

LaRouche becomes target of new British slanders

by Nancy Spannaus

Coincident with the explosion of the global financial crisis in December, came a noticeable new wave of slanders against the U.S. economist and statesman who uniquely forecast that explosion, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. From the *Wall St. Journal* in New York, to the national newspaper *El Universal* in Mexico City, propagandists for British enemies of LaRouche have published prominent smears.

Asked about these attacks during a radio interview with “EIR Talks” on Jan. 7, LaRouche put the phenomenon in the context of the key part which he and the publications associated with him have played in damaging certain British operations, like those which led to the genocide in Central Africa, those which carried out the murder of Princess Diana, and the subsequent coverup, and those carried out by de facto British operative George Soros. He said:

“So, the British government, or the British Crown, has taken a very strong adversarial interest in me, once again, as it did back in the 1980s, when it was running major operations against me. And they are using their facilities in the United States, including their influence on a section of the Democratic Party, which has been recently activated, in connection with this spate of libel slanders. . . .”

It should be noted that this wave of slander comes only a couple of months after an unprecedented array of positive coverage, internationally, of LaRouche’s forecasts on the global financial crisis. During that period, the Mexican, Peruvian, Nigerian, and Russian press—among others—gave prominence to LaRouche’s warnings about the inevitable collapse of the speculative bubble, and the dangerous incompetence of the International Monetary Fund. In that context, it is all the more clear that the purpose of the current slanders is to prevent LaRouche’s taking public leadership, based on his skyrocketing credibility in the midst of systemic collapse.

The Mexican case

The most virulent item in this British-sponsored offensive came in the Mexican national news daily *El Universal* on Jan. 6. The newspaper featured an article on the top of page 8, which claimed that LaRouche “might be” involved in financing anti-Zapatista groups who “might” have carried out the recent massacre in Chiapas. The unsigned article claimed as its sources, well-known agents of the British pirate and drug-legalizer George Soros, and the real *Comandante* of the narco-terrorist Zapatista National Liberation Army, Bishop Samuel Ruiz.

The charges in the article are not only unsubstantiated, but they are ludicrous. LaRouche and his supporters in Mexico don’t issue death threats, or tell others to do so, and the only protectors and promoters of paramilitary groups in Chiapas are Ruiz and his followers. But *El Universal*—a newspaper with a record of defending the narco-terrorists and synarchist Fidel Castro’s São Paulo Forum—clearly doesn’t care about “proving” its case. Rather, the article just keeps rattling off LaRouche’s name—seven times!—and, in both opening and closing, screeches that LaRouche is organizing to stop “a Satanic and pagan movement out to destroy Western culture.”

LaRouche’s credibility in Mexico on economic questions reached enormous heights in October, after a public scandal around the sabotaging of his potential visit to address a conference in Guadalajara, and the vindication of his forecast of an imminent financial explosion. The financial columnist for *Excelsior*, the nation’s equivalent of the *New York Times*, frequently cites LaRouche’s economic analysis, and there was much other newspaper coverage in that period.

But the purpose of the *El Universal* slander is by no means confined to Mexico.

British mouthpieces

In the United States, where there has been a general establishment media policy of pretending that LaRouche and his movement do not exist, there have been three significant eruptions in the last months, which indicate that the establishment is trying to insure against a “breakout” of the leading economist’s influence.

The most widely read was undoubtedly the Dec. 23 lead article in the *Wall Street Journal*, which included LaRouche’s name in the first sentence of an article profiling Richard Leebove, currently the press spokesman of Teamster presidential candidate James Hoffa, Jr. Leebove was once a member of LaRouche’s philosophical association, more than 15 years ago, and, while the *Journal* article does state that Leebove is no longer associated with LaRouche, its content effectively continues the line first put out by neocon former UN ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, that Leebove is a “LaRouche operative” in the labor movement.

Author Mark Maremont retails the lie that LaRouche is a “far-right politician,” who “was obsessed with the Teamsters, believing that foreign interests, Jews, and Kennedy left-wingers were conspiring to take over the right-leaning union. . . .” LaRouche has demanded a retraction from the *Wall Street Journal*, which certainly knows better. The *Journal*, run by the Dow Jones corporation and closely linked to British-dominated financial circles, has a record of attacking LaRouche that goes back to 1973—and its Asian and European editions took prominent note of LaRouche’s role in exposing British privateer George Soros, in September 1997.

The most direct British mouthpiece attacking LaRouche in this same period, was the Rupert Murdoch-owned *New York Post*, which, on Dec. 31, published a long editorial attack on LaRouche’s appeal attorney, former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, and LaRouche himself. Once again, the attack was a gratuitous lie, claiming that there are “well-documented charges of anti-Semitism and neo-Nazism” against LaRouche, whom it described as a “conspiracist extraordinaire.”

In the Jan. 7 interview with “EIR Talks,” LaRouche identified the *Post* as owned by “an international syndicate, which owns the London *Times*, which is a product of the Beaverbrook apparatus, and Rupert Murdoch, a man of Australian provenance, who controls a good deal of the press in the United States, along with the Hollinger Corporation. Now, these are press which are anti-Clinton press, incidentally. And people who support them and who work for them, are not exactly patriots.”

The only thing surprising about the *Post* attack is its prominence.

Also of British pedigree is a smear which appears in a recently published book by Yale University Press, called *political paranoia, the psychopolitics of hatred* (no capitalization in the original). A several-page section on LaRouche,

by authors Robert S. Robins and Jerrold M. Post, relies heavily on the book written by former Maoist Dennis King, once a publicist for mobster Roy Cohn. King’s book, which slanders LaRouche as a fascist, was financed heavily by the Smith-Richardson Foundation and the circles around Richard Mellon Scaife, the very same British-linked grouping that is targetting Clinton today.

To top it off, author Robins did his “research” for the book while working at the British Tavistock Institute, a psychological warfare outfit. His co-author, Jerrold Post, is a psychiatrist employed by the U.S. government’s profilers. That he would rely on quoting King, LaRouche notes, shows definitively that he’s just a “quack.”

Beyond the usual roster of enemies

In discussing the new slanders with “EIR Talks,” LaRouche also noted that “the section of the Democratic Party, which—shall we say, the Dick Morris fans in the Democratic Party—has been deployed, in addition to my usual roster of enemies, in trying to do all kinds of dirties to me and my friends inside the Democratic Party, throughout institutions of government, and so forth and so on. This is just a kind of a dirty nag operation. So, that’s what this all represents.

“But these New Age types in the Democratic Party, as opposed to the traditional Democrats, that is, the traditional Democratic activists, are pretty much British-dominated. And they’re a real problem.”

LaRouche was referring primarily to the “Fowler” wing of the Democratic Party, which is still defending itself in Federal court against LaRouche’s charges that the party violated the 1965 Voting Rights Act, in denying him delegates to the 1996 Democratic National Convention (LaRouche won nearly 600,000 votes in his bid for the Democratic Presidential nomination). Although Democratic Party chairman Don Fowler, who ordered LaRouche’s exclusion, is now gone—and ill-remembered by Democrats who are being hit by the legacy of his fundraising practices—there are party members who still follow his line. These have shown up particularly in the Commonwealth of Virginia, in British-dominated Loudoun County, where LaRouche resides, and where local Democratic honchos have moved to exclude LaRouche associates from the party.

In truth, the very continued existence of the Democratic Party, and of the United States itself, depends upon LaRouche being able to play a hands-on leadership role on economic and strategic policy. Under current conditions, the bulk of the traditional Democrats are still deserting the polls in droves, and even the disintegration of the Republican Party can’t help them get back into a commanding position. The British hope that they can prevent that happy development, based on proven capabilities of brainwashing the American population. It’s about time that Americans proved them wrong.