
I. Throw the Bums Out!

Our Electoral Campaign Policy

Jan. 28—“We want active support, from us, to boost O’Malley’s campaign, because it’s necessary that his campaign be boosted,” Lyndon LaRouche said to associates Jan. 27. Take the things we recognize in O’Malley’s policy, as opposed to maybe some side issues, which are not the same thing.

We’re going to boost this intervention, with LaRouche’s name on it,— especially from and through Manhattan and nearby points. That’s our strongest point. LaRouche’s Saturday dialogues with the Manhattan Project will be our leading voice on this issue.

And what we’re saying to O’Malley is: We’re suggesting strongly that you focus yourself on your *own* policy directly. We support your making this the issue, and we recognize our responsibility to make a contribution to that effect. We recommend O’Malley follow the indicated policy, and we’ll commit ourselves to support that policy; we make ourselves answerable to support that program in the election. “I’ll personally support his option if he wants to follow that option,” LaRouche said.

We’re moving in to unscramble some of the things that are going on in the election campaign right now. If we step in with my name on this thing, LaRouche said, that is going to cause an effect. And I personally will be supporting his option if he wants to follow that option. The message is that it’s time for clarity on campaign policy. We have to have our own national campaign policy, which we thrust into the election process. And we say, “Do you want to do something with us? This is what we’re doing!” If we do that now, we get in there, and we change the character of the thing. What’s wrong with Bernie Sanders, and what’s wrong with Hillary? The problem is that these guys are fakers.

Neither he nor she has any clear policy. The United States requires a human option as op-

posed to Hillary and Bernie Sanders. O’Malley has the option, if he wants to narrow the issues, of presenting something which will outflank these guys.

I strongly recommend that the O’Malley campaign team do this: Get rid of the dubious things, and go for a straightforward address to what the problem is, because Hillary is a fraud,— her record is that of a fraud, since she capitulated to Obama. She’s totally a stooge for Obama. A vote for Hillary is a vote for Obama, and we’re not voting for Obama. Sanders is the same kind



The screenshot shows the LaRouche PAC website. At the top is a dark blue header with "LAROCHE PAC" in white, and "ABOUT" and "OUR POLICIES" with dropdown arrows. Below the header is a light gray section titled "THE LEAD". The main headline reads "LaRouche to O'Malley: Stick to Your Core Message and Be Bold!". Below the headline is a photograph of Lyndon LaRouche, a man with short gray hair, wearing a dark suit, white shirt, and a bright green tie, smiling. Under the photo, on the left, is a red icon of a document and the text "DOWNLOAD PDF". On the right is the number "295" in large font with "SHARES" in smaller font below it, and social media icons for Google+, Facebook, and a plus sign. At the bottom, a small text block reads: "Lyndon LaRouche, in discussion with his Policy Committee on Wednesday, January 27, delivered some powerful advice to Democratic presidential candidate Martin O'Malley, who has earned the hatred of Wall Street by pushing for the immediate reinstatement of Glass Steagall, the convening of a new Pecora Commission to probe the serious crimes of Wall

LaRouche declared on Jan. 27: O’Malley is not certain that he has the authority to be the leading candidate, but he must step forward now. Here, the relevant screen shot from the LaRouche PAC website.

of thing: He's an opportunist who tries to patch something together to fool people.

We don't see any clear option coming from him or her. You don't want a "line,"— you want to solve the problems of the United States.

Tactical Surprise

It's not about what O'Malley's candidacy is; the point is that his candidacy is the only thing that's fit to be supported. Now, if he's willing to do that program, what we can do is flank this operation. You come in with a fresh approach, and say that Hillary's actually a stooge for Obama. You say that in fact of practice, she's a stooge for Obama. And she gets closer all the time, every time she makes a move. And Sanders doesn't do anything really. . . . He tries to make a line, spill a line out. Somebody attacks his line, he adjusts his line. You don't want a line, you want to solve the problems of the United States.

We have to do a pre-emptive thing; just do something that is completely different from what these guys are trying to adapt to. And present the case. Simply say that O'Malley has raised certain questions, and these questions have to be clarified. Because we don't see any option for the coming election. We don't see any sane option except that, so far. He's the only significant candidate, who so far has represented anything that fits the purpose of the United States. So, he's the best we've got; we'll go with the best we've got.

His weakness is the fact that he thinks that he is not a leading candidate; therefore he has a modesty approach in the way he reacts, and says, "Well, I'm not yet in the position where I can make the big fist. I'm a good candidate; I'm probably the best candidate that we have available, but I don't yet have the position of a leading candidate." Nothing complicated; it's that simple.

We operate on the basis of the element of surprise: of creating a tactical surprise. We go out and say we like *this* bum, rather than that bum. It's a fresh approach,— also a refreshing approach.

O'Malley is not certain that he has the authority to shoot out to be the leading candidate for the election. But the issue is not whether you think you have the authority to do this: the issue is whether you understand that it must be done. Because Hillary is a disaster, and Bernie Sanders is a different kind of disaster.

This is not one of these gimmicks; this is simple truth.

"Hey, guys: off the bullshit," is what you should be aiming for.

What changes people is when they realize that they've been idiots; that they've been suckers. Because they've been told they have to do this, they have to do that, they have to be practical. Well, let's get rid of that "practical" stuff. Go to the issue. Go to the effect; go straight to the effect.

Why don't we just tell people that what they've been given as a choice of candidacies to support is a damn fraud; a farce. Get rid of the farce. What do you mean, get rid of the farce? Well, you've got Hillary; she's a fraud; and you've got Sanders, and we're not sure what his species is.

It should be fun, because if it's done clearly, it should be "Wake up people! Are you so dumb? Do you want Hillary? Do you trust Bernie Sanders?"

You've got two candidates you're really talking about in the Democratic Party. You've got Hillary; she's an Obama stooge. She'll continue to be an Obama stooge. And Sanders? Vermont is ashamed of this guy. Dump him! Dump her! And what have you got?

O'Malley has had limited leadership for the campaign period, now. All you have to do is to get him to step forward now. Why now? Because these two jokers are not worth anything! "Hey, citizen!"

The crucial issue is to get clear what we mean: indicating why O'Malley is hesitating to take a heavy role in the election campaign. Because he doesn't think he has the muscle presented to him to do it. On the question of positive things, he'll function. But on the question of being charged with the leading responsibility, that is something that makes him a little bit nervous, because he's not sure he's in a position to do that yet. That's why my intervention, if it's done properly, will have an effect, LaRouche said. Because there are a lot of people who know me, know my name and what I've done,— know my history. You put that in there, and no one can really forecast what the result might be. But anything we would have as a result, would be far better than anything we would have by not doing it.

And so, you try to stir the thing up. Put more features in it. Because Hillary is a fraudster, and Sanders is not exactly a gentleman.

The way the political operation is headed now, everything is being set up to try to get it under control. And if you go into that with an approach which is not on that agenda of planning and control, then you can tip the whole thing into collapse.

Now let's make our intention clear, not as a rumor, but as an explicit intention.