

THIS WEEK'S NEWS FROM



Vote Against Liberalism?

Illinois Demos Rocked by LaRouche Primary Victors

Until last week, Republican strategists in Illinois were gloomy. The candidates seeking the GOP nomination for Senate were unknown and seemingly no match for popular Democratic Sen. Alan Dixon. And three-term Gov. Jim Thompson seemed to have an uphill battle against Democrat Adlai Stevenson III, whom he defeated by only 5,074 votes in 1982.

Then on Tuesday the impossible happened, leaving Republicans jubilant and Democrats in shell



HART FAIRCHILD

shock: Two virtually unknown followers of cult leader Lyndon LaRouche sneaked off with the Democratic nominations for lieutenant governor and secretary of state.

In Illinois, the candidates for governor and lieutenant governor run as a team, just as do candidates for President and Vice President. So any vote for Stevenson this fall is also a vote for LaRouche disciple Mark Fairchild.

Twenty-four hours after the astounding returns were in, Stevenson declared, "I will never run on a ticket with candidates who espouse the hate-filled folly of Lyndon LaRouche." He said he'd search for ways "to purge these bizarre and dangerous extremists from the ticket, to short-circuit this subversion of our party."

But Fairchild and secretary of state hopeful Janice Hart clearly won the Democratic nominations and Stevenson's options are limited. He might have to withdraw from the Democratic ticket and form a new party for the November election. But this would leave the regular Democratic state without a gubernatorial candidate.

How were Fairchild and Hart able to win? First, they were running against candidates very nearly as unknown as themselves—State Sen. George Sangmeister, Stevenson's choice for lieutenant governor, and Aurelia Pucinski, daughter of Chicago Alderman Roman Pucinski.

Secondly, attention was focused not on the Democrats' statewide primary but on the life-and-death struggle for control of the Chicago Council between the forces of Mayor Harold Washington and Alderman Edward Vrdolyak.

Fairchild and Hart ran decidedly low-profile campaigns—she supposedly spent only \$50 and capitalized on an apparently growing antipathy on

the part of blue-collar Democrats towards the party's power brokers.

Pollster J. Michael McKeon, who has worked for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee and the party's Illinois candidates, said he detected a "big core vote" for the LaRouche candidates last June.

"This LaRouche party has been making moves here for a while," McKeon said. "But it isn't support for the LaRouche party that's being reflected. It's the mood of working-class people who are tired of having things rammed down their throats."

In a primary election in which three of every four eligible voters stayed home, nearly complete returns showed Fairchild with 331,480 votes and Sangmeister 310,510. Hart won an even closer victory over Pucinski, 321,169 to 311,305.

Most of those voting for Fairchild and Hart probably knew nothing of the LaRouche connection. As pollster McKeon said: "It's a protest vote against the liberalism of the Democratic party. It's the disenfranchised vote that is lower-middle-income that can't identify with the Republican party and feel the Democratic party has left them behind."

Although many news stories identified LaRouche as "right-wing" or "ultra-conservative," his ideology is not so easily pinned down. A former Trotskyite and Students for a Democratic Society activist, LaRouche ran for President on the leftist U.S. Labor party ticket in 1976, in 1980 as an independent and in 1984 in the Democratic primaries.

Although LaRouche supports a beefed-up defense, the Strategic Defense Initiative and nuclear power, other positions are not so identified as conservative-oriented. In Illinois, candidates Fairchild and Hart took some decidedly non-conservative positions.

Hart described the Gramm-Rudman law as "an evil economic policy we will work to revoke." Fairchild said he would use the state's power of eminent domain to stop steel mills from being shut down and farms from being foreclosed.

The ideologies of LaRouche, Fairchild and Hart are, in a sense, beside the point. Obviously, Fairchild and Hart have no chance of being elected in November. But their shocking victories in last week's Democratic primary—and their place at the top of the party's ticket—will have enormous impact on the fortunes of Democrats and Republicans running at every level across Illinois this fall. Stay tuned.

Will Aquino Succumb To Leftist Influence?

Some conservative analysts and foreign policy experts are expressing concern about the direction of the Corazon Aquino government in the Philippines.

First, Aquino released from prison Jose Maria Sison, founder of the Communist party of the Philippines, and Bernabe Buscayno, former commander of the Communist terrorist New People's Army (NPA).

Aquino portrayed the move as a conciliatory

gesture, but the NPA responded in its characteristically brutal way by staging ambushes on Filipino policemen and Army troops.

Moreover, upon their release, Sison and Buscayno showed their thanks by attacking Aquino's government as unrepresentative of the people and slow in responding to the nation's problems.

Defense Minister Juan Ponce Enrile and Military Chief of Staff Fidel Ramos had argued strongly against releasing the Communists, saying it would send the wrong signal to the Filipino army and be viewed as a sign of weakness.

Second, the Aquino government has accepted the services of a far-left U.S. legal group, the Center for Constitutional Rights (CCR), in an effort to recover the money that former President Marcos allegedly stole.

The efforts to recover the Marcos loot have generated enormous media attention, but the CCR's controversial role has been generally ignored or relegated to a footnote.

However, in a recent front-page story in the Washington Times, Bill Kritzbeg reported that the State Department was preparing to express concern to the Filipino government over the CCR connection. Kritzbeg noted that the CCR has numerous Communist ties and has even defended clients accused of "armed struggle" against the United States and its allies.

But State Department officials contacted by HUMAN EVENTS denied the Times story. They said the selection of the CCR as legal counsel was an internal matter for the Aquino government. "It's none of our damn business," one said.

Critics of the State Department have responded that the CCR has a track record of opposing U.S. interests around the world, and that this makes it "our business."

John Rees, publisher of Information Digest, a newsletter on social and political movements, told



AQUINO

HUMAN EVENTS that some lawyers associated with the CCR "have extremely close relationships with

(Continued on page 8)