

LaRouche: What We Need Is A Groundswell Against Cheney

by Edward Spannaus

When asked, during his Feb. 23 webcast about the issue of foreign ownership of ports, which has triggered a Republican revolt against the Administration and a huge furor in Congress, Lyndon LaRouche answered in a manner that must have surprised many of his listeners.

First, LaRouche said, the issue is globalization and deindustrialization, and it's not going to be straightened out until someone has the guts to raise the issue of the return of nuclear power. LaRouche declared that we must reverse the policy shifts that took place between 1971 and 1981, under Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, and he stressed that without confronting the question of nuclear power, you can't deal with the petroleum crisis in the United States. If we produce high-temperature gas-cooled reactors, then we have the basis for moving to a hydrogen-based fuel, and we can efficiently use hybrid cars, and produce the kind of fuels we need for home heating, etc.

"If you're willing to do that, then you can do something," LaRouche said. "If you're not willing to reverse free-trade and go back to fair trade, you can't reorganize the U.S. economy."

"Is the Democratic Party willing to go back to a fair trade policy against free trade? Is the Democratic Party prepared to oppose globalization?! Are Republican allies of the Democratic Party prepared to oppose globalization in terms of defending fair-trade policies, that is, a protectionist policy for the product of the American farmer and American industry?"

These are the questions that must be addressed, LaRouche continued, so that we can make large-scale investments in infrastructure, and shift employment from low-paid service employment, to higher-paid productive employment. "Are you willing to reverse the '68 formula, and go back to a high-technology economy which is able to sustain pensions, able

to sustain health care and so forth, or not?"

LaRouche then came back to the port issue, and pointed out that "if you try to take some particular issue, like the port issue, by itself, you're in a trap, because you have no principled position from which to fight!" And you have no way to deal with the wheeling-and-dealing politics in the Congress, he added.

"Yes," LaRouche continued, "we must control, we must say and protect, defend our national public infrastructure. Port facilities, rail lines, similar kinds of things, power systems, are infrastructure. . . . They're something that the whole territory, or the whole nation, needs. Now if the nation needs that whole thing, it's not up to some private interest to come along and give it to us. If the nation needs infrastructure, it's up to the government to provide it, and tax to raise the money to support it."

Cheney Is the Issue!

On the port issue as such, LaRouche said that Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.)—who has said that ports ought to be government-operated, and that it is a mistake to let them be privately owned—is right. "The other stuff is just kind of loony!" But then, LaRouche got to the heart of the matter, explaining:

"My view is, what is really going on is not the port issue. And standing away, you can see this a mile away, or 10 miles away, or 50 miles away. The issue is, the shooting event in Texas has so undermined the authority of the Vice President, that Republicans realize they've got to get out from under that *now!*"

What Republicans are now doing, is looking for "some gimmick which gets them off the hook of the Cheney-Bush

party,” something that appeals to their constituencies—which the issue of foreigners taking over the ports does, even if with a chauvinistic kind of patriotism.

But, LaRouche emphasized, what is driving this situation, is “the growing discredit of the eminently discredited, stupid, psychotic President and his Vice President, who’s in charge of vice, and who doesn’t aim very well.”

The other key factor determining this situation is that the Democrats failed at the beginning of the year; they failed to continue the initiative they had going in the Senate during 2005, and they fell on their faces at the beginning of the year, stumbling over the Alito nomination.

‘Patriotic Politics’

LaRouche summed up the current political situation as follows, by noting that “you have a Democratic-Republican coalition on something which make sense, which is defensible,” and that now, people must use this, to get some momentum. “You’ve got to get a majority momentum in the Congress, to get together to start to move this government in a positive direction. Without that, you’re not going to go anywhere. . . .

“The more important thing is to get people to talk to each other, in a collaborative way, especially across the aisles, to get beyond party politics, to get to patriotic politics. That is, politics for the benefits of the nation, and to get people back into organizing the people out there on the streets, and in the communities. To get them in the act, and use their power, the power of their vote, we can determine the results of elections. The people can do that, if they are mobilized to that. To be mobilized to do that, they have to be motivated to do that. To be motivated to do that, you’ve got to educate them, because they have a lot of wrong ideas. They don’t know what is going on. But they will listen to you if they think you’re on the right side, because they want an alternative.”

‘Mood Shift’

A little later in the question period, another question came up about Cheney, this one about the Vice President’s claim that he has been given the authority by President Bush to classify and declassify information. The questioner called this “the greatest expansion of the power of the Vice President in American history,” which gave Cheney the power to control intelligence and foreign policy. By doing this, Bush “elevated Cheney to the same level, and he acknowledged that Cheney was already the de facto Executive of this government in national security,” the questioner said. “Never before has any President diminished and divided his power in this manner.” The questioner called this “Cheney’s Coup,” and asked “whether you think there’s any potential for either a Congressional or judicial intervention in this, since it seems to be contrary to the intentions of the Constitution.”

LaRouche agreed that the Executive Order, which came to light because Cheney’s Chief of Staff Lewis Libby said

Cheney gave him the right to disclose classified information, is contrary to the intentions of the Constitution. He pointed out that this creates a “parliamentary kind of feature inside the Presidency,” adding that we don’t want a Prime Minister, or a situation in which others can intervene and override the Chief Executive.

But, LaRouche stressed, the point is not to take some simple legalistic action. “What’s needed here is a mood shift, and I think we already have the mood shift. I used to like this thing from McCauley on the history of England, from the accession of the Stuarts, in which he described the case of Lord Jeffries, the Chief Justice, or this old man who came out of a whore’s court to become the Chief Justice of England, and conducted the Bloody Assizes, which were really a Nazi-like operation throughout the continent. And then, when the Revolution, the Glorious Revolution, occurred, Jeffries was seen—according to McCauley—fleeing the mob in his night-shirt. He eventually did live after that, but he lived in some degree of obscurity.

“I think what we want here is the effect of Cheney fleeing the mob in his nightshirt, whether or not Mrs. Cheney is with him,” LaRouche told his listeners. “But in any case, instead of trying to play parliamentary politics with an issue like this, the question is: ‘Do you have sufficient groundswell in the U.S. population and in the institutions to get the bum out?’ If there’s sufficient groundswell to get the bum out, the bum will be out! It’s that simple. But it has to be done forthwith.”

LaRouche said that the shooting incident in Texas, and everything that came out around it, “indicates that this was a coverup of nothing other than Cheney’s drinking habits.” Cheney is shooting from the front, and then he turns around and shoots a guy who’s probably less than 30 yards behind him. “He just turned around and shot a guy. Now, that would be easy if he’s drunk, or half-drunk . . . he’s breaking all the rules. He’s got a shotgun, he’s turning around and shooting the guy behind him! That’s the number one no-no!”

“But the key thing here,” LaRouche declared, coming back to his theme, “is that we have a groundswell developing against Cheney,” and the aroma of the situation is becoming decisive. And what we want, is the groundswell that induces Cheney to either quit, or induces someone to tell him that he’s fired.

“If you have a groundswell to get rid of him, then the institutions will find a perfectly legal way to get him out of there.” So don’t try and come up with some lawyer’s scheme.

“What you need is a groundswell,” LaRouche concluded. “You have a groundswell. The \$32,000 shotgun, misused, with an important figure hit, shot, and then the obvious signs of a coverup, including the Armstrong family and so forth, were all orchestrating this thing to cover this thing up. What do you do? How do you overcome the coverup? You get a groundswell that won’t let go—and my job is to say: ‘Get a groundswell going!’ ”