

LaRouche Wins 22% in Arkansas, as 'Dump Gore' Movement Grows

by Debra Hanania Freeman

Democrats in President Clinton's home state of Arkansas rapidly accelerated the already-growing momentum of a "Dump Gore" drive inside the Democratic Party, by delivering upwards of 22% of the vote to Lyndon LaRouche, in what was the first head-to-head contest between the noted physical economist and Vice President Al Gore, in that state's May 23 Democratic Primary. LaRouche, who was credited with more than 53,000 total votes, with 98% of the precincts reporting, also outpolled Republican front-runner, Texas Gov. George W. Bush, by more than 17,000 votes.

Asked to comment on what is being called a significant breakout vote in support of his candidacy, LaRouche, who was speaking from Wiesbaden, Germany, where he is currently engaged in high-level meetings on the global strategic and financial crises, had the following to say:

"During the past four weeks, I had expected that I would top the 15% threshold [needed to win delegates to the Democratic Party National Convention in August] in more than one Democratic primary before the June 6th date. The Arkansas Democratic primary result is typical of the sometimes unexpected way in which the foreseen and inevitable often happens. The fact that I out-pollied George W. Bush's candidacy, on this occasion, adds a delicious element to the entire development.

"To understand the reasons this breakout for the LaRouche candidacy had to occur, one must look beyond all considerations, to the larger global reality. In short, the issues featured by my campaign website, and by no other candidate's site, are the only real issues of the day. In one way or another, those issues of the onrushing world financial collapse will determine the history of the United States during the several months immediately ahead. In that sense, I have been the only real Presidential candidate of any party in the race so far. Yesterday, in Arkansas, *reality* struck."

Wall Street Is Losing Control

The strategic significance of the vote, LaRouche commented, is that it shows that the Wall Street crowd is losing control. The oligarchy is losing control of the election in the same way that it is losing control of the Nasdaq and the so-called "New Economy." And what they do to try to regain control, will only make their predicament worse.

Indeed, it was approximately four weeks ago, that the increasingly desperate attempts to stave off the inevitable collapse of the global financial system until the November elections, by pumping in staggering amounts of liquidity, began to founder when the Nasdaq took a sharp dive. At that time, LaRouche declared that Gore's candidacy was doomed. Since then, although the markets have experienced a series of wild fluctuations, the overall trend has been downward, with the Nasdaq losing approximately 37% from its height. Gore's campaign has experienced none of the hyper-volatility seen on the financial markets. On the contrary, the Gore campaign has plummeted steadily.

Over the last few weeks, private concerns expressed by Democratic Party operatives, that Gore himself was unelectable, and that, if he succeeded in capturing the Democratic nomination, he would lead the party to a stunning defeat, began to break into the public arena. Editorials and commentaries have appeared in major American newspapers, from the *New York Times* to the *Washington Post* to the *Los Angeles Times*, comparing Gore's candidacy to some of the most humiliating defeats in Democratic Party history: Jimmy Carter in 1980, Walter Mondale, Michael Dukakis. One Washington pundit joked, "The only loser Gore hasn't been compared to is Paul Tsongas and he's dead. No use in wishful thinking."

On May 23, United Auto Workers President Stephen Yochick said that the UAW may not endorse Gore, and instead look at "alternatives like Ralph Nader," the candidate of the

pathetic Green Party. Even Al From, of the “third way” Democratic Leadership Council, a group that constitutes the hard core of Gore’s waning support, set off alarms at Gore’s Nashville headquarters, when he was quoted as saying that Gore was losing support because he was being unfaithful to the “New Democrat” agenda. In fact, Gore’s done nothing of the kind, and From’s statement has been likened to a rat abandoning a sinking ship.

Nevertheless, the Gore-dominated crowd at Democratic National Committee (DNC) headquarters in Washington, D.C. remains determined to stamp out any visible resistance to a Gore coronation at the Aug. 14-17 convention, even if it means destroying the Democratic Party in the process.

In Arkansas, just 48 hours before the primary election, State Attorney General Mark Pryor, Gore’s Arkansas campaign chairman, was quoted in the *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, the state’s major newspaper, blustering that Democrats would come out in large numbers to show strong support for Gore and to keep LaRouche out of Arkansas Democratic politics. “Maybe part of this election is to send a signal to Lyndon LaRouche to get out of our primary,” he said. The article goes on to say that, according to Pryor, LaRouche is an interloper: “I don’t think he has any organization or presence in the state. I’ve never talked to or heard of a person here who is a supporter of his. His policies are not Democratic policies, and I really don’t know why he files as a Democrat.”

The *Democrat-Gazette* features LaRouche’s response: “That a Gore supporter defines a Democrat as someone who

supports Gore is not surprising and also not true. I supported President Clinton during the impeachment, when many ‘good Democrats’ wanted to give up and abandon him.

“Gore supporters are sending out a message that all good Democrats will turn out and vote for Gore on Tuesday. They fear a ‘Dump Gore’ movement at the Convention.”

LaRouche goes on to emphasize, “Gore may get the nomination, but he can’t win. . . . That will become more and more obvious” as the Democratic National Convention approaches.

Three days later, the *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, reporting the results of the May 23 primary, states that “LaRouche will get 10 of Arkansas’ 48 delegates if his 20% margin holds.” Of course, by the time the newspaper hit the streets, LaRouche’s 20% margin not only held, it grew. A clearly destabilized Mark Pryor is again quoted, “I never knew of any sort of presence LaRouche had in the state, and my guess is he might have had his folks do some early voting. . . . I would be surprised if that percentage holds. . . . It’s too early to know what that [figure] means, if anything.”

Gore Steals Delegates

Earlier, Pryor had been quoted boasting that getting all 48 delegates for Gore was an attainable goal. What he didn’t say, is that Gore would have to get them by stealing!

But, less than 24 hours after the Arkansas polls closed, despite the fact that well over 50,000 Arkansas Democrats had gone to the polls in good faith, and cast their votes for Lyndon LaRouche; despite the fact that the Arkansas Election

Reich Assails Gore for Peddling Status Quo

It is no longer blasphemy for well-known Democrats, including former Clinton Cabinet officials, to let down their hair about how horrified they are about Al Gore’s desperate Presidential campaign, which threatens to relegate the Democratic Party to minority status in Congress and in state houses all across the country this November.

First, in March, and again in May, former Labor Secretary Robert Reich penned stinging attacks against the Vice President, for running such a rotten campaign, devoid of imaginative new ideas, that “right now, Bush’s vision wins by default simply because it dares to be new and different.” “Gore,” Reich wrote in the June 5 issue of the *American Prospect*, “is losing ground because he’s not talking about what could be. He’s riding on what is.”

“Al Gore’s problem,” Reich continued, “is that he’s acting as if he’s desperate to be President, but sounding as if he doesn’t want to do anything new once elected.”

In the *New Republic* in March, Reich had been even

more blunt, attacking Gore’s nutty ideas about paying down the debt at all costs—even during a severe recession. He referred to Gore’s position as “worse than Reaganomics. It’s Coolidgeomics.”

Jeff Faux, the president of the Economic Policy Institute, a Democratic Party think-tank that shares some of Reich’s views, talked about Reich’s critique of Gore. “There’s no question that Bob Reich’s article reflects the frustration of a lot of Democrats. . . . We’ve been playing defense for so long, it’s about time we had an inspiring agenda and we haven’t had that from Gore.” He added, “Now we have Al Gore saying that we have to reduce the deficit to zero, and that puts him to the right of Herbert Hoover. . . . The polls are telling us something. When you have union members saying they would vote for Bush over Gore, there’s something wrong with his campaign.”

Another prominent Washington Democrat, who served for years as a chief counsel to a ranking Senator, confirmed that there is rampant disgust at Gore and his abominable campaign. This Democrat vented his spleen in particular at the fact that Gore has failed to dump his campaign director, Tony Coelho, who is the subject of several criminal investigations.—*Jeffrey Steinberg*

Code clearly requires each state party to hold a binding preferential primary election and states that delegates to the national nominating conventions of the political parties “shall be apportioned according to the votes cast for each candidate”; and, despite the fact the Arkansas Democratic Party, in its Arkansas Delegate Selection Plan, which has been approved by the DNC, clearly states that the primary *shall* be governed by the election laws of the State of Arkansas, the Arkansas Democratic Party announced that, based on orders from DNC Chairman Joe Andrew, Lyndon LaRouche would not be awarded any delegates, despite the fact that he cleared the 15% qualifying threshold in all four of Arkansas’s Congressional districts, and that those delegates who would have been awarded to LaRouche had the law been followed, would instead go to Al Gore!

Not surprisingly, the announcement created an uproar. Reporters who questioned state party officials were referred to the Washington headquarters of the DNC, where ranking party officials declared that they didn’t care how many Arkansas Democrats voted for LaRouche! Apparently, one journalist, who called the White House for comment, was told that President Clinton had nothing to do with the events, and would not comment, “since he is no longer a resident of Arkansas,” and has already registered to vote in the New York Democratic Primary!

Sen. Tim Hutchinson (R), who is Bush’s Arkansas chairman, was quoted from the floor of the U.S. Senate, saying that the LaRouche vote was unquestionably a strong challenge to Gore’s candidacy, and reflected the growing anti-Gore sentiment. Not surprisingly, Hutchinson failed to comment on the fact that LaRouche also trounced George W. Bush.

Although a Supreme Court decision earlier this year upheld the Democratic Party’s right to function as a private club, and exclude LaRouche and his supporters, the explicit nature of Arkansas’ Election Code, and of the state party’s agreement to adhere to that Code, poses new problems for Gore’s would-be dictatorship, and promises to develop into a brawl that will spill over into an all-out credentials battle at the National Convention. Civil rights leaders across the United States have likened LaRouche’s continuing fight to defend his growing vote to the 1964 Convention fight waged by the Mississippi Freedom Democrats. It was that fight which thrust the issue of voting rights before the American people, leading to the passage of the Voting Rights Act, considered among the crowning achievements of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s civil rights movement.

LaRouche will have the opportunity to amass more delegates in the period immediately ahead, when Democrats go to the polls in Alabama, New Jersey, and New Mexico on June 6. And, the compelling question on the minds of Democrats across the nation, is whether the current Democratic Party leadership will come to its senses, and embrace the voters that only Lyndon LaRouche’s candidacy can turn out, or whether they will continue on their current suicidal drive to deliver the party’s nomination to the unelectable Al Gore.

Poverty’s Link to AIDS Demands Financial Reform, Says Mbeki

by William Jones

The first official state visit of South African President Thabo Mbeki to Washington on May 22-23 may have helped to strengthen the strong bonds already established with U.S. President Bill Clinton, and may have served to shake things up a bit in Washington, which has been all-too-complacent in the face of the global financial crisis, which has collapsed living standards and led to pandemics of old and new diseases around the globe.

Speaking at the state dinner at the White House on May 22, President Mbeki praised the attention President Clinton has placed on Africa. “I followed a lot of your remarks, Mr. President, as you’ve raised questions about poverty and deprivation and disease around the world, as you’ve spoken against war, against conflict, and the need to find peaceful resolutions to these various questions. You may remember that when you spoke at the [UN] General Assembly last year . . . we met, and I said I was very, very moved by the comments you made, where you were clearly saying that the levels of poverty and suffering around the world were unacceptable and something needed to be done about that.”

Indeed, it was this issue that dominated much of the discussion between President Mbeki and President Clinton when they met on May 22.

Urgent and Extraordinary Interventions

The international media virtually declared war on the South African President when he set his mind to finding a solution to an AIDS epidemic that has become a grave threat to the very existence of his nation. When asked about the numerous press allegations that he had denied a connection between HIV and AIDS, or belittled the significance of AZT in combatting the disease, he characterized such allegations as “pure invention.”

The media have been especially incensed over Mbeki’s consistent emphasis on linking the rapid spread of AIDS in Sub-Saharan Africa to the rampant poverty there.

Speaking at his arrival at the White House on May 22, President Mbeki said, “We believe, Mr. President, we must act together in solidarity with as many people around the world, and especially in Africa. The best possible ways have to be found to end poverty and disease, and to help people to extricate themselves from the indecencies of wars and violent