

The incompetence of George Bush

LaRouche analyzes qualifications of presidential hopefuls

George Bush is a contender for the GOP's nomination as its presidential candidate for the 1980 elections. His qualifications to hold the highest elected office in the United States are the subject of many questions. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., who announced his candidacy for President on Jan. 15, answers these questions in a statement (excerpted below) issued Jan. 29.

Some close acquaintances of mine requested my evaluation of the possible merits of George Bush as an alternate to British nominee for President, General Alexander Haig. By reporting the highlights of the matter publicly, I shall not have injured my acquaintances' interest in receiving an evaluation privately, and I shall have fulfilled my duty to numerous others within the Republican Party.

First, I situate the discussion of Bush. This is accomplished by outlining the quality of **process** a general election campaign ought to be. In the case of Mr. Bush, one should consider the matter of organization and policy for our nation's intelligence services.

The campaign as a process

If our national general election campaigns were conducted in the national interest, the selection of the leading candidates would be only an important secondary function of the process as a whole. The primary function of a prolonged (18 months or so) campaign for election of a President is a broad and profound national review of our foreign and domestic policies, with included emphasis on the causal interconnections between the two. The function ought to be to draw as many as possible of the individual voters into a combined educational and self-educational process, in which individual citizens think through the questions which will determine the future security and prosperity of our nation and its posterity **as a whole**. (...)

This shift of attention to policy matters as a whole is not injurious to the individual self-interest. The question whether there will be improvement in household incomes is a question whether the total national economic pie will grow or shrink. The question of employment and job security of the individual citizen will depend on the scope of opportunities provided for the nation as a whole. In thinking about the nation as a whole, the individual citizen is helping to shape the policies which will determine the opportunities and other circumstances of individual life. Will the citizen find himself engaged in fratricidal battle with his neighbor for one among a diminishing number of

jobs, fight with a sickened neighbor for one of a diminishing number of hospital beds, or shall we as a nation provide adequate employment and medical care for all?

An election campaign must not be a mere parading of candidates, efforts to sell each candidate like a brand of soap powder. An election campaign must be a process in which the candidates and the general electorate are qualitatively improved in knowledge and policy-outlooks, such that the general election balloting of November 1980 represents the outcome of an organic elevation of the national understanding and policy-outlook. Shall we repeat the dismal practice of balloting for what is perceived as the "lesser evil," or shall we — for a change — vote for a way of thinking, a policy-outlook and for a President best suited to implement that organic expression of an enlightened national will?

A good general election campaign ought to resemble a Platonic dialogue. The question of putting forward a candidate at this stage ought to center on several things. We ought to be concerned with what the prospective candidate has to contribute to the sort of dialogue the electorate requires. We ought to be concerned with the intellectual and moral qualities of the candidate, his or her ability to develop his or her own mind and outlook within the context of a Platonic dialogue, his or her ability to advance the quality of that dialogue. We must be concerned to find candidates who will oppose prevailing opinions, candidates who are not pollwatchers, who have the intellectual development and moral qualities to state what is right "without fear or favor" to guide them to any other course. Above all, we require candidates who are dedicated to the principles for which our nation's Founding Fathers fought against the British monarchy.

Generally, in both foreign and domestic policy, the central issue now confronting our institutions and our general electorate is the choice between continuing to have our policies dictated in London and the alternative of shifting our special alliance to the forces associated with France's President Giscard d'Estaing and Germany's Chancellor Schmidt. That choice will determine whether there will be thermonuclear war or durable peace during the next six years. That choice will determine whether the United States slides into a depression or rises into a durable period of growing global prosperity.

Circles associated with Arthur Goldberg and with the Mont Pelerin Society have gone to extravagant measures to suppress any knowledge of these choices from the general electorate. So far, only two prospective presidential or vice-presidential candidates, apart from myself, have endeavored to bring any of this

truth to the electorate. For the Republican Party, Congressman Jack Kemp has attempted to bring the truth concerning the European Monetary System into public knowledge. For the Democratic Party, Senator Adlai Stevenson has taken some steps in that same direction. None of the presented candidates, except myself, has so far mentioned the most crucial issue of the 1980 election campaign, the issue on which the very existence of our nation depends.

Examining each of the announced Republican candidates, we discover that each of them is actually running for the nomination of London's choice, General Alexander Haig. Granted some of these candidates are too dumb to recognize that fact, but the evidence is clear. Examining the campaign advisory staff of each, we find a nest of persons deployed from Eugene Rostow's Committee on the Present Danger. This committee has chosen General Haig as its 1980 choice; why, then, do the other Republican candidates make themselves mere pawns of the CPD? What are Bush, Reagan, Crane, Connally, actually running for? — to be nominated as the vice-presidential candidate on a Haig ticket.

The game is clear, these other candidates will chew themselves up in the primary campaigns, creating the deadlock and factional atmosphere which ensures a Haig selection. If Haig wins, the United States would surely be destroyed and defeated in thermonuclear war before 1984, if Brzezinski, Schlesinger, et al. do not push Carter into such a war before the 1980 general elections.

On the Democratic Party side, President Carter must be helped to get successfully through the remainder of his term in office. Another term would be unthinkable! What, then, Senator Kennedy? That would be an unthinkable abomination.

Among the Republican candidates fielded so far, Governor Ronald Reagan is without doubt the best, relatively speaking. Often wrong, too easily misled, he has shown a moral quality lacking in all the rest. Connally is a better intellect, and much slicker — but the policies to which he might apply his powers are left too much in doubt by both his flipping and flopping on vital issues, and his unfortunate, pro-British record as Nixon's Treasury Secretary. Crane is bright, but massively controlled by the wrong people, which is to say, corrupt. Ronald Reagan does not know his policies are corrupted; what he becomes depends upon the quality of his advisors. It ain't much, but it is unquestionably the best the Republican Party has fielded so far.

Bush League policies

Bush's announcement of his candidacy was most unfortunate. He had the effrontery to cite a London Economist report as the basis of reference for his proposed strategic outlook.

In light of Bush's past career, and the current issue of the quality of performance of U.S. intelligence services, Bush renders himself totally unacceptable from the outset.

It was British intelligence, with complicity of such figures as Zbigniew Brzezinski and Henry Kissinger, who orchestrated the destabilization of Iran, and are overtly dedicated to destabilizing the entire "arc of crisis." Admittedly, unless the Bakhtiar government successfully stabilizes the situation in Iran, there might begin a significant direct intervention by Soviet forces — and there are, admittedly signs that one faction in Moscow is

dedicated to initial activation of political options for such a contingency.

Bush has no excuse not to know this; hence, his citing a London Economist strategic estimate as his own inclination would be, by itself, adequate reason for dumping his candidacy from the outset. He is either corrupt or is of an incurably Bush-league quality of strategic intelligence competence. Granted, he might step forward to correct his own monstrous candidacy announcement. Barring that, his case is hopeless.

At this point, he is simply another Rostow-Schlesinger "Me, too" stalking horse for the candidacy of Haig, a spoiler for both the Reagan (most notably) and Connally candidacies. He is, tactically, simply more confusion.

The CIA angle

Were Bush to be regarded as a serious candidate, he would be expected to attack the wrecking of the CIA under the direction of Brzezinski, Turner, Schlesinger, Mondale, et al. He would be obliged to point out that the problem of CIA performance is largely the increased dependency on London, Canadian, and Israeli second-hand information through the destruction of the CIA's independent intelligence-gathering capabilities. He would be obliged to attack directly the Israeli signals of an intent to effect a total British-Israeli takeover of control of the CIA. He would insist on establishing the U.S. intelligence services' independence of the British-Canadian and Israeli agencies.

Implicitly, Bush has done the direct opposite.

1980: Year of the

Chinese Vice-Premier Teng Hsiao-ping's formulations concerning the Soviet Union and the world strategic balance bear a remarkable resemblance to views recently expressed by a number of leading British agents and agents of influence in the U.S. on the same topics. From National Security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski—who accused the Soviets last month of creating an "arc of crisis" stretching from Iran through the Horn of Africa to Afghanistan and Pakistan,—to Henry Kissinger, George Bush and NATO Supreme Commander Alexander Haig—these "policymakers" have been sounding very much alike—witness a speech Haig delivered in Paris Jan. 26, which the Christian Science Monitor characterized as "his sharpest warning yet about the dangers of the Soviet military buildup in Central Europe." One naturally wonders if they've been trying to fight inflation by sharing the same speechwriter.

Potential presidential candidate George Bush is particularly intriguing in this regard since he spent a substantial period of time in Peking as the U.S. envoy following the Nixon Administration's overture to China. Bush's current bid for the GOP presidential nomination is being backed—at least for now—by friends of Kissinger, including Anne Armstrong, the iron lady of the Texas Republican Party who was Ambassador to the Court of St. James during the Ford Administration. Armstrong sits on the board of Georgetown