

# Rogers Campaign in Break-Out Mode for LaRouche Policies

by Harley Schlanger

Oct. 22—Outside of the Obama/Romney campaign, there is almost no visible presence of any campaigns in the Houston, Texas area, as the Nov. 6 election draws near—except for that of LaRouche Democrat Kesha Rogers, the Democratic nominee in the 22nd District. Rogers' campaign has been everywhere in the district, from boisterous rallies at well-travelled intersections, to door-to-door deployments in the suburban neighborhoods, which make up the bulk of the district. Organizers for the campaign are finding that many people are familiar with Rogers and her fight to remove Obama, though awareness that she is on the ballot is not yet universal, especially as this has been historically a "Republican district," and many of the voters mindlessly pull the voting machine lever for a straight Republican ticket.

That is changing, as the Rogers campaign has made clear that the issue this time is much larger than party loyalty. Organizers have been challenging voters to rise to the occasion, to recognize that the issue is a nuclear World War III if Obama is re-elected, and that he has no solution to the economic crash that has been worsened by his City of London/Wall Street-imposed financial policies. However, it is not enough to remove Obama. What must be done is to change the entire thinking about politics in the United States, as Lyndon LaRouche has been emphasizing in his weekly "Friday Project" webcasts, and to carry out a real recovery program.

The problem LaRouche and Rogers are addressing is that exemplified by the many blocked Republicans who respond to a briefing on Obama's war drive by saying, "Don't worry, I'm voting for Romney." While Rogers has been effectively taking on, in interviews with media and her personal appearances, the idiocy of party-politics-as-usual, organizers have developed a powerful means of getting at the Red Team/Blue Team foolishness of voters in both parties, by presenting the irony that Rogers, a Democrat, won her party's primary because she called for Obama's ouster.

They are telling self-identified Republicans that Rogers issued a challenge to Democratic voters in the district in 2010, and again this year. Do you have the brains and the guts, she asked them, to join me in removing Obama? Organizers then tell GOPers that the Democratic Party primary voters rose to the challenge, twice nominating her, despite fierce, and dirty, Democratic Party opposition, coming largely from the declining number of Obama supporters in the district. They then ask them, "Do you Republicans have the brains and guts to take up the challenge, to oust incumbent Republican Pete Olson, who has been protecting Obama, and join us to create a new, non-partisan Presidency?"

## Austerity Will Never Balance a Budget

This has led to very sharp and frank discussions, as many voters are first intrigued, and then drawn into a dialogue on the deeper issues—the danger of World War III and global hyperinflation—if Obama is re-elected, or if a Romney victory is only a "regime change," in which the City of London/Wall Street financial elites remain in control. Rogers makes the case that, at present, neither Obama nor Romney has an economic solution. While Romney has become sharper in identifying the failure of Obama's policies—as he did in their first debate, leaving Obama virtually speechless—he has failed to provide any alternative. The GOP demand for reducing government, through broad cuts in "entitlements" and government programs, which Romney defends, will kill the nation—although more slowly than Obama's nuclear war.

Romney's problem can be seen in his quip that he doesn't want the U.S. to follow Greece as a model. However, as Rogers emphasized, the draconian austerity that he, his running mate, Paul Ryan, and Rogers' opponent Olson are calling for, will have precisely the effect on the U.S. that the European Union/International Monetary Fund austerity is having on Greece, of causing hyperinflation while simultaneously shrinking the economy, and killing people in the process.

Rogers' campaigners are engaging many voters in discussions of how to break with the controlled environment shaped by this focus on money, rather than physical economy. Central to this is science policy, and its implications, as this is the district which, until this year, was home to NASA's Johnson Space Center. Many people are delighted to have this discussion, with many reporting that they used to be Democrats, or their parents were Democrats. One woman embraced Rogers

at an event and said that she thought there were no more Democrats like her, upholding the tradition of John F. Kennedy.

This is a common response to Rogers, as many see in her the courage and intellectual leadership qualities lacking in the other, virtually invisible campaigns—not to mention in the Presidential campaign!

### Some Media Take Note

Rogers' impact on the NASA issue is reflected in the endorsement, by the *Houston Chronicle*, of Romney over Obama, in an editorial on Oct. 21. The *Chronicle* endorsed Obama in 2008, writing that they were “captivated by the Illinois senator’s soaring rhetoric and energized by his promise to move American politics beyond partisan gridlock and into an era of hope and change.”

“It hasn’t happened,” they said today.

After a broad attack on Obama’s economic failures (no jobs, slow growth, etc.), they write, “There is a launching pad to reignite the national economy,” identifying that as the potential in the energy sector—not Green technology, but in traditional energy sources and newer technologies in oil and gas.

They then add: “The other launch pad ignored by President Obama is the literal one—NASA, and specifically the Johnson Space Center.”

Clearly, the *Chronicle* should endorse Rogers for Congress, whose slogan has been “Save NASA, Impeach Obama”!

The change in the politics-as-usual is also reflected in an article in the *Fort Bend Herald*, the major newspaper in Fort Bend County, where the majority of voters in the 22nd district live. The piece gives straight coverage to Olson and Rogers on their respective programs. For Olson, it emphasizes his (imbecilic) talking points, especially his “conservative values,” which, like those of Romney and Ryan, have convinced him that prosperity and opportunity depend on “limiting the power and the scope of the federal government.”

By contrast, the coverage of Rogers opens with her statement that she continues to support the impeachment of Obama, and that she said, in 2010, her “opponent was not Pete Olson, or even Obama, but the British financier oligarchy, which Obama is a puppet of.” The *Herald* includes quotes taken from her website, such as her commitment to the tradition of “Democratic Presidents Franklin Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, who came from ‘a political party fighting on behalf of this



LPAC-TV

*Kesha Rogers is challenging voters to rise above party politics, and act on behalf of the common good. The Romney-Ryan austerity program will kill the nation—albeit not as fast as Obama’s nuclear war.*

nation, rather than for the supremacy of Wall Street. . . . The time has come for our government to be loyal to the Constitution, rather than to whatever party faction has the majority.’”

The article then reviews Rogers’ support for restoration of Glass-Steagall, and for the proposed Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE), which would “create millions of jobs in building the requisite technology.”

The article concludes with quotes from Rogers on the accurate forecasting of LaRouche, and her support of a new Classical Renaissance, which will make it “easy to mobilize against foreign enemies, corrupt politicians and corporate banksters; but the most important battlefield in the war to defeat the British Empire and unleash a global renaissance, is the battle over what culture we have as Americans and our self identity.”

Her campaign will be engaged in the next two weeks in an escalation in the battle to oust Obama, and to create a new leadership in the nation, above party, committed to full restoration of the economic and scientific principles of LaRouche’s program of Glass-Steagall, national banking, and NAWAPA.