

Address to the nation

The real stakes in Billygate

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Contributing Editor

At midnight on Aug. 8, Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. delivered the fourth of his nationally televised broadcasts to the American people scheduled before the Democratic Party's National Convention. An edited transcript of LaRouche's address follows:

I had planned to speak to you tonight about the effect of my nomination on international developments—and it would have a prominent effect. I shall still speak about that, but I shall speak first about a dog and pony show that was performed this week in Washington, D.C. I refer to that fraud under which Jimmy Carter and his backers pretended to “tell all” to clear up the Billygate case.

Billygate is so big that I couldn't tell you what I know about it, in terms of hard fact, in several hours of broadcasting. But I'll indicate a couple of things to show you what the problem really is.

There is a game being played. The game is being played in part by the backers of John Anderson and in part by some people who are among backers of the candidacy of Governor Ronald Reagan. These people believe—and rightly so—that were Jimmy Carter to be nominated the presidential candidate of the Democratic Party, Mr. Reagan would probably win the election by a landslide. In fact, if Mr. Reagan were running against Mr. Carter, and Mr. Anderson weren't involved, it would be assured that the Democratic Party would face a defeat far worse than what Herbert Hoover and his party faced in 1932.

With the introduction of Mr. Anderson, however, who, like vice-presidential candidate George Bush and like Jimmy Carter is a protégé of the Trilateral Commission, we'd have three Trilateral Commission candidacies, since Henry Kissinger, in a sense, is controlling Reagan's

policy at this time. Anderson would get, probably, a significant number of states, if not more votes than Jimmy Carter.

That would mean that the convention wouldn't mean anything. It would mean that Congress would have to make up its mind next January 10 or so as to who they thought the next President and Vice-President of the United States might be—a general crisis, a constitutional crisis beyond anything we've faced in this century.

Therefore these people, including some Democrats who feel they have a fall-back option in making a deal with Mr. Reagan, and those who are planning to rush off and join Mr. Anderson if Mr. Carter is nominated, have said “Let Billygate be postponed for a while until after the convention.” And Mr. Carter and his immediate backers, of course, have gone along with that.

The real Billygate

What Mr. Carter said this week is totally irrelevant to Billygate. The problem is not, as many people believe, that Billy Carter did something that somehow did or did not implicate his brother the President in an “Abscam” case, an influence case. It's exactly the other way around.

Billy Carter—and I have direct, personal knowledge of this—was drawn into an operation which originated with the White House. The problem is not that Billy Carter did or did not take Arab money to influence his brother's policy. The problem is that the Carter administration is running a very filthy operation, and at one point in the operation people around the White House decided it would be a cute trick to bring in Billy Carter, the President's brother, as part of the operation for manipulating certain Arab circles.

The key thing Mr. Carter has avoided was raised in

part by a senior correspondent in Washington during the course of the broadcast this past week. Mrs. Sarah McClendon, who is a well-known senior correspondent, a most responsible figure, asked Mr. Carter—referring to some of the material my associates have put out—whether the White House, or the administration, had not in fact been covering up for a key figure of the Khomeini intelligence service in the United States—a rug dealer, Nahidian, based in Washington, D.C. Mr. Carter said he preferred not to comment on that with a simple “No” at that point; that’s one of the big frauds.

In point of fact the Carter administration *knows* that the Nahidian circle—and Nahidian is actually a resident agent of Khomeini’s Savama—is the key conduit for supplying drugs to and controlling a group of assassins allied to Khomeini. They have killed one prominent figure in the United States in recent weeks already, have attempted an attack on another prominent figure, and have a very long hit list of people they intend to kill.

Regular law enforcement agencies have been obstructed from pursuing known criminals involved in these assassinations and attempted assassinations. They have been prevented by the State Department, by Civiletti’s Department of Justice, and by the White House. In other words, the Carter administration, on this count alone, is involved in cover-up and obstruction of justice involving a wave of murders within the territory of the United States.

That’s the issue. And everybody on Capitol Hill involved in the investigation of Billygate knows that this is a key part of the paydirt.

Brzezinski’s Islamic card

Many people involved in the Billygate investigation also know that the hostage situation has been manipulated by the White House, by the State Department, from the beginning. That is, most people in the intelligence community, in military circles, as well as in leading political circles in this country, know that last summer Secretary of State Cyrus Vance issued a memorandum over his signature to relevant stations. The official view of the State Department, as set forth in a memorandum signed by Secretary Vance, was that if the Shah of Iran were brought back into the United States, it was probable that the Khomeini dictatorship would take American nationals hostage.

Having had that appreciation, the Carter administration, under pressure from Mr. Henry Kissinger and his traveling checkbook David Rockefeller, did conduct a phony medical investigation, contrary to all the other medical findings which had been made in the Shah’s case. The peculiarity of this medical finding was that Henry Kissinger’s doctor said the Shah had to be brought back into the United States for medical treat-

ment he couldn’t get in Mexico.

That happens to be a lie. But the Shah was brought in; he was brought in by the Carter administration under Kissinger’s pressure, knowing that this would lead, in all probability, to the taking of U.S. nationals hostage by the Khomeini dictatorship. That was done; it was done without any precautions to protect our embassy and consulates; it was done without any alternative measures to defend American nationals whose lives were put in jeopardy.

I proposed, at the time the hostages had been taken, directly to the Carter administration that a certain operation should be conducted to get the hostages free; it’s the only thing that would have worked. The Carter administration turned this down directly, through Jody Powell, saying the reason they would not run this operation was because they were determined to maintain the Carter administration’s alliance with the Muslim Brotherhood—the entity which took the hostages. The exact phrase used by Mr. Jody Powell was, “Mr. Brzezinski is deeply committed to Islamic fundamentalism.” Islamic fundamentalism is a code-word for the Muslim Brotherhood.

Now this crowd, the Muslim Brotherhood—of which I could tell you a great deal more, but for the sake of time I shall not—is actually an intelligence operation which was created by British intelligence in 1929. It is connected among other things, to a circle in Italy called the Circolo Rex, which is a bunch of very fruity old aristocrats who are very wealthy and powerful and do a lot of conspiring.

Billy Carter came into this picture through a gentleman called Michele Papa. Michele Papa is a politician in Italy, a Sicilian politician who is associated with something called the Sicilian Separatist Movement. This movement is funded in part by Qaddafi.

What happened was Billy Carter was simply used—because Arabs place a great value on family—as the President’s brother to reinforce Carter administration alliances with the Muslim Brotherhood, through its Libyan branch, and with the assistance of a drug-infested, international terrorist-linked operation, based in Sicily. As a matter of fact, this is an operation which is tied in to the recent bombing of a railroad station in Bologna, Italy, in which an estimated 80 people were killed and more than 100 seriously injured. So, the poor Billy Carter was simply drawn in, used as a tool by the people that run Mr. Carter, as part of an overall operation which involves the dirty connections of the Carter administration to the whole hostage situation in Iran.

That is what the boys in the back room, who have moved to temporarily play down Billygate, have done. As I indicated earlier, some are supporters of Reagan, though I don’t blame Governor Reagan for this in

particular, and some are supporters of the Anderson option and have said "Let Carter get the nomination; that will ruin the Democratic Party; that will increase Reagan's chances to run against this discredited Carter and it will increase the power of the Anderson option."

The media question

I propose that you as citizens, and you, particularly, as delegates, have to face this reality. Now, as to what will happen were I to be nominated—and I think at this point I'm the only person visible who is either running, or who might be put forward by some concerned Democrats, who is qualified to be President of the United States in this period of crisis—let me indicate to you some of the things that would tend to happen.

First. Many of you know that I have done more broadcasting, person to person, to nationwide audiences of citizens during the course of this election campaign than any other candidate. I have spoken to more of you directly than any other candidate in the course of the campaign. And yet, many of you are astonished that, apart from a wave of libel published against me in major news media during the fall of 1979 into February of this year, there has been virtually not a stick of coverage of my campaign in the major news media, that is, in papers like the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and so forth.

Many of you wonder: why is it that a candidate whom you see on TV in a series of half-hour broadcasts nationwide, why is it that on a figure who is running such a campaign, who seems to have such impact and influence, the media has a policy of blackout?

It should occur to you that the people behind this don't consider me an unimportant figure; they don't consider me an eccentric fringe candidate. Some of the people who influence this policy consider me very dangerous to their interests. Which indicates to you perhaps, that in some circles of the world I am very well known, and that my policies are very well known, and that some people are for them and some people are against them.

I don't know exactly what the Chancellor of West Germany, Helmut Schmidt, thinks of me personally, nor have I ever spoken directly to President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing of France. But most of the leading figures of most of the nations of the world have studied my policies, many of them agree with my policies, and I am, of course, well acquainted with circles which influence these governments. These governments, most of them, regard Governor Reagan as a disaster for the world, in particular, for the alliance among Western European allies. They regard Carter as a disaster. They regard Anderson as a disaster. While they refrain from intervening in the internal affairs of the United States, I can tell you frankly that many of the governments of

our allies, and the governments of some leading Third World countries, would rejoice if I were nominated as the presidential candidate for the Democratic Party this coming week.

What would happen? First of all, if I were nominated as candidate of the Democratic Party, our friends in Europe would move aggressively—*aggressively*—to put into place phase two of the European Monetary System. That is, my nomination would indicate that there is sufficient force behind the desire for a new gold-based monetary system within the United States, that Western European governments would consider themselves in a position to tell Carter to go fry—they're going ahead with the gold-based monetary system, the system that the Carter administration has tried to prevent.

International allies

The government of India—I helped, together with my associates, to devise a development program for India which friends of Mrs. Gandhi are pushing actively in India—would respond, on the basis that there was hope in the United States, and they would begin to act independently, on the assumption that a powerful portion of the American population wanted that kind of policy.

The government of Mexico would immediately change its policy on many questions, assuming that, at last, there was hope from the United States, that a significant number of the American people wanted a President who would mean true cooperation between Mexico and the United States.

And the same is true of governments throughout the world.

Ten million of the people in Africa are now facing death by starvation by November, partly as a result of policies imposed not only by two Kissinger administrations, but the policy of the Carter administration. Those U.S. administrations are responsible for the present situation in Africa, which is now genocide through famine, epidemic, and social chaos. If our government had had the right policies, and had been willing to work with France and West Germany on these policies, the present genocide in Africa through famine, epidemic, and social chaos would never have come about. Those people will have hope.

People in Europe, who might be able to move to help these starving people in Africa, might be encouraged to act independently to try to stop this genocide—where they would be afraid to move independently, or deterred at least, if, say, a Carter or some other unacceptable candidate were nominated on the Democratic ticket and if Reagan continued to be run by people like the "Gang of Four" around Henry Kissinger, Richard Allen and so forth.

That would mean changes. It would mean around

the country apart from what it means overseas—that many of you who represent what we used to call constituencies—black minority groups, farmers, trade unions, entrepreneurially-minded small-to-medium size businessmen who want to get the country moving again, and even some people in the ranks of the larger corporations who may presently be going along with these jokers I'm opposing—would realize that support for my nomination means that a powerful force has been pulled together in this country for a reindustrialization of the United States. A powerful force for the kind of tax policy that most people would rejoice over, and for making us again a great industrial power, respected among other nations, and able to exert leadership among other nations.

I don't know exactly what the reaction would be in the Kremlin; I have some well-known enemies there who have been responsible for running operations against me over the years and who have been publishing libels against me over a period of years. But the fact that I were nominated would mean a change in the Kremlin policy. They have studied my policies intensively, we know that, and it would mean that they would respond realistically to the kind of United States that my nomination would mean is coming into existence.

Therefore, your nominating me and your work to nominate me, means that the Anderson option will not work. Most of you—including those of you who have not voted in recent years—want an end to drugs; want an end to the decay of this society; want schools and you want an end to debedding of hospitals. You want our honorable agreements to social security recipients to be met; you want us to have the production, the means, to meet those things and you want peace and security. You want these things, and if you nominate me, you're not nominating me in the sense of honoring me, you're pulling yourselves together as a united force which is capable of shaping the future of this country.

Rottenness in America

I would like as many of you as possible to get in touch with my people, to find out for yourselves, not merely for the sake of this convention, but over the coming period, what Billygate is all about, what kind of an evil is involved in this thing.

This involves not just the Democratic Party, it involves many things, cutting across party lines. For example: William Casey, who is a key figure in the Reagan campaign, was a partner of Robert Vesco, during the period in which Vesco allegedly performed the frauds for which he is wanted. John White, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, has got a little explaining to do when it comes to Robert Vesco. You remember Stans and Mitchell, under the

Nixon administration. The thing that got them was manipulations of the Republican Party, or the Nixon administration, through Mr. Vesco's operations. Mr. Robert Strauss has some explaining to do when it comes to Vesco. Mr. Ramsey Clark has a great deal of explaining to do as to why he, a Carter administration agent, helped to bring Khomeini to power in Iran when the Carter administration *said* we must try to prevent a destabilization in Iran. Mr. Ramsey Clark has to explain how it is that he, one of the most famous defenders of international terrorists—including the Baader-Meinhof gang and the Red Brigades in Italy, including defenders of organizations which are committed to causing riots in the United States—with his track record, became a Carter administration agent.

Mr. Civiletti has to explain why, since he's become Attorney General, he has turned loose four unrepentant Puerto Rican terrorists, who announced that they were going to go out and incite terrorism, and did! He has to explain why his administration turned loose a friend of Mr. Ramsey Clark, Philip Agee, a man who is responsible for targeting agents of the United States for assassination. He has to explain why the Civiletti administration of the Justice Department dropped prosecution charges against the Weathermen at a time when this country faces a new wave of terrorism, and at a time that international terrorism has gone ahead.

This involves not merely this or that Democratic administration or Republican administration; it involves a rottenness within the command structure of our society, a rottenness which it is time that we clean up. And it is for this reason that some of these powerful and rotten people, who control not only the Trilateral Commission in the United States, but who have influence in the *New York Times*, who are allied to that military-industrial complex that President Eisenhower referred to—that of General Medaris and Roy Cohn and their friends, who are allied to many of the news media in this country.

We have to clean our nation out. It is not a partisan matter. Mr. Carter has simply, like administrations before him, permitted himself to become in large part an accomplice and a tool of this rottenness. And the reason they black me out is because they know that I know where the body is buried. I know how to clean it up. I know that once you, the average citizen, at the least the three-quarters of you whom I know to be sound in moral commitment, are given the facts, and once you are given the support of a President who unites you as a force, you are going to support the necessary forms of action to reestablish our nation as a constitutional republic that is accountable to the people; reestablish our centralized government as, not an alien thing, but as an institution of self-government of a well-informed and morally committed citizenry. Thank you.