

## Editorial

### *What a Bush victory means*

Democratic presidential nominee Michael Dukakis proposes to turn the United States into a copy of former left-winger Benito Mussolini's Fascist Italy. That is the truth behind Dukakis's corporatist politics. Since Lyndon LaRouche cannot win the next election, this leaves George Bush as the only option for President, even though there is no guarantee that he would be a good President.

Even though he is not going to win, the LaRouche independent candidacy is extremely viable. People will be murdered in the hundreds of millions, by famine, disease, and war, unless U.S. policies are changed. Effecting this shift is the task which LaRouche has set for himself.

Were LaRouche to carry even one or two states, the role of his electors in the Electoral College might be the deciding margin in determining who would be the next President. Even the fact that he racks up a sizable vote will not be unimportant in determining the policy direction of a Bush administration.

It is important that there be a large vote in the next election. Dukakis must not be allowed to win, but the real objective is not just keeping Dukakis from power, but weakening the power of his controllers. If Bush is elected, he must be freed from the domination of those ultra-liberal backers who have had a foot in both camps.

It is essential that the policies of the next administration be influenced by a bipartisan traditionalist grouping. Only then will there be any hope for this nation to steer through the terrible financial, economic, food, and strategic crises which will immediately face the President in the post-election period.

The trans-Atlantic establishment which controls the American government, whether a Democrat or Republican is in power, is, broadly speaking, divided into three factions, which function above the level of party politics per se. There are the one-world liberal fascists now supporting Dukakis; there are the traditionalists best represented by LaRouche; and there is a center grouping.

This center grouping is represented by Henry Kissinger, who has been recently warning publicly against the danger of conceding too much to the Soviets. These center forces accept the idea of sharing global power with the Soviets, but they worry that the West is in danger of conceding too much, too quickly.

They caution that the West must never give away so much, that it can no longer remain a major player in the global "balance-of-power" game.

The London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies has just concluded in a report, that there is no basis in fact to support the Soviets' contention that they are moving toward a new defensive posture in military-strategic thinking and deployment.

While the IISS is certainly on the right track with this warning, no one should forget that *they* were instrumental in creating the New Yalta policy of redividing the world into spheres of influence with the Soviets, in the first place. It is this center grouping who were the architects of the policy of appeasement under the name of détente, and they must not be permitted to dominate a Bush presidency as they came to dominate the Reagan administration.

The choice in this election is a grim one; nevertheless it is necessary. The election must result in a George Bush victory, since there is no possibility that LaRouche will be elected. Yet the LaRouche election campaign must contribute to shaping the policies of the next President and Congress.

A Dukakis victory will ensure that the Soviets are emboldened to more aggressive adventures in future. With Michael Dukakis in the White House, the United States would be destroyed as a sovereign nation within the next four years.

This is not an election to sit out. The electorate must make the best of a poor choice. After all, the voters themselves are to blame that LaRouche was not the choice of the Atlanta Democratic National Convention.

On November 8, vote! Vote LaRouche if you can! But make sure that Michael Dukakis is not elected.