

“The spread of the militia movement, based in those social strata which have either fought our nation’s wars, or were prepared to do so, merely symptomizes the accelerating disaffection of the citizenry from their government, at all, local, state, and Federal levels. The economy, health-care and retirement issues, housing issues, and the past twenty years’ pattern of deepening corruption of the justice system, are driving a growing, large ration of our citizens from among ethnic minority groups, senior citizens, and others, to view government on both the state and Federal level, as their mortal adversary.

“Even more ominous than the citizens’ growing enmity against state and Federal government, is the bitter resentment setting the citizen suffering from governmental abuses, against the other citizen whose merciless indifference to truth and justice is rooted in what senior economist John Kenneth Galbraith has accurately portrayed, as a flight into the virtual unrealities of the ‘entertainment society.’ ”¹

The alarmingly low percentile of voter turnover for the Nov. 5th national election, reflects that galloping social crisis within our citizenry. The passage of the overtly racist attack on “affirmative action” in the California ballot, reflects the brutal, and enraging quality of “merciless indifference” which the “entertainment-society culture” has fostered among the majority of our citizens. What enrages these citizens the most is the terrible obsession of official Washington with parlor games of “dialoguing,” on those issues of simple right and wrong which are sometimes, quite literally, life-or-death issues for millions of our citizens.

When a political opponent has a policy which must either kill or otherwise cause great suffering among some of our people, call that policy by its right name. If a group of Gingrichite wretches set out to impose a policy which must increase the death-rate, call it a “murderous policy which no civilized people could tolerate”; do not duck the issue by simpering proposals that we must “avoid harsh language, and seek to ‘dialogue’ ”—perhaps even with the devil, himself.

In the case of health-care policies which must, calculably, increase “morbidity rates” (e.g., death rates) among targeted strata of the population, policies to rob citizens of their Social Security benefits through “privatization,” and so on, the word “dialogue” must be classified as “hate language” in its effect. What the increasingly angry citizens of the country await, is candidacies which face life-or-death issues of policy-making “straight up and down.” If a policy will kill, or destroy the nation, then the language to be used in addressing the proponent of that policy is: “Shape up, or ship out.” The offending candidate must either repudiate the policy, or be thrown out.

The standard for political morality, is not “civility”; it is truth and justice. When one wishes to buy a carton of fresh

milk, one should say, “Fresh milk.” When one speaks of the relevant policies of Pennsylvania’s Republican Governor Tom Ridge, the “fresh milk” principle of honesty in political language must also apply: His policies are identical with those for which we indicted and convicted people of capital crimes against humanity, in the post-war Nuremberg trials of Nazi officials and professionals who served as the accomplices of those policies.

Unless we put a ban on misuse of the terms “civility” and “dialoguing” as sophists’ tricks with semantics, expect the citizens’ hatred of government, at all levels, to spread like wildfire. That should be read as a clear message from senior citizens, minority groups, trade-unionists, and many others, in the results of the Nov. 5 general election. For a start, practice hearing yourself say the plain truth, such as: “Pennsylvania Governor Tom Ridge’s health-care cuts are a copy of the crime for which we indicted and convicted Nazis at Nuremberg.”

Election '96: LaRouche and labor 'factors'

by Jeffrey Steinberg

But for the treachery of Democratic National Committee (DNC) Chairman Donald Fowler, Clinton campaign Republican “mole” Dick Morris, and other allied Bush-league Democrats, the 1996 general elections would have likely swept the Democratic Party back into the majority in both Houses of Congress. Had that occurred, in tandem with President William Clinton’s substantial victory over Robert Dole in the Presidential election, the United States and the world would have been in far better shape to tackle the looming global monetary-financial crash.

Despite the sabotage by the Fowler-Morris team, the Democratic Party made gains, particularly where there was direct involvement by “LaRouche Democrats” and the AFL-CIO, in targetting Congressional Republicans allied with Newt Gingrich and his “Contract on Americans.”

With five House races and one Senate race yet to be decided, the Democratic Party has so far secured a net gain of eight seats in the House of Representatives, defeating 18 GOP candidates who had been targetted by LaRouche and organized labor. Sixteen of these Republicans were incumbents who had voted up and down the line with the Gramm-Gingrich “Conservative Revolution.”

AFL-CIO President John Sweeney, who led the most successful mobilization of union voters in decades, called the

1. “On November 6, Reality Strikes!” *EIR*, Nov. 8, 1996, pp. 68-70.

Congressional elections a “sea change.” “The 105th Congress will legislate under the spotlight of a working families agenda, not a . . . Contract with America,” Sweeney vowed, in a statement issued immediately following the Nov. 5 elections. Indeed, union voters provided a crucial margin in both the Presidential and Congressional elections. Twenty-three percent of the voters who turned out on Nov. 5 were union members—a 9% increase over the dismal 14% union vote in 1994—and they voted by a 62-35% margin for Democrats over Republicans in the Congressional races, and by 59-29% for President Clinton over Dole in the Presidential race.

While President Clinton won approximately 50% of the total votes cast for President, his electoral college victory was by a near-landslide margin, 379-159. The President carried 31 states, plus the District of Columbia. Whereas, in the 1992 election against George Bush and Ross Perot, Clinton won an absolute majority of the vote only in his home state of Arkansas, this year, he won more than 50% of the vote in 21 states, including such large population centers as California, New York, Illinois, Michigan, and New Jersey. President Clinton won 19 states that had gone Republican in 1980, 1984, and 1988, including Florida, a traditional Republican Party stronghold that had not delivered its electoral college vote to a Democratic Presidential candidate for 20 years. In Florida, there was an outpouring of senior citizen voters for President Clinton, in a repudiation of the GOP’s Contract on Americans, which would decimate Medicare, Medicaid, and other vital programs.

In contrast, Dole’s only solid base of support was in the Deep South and the Rocky Mountain region—hardly the foundation of a winning Republican Party Presidential strategy in 1996, or in the future.

The electoral gains by the Democratic Party extended down to the state level, where the Party took control over both houses in eight states where the Republicans had previously been in control (the Republicans took back control over three state legislatures). As a result, so far, the Democratic Party holds a majority in both houses in 21 states, and the Republicans, in 17. Nine states are divided, with the Democrats controlling either the upper or lower house.

The Fowler-Morris factor

All of these gains were secured in spite of a systematic campaign by DNC Chairman Fowler, to sabotage the effort. The Democratic Party general chairman, Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.), in a post-election speech on Nov. 6 at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., candidly admitted that the Republicans had out-spent the Democrats by \$150 million during the 1996 elections. Dodd was referring to the funds raised and spent by the party national committees, and the House and Senate campaign committees—not the money raised by individual candidates for their own campaigns.

Sources close to the DNC have told *EIR* that Fowler

withheld party funds, and other vital support, from the vast majority of Democratic Congressional candidates, focussing on only 120 to 150 out of the 435 Congressional races. In the South, in particular, state Democratic Party officials complained bitterly to *EIR* that Fowler blocked the national Democratic Party from providing any funding to the candidates, until it was too late, if at all. The same sources report that there are still unspent funds in the DNC accounts.

Instead of putting in the kind of financial and logistical support to Democratic candidates, Fowler poured money into a mafia of professional “political consultants,” typified by the Clinton campaign’s ex-consultant “Dirty” Dick Morris. A relative and protégé of the late mob lawyer and political corrupter Roy Cohn, Morris garnered millions of dollars in polling fees, and media royalties, from the DNC and the Clinton campaign, during the 1996 elections.

Even after Morris was bounced from the Clinton campaign during the August Democratic convention, he continued to proffer his political “advice” up through election eve. In a Nov. 2 interview with Reuters news service, published in the *Washington Times*, Morris “predicted” that the Democrats would take back the Congress, with a 30-seat majority in the House and a two- to three-seat majority in the Senate. Morris, whose “triangulation” strategy of isolating President Clinton from the rest of the Democratic Party, contributed to the 1994 GOP Congressional takeover, then turned around, after the Nov. 5 elections, and claimed that the reason the Democrats lost the Congress was because they had gotten too close to organized labor and senior citizens worried about their health insurance. These were precisely the constituencies that turned out to give the Democrats the victories over the 18 Gingrichite Representatives.

The fight for the Democratic Party

With Morris gone, and Fowler on his way out, the stage is now set for a renewed battle for the soul of the Democratic Party. That fight began early this year, when leading Congressional Democrats, including Sen. Jeff Bingaman (N.M.), Rep. Richard Gephardt (Mo.), and Sen. Edward Kennedy (Mass.), issued a series of policy papers and draft bills, mirroring many of the long-standing economic recovery proposals of Lyndon LaRouche. Those policies provide a basis for an expanding coalition of labor, senior citizens, a revived civil rights movement, etc., with the potential to sweep the Republicans out of the Congressional majority in 1998. The fight will occur, in the context of a concerted effort by the Bush and neo-conservative factions of the Republican Party, to destroy the Clinton Presidency through any dirty means necessary.

American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees President Gerald McEntee, who chairs the AFL-CIO Executive Council’s political committee, summarized the situation aptly: “I don’t think the next campaign starts in two years. I think the next campaign starts when the next Congress convenes in January.”