
An EIR Contributing Editor Feature

The Washington Post: a daily dose of political ignorance

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

In an opinion editorial, entitled "Secular Politics," by writer James K. Glassman, the *Washington Post* of Aug. 22, 1995 asserts the following absurdity:

The secular trend has been clear since 1978, or even 1966: Americans are returning to values and ideas associated with the Republican Party, which dominated political life from the 1880s to the early 1930s.

How like the used-car salesman, who didn't care what he said, as long as saying it sold the heap; how like the *Washington Post*.¹ It happens that Ohio's William McKinley, the author of the famous "McKinley Tariff," was a Republican congressional leader and President (1897-1901) in the Anglophobe, and pro-agro-industrial tradition of Abraham Lincoln; his successor as President, Theodore Roosevelt (1901-09), was in the tradition of his Confederate uncle and mentor, James D. Bullock: an adversary of industrial interest, and a virtual devotee of Britain's King Edward VII and Edward's imperial design.

Glassman has packed two major lies, not just that one, into his single sentence.

The post-1966 trend leading into today's Republican House Speaker Newton Gingrich, is not the trend of even the pre-Depression Republican Party. Like Theodore Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover represented a cruel and foolish policy, which led the U.S. economy into the 1930s Depression: But shameless ideologues like Newt Gingrich and Senator Phil Gramm, represent a quality of "bottom feeder" which would send any self-respecting catfish quickly into another stream, to say nothing of the reaction among any persons sharing the outlook of 1940s and 1950s hardrock industrialist entrepreneurs.

1. See the *Post*'s editorial-page declaration of its "libel only" policy against Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.: Stephen Rosenfeld, "NCLC: 'A Domestic Political Menace,'" *Washington Post*, Sept. 24, 1976. See also, *Post* writer's John Mintz consistent falsehoods against this writer, 1984-88. During the interval 1984-88, the *Post* was an open editorial sewer-pipe for the standard issue of libels generated by the New York editorial salon of Smith and Train banker John Train.

Even Newt Gingrich has insisted repeatedly, that he and Alvin Toffler are hard-core "Third Wave" freaks, who do not wish to be linked in any way to what guru Toffler and devotee Gingrich reject with a lip-curling utterance of "Second Wave!" Remember: "Second Wave" is the Toffler-Gingrich hate-word for the agro-industrial society to which the Republican Party was firmly committed, until the middle 1960s. Indeed, if there is one thing which the flopping Newt Gingrich, and Phil Gramm, have actually accomplished, it is to wipe up many of the surviving remnants of that kind of agro-industrial economy which, until 1963, built the U.S.A. as a great economic power. The only quality which Gingrich and Gramm share with Calvin Coolidge, is pure meanness.

There is only one important point of resemblance between Newt Gingrich's "Third Wavers" and the Hoover Republican Party of the early 1930s: Everything which Gingrich represents politically is about to be washed away by a far greater international economic calamity than wiped out the 1932 Hoover re-election campaign.

From that point on, Glassman's piece is all down-hill. Why mention it, then? As one might have asked the Scottish poet Robert Burns: "Why write a poem about a louse on a lady's bonnet in church?" Simply, the significance of poor louse Glassman is that he shows that the lady in question—Katie Graham, in this case—is lousy. Think of the silly Sunday-morning TV pundits, who will treat a *Post* piece such as Glassman's as solemn critical stuff; think of the foolish voters, who will look up from reading such trash as Glassman's, and delude themselves "better informed" for the experience.

There was once a citizen, who sought to rally the people against a grave danger to them all. He asked for their political support; they gave it. He asked for their financial assistance; they gave it. He asked some of them to join him in risking their lives to ensure success; they joined him. He asked if they will be willing to give up their ignorance, so that they might work effectively; they turned away from him in anger. Thus, the catastrophe occurred.

You, personally, face the worst financial and economic crisis in five hundred years history of modern European civilization. It is not something which might occur; it is something already coming on, like a tidal wave building up as it moves

toward us. The entire International Monetary Fund system is now collapsing; a major shock could occur either during the months just ahead, or a major collapse-shock by sometime during 1996: unless the U. S. government takes certain actions which, presently, it is not inclined to do during an election-year. Unless the wave of ongoing monetary and financial speculation is stopped, the early result will remind some future historians of the Germany *Reichsmark* collapse-scenario of 1922-23; the difference is, that was in but one nation, while this will be on a world-wide scale.

Franklin Roosevelt said, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." I prefer to say: "We have nothing to fear as much as our tendency to cling to the ignorant opinions so many of us adopt from the popular mass media." That sickening soap-opera called "The O.J. Simpson Trial," for example. Do you care enough about this nation, about yourself, to kick the *Washington Post* habit, a leading source of this nation's daily dose of political ignorance?

LaRouche on health-care

From a letter exchange between Mr. LaRouche and a reader:

From a Puerto Rican reader:

. . . In spite of the fact that he became a Democrat, the governor of Puerto Rico is carrying out a GOP business platform. His administration is known for the creation of a free health ID for the poor people. The problem with this health ID is that the Puerto Rican government had previously instituted a free regional health system for the poor population. Our island had a regional health system, with one of the best life expectancy records in the world. The insurance companies are the real winners of the health ID plan. They justified the creation of the health ID plan through negative propaganda against the public health system's public services. The real problem with the health ID's is that the government is paying for it by taking loans on its non-recurrent funds. The same thing is being planned against the educational system: Slander it in order to justify its privatization.

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.:

I can not disagree with your assessment of the impact of such types of changes in practice. Under the impact of the Gramm-Rudman tradition and the apparent 1994 electoral success of the Newt Gingrich "Contract with America," changes of the type you report have become an accelerating trend among opportunistic political figures. My historically informed view of such policies is, that Gingrich's policies are fairly compared with the same, infamous Nazi doctrine, of reducing expenditures of "useless eaters," which Colorado's Governor Lamm echoed more than a decade ago.

I make three points on that trend, as follows.

First, I cite the principle established by the post-World

War II Nuremberg-trials process. I describe that policy as follows: 1) If the standards employed by competent insurance actuaries should have forewarned government officials, or relevant private professionals, that the adoption of a certain policy would increase the death-rate, and 2) If those responsible public officials, or private professionals established, or practice such a policy, 3) They are as guilty of willful murder as if they had killed each of the victims personally, with an axe; 4) Such persons, today, are to be despised now, as no better than the very worst criminals under the Nazi regime were considered, under the Nuremberg code. . . .

Second, as an economist, I regard such policies as not only capital crimes against humanity. Speaking professionally, the arguments of people, such as the culpable politicians Senator Phil Gramm and Speaker Newton Gingrich, mark them as the worst kinds of pseudo-scientific quacks in the field of political-economy. They are a capital-criminal variety of pseudo-scientific quacks, comparable to the Nazi race-theorist, Dr. Ernst Rudin. This means, that their pseudo-scientific dogma, if applied to practice, must result in capital crimes against humanity.

It is relevant to understanding Gingrich's and Gramm's health-care policies today, that that Dr. Ernst Rudin was the same Nazi official whom the late Averell Harriman, and the George-Bush-family's late General William H. Draper, assisted in promoting as the head of the Harriman family's International Federation of Eugenics Societies. That was the same Harriman whose chief executive officer, and President George Bush's father, (Republican) Prescott Bush, brought Adolf Hitler to power in Germany through aid of a massive transfer of funds to the Nazi Party, funds supplied by ("Mr. Democrat") Averell Harriman's New York banking firm.

Third, if we are to maintain the health of citizens generally, there are two principal sets of economic facts we must address. 1) The chief cause of the rising cost of health-care, is centered in two facts about the 1967-95 trends in the U.S.A. (and, world) economy: that the per-capita physical-economic income and productivity, and tax-revenue base of the U.S.A. has collapsed during this period, and, 2) that this collapse is aggravated by forms of financial speculation which have embedded monstrously rising debt-service charges within the costs and prices of virtually everything, including physician and hospital costs. The hoax of rising malpractice-insurance rates, is a part of this.

. . . We are presently in a process of world-wide economic collapse. . . . This nation, and most of the world, could not survive such a collapse, unless the U.S. government, in particular, makes a fundamental reversal in economic-policy trends, probably during no later than 1996. The wicked policies to whose symptoms your letter referred, must be changed; the so-called politicians (and others) now have no alternative. . . .

Cutting health-care in the ways you report, reminds one of the intellectual brilliance of the accountant who discovered that he could effect a tremendous saving in the use of his automobile, if he eliminated fuel-costs.