

LaRouche testifies in du Pont Smith case

On March 22 in West Chester, Pennsylvania, before a packed courtroom brimming with national and local news media, U.S. congressional candidate Lyndon LaRouche delivered 80 minutes of videotaped testimony in the case of Lewis du Pont Smith, an heir to the du Pont family fortune who is now challenging an earlier court decision which declared him incompetent, solely on the grounds of his political and financial backing for LaRouche's economic and social policies.

In 30 minutes of direct testimony and 50 minutes of cross-examination, LaRouche reviewed not only the history of his personal friendship with Smith, but gave an in-depth picture of LaRouche's own unique competence as an "American System" economist. LaRouche's economic analyses have become central to Smith's challenge of the earlier ruling, since Smith charges that the Wilmington Trust, the court-appointed guardian of his substantial trust fund, lost him \$4 million in the October 1987 and October 1989 stock market crashes, solely because the bank ignored Smith's advice to pull out, which he had based on LaRouche's forecasts.

LaRouche described at length to the court how he had developed those forecasts, detailing the fundamental problems in the real physical economy of the United States, and the shift away from actual wealth-producing economic activity into speculative and parasitical forms of employment and investment. LaRouche stressed that his contributions in this field of physical economy are what gives him his unique forecasting competence and what separates him from all other living so-called economists.

LaRouche recounted his advice to the du Pont heir to make secure investments in real estate and cattle breeding in Loudoun County, Virginia, and also spoke about his discussions on history and historical research methodology which he had held with the former high school history teacher. "Smith visited me in 1985," LaRouche said. "He was studying history and that he wanted my advice, my opinion. I got a strong impression that Lewis was a bright, independent cuss. I rather liked him." As for the allegations that LaRouche had somehow victimized Smith, LaRouche denied that he had some sort of mystical control over him. "If Lewis felt pressured, he would tend to dig in and go the other way to

give himself space to decide for himself. He is an independent, stubborn cuss. A prudent tightwad."

LaRouche described his outrage at the court decision to declare Smith mentally incompetent, and said he had discussed the matter with many other people in "the same way I would discuss Adolf Hitler. What happened to Lewis is a moral atrocity. Things like that are done in the Soviet Union. They should not be done here."

He recounted how he and his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche reacted with "moral outrage" on hearing of Smith's family's attempts to prevent him from marrying his fiancée on the grounds of his alleged "incompetence," and how Mrs. LaRouche had assisted the couple in getting married in Rome, Italy under the protection of the Vatican.

'Get LaRouche' task force under spotlight

LaRouche also had an opportunity to do directly against the government inter-agency "Get LaRouche" task force, in response to the question, "Haven't you said that this case, as is every case is a LaRouche case?" The congressional candidate responded that it was not he who said that, but those who initiated all of the politically motivated legal persecutions against him and his associates.

One of the most dramatic moments in the testimony was during cross-examination by David Foulke, the attorney for Smith's oligarchical family. When LaRouche mentioned the fact that the family of whiskey baron Edgar Bronfman had been involved in the du Pont family's operations against Lewis du Pont Smith, Foulke asked LaRouche how he had come to know that this was the case. LaRouche responded that it was Mr. Foulke himself who had said so, and proceeded to tell the court about Foulke's own efforts to either "buy off" or kidnap Smith, to force him to sever his relationship with LaRouche. Later outside the courtroom, the press bombarded both Foulke and Smith with questions about the Bronfmans, who are key players in the Anglo-Soviet "Trust" circles which are among LaRouche's bitterest political enemies.

After the hearing, one courtroom observer who is not a LaRouche supporter was overheard saying, "LaRouche has a right to his beliefs, and quite frankly, they're more rational than I expected, as are those of Lewis du Pont Smith; and whatever those beliefs may be, Lewis should not be determined incompetent through a process of guilt through association."

LaRouche's testimony was widely covered in the Philadelphia area media, especially because the jurisdiction of the court, Chester County, is also where two LaRouche Democrats, Tony Hadley and Betty Clift, are running for Congress and Democratic state committee respectively in elections on May 15. Two years ago Hadley threw the local Democratic Party into a turmoil when he won the Democratic primary and made a respectable showing against his Republican incumbent opponent, Richard Schulze.