

## Bush is scorned by world press

*History is continuing to act against the wishes of President George Bush, and in the wake of his foolish antics in Japan, many voices in the world's press which formerly adulated his reign during the Panama and Iraq massacres, are now turning against him. Some of these voices are from establishment cronies who simply long for the "good old days" of the "new world order." But chunks of truth also poke through here and there—especially in our first selection.*

**Philadelphia Leader, Jan. 12:** Family therapist Sarakay Smullens compares Bush to the "dysfunctional" head of a family, who is both abusive and neglectful of his family and suffering a split personality:

"When a nation loses its way and is moving frighteningly toward a dysfunctional state, it is necessary to look long and hard at the leader of that nation. . . . Dysfunctional parenting can take many forms, including abuse, disinterest and neglect. A dysfunctional parent—like a dysfunctional President—may lie to members of the family, undermine their trust, pit them against each other, blame them for their own derelictions and, in the end, even destroy those family members who cannot escape him. . . .

"Bush acts out the two personality styles of dysfunctional fathers: the 'baby' (problems are always someone's fault) and the 'bully' (communication occurs through temper tantrums and/or a need for relentless physical excess to prove one's masculinity). In Bush's case, the 'man on the run' syndrome is a combination of each. . . . In the baby category, we are expected to believe the whining, scape-goating blame of John Sununu, the Democrats, Congress, and finally the American people for having lost faith in the credit card economy because of 'politics.' . . . The bully category can be illustrated by Bush's failed wars against drugs, pollution and illiteracy. The talk is big, but the commitment is nonexistent."

Smullens concludes: "Without mature problem-solving approaches from substantive, functional leadership, a society—like a family—loses hope and begins to disintegrate. Reeling in this process, it moves toward chaos. As funding to help the sick and hungry has been slashed, we turn our heads away from the impoverished and mentally ill in our streets. As we live in a more and more dehumanized state, we feel guilty and anguished. To a larger and larger extent daily, we are a country losing both our consciousness and our conscience. . . . Once a country loses both its conscience and its consciousness, the next step is that it loses its mind."

**New York Times, Jan. 10:** Lead editorial, titled "Lost in

Tokyo," calls Bush's visit "a fiasco," especially for his failure to "help shape Japan's plans to assume a more active international role." The editorial concludes that "the only Bush who gained anything from the trip was Barbara."

**Wall Street Journal (New York), Jan. 10:** Editorial titled "Beggar Thy Neighbor," opens by asking, "We keep wondering what in the world President Bush hoped to accomplish with his trade and 'jobs' mission to Japan. If Mr. Bush's purpose was to demonstrate U.S. leadership in the post-Cold War world, he didn't succeed by turning his visit into a Commerce Department trade fair. The President who organized a global coalition against Saddam Hussein was reduced to the appearance of begging Japan to buy more American parts."

Worse yet, Bush left the impression that the U.S. wants "managed trade. . . . The people happiest about [his] trip are those foreigners who want to fight the trend toward free-market and political liberalization in such places as Mexico, Latin America, the Philippines and the former East bloc."

Summarizing the Anglo-American establishment's general complaint, the *Journal* concludes by asking, "Whatever happened to the New World Order?"

**International Herald Tribune (Paris), Jan. 10:** In a commentary titled "For Bush, One More Stumble," establishment mouthpiece Jim Hoagland writes: "The flu bug that dumped President George Bush under the dinner table in Tokyo was the final indignity on a trip to Asia that will be remembered in the White House as The Trip From Hell. Mr. Bush's ten-day jaunt has become a symbol of everything that has gone wrong in a stumbling presidency over the past three months."

Criticizing all the planning aspects of the Asia trip, Hoagland comments: "Instead of a Tokyo image of a tougher, firmer America muscling Japan into job-producing concessions that Mr. Bush could use politically at home, the world's television screens were filled with the imagery of an unhealthy American leader flat on his back at the feet of a Japanese prime minister. (Any novelist who sought to use such heavy-handed symbolism for the U.S.-Japanese economic relationship would be spanked by his editor.)"

Hoagland asserts that "the President has only himself to blame that it happened this way," and concludes: "If this is Mr. Bush's idea of smart politics, he may yet, against all odds, have time after November to visit a select group of friends—Bob Hawke in Australia, Margaret Thatcher in Britain and Mikhail Gorbachov in Moscow—to compare notes on how ungrateful nations can be."

In the same issue of the *Tribune*, correspondent Flora Lewis reported from the Inter-Action Council meeting of former heads of state in Konigswinter, Germany, that one European influential told her: "What contempt the Japanese must feel for [George Bush's] entourage of super-paid industrial failures."

**Nihon Keizai Shimbun (Tokyo), Jan. 7:** An editorial in this

Japanese economic daily said that if Bush's trip was aimed at creating American jobs, he should have stayed at home, and that Asia was the wrong place to look for solutions to the U.S. economic slowdown, the causes of which are primarily domestic. U.S. exports to Asia were in fact already strong.

"Therefore, the 'job-creating trip' ought really to have been made inside the United States." Since the U.S. market is the most open in the world, truly competitive products should sell well there: "If American products don't sell as expected in their own market, the cause is the lack of competitiveness of the American products themselves."

**Asahi Shimbun (Tokyo), Jan. 9:** "What led the President to embark on an overcrowded schedule to the point of collapse, was the U.S. economic slump and Bush's own sinking popularity. . . . If we look at just the first round of summit talks, it would appear Bush's visit could end as just a fruitless election campaign."

**Yomiuri Shimbun (Tokyo), Jan. 9:** "This amounts to controlled trade. . . . The U.S. government must have concluded that Japan's annual trade surplus of about \$40 billion

cannot be reduced under the free-trade system. . . . Japan-U.S. relations are not a simple formula of Japan making concessions after being pushed hard by Washington."

**La Croix (Paris), Jan. 10:** An editorial titled, "Bush: The Fragile President" remarks that the medical diagnosis, intestinal flu, was not quite enough to erase the emotional shock caused by the image of a livid man being put back on his feet like a puppet. One wonders: "Isn't Bush a fragile man after all? His thyroid collapsed after the fierce stampede of the Gulf war. A bad virus makes him collapse in the midst of the recession. This repetition worries Americans who especially love the dynamic leaders: the triumphant youth of Kennedy, the warm robustness of Reagan. With Bush one hesitates: The character becomes fuzzy, unpredictable at the very moment where he would need the greatest authority and even a certain rage to govern. Because Bush has never been a real fighter, his physical problems take on huge proportions each time; one pardons disease more easily to a fighter type than to an undecisive one."

"To fall from a chair during an official dinner has never been a good political performance."

## LaRouche identified Bush's mental problem early on

*Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche has upon several occasions identified George Bush psychophysical problems. We excerpt from his statements.*

**December 1989:** . . . George is a very shallow-minded person, very impulsive. He's a person of rage-driven obsession, and impulses flowing from rage-driven obsessions. Very shallow-minded. He's sort of a jock of one kind or another, in his mentality. He talks like it, he acts like it, his body language is that of it. He can't present a concept. The man is incapable of carrying a concept in his head. He's a poor fellow who's so rage-driven that very little intellectual activity can occur in his head; that's his conceptual type. He's a man characterized by sudden fits of jock-style rage, of obsessions which flow from seizure by that rage, and of impulses which flow from those obsessions.

**Nov. 24, 1990:** . . . There is no question that President George Bush is suffering a more acute form of implicitly schizophrenic paranoia than he showed during the height of the moments of uncertainty during the Panama atrocity by forces under his direction.

The President, in short, is *cracking*: *He is going nuts*. . . . When people lack access to a conscious, rigorous use of their higher mental powers, at least in any degree of concentration, they exhibit psycho-sexual impotence—in the sense of the man who may have a loving attitude toward his wife, for example, but is incapable of anything but a psycho-sexually impotent, i.e., erotic, form of the sex act; is incapable of anything *agapic*, in physical intimacy and related affairs with his wife. . . .

**May 29, 1991:** [During the invasion of Panama in 1989] I observed . . . that the President was in a dissociated state such that at least in that moment or in that context, the stresses of what he was doing had overwhelmed him, and he was to all intents and purposes virtually psychotic at that time. . . .

Many of us know, sometime, quasi-successful or successful business executives and others who are most unpleasant personalities to work with, precisely because they are given to obsessions, and can be set off into terrible states of rage if any of these irrational obsessions is disturbed. That is, if these obsessions are frustrated in any way, the obsession may erupt as a glower at work, on the job or elsewhere; it may take the form of the launching of a vendetta against some person on the slightest kinds of flimsy pretext; it may also take the form of kicking the wife, the children, and the family dog on the weekend, at home, to compensate for the frustration that is experienced in the week before. . . .