

## LaRouche takes high ground on policy alternatives

by Jeffrey Steinberg

A week after his release from federal prison after serving five years on phony, politically motivated charges, Lyndon LaRouche is already establishing himself as a significant alternative policy voice on such crucial strategic issues as the growing crisis in Russia and America's own domestic economic woes.

On Feb. 1, LaRouche appeared on the Larry King radio show, which airs on 350 stations across the United States and is also broadcast on Radio Moscow. Two days later, he was interviewed by a group of TV, radio, and newspaper reporters in the metropolitan Washington area.

At a press conference in northern Virginia, LaRouche offered his assessment of the Clinton presidency:

"We have at this moment a young President of the United States who is experiencing some difficulty, whose virtue as far as I have been able to see so far, is that he is much more open than his predecessor to considering policy. He recently said he thought we ought to look at the wisdom of IMF [International Monetary Fund] policies for Russia. Then his Vice President, Al Gore, said something similar in Moscow, and then, Strobe Talbott, his past close confidant and State Department representative, said we should have less shock and more therapy on the Russian situation. In response, a bunch of my non-friends among the neo-conservatives decided to go fishing in Whitewater. They are trying to get the President off course. . . . I would hope that, not by going to him and saying 'Please listen to me,' but rather, as a candidate and in related functions, saying publicly what I think the problems are and what should be done about them, I would be helpful in shaping or contributing to shaping a very anguished, a very frightened policy complex in the United States. That's my job."

LaRouche elaborated the point in his interview with Larry

King. Asked about his early 1980s collaboration with President Reagan's National Security Council in fostering the policy that President Reagan later adopted as the Strategic Defense Initiative, despite his status as a Democratic Party candidate for the presidency, LaRouche noted: "I've always taken the view that the presidency is a constitutional institution, and whether you like the incumbent or not, if you're a citizen of any influence, you have responsibility to try to assist the President in doing his job."

While voicing his support for the presidency, LaRouche minced no words in telling King about the gravity of the strategic situation, characterizing it as "the worst crisis of the 20th century. We see, for example, Russia. In 1989, we had the greatest opportunity for building world peace we've had this century if we had done the right thing, an economic development package. . . . Thatcher and Bush went with the idea of the IMF conditionalities. . . . As a result, what has happened is what I feared would happen if we didn't do the right thing. We've now got what is called a Third Rome Russian imperial impulse which is dominating the present government in Russia."

LaRouche then turned to the U.S. economy: "We have a worldwide economic collapse. It's collapsing here if you measure things in physical terms, as opposed to money bubbles. If we don't do something about it, the social effects and the political effects of the economic crisis are going to lead to some terrible things."

Later in his dialogue with King, LaRouche was asked to elaborate his plan for reversing the worldwide economic collapse. LaRouche stressed the need to restore the U.S. monetary system to its constitutional form by passing legislation to federalize the Federal Reserve Bank. He then gave the audience of several million households a mini-lesson in

American System economics: "Economy, as I know it, is based on the use of science and technology to increase the productive power of labor, which means we have to meet certain minimum requirements to sustain human beings, to develop the family, to educate people. . . . Essentially what you do is foist in the monetary process, investment in technological progress. You have to provide basic infrastructure, which is the responsibility of government either to provide it or see that the private sector does. You have to provide credit to foster business. You have to have a banking system which is looking and seeing who is a likely good risk to loan this money."

### **Adlai Stevenson blew it**

In his meeting with reporters near Washington, D.C., LaRouche was asked to comment on the current race for state and federal office in Illinois, and on the prospects of candidates associated with him to score victories in the upcoming Democratic Party primaries. In March 1986, two LaRouche Democrats won the party's nomination for lieutenant governor and secretary of state, only to have gubernatorial nominee Adlai Stevenson III withdraw from the party slate rather than run with the LaRouche associates. Media throughout the Midwest have been ballyhooing the upcoming elections, in which LaRouche-affiliated candidates are again running for a wide range of offices, and have been warning about a potential repeat of the 1986 victories.

LaRouche had the following response to a question from WLS-TV, the ABC affiliate in Chicago: "Look at the forecast that had been made by Michael McKuen, the Democratic Party forecaster, in the summer of 1985, that candidates associated with me would take prime positions in the primary of the spring of '86. That came as no surprise to anyone. But I look more particularly at an interview which Adlai Stevenson later gave in the New Hampshire primary campaign of 1988 in a Vermont newspaper, which described in detail . . . that he was prepared to go with the ticket and that he stopped only because a certain member of Congress—Paul Simon—threatened him. He, who was going to become the governor, gave up a serious shot at the presidency, a position to which his father had aspired, because of some threat delivered through the mouth of Paul Simon. The problem and the qualification of candidates associated with me in Illinois today is that same problem. There is still a faction behind the threats that Paul Simon emitted to Adlai Stevenson in 1986 which doesn't want people associated with me to run. I think people should ask Paul Simon what that threat was, and then they would have the full answer on the competency of the candidates associated with me."

In response to a followup question from the same reporter, suggesting that the LaRouche candidates had "sabotaged" the Democratic Party, LaRouche posed a challenge to the Democratic leadership in Illinois: "If you look at what's happened to the Democratic Party in the state of Illinois in elections since the spring of 1986 as a result of this McCarthyite

witchhunt, which was launched through the mouth of Sen. Paul Simon, the Democratic Party of Illinois, despite all the failings of the Republicans in that state, have failed to secure a major position in any election since. I think the Democratic Party should give up the nonsense which it practiced in 1986 in ruining an Adlai Stevenson, with whom we had no quarrels and who had no quarrel with us, in ruining his chances for the presidency, which would have been a great distinction for Illinois, and say, 'We made a mistake and we've got to get these guys backing off.' So some people in the Democratic Party are the problem. . . . They're the ones who are running these kinds of lynchings. If the party gets rid of that kind of practice, lets the normal Democratic officials of the state come back into the game, we could put the party back together again, we can begin to win elections this year."

In a private comment to a reporter from *EIR* afterwards, LaRouche pointed out that, not surprisingly, the very same neo-conservative political apparatus that was behind Paul Simon's wrecking of the Stevenson-LaRouche Democrat opportunity for victory in 1986 is behind the ongoing effort to wreck the Clinton presidency through such follies as the Whitewater scandal.

### **Committed to full exoneration**

In every recent interview and public statement, LaRouche emphasized his commitment to win full exoneration for himself and all his co-defendants in both his federal case and the state prosecutions in Virginia and New York. He elaborated on Feb. 3 in response to a question from Fox TV: "The fact is there in a letter from [former U.S. Attorney General] Ramsey Clark and [LaRouche's counsel] Odin Anderson to the Fourth Circuit summarizing the case. The same point was made summarily recently to the Justice Department. That is, the record shows, at present, that at all times relevant to the period of the indictment, from 1979 to the present, the government at all times knew that I and my co-defendants were completely innocent of the charges brought against us; and that the government, the prosecution acting for the government by means of lying, by suborning of perjury, by suppressing exculpatory evidence, and similar means, brought about a conviction through a massive fraud upon the court. So far the status is that the Fourth Circuit and the courts have declined to hold a hearing on the evidence (which involves six volumes of evidence), showing these facts that I have indicated, and the Justice Department has yet not begun the inquiry into this misconduct by government officials. This is the kind of thing that happens when you become a significant adversary. They think you are becoming too powerful in Washington and they decide they are going to try to destroy you. They had two choices: Shoot me or try to defame me and incarcerate me for life. They did the latter. It didn't work. I've got more influence on the world today than I did five years ago and I'm back. That's the way I am characterizing it."