

Lyndon LaRouche tackles the drug lobby's media

The following presentation was made by Lyndon LaRouche before a packed audience at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. on April 9. Following the full text of the opening remarks are excerpts from the question and answer period.

I will make remarks on three areas and some general comment on the inter-relationship of the three areas, particularly as it bears upon the profession of those represented here today.

The constituency that voted for the candidates in Illinois was composed primarily of three groups, which are the hard core of a section of our population which we might call "the forgotten majority." These were farmers, of whom 50% probably will go out of business within the coming period, under present policies. These represent what might be called fairly "blue-collar households." These also include prominently 70% of the black vote of Cook County, which voted for the candidates, against the party ticket and against the news media.

The characteristic of these voters is that they don't believe in Washington; they don't believe in the party leadership; if they're blue-collar trade-union members, they don't believe in the national AFL-CIO leadership. As a matter of fact, on the local level, union officials are being elected *out* of office, simply because they are incumbents, because of the hatred of the AFL-CIO leadership by the average trade-union member in this country, particularly in the industrial unions. And now, with the effects of Gramm-Rudman, we're going to see similar rage among the so-called municipal unions, which have been more leftist and softer on this question.

When they are told by the President, by Donald Regan—and this is echoed by the press—that we have been in a Great National Economic Recovery, the great and mysterious and wonderful and all-consuming Reagan Economic Recovery—

since the end of 1982, these people use four letter words. Because their experience tells them that if there is a recovery, it didn't happen to them, and it didn't happen any place they can see it. And they will say, maybe those people in the country club set have seen a recovery or are experiencing one. Maybe the yuppies are undergoing recovery. Maybe the yuppies think there's a recovery going on, because they'll believe anything. But *we* do not experience a recovery. Our industrial plant is closing down. Our farm is closing down. Our debt-service rates are closing down. Our banks are closing down. And these idiots say there's a recovery going on.

They don't believe you!

Well, take the case of the Illinois press. The Democratic Party ran bullet operations to try to knock out two or three candidates we'd endorsed, including Sheila Jones, who was the candidate in Chicago. They pretended otherwise, even though they'd been warned by J. Michael McKeon, that my slate was going to win in the Democratic ticket. They ignored the heel-and-toe coverage. They said, "Well, he's a Nazi; he's an anti-Semite; he's a this or he's a that." And they thought that was good enough.

Then the voters surprised them. They ignored the party bosses. They ignored the news media. And they voted in two candidates, with strong support for other candidates on the same slate. And the news media said, "How did it happen?"

You're going to get the impression that somebody goes out in Illinois, to a bunch of voters, and says, "Do you know he's a Nazi?" "No." "Do you know he's an anti-Semite?" "No." "See? Nobody knew who they were voting for!"

The news media begin to believe their own lies, lies which originated with the drug lobby. Let me give you a concrete example: Chip Berlet, drug lobby, *High Times*; Dennis King, drug lobby; a group around the ADL, around Suall and company, drug lobby; Mark Nykanen of NBC,



NSIPS/Stuart Lewis

Candidate LaRouche, at the National Press Club April 9, 1986.

drug lobby—his background, before he went to NBC and since he's been with NBC.

These lies—"Nazi," "anti-Semite," and so forth and so on—repeated by the news media, have intoxicated the news media into believing its own lies, and trying to explain how the voters would behave in response to a person as characterized by these lies.

But the voters don't believe you. They don't believe the news media. They trust their own experience. They trust what they see, they trust what they read—not too much. They're leery; they're cautious; they've had too many scams coming up to their front door. They don't trust anything too quickly. But these voters, who have been voting for my slates around the country over the past several years—15 to 35% of the vote, or sometimes higher—a consistent pattern among farmers, blue-collar households, black households—the family households, not the radicals, like the Farrakhans—but the normal religious black families, and scientifically oriented professionals and a few entrepreneurs.

That has been consistent. Michael McKeon indicated it was consistent. Anyone in the news media who wanted to know it, could have put the facts together. It was there. And it's going to stay there, and it's going to grow. You cannot put the genie back in the bottle. The voters who picked me as

their representative, looked at me as the guy who's going to stick it to them in Washington, in a manner not much different from the Wallace phenomenon some years ago. They want me to stick it to Washington. That's what the voters want. The unrepresented majority; the forgotten majority. It's going to grow.

Oh, there will be tricks. They're going to try desperation tactics in the state of Maryland to try to keep the slate from carrying there—every dirty trick in the book. And it's begun to surface in the news media with these rigged polls that try to prove that the candidates they're trying to knock out as the frontrunners don't exist. And then if one of them is elected in Maryland, boy, you're going to hear them scream, "How could they do that? They didn't exist. How could they win the election?" Ohio is a contested state. Texas is a contested state.

The economic collapse

Take the states of Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma. We're now on the verge of a collapse of the U.S. commercial banking system. There was a meeting, as many of you know, last month in Basel, of Swiss bankers who pointed to the fact that the U.S. commercial banking system is bankrupt, despite what Donald Regan says. There is about \$1.2 trillion of off-balance-sheet lending in the banking system. There is about a 2.5 to 1 ratio of current liabilities to current assets in our commercial banking system.

Real estate values, particularly those linked to agriculture, are collapsing. Land prices are collapsing, outside of a few speculative project areas. In Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and other states, but those states in particular, the oil business is collapsing. Now the oil business is linked to agriculture in many ways. But the institutions in those states which lend to the one are lending to the other, without going into the details of the matter.

If the United States government continues to support that idiotic ritual "free market, free market, free market," on the question of the oil price drop—and if the oil price drop continues to go into single-digit per barrel prices on the world market, that can set off a political explosion in this country, and—it is enough of a charge to set off a general collapse of our entire banking system.

And these idiots in Washington are talking "free market, free market." [Texas Gov. Mark] White is right: We need a trigger price oil import tax; we need it now. He's wrong when he says \$15 a barrel; it should be \$20, because we have to go above the stripper break-even price. And then we have to worry about the fact that it costs us \$27 to \$28 per barrel to maintain oil production through continued development. At \$20 per barrel, we simply run down our developed reserves. At \$27 per barrel, we can continue to develop oil. We might lower that price slightly if we changed our tax laws to give a few tax incentives, which would make it cheaper to make those kinds of investments.

But if we're concerned with our national security, some-

body is going to go into the Congress and into the Executive branch and *ream* anyone who is idiotic enough not to impose an oil import tax based on a trigger price and do that right now, before it's too late, before the banking system goes. It could be fixed, but there's nobody in this town of Washington presently with the guts and knowledge of what to do about it. There are no Franklin Delano Roosevelts on Capitol Hill or in the administration. No one with the guts to do this.

Again, the same problem. What the press is reporting and what government is saying are out of correspondence to reality.

There are two other issues I'll conclude with.

Foreign policy: We're idiots, we're criminals in foreign policy. If you're an enemy of the United States, you're going to get a good deal. If you're a friend of the United States, you're going to be traded off and sold down the river. That is the foreign policy of the United States. It's a travesty.

I travel around the world; I have friends in many governments and circles in various parts of the world. And what the Soviets have said against the United States is mild compared to the reality. And that's one of the reasons why the Soviets are moving in and taking over, easily, entire areas of the world. Our policy in Europe is insane. Our policy toward West Germany is insane. West Germany is on the verge of going into the Soviet sphere of influence. If the Social Democrats and Greens come to power—and they are on the edge of doing so—the United States is out of Germany, even out faster than Gramm-Rudman can pull our troops out.

And if West Germany leaves NATO, as the Social Democrats have promised to do, then NATO no longer exists. Greece is already gone. Turkey is neutralized, and Italy is undermined. And that is the policy of Shultz. That's the policy of our State Department. That's the policy of that little guy who runs Richard Burt, our Mark Palmer over there. We tell the Europeans that we're pulling out of Europe, because we have to defend our financial interests in the Pacific. We go into the Pacific and we tell the people in the Pacific: No, the Guam Doctrine sticks, because our primary concern is Europe. We go to our traditional export markets in South America and we destroy them. We turn around, we cut down their imports from the United States, demand that they increase their exports to us, and then we turn around and scream, to say that our trade balances are rising and we've got to do something to fight off these very bad people who are flooding our markets with goods.

In the area of foreign policy, the government of the United States is either criminal or insane. And the press watches this and does nothing and comments not upon it.

In the area of strategic policy, we're insane. In our country you've got a confused mass of patriots and a bunch of liberals. The liberals say, as does Henry Kissinger, that the world should be run as a kind of ongoing, continuing crisis management negotiation between Washington and Moscow.

And maybe if we're good-natured on a particular day, we might consult London on the matter. But nobody else. These people say they believe in global society and a bipolar world. And everybody's worried how Gorbachov *feels* about us. And people take seriously what the Soviets say. They're idiots!

The Soviets are Russians. Look at the composition of the Politburo and Central Committee. Look at the composition of the *Nomenklatura*. Russia is a dictatorship, run by a ruling class, an oligarchy, called the *Nomenklatura*. Forget all this garbage that you read in *The Daily Jerker*, or whatever that thing is called these days. The Russians are irrationalists; they're racists. They're Russian racists, Great Russian racists. If you don't believe it, ask a Ukrainian. They're irrational. They believe in power, in the perception of power, and in political will. And when the United States runs around with people like Hans-Dietrich Genscher in Germany and says to the Russians, "Look, we'll try to negotiate; we'll try to please you," the Russians say, in the words of Lenin, "Liberals are useful fools."

You can have war avoidance with Moscow if you have, number one, power; if you have, number two, the perception of power; and if you have, number three, political will. In that case, Moscow will say, "The risks of war are greater than we're willing to accept; therefore there will be war avoidance. But because we are frustrated, we will call the President of the United States all kinds of nasty names." And anyone who's President of the United States, who's a patriot, has got to go with that. He's got to expect to be called nasty names, and say to the Soviets, "Okay, you SOB's, come on over here and talk." But don't say "nice guys," don't say "liberal," don't say "patriot," don't say "peace-lover." Say "SOB," the way Patton is reputed to have said to the Russian generals. Say, "Okay, you SOB. Come on over here. We'll talk. We're not going to kill you and you're not going to kill us, because you haven't got the guts to do it. So let's talk." And that's the only way to deal with the Soviets.

We are today promoting still in the press—we're promoting nuclear deterrence; we're calling that peace-loving. And we're opposing the development of the Strategic Defense Initiative, which is a means of killing missiles. So there's a great inconsistency between those who are screaming about nuclear weapons and at the same time defending nuclear weapons against those of us who are trying to kill them.

The problem is that you in the press who are patriotic, or rational, who would like to do the job that you should be doing, which is to be informing the public of this country of reality and helping them to understand reality, you have not been doing your job. And what happened in Illinois, and what is going to continue to happen, will demonstrate that the forgotten majority of the voters of this country represent reality and have asked me and my associates to stick it to

you, to force you to recognize reality. And the sooner that you in the news media dedicate yourself to reality, instead of the present game of media phenomena and perception, the sooner you will make your vital contribution to the future of this country and of civilization. Thank you.

Q: Illinois Democratic gubernatorial nominee Adlai Stevenson on numerous occasions has called you a "neo-Nazi," a "bizarre and dangerous extremist" who espouses "hate-filled folly." How do you respond to Mr. Stevenson?

LaRouche: Mr. Stevenson is doing a funny thing, coming out every day and pushing the self-destruct button, and if he keeps pushing it, it's going to work sooner or later. Adlai Stevenson's great-grandfather attacked Abe Lincoln in terms which are not too dissimilar. The Republican Party is no longer the party of Abe Lincoln; they have the opposite policies.

tended more toward the Abe Lincoln side, in terms of policy. If Abe Lincoln were alive, he would probably be standing up here with me today. And Adlai doesn't like me. As far as this garbage of "Nazi," "anti-Semitic"—that comes from the drug lobby. . . . Adlai is destroying himself by repeating these lies, and acting upon them. That's my answer.

Q: In 1977 in an article in *New Solidarity* newspaper you stated, in your words, that the center of evil in the United States is a mafia-like conspiracy between the Rockefeller brothers and Jewish bankers in Manhattan. . . .

LaRouche: Oh, I didn't say that. That's a misformulation of what I have said at any time. . . . That is not what I wrote. That is a *characterization* of what I wrote, which is not what I wrote. . . . The point is, this was a response to some charges which were circulated by a drug-lobbying organization called the ADL. There were attacks on me because of my attacks on Meyer Lansky and his friends, including Rockefeller. Meyer Lansky and Rockefeller, as you know, met down there in the Bahamas, together with some other fellows, and set up an operation called the Mary Carter Paint Company, which later became Resorts International and Intertel, which is an integral part of organized crime and the drug lobby.

The attack was on me for mentioning the names of a few people like Meyer Lansky, who happen to have Jewish names. I was attacked for mentioning gangsters with Jewish names, like Meyer Lansky, whom Israel refused to admit to citizenship because he's a gangster. And I said, "Yes, there are people, including people in financial institutions, with Jewish names, who worked with Rockefeller, and that is one of the centers of evil in the United States." I said that. *That's* what I said. . . .

Mark Nykanen (NBC-TV): Monday night, we reported that a former security consultant who worked for you said that he had been approached by one of your top aides, Paul Goldstein, and that Goldstein had told him how the organi-

zation, your organization, had shadowed former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and wanted to assassinate Kissinger. If you have a response, I would like to hear it now.

LaRouche: The question is, how much did you pay him for that? Number two, if you want to ask me about the gentleman, don't ask me; go ask the CIA.

Q: I'm not going to get into a debate with you. Is that the sum total of your response to that?

LaRouche: I'm saying, how much did you pay him for those lies, in November of last year?

Q: Obviously, we've paid him nothing.

LaRouche: Well, I'm not sure of that at all. My information is that you did pay him for it. My information was that he was taken up to New York by a fellow from Reading, Pennsylvania, after the FBI turned him down on the cock 'n' bull story. And they took him up, and they sold him to NBC, and NBC photographed him in their studios in New York, had a sum of money conduited to the individual, who was in financially desperate condition at the time, and still is. As a matter of fact, I had an offer for \$10,000; he tried to blackmail me out of \$10,000, after you put him on the air.

So the whole thing is a cock 'n' bull story. It's a complete lie. If you want to know more about it, go ask the CIA. . . .

Q: I have a question about Virginia. Virginians are an intelligent and patriotic people, and have made it clear that they reject your activities wholeheartedly. My question is, why did you move to Virginia. . . . ?

LaRouche: I don't think Virginians have rejected me at all. I think, again, you're dealing with the problem of media perception. . . . How have Virginians rejected me? When did you ever publish as a journalist any accurate account about me in the state of Virginia? . . . I think the voters are patriotic, in the main, in this state too, in Virginia. And I think the majority of them are going to support me. I haven't made any aggressive political moves in the state of Virginia, nor do I have any plans to do so.

But I think when you get the split in the attempt to create this Southern alternative for 1988, which former Governor Robb is presently involved in, that you're going to find that the conservative Democratic Virginian, if I get the reputation of having won two more primaries, like the Illinois thing or anything approximating that, the conservative Virginians, like conservative Democrats throughout the South, those that aren't anti-black, are all going to come talking to me in one form or another, and when they talk to me, I'm going to cooperate. And we're going to throw together a Southern strategy which I will cooperate with, which will help to carry the 1988 elections.

So I think you're very premature. You may be prejudiced; you may have been worked up; you may have been soaked

up with a bunch of lies, like many people in the media have, but you don't really know a thing about me. Probably today is the first time you've ever gotten a feel of what I might be. Why don't you hold judgment and learn a few things, before you shoot your mouth off that way?

Q: You have told us many of the things you oppose, but can you tell us specifically what you advocate to solve the farmers' problems, the blue-collar, the unemployed, the budget deficit?

LaRouche: First of all, I'm primarily an economist, which we haven't gotten to much in here. But this country was founded on the basis of a rejection of everything in Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, even though Smith published the book as an apology for the policies of the East India Company, after Washington had started his war against the British. Nonetheless, the entire conflict between the United States and Britain was on the central issue, the economic one, even though there were moral and legal questions as well. This was based on the Massachusetts Bay Colony in the 17th century. We had policies; they were influenced, probably through Franklin, by the policies of Leibniz; an English faction opposed to Marlborough, the Marlborough Churchill family—Hunter and Spottswood, in particular, introduced into Virginia, in particular, and New York state, certain of the principles of our nation, and this became known as the American System of political economy—a name which is given to it by particularly three papers of Alexander Hamilton, when he was Treasury Secretary, the one on public credit, the one on the national bank, and on the subject of manufactures.

These were the policies of the American Whigs; these were the policies of Lincoln's Republicans; and these are my policies: that we must abandon this *free trade philosophy* which we fought the American Revolution to free ourselves from, which has led us into bankruptcy, national bankruptcy, every time we adopted it. We have to go back to—away from—British style banking, to national banking, as Hamilton proposed it. We have to go to protectionism, in the sense of the Whig tradition.

We have to take this bankrupt currency and this bankrupt banking system that we have—and like to pretend that it's not falling apart, but it is. We have to have a President and a Congress with the guts to ram through a currency and banking reform as emergency measures, put our currency back on a gold reserve basis, which we took it off between '68 and '71, establish a hard U.S. currency in international markets, shut down the present methods of banking by having the federal government go back to what the Specie Resumption Act forbade: to reissue, as Lincoln did, federal currency Treasury notes, to loan those notes at low interest rates through the private banks to agricultural investments, to infrastructure by utilities, state and local governments, to industrial investments, to export, and in the case of emergency, also for

national defense production, to get this economy moving again. Not moving in terms of credit-card money, not moving in terms of casinos, not moving in terms of gambling dens of all kinds, and speculation, but get it moving in terms of production. Do what we learned to do (albeit with mistakes included) between 1939 and 1943, when Roosevelt, granting his mistakes, demonstrated empirically that any time the President and Congress have the guts to do so, you can pull this country out of a depression and you can pull it out fast. The only thing you have to do is have government-created credit steered into things that cause people to be employed to produce useful things, including infrastructure, and you could save this country.

We don't have small unemployment. We have in point of fact about 25% of our labor forces unemployed. We just don't count most of the people who are unemployed. We need something better than the CCC. We've got in this country millions of unemployed youth. There's no hope for them at present. No hope! Why don't we expand our Corps of Engineers? We've got a \$3 trillion deficit in infrastructure, just to get back to where we were in 1970. Why don't we take these unemployed youth, put them under the Corps of Engineers for employment and training in major projects of infrastructure, such as building the western NAWAPA water system and other things that have to be built? Why do we leave them around to rot, when we can put them to work and upgrade them so that coming out of that program, they'll be employable and will have a future for themselves and their families, while right now they have got nothing? . . .

Q: If you could somehow, just for a moment, believing what you believe, put yourself in our shoes: Would you find a lot of what you're saying fairly ridiculous?

LaRouche: No. Of course not.

Q: What is it the drug lobby, the drug traffickers, have to fear from you? How can you hurt them?

LaRouche: Well, I think we have hurt them. We ran a campaign from 1978 on, called "War on Drugs." Shortly after President Reagan was inaugurated, he adopted that program called "War on Drugs." There was a great deal of screaming about that. You see, people who talk about drugs, they're not really serious about it. . . . What we insisted upon in *Dope, Inc.* is that you have to go at the fact that today the drug traffic is over \$400 billion a year. That's a conservative figure internationally. Now that money does not go into mattresses. That money goes through *banks*. If you want to stop the drug traffic, you have to detect the flow of drug-money receipt laundering through the international banking system, and you have to confiscate funds of that type, going through the banking system, and you have to put the bankers who do that, like Donald Regan, presently chief of staff of the White House, in jail where they belong. Because Donald Regan set up a drug-money-laundering operation. . . .