

## Voters slap Bush in face, but not hard enough

by Nancy Spannaus

President George Bush is smarting from the slap in the face he received in the Nov. 6 mid-term elections, but it was definitely not a knockout punch. The weakness of the message he received from American voters means that Bush is free not to change his economic policy, and is also free to go ahead with his lunatic flight forward in the Persian Gulf. That means that Americans are certain to be hit by a shattering financial and depression collapse, and will very likely be thrown into an unjust war that will make Vietnam look like a picnic.

Direct hits on Bush occurred in Texas and Florida, where Republican gubernatorial candidates were defeated. In addition, the Republican Party not only did not regain control of the Senate, but it lost eight seats in the House of Representatives.

Nevertheless, the much-publicized anti-incumbent mood did not result in either a high voter turnout or a broad punishment of those congressmen who had passed the austerity package of health cuts and tax increases. Voters refused to challenge the status quo, in the insane hope that perhaps things wouldn't get worse.

Most devastating among the results was the fact that Lyndon LaRouche, congressional candidate in Virginia's 10th Congressional District, was credited with an unbelievably low vote total of 1.38%, while no members of his slate running nationwide were elected to Congress. American voters are not yet ready to go against the powers-that-be who are determined to destroy LaRouche's movement, and their unwillingness to do so will have deadly consequences for the United States, and the world.

The powers that be will not miss the fact, however, that numerous LaRouche Democrats won from 18-30% in races around the country, and are posed for an expansion of anti-war and anti-depression organizing in the months ahead.

The Texas victory of Democratic gubernatorial candidate

Ann Richards over Republican Clayton Williams was a personal defeat for Bush. The President had spent days in Texas right before the election campaigning for Williams, and has a personal animus against Richards. That is based on her memorable anti-Bush rhetoric at the 1988 Democratic Party convention: "Poor George, he was born with a silver foot in his mouth!"

The President and his wife had also personally committed themselves to providing the winning margin for Florida's incumbent Republican governor, Bob Martinez. Martinez was roundly defeated by former Democratic senator Lawton Chiles, in what was clearly an anti-incumbent vote.

There were other significant Republican defeats, notably Virginia congressional candidate Stan Parris in the Eighth C.D., and Minnesota Sen. Rudy Boschwitz. But the Republicans were able to squeak by and win several very important gubernatorial races, notably California and Massachusetts, and they beat back a nationwide mobilization against North Carolina Anti-Defamation League stooge Sen. Jesse Helms.

### The LaRouche vote

The most significant message which the voters could have sent to the President against his depression and war policies, would have been to elect imprisoned Democratic statesman Lyndon LaRouche to Congress. Instead, despite a major mobilization of LaRouche supporters from around the country and the world into LaRouche's home district, the political prisoner was credited with only 1.38%.

"Totally unbelievable," was the evaluation of LaRouche for Justice campaign coordinator Melvin Klenetsky. He noted that in nearly every precinct, LaRouche was held to nine votes or less per voting machine—a pattern which has been previously identified with machine-fixing. Some machine malfunctioning was also reported, along with a deliberately confusing ballot.

# LaRouche on the vote

*From a statement issued early Nov. 7:*

Although the results of the Nov. 6 national congressional and gubernatorial elections are so far incomplete, two things are clear: First of all, that President George Bush did receive a significant political black eye. A message in that degree was sent to Washington. However, the message was not strong enough, on several counts, and therefore, we are now faced with two great catastrophes, which will hit the American people as a result of the American people's failure to go far enough in yesterday's elections.

First, we will now begin to feel the full force of the worst economic depression of the 20th century. This depression will be a shattering one—at least until the point we reverse trends, and stop it.

Secondly, it is not yet certain, but it seems likely, as a result of the failure of yesterday's election to go far enough, that we shall have a war in the Middle East. If so, many Americans will find their relatives returning from the Middle East in bodybags. The prospect is, that we will have a world price of oil of between \$70 and \$100 a barrel, which will aggravate the great depression which is now rolling in, reaching toward gale force, and toward hurricane force.

These are the lessons of history. When a great people,

having reached the kind of power which the United States reached, become so corrupt and stupid, that they allow to continue the kinds of trends in policy-shaping which have persisted over the past 25 years, that people will be punished. Not merely for the sake of punishment, but in order to purge that people of those cultural weaknesses, those moral weaknesses, which encourage them to tolerate such errors for so long.

I hope that the punishment wrought upon our nation will not be as cruel as that which destroyed the Roman Empires, first in the West, and then in the East. However, I fear that we are going to move in that direction, if not all the way.

I can only hope that our American people will wake up soon enough; will give up their rock-drug-sex counterculture, will give up their malthusian insanity, and will give up a racist intolerance for the human rights of Arabs, people who speak Spanish below our borders, and Africans, generally. Until we learn to be less racist toward Arabs, toward black Africans, toward Mexicans, toward South Americans, toward people in Southeast Asia, we will probably lack in ourselves the moral fitness which a nation requires for durable national survival.

I think we'll wake up; I hope we wake up in time. I dedicate everything I can do, to causing us as a nation to wake up, and stop acting like fools. Yesterday, we took a step slightly in the right direction, with the humiliation of George Bush. We didn't go far enough; we must go far enough.

The LaRouche vote total was also wildly at odds with the level of citizen participation in the campaign in the district. Hundreds of residents had come forward to participate in some way or another in the LaRouche congressional campaign, breaking apart the taboo ordered by the national press and major political party bureaucracies on speaking seriously about the candidate's proposals for an emergency economic recovery program in order to avert the misery of depression and war.

The LaRouche vote was also inconsistent with results credited to senatorial candidate Nancy Spannaus, a LaRouche Democrat, in the northern Virginia area. Spannaus received 17.2% of the vote in Loudoun County where LaRouche resides, and over 18% of the vote in nearby Fairfax County, despite the sustained campaign of slander and mockery against LaRouche and his ideas in the area.

## Statewide breakthrough

Vote-fixers were not able to prevent a significant vote for LaRouche Democrats from showing up in the rest of Virgin-

ia. The highest total was won by Harry Broskie, the LaRouche Democrat running against incumbent Democrat Owen Pickett in the Second C.D. (Norfolk area)—22.28%.

The next-highest statewide LaRouche vote was given to Spannaus, who ended up with 18.35% against incumbent Republican Sen. John Warner. Spannaus's vote, which occurred against a coalition of the Democratic Party and major media, as well as the Republicans, is considered to be a sharp warning to the Commonwealth's "Bush Democrats."

In the words of the *Richmond Times-Dispatch* editorial on Nov. 7, "the fact that a fringe candidate, Nancy B. Spannaus, a Lyndon LaRouche adherent, captured almost one-fifth of the vote says something about the anti-incumbent anger in this political season, and perhaps about conservatives' discontent with Mr. Warner as well."

Indeed, if Spannaus had received such a percentage in a European country such as Germany, which does not adhere so strictly to the two-party system, she would have easily won a seat in the national parliament.

The breakthroughs reflected in the Spannaus campaign

show up more dramatically in the county-city breakdown of the vote. While Spannaus won in only one precinct in Norfolk—with 53% of the vote—she polled as high as 39% in one county, and 25% or more in 11 others. In most major urban centers, over 20% voted for her.

The relatively higher results can be attributed both to the fact that Spannaus concentrated her three-week radio campaign in the area of the state from Richmond east to the Tidewater, and to the rage felt by black voters against Senator Warner's role in killing the Civil Rights Act of 1990.

Overall, the vote in Virginia was as small as predicted, with only 40% of the registered electorate voting. There was a significant drop-off from even that total in the senatorial election, because the major media continued to lie, up to and including on the day of the election, that Warner had no opponent whatsoever.

### **LaRouche campaign gains**

The most significant victory in the elections, both for the country and for the efforts of the LaRouche movement, was the two-to-one defeat of the Big Green environmentalist initiative in California. The major opposition to this piece of environmentalist stupidity, which would have destroyed what remains of California's economy, was catalyzed by political supporters of LaRouche who organized themselves into the Stop Eco-Fascism Committee. In Washington State, Proposition 547, the equivalent to California's Big Green, was roundly defeated, 77% to 23%.

Other results across the country show that LaRouche candidates received votes in the range of 30% in districts which have been hit hard by the depression, and even higher totals in smaller areas where people have been hit so hard that they are ready to wake up and do something about it. In the central Texas area around San Angelo, Lester Dahlberg, a working farmer running a home-grown campaign on the LaRouche platform for state House of Representatives, polled 29.9% in a two-way campaign, and won in one county, with 51%. In the Houston area, Bruce Director received 29% in a U.S. congressional campaign against Republican incumbent Tom DeLay, and polled 48-49% in areas where his shoestring campaign was able to do walking tours.

In other LaRouche campaigns, Lewis du Pont Smith, the du Pont heir who is being persecuted by his family for supporting LaRouche, received only 4.5% in Pennsylvania's Fifth District, in an independent campaign against Republican incumbent Dick Schulze, who only scraped by with 56% because many who did not have the courage to vote for Smith, voted instead for a Democratic stand-in. In St. Louis, Missouri, Jerome Schmidt won 27.5% against a Republican incumbent state senator; in North Dakota, Jim Mosienko received approximately 33% in a bid for county commissioner; and in Michigan, Joan Dennison, running as a Food for Peace Democrat, polled 33% against her Republican opponent.

## **FBI coverup of Iranian arms-for-hostages deals continues**

by Edward Spannaus

The FBI is still covering up Iranian arms-for-hostages deals from the beginning of the Reagan-Bush administration in 1980. Despite all the investigations into the Iran-Contra arms dealing, the FBI's coverup of illegal arms deals from the early 1980s has so far escaped the scrutiny of both Congress and the Special Prosecutor.

In documents filed recently in a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) lawsuit in federal court in Washington, FBI officials have continued to suppress evidence concerning the role of a former Justice Department official in facilitating the illegal arms deals. Four years ago, it was revealed that former Assistant Attorney General J. Stanley Pottinger had narrowly escaped prosecution because the FBI had "lost" the transcripts of wiretaps on which Pottinger had been overheard.

Now, in the new court filings, the FBI is flatly denying that it has any record whatsoever of the wiretaps.

### **Bugs and guns**

Arms-for-hostages dealings actually date back to the fall of 1979, when Pottinger, acting as a lawyer for Iranian banker and arms dealer Cyrus Hashemi, approached officials of the Carter administration with proposals for using Hashemi to negotiate the release of the American hostages then being held in Teheran. In January 1980, Pottinger and Hashemi met with high officials of Carter's State Department, to discuss Hashemi's proposals. The fact of this meeting was first revealed in FOIA documents obtained by *EIR*.

Hashemi's first offers to act as a go-between between Washington and the revolutionary government in Iran came to naught. But with the outbreak of the Iran-Iraq War in late summer of 1980, Hashemi again offered his services, since Iran was now in need of military equipment and spare parts for the war with Iraq. In October 1980, Hashemi again met with Carter administration officials, this time including Lloyd Cutler, Carter's legal counsel.

According to reports published in various news media, the CIA supposedly became suspicious of Hashemi as a result of these meetings, and requested that his offices be wire-