

other is yet even more essential: a leadership which, like General William Tecumseh Sherman marching through Alabama and Georgia, translates the potential for victory into the “hammer” by means of which actual victory is forged. The case illustrates a general principle (which ought also to be a principle of generals), the principle of innovation. Like Sherman, or Douglas MacArthur later, all great commanders, whether as military leaders, political leaders, or leaders of important movements in history, have one commonly distinguishing quality, which distinguishes them as leaders, from persons of different qualities of capabilities. They are able, under fire, to generate appropriate discoveries of principles for action, principles whose manner of generation, as discoveries, meet all of those essential qualifications otherwise associated with an experimentally validatable discovery of a new physical principle, in physical science.

This latter quality must be abetted by a quality of decision-making for which Clausewitz employs a special usage of the German term *Entschlossenheit*: the quality of committing everything necessary, and perhaps a bit more, to immediate actions whose choice depends entirely upon the validity of some freshly discovered principle for action. It is not sufficient to recognize the existence of a possible course of action; it is necessary to find the sense of moral certainty that this is the course of action which must be implemented without flinching.

This quality in a military commander is shown as the commander’s habit of outwitting superior forces which are commanded by well-learned, but intellectually conservative opposing commanders, as Frederick the Great used his greatly weaker forces to rout a well-organized, vastly greater Austrian force at the famous battle of Leuthen. This is what Sherman did to his intellectually inferior opponents, the Confederate commanders, in Alabama and Georgia. This is what General Douglas MacArthur (but, not his rivals in the Navy) did in the Pacific War, as, again, in the Inchon landing. Remove the like of a MacArthur, as Truman did, and the fight mires itself in that siege of mud and attrition, which rehearsed the U.S. military command for the combined bloody diplomatic and military farce of McGeorge Bundy’s and Robert McNamara’s Indo-China war.

Whether in war, or other expressions of strategic conflict over great issues, a population relies upon justifiable confidence in qualities of leadership which meet the general standards I have just outlined here. In times of great change, a shrewd popular constituency relies on the tested authority of the leader who was consistently right, when virtually all of those otherwise in authority were shown, subsequently, to have been wrong. It is the implication of such a uniquely qualified authority in economic and related matters, which my associates and I represent, that a U.S. and broader leadership can be rallied, to call forth the forces of victory from reality-oriented constituencies, like those which made the difference in the most recent U.S. election.

Election Analysis

LaRouche movement played the key role

by Debra Hanania Freeman

Newt Gingrich’s resignation, first from his post as Speaker of the House, and then from his Congressional seat, is perhaps the most publicized result of the Nov. 3 elections. There is no question, that the election results represent a decisive and dramatic repudiation of Gingrich’s—and independent counsel Kenneth Starr’s—agenda. Equally clear, but less talked about, is the fact that the election has left those “deviant Democrats,” who had joined in the attacks on the President, while at the same time abandoning the traditional base of the Democratic Party, utterly discredited.

Although you are not likely to read about it in the *New York Times* or *Washington Post*, what is being discussed among key Democratic operatives nationally, is the simple fact that not only would a clear Democratic majority have been won in the House, had it not been for the mis-steps, and in some instances outright sabotage, by those elements grouped around the Democratic National Committee (DNC) and the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC); but also that, were it not for the efforts of the LaRouche movement in catalyzing the mobilization to save the Presidency, the Democratic victories that did occur would probably have never happened.

What would have occurred if the “Third Way” Democrats’ script had been followed? Based on the advice, and the clear lack of a funding commitment from DNC headquarters in Washington, D.C., Democrats failed to even challenge Republicans in many seats around the country. In some places, most notably Texas, Democratic candidates tried to mimic the GOP, with a “move to the center.”

But, the most damaging actions came when DNC Chairman Roy Romer, along with other spokesmen for the national party, were repeatedly quoted saying that they expected the President to be impeached. Indeed, by late August and early September, prominent Democrats, including House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt (Mo.), Sens. Joe Lieberman (Conn.), Daniel Moynihan (N.Y.), and Bob Kerrey (Neb.), were saying that President Clinton should resign to save the Democrats’ Congressional races!

Any accurate analysis of the election results requires going back to the reaction to Gingrich’s Conservative Revolution in the 1994 Congressional races.

At the time, the so-called political experts insisted that the key to all future elections was the “swing vote”—principally baby-boomer suburbanites. The argument was that the traditional base of the Democratic Party—labor, minorities, etc.—would vote Democratic in any case, and could, therefore, be ignored. The DNC-DLC crowd insisted that the Gingrichite victory came because they were more appealing to the “swing voters.” The solution they proposed was to turn the Democratic Party into a second Republican Party by the next national election.

‘We don’t need two Republican parties’

Not everyone agreed. Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) declared, “We don’t need two Republican parties.” James Carville, the chief political strategist of Bill Clinton’s 1992 victory, authored a handbook for “real” Democrats, *We’re Right—They’re Wrong!* But it was LaRouche who first took the point in exposing Gingrich’s fascist program as a “Contract on America.”

New Federalist, the weekly newspaper of the LaRouche movement, published a pamphlet, “How the Conservative Revolution Crowd Plans to Destroy America,” which documented how their program would throw most Americans onto the scrapheap. More than 5 million copies of the pamphlet were distributed during 1995-96, and the LaRouche movement placed ads signed by more than 100 legislators calling for the defeat of Gingrich in newspapers across the nation. When Gingrich’s jacobins shut the government down just after Christmas in 1995, Gingrich became one of the most hated men in America.

Had the Third Way Democrats followed LaRouche’s advice back then, Gingrich and his cohorts could have been knocked out in 1996. Instead, they preached “triangulation.” President Clinton capitulated and, despite earlier threats of a veto, he signed Gingrich’s 1996 Welfare Reform Act. As a result, although President Clinton won a decisive victory nationally, Democratic gains in the House were marginal.

LaRouche’s Presidential primary campaign, and *EIR*, had been pounding the British-spawned assault on the Presidency from 1994 on. But, with the Gingrichites managing to hold onto a majority in Congress, the stage was set for an escalation of the attacks.

During this same period, LaRouche’s associates, largely as part of an effort to gain exoneration for the American statesman and political economist, were working to expose the corrupt permanent bureaucracy inside the U.S. Department of Justice. In 1995, LaRouche’s associates facilitated Independent Hearings to Investigate Department of Justice Misconduct.

Those hearings documented the activities of a virtual political assassination bureau inside the Department of Justice, that had, over decades, framed up elected officials, civil rights leaders, and other enemies and potential enemies of the financial establishment, such as LaRouche. A powerful coal-

ition of forces, including prominent African-American public and elected officials targeted by this apparatus, began coming together.

The fight over McDade-Murtha

In the spring and summer of 1998, the LaRouche movement spearheaded a national fight against the tyranny of the corrupt Department of Justice bureaucracy, by mobilizing support for the McDade-Murtha Citizens Protection Act of 1998. Starr’s witch-hunt against President Clinton and anyone associated with him, had served to draw unprecedented public attention to the manner in which this vicious apparatus operated.

The mobilization demonstrated a virtual revolution, among Democrats and Republican alike, in defense of Constitutional rights. Under the auspices of the Schiller Institute, scores of state legislators travelled to Washington to lobby for the measure. Back in the districts, citizens were confronting their elected representatives. By late July, early August, the number of co-sponsors for the bill had climbed to more than 200 members of Congress from both parties. Gingrich, a vigorous opponent of the measure, was taking daily vote counts. He stalled the floor debate on the bill for more than a week, to allow more time for the DOJ apparatus to strong-arm members of Congress into changing their votes.

On Aug. 5, 1998, the day the historic debate and vote finally occurred, Gingrich refused to appear on the floor of the House. In a stinging defeat for the silent Speaker, and a stunning show of strength for the new coalition spearheaded by the LaRouche movement, the measure prevailed, by a vote of 345-82.

Americans to Save the Presidency

The decisive event sparking the outcome of the Nov. 3 election came over Labor Day weekend, when Helga Zepp-LaRouche met with a group of elected officials, labor leaders, and civil rights veterans. That meeting resulted in the launching of “Americans to Save the Presidency,” a mass petition drive that urged support for President Clinton, against the calls for his resignation by the “deviant Democrats,” so that he could get on with the business of dealing with the world financial crisis.

The drive sparked a political explosion, providing the catalyst for a mobilization of the base of the Democratic Party. Democrats who had attacked the President, like Rep. Jim Moran (Va.), found picket lines outside their offices. LaRouche supporters organized shows of support for the President at appearances around the United States, with banners that read “Support President Clinton—Jail Ken ‘Porno’ Starr.”

Rep. Harold James, the chairman of the Pennsylvania Legislative Black Caucus and one of the initiators of “Americans to Save the Presidency,” organized the first mass rally in support of the President on Sept. 28, at the Pennsylvania State Cap-

itol in Harrisburg, drawing in other Democratic and AFL-CIO leaders.

The Maryland gubernatorial race provides something of a paradigm for what occurred elsewhere. Maryland's Democratic Governor, Parris Glendening, was involved in what was considered an uphill battle to hold onto the State House. He had beaten Republican Ellen Sauerbrey, a Phil Gramm protégé, by a narrow margin in 1994. That win was largely attributed to support from African-American voters in Baltimore and Prince George's County, adjacent to D.C. But this year, Baltimore Mayor Kurt Schmoke and Prince George's County Executive Wayne Curry had thrown their support behind Eileen Rehrmann, who was challenging Glendening for the Democrat nomination. Rehrmann's sole campaign platform consisted of bringing slot machines to the Maryland race-tracks, and attacking Glendening for opposing it. LaRouche Democrat Lawrence Freeman, who was also seeking the Democratic nomination, served to keep the actual issues in

James praises Schiller Institute's efforts

Pennsylvania State Rep. Harold James, chairman of the state Legislative Black Caucus, issued the following statement to the Schiller Institute on Nov. 4:

My commendations to the Schiller Institute, and to Helga Zepp-LaRouche. I think the election results had a lot to do with the mobilization started by the Schiller Institute [at its Labor Day weekend conference] with the petition "Americans to Save the Presidency," and our coming to the defense of Clinton when no one else would take that leadership, and our targetting of those Democrats calling for the President's resignation. I think it was this mobilization which was responsible for the Democratic surprise, and by the Schiller Institute taking the leadership and rallying the community with the "Americans to Save the Presidency"; this is what helped motivate a lot of our voters, both in the African-American community, other minorities, and with labor, to mobilize to get people out at the polls.

The fact that we challenged those Democrats who attacked Clinton, and were forced to take leadership, in mobilizing the real vote of the Democratic Party, was thanks to this initiative. I think the coalition that came together around this, demonstrated by the vote in this election, has to be developed further now, because we mobilized to successfully get people out to vote, and now we have to increase that participation.

focus, and chastised Rehrmann for doing little to address anything serious. The fact that she was devoting her considerable campaign war chest to attacking the Governor, Freeman said, was having no effect except to help the Republicans.

When Rehrmann failed to show she could deal Glendening a decisive defeat, the racetrack interests pulled their money out of her campaign, and she dropped out of the race. But, the damage had already been done.

Then, shortly after President Clinton's appearance before Starr's grand jury, Glendening came out attacking President Clinton. He said he would not appear publicly with the President in Maryland, and asked President Clinton not to attend a Glendening fundraiser where the President had been scheduled to speak.

Following the Labor Day weekend, and the formation of Americans to Save the Presidency, the Freeman campaign rallied Democrats across the state in support of the President, and demanded that Glendening apologize. It was the issue that rekindled voter enthusiasm in this heavily Democratic state.

Glendening had clearly committed a major error. The President enjoys almost universal support among African-Americans in Maryland and across the nation. The reason is obvious. Clinton may not be perfect, but he is viewed as the last line of defense against Gingrich's fascist policies. African-Americans weren't going to vote for Sauerbrey, but they also wouldn't turn out to vote for someone who was attacking the President.

In the wake of the Freeman drive, African-American Democrats, led by Rep. Elijah Cummings of Baltimore and Rep. Albert Wynn of Prince George's County, both staunch supporters of the President, appealed to President Clinton. Observers say that at first, President Clinton was angry enough that he might have been willing to let Glendening lose, if it had not placed Lt. Gov. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, a close ally of the President, at risk.

Two days before Election Day, at a critical moment in the campaign, President Clinton, with Elijah Cummings at his side, stood at the pulpit of West Baltimore's New Psalmist Baptist Church, which enjoys a membership of 6,000, and urged African-Americans to honor the heroes of their "long march to dignity" by voting for his agenda and for Democratic candidates in Maryland. He was relentless; he quoted from Corinthians and Matthew; he sang every hymn; and, finally, he appealed to them, "There are thousands of you. You will see tens of thousands more between now and Tuesday. Please. Be a doer. Take them by the hand. Tell them about Rosa Parks. Don't let them forget what Dr. King died for."

It worked. The entire African-American community was energized. One prominent community leader was quoted on all three network affiliates, "If President Clinton can forgive Parris Glendening, then he's saying we can forgive him too." The President's visit meant Glendening would get her vote, and thousands of votes like hers.

Prior to the President's visit, Glendening and Sauerbrey

were in a dead heat and pollsters were predicting a record-low voter turnout.

Nationally, the turnout in this mid-term election was slightly below the norm, about 36%. But not in Maryland. In Maryland, 58% of the electorate went to the polls. African-Americans voted in record numbers. Glendening won a stunning victory, beating GOP challenger Ellen Sauerbrey by more than 12%.

It was a pattern that was repeated: Leading Republicans were dealt smashing defeats in critical races. Newt Gingrich, who likened the 1994 Conservative Revolution sweep into Congress to the French Revolution, met his Thermidor.

It was, to be sure, a decisive election. But, imagine what could have been accomplished, had there been a coordinated national strategy by the Democratic Party to win back the Congress; if LaRouche's strategy, rather than the Third Way Democrats, had prevailed from the beginning. That issue is, at the moment, the center of a heated controversy among leading Democrats.

The Third Way Democratic agenda, and, it would seem, Al Gore along with it, has been discredited as the road to nowhere. Where does the alternative leadership lie? Associates and friends of Lyndon LaRouche continue to urge President Clinton to enlist LaRouche's help in guiding the nation through the financial and strategic storms that loom on the horizon.

Democratic victories: A sea change has begun

by Jeffrey Steinberg

For the first time in 54 years in a mid-term election, citizens cast the majority of their votes for the party in control of the White House. Democrats gained a total of five seats in the House of Representatives, the Senate remained unchanged, Democrats scored gains across the nation in state legislatures, and won some important upset victories in gubernatorial races.

The election was a crucial vote of confidence for President Bill Clinton, coming at a moment when any GOP gains would have incited a partisan flight forward toward an unconstitutional and treasonous impeachment of the President. Voters across the country made it clear that they want the impeachment stampede to end — now!

“Cry Baby” Newt Gingrich's sudden departure from the Congress, 72 hours after the polls closed, represented an unambiguous sign that the “Contract on Americans,” the Elmer Gantry antics of the Christian Right, and the other manifestations of the Conservative Revolution in America are played

out, and have been rejected by the majority of Americans. It may go down as the greatest casting out of a political revolution since the Jacobins met their fate in France's Thermidor, 200 years ago.

But, an honest appraisal of the vote should also send a clear message to the so-called “New Democrats,” especially the team of campaign strategists contemplating Vice President Albert Gore, Jr.'s 2000 Presidential campaign. “Triangulation” — “Dirty Dick” Morris's term for the Democratic Party's abandoning of traditional FDR constituents in favor of an appeal to suburban yuppies and other Gingrichite Republican voters — is also dead. Triangulation meant obliteration on Nov. 3 for any Democratic candidate dumb enough to pursue the campaign strategy set forth by Morris, the Democratic Leadership Council, and other like-minded poll-cats.

What did, and didn't happen

The overwhelming majority of incumbents won re-election to Congress. Where there was no serious challenge, or some other ballot initiative driving voter turnout, voters stayed home in record numbers. Roughly 34-36% of the eligible voters turned out nationally on Nov. 3. But, where there were serious races, particularly where President Clinton personally went to bat for Democratic candidates, voters turned out in droves. In Maryland, where incumbent Democrats Gov. Parris Glendening and Lt. Gov. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend faced a well-financed challenge, the voter turnout was 56% — and the Democratic slate scored a landslide victory.

In New York, the President and the First Lady played the pivotal role in securing Rep. Charles Schumer (D) an upset victory over incumbent Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (R). Hillary Rodham Clinton made six campaign trips to New York to boost Schumer's challenge. The Schumer race against D'Amato was one of the most unambiguous referendums on Clintongate. The three-term Republican Senator had used his chairmanship of the Banking Committee to stage vicious partisan hearings on Whitewater. A combination of African-American, Jewish, and Hispanic voters in the urban centers of New York State sent D'Amato packing by a surprisingly wide margin.

The other clear Clintongate referendum took place in North Carolina, where incumbent Sen. Lauch Faircloth (R), who was central in the selection of Kenneth Starr as Whitewater independent counsel (see *EIR*, Aug. 19, 1994), was defeated by 48-year-old attorney and Democratic Party activist John Edwards.

The Christian Right also suffered some stinging defeats, which will now trigger a major battle for control of the Republican Party at the grassroots level all across the country. The Nov. 3 vote busted the decade-long media-promulgated myth that “no GOP candidate can win without pandering to the social conservatives.”

From Wisconsin to South Carolina, from Alabama to California, hard-core clones of televangelists Jerry Falwell and