

Contra apparatus and its continuation, operated; of which Falwell, Bo Hi Pak, Robertson, etc., are parts. This is the constituency from which Starr comes. And this is a menace. These are the Elmer Gantrys. *This is American fascism*. If you're going to get a native form of American fascism, *it will come from these nuts*, and I say "nuts" advisedly: *They're crazy! They are not rational*. They have the glistening, glazed-look eyes. You want to talk about insanity, mass insanity? *This is mass insanity, just like the Hitler Triumph of the Will and Nuremberg rally-type people*. And, that's the problem, and that's what's being done.

So, for them, sex: What's their fascination with sex? These are guys who pretend, "Oh, I'm sinful, I'm a wretch. I do all these things." Or, they either do it, or they'd like to do it. You bring up the idea of the President of the United States involved in a sex scandal, and these morbid types, these degenerate types, they're obsessed, they're fascinated with this stuff.

Whereas, you'll find that, as a corrective, the strongest support for the President comes from American women. That what you've got here, is, essentially, from the Southern side, you've got these Bubbas, who are sex fanatics, who can't stay in their own beds at night. They go down to pick up a girl, you know, to find some girl with sluttish characteristics, and pick her up, and a couple of guys have fun with her in the back of a car, or something. This is the mentality of these people, who call themselves "Christians," but really are running around with sexual fantasies controlling them.

So, you divert: They *love* this stuff! It's a pornographic fascination. You know, these churches ought to be placed off-limits to children, because of the concentration of pornography running amok in them, particularly from the mouths of Falwell or Robertson. Watch their programs: *What I see coming across to me, is pure sexual pornography, of a Bogomil type*. A couple of Buggers, in short. So, that's what the problem is here.

And Netanyahu represents that. *He knows that that is his constituency in the United States*. Netanyahu's constituency is *not* American Jews. Oh, maybe a few, maybe a few nuts, like the type you have around Brooklyn, with these crazy cults. But the typical American Jew is *not* the constituency of Netanyahu. The Labor Party is much more the constituency, finds its constituency in the American Jew, who, you know, lived through all these experiences, who hates this kind of horror show, who hates these memories, and is not a nut, is not a fanatic. He may be panicked by the images of the Holocaust, and so forth. But, he's not a nut; he's a normal person with good feelings. And he *hates* and *despises* Netanyahu, who he recognizes as being a *gangster*. You wouldn't let your daughter marry that gangster. And the gangster finds his affinities, outside of the criminal element, the Jewish criminal element in the United States, finds them in these Elmer Gantrys, and the sex fantasy-ridden constituencies of Robertson, Falwell, and company.

Wall Street Journal's hate propaganda vs. Clinton, LaRouche

by Edward Spannaus

"The *Wall Street Journal* editors lie without consequence," White House deputy legal counsel Vincent Foster wrote in a note to himself a few days before he apparently killed himself in July 1993. "I was not meant for the job or the spotlight of public life in Washington. Here ruining people is considered sport."

A month before his death, the *Wall Street Journal* had run an editorial, part of its editorial "series" targetting Clinton administration officials from Little Rock, entitled "Who Is Vincent Foster?" About a week before Foster's death, he had also been targetted in another editorial which accused "the Rose clique from Little Rock" of running wild in the Justice Department—referring to members of the Rose Law Firm, in which Hillary Clinton, Foster, and Webster Hubbell were all partners.

Without missing a beat, a few days after Foster's death, the *Wall Street Journal* ran yet another lead editorial on Foster, this one with the matter-of-fact title, "A Washington Death."

"We had our disagreements with Mr. Foster during his short term in Washington," said the editorial, in a model of understatement, "but we do not think in death he deserves to disappear in a cloud of mystery that we are somehow ordained never to understand." Indeed, the *Journal* made sure that Foster, and his colleagues, did not disappear from the *Journal's* sight: It kept up its relentless attacks through to the present day.

We will return to the story of the *Journal's* crusade against President Clinton and his administration a bit later. But first, an earlier case study—and also one that continues to the present time: the *Wall Street Journal's* role in the campaign of defamation and the illegal prosecution of Lyndon LaRouche.

'Get LaRouche'

The *Journal* played a prominent role in the news-media campaign of defamation against Lyndon LaRouche, which was organized out of the "Public Diplomacy" operation in the Reagan-Bush National Security Council and State Department. "Public Diplomacy" was a veritable Ministry of Propaganda within the United States government; the seed money for the operation came from Richard Mellon Scaife's founda-

tions, as well as the Smith-Richardson Foundation, a longtime adjunct of the Anglophile sections of the CIA.

The “Public Diplomacy” propaganda effort against LaRouche was part of the conditioning of public opinion which was seen as a prerequisite for a successful judicial frame-up of LaRouche. The *Journal* played a central role in this illegal operation, not only providing an outlet for derogatory articles on LaRouche, but even assisting in recruiting false witnesses for the prosecution.

This is how it worked.

In the spring of 1983, the incipient “Get LaRouche” news media operation was organized at a meeting held at the New York apartment of Wall Street financier John Train. At that meeting were representatives of the news media, of government intelligence agencies and the Bush “secret government” apparatus, and, of course, Richard Mellon Scaife himself. This was the first of at least three such meetings.

A few weeks earlier, on Jan. 12, friends of Henry Kissinger had raised the “problem” of LaRouche at a meeting of the President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB). Under the fraudulent pretext of investigating whether LaRouche and his organization were the recipients of foreign funding, the FBI launched a “national security” investigation of LaRouche under the purported authority of Executive Order 12333; among other things, E.O. 12333 permitted the use of private parties and private contractors in official government-run intelligence operations. (The drafting of E.O. 12333 was all done in seminars and think-tanks financed by Scaife; these same institutions financed much of the personnel for the “secret government” apparatus.)

According to legal evidence on file in the LaRouche case in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in Richmond, Virginia, a participant in the “Train Salon” meeting described that meeting as involving about 25 journalists; among the news media agencies represented were NBC-TV, *Readers’ Digest*, the *New Republic*, and the *Wall Street Journal*.

The opening guns of the campaign were two NBC-TV attacks on LaRouche run in January and March 1984; the second of these was produced by Pat Lynch, a participant in the Train Salon meetings who later co-authored a key attack on LaRouche in the *Wall Street Journal*. Another participant was Dennis King, who later wrote a book attacking LaRouche, financed by the Smith-Richardson Foundation.

Two major *Wall Street Journal* pieces on LaRouche came out of the Train meetings.

The first was published in the March 23, 1986 issue, and was written by Ellen Hume. When interviewed a few days later, Hume acknowledged that she had attended one of the Train meetings; she said that sources for her article included NBC’s Patricia Lynch and law enforcement sources. Hume’s article was headlined, “LaRouche Group, Long on Political Fringe, Gets Mainstream Scrutiny.” Hume’s article also targeted LaRouche’s contacts with officials of the the Reagan

administration. It also included the by-then-standard “cult” characterization of LaRouche’s organization and cited various investigations. It contained not one word about LaRouche’s actual economic policies.

The second attack on LaRouche came in the form of a May 27, 1986 *Wall Street Journal* piece co-authored by NBC’s Pat Lynch and Dennis King. An FBI document later obtained by LaRouche’s attorneys, showed that Lynch had obtained information about prospective government witnesses who might be used against LaRouche. Lynch and King illegally obtained confidential grand jury information; they also interviewed a number of former associates of LaRouche whose statements provided a “roadmap” for Federal prosecutors. In effect, under the cover of writing an article for the *Wall Street Journal*, Lynch and King became “recruiters” for the Justice Department’s “Get LaRouche” task force.

Assistant U.S. Attorney John Markham, the lead Federal prosecutor in the LaRouche cases, later confirmed in court testimony that he had learned of a number of potential witnesses from the Lynch-King *Wall Street Journal* article.

Other Journal attacks on LaRouche

The *Wall Street Journal*’s attacks on LaRouche began much earlier, however. On May 24, 1973, after members of the Communist Party, USA had provoked a series of violent confrontations with LaRouche’s organization, the *Wall Street Journal* praised the CPUSA. LaRouche’s organization, “grandiosely titled the National Caucus of Labor Committees, wants to destroy the CPUSA,” the *Journal*’s editorial complained, adding: “These deranged goings-on have produced one edifying result we can support. The Communists and the Trotskyists are forming a front in defense of Law and Order.” (Perhaps encouraged by the *Wall Street Journal*, the CPUSA’s defense of law and order got to the point that by November 1973, the CPUSA and FBI were collaborating in planning the “elimination” of LaRouche.)

Later, after LaRouche had been railroaded to prison, the *Journal* ran an article by Sergio Sarmiento, Spanish-language editor of Encyclopedia Britannica Publishers, Inc., entitled “Lyndon LaRouche’s Latin American Connection.” It reviewed the LaRouche movement’s activities in Latin America, commenting that “his kind of lunacy may not be as innocent as it seems,” comparing LaRouche’s movement to “Hitler’s fanatics.”

On April 9, 1992, an editorial in the *Wall Street Journal* endorsed the Federal Election Commission (FEC) denial of Presidential campaign matching funds to LaRouche, with the following comment: “Fringe candidates with fanatical followings love public financing. Lyndon LaRouche milked taxpayers for several million dollars. . . .”

Defending George Soros

In recent months, as LaRouche’s influence around the world has skyrocketed, because of recognition of the accuracy

of his economic forecasting, two notable interventions against LaRouche by the *Wall Street Journal* have taken place.

First, on Sept. 19, 1997, the Asia and Europe editions (but not the U.S. edition) ran a front-page article entitled "Malaysia's Mahathir Finds Strange Source for Soros Campaign: Asian Country's Media Tap U.S. Conspiracy Theorist Lyndon LaRouche, Jr." The authors claim that some of Mahathir's attacks against speculator George Soros "apparently came from an unusual source: a publication run by Lyndon LaRouche, Jr., an eccentric 75-year-old American who spins elaborate conspiracy theories, has run unsuccessfully for President five times and was convicted in 1989 of conspiracy charges in the U.S."

"LaRouche," the authors say, "has alleged that Mr. Soros is a key figure in a global financial conspiracy against sovereign nation-states involving, among others, the Queen of England, international drug cartels and the Israeli secret service. . . ."

"Mr. LaRouche has long been at odds with the U.S. political mainstream, which regards him as an extremist in his views about reforming the global financial system. But his theories receive a warmer reception in Malaysia, where the 60-page *EIR* report on Mr. Soros has been passed among Malaysian editors, intellectuals and politicians."

While the *Wall Street Journal* didn't dare run that article in the U.S. editions, it ran another piece aimed at LaRouche on the front page of its Dec. 23, 1997 edition. Aimed at making it appear that LaRouche is behind the attacks on deposed Teamster president Ron Carey, the article opened with a reference to "far-right politician Lyndon LaRouche." The article was ostensibly on the nefarious career of Richard Leebove, a long-ago associate of LaRouche who is currently press spokesman for Teamster presidential candidate James Hoffa, Jr. Leebove is identified in the first sentence as having "worked for far-right politician Lyndon LaRouche." The article included lies such as: "Mr. LaRouche was obsessed with the Teamsters, believing that foreign interests, Jews and Kennedy left-wingers were conspiring to take over the right-leaning union as part of a plot to weaken the U.S. industrial base."

'Get Clinton'

The *Journal's* crusade against the Clinton administration began almost as soon as it was in office. On March 2, 1993, the *Journal* ran the first of its editorials entitled, "Who Is Webster Hubbell?"—which was to grow into a long-running series, and one with tragic consequences, in the case of White House deputy legal counsel Vincent Foster. The "Who Is . . ." series targetted the members of the Rose Law Firm in the Clinton administration: Hillary Clinton, Webster Hubbell, Vincent Foster, and William Kennedy III.

In early June, the *Journal* called Foster's office to ask for his photo, which Foster's office initially declined to provide. So, on June 17, the *Journal* ran a "Who Is Vincent Foster?"

editorial, with an outline of a man's head with a big question mark in it. A week later, another editorial, on the subject of the health care task force, began: "Meet Vincent Foster." On July 14, shortly before Foster's death, another *Journal* editorial accused the "Rose clique of Little Rock" of running wild in the Justice Department, and preventing Attorney General Janet Reno from running the place.

Within days of Foster's death by suicide on July 20, 1993, the *Journal* was back at it again, an editorial entitled "A Washington Death." The editorial commented that "we have devoted considerable space to inquiring after the precise nature of the activities of the four Rose Law Firm partners working in the Clinton administration. . . . We think these issues are entirely appropriate, and presume there will be occasion to return to them in the future."

Indeed there were. The "Who Is Webster Hubbell?" series continued. On Feb. 14, 1994, the fifth installment appeared. The *Journal's* original objection to Hubbell seems to have been that he was an "outsider" coming into the Justice Department, interfering with the career professionals and the permanent bureaucracy; now they called Hubbell the "regent in the Justice Department." When Hubbell was forced to resign, the *Journal* started a new series with a March 15, 1994 editorial entitled, "Who Was Webster Hubbell?—I." And all the while, the *Journal* continued its morbid fascination with Foster's

So, You Wish To Learn All About Economics?

So, You Wish
To Learn All
About Economics?



by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

A text on elementary mathematical economics, by the world's leading economist. Find out why *EIR* was right, when everyone else was wrong.

Order from:

Ben Franklin Booksellers, Inc.
P.O. Box 1707 Leesburg, VA 20177

\$10 Call toll free 1-800-453-4108.
plus shipping (\$1.50 for first book, \$.50 for each additional book). Bulk rates available. Information on bulk rates and videotape available on request.

death by accusing special counsel Robert Fiske of conducting a “cover-up,” and filing a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit for records concerning Foster’s death.

The media ‘food chain’

A little over one year ago, on Jan. 6, 1997, the White House sent shock waves throughout much of the news media—both in the United States and in Britain—with the release of its explosive 331-page report documenting the “media food chain” and the central role played by the British press in orchestrating news media attacks on the President. The report, “Communication Stream of Conspiracy Commerce,” documented, in the White House’s own way, what readers of *EIR* were informed of very well: that many of the stories retained in U.S. press outlets such as the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Washington Times*, and so on, came directly from the British press.

Despite attempts by the *Washington Post* and other “major” media to ridicule the White House report, the *Washington Post* itself had run a feature in May 1994, headlined “Brits Keep Tabs on Clinton Sex Life: London Papers Trumpet Tawdry Allegations About the President,” featuring the role of the London *Sunday Telegraph* and its Washington correspondent, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard. The *Post* commented: “Some of what appears in London soon echoes back across the Atlantic. The *Wall Street Journal* editorial page and the *Washington Times* have repeated some of the *Sunday Telegraph*’s allegations.”

In the White House report, the section of documentation was entitled, “Sources without Credibility: Pushing Stories into the Mainstream Press.” The first example given was: “Whitewater: From Floyd Brown to *Wall Street Journal*.” The report showed how Floyd Brown, the creator of the notorious “Willie Horton” ads for George Bush in the 1992 Presidential campaign, had met with members of the *Wall Street Journal* editorial board in February 1994, and then, within weeks, the *Journal* had devoted nearly half of its editorial page, on March 4, 1994, to reprinting documents it had obtained from Brown.

Then, on March 9, 1994, Brown put out a “Whitewater fax bulletin,” saying that then-Whitewater special counsel Robert Fiske had subpoenaed a number of Clinton administration officials but had missed one: Patsy Thomasson, who Brown said was a friend of convicted Arkansas drug dealer Dan Lasater, and who searched Vincent Foster’s office after his death. So, the next day, on March 10, the *Journal* ran an editorial entitled “Who Is Patsy Thomasson,” citing her alleged ties to Lasater.

The White House report cited another example, a fraudulent story about an associate of Lasater named Dennis Patrick. This story began in the London *Economist* on May 7, was then picked up and published in the London *Sunday Telegraph* on May 8, and the *Times* of London on May 12, and from there, according to the White House report, made

its way into the *Washington Times* on May 13, Pat Robertson’s “700 Club” on June 6, and then the *Wall Street Journal* on June 21.

The *Journal* has not limited itself to attacks on Clinton cronies in the Justice Department. Its editorial page frequently features articles by Micah Morrison, identified as a “*Journal* editorial page writer,” who accuses Clinton of complicity in drug-running, money-laundering, and many murders in Arkansas; Morrison’s articles, and the editorial comments which often accompany them, are right at home on the lowest, bottom-feeding levels of the media food chain. But what would you expect from a *Wall Street Urinal*?

Wall Street Journal: tool of destruction

by Richard Freeman

From its May 1973 editorial supporting the Communist Party USA’s goon attacks against the LaRouche movement, to its Sept. 19, 1997 front-page defense of speculator George Soros against Lyndon LaRouche, the *Wall Street Journal*, America’s “business” paper of record, and second largest circulation newspaper, has made clear that it is dedicated to erasing the ideas, and even the presence, of Lyndon LaRouche.

The *Journal* proceeds from axiomatic beliefs which have led it to defend Fed Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker’s October 1979 high-interest-rate destruction of the U.S. physical economy; promote the disastrous 1981 deregulation of the U.S. banking system; and champion Anti-Defamation League/mob-linked financiers Michael Milken and Ivan Boesky and their junk-bond leveraged buy-outs, which ravaged the economy further, as the “free spirits” of “free enterprise.”

The *Journal* presents the world from the vantage-point of a speculator. It envisages a world in which the usury-driven “market” rules all, and in which the sovereign nation-state is to be “withered away,” subordinated to the demands of the speculators. Long owned by the Boston Brahmin Bancroft family, the *Journal* voices the policy of the Wall Street-City of London axis, which is controlled by the British financier oligarchy. From its 1889 inception, the *Journal* has been deeply opposed to the American System of Economics of Gottfried Leibniz, Alexander Hamilton, and Abraham Lincoln. In this system, the state dirgistically fosters anti-usury, energy-intensive, capital-intensive economic development. It develops the cognitive power of the sovereign mind, which is the source of all economic wealth.

But, the *Journal* underwent a further policy change soon