

Bipartisan government in 1985, pledges LaRouche

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following release was issued on April 6.

If I choose to campaign for the 1984 presidential nomination of the Democratic Party, as I am presently inclined to do, and if I am also nominated and elected, I now solemnly pledge that my cabinet will constitute a bipartisan government. I would also ask President Ronald Reagan to consider a similar commitment, in the event of his almost-certain nomination and probable reelection.

The action taken by President Reagan, in establishing an irreversible new strategic doctrine for the United States, changed the course of human history at almost the same moment he completed his televised address to the nation. Within no less than 48 hours following that address, the government of the Soviet Union acted to accelerate its existing program of development of a full-scale strategic ABM system based on beam-weapons technologies. Among the leading political figures of the world, only small-minded fanatics still believe that the change in strategic doctrine could be reversed. The proverbial genie is out of the bottle, and no one could ever put it back in.

What the President has accomplished is what the great German poet, historian, dramatist, and political leader Friedrich Schiller defined as a *punctum saliens*. In the major crises of real history, and in the course of warfare among well-matched adversaries, as in the great classical tragedies of Aeschylus, Shakespeare, and Schiller himself, a point of no return is reached. At this point, there exists some unique command-decision to be made by a leading figure, on which the future course of events entirely depends. If that unique choice of command-decisions is made, the looming tragedy is averted. If that command-decision is not made at that point,

there is no power on earth capable of stopping the monstrous tragedy ready to unfold.

Dimensions of the crisis

At the moment the President made his historic command-decision of March 23, the world was already in the grip of a downward-spiralling, new economic depression, and was at the brink of the biggest worldwide financial collapse in history. We faced an almost certain new missile-crisis, far more dangerous than that of 1962, during the period between October 1983 and March 1984. If we escaped general nuclear warfare during that crisis, we faced the prospect of almost certain nuclear warfare sometime during the second half of the 1980s. The economies of the United States and Western Europe were collapsing into the helpless ruin of "post-industrial society." Our principal trading-partners of the developing nations were on the verge of either being destroyed by Khomeini-like murderous insanity, or were simply financially bankrupt and collapsing into economic and social ruin.

All of these critical problems had been avoidable. Over the recent 15 years or so, our nation had made the wrong decision at nearly every turning-point. We had continued an absurd policy of nuclear deterrence, which led lawfully to the brink of nuclear warfare. We had permitted Malthusian fanatics to bully government into turning our economy into a post-industrial scrap-heap. We had made wrong decisions at each point of new monetary crisis we should have reorganized an exhausted Bretton Woods system.

The problem has been that the habits of decision-making built into our government and major parties led us each time to the wrong choice of action in each of these areas. Unless some profound political shock broke up those acquired, built-



Stuart Lewis/NSIPS

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

in habits of decision-making, our civilization was doomed to die during the present decade. As the second quarter of 1983 approached, time was running out. The command-decision needed must be made now, and among all the forces in the world, only the President of the United States had the specific power to deliver that needed decision.

On March 23, 1983, that President acted. If our civilization is saved, as we may now hope it will be saved, it will be that decision of March 23 which made such a happy consequence possible.

'Do not blame President Reagan'

It may be deemed unfortunate by many, that the President's *punctum saliens* was in the form of a military-decision, a decision which obliges us to unleash a new, high-technology arms-race. Similarly, we stumbled through eight years of a Great Depression, from 1931 to 1939, before we ended the depression with the 1939-43 military-production buildup under President Roosevelt. We could have risen out of the depression by non-military means, at any point during the preceding eight years, but even President Roosevelt could not force through the needed actions of general economic recovery, except at the point the popular will forced through the decisions needed to mobilize idled labor, depleted agriculture, and collapsing industry for producing the means of warfare. Similarly, Lazare Carnot saved France from destruction under Jacques Necker and the Jacobin Terror, in 1793-94, by effecting an industrial revolution as part of a revolution in warfare.

Do not blame President Reagan, that we could be saved from our habitual follies only through a necessary decision

on strategic doctrine. The folly of warfare is the folly of the human condition from unremembered past to the present. Circumstances not created by him gave this President no other choice. He did not create the mess, the folly; he acted as President to mobilize us to work our way upward out of all of those catastrophes which loomed before us.

Our great republic and the Soviet Union are now locked into the new strategic doctrine the President has unleashed. We have no choice but to unleash that national mobilization of idled labor, depleted agriculture and industry, and ruined urban infrastructure, by which to develop and to deploy in the shortest possible time, a complete strategic defense-system adequate to ensure that our nation can not be physically destroyed within the initial 25 minutes of thermonuclear barrage. The resistance will vanish, as the whisper of a "fool," or perhaps even "traitor," is the word the citizens speak almost by reflex against whatever political figure would obstruct this inescapable effort.

Fundamental changes implied

This command-decision, and the mobilizations of our wasted capabilities it implies, will change fundamentally the trends of general opinion of our citizens, as well as the decision-shaping institutions of government and political parties. In this way, we shall become the United States of America once again.

We shall probably avoid the terrible war still threatening us. Sooner or later, it will become clear to the Soviet leadership that our government and our people will proceed with full commitment to implement the President's decision. At that point, the Soviet leadership will negotiate with us on the terms which the President and Defense Secretary Weinberger have implicitly offered publicly. Those negotiations will be successful, and will require neither power to compromise any interest which is truly vital. Those negotiations will accomplish the purpose stated by Richard Allen in a televised comment following the President's March 23 address: Mutual Assured Survival.

The Soviet reaction

At this present moment, the Soviet leadership is bitterly frustrated that the President has stopped the 15-year-long process of self-destruction of Western civilization. Until March 23, some gentlemen in Moscow might have dreamed that we would succeed in transforming ourselves into the pitiable wreckage of a post-industrial society, and that they might become world-hegemonic during the 1990s, on condition they manage their way through the strategic crises erupting in the last moments of our collapsing power. Any leading circles in Moscow whose thoughts had drifted hopefully in that direction, must have suffered an inevitable sudden rage of deep frustration as they heard the President's words on March 23. Even now, as Moscow dispatches expose this fact of the situation, dead dreams die hard.

Sooner or later, during the weeks ahead, the Soviet lead-

ership will reconcile itself to the inescapable fact, that the United States of the 1990s will be once again the greatest economic power on earth, and that the Soviet Union must learn to live on the same planet with our republic for a very long time to come. Then, albeit with bitter scars where dead dreams once flourished, they will negotiate the implementation of a new strategic order in world affairs, Mutually Assured Survival.

The reawakened power of reason

Out of this military endeavor there will erupt the greatest technological revolution in history. The benefits of controlled energy-flux densities, beyond the wildest dreams of a generation ago, will, during the next several years, begin to transform both industrial production and also our definitions of natural resources and raw materials. Within a decade, a single operative in one of a growing number of revolutionized industries will have the power to do the work of 10 or more skilled workers of today. Within the span of the remaining years of this century, laser-like devices above the gamma-ray spectrum will provide some skilled operatives the power to change the nuclear structure of matter at will. The average power of each of our citizens to produce the material prerequisites of life will rise to many times that of today's technology.

Accompanying this economic benefit for all our people, there will be a great resurgence of morality. Even within hours of the President's March 23 address, a significant upsurge of technological optimism was evident among our citizens. This represents a process of reawakening of the best features formerly associated with the American character. That best quality of the American character was not our concern with material wealth as such. It was a belief in reason, that the development of our powers of reason gave us the proper means for facing problems in all aspects of life. It was also a belief in developing these powers in our children and grandchildren, with aid of appropriate education, and thus bequeathing to our posterity a better world, a better life than we had known. It made us moral insofar as it prompted us to regard the brief span of our mortal existence as serving a purpose higher than those monetary pleasures whose memory dies in our graves.

During the coming years, we must be engaged in transforming the quality of both our political parties and our institutions of self-government. Our federal bureaucracy has been molded by 15 years of error in habits of decision-making. To guide that bureaucracy into the new habits of decision-making practice implicit in the new course of our national practice, it is essential that a certain continuity of leadership from the top-most positions be ensured. A President is elected for only four years, and serves at most for eight. The new directions in policy-making now unfolding since the March 23 *punctum saliens* of future world history, are policy-directions to be maintained and developed over decades. We must en-

sure to our children and grandchildren a different quality of response by government than has prevailed since the middle of the 1960s. Particular decisions come and go; new laws are enacted to replace old; technologies will develop rapidly. The quality of decision-making our people properly require of government does not change. We must mold habits of response by government, and must accomplish that by a continuity of direction in leadership of each branch and department of our federal government over successive terms of our Presidents.

I would heartily recommend to those of my fellow-citizens who wish to reflect on this matter, three books written by two among the great leaders of our nation in the past. The first was written in 1815 by Mathew Carey, a former Irish republican, who joined Dr. Benjamin Franklin in Paris, who became a great citizen of the city of Philadelphia, and did much to restore our national prosperity during the terms of office of Presidents Monroe and John Quincy Adams. His book, *The Olive Branch*, addresses the fact of the ruined condition of our major political parties of that time, the Federalist and Democratic-Republican parties, and proposes a bipartisan effort by the best currents of both parties to remedy the evils which had befallen our nation since 1796. The second two books are by Mathew Carey's son, the leading American economist of the 1840s through the 1870s, and Abraham Lincoln's chief economic advisor. I recommend his 1848 *The Past, The Present, and The Future*, and also his 1851 *The Harmony of Interest*. These are, admittedly, books from our past, but they aid us to put our present problems into historical perspective. We must learn how the past shaped our present, and use that knowledge gained to make us wiser in contemplating what consequence our present policy-actions will have for our own posterity.

Therefore, I now solemnly pledge, that were I to become President in January 1985, I would hope to invite some of the best officials of the Reagan administration, those who have performed well in implementing policies I deem in our nation's best interest, to be included in the new federal Government.

If both great parties of our nation are equally committed to the leading, essential features of the new direction in our republic's policy, although also disagreeing on some specific features of policy, this ensures the essential continuity of government. Properly designed, bipartisan government ensures the best government.

If I choose to run, it will be in large part to ensure that the Democratic Party is committed to effective implementation of the new strategic doctrine and the high-technology economic recovery that doctrine implies. I will also campaign, whether I become a candidate or not, to ruin the possibility that our Democratic Party could nominate a candidate or adopt a policy contrary to such a strategic doctrine, and contrary to such a high-technology economic recovery.