

LaRouche files for matching funds, shakes up establishment

by Michele Steinberg

Politics in Washington departed from “business as usual” on Aug. 18, when Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche’s Committee for a New Bretton Woods held a news conference at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., announcing that the campaign had raised more than \$1 million, and had filed for Federal matching funds at around 11:30 a.m. that morning.

“There is little question that Mr. LaRouche has the largest and most active volunteer force,” estimated at about 7,000 people, of any candidate in the Year 2000 Presidential race in either party, stated Debra Hanania-Freeman, spokeswoman for LaRouche’s campaign, in her opening remarks at the Zenger Room of the National Press Club, where reporters from Agence France Presse, Associated Press (AP), Cable News Network (CNN), and other media attended.

Freeman spoke just a couple of hours after the LaRouche campaign had delivered campaign fund documentation to the Federal Election Commission, and filed for Federal matching funds with an initial submission far over the threshold of the FEC’s requirements of certification. The total amount of the LaRouche campaign’s initial submission amounted to \$387,709. Some \$7,000 was raised in contributions of \$250 or less from individuals in 25 states — an amount far exceeding the FEC’s minimum qualifying requirement, which is \$5,000 raised in each of 20 states, in amounts of \$250 or less.

In a written statement issued before the news conference, Freeman said that LaRouche’s Committee has “raised more than \$1 million in small contributions from ordinary citizens, filed a submission today documenting well over \$7,000 in such contributions from 25 states. Given that we are so far over the minimum threshold that the FEC requires, qualification for Federal matching funds is a certainty.”

LaRouche’s filing is a major event for the U.S. political

landscape, where only five other candidates have been certified by the Federal Election Commission for matching funds: Democrat Bill Bradley; and Republicans Elizabeth Dole, former Vice President Dan Quayle, Gary Bauer, and John McCain.

Three other “major” candidates, millionaires George “Dubya” Bush, Steve Forbes, and Democrat Al Gore, Jr., have forgone FEC matching funds for a variety of reasons — the most-reported reason being that they would be constrained from “buying elections” with FEC state-by-state spending limits. In the Iowa “straw poll” run by the Iowa state Republican Party the previous week, the highest number of votes came in for Bush and Forbes, both of whom spent an enormous amount of money: It was reported that Bush had purchased 10,000 tickets at \$25 each (a quarter of a million dollars in free tickets!) to get himself into first place. But even with 31% of the straw poll, Bush scored lower than his father did in the same straw poll in 1979 (the elder George Bush eventually lost the GOP nomination to Ronald Reagan), and pundits are happy to report that no one who ever won that particular state GOP straw poll, ever went on to receive the Republican Party’s Presidential nomination.

In many states, certification for FEC matching funds is the major requirement (in some cases the only one) for being placed on the ballot. “For some time, the FEC has conceded that Lyndon LaRouche is the third major candidate for the Democratic Party,” said Freeman. “So, in a sense, today’s submission is only a formality.”

International heat

News of LaRouche’s candidacy spread throughout the United States in the wake of the FEC filing and news conference. A brief report on the event was aired internationally on

CNN's "Inside Edition." An AP wire service story circulated in print, on television, and on Internet coverage worldwide. Newspaper coverage has appeared in the *Toledo Blade*, *Baltimore Sun*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, and many others (see *Documentation*).

But no sooner did LaRouche's campaign make the filing, than the dirty tricks began in earnest, with a quote from an FEC official, erroneously claiming that "35 states will not put convicted felons on the ballot." His remarks are ostensibly in reference to the illegal frameup and railroading of Lyndon LaRouche into prison in 1989 by the George Bush White House and U.S. establishment faction around Henry Kissinger. In response, LaRouche's Committee for a New Bretton Woods issued a press release titled "FEC Official Caught in Lie," and shot off a letter to the FEC, warning them to either correct the record and discipline the offending official by Aug. 25, or face litigation.

LaRouche's candidacy is centered around his unique role as a strategic thinker, as an expert in the field of physical economy, especially at this time of great crisis, explained Freeman. She said that LaRouche's strategic understanding is renowned, especially in the international arena, but also widely in the United States, where nearly 100 current and former elected officials—many of them prominent Democrats—"have chosen to endorse Mr. LaRouche for President."

One of the main themes of the press conference, and of the subsequent press coverage—most notably in Agence France Presse (AFP)—is the strategic battle that LaRouche is leading against the forces centered within the British monarchy and Her Majesty's Tony Blair government, who are orchestrating a crisis which could result in a world war.

In an Aug. 18 wire report, AFP reported on LaRouche's intervention into the current strategic showdown: "On Wednesday, right-wing extremist Lyndon LaRouche threw himself into the Democratic Party nomination race for the November 2000 Presidential elections, warning the world that British 'adventurism' will lead to a Third World War.

"The race toward nuclear war comes from the British monarchy," warned Mr. LaRouche.

"Mr. LaRouche, who is presently convalescing in Germany where he is recuperating from the aftermath of a heart operation, estimated that recent NATO bombings against Yugoslavia were the proof that Great Britain wants to force the U.S. into a war against Russia.

"Lyndon LaRouche is in 'perfect health' and fully able to assume the Presidency, were he to be elected, stated his spokesman, Debra Hanania-Freeman."

Well-informed French sources noted that the press agency had very "carefully" detailed LaRouche's attack on the British oligarchy.

At the press conference, questions were also fired at the LaRouche campaign spokeswoman about the recent slander in the British pulp magazine *Take a Break*, which featured a



Debra Hanania-Freeman, spokeswoman for LaRouche's Committee for a New Bretton Woods, announces the Presidential campaign's submission for Federal matching funds at a press conference in Washington, D.C. on Aug. 18.

front-page story that Queen Elizabeth II was demanding, "Shut This Man's Mouth," referring to LaRouche's criticism of the British monarchy (see *EIR*, Aug. 13, 1999).

One reporter asked whether the White House had responded to the *Take a Break* slander, which was interpreted as a threat against Presidential candidate LaRouche, and possibly against President Bill Clinton as well. "The White House, as you can imagine, takes very seriously anything which can be considered a threat to the President's life," replied Mrs. Freeman. "We gave them everything we had available. . . . They took it very seriously." Freeman said, "There was some follow-up," but said she could not elaborate further.

In a follow-up question about how the British monarchy had responded to the charge that the article was a threat to LaRouche, Freeman said that a "spokesman for the Royal Household *admitted* that they are very unhappy with the role that Mr. LaRouche has played," and that as a consequence, they have had to conduct a campaign to "rehabilitate the Queen's image." She added, however, that the Royal Household has denied that there was any physical threat to LaRouche implied.

LaRouche opens the American debate

Like LaRouche himself, Freeman doesn't pull her political punches, and her perspective is that the Presidential campaign is wide open. With "the rapidly escalating crisis," especially with the increasingly admitted financial crisis, said

Freeman, “more and more people would simply turn to LaRouche.”

She said that when this campaign started, George “Dubya” Bush’s success was based entirely on his running against Al Gore, who is now “in big trouble.” But, “everyone seems to realize that Mr. Gore’s campaign is over — except Mr. Gore,” said Freeman. “Bill Bradley’s support is increasing, as Al Gore’s support wanes.” But even more importantly, she explained, if “you knock out Al Gore, you knock out the strong-arm tactics . . . it throws everything open.” Then, you can see a “policy debate which is appropriate to the crisis.”

“Mr. LaRouche will be hosting several live press conferences over the next period,” Freeman said, and a “panel of state legislators will gather on the Friday of the Labor Day weekend” for a dialogue, in which Mr. LaRouche will participate. Between now and Labor Day, LaRouche will intensify his policy input into the Presidential campaign process, and already the third national tour by leading campaign representatives is under way.

Freeman revealed that Al Gore’s strategy of stifling the primaries before they even happen, has angered a lot of Democrats, and that LaRouche is taking a personal role in breaking open that situation, with a 7,000-person campaign volunteers force, an Internet campaign website that is gaining popularity, and a fight to open up the Democratic Party to real political freedom.

In a dramatic discussion of how the railroading of LaRouche into prison had occurred, Freeman told the press conference about the lawsuit that LaRouche is fighting from the 1996 Presidential election campaign, when the Democratic National Committee, under the chairmanship of Don Fowler, *refused to seat the delegates* that LaRouche had won fair and square, in elections that had garnered him more than 600,000 votes in 28 states.

She said that there is still a “nasty court fight” going on around the 1996 LaRouche delegates, but that to her “surprise, the attorneys for the Democratic Party thought it was time to declare the Voting Rights Act . . . unconstitutional!” Freeman termed the DNC’s behavior a “frightening reach back to the failure of the Democratic Party to seat the delegation from the Mississippi Freedom Democrats at the height of the civil rights movement.” It was that act of racial discrimination, among others, that was corrected by the Voting Rights Act that was signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson in 1965. Freeman predicted that the DNC’s efforts this time against this movement today, would be “as unsuccessful as their failure to stop the march of the civil rights movement.”

Freeman was asked repeated questions about LaRouche’s 7,000-strong campaign volunteer force: Where are they from, who are they, what do they do? In response, Freeman also talked about the waning weeks of Gore’s “frontrunner” status. She said that many people were skeptical about how LaRouche could, with only \$1 million in campaign funds, compete against Al Gore. First of all, she said, the LaRouche campaign is going to escalate all its activities, and the truth

is, “on a close reading” of Mr. Gore’s filing, he *spent* \$18 million to *raise* his \$21 million, and Gore has a “very highly paid staff.”

In contrast, with the LaRouche organization having at least 7,000 volunteers with whom the campaign is in direct contact, the funds are going a much longer way than Gore’s. Additionally, the LaRouche committee has distributed millions of pieces of campaign literature, including the program book, *The Road to Recovery*, and a pamphlet detailing the needed reconstruction of the Balkans, which had also been “provided to President Clinton.” These are “not just palm cards,” Freeman said, but a battle to open up the American political system of elections.

Documentation

‘We need policies,’ LaRouche backer says

Alabama State Rep. Thomas E. Jackson is one of the elected officials endorsing LaRouche’s campaign. Excerpts of his letter to the campaign:

I call upon people in leadership positions and people of influence to help get this message out across the nation, in order to maintain sanity and to save humanity from self-destruction. . . .

We have sown to the wind and reaped the whirlwind; and sown to the flesh and reaped corruption and death — death of innocent men, women, and children throughout the nation and world.

Mr. LaRouche is the only Presidential candidate who has policies to help save the nation from itself, to bring a moral and spiritual order to America, to restore our economic system . . . while reaching out to help save Third World nations from economic chaos.

We do not need more smart bombs killing people around this world; nor do we want any more Jonesboros [sic], Littletons, or Atlanta’s senseless killing. We need policies to restore our moral conscience back to our nation and sanity back to our people. . . .

I call upon men and women of purpose, courage, and vision to join with me in supporting the policies of the Schiller Institute and Mr. LaRouche.

FEC official caught in lie

Excerpts of an Aug. 18 press release from LaRouche’s Committee for a New Bretton Woods, his Presidential campaign committee:

Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche’s national spokeswoman [Debra Hanania-Freeman] has

charged that an official of the Federal Election Commission [Ian Stirton] made statements to the press concerning LaRouche's candidacy that he knew were lies. . . .

An Associated Press wire story issued shortly after the LaRouche press conference [where Mrs. Freeman spoke] quotes FEC spokesman Ian Stirton stating that although the Commission will process the LaRouche campaign's request in a timely fashion, "35 states will not put the names of convicted felons on the ballot," referring to the fact that LaRouche served five years in Federal prison following a politically motivated judicial frame-up that drew harsh criticism from legal experts and civil and human rights figures across the nation and the globe. Stirton added, "LaRouche has even lost the right to vote for himself."

"It is obvious to anyone with even a cursory grasp of the Constitution, that Mr. Stirton's statement is false," Freeman said. "While some states retain the right to exclude convicted felons from seeking state office, there is nothing in the U.S. Constitution that would exclude . . . seeking the office of President due to a felony conviction. And, whether it pleases Mr. Stirton or not, the U.S. Constitution is the last word on this issue. . . ."

"This question was definitively settled in 1992, and again in 1996. Mr. LaRouche's attorney, Odin Anderson . . . has submitted memoranda on this that are included in Mr. LaRouche's 1992 and 1996 filings. . . . For a public servant, whose specific duty is to serve as a spokesman for a Federal agency, to knowingly disseminate disinformation, is both morally and professionally reprehensible."

LaRouche's campaign demands correction

In a letter signed by Campaign Treasurer Kathy Magraw, and sent to FEC chairman Scott E. Thomas on Aug. 19, LaRouche's Committee for a New Bretton Woods said:

On August 18, 1999, Ian Stirton, a Federal Election Commission employee, acting in his official capacity and as a spokesman for the Commission, made an egregious anti-LaRouche statement to the media, that received widespread coverage. The statement was egregious, not only because it was a violation of the FEC's required neutrality and represented an expression of political opposition to Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., but because it was palpably false. The assertion that Mr. LaRouche was prohibited from appearing on the ballot in 35 states (or in any state for that matter) is a complete fallacy and apparently intentionally so. It is difficult if not impossible, to imagine that a spokesman for a government agency could be so mistaken, as to the law applying to its function, unless it was intentional.

On behalf of Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., the Committee for a New Bretton Woods demands that the Commission immediately correct the public record, take appropriate disciplinary action against Mr. Stirton, and issue a formal and public apology for the malfeasance and any negative effect it may have on Mr. LaRouche's campaign.

In the event that acceptable action by the Commission has



"Now that you're up there, George...?"

This cartoon appeared on the web-site of Lyndon LaRouche's Presidential campaign. With Gore's campaign collapsing, George W. Bush's win in the Iowa straw poll will likely continue the trend—that no one who ever won that poll ever went on to receive the GOP Presidential nomination.

not been taken by August 25, 1999, appropriate legal action will be commenced.

Press coverage around the nation

The first widespread coverage of Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche appeared following his filing for matching funds on Aug. 18. Articles appeared in the *Baltimore Sun*, *Toledo Blade*, *Boston Globe*, *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, *Philadelphia Inquirer*, and *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, to name a few.

Many articles mixed disinformation from the FEC that LaRouche would be excluded from the ballot on 35 states, a falsehood challenged by LaRouche's campaign.

Giving a more neutral report, the *Toledo Blade* said:

"Democratic candidate Lyndon LaRouche filed papers with the Federal Election Commission Wednesday asking for federal matching funds for the Presidential election.

"The LaRouche campaign says it raised more than \$7,000 in contributions of \$250 or less, beating the \$5,000 requirement [sic] to receive matching funds. National spokeswoman Debra Hanania-Freeman expects the FEC to respond to the request withing 24 hours."