
Interview with Harley Schlanger

We Face a Dangerous, But Optimistic Time

Harley Schlanger, the Western States Coordinator of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, was interviewed on Sept. 2, by Christine Schier, for Nouvelle Solidarité, the French-language newspaper of the LaRouche-associated Solidarity and Progress party, based in Paris. Here is an edited transcript

Nouvelle Solidarité: Harley, you have been very active in the ongoing Presidential campaign, in particular, in the Democratic Party, organizing for a Franklin Roosevelt-style solution, both to the economic crisis and the strategic crisis. Now that Obama has been nominated, and McCain is about to be, how do you judge the situation?

Harley Schlanger: It's a disaster. Obama gained the nomination through the coordination of George Soros, on behalf of the City of London, and they steam-rolled it through the Democratic Party, breaking the rules and corrupting the process as a whole. As a result, the Party is very divided, and Obama has made no serious effort to win over the voters of Hillary Clinton. It should be noted that Clinton got more votes in primaries than Obama did, and he needs those voters if he's serious about winning. And between about June 8, when she suspended her campaign, and the day he got the nomination, he made no effort to speak to her major constituencies, which included Hispanics, a large number of women in the age group of 35 to about 55, and older people, urban workers, people who used to work in factories, but have lost their jobs. That's a very big constituency that he has thrown away.

On the other side, McCain has essentially the same economic policies as Bush, which have brought us to the edge of global financial disintegration.

I should add that, up to this point, neither campaign has understood the depth of the crisis that was caused by the Georgia invasion into South Ossetia. Neither Obama nor McCain are addressing any of the serious issues that confront the nation, and neither of them has any solutions to the problems that the majority of the population is facing.

NS: How do you explain that the Obama campaign is ready to throw away those votes of Clinton's, even if that means losing the election?

Schlanger: Well, what Lyndon LaRouche said months ago, is that the purpose of the Obama campaign was to defeat Hillary Clinton, and then he would go down in defeat. That was not Senator Obama's intention, but the intention of the people behind him, the Soros crowd, which controlled Howard Dean, who is the DNC [Democratic National Committee] chairman, and Nancy Pelosi, the Speaker of the House. Dean and Pelosi have been the enforcers of the violations of the rules that have given Obama the nomination.

Soros and his backers never intended for Obama to win. But the problem they had is that Hillary Clinton wouldn't quit: She was tenacious, she was resilient, and that actually endeared her to a whole section of the population that is suffering, and that saw someone who was fighting for them. So, Soros and others couldn't dump Obama before the convention; but now, they are in a situation where they can let him collapse. The people backing Obama never intended he become President, only that he prevent the Democratic Party from returning to a Franklin Roosevelt tradition.

Soros's Fifth Column in the Democratic Party

NS: Our readers have followed the LaRouche PAC [LPAC] campaign to expose George Soros as an agent of London, out to destroy the Democratic Party; and the pamphlet you have mass-circulated is instrumental in eliminating his influence. I wanted to ask you about one aspect of the Soros apparatus, which is the apparent grassroots mobilization of the Obama campaign, and in particular, the role of ACORN, as this group has become a major target of our organizing. What is their importance? Why is LPAC going after them?

Schlanger: Well, Soros funded two operations in the Democratic Party. One was MoveOn.org, which was initially thought by everyone to be an anti-war movement, against the Iraq War of Bush and Cheney. It was through MoveOn that many people entered the blogosphere, because they got so-called progressives blogging non-stop about how Obama was the only one who was serious about stopping the war. Then, MoveOn got people to come to caucuses to vote and to register to vote for Obama, and things of that sort.

A lot of the legwork that was done was through ACORN [Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now]. ACORN was originally set up as a com-

munity organizing entity for purposes of helping people who couldn't afford to pay their utility bills and needed help. It was a typical local control community operation, that grew out of the Saul Alinsky/Chicago operation that Obama entered even before he went to law school.

ACORN is another one of these organizations that is supposedly helping poor people, while MoveOn was supposedly fighting the war, and both of them were funneling huge amounts of money—as it turns out now, in the case of ACORN, much of it was illegal—to provide the “boots on the street” operation, finding people who could flood the caucuses, and bringing students into the various districts to elect delegates for Obama.

In fact, one of our colleagues, Rachel Douglas, who has studied the Orange Revolution in Ukraine and the Rose revolution in Georgia, both of which were heavily funded and subsidized by Soros, said that the process by which the anti-Russian movement came to power in those two countries, is very similar to what was done to organize the Obama campaign in the United States. Here, ACORN and MoveOn were the two organizations used to do that.

Rebuilding the Democratic Party

NS: What are the indications you have that organizations affiliated with the Democratic Party, but independent of the DNC, such as PUMA [a pro-Clinton group: Party Unity My Ass], are planning to mobilize for the coming elections?

Schlanger: I know for a fact that the PUMA organization—which is a broad umbrella group which sometimes goes by the name “Just Make No Deal,” or “18 Million Voices” (these are three somewhat coexisting groups)—has said it will not back Obama. The central reason for that, is that many of the people in these groups are women, including professionals, working-class mothers or housewives, who were attracted to Hillary Clinton's campaign, initially, just because she was speaking to their concerns about economics, in particular, as well as family issues such as home foreclosures, utility bills, and health care. People in the United States are hurting badly on all these fronts. You had a grouping attracted to Senator Clinton, and they became increasingly angry at the hostility directed towards her.

Most of them attributed that, first, to her being a woman. And a lot of that is justified, I have to say, without being a feminist. She was attacked for how she dressed, whether she laughed too loud, if she got tears in her eyes.

Is she strong enough to be President if she is so emotional? This made a lot of women extremely angry with the press, and then with the DNC for not attacking the media, and then with Obama. for not saying anything.

But, as some of them looked more deeply, they realized there were other issues involved, in particular, the economic issue, and secondly, the question of experience. It was clear that Obama had never run anything except a campaign for office. He went from being a U.S. Senator in 2004, to launching the Presidential campaign.

These groups grew up mainly after Hillary Clinton suspended her campaign, on June 8, and by the middle of the Summer, had reached an agreement that if she did not get the nomination, they would not support Obama. Now, had Obama made some overtures to them, in other words, had he been a real person instead of a front for these wrecking operation against the Democratic Party, maybe they would have listened—but he didn't. They then decided they would continue to fight up to the last minute, to see if Clinton could get the nomination. Because she was very close in votes, in delegates; it was a very close election.

But the Obama crowd made a mistake, they said they would not allow a roll call vote at the Convention, and that led to a more intense mobilization; it sort of stiffened the spine of former President Clinton and Senator Clinton, and their supporters. At the Convention, when it became clear that Obama had enough votes, because of the way the process had been rigged, they both made concession speeches, supporting Obama. But the people in PUMA and Make No Deal are not going to support him.

They are talking about two things. One: electing a filibuster-proof Democratic Senate and House, which means picking up about five or six seats in the Senate, and about 20 more in the House, which is possible. Secondly, some of them are thinking about voting for McCain, and I think that's why he nominated this wild Governor of Alaska, Sarah Palin, to try and appeal to women. I don't think that will work, ultimately. But most of them say, whatever your choice in the Presidential race, we have to stick with the Democratic Party and build it.

Our intervention into this, is to talk to these groupings in the population about going beyond what Senator Clinton was talking about in her campaign, to adopt a full, principled program, based on FDR/LaRouche economic policies. And there is a lot of openness for that. PUMA said it would try to set up a policy issue-oriented wing of the Party, to fight for the policies that brought them into politics: taking care of the people in the lower 80% of family-

income brackets. This is a hopeful and positive sign, but it definitely needs leadership, that we can provide.

Christian Fundies in the GOP

NS: You mentioned the choice of Sarah Palin as the Republican Vice Presidential candidate, which brings up a question that often baffles people here in Europe. What is the actual importance of Christian fundamentalism in the American population?

Schlanger: Well, it is a relatively significant force in the Republican party. It may be as much as a third of the voters—Karl Rove claims it's up to 50% of the voters, which I think is an overestimate. But it does represent the more activist side of the right wing of the Republican Party. This was the base that George W. Bush appealed to in his two election campaigns—and I won't say victories, because I'm not convinced he won either time. This is his base in Ohio, in Indiana, throughout the Midwest, and the Southern states.

The irony is that, instead of moving to address the causes of the economic crisis, they support candidates like Bush and Cheney whose economic policies hurt them more. Some of the leaders of these groups, like the late Reverend Falwell or Pat Robertson, were promoters of privatizing Social Security, which would have badly hurt the little bit of the pensions which those who consider themselves Christian fundamentalists would get. Their policies would hurt these people, yet they support them on the issues of abortion, guns, or homosexuality.

The Real Issue in the Presidential Campaign

NS: To conclude, could you give us an idea of our organizing perspectives for the LPAC? It's a long time until November, and I know the LYM is working on some ambitious projects.

Schlanger: There are two aspects to it. First, getting the reality of the strategic crisis across. As Lyndon LaRouche has been emphasizing, there is a whole section of the U.S. population that is moving from being angry, to really hurting. They're facing serious decisions: Do we stop paying our pharmaceuticals, in order to pay our utilities? Do we cut back on food to pay for rent? On these kinds of questions, we have to give leadership, both to show them historically how FDR got us out of the Great Depression in the 20th Century, and how our policies present a solution, especially Lyndon LaRouche's "Three Point Program," which includes the HBPA [Homeowners and Bank Protection Act], the Two-Tier Credit System, and the Four-Power Agree-

ment to get a new Bretton Woods.

We will be organizing on principle and issues, forcing a recognition in the population that neither of these candidates are addressing the financial disintegration, nor the strategic crisis, that is being provoked by the British, who want to use the financial crisis, in a sense, to destroy, once and for all, the notion of national economic sovereignty. We will be intervening into that.

Specifically, as people can see by going to the LaRouche PAC website, we have a series of videos that teach this history: The "1932" video; and the "Firewall" video on hyperinflation in Weimar Germany, how that occurred and why it's relevant today, given the bubble economy. We have two "1989" videos, one showing the fight launched by the LaRouche movement in the 1980s, where the remarkable occurred: Out of nowhere, Ronald Reagan backed Lyndon LaRouche's Strategic Defense Initiative. In part two, after 1989, we have the initiatives [for a Eurasian Land-Bridge] directed by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, which created the basis, that we see today in the Russia, India, and China orientation toward the Four-Power outlook of Lyndon LaRouche.

It's on those issues, questions of principle in science, history, of real physical economy that the LaRouche Youth Movement will be intervening. And in that process, recruiting the patriots on the Republican Party side, and those in the Democratic Party who supported Senator Clinton, as well as a whole section of the African-American population, that has concluded that Obama is more about him, than them, and that they have no representation in him. This is occurring, especially with older African-Americans, who remember Martin Luther King, Jr., and not just the promises, but the fights of the Civil Rights movement. They see none of that coming out of Obama. He's sort of a beneficiary and he feels entitled to this, but he has done nothing to engage them in a fight for continuing the work of Dr. King and the Civil Rights movement.

We will bring this history and this real process back into the political mainstream. These next couple of months will bring very uncertain times. This campaign, as portrayed on television, will be nothing but a circus, with a lot of psychological warfare, and nasty advertisements attacking the character of especially the two Presidential candidates. And that is designed to keep substance out. We are going to have to bring real substance, in the form of scientific principle, into the campaign.

It's going to be a dangerous period, yet one in which there is still reason to be optimistic.