

economics, to utopian military madness, and to the past four decades' cultural-paradigm down-shift of the economy, mind, and morals of our nation, are three aspects of the same issue. For that, they wished me "eliminated" in 1973, sought to eliminate me by shameless open actions in 1986, and wish to eliminate all traces of my international influence today.

### 'Prison, Anyone?'

The abortion of the shooting assault intended for Oct. 6-7, 1986, led to a subsequent, high-level, intense debate in relevant circles. "Shall we kill him, or imprison him?" was the tenor of that debate. The threat from the utopian faction was, "If you allow him to beat the legal frame-up we are conducting, you will not stop us from killing him this time!"

That decision was in debate from no later than the evening of President Reagan's televised address of March 23, 1983. After a few days, the utopians had regrouped their forces around circles including the right-wing utopian, and fervent SDI (and LaRouche and Edward Teller opponents) Daniel P. Graham and the utopians of the Heritage Foundation. So, the name of SDI was continued, but, under the influence of circles backing Graham, the content was changed radically to emphasize obsolete, chiefly "off-the-shelf" technologies of no use for the indicated type of mission-assignment.

On Oct. 12, 1988, I delivered a memorable address in Berlin, which was taped there for later broadcast, that same month, on a nationwide TV campaign feature. I forecast the imminent collapse of the Soviet alliance, beginning probably soon in Poland, and spreading into other parts of Eastern Europe and the Soviet economy itself. I proposed a course of U.S. action to deal, through affirmative economic action, with the opportunity to uproot the embedded institutions of major military conflict throughout the world.

I was soon hustled off to the hoosegow by the fastest, if perhaps the most crooked railroad in the U.S.A., the Alexandria Federal Courthouse in the Eastern District of Virginia. So, in effect, the newly sworn President George Bush put me into prison, and, a little more than five years later, Bill Clinton pulled me out. Now, the world makes a new turn around the circle of crisis. This time, those bankers who wish to put a Democrat who would be a virtual office boy for their Schachtian policies into the White House, are at it again. They are terrified at the thought that I, no office boy in these matters, would come even close to the White House.

Some leaders of nations are elected, others are either killed, or sent to prison to be defamed. So, powerful financier cabals have often ordered the fate of nations and the people, if the people let that happen. Thus, in today's world, the ultimate feat of importance for a republic, is to get competent leaders elected, and keep them from being killed at a sign from the hand of a pro-Synarchist financier mafioso.

---

## Documentation

---

# LaRouche's Fateful Debate With Abba Lerner

On Dec. 2, 1971 an encounter took place at Queens College, in New York City, which shook the international financial community. Economist and political leader Lyndon LaRouche faced off in debate against the leading Keynesian economist Abba Lerner.

The "issues" of the debate had been put forward in a leaflet by LaRouche's National Caucus of Labor Committees, specifically on the questions of the wage-price controls and fascist austerity policy being put into place at that time by the Nixon Administration, and by the government of Brazil. LaRouche and his associates had branded these policies as in the tradition of Hjalmar Schacht, Adolf Hitler's Economics Minister up to 1936, and condemned them as such.

### 'Schachtian' Austerity

In his opening statement, Professor Lerner made it clear that he agreed with the *economic* idea behind the wage-price controls announced by Nixon, and with "anti-inflationary" measures which had been taken in Brazil, where ordinary workers were being "recycled" into slave labor jobs at lower and lower wages, although he did not think that enough jobs had been created in the wake of these measures. Crucial to his argument was what he said on Brazil: "Because I agree with what was done in Brazil, to check the inflation, it doesn't mean that I'm in favor of the fascist dictatorship which they have there."

LaRouche directly responded to that point, as follows:

"A professor, who says innocently, "The economy, from my point of view, would be better organized if certain administrative arrangements were made," does not necessarily think *out*, the kind of administrative arrangements which in practice *realize* that very innocent proposal. Professor Lerner may attempt to divorce his economic policies from the policies of the government of Brazil, and see them in abstraction and detachment from that; however, you can not carry out the economic policies, which are recommended for Brazil, without having the kind of government which makes those economic policies work. You could not have the kind of policies which are recommended, which he has recommended as a classic austerity policy for increased unemployment.

"Now, this is classic, in the sense that this is precisely the policy of Schacht from 1933, on, in Germany, in which wages were frozen to prevent the inflation, and in order to increase employment. He may personally detach himself from that,

but it's not possible for the politicians to accept his advice, to detach themselves from the kind of government, and the kind of procedures, which enable those abstractions to become reality. And, that has to be grasped; because, now, no longer is economics merely a plaything of an obscure corner of the academic priesthood. Now economic policy is that which determines the lives, and daily lives and conditions of people. The form of economic policy, determines the kind of government, which is necessary to carry it out. And, the only kind of government which can carry out the kind of policy which Professor Lerner recommends . . . would have to be a Bonapartist or fascist government.

"He may be opposed to fascism with every fiber of his being; this was also true in Germany, where many economists, liberal economists, proposed austerity, who also opposed the Nazi regime. But, nonetheless, there are men who will take up these policies and carry them out, and they will be Bonapartists or fascists; but not Professor Lerner. So, he must understand, that sometimes his good intentions do not ensure, that his policies, carried into practice, will work out as he sees them, in human terms."

And, in fact, LaRouche said, "the kind of solution he's [Lerner's] proposing is precisely the kind of solution that was discovered by the German financiers of 1933, was implemented by Schacht—to *reduce* wages. That is, to fix them at the level of 1933—depression levels in Germany—as a means for expanding employment; and this is precisely the pattern, I suggest, throughout the world today."

### Hitler and Schacht

Professor Lerner did not take LaRouche's point kindly. "It's a complete misunderstanding to take the holding-down of money-wages as meaning austerity," he claimed. The question is more jobs. Hitler even created more jobs and prosperity for some, although he was bad politically.

LaRouche upped the pressure, in response: "The *only* way that the kind of policies that Professor Lerner is talking about can be carried out, is by a Brüning and von Papen regime, succeeded by a Hitler regime, or its equivalent in the U.S."

Professor Lerner got more and more agitated, until he blurted out his clearest statement, to the amazement of those in attendance: "But if Germany had accepted Schacht's policies, Hitler would not have been necessary."

The debate then limped to an end, with the professor insisting again and again that fascist economics had nothing to do with fascist politics. He kept a brave face on, but his friends and allies knew better. They determined that they would never let another one of theirs face off against LaRouche again.

**To reach us on the Web:  
[www.larouchepub.com](http://www.larouchepub.com)**

# SDI and the Jailing Of Lyndon LaRouche

by Paul Gallagher

*This speech was given on March 21, 1993, to a conference of the Schiller Institute in Northern Virginia, and was published in an April 1993 EIR White Paper on "The Crucial Role of Lyndon LaRouche in the Current Strategic Situation." Gallagher was the former executive director of the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF), which had been shut down by an illegal government-forced bankruptcy in 1987.*

President Reagan's Strategic Initiative Speech ten years ago—or as it was called worldwide at the time, his "Star Wars" policy speech—caused one of the greatest worldwide furors of any statement by any President in history; it changed history; although it was merely the final five minutes of his half-hour nationally televised speech of that evening. The President proposed to abandon the threat of massive nuclear retaliatory destruction (known as Mutually Assured Destruction or MAD), and to embark on a crash scientific mobilization to develop energy-beam anti-nuclear defenses, offered to nations worldwide to remove the threat of nuclear attack against them. This new strategic doctrine had been developed and fought for for years, by Lyndon LaRouche.

More than that, LaRouche had been discussing this possibility with representatives of the Soviet regime for more than one year, known to both sides to be acting informally for the Reagan government. In diplomatic language, such an intermediary activity by a private individual is called a "back-channel" between two governments.

Let me quote what Gen. Paul-Albert Scherer told an audience at the National Press Club two weeks ago. General Scherer is the former head of military intelligence for Germany.

"In the Spring of 1982 here in the Soviet Embassy, there were very important secret talks that were held. . . . The question was: Did the United States and the Soviet Union wish jointly to develop an anti-ballistic missile defense that would have made nuclear war impossible? Then, in August, you had this very sharp Soviet rejection of the entire idea. . . . I have discussed this thoroughly with the developer, the originator of this idea, who is the scientific-technological strategic expert, Lyndon LaRouche. The [Soviet] rejection came in August, and at that point the American President Reagan decided to push this entire thing out into the public eye, so he made his speech of March 1983."