

An Enemy of LaRouche Is an Enemy of Clinton

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

March 24, 1998

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 25, Number 14, April 3, 1998. [View PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

According to relevant official documents released, the 1980s, massive, combined, official and news-media operation against Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. *et al.* was launched during the interval August 1982-January 1983, on the initiative of a publicly confessed British Foreign Office agent of influence, former U.S. National Security Advisor and Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger.¹ Beginning the period of the 1992 primary and general election campaigns, what surfaced then as a “political dirty tricks” operation of President George Bush’s reelection campaign, has turned out to be an operation remarkably similar to the secret intelligence, “Get LaRouche” operation: the so-called “Whitewater case,” originally launched in 1992, on behalf of Bush, against his, and, now, Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich’s political rival, U.S. President William Jefferson Clinton. In many respects, the two covertly directed operations appear to be almost identical, involving many of the same institutions and key personnel.

¹ The first documented, presently known initiative to this effect, is a letter, dated August 19, 1982, from Henry A. Kissinger to FBI Director William H. Webster. A related, second letter obtained, also to FBI Director Webster, on the same subject, is dated November 25, 1982. During a meeting of David Abshire, Edward Bennett Williams, and other Kissinger cronies on the President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB), on a date, or dates prior to January 12, 1983, the Board endorsed an EO 12333 operation against LaRouche *et al.* According to official documentation obtained, the charge concocted as a cover for activating the relevant EO 12333 operation against LaRouche, was an accusation charging that he and his associates were funded by “East bloc agencies.” Earlier, on May 10, 1982, Kissinger had bragged publicly, at a London Chatham House address, that, during his “White House incarnation” as U.S. National Security Advisor and Secretary of State, he had been an agent of influence of the British Foreign Service, who had kept the British Foreign Office “more closely engaged” in shaping U.S. foreign policies, than the government and republic to which he had sworn allegiance.

The 1982–1989 “Get LaRouche” operation,² was launched under the special provisions respecting use of private agencies as participants in official, covert foreign-intelligence operations targetting U.S. citizens, or others.³ The provision employed for this use, had been established, since December 1981, as part of the terms of U.S. Executive Order 12333. Exemplary of the use of private organizations in the “Get LaRouche” operation, were the included roles of Richard Mellon Scaife, the Scaife-backed dirty-tricks organization known as the American Family Foundation (AFF), Project Democracy, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), and a news-media cabal, including NBC-TV and Robert Bartley’s *Wall Street Journal*, the latter coordinated under a New York private banker and veteran “spook,” John Train.⁴

Compare the so-called “Whitewater” operation, which surfaced as a “dirty tricks” stunt of President George Bush’s campaign, during 1992. That dirty trick resurfaced in a new, Richard Mellon Scaife-funded incarnation, against both President and Hillary Clinton, during the latter months of 1993. Since that time, most of the newly surfaced, covert operations run against the President have been backed by both the same Richard Mellon Scaife central to the “Get LaRouche” efforts of 1983–1989, and by foreign-intelligence assets such as the propaganda machines of the British Commonwealth’s Rupert Murdoch and the

² In fact, the operation continues today. The difference is, Bush is no longer in the commanding position he enjoyed in intelligence operations while he and subordinates such as Lt.-Col. Oliver North were running the drug-trafficking Iran-Contra operations of the mid-1980s. However, inside the U.S.A. and western Europe, the major international news media deployed under the EO 12333 “Get LaRouche” operation of the 1980s, are continuing those editorial policies still today. It should be noted, that an officially documented FBI plot, to use its influence over the Politburo of the Communist Party USA (CPUSA) to bring about what the FBI document identifies as the “elimination” of economist Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., is revealed in exchanges between the FBI’s Washington, D.C. headquarters and the New York FBI office, on several dates during November 1973. This official use of the CPUSA channels for conduct of a U.S. Federal government act of violence against LaRouche *et al.*, dates from not later than events involving the CPUSA’s YWLL youth group, in Philadelphia, during middle to late March of that same year. U.S. Federal government COINTELPRO operations against LaRouche *et al.* continued officially into 1976, after which much of those sorts of operations against LaRouche, *et al.*, were shipped out, beginning early 1978, to already ongoing privately funded covert-intelligence operations, launched in 1974, involving Richard Mellon Scaife and the American Family Foundation and the FBI-linked Anti-Defamation League (ADL). Leading elements from these dirty covert operations of the 1970s, were brought together under the EO 12333 umbrella, around the New York City salon of John Train *et al.* (see below), no later than April 1983.

³ An operation against Lyndon H. LaRouche associate, and 1995 candidate for election as President of France, the distinguished Jacques Cheminade, was conducted, with aid of complicit French officials, from the same origins and through the same channels of Richard Mellon Scaife *et al.*, which had been used for the 1983–1989 EO 12333 operation against U.S. Presidential candidate LaRouche. Similarly, in Germany, during the early 1990s, a Richard Mellon Scaife covert-intelligence front ran a major covert operation, attempting to penetrate German government institutions, against the wife and friends of LaRouche in that country.

⁴ Bartley plays the same role in a Richard Mellon Scaife-backed, Great Falls, Virginia, “Get Clinton” forum run by Kenneth Starr crony Ted Olson, which the same Bartley, also then editor of the *Wall Street Journal*, performed for a Richard Mellon Scaife-backed New York “Get LaRouche” salon headed by veteran spook John Train.

Hollinger Corporation. It is then apparent, that, since late 1993, this targetting of the U.S. Presidency for destabilization, has become a virtual carbon copy of the 1983–1989 phase of the “Get LaRouche” operation run, both inside the U.S.A. and abroad, under the provisions of EO 12333.

As we have announced earlier: Since the present “Get Clinton” operation was launched as a “dirty tricks” operation of President Bush’s re-election campaign, in 1992, the circumstantial evidence points toward either a literal (Bush-launched) EO 12333 operation against President Clinton, or an official, covertly coordinated operation, so similar as to be virtually the same thing as the secret intelligence community’s “Get LaRouche” operation. That is the carefully considered judgment of *EIR*’s editors; it is also the connection between the two cases, which is now recognized among an increasing number of concerned circles around Capitol Hill, and elsewhere.

The investigation to be made, is situated in the following proposition. There is no competent denial, that the “Get Clinton” and EO 12333 “Get LaRouche” operations are remarkably similar in form, perhaps almost identical in all leading features. The question posed, is: How might we discover crucial proof, or disproof, of the proposition, that the “Get Clinton” operation is either an actual EO 12333 launched by President Bush, or an official operation so similar in critical features as to be the same thing in effect?

To settle that crucial question, *EIR* has relied upon the same scientific methods required in that long-range economic forecasting for which the recent global, systemic financial crisis has, again, shown this reporter to be a uniquely distinguished economist. That method of long-range economic forecasting, is derived from those notions of a characteristically non-linear, multiply-connected manifold, the which were successively developed, most notably, by Johannes Kepler, Gottfried Leibniz, Carl Gauss, and Bernhard Riemann. Such methods of investigation, applied to the present type of subject matter, since they are intrinsically non-linear, are not algebraic, of course; but, this hypergeometric method for treating characteristically non-linear functions, has the same authority, in effect, within the domain of counterintelligence investigations, as in its most rigorous sort of appropriate applications within the domain of mathematical physics. It is a method uniquely suited to addressing the indicated comparison of the “Get LaRouche” and “Get Clinton” operations.

So that the reader may have the means to understand the nature of this method of proof, we briefly situate the method’s origins historically, and describe the leading features of application of this method, in constructing *EIR*’s study of the conclusively defined, essential elements of information presently in hand.

Look to the Stars

For the needs of the general readership of this report, it is sufficient to look at the notion of a Kepler-Leibniz-Gauss-Riemann multiply-connected manifold, as the idea of such a set of relations might be introduced to a class of not more than fifteen to eighteen, literate secondary-school pupils.

Imagine that one or more among those pupils, is a bright, inquisitive, and energetic young person, who spends a significant portion of his, or her daytime and nighttime activity, studying the visible motion of the Sun, by day, and, on clear nights, the starlit heavens. The principled source of difficulty which would confront that pupil in such undertakings, is the following sort of facts.

Most notably, the place on Earth, on which that pupil stands, is not a fixed, but, rather, a moving point. For purposes of geodetic studies, as for astrophysics, the motion of the point on which that pupil is standing, is not simply located. The motion of that point itself, is complex, is, as Gottfried Leibniz emphasized, a motion of characteristically non-constant curvature. Similarly, the celestial motion observed, is of similar complexity.

To illustrate that complexity: The Earth is rotating on its axis. Additionally, it is, simultaneously, orbiting the Sun. Additionally, the Sun has motion within its galaxy. Additionally, the galaxies have motion with respect to one another. Worse, additionally, the observable stellar referents for the Vernal Equinox are changing, in cycles of approximately 25,200 years each. Additionally, the Earth's orbit around the Sun is also undergoing changes (which are principal determinants of our climates on Earth), in cycles whose effects are observed during cyclical spans of hundreds of thousands of years. There are many other relevant, additional such changes occurring within the observable universe. How might the pupil, then, calculate a standard frame of reference for the place, so defined, on Earth, from which he is conducting his observations of similarly complex trajectories of motion in the universe around us? How should he define an observed planetary orbit, or other trajectory, given such complications?

In short: it is only by combining all of these cycles of motion, that we approximate the relationship between the observer, on a fixed point on the surface of Earth, and the motion which that person is observing. Only in that way, do we approximate the needed, standard frame of reference in which to situate, and interpret that person's observations.

Therefore, given two distinct sets of observations, which we suspect to represent one and the same motion: how can we determine whether two different sets of observations actually represent one and the same trajectory? That challenge is the astrophysical, or comparable equivalent to the task confronting us here: two, apparently distinct sets of observations,

which we suspect might be our separate observations of one and the same “orbital trajectory.”

Generally, such problems may be approached by thinking of two sets of considerations. First, *the forms of motion*, as one might attempt to construct a standard frame of reference for describing an interconnected set of such interacting motions. Second, by examining the objects, and, also, *their associated characteristics of action*, which lie within such sets of motions. There must be significant coincidence between the trajectory, as it might be adduced from study of the forms, and among the characteristic interaction among the elements participating in the observed motion.⁵

The general object, as Kepler and Leibniz, for example, understood this, is to define a standard frame of reference, within which one can relate local, observed, usually, most emphatically, non-linear developments, to their impact upon the trajectory of self-development of the framework as a whole.

Proof of congruence of two sets of observations must satisfy both a) significant agreement in compounded forms of motions, and, also, b) meet the test of significant agreement in the characteristics of action (i.e., “change” in Plato’s sense of that term) among associated objects.

This same method is obligatory for competent, long-range economic forecasting. In such forecasting, the result addressed is the reciprocal character of the long-term impact of political and other cultural axiomatic influences upon the combined process of discovering, developing, and employment of physical principles. In this application, as the present writer’s somewhat celebrated “Triple Curve” illustrates this point, the most elementary frame

⁵ Consider a related question. Is light propagated as the inertial action of photons, or is there a more active feature to this propagation? In other words, is electromagnetic radiation self-propagated (even in a virtual vacuum) in the sense that the radiation itself is the source of the action by which it is self-continued? In other words, is the observed speed of light, for example, an example of retarded rates of self-propagation? The answer lies in another question. Can light, for example, be refracted within a vacuum as such? Ampère’s discovery of the electrodynamic “longitudinal” (“angular”) force, as demonstrated experimentally by Wilhelm Weber, is a related issue. This suggests a review of the work of Ampère’s celebrated collaborator, Fresnel. For the edification of the university freshman: Projecting a light beam precisely at a very sharp edge, within an efficiently evacuated chamber, can the incidence produce the phenomenon of refraction within that chamber? If so, then further crucial experiments must be conducted to verify the suggested implications of that laboratory exercise. The question thus persists, pending the completion of such experiments: Are the characteristic features of the propagation of light (and other electromagnetic radiation) rooted primarily in the self-propagation of that radiation? Implicitly, the issue of “gravitational waves” is also posed in a related way. That conjecture is typical of a very large array of analogous issues of crucial-experimental method, not only within the bounds of study of new physical principles, but equally applicable to the domain of language, viewed, as Panini and other scholars since have viewed Sanskrit and its forerunners, from the standpoint of the role of metaphor in Classical forms of poetry, tragedy, music, and plastic arts.

of reference we must employ, is the functional form of interaction among physical-economic, demographic, financial, and monetary trajectories.

In such cases, we must consider the impact of cultural and scientific development, or retrogressions,⁶ upon the ordering of those choices of policies which are governed, variously, by the long-wave, and medium- and short-term social processes. This includes choices of artistic and physical-scientific culture, which affect the shaping of policies and other behavior bearing upon the per-capita and per-square-kilometer relations among these three, interacting trajectories.

Reciprocally, the same general tactic provides a method for addressing such topics of non-mathematical topology as historical cycles and long-range counterintelligence studies. The last among this list of exemplary applications, focuses our attention on the stated case immediately at hand. In this case, we must show a congruence among the array of motions (i.e., *forms*: e.g., legal action, media campaigns, etc.) and, also, a significant coincidence among the *types* of institutions and persons employed in those actions.

Additionally, since the universe is finite, we must expect, that, in the case of congruent motions, not only must there be a correlation between the sets of types of institutions and persons observed in action; we must expect a significant representation of the same institutions, and some of the same persons, in the cases compared.

The Results Obtained, Thus Far

So, as we have already indicated, we have conducted our scrutiny of the evidence in hand, as an application of this indicated method to a task of strategic counterintelligence against certain among our Federal Republic's foreign and domestic adversaries.

In the specific topic of counterintelligence at hand, the writers and editors are not presently prepared to claim, that the "Get Clinton" operation is another case of the same kind of operation under EO 12333 documented for the "Get LaRouche" case. We do claim that the similarities are startling; we also observe that the forms are, at least, nearly identical, that the arrays of institutions involved in each of the two cases are virtually identical, and that the personnel engaged are drawn, chiefly, from the same set. The congruence is sufficiently tight, that we must suspect that any institution, or persons, engaged in the "Get LaRouche" operation, are resources either already deployed in support of the "Get Clinton" operation, or are in readiness to be so deployed.

Before concluding these prefatory remarks, we should stress the nature, and importance of one specific characteristic of the enemy's behavior. These final remarks are crucial for

⁶ In other words, the kinds of axiomatic changes which are sometimes identified by the term "cultural paradigm-shifts."

understanding the purposes deeply underlying this counterintelligence effort. In addition, as the reader will quickly recognize, this specific characteristic of the global frame of reference within which these matters are situated, is indispensable for understanding the enemy's motives in the evil done by such implicitly treasonous operations as the "Get LaRouche" and "Get Clinton" operations.

As this present writer has insisted, over decades, the *exceptional* character of the creation of our United States, is precisely that upon which President Abraham Lincoln often put his finger, as, for example, in that famous Classical mode of utterance passed down to us as his Gettysburg Address.⁷

Although the aspiration for such a result is known to us as early as the Classical Greece of Plato, the principle axiomatically underlying our 1776 Declaration of Independence and 1789 Federal Constitution, was first established by Jesus Christ and his Apostles: the notion that there is no ethnic distinction among men and women, in the respect that each is equally made in the image of the Creator, an image which we may recognize in the human individual's unique potentials, for discovering, imparting, and receiving, both valid new physical principles of our universe, and those notions, of the human cognitive processes themselves, which are best forced to our attention by the metaphors upon which each and all of the greatest works in Classical art-forms are premised.

President Lincoln's notion, was that political society must be self-governed by that principle, in opposition to Twentieth-Century Nashville neo-feudalists, such as the literary assassin of Huey Long, Robert Penn Warren, and Henry A. Kissinger's trainer, treasonous William Yandell Elliott. In the sweep of medieval and modern European history, that specifically Christian appreciation of *Genesis* 1:26–30, the principle of universality of such equality,⁸ is expressed in combat, by such as Abelard of Paris, Frederick II of the Holy Roman Empire, and Dante Alighieri, against that superstitious irrationalism which is intrinsic to any society

⁷ President Lincoln's Classical expression, in thought as in speech, was deeply rooted in his persisting studies of the tragedies, and other dramas, of William Shakespeare. Some among his Cabinet members attested to the heavy emphasis which Lincoln placed on metaphors from Shakespeare as tools for insight into crucial strategic problems of that period of crisis.

⁸ E.g., in contrast to the racist (e.g., anti-Arab) implications of the radical Zionism of the fascist, and British intelligence asset Vladimir Jabotinsky. In rejecting the Babylonian reading of Hebrew texts, we must not overlook the cases of Jesus Christ's contemporary, Philo of Alexandria, or the core supplied to modern Judaism by Rabbi Hillel, or the reform of Judaism led by Gotthold Lessing's friend, the great Moses Mendelssohn. The principle is elaborated with clearest emphasis by the *Gospel of John* and the Epistles of Paul, the two apostles most hated by sundry varieties of morally and culturally backward religious bigots. Nor, can one overlook the prehistory of the *Shoah*, to be found in such locations as the writings of the proto-Nazi Friedrich Nietzsche, and others of those streams leading into Nazism, which located the principal "crime" of the Jews, as the creation of a Christianity which embedded in modern European republicanism, Lincoln's view of the anti-feudalist principle, of governments "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

which submits to the existence of the feudal classes of financier oligarchy, landed aristocracy, as also Babylonian styles in usurpatious governmental oligarchies.

The most notable irony in the exceptional, world-wide importance of our republic's existence, is that no leading idea informed our struggle for our Declaration of Independence and Federal Constitution, which was not an idea imported from Europe, chiefly from continental Europe. The most crucial factor determining the historically exceptional importance of the creation of our constitutional republic, to the present day, is, that this republic was established to realize the dreams of republican Europe, that in a place at a convenient strategic distance, from the brutish long arm of those feudal classes which remained the predominant power over the governments and peoples of all Europe.⁹

The United States is not exceptional because our shores bred better ideas than existed among continental Europeans; but, rather, because, on condition we were prepared to fight against the traditionally Welf-led European feudal classes to secure this freedom, we had the geographically determined, strategic opportunity to build a society on the foundation of the best ideas, the noblest principles of truth and justice, which we had largely acquired from, or otherwise shared among the best thinkers of continental Europe.

That problem of feudal infestations, faced by Europe then, persists there still, today, as typified by the financier-oligarchies represented by the hereditary households of Welf and Orange.¹⁰ The same problem has come to infest the U.S.A., too. This appears in the form of

⁹ During the interval 1789–1848, the principal among the mortal adversaries of the United States, were the British monarchy and the forces coordinated by Austro-Hungary Chancellors von Kaunitz and Klemens Prince von Metternich, and the Holy Alliance of 1814–1848. During the 1789–1814 interval our enemies included, from France, the French Jacobins around Maximilien Robespierre, including such terrorist agents of Jeremy Bentham's British Foreign Office as Marat and Danton. They included, from earlier than 1789, the same Duke of Orléans who organized the storming of the virtually emptied Bastille, as an election-stunt on behalf of a Swiss banker, Jacques Necker, who, as former, London-backed Finance Minister of France, had bankrupted the national treasury. The U.S. enemies included Paul Vicomte de Barras and his protégé, the later Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte. Throughout the Nineteenth Century, the financier oligarchy and most of the landed aristocracy of Europe remained our mortal enemy, running operations aimed to subvert and destroy our republic through Central and South America, and otherwise. During the 1850s, through the end of his life, Tsar Alexander II emerged as a faithful friend of the U.S.A., against our nation's mortal enemy, the British monarchy. The victory over London's puppet-state, the Confederate States of America (C.S.A.), by President Lincoln's Presidency, and the 1861–1876 emergence of the U.S.A. as the world's most advanced and powerful national economy, inspired the spread of the American System of political-economy into East Asia and Europe, and the revival of the earlier pro-U.S.A. movements within Central and South America.

¹⁰ What became the ultra-reactionary family of Este-Welf, rose to a dominant position in the European feudal oligarchy during the Eleventh Century, and has been in the forefront of the leading reactionary, pro-chivalric, pro-feudalist movements of Europe and the Americas ever since. The British monarchy of the Welf dynasty, typified what Venice created, during the Sixteenth Century, as the northern, nominally Protestant branch of the Este-Welf family. What the same Sixteenth-Century Venice dominated, simultaneously, as the southern, nominally Catholic branch of the same family, is typified, during recent decades by the Este family's Principessa Pallavicini, a feudal figure who, in such matters, greatly outranks Britain's relatively picaresque currently

the U.S.A.'s own financier oligarchical classes. The basis for the virtually treasonous Anglophile faction in the U.S.A., from the time of Judge Lowell, the time of treasonous Manhattan bankers such as Aaron Burr, of the British East India Company's New England opium-traffickers,¹¹ to the time of the southern slaveocracy's present-day Kappa Alpha Society and Nashville Agrarian/Fugitive tradition, that basis has not been only some Hollywood-style of simple-minded fops' and yahoos' romantic fascination with Queen Elizabeth II's most unmelodious, "mashed potatoes" diction. The essence of the matter, is the romantic's pro-feudalist characteristics, which underlie, axiomatically, the moral degeneracy of our own actual, and would-be, native financier oligarchs. The same banal romanticism permeates the sick souls of those would-be feudal lackeys (such as Henry A. "Leporello" Kissinger), who share the same hatred of what Churchill disciple Kissinger has publicly denounced as the "American intellectual" tradition, that of Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Roosevelt.

In the "Get LaRouche" operation, the documented, motivating issue, which prompted the efforts of official lackeys, such as the relevant FBI officials, to work to bring about the "elimination" of LaRouche, is typified by the roles of Stimson-linked oligarch McGeorge Bundy, oligarch Bundy's depraved lackey, Henry A. Kissinger, and statements of McGeorge's brother William. The similar statements of Lovestone-cloned lackey Leo Cherne to Stefan Possony, in 1976, ordering Possony to an emergency deployment against LaRouche on the issue of nuclear energy, is, like Kissinger's decades-long hatred of LaRouche, exemplary of other "Leporellos" of today's neo-feudalist lackeydom. The present writer was an issue for only two reasons: he was, to sum matters up fairly, in the Lincoln tradition, and the oligarchs in question stated repeatedly that they found LaRouche "potentially dangerous" in his effectiveness on behalf of his cause, and in opposition to theirs.

The same motive, with some different predicates included, is the openly expressed, treasonous, pro-feudalist motive for the "Get Clinton" operation. In a time of crisis, the existing terror which grips the Anglo-American feudal financier-oligarchy and its vicious lackeys with horrid passion, is their fear, that under conditions of extreme and global, financial, monetary, and economic crisis, President Clinton might opt to turn the U.S.A. away from "globalization," back to the legacies of Presidents Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt.

reigning royal frump. The wars between the Welf League and Frederick II, which caused the mid-Fourteenth Century "New Dark Age," typify the purely evil role performed consistently, throughout Europe, by Venice and the Welf faction, from the Eleventh through the Nineteenth Centuries. Miguel de Cervantes' *Don Quixote* is a relevant insight into the role of this enemy, neo-feudalist tradition in bringing about the self-induced economic and cultural collapse of Spain over the course of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

¹¹ See, Anton Chaitkin, *Treason in America*, 2nd ed. (New York: New Benjamin Franklin House, 1986).

The sundry packs of LaRouche- and Clinton-haters, these assorted “patricians,” lackeys, fops, and yahoos, share the deep hatred of Roosevelt’s intended post-war, “American Century” policies, which encouraged oligarchical lackeys such as Stimson, and perennially down-at-heels aristocrats such as Winston Churchill, like McGeorge Bundy and Averell Harriman, to exploit the untimely death of President Roosevelt to Britain’s peculiar post-war political, strategic advantage.

The gut-hatred of President Clinton, among these patricians, lackeys, fops, and yahoos, like their continued hatred of Franklin Roosevelt, still today, is complemented by the terror which grips them, as they are presented now with the prospect, that the way in which reality has totally vindicated the LaRouche forecast of the presently ongoing, global financial-monetary crisis, will render his proposals for a specific type of “New Bretton Woods” reform successful. Were the latter reform to occur, their classes would lose global power, perhaps forever. That prospect does make them a bit testy. Their hatred of target Clinton, springs from somewhat distinctly different proximate premises; however, the historic, strategic circumstance which prompts those otherwise differently motivated hatreds is one and the same.

What is at stake here, is not some item of petty palace intrigue. For example, given such revealing, disgusting, clinical displays of an addled mind, as “Thyroid Storm” and “read my lips,” only a silly romantic could believe that former President Bush is capable of comprehending the real issues of his recent and present roles as a figure of the world’s living theater stage. His mean little mind is made for much pettier concerns. Respecting the ultimately determining historic issues which motivated the “Get LaRouche” and “Get Clinton” thuggeries, Bush is virtually a mere actor, in a real-life drama in which he is no more than an available player, a threadbare simulation of a modern caricature-Caligula, a Bush whose political positions of the recent nearly thirty years,¹² have always found him an otherwise unemployed, and not excessively talented actor, who happened to be conveniently at hand, to fill an assigned part.

It is from that vantage-point, that we are assured, that any enemy of Lyndon LaRouche will prove, soon enough, to have been an enemy of President Clinton.

Keep that deeper issue in mind: the continued struggle to free a republic “of the people, by the people, and for the people” from the stinking grip of the feudalist traditions of financier oligarchy and its lackeydom. That done, the particular conclusions presented, are supported by the method of argument indicated, as the following accounts show.

¹² Since he turned up, knocking on Henry Kissinger’s and other Nixon-administration doors, in Washington, begging for political jobs, after he lost his Texas run for election to the Senate.