

## Lyndon LaRouche begins Presidential campaign

by Nancy Spannaus

The first public announcement of economist Lyndon LaRouche's intention to campaign for the Democratic Party nomination for the year 2000, was made in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, at the national convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). On the morning of July 17, a huge new banner suddenly appeared outside the convention, alongside the one sporting the slogan, "Exonerate LaRouche." The new one read, "LaRouche for President in 2000, Blood vs. Gore."

The convention had already been saturated with literature from the LaRouche movement, both on the issue of African genocide—against which LaRouche has spearheaded a national drive—and on the issue of exonerating LaRouche and his associates, from the political witch-hunt which sent him to prison, and still hangs over his head. Some 500 delegates and participants, including 235 national and local officers of the NAACP, had signed the Open Letter to President Clinton to Exonerate Lyndon LaRouche. Now, with the LaRouche Presidential banner raised, according to a state legislator inside the convention, everybody began talking about the campaign.

LaRouche issued his official statement on July 18 (which appeared in the last issue of *EIR*, p. 80), noting that the "time has come" for him to fill the vacuum of leadership in the country. The initial response at the NAACP convention underscored LaRouche's point about that vacuum. A vast portion of the national electorate, more than 50% of which boycotted the last Presidential election campaign, considers itself abandoned by the "mainstream" political leaders, and is looking for strong political leadership. The civil rights movement is exemplary of the constituencies which can be expected to

rally to LaRouche's campaign.

Three leading civil rights leaders—Mrs. Amelia Boynton Robinson, the Rev. James Luther Bevel, and Oklahoma leader Wade Watts—were among the first to endorse LaRouche's Presidential campaign, as representing the certain trumpet required to lead the nation out of disaster.

### Exoneration critical

LaRouche's announcement for the Presidency immediately calls the question on the matter of his exoneration. It has long been recognized by many Democratic Party leaders—and those few sane, largely retired, Republicans—that LaRouche's economic analysis and proposals are the only ones which truthfully address the crisis in the world financial system, and that, therefore, they must be heard by the President. It is LaRouche who pulled together a grouping in 1995, to defeat House Speaker New Gingrich's (R-Ga.) "Contract on America" insanity, and it was LaRouche who led the fight against Nazi-style budget cutting, as it expressed itself most flagrantly in the case of Republican Pennsylvania Gov. Tom Ridge.

More recently, LaRouche, and his wife Helga Zepp LaRouche, have launched an international organizing drive for President William Clinton to convene a conference to establish a New Bretton Woods system, in order to restart the world economy on a sane economic and financial foundation. The organizing drive, launched in February 1997, has drawn the support of hundreds of parliamentarians from around the world, including some prominent former heads of state, such as Mexico's José López Portillo, and Brazil's João Figuerido.

Where political leaders are fighting the austerity policies

of the International Monetary Fund, and the nation-destroying effects of British free trade, they are turning to LaRouche's leadership. In the Philippines, in Ukraine, across Ibero-America, to mention a few places, such fighters do not hesitate to cite LaRouche's record and programs on economic policy. But, particularly here in the United States, the effects of the defamation campaign—which was an integral part of the illegal prosecution—scare many political leaders away from taking the necessary steps of linking up with LaRouche.

The LaRouche movement, which has already expanded the scope of the exoneration petition drive (which has currently garnered more than 4,000 signators), will therefore be intensifying the exoneration effort, along with the Presidential campaign.

Indicative of potential breakthroughs on this drive was a speech given by Pennsylvania Democratic State Representative Harold James, head of the Black Legislative Caucus, at an event in Philadelphia on July 21. Appearing with Mrs. LaRouche before 200 community activists and citizens, Representative James included in his remarks, a stinging condemnation of the corruption of the Department of Justice, and announced that he had written to President Clinton on the LaRouche case. "How can we stand before the world as a defender of the freedom of speech and political association, while many elected officials and citizens are still fearful of being associated with Mr. LaRouche's ideas on economics and other policy issues which impact the quality of life, because of his fraudulent conviction and imprisonment?" Representative James asked.

### **LaRouche's indispensable role**

In an interview with the radio program "EIR Talks" on July 22, LaRouche elaborated his view of the strategic situation, which led him to declare his candidacy. We quote:

"There are several problems, therefore, around the President, which are extremely important: You must remember, Clinton is going to have to make the crucial decisions upon which the fate of civilization depends, before the year 2000. So, forget Al Gore and what Al Gore will do after the year 2000. It's what Clinton does *before* the year 2000, which is crucial to the survival of this nation and civilization. Now, you can not sit back and say you don't like Clinton. That is not a responsible, or *sane* attitude. Because, either you get *this* President, who is incumbent, to take the appropriate action, and give him the backing when the time comes that he's willing to do it, or else, 'Look, Mama, no hands, no feet, and no head either!'

"Therefore, if you're concerned about *anything*: about your family, about your grandchildren, about the nation, about the fate of civilization on the planet, you have to be concerned about getting Bill Clinton—now the President of the United States—to utilize the powers, and influence of that office in a very definite way. You can not turn your back

on the President of the United States and expect to survive yourself. Only very foolish people will do this.

"Now: But Clinton isn't doing too well! A lot of people exaggerate that, but even from my standpoint, and I'm—maybe I'm generous—but, he isn't doing too well lately, particularly since he capitulated to pressure from what was typified—reported as being Morris, but there were other people involved—in refusing to veto that essentially *criminal* welfare rights bill last year, the welfare reform. At that point, he lost the chances for the Democratic Party to win the Congress; he lost a great deal more. And the problem is, the President, in his spirit of *compromise* with forces within his own party, and trying to compromise with *suburbia* on the Republican side, is *losing*, inch by inch. He's not doing everything wrong; he's doing a number of things which are quite good, actually. But, he's made too many compromises, and the way he's going, he *isn't going to make it*. And, if *he* doesn't make it—that is, as President, not that he's going to lose office—the country's going to fail, if he keeps going the way he's been compromising away his options, in net effect.

"Now, he's got a couple of problems: First of all, he's mortgaged his Presidency increasingly to the purpose of electing Al Gore in the year 2000, . . . but the point is, there's too much of Gore's ideology, [and it] is holding back, and Gore supporters are holding Clinton back from thinking clearly. He's got a problem in the Democratic Party. There is very little discussion of ideas in the Democratic Party, in the Senate or the House. The way there was, say, earlier last spring, in 1996; that's *gone*. The party is a shambles; the leadership of the party is a shambles, at the present time, even though there are some very good people in there, but the party, as a party, is a shambles.

". . . So, the time has come that my voice has to intervene. I have to create the situation to break the President free of the degree of compromise, which is threatening to kill him and this country. I have to force an open discussion of ideas within the Democratic Party, in particular, but also within the Congress generally. . . . *I've* got to get in there and turn the thing around, and the only way to do it is for me to run for office, and so, I said, okay, I'm going to do it. I'm in *very good health*. . . . I know more about what's going on in the world, perhaps, than any other individual in political life, and there's some other things besides. I've been *right*; the best economist—that's been proven; there's no question of that, and the crisis is the central leading expression of that.

"Obviously, I'm the person who is intellectually qualified to lead the nation. The President is Chairman of the Board, the Chief Executive Officer; he actually leads the nation, but I must provide the *intellectual* climate of leadership, in which the President and other people around him, may be brought together, and begin to function, in the way that is necessary, to save this country, and civilization from a *horror* which is beyond the belief of most people who are listening. But, it's there."