

LaRouche campaign set for breakout, as primaries near

by Debra Hanania-Freeman

As the first Presidential primaries draw closer, Lyndon LaRouche's drive for the Democratic Presidential nomination is poised for a political breakout, despite the intensification of attempts by LaRouche's enemies to contain his candidacy.

As we go to press, LaRouche's ballot status has been certified in 11 states' Democratic primaries. In addition, nominating petitions for the candidate, signed by tens of thousands of Democratic voters, were filed in early January in New York, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, and Washington State. LaRouche delegates have also caucused in all 19 of Ohio's congressional districts, and filings in at least another dozen states will occur before the Feb. 1 New Hampshire primary.

In most cases, LaRouche's ballot status has been achieved because of his ability to marshal significant support from a growing army of volunteers. In New York, volunteers gathered more than 65,000 signatures in less than one month's time. In Maryland, less than five days after the Secretary of State—who is empowered to place any candidate who has been certified to receive Federal matching funds (which LaRouche has) and is generally recognized as a Presidential candidate (which LaRouche is)—declined a request to place LaRouche's name on the state's March 7 primary ballot, LaRouche's Maryland organization filed almost three times the number of signatures required to nominate him.

Debra Hanania-Freeman, LaRouche's national spokeswoman, attributed Maryland Secretary of State John Willis's failure to place LaRouche on the ballot automatically, despite the fact that he clearly met the criteria spelled out by Maryland law, to "a criminal conspiracy by a certain racist cabal inside the Democratic National Committee (DNC) to urge state party officials to break state laws, and deny both Lyndon LaRouche, and Democrats who seek to run as LaRouche dele-

gates to the National Convention, access to the ballot." She said that the problem in Maryland was probably exacerbated by the fact that Willis serves as an "At Large" member of the DNC.

Defend the Voting Rights Act

At issue is an ongoing legal action, dating from 1996, in which LaRouche, and a group of Democratic voters, filed suit against former DNC Chair Don Fowler and others, for violations of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. The case took a particularly ugly turn in August 1999, when attorney John Keeney, Jr., representing the DNC, argued before a Federal District Court panel in Washington, D.C., that the Voting Rights Act should be nullified, rather than be applied to LaRouche's Democratic supporters.

When members of the DNC and related circles were informed of Keeney's overtly racist action, many expressed shock, saying they had not been consulted or informed that this had occurred. The Hon. Theo W. Mitchell, a former State Senator from South Carolina and a founder of the National Black Caucus of State Legislators, who was also the Democratic Party nominee for Governor in 1990, issued an open letter to the current Democratic Party leadership, former Philadelphia Mayor Ed Rendell and Joe Andrew, demanding that they publicly repudiate this racism. To date, some 500 prominent Democrats have co-signed the letter, which has appeared as a paid advertisement in African-American and Hispanic newspapers across the country.

Initially, it seemed that the current Democratic Party leadership, indeed, recognized the necessity of disassociating itself from the shameful behavior of Keeney and Fowler. But, to date, the DNC has not only done nothing to repudiate the actions, but its top bureaucracy in Washington has sought to defend its racist actions with more lies.



Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. is combatting a racist cabal within the Democratic National Committee, in his bid for the Presidential nomination.

Even worse, some DNC operatives, including DNC General Counsel Joseph E. Sandler, have been caught urging state party officials to break state laws, and deny both Lyndon LaRouche, and Democrats who seek to run as LaRouche delegates to the August convention, access to the ballot. So far, Democratic Party officials in Utah, South Carolina, Michigan, and Arizona, who have attempted to obstruct LaRouche's access to their respective states' primary ballots, have admitted that they are acting on instructions from Sandler.

Sources close to the DNC report that many Democratic officials, some at the highest level of the party apparatus, have been persuaded to tolerate racist actions against LaRouche and his supporters, even though they find those actions reprehensible, for "the good of the Democratic Party."

Apparently, the argument is as follows: "Last year, everything was clear. We were all united behind Al Gore's candidacy. Then, LaRouche launched an assault against Gore and his policies. Now, Gore and Bradley are running neck and neck in the polls, and nobody knows who the Democratic nominee will be." The argument gets worse. "By March 7, Super Tuesday, either Gore or Bradley *must* have a sufficient number of delegates to win the nomination on the first ballot. Right now, the race between them is so close, that if LaRouche is allowed to run, even if he only wins a small number of delegates, it could be enough to tie things up and force an open convention. If that happens, we're dead. The Republicans will take it all."

These arguments, ultimately, descend to the ugliest kind of racism. They say, "We can *never* allow what happened with Jesse Jackson in 1988 to happen again. It was a disaster for the party. Michael Dukakis led George Bush by double-digit margins in May and June 1998. But after the Democratic Convention in July [when Jesse Jackson was allowed to make a major address on national TV], George Bush was leading by double digits in almost every poll. And LaRouche won't

be as easy to dismiss as Jesse was."

The argument is an absurd one in all respects but one. It *is* true that LaRouche will not relinquish his responsibility to his constituency, and cut the kind of deal that Jesse Jackson did in 1988. Indeed, Americans saw Lyndon LaRouche go to prison for five long years because he would not sell them out! Otherwise, the truth of the matter is that in 1988, the reason that Michael Dukakis's poll numbers collapsed after the July convention had nothing to do with Jackson. Dukakis was, just as Vice President Al Gore is today, simply unelectable. Whatever edge he held in the polls prior to the convention, he held because people didn't know him. That was no longer true once he captured the Democratic nomination and enjoyed broad national exposure.

As for the current situation, a growing number of Democrats recognize that LaRouche really is the only candidate who is morally and intellectually qualified to provide the kind of leadership the current financial, economic, and strategic crises demand. But, even among those honest Democrats who have not yet come to that conclusion, there is broad agreement that it is only LaRouche's active role in the 2000 election cycle that holds the promise of mobilizing that 80% of the electorate who would otherwise remain outside the political process. And, unless those people can be mobilized, can be brought in, the Democratic Party, and more importantly, the United States, is doomed.

Indeed, a preliminary investigation seems to indicate that General Counsel Sandler played a pivotal role in reshaping the Democratic Party's rules, especially the rules governing delegate selection and credentials, to ensure that no "outsider" could ever repeat what Jesse Jackson did in 1988, when he won Democratic primaries in five states.

Break Wall Street's hold

No wonder LaRouche's campaign is driving the Fowler-Keeney-Gore cabal mad! Not only has LaRouche completely disrupted the scenario in which the unelectable Gore would carry the Democratic banner in a race against George W. Bush—a scenario that LaRouche has likened to a race between two Detroit auto crash-test dummies—but, from the outset, LaRouche has vowed to break the domination of the 20% of the American electorate whose interests are represented by Wall Street, by mobilizing the vast majority of Democratic constituents, what he has called "the 80%," who are not represented by the candidacies of Al Gore or Bill Bradley, and making apparent to those constituencies that "I am their spokesman."

To that end, LaRouche has revolutionized the use of the Internet to successfully outflank all attempts by the media and the Wall Street establishment to black out his campaign. He has repeatedly conducted live webcast dialogues on crucial policy issues with Democratic elected officials, with labor leaders, with civil rights leaders, with the diplomatic corps. He has conducted two live press conferences on the Internet,

which have given what remains of America's independent print and media outlets, especially in the African-American and Hispanic communities, unprecedented access to a Presidential candidate. In another first, dozens of international press representatives, from every continent, have also been allowed to participate, resulting in prominent international coverage of LaRouche's candidacy, especially his fight for a New Bretton Woods approach to transforming the financial and monetary system, and his opposition to the International Monetary Fund.

A heavy campaign schedule

On Jan. 6, LaRouche conducted a national webcast with health-care providers and state and local elected officials. On Jan. 22, he will continue the dialogue with a webcast of a town meeting on health care in New York City. On Jan. 23, he will speak live, via the Internet, with all his delegates in California, during the Democratic caucuses there.

But before then, LaRouche will make several public appearances in New England, and will escalate his use of the Internet, adding live video broadcasts to what have, up to now, been audio broadcasts. And, unlike the other candidates, who limit their Spanish-language webpages to "hot button" issues they deem "of interest" to Hispanic voters, all of LaRouche's webcasts are simultaneously broadcast in Spanish on the candidate's Spanish-language page.

And, LaRouche has instructed his political campaign organization to escalate the fight over the Voting Rights Act. At the same time that it prepares to appeal the legal challenge to the Voting Rights Act, Debra Hanania-Freeman has sent a letter, accompanied by a statement authored by LaRouche, entitled "Lying and Racism by a Cabal Inside the Democratic National Committee: the Implications" (see *EIR*, Dec. 17, 1999 and www.larouchecampaign.org), to about 12,000 prominent Democrats. In her letter, Dr. Freeman states:

"That the DNC's actions are racist and dishonest is undeniable. Sections of the relevant court files are included in Mr. LaRouche's attached statement, and they speak for themselves. But, what must also be understood, is that if this cabal is allowed to continue, if these racist and lying actions are not corrected, we Democrats will not only suffer a general rout in the coming November general elections, but even before then, our nation will be placed in grave danger during the worst financial and strategic crisis in its history.

"We cannot allow a racist cabal to run the DNC. And, the simple fact is that anyone who supports these racists in their actions to disenfranchise LaRouche Democrats, even if that support is merely by default, is equally guilty. One of the actions we are forced to consider, if the DNC continues to attempt to coerce and compel state Democratic Party organizations to violate the law by excluding LaRouche and Democrats who support him from the primary process, is a Federal civil RICO suit against the entire DNC. This conspiracy to violate the Voting Rights Act simply cannot be tolerated."

Hyde-bound racism and the Constitution

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Whether or not the evidence claiming Rep. Henry Hyde's (R-Ill.) long record of alleged adultery, proves true, or not, that same Henry Hyde is to be fairly described as "an immoral bastard" in much larger matters, including the matter of law as such.

Our nation has come into an immoral, concupiscent time, when the Nero-like editorial policy of *Playboy's* Hugh Hefner and the debate over the morality, or immorality, of degenerates such as Newt Gingrich, Henry Hyde, and Al Gore, does not reach beyond the province of the bedroom. In wider areas, beyond those domains of relatively petty, proven or merely alleged bedroom offenses, all sorts of major offenses, by even the same self-righteous perpetrators, against both man and God, were tolerated by Hyde, and that with a great show of cheerful indifference. The same spirit has been shown, even among putative leaders of the Democratic National Committee, by racist creatures of sundry patronages. One would suspect, from popular toleration for Representative Hyde's antics against President William J. Clinton, that a wild-eyed lynchmob of rabid pornographers had taken over the nation.

All of the relevant developments were paraded before the nation's mass-media in the matter of the attempted impeachment of a U.S. President, all in the name of events and allegedly democratic decisions occurring within the tiniest microcosms of personal discretion. Notably, the sordid conduct of Representative Hyde and his factitious accomplices in this affair, was premised upon their passionately avowed wish to effect a British parliamentary coup d'état, not only against a sitting U.S. President, but against the Constitution of our beloved United States.

Take in evidence the implicit racism of Henry Hyde. Hyde, addressing the Senate, in the case of H.R.H. Prince Philip, and Philip's conspiratorial and subversive organization Transparency International, vs. President Clinton, made much ado about "the rule of law." Hyde's expressed opinion on that occasion, was, and remains closely related, axiomatically, to the racist philosophy of the misbegotten Confederate States of America. In this matter, Hyde laid great emphasis upon the precedent of the so-called Magna Carta. That emphasis is a rope fit to effect the political hanging of Henry Hyde, on the grounds of grievous offenses against the most elementary principles of Christian morality considered in the large.

On this account, please recognize that the argument of the Democratic Party's current National Committee bureaucracy,