

Lyndon LaRouche on national television

Excerpts follow from the transcript of Lyndon LaRouche's interview on CNN's "Evans and Novak" program aired on May 3. The interviewers were columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak.

Evans: My first question is this, sir. Is your long-range plan to absorb or take over the Democratic Party and become the leader of that—make your political mark as the leader of the existing Democratic Party?

LaRouche: In a sense, with a qualification that I don't see it as being particularly me, or people immediately associated with me, but a coalition of the kinds of forces which used to run the Democratic Party before this 1968-72 period.

Novak: Mr. LaRouche, you told my partner that you would like to take over the Democratic Party. Now I'm sure you realize that that's not really possible in the short run; maybe in the long run, who knows. But in the short run, what are you trying to do? You're running hundreds of candidates all over the country. What is your short-term goal?

LaRouche: Well I think that we're in a serious crisis. I don't think that reasoning from past experience will work in this period. I think people who are trying to run trend analysis, a fundamental mistake—we're in a banking crisis: We have a coverup of the degree of our financial economic crisis in the United States. But people out there, the majority of our people, are feeling the effects of reality, contrary to what we're getting in most of the news media. And we are going to face some very tough decisions. We need a new combination unlike the liberal domination of the Congress today, and certain parts of the Executive branch as well—a new combination of political forces which gives the President of the United States new options for decision-making to deal with the kinds of crises we face.

Novak: But there are no combinations at this point willing to coalesce with you, isn't that correct?

LaRouche: Not really. Behind the scenes it's quite different.

Novak: Like who?

LaRouche: Oh I wouldn't name names, because they asked not to be named. But there are many people coming to our back door, who are saying, "Well, if you win two more

primaries"—I don't know if they'd do it then, but they say that—"if you win two more primaries, that is, in perception, then, of course, nobody can object to our coming out openly and working together with you."

Novak: Let me ask you again your tactical goals. You were running a lot of Democrats for Congress against solidly entrenched conservative Republicans, a couple in Texas, a couple in Illinois. Your people are going to get the nominations. But you have no chance to win the elections.

LaRouche: Not necessarily. That's a mistake. That's the same mistake the news media made in ignoring what was a clearly indicated success of at least part of the slate in Illinois.

Novak: All right. But the probabilities are, and I think you can recognize, probabilities are that you won't be defeating entrenched Republicans. What is the—

LaRouche: No, I don't think that's true. I don't think that's true at all.

Novak: Just by winning the nomination do you get a foothold in the Democratic Party?

LaRouche: Yes, you do. See, people confuse the Democratic Party with the DNC—which has some good people—

Novak: That's the Democratic National Committee.

LaRouche: Right. Which is completely divorced from reality in terms of the rank and file. There is no Democratic Party organization any more to speak of, at least not nationally. The Democratic voters are disenfranchised by the Democratic National Committee. The Democratic voters voted for Reagan in large part during the last elections. And the voters who voted for Reagan from the Democratic side are the type of voters, plus others, who would tend to vote for candidates associated with me, particularly as they see the Reagan economic policy becoming a total failure.

Evans: Mr. LaRouche, you have targeted specifically Jim Wright, the Democratic House of Representatives majority leader. The Texas primary is this weekend, it is Saturday. What do you expect to do against Jim Wright? Can you give me an estimate?

LaRouche: No idea. This is a grassroots campaign, and the idea is generally to get as many grassroots representatives elected as possible, that's the objective. We're not targeting Jim Wright in particular.

Evans: You are targeting, as I understand it, Senator Glenn of Ohio, and the Ohio primary is on May 6. Are you planning to remove him from the nomination?

LaRouche: I would hope so.

Evans: Why?

LaRouche: He's a terrible wimp, and he allowed himself to become entangled with this Warner financial operation in the

state of Ohio, and has allowed himself, while he's been good on a number of issues, on most issues he's allowed himself to be dragged along with bad policies.

Evans: I thought he was one of the Marine Corps flying heroes of World War II, and that he was one of our first men in space and was a hero. You call him a wimp?

LaRouche: I would hope he had stayed in the space program where he was not a wimp. In politics, he's a wimp.

Evans: In California, the primary of California is I believe on June 3rd. You have targeted Senator Cranston, who is showing enormous power to get himself reelected and reelected out there in California. Why Cranston?

LaRouche: Well Cranston, I have a certain admiration for the man as intelligent, knowledgeable. But his policies, particularly his left-wing leaning policies, are a danger to the United States.

Evans: So take these three—Wright in Texas, a moderate conservative, . . . John Glenn in Ohio, certainly not a liberal. Cranston in California, a liberal. Now I don't find, I don't find a congealing synthesis here that tells me anything about what you are really after. Why are these three being shot—Democratic policy?

LaRouche: Well you've singled them out, not I. But you can't characterize my approach to politics by singling out only three among many people we would be perfectly happy to displace. You've got to go from my positive standpoint. I'm concerned with two things. I'm concerned with the collapse of Western civilization, which has two aspects. One, an economic and moral collapse, particularly of the United States, as a result of bad policies. And of economic policies toward the developing countries in particular, which is immoral in the extreme. I'm also concerned about the strategic defense of Western civilization, again where we're weak. And it's how politicians stand on these two issues that concern me. We do not have representation of the interests of the United States in the Congress. We may have people who are elected to represent us, but they have not represented the interests of the United States in the Congress, and we've got to have people who do represent those interests.

Novak: Mr. LaRouche, a great triumph so far politically in your movement has been the nomination in the Democratic Party of a Secretary of State and Lieutenant Governor. You've gotten a lot more attention since that has happened. But I find that you spent very little money on those campaigns, less than \$1,000. Can't we say that the people voted for your candidates because they didn't know who they were?

LaRouche: No. That's—that was something in Illinois which—a self-consoling media and liberal myth. The point is, you had this case of, as you are well-acquainted with, J. Michael McKeon's survey. He gave the evidence before that he had last June, before these candidates had spent a nickel

on their campaign, it was indicated that candidates associated with me were going to take election victories, probably in this primary period. The candidates actually to a certain degree were riding the coattails of the influence of the movement, rather than their putting the movement behind them. The voters who voted for them knew what they were voting for.

Novak: Mr. LaRouche, I want to ask you something that's always puzzled me about you. I've read about you for years. And you started out in politics on the far left, with the Students for a Democratic Society, under the name of Lyn Marcus, I believe. You were in the Columbia University protest movement.

LaRouche: 1968.

Novak: 1968. What caused you, and I guess you wouldn't object to being called a part of the right wing right now, would you?

LaRouche: Well, it depends on what they mean by that. As a conservative American, as opposed to the European use of the word conservative, I would accept that. I'm a constitutional traditionalist.

Novak: All right, did you have a change in your whole philosophy, was there some revelation? What happened?

LaRouche: No it was just—well, first of all, the left-wing thing is exaggerated. That's where the problem starts. We went into—we actually slid into SDS not by intent, but as a matter of tactics. Because we were determined, a group of friends of mine and I, were determined to combat the New Left on its home terrain. And to deal with the entire left problem—because many good people were being drawn into the anti-war movement. There were—these were people who were being drawn into this counter-cultural process which SDS was part of. Therefore we said, let's get in there, since I thought the Vietnam War was a travesty. . . . different reasons than the Left did, but nonetheless a travesty. Let's get in there, let's represent a positive policy on the Vietnam War question, and let's win people away from what I considered and what we considered at that point a terrible thing.

Novak: You know there are some people who claim that even today you are an agent of the KGB, that they support your operation. And as you know as a student of Bolshevik history, the Bolsheviks and their intelligence apparatus have supported supposedly right-wing groups. The famous Trostnik in Russia—

LaRouche: Or Francois Genoud, the head of the Nazi International in Switzerland is a good example.

Novak: All right. Are you part of that tradition?

LaRouche: No. There are people, apart from idiots in the street, all the people who out of ignorance and paranoia will

suspect that. But there are people like Robert Moss and so forth who spread that nonsense. They ought to know better, because they have enough access to intelligence to know what the Soviets really think about me. The Soviets consider me, perhaps with some exaggeration, the intellectual author of the SDI. And they have screamed about that.

Evans: That's the Strategic Defense Initiative, yes.

LaRouche: And not without reason, but they may exaggerate my influence somewhat on that, being Soviets. They consider me the most dangerous individual not in a government position in the world today, from their standpoint.

Evans: You mentioned Robert Moss, who with Arnaud de Borchgrave wrote a famous book called *The Spike*. You are not sympathetic to Robert Moss, correct?

LaRouche: Neither one of them.

Evans: Or de Borchgrave.

LaRouche: Well, de Borchgrave is easier. Well, de Borchgrave is the fellow who's come under suspicion—

Evans: He's now the publisher of the *Washington Times*.

LaRouche: He's the fellow that comes under suspicion of being your Soviet, right-wing, conservative Soviet agent, because of what he did—all his whole life history is of that type. He actually has been, and Moss has been, agents of Soviets disinformation. Even though they were the authors of *The Spike*. . . .

Evans: Very brutally, very frontally, were you ever a Marxist in your own opinion? Ever?

LaRouche: I don't know.

Evans: All right, let me ask it this way. Are you today a Marxist?

LaRouche: I am an expert on Marx, but I would not be considered a Marxist.

Evans: At what point did you change from the I don't know to no? And what changed you?

LaRouche: Oh, I would say in the 1950s.

Evans: In the '50s. This has nothing to do with the Vietnam War. It was Eisenhower administration, it was what?

LaRouche: No, no. I became involved with the Socialist Workers Party, a Trotskyist organization.

Evans: Right, which is not a right-wing party.

LaRouche: No, hardly. But largely because of my opposition to what we called McCarthyism in that period. Then in 1954 I had a chance to see the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party at somewhat close range, and saw something which I abhorred. And that was the end, essentially, as far as

I was concerned.

Evans: You have said recently . . . "Something has broken loose in the American political process," indicating that you're going to find what that is and exploit it and fix it. broken loose in the American political process?

LaRouche: Well, for the past 20 years, increasingly, the American population has been retreating into personal recreational foxholes. The television-watching habits and the content of television programs, the way in which sports activities, habits, are used by the population, indicate a retreat from reality into narrow concerns with immediate personal life and recreation.

. . . What's happened is .

Because they couldn't cope with the reality. They said, I'm too small to deal with these larger realities, I'm going to take care of my family, I'm going to get by. I'm going to maintain my career, I'll put up with whatever I have to put up with. Somebody began putting hand grenades in those foxholes. The collapse of the economy; they could no longer believe in the illusion of the so-called Reagan economic recovery. Then, along came things like AIDS. And the American people are terrified of AIDS. And that thing is gonna bust loose wildly very soon.

Novak: Mr. LaRouche, I'd like to ask you another question that has always puzzled me. . . . Norman Bailey, who is the former National Security Council official, said that you run a pretty good intelligence operation round the world, that you have good information. If I had the money which I don't have, could I go in to you and pay you money to get intelligence information from your organization?

LaRouche: Well, we don't do it that way. What we do—we will sometimes cooperate with government agencies in terms of discussing things that we're looking into and they're looking into. We will accept what we might call leaks from government agencies, and we will follow those leaks up to see where they lead. But most of our intelligence is in the form of published—we're in the publication business.

Novak: You're not providing private intelligence as a profit-making operation?

LaRouche: That's not the nature of the operation I'm associated with. It's—we're in the publishing business.

Novak: I was reading one of your publications, *The Executive [Intelligence] Review*, and there was a lot of interesting information. I found it interesting. But then I find other things in it that I find difficult to understand. For example, Assistant Secretary of State Alan Wallis, you say was a strong advocate of Hitler's racial theories.

LaRouche: He still is, he's a population nut.

Novak: He's a monetarist, isn't he?

LaRouche: Both, both. He is actually probably one of the most dangerous men in terms of influencing Secretary Shultz's policy on economics.

Novak: But he had no connection with Adolf Hitler.

LaRouche: No, no, but—you know, there was a big fraud committed in part in the Nuremberg trials, is that while we single out some Nazis who were in most part guilty of what they were charged with and justly sentenced, we covered up the large number of people who had been sympathetic with the Nazis and their philosophy in this country, Britain, and elsewhere, during the 1920s and 1930s. We had people in the United States who were just as fanatically racist, just as fanatically eugenicist, as Hitler was. There were people who admired Hitler and publicly so, prominent figures, because of Hitler's racial policies. And Wallis represents that, not the Nazi tradition, but that American tradition.

Novak: Mr. LaRouche, one of your pet peeves is that Chief—one of the most powerful men in America, Chief of Staff of the White House. . . .

LaRouche: I think he's rubbed out on Nancy Reagan, too.

Novak: Donald Regan. And you say that Donald Regan supports operations strategically decisive for the Soviet Union, and contrary to the most vital strategic interests of the United States. How is that possible?

LaRouche: Well, there are several things involved. Donald Regan, as you know, was a Democratic-leaning fellow until Reagan appeared to be winning. And then he became a Reagan treasury secretary by adjustment in his position. But in 1978, he was the chairman of Merrill Lynch as you know. And during that period, Merrill Lynch, under the new elimination of transparency of foreign banking practices in the United States, entered into an agreement with an international firm, White Weld-Crédit Suisse, to set up what became probably today the largest foreign drug money-laundering operation into the United States.

Novak: So when you're talking about contrary to U.S. interests, you're talking about drugs.

Evans: Let me quickly, with one minute left, Mr. LaRouche. Your movement is under investigation right now, sir, by the FBI, Federal Elections Commission, the IRS, we know the tax collector, the Secret Service. All probing your operations. There is an affidavit that has been released from the federal district court in Boston by the U.S. attorney, William F. Weld—

LaRouche: That was not known as an affidavit, that was a representation.

Evans: —representation saying that there is an "extensive nation-wide pattern" of credit-card fraud. I'm not asking you

to tell me if that's accurate or inaccurate, but how does it make you feel, that your movement is the target of this vast kind of federal investigation. It must be based on something.

LaRouche: It's based on the same thing that the Reagan administration's—many officials in the Reagan administration went to prison for doing exactly what the people involved in steering this so-called investigation did. That's a political enemy. . . .

Evans: Nixon administration, you mean?

LaRouche: That's right. But this is exactly what it is. There are complicit elements of the U.S. government involved in this. This is a political enemies operation, a Cointelpro, it's a fraud from beginning to end. And I think that some people in the federal government today, may go to prison as a result of this.

Evans: Bob, have you ever tried to pick up a piece of mercury from a flat surface; I felt that way interviewing LaRouche. He is hard to pin down; yes, he says maybe it's the Democratic Party is the target, he'd like to take that over and use it to run his own program, but what is your program? It's hard to get details from him; I thought he exuded a confidence and a sense of himself that surprised me a little bit. He wasn't bombastic or nasty, but I came out of it wondering how much I learned.

Novak: You know, Rowland, the politicians say that the victories for the LaRouche candidates in Illinois were a fluke, but that's a little bit like whistling past the graveyard. Because I think they're scared to death of Lyndon LaRouche, and the reason is, there are a lot of worried people—there's farmers in Iowa, oil roughnecks in Texas, who just don't know what the future is going to bring. And when he talks about people watching television, too much caught up in leisure, he's going to catch a responsive note with some people. . . .

Evans: And clearly he thinks the process, certainly in the Democratic Party, and I think this would be the Republican Party too, is breaking down; he thinks that it's broken down to the point that somebody like him with an organizational genius perhaps, can begin to put it back together in a different way, pick up pieces. He's got 700 or 800 candidates, Rouchites or Rouchies as they call 'em, running for various offices around the country, even as low as county executive committee. Now, if he . . . we'll know after this election whether he's succeeded.

Novak: . . . I think the problem for Mr. LaRouche is credibility on some of his assertions. We didn't get to have time to get into many of them, but when he says that Don Regan is serving the strategic interests of the Soviet Union because of his connections with the drug traffic—it's a little hard for me and you to believe and I think it's a little hard for Americans to believe. . . .