

LaRouche campaign heats up, as Gore's problems mount

by Debra Hanania-Freeman

On Nov. 1, 1999, Lyndon LaRouche became the first major Presidential candidate to file for the New Hampshire primary election. Because it is traditionally the nation's first primary, the New Hampshire election, scheduled to occur on Feb. 1, 2000, is a key focal point in U.S. Presidential politics.

A week earlier, LaRouche was also the first to file in Kansas, for that state's April 4 Democratic Party primary. Both Kansas and New Hampshire, along with a handful of other states, require only a filing fee to obtain ballot status. But, in many of the nation's large industrial and agricultural states—states where LaRouche's political base is concentrated—ballot status is only achieved by fulfilling steep petitioning requirements. During November, petitioning begins in Illinois, Nebraska, Tennessee, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, New York, Indiana, Michigan, Maryland, Idaho, Oregon, and Mississippi. Eight additional states—Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New Jersey, Washington, Alabama, Wisconsin, New Mexico, and the District of Columbia—have petition periods that open in December or January. LaRouche has already qualified for Federal matching funds, and plans to have his name placed on the ballot in every state which has either a Democratic primary or caucus.

After filing LaRouche's nominating papers and filing fee at the Secretary of State's office in Concord, Roger Ham, the campaign's New Hampshire representative, spoke to the press. Ham discussed LaRouche's campaign initiatives, and cited LaRouche's promise one year ago, to "break Gore's claim to the Democratic nomination." Ham said that with that goal now clearly achieved, "the Republican Party is fissuring, and it is fair to ask whether any of the other candidates currently in the race—Democratic or Republican—will still be standing by the time of the nominating conventions."

Ham reiterated what has become a key theme of

LaRouche's drive for the year 2000 Democratic Presidential nomination, saying, "Now is the time to end politics as usual, and have a serious debate with the American people about the problems facing the nation and the world." He added that he was disgusted by CNN's arbitrary decision to bar LaRouche from participating in the so-called debate at Dartmouth the week before. Ham called the debate "nothing more than an exchange of sound bites that succeeded in putting the audience to sleep." He noted that "one thing Lyndon LaRouche has never been accused of being, is boring!"

'The wheel is still spinning, but the hamster is dead'

While LaRouche's representative was discussing how LaRouche's stated intent to dislodge Al Gore's alleged lock on the Democratic Party nomination had been achieved, Britain's Lord William Rees-Mogg, in a commentary printed the same day in the London *Times*, suggested that "Gore may yet be dumped by the Democrats in the Presidential race." Rees-Mogg commented on the state of Gore's campaign by quoting Washington columnist Jack Wheeler: "The wheel is still spinning, but the hamster is dead."

Although Rees-Mogg is not usually known for his insight, in this case, he is quite right. Gore became the object of ridicule in the first week of November, when it was revealed that he was paying feminist author Naomi Wolf \$15,000 a month to help "reinvent" Gore into a candidate who could capture the votes of Democratic women. According to *Time* magazine, "Gore was intent on hiding [Wolf's] presence on staff, going so far as to tunnel her paychecks through a consulting firm."

Wolf, who has based her advice on studies of dog packs, has told Gore that he is "a beta male," and that women like "alpha males," like President Clinton. Wolf writes, "The



A LaRouche campaign rally in Philadelphia, at a meeting of the National Association of Latino Elected Officials, June 19, 1999.

alpha male disciplines and leads other members of the pack, while beta males are subordinate and play a helpmate role.” Naomi Wolf insists, “Gore is the classic beta male and he must take on the ‘alpha male’ in the Oval Office [President Clinton] before the female public will see him as top dog.”

It seems, however, that Gore is a slow learner. At the Vice President’s annual Halloween Party, Gore came dressed as the cartoon character “Underdog,” while his wife Tipper dressed as “Polly Purebred.” The *Baltimore Sun* ran a photo of the costumed Gore with the caption, “Someone should tell him that Underdog was a beta.” An African-American radio host, quipped that Tipper’s choice of character reflected the couple’s racial views. According to the *Washington Post*, Gore’s new campaign manager, Donna Brazile, slashed Wolf’s fee to \$5,000 per month.

Gore on hotseat over DNC attacks on Voting Rights Act

Gore has more problems. According to Democratic National Committee circles, numerous members of the Party’s governing body are responding with shock and disgust as the full details of a raging legal battle become public, in which the DNC, through its attorney, John C. Keeney, Jr., submitted a plainly anti-civil-rights, implicitly pro-racist argument, which concluded with a call for nullification of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. These DNC members are holding Gore and the Washington office responsible for acting behind their backs (see *Documentation*).

Adding to Gore’s troubles, there is growing indication of a revolt against the AFL-CIO endorsement that he twisted

arms to obtain. Before the AFL-CIO convention was even over, the Teamsters, the United Auto Workers, and the American Federation of Government Employees all bolted, refusing to rubber-stamp the endorsement. By early November, a rank-and-file upsurge against the Gore endorsement resulted in the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, PACE, and United Mine Workers all announcing that they were not endorsing Gore’s candidacy.

A density of LaRouche campaign events

Meanwhile, following the October release of his high-impact video, “LaRouche Speaks to Labor,” featuring the candidate’s response to questions from a panel of labor and legislative leaders on Sept. 3, LaRouche engaged in an Internet dialogue with dozens of American labor leaders on Nov. 4.

LaRouche’s staff has also announced that since the international interest LaRouche’s Oct. 13 Internet press conference generated was so great, they decided to give the international community an opportunity to query LaRouche on his foreign policy views more thoroughly. So, on Nov. 9, at 2 p.m. EST, in an exchange that will be broadcast live on the Internet, LaRouche will become the first candidate for the U.S. Presidency in recent memory, to engage in a dialogue with representatives of other nations on what they can expect from a LaRouche administration. Another dialogue with the candidate, this time with civil rights leaders, will be broadcast on Nov. 23.

LaRouche’s campaign committee has also announced plans for two town meetings that will feature satellite hook-

ups — one on Dec. 4 in New York City, and one in Los Angeles on Dec. 11 — allowing thousands of ordinary citizens to engage in a direct dialogue with the Presidential candidate.

Documentation

Battle rages over DNC move to nullify Voting Rights Act

The following statement was issued by Lyndon LaRouche's Presidential campaign on Nov. 3:

A growing number of Democratic National Committee members from across the nation are responding with shock and disgust as the full details emerge of a raging legal battle, in which the DNC, through its attorney, John C. Keeney, Jr., submitted a plainly anti-civil-rights, implicitly pro-racist argument, which concluded with a call for nullification of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

The argument was made in the course of a hearing on a DNC motion to dismiss a lawsuit brought by Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, and Democratic voters from Virginia, Louisiana, Texas, and Arizona, before a three-judge panel in Federal District Court in Washington, D.C. on Aug. 16, 1999. The lawsuit, which was filed in 1996, charges that Donald Fowler, then-Chair of the DNC, violated the Voting Rights Act, when he ordered state Democratic parties to disregard the votes of thousands of Democrats in the 1996 Democratic Presidential primaries and caucuses, who cast their votes for Lyndon LaRouche.

The relevant core of Keeney's argument was based on an opinion authored by Supreme Court Justices Antonin Scalia and Clarence Thomas, in which they argued that national party rules were covered under the 1965 Voting Rights Act, but that the Act itself, which represents the crowning achievement of the civil rights movement, *should be declared unconstitutional*. According to court transcripts, Mr. Keeney argued, "The dissent [the Scalia/Thomas opinion] is going to put into question the constitutionality of the entire act. . . . We have four Justices who say the Voting Rights Act is unconstitutional to the extent that it reaches even state parties holding state party conventions in covered jurisdictions. . . . Your Honor, what I see is four Justices who are going to strike down the Voting Rights Act as unconstitutional if it's extended." (For fuller excerpts from the court transcript, see *EIR*, Nov. 5, 1999, also available at www.larouhecampaign.org.) Apparently, according to Democratic National Committee circles, numerous members are very upset by what Keeney, and some DNC officials, have done behind their backs.

In a statement released today, candidate LaRouche com-

mented, "The stink of racism in this action by Keeney is, unfortunately, consistent with the racism shown by Keeney's father, John C. (Jack) Keeney (Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice), a key figure in the racist campaigns which the permanent bureaucracy of the U.S. Department of Justice has been conducting against targeted African-American elected officials throughout recent years.

"Obviously it is up to both President Clinton and the relevant DNC members to effect a public repudiation of the frankly racist policy of Keeney and his culpable DNC clients. I would expect them to do so, publicly and promptly, simply as a matter of personal honor."

Endorsements

Theo W. Mitchell

The following statement was issued by Theo W. Mitchell, former Democratic candidate for Governor of South Carolina and former State Senator, on Oct. 29:

The need for new leadership in the United States has never been more critical than now; the self-centered "Good Ole Boys" who have been bought by greedy and evil people prevails unchallenged by those entrusted by the public and therefore has sold the United States of America to the highest bidders. Today, America is for sale!

Even I, let alone the founders of this great nation, never envisioned that greed, arrogance, and vile and vicious people would make toilet paper of the Constitution of the United States of America, and that only the privileged few rich boys would control the destiny of countless millions over the globe and destroy the nation in millennium 2000.

The only one who has paid his/her dues to lead us back to a sane, fair, and God-fearing society has been a sacrificial lamb because of his views and predictions and prognostications, which have been true. He has been railroaded by his government and set up for destruction by his government, among other unconstitutional and ungodly acts to silence him. He has been limited in his access to those whose ideas, goals, dreams, and aspirations for a fair, just, and equitable New World Order are shared, but he has never been silent on the remedy, as well as the cause, of the deepening and widening rift in this great nation. Of all the people offering for President of the United States of America, only one can refocus the nation on the proper and morally correct and fair path for its citizens and the rest of the world, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., whom I endorse for President of the United States of America.

Respectfully submitted,
Theo W. Mitchell

Prof. Ernst Florian Winter

Professor Winter, a distinguished veteran of world diplomacy and former director of the Diplomatic Academy in Vienna, Austria, released the following endorsement on Nov. 5, titled "Mr. Lyndon LaRouche for U.S. President. An interview with Professor Winter appeared in EIR, Sept. 3, 1999.

The American people have countless friends over here in Europe. We appreciate the recent help by Americans to rebuild a badly victimized continent. We appreciate their interest in current developments in Europe, inspired by the example of the founding of the United States of America.

However, many of us friends are also increasingly concerned and worried about developments in the U.S.A. Can current global policies and actions of the U.S. government really promote peace and help continue to develop economic prosperity worldwide? History has taught us that all attempts to force a "one world" on its inhabitants were destined to fail. A "unipolar" world can only be maintained for a short period of time by military might alone, provoking today universal armament, eventually leading to wars. A multipolar world requires diplomacy and needs economic development for its peaceful success.

Americans are going to elect a new President. Many of us friends think that this new man will have to display a high degree of personal integrity, set on the conviction that mankind is created in the image and likeness of a transcendent God; command a vast knowledge in politics, economics, science and culture. The next President must be able to gain the confidence of friends and enemies. He will have to work towards the moral rearmament of the entire nation, so that America can rededicate itself to the high moral standards admired by the whole world, and which made America great!

Many of us friendly observers have met such a man and heard him talk very positively about the America he loves. There is such a Presidential candidate in Lyndon LaRouche. He has the habits of a Renaissance man. He is a much respected, worldwide known economist, whose economic predictions over the past years proved flawless. He is personally liked by statesmen in many countries, because of his brilliance and affable habits. Above all, he believes in the virtues of the American way of life being able to overcome its darker sides.

As one who has been involved in international diplomacy since 1960, I commend to the attention of American voters to familiarize themselves with the candidate Lyndon LaRouche, and, if found worthy, to elect him to the Presidency of the United States of America.

LaRouche in dialogue with labor movement

The following are excerpts from Lyndon LaRouche's Nov. 4 live campaign webcast with members of the U.S. labor movement. LaRouche spoke by telephone from Germany. The full transcript will be published in the Nov. 15 issue of the weekly newspaper New Federalist and is available on the campaign website (www.larouchecampaign.org). The moderator is Debra Hanania-Freeman. We begin with the candidate's opening statement.

LaRouche: There are several constituencies which must come together. We used to have farmers, but they're almost wiped out. We have labor. We have African-Americans. We have Hispanic-Americans. We have senior citizens. And we have concerned professionals as well, in significant numbers.

The power in this country has to be taken away from the machines which run in cooperation with Wall Street and the news media. The country has got to be taken back from election campaigns controlled by money. Election campaigns' money is supposed to go to mobilize voters for national interests. We don't *need* the news media, to mobilize voters, if we have these constituencies together, and the natural leaders, organic leaders, of these constituencies, working together. We can turn out the vote, whatever the news media says.

So, let's stop giving in, to a so-called system which takes the power away from the people, and gives it to those who manage so-called public opinion. And that's what I think my purpose is right now, in addressing any questions you have to throw at me.

Freeman: Ladies and gentlemen, if you have questions for Mr. LaRouche, this is the time to ask them. Why don't we start with the southeastern portion of the United States? If anyone from the Southeast has a question, please identify your union and your state, and ask it.

Rudy Feagin: I'm with the UAW local 5841, in Waynesboro, South Carolina, and I would certainly like to ask Mr. LaRouche, with all the anti-labor, especially created by the National Right to Work Committee, if there's anything we can do to curb some of this? Thank you.

LaRouche: Well, I think what we have to do, is we have to get a concept of what kind of politics we're going to run.

My conception is, that the precedent which many people remember directly, or indirectly, on which most of us can agree, is the fact that whatever criticisms we have of Franklin Roosevelt as President, he led the country out of the worst