

If LaRouche goes, can Bush administration survive?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following analysis was released on Jan. 4, from Wiesbaden, West Germany.

The cheering crowd gathers at the docks. The ill-fated Titanic's newly appointed Captain George Bush is ascending the gangway to assume command. Never in recent memory, has a new administration sailed out with such a memorable collection of past celebrities composing its crew. Amid the waiting mists, a few days out, the growling icebergs are waiting.

Unless George Bush has a "secret agenda," which runs counter to every policy-posture seen around the Bush Team so far, this is the memory of the short-lived new U.S. administration which will be recorded in the history books. Unfortunately, all the indications are, that is the way the upcoming 60 to 90 days shape up as of this moment.

He, as the "Hamlet" of this threatened tragedy, is now confronted with two classes of dangers. The first class is composed of strategic developments, presently visible or upcoming during the next weeks, which reflect the state of the world without considering my presence in the world. The second class of problems centers around the Bush team's, and others' inability to comprehend the historic significance of my presence or absence from the scene, during these upcoming developments.

I summarize the nature of the first class of crises, to situate a report on the leading features of the second.

The breaking financial crisis

The most obvious and immediate threat to the administration, is the outbreak of the worst U.S. financial crisis since President George Washington's inauguration. In part, this crisis is an objective one, for which there is no solution under

the continuing monetary and financial policies of present Treasury Secretary James Baker III. In the lesser degree, the exact timing of the outbreak of this financial crisis, is a decision in the collective hands of powerful Western European financier interests.

The special added danger, is that the arrogance of the incoming Bush team is setting up the new administration for an early fall. In particular, that team greatly underestimates the degree of control which certain European establishment forces have over the policy-shaping of that team itself.

The team's own arrogance is its blind side. Where reality shows contempt for Baker's monetary and financial smugness, the team, collectively, prefers to act upon its blind faith in the illusions of Mr. Baker's policy-commitments. Its fanatical mood of belief in "American Exceptionalism," which pervades the team collectively, impels it to deny the existence of very real puppet-strings on its policies, strings controlled by elements of the European establishments.

The upcoming financial crisis is the center of it all.

There are four transatlantic factions predominantly controlling the policy-shaping of the U.S. establishment today:

1) The Soviet government, through the set of "globalist" agreements being negotiated through, chiefly, London channels of the post-December 1984 "I love Gorby" fad.

2) The principal Western establishment partners of Moscow in such "globalist" arrangements, whose Western component is built up around those grain cartel and other financier interests which were partners of the Soviet regime in the 1918-27 period of the "Anglo-Soviet Trust."

3) The "Lombard" faction in international finance, including those outside the ranks of the revived "Trust" proper, which is committed to a modern version of the same policies

of international usury which brought 14th-century Europe into the depths of a New Dark Age.

4) Overlapping all three of the foregoing three elements, is a powerful federation of occult fanatics, Gnostics, and outright satanists of the Crowley-OTO varieties, who are represented at some of the highest levels of finance, and in certain powerful factions among the sundry denominations of freemasonry.

The scandalous case of Lt.-Col. Michael Aquino, is but symptomatic of the degree to which a "flaming liberal's" sort of toleration of outright Satan-worship has infected leading institutions. This latter is the most insane, and dangerous component of all four elements of the transatlantic establishments.

These four, incidentally, are my principal adversaries, and the international combination of forces which has rigged the recent legal and news-media witchhunt against me and my associates. I have no important adversaries but these, not overlooking the credulous fools who do their bidding.

The agreed policy of all four transatlantic elements, is to break once, and forever, the potential revival of the sovereign power of the United States. To that purpose, they are all committed to breaking the Bush administration at some early point during 1989. The orchestrated detonation of the monstrous international financial bubble, is the principal means by which those forces intend to accomplish the result.

This game-plan has sundry leading complexities.

It has been Soviet policy since the October 1917 Revolution, to effect world conquest through breaking the ties between the United States and Western Europe. This policy was developed into a specific form under former KGB Director Yuri Andropov, as the Andropov-Ogarkov strategic doctrine. This policy is continued, with secondary tactical revisions, by Andropov's designated "crown prince," Mikhail Gorbachov.

This objective is supported by the Western elements of the revived "Trust" partnership. The doctrine of "Europe 1992," is an expression of this Trust influence on Western Europe. The efforts on both sides of the Atlantic, to withdraw substantial U.S. military forces from Europe, is a reflection of the influence of this Trust faction on both sides of the Atlantic.

"Europe 1992" defines an explosive quarrel within the European establishments, as well as transatlantic disputes.

It is agreed, that European agriculture and industry is to be collapsed into certain limited regions of Western Europe as a whole, with the surviving small fraction of agriculture and industry under the control of a handful of mega-cartels, the latter operating freely under the conditions created by virtual dissolution of sovereign national borders.

It is not agreed, which set of European cartel interests will dominate the arrangement. The principal lines of division on this matter, are defined in terms of a "northern faction," generally echoing that 17th- and 18th-century "Vene-



tian party" associated with the rise of the East India companies, and a competing "central European," southerly faction.

All of these Western features of the crisis, touch upon all of the leading establishment factions of Europe, Japan, and the United States, including the highly unstable set of current agreements among these regions. The map of the coming months is fairly defined so; the travel itinerary is not.

The most volatile feature of the immediate situation, is the virtual bankruptcy of the U.S. economy and nation, which has been built up since October 1982 through ever-wilder innovations in "creative financing."

The new, explosive potential detonator of a general U.S. financial crisis, at this moment, is the recent orgy of Leveraged Buy-Out (LBO) ventures, which have the effect of pushing the relevant U.S. corporate debt above the level of corporate equity. For such and related reasons, the European financier establishment views the U.S. as ready to be put through the financial wringer at almost any moment certain powerful non-U.S. interests might choose to set off the financial chain-reaction collapse.

One of the obvious vehicles for bringing about the breaking of U.S. sovereign will and power, is Mr. Baker's latest versions of the Kissinger-Baker tactic for dealing with the mass of spiraling, intrinsically unpayable indebtedness of Central and South American nations. In and of itself, this represents more of the lunacy of "creative financing" which has dominated U.S. policy since October 1982; on that ac-

count, the difference in the currently mooted versions of the Kissinger-Baker scheme, is that the bankruptcy of these debt holdings is near the breaking point.

The political danger in this, is that, under conditions of triggered financial crisis, the very process of attempting to negotiate a new version of the Kissinger-Baker debt reorganization schemes, would become the means by which the sovereignty of the U.S.A. is destroyed, and our national political will broken.

Politically, the implementation of such a tactic depends upon breaking the Bush administration, and, in the process, Mr. Bush personally. On that point, all of the forces are in position, ready to be unleashed. The object is to break the institutional power of the President of the United States; to accomplish that near-term objective now, means breaking Mr. Bush.

Once the political will of the U.S. administration is broken in these dimensions, the possibility of solving successfully any other element of strategic and foreign policy crises is near zero.

For the moment, to many, especially those caught up euphorically in admiration of the Bush team's firmness of unified will, insist that nothing like this will be allowed to occur. In reality, Bush-team illusions aside, what the team appears firmly resolved to enforce, are precisely those conditions which tend to ensure the easy success of the kind of operation we have described.

Such are the ingredients of true classical tragedy.

Yankee Yahoos

Individually, and in fractional components, many elements of the present Bush combination are far from being unintelligent persons. Like George Bush himself, most of them are merely political "technicians," none statesmen in the classical sense. Worse: Collectively, culturally, the team's decision-shaping process is that of Yankee Yahoos. That shows most clearly in their actions of recent years respecting "the LaRouche case"; that is consistent with their follies on different, but related matters.

Like the worst side of the outgoing Reagan administration, the Bush presidency enters office with the qualifications of men and women who tend to excel at making money, without knowing how to earn it. As typified by the outgoing treasury secretary, James Baker III, the more they think themselves to know about money, the less they know about economics.

As Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton understood, the function of money is merely the facilitation of the process of steering technological progress, capital-intensive investment in farms and industries, and investment in basic economic infrastructure, into the fostering of the increase of the physical productive powers of labor, and the increase of the average standard of living and real national revenues by those means.

The raw power of a nation, is measured immediately in terms of the per capita physical productivity of the average member of the labor force, with physical output measured in terms of standard market-baskets for producers' and household goods. If the use of credit and money are employed to further those investments, and the circulation of those goods, happiness; if credit and money are used, instead, in the way monetary, financial, and economic policies have been steered increasingly during the past 20-odd years, especially the recent six years of "creative financing," disaster. (Apologies to Dickens's Mr. Micawber for that parody.)

Mr. Baker has shown himself not to know the difference; the Bush team as a whole has produced no visible objection to Mr. Baker's announced intent to persist in his follies.

Talk of social welfare, federal deficits, tax shortfalls, old-age pensions, and national defense as passionately as one may choose; if the development of the per capita physical productivity of the labor force as a whole is not sustained and improved, all talk on these other issues soon becomes empty rhetorical posturing. If the nation is not producing sufficient bread and meat to put on the tables of all our family households, nothing can be done except to rearrange the distribution of hunger. It is the same in other other facets of policy, in which performance ultimately demands a supply of physical goods. Without those goods, money is toilet paper.

As to other leading qualities projected from the Bush team as a whole, the following observation sums up the relevant feature. In a sense, Yahoo America needs Moscow, to prove to the world than there is one great power which is more brutishly inconsiderate of those nationalities deemed its subjects, friends, or allies, than the United States.

To wit: The economy of Western Europe, on which the existence of the economy of the U.S.A., and our national defense depend, is pivoted on the central role of the economy and defense forces of the Federal Republic of Germany. Yet, in North America, it is fashionable to be anti-German, and to exhibit similar Yahoo chauvinism against the French, the Italians, and so on.

To wit: Bush's election would not have been possible without massive financial and economic assistance to the U.S.A. from Japan. Yet, "Jap-bashing" was, during all this time, a favorite occupation of both the Reagan administration and the Congress.

To wit: We have become a liberal nation, ostensibly sensitive to the feelings of black and Hispanic minorities. This does not deter us from continuing those IMF "conditionalities" and related policies which have virtually wiped the political existence of Uganda from the map, biologically, with famine and disease, and which are developing similar circumstances among the majority of 400-million-odd black Africans. Our attitudes toward the well-being of the nations and peoples of Central and South America, runs in the same vein of racist indifference and cruelty witnessed in our policy toward Africa.

That Moloch which is the American liberal establishment, eats the living bodies of the children of nations which are our allies or friends, and strokes our enemies with a quality of concern worthy of a professional prostitute.

Sorry, John, but we seem to be a nation of Yahoos, the more so the closer we approach the top rank of our establishment.

One is disposed to suspect the best of a new President, even to hope, contrary to our public appearances, that a noble, secret agenda reposes in his bosom. Some of the new President's appointments were encouraging to this effect; the most recent ones usually not. In the totality, every part of the establishment spectrum is represented, including the worst. Since every such shading of principle is represented, in the whole, of principle, there is none. To the degree the new President's practice is shaped by that combination, we must generally expect Yahooism to prevail in the net result.

This appears to be an incoming administration dominated by obsession with the perception of its own power, a government in the tradition of Napoleon III and caesarism: long on the exertion of administrative arrogance of power, and short on concern for those human values which this nation, when young, was founded to affirm.

The potential power of the United States of America, is reflected in the submission to the Christian conception of natural law expressed by our Declaration of Independence and the Preamble to our Federal Constitution. Since the young American republic had demonstrated in perilous battle its belief in such principles, our emergence as a sovereign republic, dedicated to government of, by, and for the people, rendered us a temple of liberty and beacon of hope for all informed men and women of good will throughout this planet.

On that account, our young republic is still today a rallying point for all those nations and peoples which aspire to the same condition for which our War of Independence was fought. That is, therefore, the continuing mission to which we must adhere, respecting both our present generations and posterity here, and abroad. If we were but to revive that heritage, and seek to honor it with practice, there is perhaps no problem presented to government which we could not master, in our domestic welfare, the well-being of foreign nations, and the common security of our republic and its friends.

There is no emanation of this American spirit from the incoming Bush administration so far, but rather the cruel obsession with the mere administration of power, both at home, and abroad. In the greatly weakened condition to which we have been reduced by the follies of policy-shaping of our governments during the recent 20-odd years, a government of such a morally and cultural shallow character, especially obsessed with the technical administration of power, is a vulnerably brittle entity, like stands of buckwheat sitting under a darkening sky, awaiting the windstorm soon to come.

Hence, the unpleasant term, Yahoo. One might hope that the unpleasantness, and appropriateness of that term might provoke the new administration to effect the obvious corrections in its posture.

The LaRouche factor

Throughout Europe and the United States, leading representatives of the transatlantic establishment, are bragging openly of the way in which they rigged the legal process of the United States, to accomplish a fraudulent verdict intended to "put away" Lyndon LaRouche forever. The Europeans claim that they ordered the frame-up trial and arranged the verdict; the U.S. establishment retorted, "That is absurd; we did it." The word is, that elements of the incoming Bush administration bought into that frame-up.

The only truth in that bragging, is four things: 1) The frame-up and verdict were prearranged by the four elements of the transatlantic establishment identified earlier; 2) The U.S. establishment was complicit in carrying out the orders of that transatlantic establishment; 3) Crucial facts of the indictment and trial, including the packing of the jury to ensure the predetermined verdict, show that the dirty deed was done as these various sources brag it was done; 4) It was done for the purpose of eliminating Lyndon LaRouche and his voice, permanently.

What does this tell us of justice in the United States today? What does this tell us of the morality of those in the transatlantic and U.S. establishments who condone such corruption? What do elections mean, and institutions of law, when a relative handful of men and women, working from behind and above governments, exert such power over the judicial process, that constitutional government is reduced to an empty charade?

What will the incoming Bush administration's response to all this tell us about its morality and respect for the Constitution?

There are also numerous lies in these bragging reports—from leading circles and intelligence channels in Washington, London, Paris, Munich, Rome, and elsewhere. None tell the truth about the establishment's motives. Some intelligence channels are merely repeating the explanations supplied to them, by the CIA and other sources. Others, at a higher level, know the truth, and are lying, telling these silly cover-stories, in the effort to distract attention from the true motives.

There are several, converging actual motives.

First, there is the matter of global agreements being reached among Washington, London, and Moscow. Moscow has agreed to curtail certain among its activities, in return for the incoming Bush administration's systematic victimization of the persons and groups on a Soviet-designated hit-list. At the top of that hit-list is LaRouche, closely followed by patriotic circles within and close to the military establishment, the TV evangelicals, the Eastern European anti-Bolshevik

lobby, and so on. In return, the U.S. is offered a free hand with Qaddafi, but not with Syria's Soviet puppet and international-terrorism coordinator, President Hafez Assad.

This proposal is supported by such friends of Moscow as Armand Hammer and Edgar Bronfman, and by the "I love Gorby" set generally.

Second, there is the issue of the consistent dedication of LaRouche and his friends to the principles of the encyclicals *Populorum Progressio* and *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*: commitment to the principles of sovereignty and economic justice for developing nations. This is most offensive to the financier circles which tend to express their views to Mr. James Baker, among others.

Third, there is the issue of drugs. Since the internationally active U.S. financial institutions, of the U.S.A. and elsewhere, have been subsisting by aid of large margins of laundered drug-money, since 1978-79 measures of deregulation, usually a bank which defames LaRouche turns up to be implicated in laundering of drug-monies.

Fourth, there are the rabid Gnostics and outright satanists, including satanist circles of actress Elizabeth Taylor. These are a powerful, mass-based force, with the penetration of higher circles of power we indicated earlier.

The real reason for the targeting of LaRouche by corrupt judicial means, is the policies which LaRouche represents, those identified most emphatically. There may be other reasons certain individuals and circles hate LaRouche, but those are only a resource of support for the action directed from the highest levels of the transatlantic establishment. Without the complicity of the majority of the U.S. liberal establishment, such a frame-up could not be conducted against a figure of the present power and influence of LaRouche.

If the Bush administration accepts that rigged verdict, then, by so doing the Bush administration adopts for itself the character of a bonapartist form of totalitarian rule. If it does, given the present circumstances of crisis, that administration establishes itself as the leadership of a nation which will not long survive, and as a government which is virtually doomed to become a footnote in the pages of infamy.

If who lives by the sword, must tend to die by the sword, then who adopts injustice as a standard of practice of government, must tend to be destroyed by the instrument of that same injustice. Let a Bush administration appeal to the Constitution in a time of its troubles, and the mocking rebuke will be, "Who are you to speak of the Constitution whose subversion you condoned for mere reason of perceived expediency?"

For these two sets of reasons: my unique and crucial role respecting the the principal issues of policy for a period of existential national crisis, and the effect of a Bush administration's tacit adoption of such a flagrant sort of judicial frame-up, virtually ensures the early doom of the Bush administration, and, most probably, with that, the United States, and, with that, you, too.

Project Democracy:

The 'parallel government' behind the Iran-Contra affair

An invisible, parallel government has been running U.S. foreign policy and economic policy—into a series of disasters that leave us open to Soviet conquest. Now, this invisible government can be exposed and driven from power. The United States can regain its sovereignty.

Order *EIR's Special Report*, for yourself and your congressman. Full documentation of the investigation behind the exclusive news stories you read in *EIR*. An indexed guide to Israeli and Soviet foreign intelligence networks in the Department of Justice and other government agencies, as well as the key "private" law firms, with greater power than most elected officials.

Please send me _____ copies of the "Project Democracy" Special Report at \$250 each postpaid. Please send (Rep. or Sen.) _____ a complimentary copy of the Report, at \$250 each postpaid. I enclose \$_____ check or money order.

Please charge my MasterCard Visa

No. _____ Exp. Date _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Telephone _____

Make check or money order payable to:
EIR News Service
P.O. Box 17390
Washington, D.C. 20041-0390