
The Democratic Party

After New Hampshire, an open field

by Kathleen Klenetsky

Walter Mondale's Feb. 28 New Hampshire defeat has shattered the myth of his invincibility, and thrown the race for the Democratic Party's nomination wide open. In these circumstances, as a number of long-time political observers now admit, the ultimate outcome is unpredictable, and the possibilities for a dark horse candidate to capture the nomination loom large indeed.

Mondale's presidential express derailed in one of the most remarkable electoral upsets in recent memory. In the first primary of the 1984 presidential race, minor candidate Gary Hart, the self-styled standard bearer for the "New Age" Democrats, trounced him by 10%—the largest margin ever recorded in the history of the state's Democratic primary.

It has become apparent that none of the "officially approved" Democratic party hopefuls has caught fire with the electorate. Signs of voter discontent with the "eight moral dwarfs" were clear in New Hampshire. Voter turnout was nearly one-third less than in 1980, and Ronald Reagan garnered 5% of the vote as a write-in candidate.

Mondale got whopped because he is unacceptable to the majority of Democratic voters—no matter what Lane Kirkland or his crony, Democratic National Committee chairman Chuck Manatt, may claim. (The delighted response in New Hampshire to a certain bumper sticker reading "I Know Mondale Is Running—But Who Do Heterosexuals Vote For?" tells part of the story.) When a little-known kook like Hart can trounce Mondale, it just proves that Fritz—who has been appointed, not elected, to every major political office of his life—cannot win an election.

Dark horse candidate

New Hampshire has exposed the leadership vacuum in the Democratic Party. The search by the party's rank and file for a real alternative to the slate of "officially approved" presidential contenders is creating an open field for candidates whom the party leadership has attempted to isolate.

By far the most important of these is *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., the well-known international economist who is mounting an aggressive campaign for the nomination on a platform calling for a national emergency defense mobilization and a World War II-style gear-up of U.S. industrial and agricultural capacity. LaRouche campaign officials have disclosed that he will make a major effort in the Pennsylvania primary April 10. By that time, they expect that only four

candidates will be left—two liberals, Jesse Jackson, and LaRouche. The result could be a brawl at the San Francisco nominating convention, and a victory for LaRouche.

LaRouche is on the primary ballot in Pennsylvania, California, Maryland, Ohio, Louisiana, Nebraska, Oregon, and South Dakota; he also soon be on the ballot in West Virginia and North Dakota.

In Pennsylvania, LaRouche will head a slate of over 130 candidates for state and local office, all campaigning on a comprehensive program for reindustrializing Pennsylvania, emphasizing the state's ports, a waterway connecting Lake Erie with the Ohio River, rebuilding the once-great steel sector, and full parity for the state's economically distressed farmers.

That program contrasts utterly with the other presidential candidates' platforms, especially that of Hart, who wants to eliminate America's basic industries in favor of the "information economy," and Mondale, whose biggest booster in Pittsburgh, Mayor Richard Caliguiri, is planning a national advertising campaign to boost the city on the grounds that it is no longer a "dirty" "smokestack" industrial center.

Anti-Mondale, not pro-Hart

Despite media attempts to play up Hart as the hottest thing since John F. Kennedy, the New Hampshire vote didn't represent a show of support for the Colorado senator, but a resounding repudiation of Walter Mondale and his backers. Mondale's fervent support for the nuclear freeze, adamant opposition to strengthening American defenses, lack of any workable economic policy, and identification with the debacle of the Jimmy Carter presidency, did not make for a candidate for the mainstream Democratic Party—despite the largest war chest and biggest machine of the contenders.

Mondale's loss is being felt nowhere more keenly than at the AFL-CIO's headquarters in Washington. Federation chief Lane Kirkland had strong-armed union support behind Mondale and gone cross-country to tell union members that if they didn't go all-out to get Fritz the nomination, labor would no longer be a presidential kingmaker. Now, Kirkland is faced with the fact that, despite the AFL-CIO's backing (estimated at \$20 million or more), the union vote was split almost equally between Mondale and the
Among union households who had not been contacted by a pro-Mondale AFL-CIO callup before the election, NBC re-

ports that Hart polled 46%, double Mondale's 23%.

Although AFL-CIO spokesmen are trying to put the best face on the outcome, the New Hampshire fiasco is bound to provoke a revolt among local union bureaucrats and rank-and-filers, who weren't particularly gratified when Kirkland rammed Mondale down their throats with an unprecedented AFL-CIO endorsement before the primaries. If this turns into an outright rebellion, that could mean the end not only of Mondale's heavily labor-dependent presidential bid, but of Lane Kirkland as well.

The New Hampshire vote has given the Eastern Establishment media two black eyes as well. For months now, such august outlets as the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the big three television networks had confidently predicted that Mondale would sweep the primaries and take the nomination without a challenge. On the day of the primary, the *Times* ran a front-page story pronouncing that "Walter F. Mondale now holds the most commanding lead every recorded this early in a presidential nomination campaign by a non-incumbent" and went on to declare him a shoo-in for the nomination.

But the media are losing their ability to mold public opinion and choose the nation's leaders. Long-simmering public outrage against the media boiled over during the Grenada intervention, when the vast majority of Americans rallied behind President Reagan, leaving the media exposed as a conspiracy of unpatriotic liars. New Hampshire is further evidence that with the country in a political and economic crisis, the media are not as influential as they might wish.

Hartburn

As for "Mr. Atari" Hart, his victory resulted far more from an unexpectedly large turnout by independent voters and a Gene McCarthy-type student brigade than from rank-and-file Democratic Party support. A full third of the primary voters were independents, not Democrats, and many went for Hart only because he claimed to be a candidate independent of the party establishment.

Hart, the man whom mass-murder advocate Averell Harriman dubbed his favorite when the Democratic race began, also benefited from a stream of front-page media coverage over the week before the New Hampshire vote in the wake of his second-place showing in the Iowa caucuses.

Hart may do well in the Maine caucuses and the Massachusetts primary, particularly if George McGovern drops out of the race and endorses his 1972 campaign manager. But he faces big obstacles on "Super Tuesday," March 13, especially in the Southern primaries. His kooky views are not expected to win the voters' hearts and minds if they happen to find out what he thinks (see *Elephants and Donkeys*, page 59). Moreover, he has almost no machine to speak of in the South, except possibly in Atlanta. He has not even filed full delegate slates in the key states of Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Florida.

Why NBC's chief

by Scott Thompson and Marilyn Murray

Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche has issued a debate challenge to Thornton Bradshaw, the chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, whose National Broadcasting Company (NBC) subsidiary ran a five-minute libel of LaRouche on the *Nightly News* Jan. 30. NBC reporter Brian Ross accused LaRouche of leading a hate group.

Circulated nationally through 60-second paid radio spots in New York, Pennsylvania, California, and Washington, D.C., LaRouche's challenge has made political campaign broadcast history. "I challenge Henry Kissinger's crony Thornton Bradshaw," he said, "to face me on a national TV news feature to defend himself against his network's using libels cooked up by members of the drug pushers' lobby, such as Chicago's Chip Berlet and New York's Dennis King, to conduct the dirtiest campaign against a Democratic candidate ever to appear on the television news media."

Thornton Bradshaw has yet to respond. Like his crony Henry Kissinger, who tells friends that "LaRouche is persecuting me," but has never taken legal steps against LaRouche's charges (except when his wife defended herself in court on charges of attempting to throttle a LaRouche supporter), Thornton Bradshaw has too much to hide for a nationwide TV debate with LaRouche.

Bradshaw is a man who turns genocide into a business. He operates at the top levels of the principal U.S. companies and think tanks promoting Malthusian "population reduction" and negative economic growth. Bradshaw is a member of the U.S. Association of the Club of Rome; during the 1960s he joined the executive board of the Aspen Institute, and soon became its vice-chairman; director of the Atlantic Richfield Co. (Arco) and its predecessor companies (1956-64), he became Arco's president in 1964; in 1976 he joined the board of the *London Observer*, when Arco bought the paper; in 1981 he became chief executive officer of RCA.

We publish here highlights of *EIR*'s dossier on these institutions, and Bradshaw's activities with them.

The Club of Rome's blueprint for genocide

The Club of Rome was founded in 1968 by Fiat executive **Aurelio Peccei** and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development scientific affairs director **Alexander King**, and has advocated "population reduction" policies that would