

LaRouche outlines plans to D.C. press

by Nicholas F. Benton

Noting that a poll of the jury confirmed that he was “cheated out of an acquittal” by the mistrial of the court case against him declared in Boston May 4, Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche told a jammed Washington, D.C. press conference that he is still very much in the race for President, and has an indispensable role to play in the crisis-ridden months ahead that will leave the nation with little choice but to catapult him into the White House.

Appearing publicly in the nation’s capital for the first time in two years, LaRouche told reporters at the National Press Club May 5, “Had the problems imposed on the campaign by the trial not occurred . . . we would not now be faced with the horrible non-choice between two front-running zeroes now contending for the Presidency.”

“Now,” he said, “I don’t know what the chances are for me to make much of an impact on the counting aspect of the campaign, but considering the crisis the United States is entering—we’re headed now for a Hoover depression breaking out in 1989, we’ve got a strategic crisis, we’ve got epidemic diseases—as a patriot with all his limitations, being the only person running who’s qualified for the position of President under these conditions, I’m just going to keep on running.”

Questions put to LaRouche by the assembled journalists focused on his role in the 1988 presidential campaign from now on.

Asked if he felt he had “any chance whatsoever” of winning the presidency, LaRouche responded, “Yes. If you say, does it look probable, then, of course, no. But remember that we’re now coming into a critical period from the middle to the end of May, and possibly a slightly longer period, during which it is extremely likely that another shoe is going to drop on the process which broke out on Black Monday last October.”

The double zero option

“Add the story about astrology in the White House and George Bush’s problems, plus people beginning to look at that zero in Massachusetts, Dukakis, taking a second look at him and saying, ‘Hey, we didn’t know what we were voting for.’ Under these conditions,” LaRouche said, “If the American people and some political bosses around this country realize we’re in a crisis and they say, ‘We’re not going to turn this country over to a choice between two zeroes,’ at that

point my significance becomes twofold. One, there will be a number of people . . . who will push to somehow get me in the picture in a brokered convention. . . . Secondly, if they don’t consider me as a likely winner of the nomination . . . they will say, ‘OK, you’ve got to be a power broker behind the scenes. You’ve got to be the brains behind the Democratic Party campaign, and the next presidency. In either case, I think we’d see our country safely through this crisis.’”

LaRouche was questioned about his heavy attack on the two frontrunners. He quipped, “The best argument for either is the other one.”

Asked “what’s wrong with Bush and Dukakis?” LaRouche responded, “What can you see in George Bush? Who is George Bush? This is one time I agree with [cartoonist] Garry Trudeau. There is a spot where you say George Bush is there, but what is there?”

“As for Michael Dukakis,” he continued, “almost no one in the country knows who he is. People in Massachusetts know he’s almost nothing. He’s a wholly-owned property of a group in Boston which is identified with a law firm called Hill and Barlow, and a financial interest called The Vault. These interests have run both his governorships, which have been catastrophic failures, in fact. Governor King’s governorship in between is the thing that Dukakis is bragging about, in terms of results. He now faces a half-billion deficit in a budget which he’s been bragging he balanced. The man, in the two times he’s been governor, has done nothing. He is simply a figurehead. He has no record.”

LaRouche’s base of support

When asked where his support at a brokered Democratic convention will come from, he said, “We’re heading for a depression. I’ve laid this out with people around the country, with state officials at the highest level—Democratic Party and Republican leaders, most on the state level—and we’ve been talking about this problem. . . . What does this mean on a state and local level? . . . State and local governments cannot, by law, have deficits. There is going to be approximately a 50% drop in the tax revenue base of federal, state, and local budgets during the coming period. You cannot cut the operating budgets of state and local government by 50%.

“Therefore, going into Atlanta, the people coming there as super delegates, not from the Washington crowd . . . but the state officials and key local government officials, know they’re going into such a crisis. . . . They’re going to come in, closing down hospitals, closing down schools, all the other horrors that go with this kind of thing, with talk from Bush’s crowd about shutting down Social Security and halving Medicare, putting a 15¢ tax on gas at the pump. They’re going to go in there mad. And they want a package. They don’t want a personality, they want a package. . . . In that circumstance, there is nobody going in there . . . capable of dealing with this problem. I am. And the state and local people know it.”