

## LaRouche Declares for 2004, Amid Crisis He Forecast

American statesman and economist Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. declared himself, on Jan. 1, for the Presidency in 2004, as the economic collapse he had forecast hit the United States with a force which, LaRouche warned, will intensify in coming months. Just days after LaRouche “set his guidon on top of the hill” to provide the leadership needed against the crisis, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan signalled desperation in the world of finance by a sudden, emergency interest-rate cut to “save” the Wall Street markets. LaRouche told the international audience of his Washington, D.C. seminar, also webcast on the Internet on Jan. 3, that such desperate “crisis-management” moves would make the collapse worse, that Greenspan was finished, and that the President and Congress had to use directed government credit to reconstruct the ruined economy.

LaRouche, in announcing, addressed himself above all to the Democratic Party, which he described as a “spectacle of confusion” following the disastrous campaign of anointed loser Al Gore. Though Bill Clinton will be the rallying figure for the party, LaRouche focussed on a more urgent problem: Both parties’ 2000 campaigns were dominated by the racist and anti-industrial “Southern Strategy” (see *EIR*, Jan. 1, 2001); therefore, both parties’ policy axioms make them capable only of making an economic blowout worse. LaRouche put forward his flag of leadership to “do what is equivalent, for today, to what Franklin Roosevelt did in his campaign of 1932.”

There was an immediate indication of this in the action of Kentucky Democratic state legislator Perry Clark. Clark sent a letter to all his colleagues on Jan. 3, pointing to the pre-election “prosperity” hype having been replaced by financial and economic decline, and saying that “our first question should be, were there any economists or political leaders who warned us of this? . . . The only person . . . is Lyndon LaRouche.” A few days earlier, Pennsylvania state legislator and Black Caucus chairman Harold James had sent an open

letter to members of the Congressional Black Caucus, asking them to challenge Florida’s Electors and to act on the lines of LaRouche’s call for an immediate Congressional investigation of voting irregularities and fraud in the 2000 Presidential election campaign. LaRouche’s call, which was being brought to all members of the new Congress, was signed by 125 state elected officials across the United States, by former members of Congress, and many other active Democrats.

### International Turnout for Webcast

At LaRouche’s Washington, D.C. seminar on Jan. 3, the candidate responded to a question from the Congressional Black Caucus: what to do about George W. Bush’s nomination of open Confederate sympathizer John Ashcroft as U.S. Attorney General? He advised the members of Congress to “jam the works up on this one”: Tell Bush to pull back the Ashcroft nomination before they agree to certify the Electoral College votes.

The seminar was attended by 125 people at the Washington location, including the one Democratic Elector who had chosen not to cast her ballot for Al Gore, and many civil and labor rights activists, representatives from six press outlets, and diplomats of 11 foreign countries. A second gathering near the United Nations in New York, included representatives of 14 nations to the international body, and a half-dozen international press agencies.

Other press, including the *Detroit News*, called in, asking LaRouche’s assessment of Bush Energy Secretary nominee, former Michigan Sen. Spencer Abraham. Other meetings in the United States and in South America, and thousands of individuals and small groups, were listening on the Internet.

The larger and broader attendance, relative to the series of webcasts LaRouche addressed during the election deadlock crisis of November and December, was a clear sign of the impact of the economic and energy emergencies which have so “suddenly” hit the United States. LaRouche had insisted

throughout his 18-month campaign for the Presidential election of 2000, that as soon as the false “booming prosperity” election hype was over, Americans would see the bottom fall out of the economy. The “prosperity” propaganda allowed Bush and Gore to never seriously mention the economy during the campaign.

LaRouche told the broadcast, “In talking about 2004, my

immediate concern is not what’s going to happen in the year 2004. My concern is what’s going to happen *now*, and whether we shall ever *get* to 2004 as a nation, or not. . . . The problem today is that, from everything you can see about what this team—not only Mr. Bush, but the entire team, his team—has said about policy, the incoming President promises to be the greatest catastrophe in American Presidential history.”

## LaRouche Announces: ‘I Take My Stand’


January 1, 2001

I herewith set my guidon at the top of the hill; those supporters of the Democratic Party, and others, who recognize the need to return to that quality of leadership out of a great financial crisis which President Franklin Roosevelt represents, must have a rallying-point around which to transform the efforts into an effective, mission-oriented mobilization, a mobilization to save this republic from what appears, presently, to be our assured ruin.

Although the outgoing President Bill Clinton will be, still, the leading institutional figure around which the Democratic Party will continue to be rallied as a party, that is not sufficient. The world is gripped by a great moral crisis, which is also a great economic crisis. The great need, is to return this nation, from the past 35 years direction in policy-making, by which the nation has ruled and ruined itself, to those successful principles of policy-shaping by means of which the nation survived the great crises of 1933-1945. The fate of this nation depends upon our ability to choose, now, a kind of leadership qualified to lead our republic out of the great catastrophe which 35 years of national folly have dumped upon us now.

Look at the spectacle of confusion raging throughout the Democratic Party today. I am reminded of a once-famous play by a Sicilian author, *Six Characters in Search of an Author*, an hysterical search for a consensus, which is reminiscent of panicked cockroaches in a New York City apartment’s kitchen, or of hungry prostitutes after a nuclear holocaust, each and all competing for the last surviving prospective customer. Typical is the virtual application for Republican Party membership, as might have been expected, as submitted on a recent CNN television broadcast by the Rev. Jesse Jackson. In short, the images of the Party’s reaction to the Supreme Court decision, are each only more disgusting than the next.

The immediate, urgent practical importance of presenting my candidacy now, is not the November 2004 vote;



the issue is whether this nation reaches November 2004 intact. Someone, a person actually qualified for this role, must place the guidon on the top of the hill, to rally the forces into order of battle, around urgent, fundamental changes in economic policy, for the days and months immediately ahead. At the moment, I am the only living person both situated and qualified to supply that quality of leadership.

The follies of the Gore candidacy, including the follies of those who relied upon that candidacy, are not clarified by the results obtained. The Democratic Party’s campaign for the year 2000 election-campaign, was a terrible mistake, a terrible error of substituting unprincipled political opportunism, in place of judgments based upon honest principle. To resume its proper role, the Party need not resort to public *mea culpas*; it will be sufficient to signal the turn, by doing the right thing, for a change.

This means a return to the principles set forth in the 1776 Declaration of Independence and the Preamble to the 1789 Federal Constitution. This means, once again, a repudiation of the legacy of Theodore Roosevelt, of Ku Klux Klan enthusiast Woodrow Wilson, of Coolidge, and of Nixon and Carter, too. It means to do what is equivalent, for today, to what Franklin Roosevelt did in his campaign of 1932. Our nation’s survival, and also that of your family, depends upon making that kind of change, now.

I take my stand. We shall sort out the succession in the leadership as the fight develops over the weeks and months to come.