

## Interview: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.



# George Bush has to say, 'Kissinger was wrong'

Nora Hamerman interviewed Mr. LaRouche on June 29 by telephone from the Alexandria Detention Center in Virginia, where he has been a political prisoner since Jan. 27.

**EIR:** I want to congratulate you on your candidacy for Congress from the 10th Congressional District in Virginia. In your announcement you put forward a parallel to Henry Clay and his 1812 campaign. Can you indicate why you were thinking along those lines?

**LaRouche:** Well, first of all at that point you had Albert Gallatin who had been running the second Jefferson administration and was running the Madison administration. The United States was at the point of entering an irreversible process of dismemberment by the forces around Britain and the forces represented by the relationship between Metternich and Lord Castlereagh for example, and the Holy Alliance of Vienna in 1815.

Clay emerged as a young Virginian who had migrated Kentucky and had a successful legal career. He emerged, elected from Kentucky, and became the Speaker of the House in his first term. It was Clay, as the head of that faction in the Congress, who saved the United States, over the reluctance of the Madison administration, and the virtual treason of Gallatin, who was of course an Anglo-Swiss agent inside the government.

In the present situation I don't want to impute anything wrongly to President Bush, but in performance, the United States of the past 20-odd years has been sliding [into the abyss], with various strategic agreements typified by Kissinger's policies over the period, by post-industrial society utopianism, by various forms of usury, of looting and ruining the economies of our friends and allies and so forth. We have now come to the point that we've got to pay the piper, one way or the other, and the question is whether we will recognize, that the policies of the past 20 years along these lines have been a *terribly* failed experiment; that we have to end the policies that have failed, before it's too late, and adopt

new policies.

That was pretty much the thrust of Clay, back then. The policies upon which the nation and the federal government had been founded had been eroded . . . and that was the basis for the destruction of our nation. Clay represented a return to those policies. That is what I essentially represent today. The parallel, with those kinds of qualifications, is a precise one. And if it obliges some people to study a bit of American history, all the better.

**EIR:** Some observers in Western Europe, in the midst of a general frustration about affecting the process in China, have suggested that sanctions against the Beijing regime should be accompanied by expanded trade and relations with Taiwan. What do you think about that idea?

**LaRouche:** That's simplistic. You could do that and still miss the boat. The problem today is that most people in government don't understand politics at all. George Bush understands absolutely nothing about strategy. I don't know what he may know *privately*, [but] to judge by his known, public behavior over the years and now, he does not understand the ABCs of strategy.

In Aeschylus' *Prometheus*, there is a reference to a passage where Prometheus says that the gods of Olympus think they are a law unto themselves.

The problem is that you have an Anglo-American establishment, of which Bush is a part, which thinks they are a law unto themselves. They imagine that their collective *will*, in terms of policy, methods, procedures, channels, and decision-making, can rule the world. They decide to cut a deal with the Soviets; they're going to cut a deal with the Soviets. If they decide that Mr. Gorbachov is going to succeed in the Soviet Union, their *will* will ensure that, if they only have a strong enough will.

It's the same thing on the economy. They think the United States will avoid a financial collapse if their *will* that it not occur is sufficient. In the case of China they are committed

to Deng Xiaoping and all of that process—they're committed to it, regardless of reality. They defy the known laws of the universe.

The problem here is this. It is not simply a matter of doing as single-issue people do, on the China question, which is sanctions/not sanctions, help Taiwan/not to help Taiwan. *Of course* we should increase our position with Taiwan. That is more important than any sanction of the mainland, that we recognize that there is one China, with two governments: a government based in Taipei, and a government based in Beijing. The government in Beijing has lost the Mandate of Heaven. The United States has to continue to deal with Beijing as a de facto state, a de facto government. But we know that Beijing has lost the Mandate of Heaven, in Chinese terms. That does not mean that Taipei has won it, but it means that a revolution is in process in China, a revolution like the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty. . . .

What we have to do is to *say* that. We have to say that the policy of the United States is a commitment to the *nation* of China: its survival, its well-being, and its future; that we recognize that there is one China with two governments, one in Taipei, and one in Beijing; and that we have to take measures which are appropriate to deal with this reality. That's what's primary. It's not a question of what action you take: It's what *motivation* you gave your articulation of policy. Then, your actions must flow from, be consistent with, and be stated and presented in support of that policy.

Sanctions can be wrong, they can be right. This kind of action by governments is often a face-saving kind of business, "Aw, we did something." Like, George Bush is going to put in an amendment against flag-burning. Well that costs him nothing to say that! It really does not do anything about the issue! It's a public relations stunt. And sanctions can be a public relations stunt. But if they are done in furtherance of, and as part of a stated policy which is a sound policy, then you will begin to shape your response to China developments and other developments in terms of that policy. The problem is there is no *policy*. The question is not a need for action, there is a need for a policy to *overturn* the so-called "China card" policy. George Bush has to come out and say, "Kissinger was wrong."

**EIR:** You have referred to the flag burning decision of the Supreme Court. Over the past week or so, they have legitimized "dial-a-porn," they have approved capital punishment for minors and retarded persons, they have upheld civil RICO and a number of other things. Many people are shocked by these decisions.

**LaRouche:** They are shocked by the decisions, but they were not shocked by the process which leads to these decisions. There is a philosophy, which we could call a Rehnquist court philosophy, which is either a 4-5 minority or a 5-4 majority, it swings back and forth, but the basic tendency is toward a radical positivist interpretation of law, of which the

only precedent in recent experience is Nazi law, and Soviet law.

For example, radical positivism: [Nazi jurist] Carl Schmitt. Punishment by consensus: That's Soviet law, or it comes right out of the mouth of the infamous Nazi judge Roland Freisler. . . . Back in the 18th century, there was a quarrel in our society against the kind of positivism that came out of British empiricism, like [John] Locke, in opposition to any conception of higher law, of natural law.

The problem here has two aspects. The *philosophical* problem is that the Supreme Court is now essentially in opposition, in its philosophy of law if not in all details, to the Founding Fathers and the original intent of the Constitution. The *practical* problem is that the remedy for that, under our Constitution, is that the President and the Congress are supposed to supply the remedy for errors of the court. That is, the other two branches of government are to provide remedies for the errors of the third. The triad of our constitutional system is essential in that respect.

The Congress must write legislation that wipes out this RICO thing, which is an obscenity to begin with. The Congress must enact legislation, which defines the law, and then the Supreme Court has to interpret those laws. And, as I said a number of years ago, when this court was being fashioned, during the eight years of the Reagan administration, we were not examining the philosophy of law of the candidates, or those for other federal courts, and we were going to suffer for it. Now we are suffering for it.

**EIR:** Andrei Sakharov, who is said to be pro-Gorbachov, has received much publicity for warning about interethnic violence and the threat of fascism in the Soviet Union.

**LaRouche:** Sakharov's a very intelligent fellow, and I would not necessarily assume that he is Gorbachov's man. . . . I think that Mr. Sakharov, like many others . . . sees that the *truth* about Gorbachov and his wife Raisa née Titorenko Gorbachova, is that they are the true apostles of the Pamyat, the great Russian fascist organization, the pan-Slavic tendency of which Boris Yeltsin is . . . "the Mussolini of Moscow." What's going to happen, which Sakharov is referring to, is that the Soviet Union, by becoming rapidly environmentalist, is eliminating the last feature of its philosophy as a state's philosophy which separates Bolshevism from Nazism. To all intents and purposes, by becoming "environmentalist," Bolshevism is now Nazism. The Pamyat Society is the expression of that. And under the conditions of the food shortage worldwide, massive hunger this year—a food shortage *panic* during the course of 1989 is possible—this means that we can expect a fascist regime in Moscow, openly so, very soon.

**EIR:** In your campaign announcement you pointed to a conflict between ethics and morality on Capitol Hill.

**LaRouche:** I was referring to the influence of [Aristotle's]

*Nicomachean Ethics*—that sort of *sophist* ethics—on Rome, when the Roman Senate and other institutions abandoned morality, and adopted this model of Nicomachean ethics, or ethics as such. It's a Lockean radical positivist conception in one sense, but Locke's ideas *come* from ancient sophistry, particularly the Phoenician and the Canaanite and other forms of sophistry, which is where the Greeks got it.

The idea is that there is no truth, there is only a set of rules, either dictated by some authority, like a tyrant, or as Locke would put it, by social contract. So there is no morality, there's only social contract. For example, the German *Grundgesetz*, the Basic Law [written for the founding of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1949—ed.]. In that period the discussion of morality was not allowed in the German Bundestag, the German parliament. This came up in 1982 when a woman from SPD attacked the immorality of behavior toward Schmidt, the way the Schmidt government was being toppled. And there was a motion of censure on that woman on this issue, because she brought in the question of morality! The history of this banning of morality from the proceedings of the Bundestag was discussed by Schmidt and a number of other parliamentarians, and this was rather shocking to me. I was in Germany at the time and watching the television broadcast of those Bundestag proceedings, and that's how I was given an education by the parliamentarians of Germany

in this problem.

And that's what has happened to our Congress. The Roman precedent—"morality is bad"—this goes back to what I referred to with the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus. They consider themselves a law unto themselves, they deny the existence of a higher law, of natural law, of God's law, and they substitute a *code*, of ethics, a set of rules. It's like the way [child psychologist Jean] Piaget discusses the way children make up the rules of the game. We have the rules of the game made up by infantile minds, called "ethics," which change mercurially from moment to moment and from session to session. And people are pilloried for this, and their morality, as we know, is nonexistent. The political morality of recognizing that this person is the representative of a constituency, and the attempt to eliminate all constituency politics by pillorying on the grounds of ethics, is *wild*, as was done to [Speaker Jim] Wright and others, in order to deprive people of representation. In order to set up a fascist, or Bonapartist form of fascist regime, in which the Congress is nothing but a bunch of frightened hens—technocrats, as they're called—terrified of the FBI and similar investigative agencies, and of the press, who have no morality whatsoever, no rationality, but simply act out of expediency. This is what we're headed toward.

**EIR:** An encouraging development on the morality front has to do with the lowering of the tuning to C = 256. I refer to the recent Cini Foundation conference in Venice, where your wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche spoke, and the upcoming London concert of *Rigoletto* at the lower pitch. As the initiator of this whole process, where do you think it ought to go next?

**LaRouche:** It ought to go just exactly where it is going. First of all there is this funny fellow who wrote the article in *U.S. News & World Report* [of June 26]: He really doesn't understand anything, it's all over the lot, but nonetheless, when he came to the end, he says that the question is *excitement* versus *beauty*. What I've done is to acknowledge the relationship between truth and beauty, as against the romantic, irrationalist conception; that is the issue. And even this fellow, with his otherwise rather sloppy report, grasped that.

There's where people see it. Singers of course will also see it from the standpoint of technicalities of the voice and from the standpoint of interpretation, how to use those technicalities of the voice if it's properly trained. And naturally, as I predicted years ago this would come from the singers first, and the instrumentalists, probably the pianists, would be last. So far it seems wind players are the most problematic, but they are beginning to break ranks, and now the problem is the pianists.

We're in a crisis—this particular discussion does not occur in a vacuum, within the vacuum of art—in which romanticism, irrationalism, "my opinion of what is right or wrong," is no longer too popular. The "right opinion" of government—free trade, this *insanity* under which we have

## CONSULTING ARBORIST

Available to Assist in

The planning and development of wooded sites throughout the continental United States as well as

The development of urban and suburban planting areas and

The planning of individual homes subdivisions or industrial parks



For further information and availability please contact Perry Crawford III

**Crawford Tree and Landscape Services**

8530 West Calumet Road  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53224

been living for 20 years—we simply cannot afford any more. We're hungry. We have no industry. We don't like those insane, arbitrary environmentalists. We need industry, hospitals, schools, not somebody's gibberish or opinion.

There is a reaction, a healthy Renaissance sort of reaction, saying let us grab those values we know which represent rationality, which represent sanity; let us seize upon these firmly, as a way of reversing the slide toward hell, the apocalyptic state of affairs which is going on in society today. People who are more sensitive to beauty, will be the people who tend to respond most readily.

**EIR:** You may have noticed that one of the foremost opponents of reason in our country, I. F. Stone, has died.

**LaRouche:** I. F. Stone should be thought of as a Chekist. Take the national security question. Is Henry Kissinger a Soviet agent? Is Leo Cherne's crowd, those Democrats, are they Soviet agents? Are they moles? In every sense, they are. If you shift it away from the Soviets per se, you shift it into something to which we give the name Trust, in the 1921-27 period when Anglo-American financier circles were working with the Dzerzhinsky Cheka [Soviet secret police] in the so-called Trust. They established a world federalist agreement with the powers of the Soviet Bolshevik government at that time. It's that kind of thing being revived today, which Leo Cherne represents—not the Soviet government, but something in which the Soviet government is a partner. What is it?

I. F. Stone is characteristic of this, in his attitude toward Socrates, and his attitude toward me. He recognized me as a philosophical enemy, and identified his attack on Socrates as an attack on me today. I. F. Stone was a Bolshevik. Leo Cherne is a Bolshevik. Essentially, Henry Kissinger is something—in *mind*—between a fascist and a Bolshevik. His mind is either a Bolshevik or a fascist, a bit of both. And that's the problem. Not only is he a Bolshevik, but a modern version of oligarchism, of Sparta, of the Lycurgan tradition. So here I represent the Ionian faction of Athens, in those terms of reference, against the Lycurgans of Bolshevism and Nazism.

And it is not accidental that when you look deep into the mind—I do, because of my training—I read the writings of I. F. Stone, and I see a Bolshevik. I read the contributions of Leo Cherne, and I see a Bolshevik. It's a Bolshevik mind, I don't care what the label is. Such people, if they get to high places in power, they are Bolshevik moles. That's the lesson to be learned from the unfortunate death of I. F. Stone. His death is unfortunate, as many deaths are, because his life was unfortunate.

**EIR:** I think that we who live in Northern Virginia can count ourselves lucky to be able, in the 1990 congressional election, to anticipate being able to vote for a spokesman of the Ionian faction. Thank you.

---

## Book Review

---

# CIA commissioned anti-LaRouche book

by Jeffrey Steinberg

---

### **Lyndon LaRouche and the New American Fascism**

by Dennis King

Doubleday, New York, 1989

415 pages, illustrated, index, \$17.95 hardbound

---

In March of this year, Doubleday published Dennis King's book-length, slanderous economist Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., under the title *Lyndon LaRouche and the New American Fascism*. The fact of the King book being published and distributed by a reputable market publishing firm, albeit one run by a close friend of Henry Kissinger, has contributed to the false impression that author King penned his anti-LaRouche tract as a private citizen and independent author. The inclusion of book reviews in several news outlets in the United States has further contributed to that error.

As Dennis King himself all but openly admits in the acknowledgements contained on pages 399-401, his book was the fruit of a government-financed and commissioned project, part of a coordinated interagency "Get LaRouche" task force effort that drew upon the resources of the Central Intelligence Agency, the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the National Security Council, as well as an interagency unit headquartered at the NSC dubbed the Office of Public Diplomacy. To treat the King book as a private effort at investigative reporting, is to wittingly or unwittingly abet an illegal domestic U.S. intelligence operation.

In his acknowledgements, King states: "Financial help in writing this book was provided by the Smith-Richardson Foundation, the Stern Fund, and the League for Industrial