
DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Midterm convention: a political funeral

by Allen Salisbury

One could not be entirely sure what kind of funeral it was, a Roman orgy after the slaughtering of several hundred Christians, or a Fellini version of an Irish wake. The overwhelming scene of *déjà vu* indicated both of the above, but the mere facts simply stated that the Philadelphia mid-term convention marked the death of the Democratic Party.

This mid-term convention was supposed to rally the party for the November 1982 Congressional elections.

Presiding over the affair was an obscure banker named Charles Manatt. The special guest of honor at this party, which once prided itself on its commitment to fighting for the rights of the nation's minority citizens, was the noted eugenicist and racist Averell Harriman, whose family was among the most important U.S. supporters of Hitler and the Nazis; Averell firmly maintains such commitments. Harriman was honored as the senior statesman of the Democratic Party.

The platform adopted by the Mini-Convention must have been the crowning achievement of the patrician Harriman clan. The platform called for the United States to commit itself to policies of genocide in Asia, Africa, Ibero-America, and India:

"America's foreign policy must address the global problems of environmental deterioration, hunger, and rapid population growth. . . . America's longstanding leadership in confronting the population threat should be maintained."

In all honesty, as I reported back to my fellow Democrats, the entire convention was rigged.

In the first place, out of the 5000 or so people that showed up in Philadelphia, there were no delegates. Instead, there were 1000 individuals called "conference participants." The rest were assorted aides, guests, and "alternate participants."

In American politics, the term delegate is understood to mean a person who represents a local area or trade union or some other constituency group, and is charged with the responsibility of discussing and debating those constituents' views on crucial matters of foreign, nation-

al, or local policy. A representative from an agricultural community, for example, would be keenly interested in the issue of parity for American farmers and in firing Paul Volcker as chairman of the Federal Reserve—because he's responsible for usurious interest rates. Delegates to a party convention would have the opportunity to discuss and vote on policies whether Manatt liked them or not.

What is a 'participant'?

I can only describe to you what happened to those poor unfortunates.

A participant was assigned to one of seven plenaries ostensibly to discuss one of seven sections of the draft platform presented by Manatt. A participant, however, did not know which plenary he or she was assigned to until the first day of the convention.

A participant supposedly was a person who knew the complete schedule of the conference, the program of workshops, receptions, and so forth. However, many participants had to go to the press for that information, because the press packets were more complete than those packets prepared for them.

A participant, one presumed, would have the opportunity to offer amendments to either improve or reject sections of the platform. But the participants were informed some time on Saturday morning that they needed 30 percent of the participants assigned to their particular plenary to sign a petition in order to even introduce an amendment. And each participant was permitted to sign only two such petitions. If you decided nevertheless to fight for an amendment and follow the petition procedure, in order to get your petition signed, you had to track down the participants assigned to your plenary at the many parties and receptions which were hosted by Manatt-approved presidential hopefuls and other office-holders or office-seekers.

Are you perplexed? Don't be. A participant is a person who is not supposed to participate.

The convention was stacked not only to prevent National Democratic Policy Committee advisory board chairman Lyndon LaRouche from speaking—LaRouche is already a potential candidate for the party's presidential nomination—but obviously to severely limit participation of the majority of Democrats who agree with Mr. LaRouche that Volcker should be fired and interest rates brought down.

One-third of the participants were handpicked by Manatt's staff; another third were picked by the State Democratic Committees; and the rest were either Congressmen or other elected officials.

Even the U.S. Congressmen pleaded their impotence at the convention. A typical refrain was "What can I do. I'm only a Congressman." Bob Tilton, the chairman of the Kansas delegation, said he would be told to shut up if he tried to speak from the floor against the

resolution supporting the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

Bob Slagle, chairman of the Democratic Party in the state of Texas, said that he would not be allowed to speak in opposition to the resolution even if he wanted to; Manatt would shut him up too.

A participant from the state of Minnesota said she had been warned at her trade-union caucus that they would be able to do nothing to amend resolutions.

Most Americans found out on Monday morning that the convention had voted up a resolution in support of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. The participants found out much the same way the rest of the world did. Fully three-quarters of the participants had left the City of Philadelphia before workshop resolutions were voted up—this although the overwhelming majority of participants expressed open disagreement with the genocide being committed in Lebanon. But what could they do; they were only participants.

MaGnat's boners

The present chairman of the Democratic National Committee is a very small person indeed. At the convention's first major press conference by Pamela Harriman, MaGnat defended the racist pedigree of the Harriman family, when a reporter questioned their objectives.

Pamela, appearing as flighty as she has been personally described to me to be, suggested that the reporter had received her information from the "LaRouche people." MaGnat leaped to his feet screaming, "She is the LaRouche people!" MaGnat then went on record identifying LaRouche as the principal opponent of Alexander Haig and Henry Kissinger, and defended the two British agents from his attacks.

Three hours later the announcement came that Haig had been fired. To the credit of the participants, this news was greeted with joy. With considerable consternation, MaGnat dispatched Senator Paul Tsongas to proclaim that Haig was the "moderate" in the administration and that his firing was a disaster. Even the usually labile press corps were heard commenting on the wisdom of removing the "psychotic" Haig from office. But that privately expressed view will probably never make it into their columns.

The most petty of MaGnat's boners came when he insulted the intelligence of the President of Mexico, José López Portillo, by telling a reporter that the only reason that the Mexican President met with Mr. LaRouche in Mexico City in May was because he confused Mr. LaRouche with himself, Charles Manatt. Mr. LaRouche has been well-known in Mexico for years as the promoter of the policy that would allow Mexico to trade its oil for U.S. technology to encourage its industrial and population growth. In contrast, MaGnat, only recently a national figure in a small way, has just rammed through the Mini-Convention the population control and genocidal policies of Averell Harriman and

George Ball. I wonder if Chuck has read all the humorous little articles that have appeared in the Mexican press on that one.

The little man gets vicious

In the same interview MaGnat suggested that he was encouraging suits to be filed against LaRouche and the NDPC and went even further to state that he personally thinks that "other things should happen to them."

Later that evening an aide to MaGnat was overheard telling him, "We've got to get rid of that LaRouche." We take these threats for what they are, and they have been filed with the appropriate authorities.

MaGnat's pettiness was not only reserved for us, but he handled people generally in a way reminiscent of a frustrated headmaster at a small school for boys. For example, MaGnat at the height of his grandeur snapped at the chairman of the DNC rules committee to immediately stop talking and pay attention to what was going on at the podium. At another point he screeched, "Let it be shown that the National Chairman of the Young Democrats was too tired to stand during the rendition of 'Happy Days are Here Again.'" MaGnat constantly berated members of his restless audience to sit down and shut up; there would be proper decorum at this wake or his name wasn't Chuck MaGnat.

The fight against genocide

A delegate from Minnesota, Irma Craven, attempted to introduce an amendment against population control into the Making Government Work Better workshop. She pointed out in her motivation that one of the principal reasons Jimmy Carter had lost by a landslide to Reagan was because of the Democrats' population control policies.

She also pointed out that one major government disservice was the U.S. AID program, which spent \$4.5 billion a year on world population control. This should not be the underpinning for our foreign policy; it was not the policy of Roosevelt, she said, identifying herself as a life-long Roosevelt Democrat who was attending her third national convention. She showed there was rhetoric in the Democratic Party platform that smacked of genocide and urged the party to oppose all population control, "because it has the potential to eliminate ethnic groups in depression conditions."

Mrs. Craven, who was not acting as a participant but instead as a delegate, was ruled summarily out of order twice by both the Lt. Governor of Vermont and the chairman of that workshop, Allan Ertel, the Democratic gubernatorial candidate for the state of Pennsylvania. I take the opportunity now to remind Mr. Ertel that his opponent in the primary, Steve Douglas, a LaRouche Democrat, won 35 percent of the vote in the city of Philadelphia, much of it from the black and Hispanic wards.

NDPC poster called 'brutal'

Sometime on Friday night, community groups allying with the NDPC to form a Committee Against Genocide, plastered the city with a poster depicting Harriman as a pink baboon with the caption: "Anglo-Saxon Superman. He thinks he's superior because he's pink." The poster was a big hit in the black and Hispanic wards and is presently being mass-produced for circulation throughout the United States.

The poster has been called "brutal," "vicious" and numerous other things which can't be mentioned in these pages, but I can only guess what Pamela Harriman was saying as she was seen gesturing wildly while leaning over the backseat of the car, trying to point out the posters to Averell.

The postering was done in preparation for a Saturday demonstration called by the Committee Against Genocide to protest the presence of Averell Harriman and the adoption of his policies at the convention. One-hundred people demonstrated, and it was covered on local television with more prominence than other numerically larger protests.

LaRouche not a Democrat

By the second day of the convention, MaGnat's staffers were telling everyone who would listen that LaRouche was not a Democrat.

"But didn't he run in 14 primaries for the presidential nomination?"

"I don't care. He's not a Democrat."

"But didn't Steve Douglas win 35 percent of the vote in Philadelphia?"

"I don't care. He's not a Democrat."

After all this haranguing, guess what happened at the meeting of the accountability commission? They couldn't decide what a Democrat was! The vice-chairman of the panel put it something like this: "The accountability effort is not going to work unless we agree on what are the basic principles of the Democratic Party. Therefore, over the next months, the commission will try to define the cardinal principles of the party."

Mr. MaGnat's resolutions were all voted up—because it wasn't possible to vote them down; the "participants" went along, perhaps convincing themselves that a display of "unity" would help them win in November. Privately, they know better.

Many Democrats from around the country want Charles Manatt out as chairman of the Democratic Party. Farmers, trade-unionists, who don't like his and Topsy O'Neill's support for Paul Volcker's high interest rates. Minorities who don't like the genocidal platform Manatt and Harriman just engineered. This will happen, no matter how brutally we have to interrupt Manatt's funeral services.

Conference Report

A Manhattan Project for beam weapons

by Laura Chasen in Washington, D.C.

Both public and secret-session discussion broke out around the Defense Department and Congress last month on how to develop anti-ballistic missile defense systems—weapons capable of "killing" strategic ICBM barrages launched by the superpowers or by third nuclear powers. Since *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche's January speech in Washington, in which he called for open U.S.-Soviet competition to develop and deploy ABM "beam weapons" in space and "end the age of mutual thermo-nuclear terror," the issue has moved to the fore.

On June 24, the Fusion Energy Foundation presented a two-hour Capitol Hill briefing outlining a "Manhattan Project" for beam-weapon missile defense to 60 representatives of Congress, the Pentagon, aerospace firms, and foreign embassies. This was the highest-profile session among a number of June meetings on space-based ABMs, involving the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA), Gen. Daniel Graham's High Frontier group, secret sessions of the House-Senate conference committee on military appropriations, and others.

FEF plasma physicist Steven Bardwell, who gave the major presentation on beam weapon systems, had been invited to Capitol Hill by Rep. John Rhodes (R-Ariz.). Dr. Bardwell, author of the 1977 pamphlet on beam weapons entitled "Sputnik of the 80s," has just written a technical White Paper on the subject for *EIR*, following the release of a National Democratic Policy Committee discussion document on ABM "war-avoidance" strategy by LaRouche and a book by Gen. Graham for "High Frontier."

The 'nuclear-freeze' question

Introducing Bardwell's Washington briefing was FEF Director Paul Gallagher, who asserted that the "nuclear freeze" movement is seeking to halt all nuclear progress, civilian and military.

Gallagher stated: "General Daniel Graham and political economist Lyndon LaRouche have both advanced a very fundamental conception, that at the moment it is necessary in the development of war-