn stable—which is not just Roy Cohn; Roy Cohn was an operative of J. Edgar Hoover, Tom Dewey, the Dulles brothers, Rankin, that crowd. You find three of these characters are sitting on the Warren Commission, as controlling figures there, at the relevant point. Roy Cohn is connected with a part

of the organization which is implicated in the organizing and assassination attempt on President Kennedy back in 1963. And the organization was caught red-handed trying to assassinate President Charles de Gaulle of France in the same period."

As for Morris, "he was working, like Rasputin, to destroy President Clinton," LaRouche said. "And, he came close to destroying him, with inducing the President, under virtual extortionist pressure, to do something the President had no intention of doing. But the extortion got him to do it. I don't know the exact details of the extortion, but I know there was extortion, to announce he wasn't going to veto the welfare bill. The President was *committed* to vetoing that thing. It's abhorrent to everything he stands for."

Morris's dirty tricks may not be over. According to a Sept. 5 *New York Times* op-ed by Maureen Dowd, Morris, who resigned on Aug. 29 over the exposure of his affair with a high-priced prostitute, will reportedly "unmask" the President, in a book for which he signed a contract with Harry Evans of Random House, after a Sept. 4 meeting with publisher Judith Regan.

LaRouche's strategy

LaRouche's concept of a "third force" comes out of his concern to undo the political damage done to the President's re-election efforts by the signing of the welfare bill. Speaking to "EIR Talks," he elaborated on his plans between now and the November elections. "I'm working now on the final stages of putting together what we call a 'third force in American politics,'" LaRouche said. "That is, there are a lot of people

in the United States who, particularly after the President's signing of that terrible welfare bill, would not directly support the President's re-election. It caused very serious damage. The President may have lost as much as 5-10% of the potential vote he had . . . by that series of actions. And, as a result, there are a lot of people who may support the President indirectly, but are not going to support him directly. But, they will support me, and they will help me and my efforts.

"So, we're pulling together a group of people who will constitute, on the basis of the principle of being the third force. Our concern is to work on the question of the composition, chiefly, of the next session of the House of Representatives. We have enough power—since you can knock a candidate out by taking away 5-10% of his vote—we have enough power in parts of the country, to at least change the result in 20 or more Congressional Districts."

LaRouche's new efforts follow on the heels of a several-year campaign against Newt Gingrich's Contract with America and those influences within the Democratic Party, such as Don Fowler and Dick Morris, who have tried to get Clinton to follow a strategy of becoming a second Republican Party, by making their policies appear indistinguishable from those of the GOP. "As Senator Kennedy correctly summed up the situation and the results of all the honest polls," LaRouche told the Schiller Institute-ICLC conference, "the reason that we lost the 1994 Congressional election, is because some Democrats didn't understand that this country has no need for a second Republican Party."

Dick Morris, according to numerous press accounts, was the main force behind Clinton's decision to sign the welfare reform bill. Vice President Al Gore was also a backer of the bill, with White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta and White House adviser Harold Ickes opposed. Other Morris achievements, according to a *USA Today* article of Aug. 28, included Clinton's Gingrich-like statement, "The era of big government is over," in the State of the Union message last January. Morris is also credited with Clinton's seven-year balanced budget counterproposal to the Republicans.

Morris and his pollsters Mark Penn and Douglas Schoen are credited with getting the Clinton campaign to orient toward young, married, suburban families with incomes between \$30,000 and \$60,000, rather than the traditional Democratic base.

Gearing up an attack on the Newtzis

At the end of August, with Morris announcing his resignation and Fowler saying that he would resign next January, the Edward Kennedy-Mario Cuomo wing of the Democratic Party, opposed to the Morris strategy, started to take off the gloves against Gingrich and his ilk. Election strategist Harold Ickes, the man who is supposed to replace Morris as Clinton's main campaign strategist, began to refer to the Republican ticket as the "Dole-Gingrich ticket." Ickes, according to the

New York Post, lined up Mario Cuomo, former governor of New York and a major liberal critic of welfare reform, at the last minute, to address the Democratic Convention. The *Post* reported that Morris could not even obtain an advance copy of Cuomo's speech.

Further signs included a *Wall Street Journal* article of Aug. 30, which announced that Clinton was adopting a strategy of attacking Gingrich, and that he began to warm up to that idea after the 1995 Kentucky come-from-behind race for governor of Paul Patton. In the wake of the Patton victory, Clinton began talking about "nationalizing Gingrich." At the convention, Sen. Tom Daschle (S.D.) and Rep. Dick Gephardt (Mo.), the Democratic leaders of the Senate and House, respectively, announced a step forward in getting out their "Families First" agenda, their attack on the Contract with America.

The appearance of Jesse Jackson at the convention was designed to undo some of the problems that Don Fowler had created. Early on in the campaign, Fowler had alienated African-American Democrats by failing to support various voter registration drives in the South. Fowler also attacked LaRouche and, by a dictatorial violation of Democratic Party rules, which went totally against the spirit of the Democratic Party pledge and mandate for an open party, he refused to seat convention delegates pledged to LaRouche. LaRouche received more than 600,000 votes in the Democratic primaries, in his bid for the party's Presidential nomination. Yet Fowler ordered Democratic state officials that they should "disregard" the vote for LaRouche, on the absurd grounds that he was not a "bona fide Democrat."

In August, LaRouche and voters from Arizona, Louisiana, Texas, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. filed a complaint in U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C., charging Fowler and other party officials with violation of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Fowler's lawyer used "Jim Crow" precedents to argue that the Democratic National Committee was basically a private club that could choose its own members; Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson upheld Fowler's racist arguments. But the case is still active.

While LaRouche views the anti-Morris and anti-Fowler efforts within the Democratic Party positively, he is not relying on them to shape the November debate. LaRouche's concern, as outlined to the Schiller Institute conference, is to save the Presidency and the Democratic Party, by taking on the fascists and the racists, in both the Gingrich camp and the Democratic Party itself. LaRouche described how his supporters led the charge in defeating Conservative Revolution darling Ollie North, during his campaign for Senate in Virginia in 1994, when the Conservative Revolution swept the rest of the country. "The major reason the Clinton administration didn't do that [go after North], even though they admired what we did, was because they couldn't take on the fascists within the Democratic Party," LaRouche told the Schiller

Institute audience.

After the Republican sweep of the 1994 elections, Morris was brought in to turn around Clinton's chances, according to *USA Today* and other press sources, which argue that Morris gave Clinton his current lead. But the fact that Gingrich is one of the largest liabilities for the Republican Party, would say something quite different.

LaRouche puts it emphatically: "Dick Morris is the disease that sunk the Democratic Party in the 1994 Congressional elections. He is the spirit, the soul, or at least the rear end, of the Democratic Party. . . . Therefore, we have to transform the Democratic Party within two months, in the process of an election. Therefore, we are deploying as a third force into the Democratic national campaign, in order to rally forces that can trust us. . . . Would you recommend to place trust in a leadership in the Democratic Party, and in the White House, which did nothing, while Jim Crow tried to run us out of the Democratic Party? A leadership which is ready to sell out to Gingrich, for the sake of . . . winning an election, by politics, not principle?"

Impeach Pennsylvania's Governor Ridge

LaRouche is absolutely committed to saving the Clinton Presidency and the Democratic Party. In addition to his "third force" campaign, LaRouche spoke of a second aspect. "At the same time, as part of the same package," he told "EIR Talks," "I'll be conducting and accelerating the campaign against Pennsylvania's Gov. Tom Ridge, whom I've indicted for his commission of what the Nuremberg court defined as a Nazi-style crime against humanity. Our problem is that a lot of the people who are in Newt Gingrich's camp in the Republican Party, and a few Democrats here and there, too, are very sympathetic to, or have committed similar crimes. California, for example, Wilson, the governor; Weld in Massachusetts, for example, another one of these criminals. We're focussing on Tom Ridge. Take out the lead duck, and then go for the rest of the flock. . . .

"Before Election Day, it is going to be very clear to a large number of Americans who are not yet persuaded of that fact, that Newt Gingrich's flock of inedible ducks, is a Nazi-style pack of Nuremberg-type criminals; and we shouldn't be reelecting them, or their kind, to federal office."

A principal vehicle for the campaign against Ridge will be the FDR-PAC, a new political action committee formed on Aug. 29 by associates of LaRouche in the Democratic Party. The committee will draw upon the Democratic tradition of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, to mobilize the traditional base of the Democratic Party—particularly labor and minorities—to defeat the "Contract on Americans."

With these two projects, LaRouche thinks that he and his friends will significantly shape the results of the November elections in their very unique way.

The murderous impact of the welfare bill

In the stampede to get the welfare "reform" bill (H.R. 3734 and S. 1956) through Congress and signed by the President, some important statements describing the real impact of the Conservative Revolution's program went unreported. The following are excerpts from the July 31 and Aug. 1 debates in the Senate and House on the "Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996," before the vote on the bill.

Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.): According to the Congressional Budget Office, federal funding in the coming years is approximately \$10 billion less than the amount needed to meet the work requirements in the bill.

Sen. Paul Sarbanes (D-Md.): What are the states going to do under this legislation when a recession hits, and more and more people slip into poverty, people lose their jobs, they are out of work? The bill essentially gives the state a block grant based on 1994 figures, and that's it.

Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun (D-Ill.): I want to refer my colleagues to the history of what happened before we had a national safety net for poor children in this country. I am looking at the spring 1995 issue of *Chicago History* magazine. It says, "In 19th-century Chicago, the debate over the care of needy children raised issues of Government versus private control and institutional versus family care." Mr. President, that is exactly the argument I have heard all day long on this welfare debate in this Senate today. We are revisiting the past. Let me show you what state flexibility got us last time, Mr. President. The last time we had state flexibility (in the 1890s), we had children sleeping in the streets, which was the first poster.

Here is another one. This is another part of the experiment, again, the history that maybe we have forgotten. The fact is, they were scooping children up from the alleys in New York, shipping them to Rockford, Illinois, and auctioning them off.

Sen. Bill Bradley (D-N.J.): The CBO [Congressional Budget Office] says that most states will ignore the request to put people to work and instead pay the 5%, \$50 penalty for the failure to meet the work requirements. It will pay them to do that. Just taking one example, the biggest city, New York City, which operates the largest work program in this country. Only 32,000 welfare recipients are in it, out