

LaRouche campaign battles un-Democratic DNC for ballot access

by Marianna Wertz

All across the country, supporters of Lyndon LaRouche's campaign for the Democratic Party nomination for President, are engaged in virtual hand-to-hand combat with the racist, undemocratic leadership of the Democratic Party, who are attempting to stop LaRouche, the sole challenger to Al Gore's losing candidacy. LaRouche is currently on the ballot or participating in primaries and caucuses in 40 states and the District of Columbia.

In state after state in recent days, however, Democratic Party officials have knuckled under to the illegal dictates of Democratic National Committee Chairman Joe Andrew, an Al Gore supporter, and of a small clique within the party leadership in Washington, D.C., all in an effort to exclude LaRouche and his fellow Democrats from participating in the primary elections or party caucuses. Andrew's demand is that all votes for LaRouche be "disregarded," and that he not be awarded any delegate.

Ironically, at the same time that this is going on here in America, the U.S. State Department has the temerity to interfere in the Presidential elections in Peru, in the name of "safeguarding democracy," to ensure "free and fair elections." Yet, here in the United States, the Democratic Party will go to any lengths—even cancelling an election—to prevent votes for Gore's only opponent, LaRouche, from being counted.

South Dakota cancels election

One of the most egregious cases is in South Dakota, where LaRouche and 13 Democrats pledged to be his delegates and alternates, filed suit on April 12 against Judy Olson, chairwoman of the South Dakota Democratic Party, because she refused to certify them as candidates for the June 6 Democratic Presidential primary. Due to Olson's refusal to certify LaRouche, Secretary of State Joyce Hazeltine then cancelled the Democratic Presidential primary; she, too, is named in the suit. A hearing has been set for April 17, before Circuit Court Judge Steven Zinter.

The LaRouche Democrats filed the suit after South Dakota Democratic Party officials sent a letter to Secretary of State Hazeltine on April 3, declaring that "only one Presidential candidate" had qualified under its rules to field a slate of delegates and alternates, and that by certifying only Al Gore

and his delegate candidates, "South Dakota might not hold a Democratic Presidential primary." The letter's existence was only discovered by LaRouche's campaign, upon inquiries to the Secretary of State's office. Until the letter surfaced, LaRouche and his supporters in the state believed they would be on the June 6 primary ballot.

At least 51 South Dakota Democrats filed to run as delegates pledged to LaRouche at the first-tier caucuses held on March 11, and well over 50 LaRouche delegates and/or supporters attended the March 25 statewide caucus to vote for a LaRouche slate. At the March 25 caucus, the LaRouche Democrats were permitted by state party officials to conduct their caucus and submit their delegate slate. Nonetheless, in the April 3 letter, state party officials refused to certify the slate, belatedly claiming that too few voters had been present.

On April 12, the day before the suit was filed, LaRouche's South Dakota spokesman Ron Wiczorek charged, in an interview with an AP reporter, that Vice President Gore and Democratic Party officials "are seeking to exclude all other candidates, much as Adolf Hitler did when he seized power in the 1930s." Numerous newspapers ran with the story.

"LaRouche's supporters believe the world financial system is headed toward collapse and his policies offer the only chance to avoid disaster," Wiczorek said. "Democratic Party officials are scared that if the economy fails and LaRouche is on the ballot, people will support him. If he doesn't have a chance, why are they so scared to put him on the ballot?"

If the cancellation of the South Dakota Democratic Presidential primary is not reversed, it will be the third state (primaries were also cancelled in Kansas and Arizona) where Democratic Party officials have cancelled a primary election, thereby depriving citizens of their right to vote. Moreover, the South Dakota Democratic Party's actions violate its own rules, which require delegates be allocated "to reflect fairly . . . the primary voters' " preference.

Battling the Confederacy

In Virginia, the Democratic Party leadership has been shameless in its attempts to keep his candidacy out of the April 15-17 Democratic caucuses. On April 10, LaRouche supporters were forced to file as "uncommitted" delegates,

as part of a “Freedom Democratic Slate” around the state, as Nancy Spannaus, a longtime leader in the LaRouche political movement, explained in a statement when she filed the full slate of delegate candidates in Loudoun County, where LaRouche resides.

“Today, I am submitting a slate of uncommitted delegates to be elected from Loudoun County for the 2000 State/District Convention of the Virginia Democratic Party. This is a full slate of 64 candidates for delegate, and a partial slate for alternate of 14 candidates.

“Thanks to the decision of the Virginia Democratic Party to kowtow to the lying, racist decisions of the Democratic National Committee, it is clear that a slate of delegate candidates for Democrat Lyndon LaRouche would not be put on the caucus ballot—therefore leaving the Loudoun Democratic Party free to cancel the Presidential caucuses, which is exactly what it wants to do. Such a cancellation would be a disaster for the party this November.

“Therefore, under protest against the exclusionary rules now in force, and in anticipation of the political battles ahead to open up the party again, I hereby submit the Freedom Democratic Slate, pledged to uncommitted, but with a full commitment to restoring the Voting Rights Act and the Democratic Party itself to the interests of the ‘forgotten man.’ ”

‘Doesn’t he read the financial press?’

LaRouche himself issued a strongly worded response to an April 10 press release by Loudoun County Gore 2000 co-chairmen David L. Whitmer and John P. Flannery, in which the Gore men accused Spannaus and LaRouche of trying to “hijack” the Democratic caucus, and, in near-panicked tones, urged Gore supporters to show up in force at the Saturday caucuses.

LaRouche replied, “I have read the attached dispatch. I respond as follows. David Whitmer has earned notoriety for both the falseness and foolishness of his dispatches. On that account, he remains at least consistent, if not honest.

“I have some bad news for said Whitmer: By what wild presumption, does he promise that Al Gore will be either elected, or even the nominee of the August Los Angeles convention? Doesn’t he read the world’s financial pages?

“John Flannery, the literate member of what Whitmer proffers as a Flannery-Whitmer partnership, should recall, that since the Virginia Democratic organization turned against me and my friends, in 1996, it has lost its ability to win state-wide elections in the excellent fashion it beat Oliver North, with our significant help in 1994.

“That pattern is no fluke. After the Illinois Democratic Party turned against me in 1986, it has been consistently unable to win general elections for leading state offices there since. Since the Texas Democratic Party turned against me in Summer-Fall 1988, it has become, step by step, almost non-existent in that state.

“Now, if the Virginia Democratic Party continues to back Gore, support the Nasdaq cult, and Whitmer, it could lose much, much more than the next general election. I admit that foolishness has never prevented fools from making fools of themselves, but Whitmer is abusing that privilege.”

Bradley supports LaRouche challenge

LaRouche supporters created pandemonium at the Delaware State Democratic Convention on April 8, after learning that the party had excluded LaRouche’s duly elected delegates from the convention (which was called to elect delegates to the Aug. 14 Democratic National Convention).

Twenty-two leading Delaware Democrats, including a member of the board of the state AFL-CIO and a state senator, had filed an official challenge with the state party and the DNC prior to the convention, demanding that five LaRouche delegates be seated, including three delegates who were duly elected at their caucuses and had subsequently been deleted from the rolls at the behest of the DNC; and two others who would have been elected, if the LaRouche votes had been properly counted.

A challenge was also filed by the state coordinator for former Sen. Bill Bradley’s Democratic campaign, which included the demand that a LaRouche delegate be seated from the First District. Bradley’s coordinator had attended a district-level caucus on March 27, at which seven LaRouche supporters were robbed of a delegate when one of them was falsely told he could “go home early.” “The caucus was a complete failure,” the Bradley challenge read. “Allow the seventh LaRouche voter to have his vote counted, thus giving LaRouche a delegate.”

The Bradley challenge concluded, “Bottom line/outcome: Treat all registered Democrats as fairly as any sitting Democratic officeholder, or any other registered Democrat, should be treated.”

As LaRouche’s literature began to circulate at the convention, the eight supporters took seats close to the front of the auditorium. After the Credentials Committee chair announced that the Bradley complaint would be rejected, and an attempt was made to railroad through a vote on its rejection, Phil Valenti rose to speak on LaRouche’s behalf. “This is in violation of the Voting Rights Act! The LaRouche delegates were elected, they must be seated!” Valenti demanded. Pandemonium broke out for several minutes, until finally Valenti was forcibly ejected by the “democratic” sergeant-at-arms.

While endorsements for LaRouche’s campaign continue to flow in from around the world (see p. 69), and while the evil Gore goes down with his beloved “new economy,” the Democratic Party hacks who are trying to block him appear increasingly un-democratic and foolish, in the eyes of a watching world. As Ron Wiczorek put it, “If he doesn’t have a chance, why are they so scared to put him on the ballot?”