

# The reasons why Kissinger and his sponsors fear LaRouche's power

*Lyndon LaRouche made the following remarks on Oct. 30.*

I have stressed recently that one of the major qualifications I have for becoming the Democratic Party's presidential nominee, is that I was put into prison by an alliance between Henry Kissinger and the American Drug Lobby [Anti-Defamation League].

There is some discussion about what happened in 1982 to prompt Henry Kissinger to write that series of letters to the Justice Department and the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, which resulted in setting up the secret dirty operation under Executive Order 12333 which was used to try to frame me up and put me into prison, along with others, on one pretext or another. Some people say that Kissinger reacted to some provocative personal attacks which we allegedly made on him.

## **Kissinger's return to power**

Well, that's not true. The issue was as follows, and if people look back to June, July, and August of 1982, the period during which Kissinger made these attacks and wrote the first of these series of letters which resulted in my incarceration, you'd find out that what we were doing to Kissinger was, number one—number one as far as Kissinger personally was concerned—we were exposing internationally the content of an address which Kissinger had made on May 10, 1982 to London's Chatham House. We received a copy of that address through Kissinger's friend's office, the offices of David Abshire et al. at Georgetown University. We verified it and circulated the information in it widely. This address admitted—as a matter of fact, Kissinger bragged—that while he had been national security adviser and, later, secretary of state to the Nixon and Ford administrations, that he had been working behind the backs of the American Presidents as an agent of influence of British foreign intelligence. That is what Kissinger said and what he explained in that speech at Chatham House.

At that point, Kissinger was coming back into a powerful position in Washington, backed by the British Crown. As a matter of fact, it was the British Crown which had given Kissinger his just founded, new firm Kissinger Associates, Inc. So, in our putting out internationally, calling attention to the very words which Kissinger had used publicly in London to describe his treasonous behavior in the 1970s, we were threatening to ruin not only Kissinger's career, but London's policy and the policy of London's friends in New

York in pushing Kissinger back into a key position of power within the orbit of the Reagan-Bush administration.

## **The Ibero-American debt bomb of 1982**

Number two, during that period, I had warned that by September of 1982—this was during the entire period from January, but most prominently, from April-May on of that year—that the world was sitting on the verge of a blow-out of the debt of Central and South American countries, specifically, Mexico.

In response to that, at the prompting of several governments' agents in Central and South America, I had issued a book-length special report, *Operation Juárez*, copies of which went to these governments and to the U.S. government, and, of course, to the National Security Council at the beginning of August 1982—just a few weeks before Kissinger had sent the first recorded "Dear Bill" letter to the director of the FBI, William Webster, the letters which started the process of having me put in prison.

*Operation Juárez* outlined the imminence of a threatened collapse of the U.S. banking system unless something were done, and very specifically done. I proposed what needed to be done to solve the problem.

Kissinger and a commission headed by then-Vice President George Bush, during that fall, took the opposite route. They took the route which has led to the blowing-out of the saving and loans and the general collapse of the banking system, insurance companies, and so forth, today. Your savings, your pension fund, your life insurance, are gone, because George Bush and Henry Kissinger were successful in defeating my policy back then in the second half of 1982—and believe me, my policy was heavily debated.

## **My policy was right**

At that point, because of these two threats, because I threatened to show how London was actually controlling U.S. policy through channels such as British agents like Kissinger, because I showed the threat to the entire economy and banking system of the United States, and because I was also showing the relationships between Kissinger's pro-drug policy and some other things, it was decided to get me out of the way. I was becoming too powerful, too internationally influential, too dangerous.

*But*, if you go back to this, you find out not only the reasons, the motives which Kissinger and others—such as David Abshire of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advi-

## LaRouche decries cult of 'absolute music'

*The author is a political prisoner of George Bush's at the FMC in Rochester, Minnesota.*

This is a review of an experience I had, more than of the concert itself, on Friday evening, Oct. 25, in a broadcast of a Minnesota Symphony Orchestra concert I heard over station KLSE. It was a concert of two Mozart works conducted by the symphony's conductor, Edo De Waart, of, first, the famous Mozart Mass in C, and then concluding with the Symphony No. 40 in G minor.

I almost cried throughout the performance—cried with sadness. The compositions, as to intent, while professionally performed, were butchered. I refer to the butchery, which is not too uncommon these days, in order to address a related point: the tragedy of what's happened in the 19th and 20th centuries to musical tastes.

The general characteristic of the Mass, was that all of the essential voice transparency of both instrumental and vocal voices, was lost. It may be the size of the chorus, which was much too large for the piece—a size which was probably occasioned by the poor quality of singing voices these days, with the influence of the English anti-bel canto school in various forms running loose around the country, and the fact that the choruses generally are of poor quality, including professional choruses. But the performance was bad all throughout, in the sense that there was no vocal transparency.

The tempi were exaggerated, which is not uncommon; but in the exaggeration of tempo, one thinks of what is going on in the mind of the conductor, Edo De Waart, to choose these tempi which complicate every problem he already has, first in the Mass, which was a travesty, and in the Symphony No. 40, which was almost a burlesque.

What is lost, of course, in these kinds of exaggerated

tempi and this kind of direction, is all sense of singing quality, of the shaping of tone, the shaping of phrases; the relationship to singing, is most notably what is lost. The orchestra does not sing; the chorus in the Mass did not sing; the voices did not really sing, although some of the soloists did try to sing a bit; the orchestra did not sing. The same thing is true in the Symphony No. 40.

What are we looking at here? What we're looking at, most crucially, I believe, is the influence of the cult of instrumental or absolute music upon conductors and upon musicians generally. The idea that there is such a thing as absolute music, allows the conductor and other musicians—and even audiences—to wean themselves away from the obligation to perform in such a manner that they always represent the standpoint of the human singing voice.

Now, we have another characteristic of programming, which is characteristic and increasingly so, of KLSE over the period in which I have been listening to it. More and more, the programming is of the Frankfurt School dogma type. That is, you have one piece, a classical work which is sometimes well-performed, sometimes not; but then it's mixed up with absolute trash: modernism, wild Romanticism, and so forth. The station's personnel are, in greater part, fairly knowledgeable musicians. They have a certain professional competence in presenting their product; but they're all clubbed into the cult of Romanticism as taught by the more degenerate music schools and conservatories in the United States today, which says, of course, that Romanticism essentially began with Beethoven and Schubert, and they class everybody as a Romantic. Of course, there are some people who perform these works from a Romantic standpoint; but nonetheless, one sees the influence of the neo-Hegelian or quasi-Hegelian or Kantian and similar tendencies as well as the Frankfurt tendencies throughout: ideological dogmas, including the worst of the Schenkerian variety, this notion of absolute music, which destroys mind and morals as well as composition. —Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

sory Board, the agency which started the Executive Order 12333 track against me—had, you find out that I was right on the policies, and all those who attacked me were wrong. I was right.

Have you lost savings in a bank that has gone belly-up, or will you lose savings in a bank that has gone belly-up, or is about to do so? Have you lost a life insurance policy or are about to do so, because the life insurance company is going belly-up? Are you losing your pension, because people such as the attorney general of Minnesota, Skip Humphrey, was complicit in allowing Kohlberg, Kravis and Roberts, the friends of George Bush, to loot Minnesota state pension funds?

If you're such a person, or if you're a farmer who's lost a farm, or if you're a person who worked in industry who's lost a job, if you're losing your house, or about to do so, then I was right, and Kissinger was wrong. And for that reason, because I was right, because I put my finger on the policy and on the people behind the policy—I was becoming too powerful—they put me in prison.

Therefore, if you see another Democrat running for President, or for the nomination, such as Paul Tsongas, Douglas Wilder, Tom Harkin, Robert Kerrey, or William Clinton, ask him: "Hey buddy, if you're so honest and so important, why didn't they stick you in jail?"