

period of hardship.

What the Citizens for the Republic aimed to do was to create a structure parallel to the official Republican Party—and totally controlled by Reagan loyalists. Aside from publishing a column by Reagan in each of its newsletters, the committee provided other public platforms for their proto-candidate. Under the group's aegis, Reagan conducted numerous cross-country speaking tours, giving countless media interviews in the process.

The committee also provided financial and political support to Republican candidates for Congress and other political offices. This part of its operation helped to establish significant blocks of support for Reagan in key areas of the country, which could be relied on to turn out the vote come the November elections. Another part of the Committee's operations involved training grassroots activists through a series of workshops and seminars. Those recruited in this way formed the core of Reagan's official campaign machine, Citizens for Reagan, when the actual campaign went into high gear.

The weakness of the committee was that it was not solely controlled by Reagan loyalists, in much the same way that Mr. Reagan's current administration is not. Following the experience of the Wallace campaign, the circles who had engineered the crises in both parties determined that there be a way to control future grassroots movements. From this was born what is today known as the "neo-conservative movement." Unlike the Wallace machine that was built by Wallace and a core of activists, individuals like direct-mail fundraiser Richard Viguerie and the British intelligence outpost Heritage Foundation insinuated themselves among the truly patriotic sections of the operation.

In this fashion, Mr. Reagan's relationship to his constituents was mediated by organizations other than his own campaign—eventually resulting in the subversion and disorientation of the campaign. Only a comprehensive domestic and international political program that was capable of translating Reagan's aspirations into real gains for the American people could have surfaced and isolated the British-infected portions of the campaign apparatus. Lacking that, shortly after his first big win in the 1980 primary in New Hampshire, Reagan wavered in the program that had built his base with increasing evidence that he was beginning to take on the GOP habits of making deals. By the time Reagan brought his campaign to Texas, he had decided not to challenge also presidential hopeful George Bush for his affiliation with the Trilateral Commission. At the convention, after accumulating 60 percent of the vote from primary victories in 29 states, a tribute to the base he had built over the course of six years, and easily attaining his party's nomination, Reagan chose George Bush as his running mate for the general election.

The Harrimanites downplay the NDPC

by Robert Zubrin

How do other sections of the Democratic Party view the unusually rapid growth of the National Democratic Policy Committee? To find out, the EIR's Robert Zubrin talked with aides to the Democratic National Committee, spokesmen for other political action committees, officials of the ousted Carter administration, and members of the opposition camp in several state primaries. This sampling of the responses indicates a particularly keen interest in the 20 percent statewide vote for NDPC-backed candidate Steven Douglas in the May 25 Pennsylvania gubernatorial primary.

Peter Fenn, director of Pamela Churchill Harriman's Democrats for the '80s, reached at Mrs. Harriman's home:

"The LaRouche party is a fringe party. I think that you would find that people who cast their ballots for it are not very committed. I think that LaRouche is a fringe politician. He is kooky and has no real credibility within the Democratic Party. I don't think that he is talking about anything that is likely to capture the imagination of the American people. He is the one who has people at the airports with signs saying things like 'more people have died in Ted Kennedy's car than in nuclear power plants.' There is a degree of bizarreness in his whole approach. Conspiratorial theories abound. There was a thing in his newsletter recently about someone trying to kill his wife in West Germany. It's all rather Twilight Zone-ish.

"What I'm intrigued about is where they get their money. It would be interesting to examine their FEC records. . . . They say they represent the grand coalition of the FDR? Hah! I've never seen any platform of theirs that makes any sense. Just kooky, conspiratorial stuff and simplistic arguments for nuclear power.

"This Douglas vote was just a fluke, a function of spending a lot of media money in a limited market. I don't think it will happen again."

Stuart Eizenstat, a former domestic policy adviser to President Carter, at his Washington, D.C. law firm:

"The Democratic Party is certainly in disarray now, but I don't see the LaRouche group as a significant force nationally. This Pennsylvania vote is the only significant

vote they have gotten so far. . . . To the extent that the new party rules give more power to office-holders, it makes it more rather than less difficult for groups like LaRouche's to make progress. . . . Right now, the Democratic Party ought to be putting forward economic alternatives. We ought to start with energy, with an acceleration of our efforts to develop alternative energy sources and conservation. We should call for an oil import fee, which will raise revenues and decrease consumption. . . ."

Ann Lewis, political director of the Democratic National Committee, reached at DNC headquarters:

"I am very familiar with LaRouche, but it is impossible for me to assess the importance of the vote for Douglas in Pennsylvania. I don't know what it means. I don't have the data yet."

Steve Glaser, deputy chairman of Jerry Brown for Senate campaign, reached at Brown campaign headquarters.

"We are polling for [NDPC-endorsed challenger to Brown, Will] Wertz, and he has less than a percent. I don't think the same thing will happen here as did in Pennsylvania. Are you trying to predict a trend?"

"You know, LaRouche and his people harrassed Governor Brown in New Hampshire in 1980?"

"Did Douglas have a lot of TV time? Where did he get his votes?"

Jack Leslie, executive director of Ted Kennedy's Fund for a Democratic Majority, reached at the PAC's headquarters.

"I don't see them as a significant force in Democratic Party politics. . . . I don't know where they get their funds from. They appear to be well-financed. But they are a fringe organization that won't have any real appeal."

Kurt Wiley, executive director of Walter Mondale's Committee for the Future of America, reached at committee headquarters:

"What's the big deal about this Pennsylvania vote? I do not think it is significant. It is not significant. That's the bottom line. Good-bye."

Amy Isaacs, deputy national director of the Americans for Democratic Action, reached at the ADA's Washington, D.C. office.

"I heard about the Douglas vote, and I don't think it has any significance, at least not outside Pennsylvania."

"I automatically discount everything they say. But if I were in their position, I'd be saying exactly the same thing. We have to see what happens in a few more primaries. You know, we've had a lot of the one-election phenomenon in American politics, where a candidate made a real strong showing and then disappeared."

Interview: Democrat Hulan Jack

'NDPC can bring equal opportunity'

Hulan Jack was born in the British West Indies and came to the United States in 1923. He was active in the formation of the National Democratic Policy Committee, and continues in its efforts to revive mainstream American politics. He served in the New York State Assembly from 1941 to 1953, and again from 1968 to 1972. In 1953 he was elected the first black borough president of Manhattan, in which office he served for seven years. His autobiography, Fifty Years A Democrat, is scheduled for publication later this year.

He was interviewed by EIR on June 4.

EIR: What do you see as the goals of the NDPC for the Democratic Party?

Jack: Who represents the Democratic Party? Who portrays the kind of life where a person feels security, where the education of his children is something he can look forward to, where there are some kinds of standards? The NDPC has for its purpose re-establishing the kinds of programs that mean everyone will be given equal opportunity to develop within the framework of a healthy family life.

EIR: How would you size up the political leaders of today compared with 20 or 30 years ago?

Jack: In the past the Democratic Party was always concerned with the welfare of the people. Now we seem to be imposing certain penalties on the poor. . . . We have turned our backs on the development of technology, on the farmers. . . . There is no reason—with the vastness of America, the technical know-how, the magnificent productive ability of America—why anyone should be without employment, without the opportunity of getting a job.

EIR: The NDPC played a major role in Harrison Williams's defense against Abscam. What do you think was the significance of this effort?

Jack: I too have had my Abscam. I came to these shores many years ago, and I am proud to be an American. But I am vigorously opposed to any segment of the government—particularly our FBI or any division of our Justice Department—violating the law in order to crucify a person. I think that is what happened with Senator