
LaRouche in Seattle

1984 election campaign must reverse the moral crisis in American society

Independent Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., gave a press conference in Seattle, Washington on Sept. 17, en route back to his home in Virginia from a week-long trip to Hawaii and Japan. We excerpt here his discussion, in his introductory statement to the press, of the most fundamental problem of American political life today: immorality among the political parties and among the citizens who tolerate an immoral leadership. LaRouche gave equally extensive consideration to the economic and military-strategic crisis facing the nation today, which space prevents us from covering here.

The defeat of Mr. Mondale would be a cause for great celebration; however, the victory of President Reagan might not be such a great thing. That's our problem.

You see, Mondale is a Soviet agent of influence. There's no question about that, except in the minds of some people who don't want to face reality and simple facts. If you want a sleaze factor, take the case of Geraldine Ferraro, and she is a smutlord, she is a slumlord. She was an officer as well as a partner in her husband's firm, on which she failed to conform with federal law and failed to file and she *did* do the things *actually* of which Rep. George Hansen was accused and was sent to federal prison. And *she* belongs in federal prison, not in elective office, according to the law. And the fact that she pretends and bulls it out and covers it up, and the Democratic Party leadership attempts to cover it up and bull it out, indicates the morality of the Democratic Party's leadership, with which I'm otherwise familiar.

This is not unusual on the part of the Manatt leadership of the Democratic Party or the Tip O'Neill leadership of the Democratic Party. They are *immoral*, which is why they seem to be so sensitive about the discussion of morality, and religion in government. We may be rid of them, but, unfortunately, the re-election of President Reagan does not automatically bode well for the United States. The fact that Mondale and Ferraro are disasters does not mean that Reagan and Bush are paradise. Quite the contrary—this is where our campaign comes in, the campaign of myself, Billy Davis, and

those who are campaigning on the same slate with us, chiefly in the Democratic Party.

There are several crises facing the country. . . . Now the problem in Washington, and the Reagan administration admits it, is that the Reagan administration is self-declared to be insane. That is, there's a sign hung over Washington which says, "We're crazy until Nov. 7 of this year. Reality does not exist for us until *after* we have won the election." . . .

[Here Mr. LaRouche discusses at length the Soviet threat to Europe and the fraud of administration claims that an economic "recovery" is under way.]

On top of this, we have a moral crisis. There has been a great to-do—a lot of Gnosticism and hypocrisy—about religion, ever since Geraldine Ferraro, that famous slumlord and smutlord, started talking about morality the day before she got nominated at the recent Democratic Party convention. Now the Reagan administration admittedly has been more moral personally than any administration in the last 25 years; that has to be granted. On a number of issues which were important, but weren't too dangerous politically, Reagan has reacted from personal moral commitment on those issues. However, *that ain't much*.

There is no such thing as morality in government; it doesn't exist in Washington. You may find a fellow here and there who's moral, but there is absolutely no morality. Now Ted Kennedy said this rather plainly the other day, on this question of morality and religion. Ted said there's no morality in government. That's what Cuomo said; that's what Geraldine Ferraro said. They're against morality in government; they say it ought to be forbidden. Ted said that one's personal morality should not be brought into government in a system of government—ours, he said—based on social contract in a pluralist society.

Well, that is not the United States. Ours is not a social-contact form of government, or if it is, somebody ought to be shot for treason. Nor is it a pluralist form of government.

We celebrate today the anniversary of the signing of the U.S. Constitution. Our Constitution was based on the principles of natural law, the establishment of a republic under

which certain principles were held to be sacred, sacred to the point that no legislator, no executive, and no judge could deny these principles—a set of principles higher than any man, any legislature, higher than any court, higher than any President, a set of principles which the majority of the people themselves could not violate or repudiate. That is our morality. We rejected explicitly any social-contract form of government. Pluralism was something brought in by the British, brought in by the Harvard liberals, by Williams James at the beginning of the century. It is something which our founding fathers abhorred—both the social contract and what we call liberalism, or British pluralism today. It's what we fought against.

Now, in our system of government, every public official is accountable morally and personally for the consequences of those policies which that public official fosters, implements, or merely condones. If the President of the United States supports a policy which results in the death of millions of people in Africa, the President of the United States is morally a mass murderer—that is our morality. If the President of the United States says, because he believes in “the magic of the marketplace,” that mass unemployment and suffering in the United States must be tolerated, then the President is personally responsible in principle for the suffering of our people caused by that belief in this superstitious nonsense of the magic of the marketplace. Government is accountable for the condition of every citizen of the United States. Government is accountable for what our policies mean overseas, in the world, and every official in government must be personally accountable. And the thing we have to look at, in putting people into public office, is their morality. . . .

That's the real crisis in our society, and it's not only a crisis of the politicians, of the parties. The parties are totally immoral. The Republican Party is immoral, don't kid yourself. The Democratic Party leadership presently is just more obviously immoral.

But the problem lies not merely with the politicians or the parties or government. The problem lies with you; not you necessarily as individuals here, but the people. If the people do not enforce morality . . . by hounding out of government every person who is not moral, and holding every politician morally and personally accountable for the results of his decisions or non-decisions, then the citizens are responsible for what has come of our society. . . .

Threat to Western civilization

We are in the kind of crisis—this may seem incredible to people who don't watch it—but we're in the kind of crisis where this year, next, or the year after, 2,000 years of Judeo-Christian civilization could be gone and gone forever. We are *at that point*. We're at the point where the Soviet Union could, within almost any period of time, establish in effect a world empire. The minute Germany falls to the Soviet stra-

tegic political sphere of influence, all continental Europe goes under Soviet influence . . . [and] the United States becomes a third-rate power which then lives almost at the permission of Moscow. . . .

Now that's an ugly reality. That's not the worst of it. The worst of it is that the morality, the culture, the Judeo-Christian culture which we've represented for the past 200 years, the culture on which the United States was founded, the culture on the basis of which we are supposed to be—whether we are or not—a leading beacon in the world, a temple of liberty and beacon of liberty for civilization—all of that will be wiped away and we and Western civilization, our Judeo-Christian civilization, would disappear as finally or more finally than the Roman Empire or the Assyrian Empire. *We're at that point*.

It is possible to say that our political institutions and our politicians have brought us to this point. Certainly, the U.S. Congress is something as bad as the legislature of ancient Rome under the Caesars. But really, since we are constitutionally a democratic republic, this could not have happened to us, by means of any politician or any party, unless *we the people* had become so corrupt that we allowed it to happen.

And how have we become so corrupt? Well, 70% of us at least are still moral in our dealings with our family, our friends, and our immediate community, but we are *not moral* when it comes to things on a national scale or a world scale, and we are not moral over a very long period ahead. We don't take responsibility when it comes to things on a larger scale, over a longer period of time or a generation ahead. . . . It's that prevailing attitude within our own citizens which has caused those citizens to permit our institutions and our government to take us to the brink of collapse of civilization.

Now therefore it's necessary for this slate, this movement within the Democratic Party to cleanse the Democratic Party of that bunch of scoundrels who've temporarily taken it over, typified by Charles Manatt and the Mondale-Ferraro sleaze factor—that this movement of candidates, of citizens which I have the honor to lead at the moment as the leading candidate, that this movement go forward at this time. No one in the Democratic Party or who supports the Democratic party has a thing to lose by not voting for Mondale and Ferraro. As of now, it's pretty well defined that Mondale and Ferraro are going to lose anyway. They're going to make George McGovern look like a big winner back in 1972. That's what the polls are saying. The important thing, since Reagan seems assured of victory, is how much can we muster as a registered vote of rejection both of what Mondale and Ferraro represent, and also a vote against the indifferentism and “magic of the marketplace” superstition which befuddles and grips the Reagan administration. Maybe we can do something in that direction. If enough turn out, maybe we can tilt the situation. I don't see that we have any course of action but to do just that. . . .