

# Lyndon LaRouche hits the campaign trail in New Hampshire

On Sept. 13, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. returned to his native state of New Hampshire to campaign for the 1988 Democratic presidential nomination. His return, following a several-month stay in Western Europe, comes at an extraordinary moment in history, as the President of the United States is proceeding toward an Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) agreement with the Soviet Union, which will leave the Western alliance indefensible. LaRouche vowed, in a press conference in Manchester, New Hampshire, to “rip up” that treaty when he becomes President, should it be signed by President Reagan and ratified by the Senate.

LaRouche’s campaigning is the more remarkable, in that his enemies never expected him to be there at all. On Sept. 21, the U.S. Justice Department will commence its long-awaited trial against LaRouche and associates, in a last-ditch effort to stop his political impact and prevent him from becoming President. Nearly one year ago, on Oct. 6, 1986, a massive raid against companies linked to LaRouche in Leesburg, Virginia, was intended to smash LaRouche’s political movement, with a knockout blow from which that movement would never recover. Instead, despite perhaps the most intensive attacks ever launched by a government faction against a U.S. political figure, LaRouche’s support, and the power of his ideas, are growing day by day.

We publish here excerpts from several of his speeches and press conferences in New Hampshire.

## Why the economic crisis?

*Opening remarks at a “town hall” meeting in Manchester on Sept. 13, attended by 160 supporters.*

... Right now we’re in the beginning of the biggest financial crash in world history. How rapidly this crash will develop is difficult to say. But, if Mr. Greenspan—Alan Greenspan, the new chairman of the Fed—continues to do as he is doing, I’d say it would come on very soon; because the man is the ayatollah of the Federal Reserve System—the worst economist in the United States, I believe. . . .

Back at the end of the War, we had nearly two-thirds of

our people who were employed in producing something useful—goods, mainly manufacturing or other kinds of industries such as construction, or in farming—producing wealth, the kind of wealth on which human existence depends. About 60% or 52% was the figure then.

Today, we’re down to about 20% of the labor force producing. The United States used to export. The United States is no longer capable of providing for the needs of its own people. They tell you there are food surpluses in the United States. Well, that’s true only to the degree that people in the United States can’t afford to buy it. That is, per capita food production in the United States is less than it was at the end of the 1960s. Why? You eat less, because you can afford less. . . .

We no longer produce. We have food. Where do we get our food from? Well, we don’t get it from our own farmers. *We import it from the hungriest countries in the world.* We import food from Mexico, where there’s hunger. We import food from Brazil, where there’s hunger. We import food from Africa, where there’s starvation. We put our own farmers out of business, because it’s cheaper to take the food out of the mouths of starving people in Central and South America, and Africa, and elsewhere. This is called surplus. We no longer produce.

So, we are engaged in service industries. Now that’s something: unskilled labor, done by illiterates, for the lowest possible wages. You have a President that says to us that he’s created 8 million new jobs, during his administration. It’s a lie! What has happened is that people have lost jobs for which they got something like a normal income, and they’re now working at 40%, on the average, of the wages that they got when they had a proper job earlier. What are they doing now? They’re doing service jobs, unskilled forms of labor, selling hamburgers to each other at fast food stands. . . .

But all this costs. Even with these miserable jobs, somebody has to pay for it; it comes out of the economy. And you have 80% of the labor force either unemployed, or doing administrative, clerical, sales, service, and only 20% actual-

ly producing wealth. Not enough physical wealth: junk, and very high-priced junk, because it takes four people to look at one person working, and you have to pay for four. In the old days, it took one person to look at four people working. Nowadays, four people. My guess is, because of poor eyesight—I don't know. Maybe some of the things that people are smoking impair their powers of vision. . . .

And the foreign policy and strategic policy of the United States are now being based on the fact that the United States could not produce enough to defend itself. . . .

[Look at the Russian Empire, the Bolshevik Dynasty.] As a matter of fact, a lot of the so-called communist leaders of Russia today are members of the old aristocratic families which have ruled Moscow for a thousand years and longer. Like the fellow who's negotiating at Geneva, Vorontsov, the number three-man in the party apparatus. He's an aristocrat! The Soviet ambassador to Washington, Dubynin, is a Russian aristocrat of the Prokrovsky family. The first Russian foreign minister, Chicherin, was a Russian aristocrat, descendant of the Cicerini family of Venice, who went there in the 15th century. It's just an old bunch of Russian aristocrats doing the same things that the Muscovites have done over the past 500 years. They are out to conquer an empire.

Now, how does that stand up against what we, in the West, are supposed to have? If we take Japan into account, the so-called OECD, or industrialized Western nations, represent more than twice the population of the Russian Empire. We, of these nations, providing we're employed in proper jobs, we have on the average the ability to produce twice as much as the average Russian. In addition to these countries, where we're twice as strong; and we're potentially four times as strong, economically, because of our superior productivity—if we're employed and allowed to use our productivity. Because we have brains. Russians don't believe in brains, they believe in the *earth*. . . .

[LaRouche describes the further potentialities of Ibero-American nations, Africa, and India, showing how the United States and its friends—or potential friends—in fact control most of the world's productive potential.]

We went through something some years ago called the civil rights movement. And some people like Martin Luther King got the funny idea that the Constitution ought to be taken seriously, and the Declaration of Independence, and said that people, particularly since the Jim Crow decisions at the turn of the century, had been kept out of the mainstream of opportunity in this nation and had a right to get into it like everybody else—in education, in employment, and just plain living. And up in the middle of the 1960s we all thought that was pretty good. Then somebody murdered Dr. King.

We all, at that point, during the civil rights movement, accepted the proposition that the rights of the individual—including economic rights, the right to develop, the right to be educated, the right to seek better employment, the right to

improve one's condition in life, the right to play a meaningful part in developing society and the world, the right to be respected for the good that one contributes to life in the world, even if it's contributing a new child—these are fundamental rights! We believed in them.

We don't believe that anymore. Or, many of us do, but our government doesn't believe that, hasn't believed in it for 20 years. Our government says, "You're too educated; you need to be de-schooled. You're oppressed by being told to know something. Now, we'll give you the kind of teachers to insure that you don't learn anything." As a matter of fact, every day your child goes to school, he comes home a bit more stupid at the end of the day. That's the kind of teaching we've got. We have children who will get to the age of 25, with what is called "terminal degrees"—which has a certain meaning in this day and age: It means that you've reached bottom. . . .

We used to say that technological progress was good, that any problem that comes along, well, we'll put our science and technology to work, we'll figure something out, we'll make things better; it may not be perfect, but we'll keep making things better; we can attack every problem.

Go back now to health, for example. Back in the 1960s—when we still believed that Martin Luther King, when he addressed the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, was addressing our conscience—we had a hospital system. Oh, it was terrible, full of all kinds of problems, typified by Bellevue in New York City. Terrible, run-down things, never done right; people underpaid, and all sorts of problems. But back in that day and age, 20 years ago, if somebody fell down in the street, and somebody called a police officer, somebody would pick that person out of the street, get an ambulance, and take him to some hospital as quickly as possible. And that person would probably live. Then, of course, there was the usual nonsense of who's going to pay for all this, but that came afterward. The first concern was to keep the person alive and give him the necessary treatment that he, as a human being, deserved. Then afterwards the nonsense came.

Now, we don't have that anymore. Over the past 20 years, they tore down a system of rather beaten-down, run-down, city, county, public and voluntary hospitals. *Now, if you're found on the street, you'll probably die while they try to find somebody to begin the paperwork*—which may not be until next Monday, and you're there Friday night, and you're just going to lie there and bleed, until somebody comes in on Monday.

We used to have a workable system. It was bad, it was full of flaws, people suffered, but compare what we had then with what we have today.

Today, many doctors around the world, increasing numbers of them, are saying: "Doctors, for years, have been saving lives—for generations. We've gone too far. We've got to reverse the trend. We've got to start killing people,

pulling the plug.”

Do you trust your night nurse with a pillow? It's a common occurrence. In the Netherlands, in Holland, murder of patients in hospitals by physicians is now epidemic. It's not a few isolated cases; it's a common occurrence, a common, daily occurrence.

Throughout the United States, in insidious ways, physicians are killing their patients. Hospitals, and hospital systems, and insurance systems are setting up procedures for killing patients. There are many ways to kill a patient, aren't there? Starve them; don't provide them care; stall them; manipulate the system. Just increase the death rate!

What happened to our morality? What happened to, basically, what 20 years ago we thought we could take for granted? What happened to the standard of morality that we would apply to ourselves, our own behavior, and the behavior of others, and the behavior of the government? It's gone! . . .

Take the person who's got AIDS. We now have between 5 and 10 million people infected with AIDS in the United States. What's that? That's a trillion dollars. How soon do we have to pay the trillion dollars? Over the next 10 years. A trillion dollars! And by then there'll be more people infected. We're talking about 2 or 3 trillion dollars for medical costs alone for AIDS—even presuming that 10 years from now we have a cure available. We're going to solve that problem. I would spend \$50 billion a year on research, if we had the people who could do it. We don't. We only have enough people and facilities to spend \$3 billion a year on research for a cure for AIDS. . . .

So, it's the job of people in the position of President, and so forth, to be the philosophers, the leaders, the people out front leading the charge to make things possible; to know what has to be done, and to do it. But the survival of this nation depends, in the first instance, on activating the potential of the majority of our individual citizens; making it possible for them to do what they are capable of doing. If they are remoralized and have confidence in attempting to do it once again, we can get back to a nation with a sense of the future.

And if, in the course of my campaigning—and I think we can either win the New Hampshire primary, or take a large chunk of it—in the course of the campaigning, if we can activate at least some of that sense of a different morality, the kind of morality we used to like—morality which rejects escapism. A morality which believes in the higher aspect of our nature, not the bestial aspect alone; which is not pessimistic—it doesn't say, “Well, the world's going to hell, I'm going to take care of myself”—getting away from that, and saying, “Look, I've got only one life, and each of you has only one life.”

I don't care what they tell you; you have only one life! One mortal life, and then you're gone—just the way I'm going to go pretty soon. How are you going to spend it?

What's going to come out of it? What, in the long reach of many generations, is your living going to mean? Will people say, “I wonder what that was all about?”—your life? Or, will they say that you brought up a child, or that you did something else which beautified and enriched humanity's prospects, and, that you enjoyed doing that? That you believed in the importance of doing that? And you did it well?

And you know that part of you, that capacity, even to love a child, which is the higher aspect of yourself. Are you able to live accordingly? Are you able to live courageously? Are you able to realize that there are some things so important that you would die for them? Rather than running like a rat, a pessimistic rat, to the next television entertainment—some silly soap opera, or some bunch of actors who are going to die of AIDS the next season—teaching you how to live.

Find that in yourself which makes you better. My job is to be the fighter and the leader who helps you, thus, to find the best within yourselves. I will lead; you are going to do, and you are going to govern this nation. This is a system of self-government we must restore. My function is to create the conditions under which the kind of self-government which this nation was intended to have is restored and becomes actualized. And it will become actualized if you, I think, understand the point I've just made, in your own terms of reference.

## The New Hampshire campaign

*The following is excerpted from LaRouche's discussion during the question and answer period at the town meeting in Manchester on Sept. 13.*

. . . It's our plan to have 100 campaign organizers, functioning by the end of September, or at the beginning of October. It's our plan to have 1,000 campaign organizers in the field by the end of January. It's our plan to have an operating network of 5,000 to 6,000 in the state of New Hampshire. It is our plan that every member of the network, 5,000 to 6,000, represents 10 voters in the New Hampshire primary. Now, guess how many votes that means? . . .

That's my kind of politics! I never met most of these candidates, but that's my kind of politics! Representative government! And, my aim is not merely to get *me* elected—I really don't want the job. I just think I've got to do it, it's my moral duty to take the job. . . .

My job is to create in this country a movement, a movement which is really representative government. My job is to encourage people to run for office, who've got sense, which means that almost any citizen can easily replace any member of Congress. All you have to do is have devotion, sense, and commitment—that's all you need! . . .

We're going to change this nation in the next several months—in New Hampshire. Among these poor, frightened people in New Hampshire, who didn't think they had a chance. We're going to change the world. . . .