

Editorial

Bush campaigns against LaRouche

Vice President George Bush was considerably worried on July 31 in Iowa, right after his rival Lyndon LaRouche's visit with the prime minister, defense minister, and foreign minister of Turkey. In fact, Bush, the leading Republican candidate—if polls are to be believed—for the first time in this presidential campaign, got up on his hind legs and attacked LaRouche, the only Democratic Party candidate he considers sufficiently threatening to his 1988 chances to give the “name recognition” of an attack.

“I don't like the things that LaRouche does,” the Republican candidate is reported to have said, reacting to LaRouche's call for revoking Executive Order 12333 and his visit to Turkey.

Ironically, the “leading” Republican candidate for President in 1988, and all the Democrats agree on one thing—they don't like what LaRouche is doing. In this, as the latest outburst in the Soviet *New Times* shows once again, they are on Moscow's line.

Following his address to a campaign meeting in Shelton, Iowa, Bush was asked whether he agreed with LaRouche that Executive Orders 12333 and 12334 should be revoked. Bush replied: “I don't know what they are. I haven't heard about them. Tell me more.” After it was explained that the two orders have made possible the mushrooming of the “secret government,” Bush said: “Well, I wrote an executive order that made intelligence accountable to the appropriate institutions. Maybe this order has been amended. But, in any case, if Lyndon LaRouche is for it [revoking E.O. 12333 and 12334] I'd be very, very wary.”

Later, Bush was asked to comment on General Rogers and the “zero option” and on LaRouche's visit to Turkey. Answering the second question first, Bush said: “I don't know what to make of the LaRouche visit and I assume the Turkish prime minister doesn't know what to make of it either. . . . I don't like the things LaRouche does. . . . He's bilked people out of lots of money and misrepresented what causes the money was going to.”

Asked whether he approved of the trumped-up political indictments against LaRouche, Bush said:

“LaRouche is in a lot of trouble and deserves to be in a lot of trouble.”

Bush then got to the strategic point: “It's true that Rogers expressed opposition to the zero option, because he thought it would be bad for Europe. But General Galvin approves of the zero option and I agree with Galvin.”

Bush's defense of the policy of decoupling of the alliance by means of the zero option, and his insults of the Turkish government, our biggest military partner in NATO, simply illustrate what the problem is, in the shipwrecked Republican administration in which George Bush is still serving. While the vice president was campaigning against LaRouche in Iowa, Gen. John Galvin, who replaced Bernard Rogers as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, issued his first statement in complete support of the treacherous zero option, which his predecessor had so gallantly opposed. The State Department announced that there will be a three-day meeting on Sept. 15-17 between George Shultz and Eduard Shevardnadze, to discuss the zero option deal, “regional matters,” and, of course, a Reagan-Gorbachov summit this year.

Lyndon LaRouche in Ankara made it perfectly clear that his presidential campaign is about rallying the forces of the Western Alliance to organize resistance to the Soviet imperial drive for world conquest. His is the only presidential campaign doing this. Every one of the Democratic seven dwarfs paid his homage to Moscow a long time ago.

Vice President Bush in Iowa showed for the first time that he squarely supports the policy of capitulation to Moscow. Wittingly or not, he, too, paid homage to Moscow with his uncalled-for personal attack against LaRouche, the man Moscow considers its main adversary. Moscow has two “unconditional demands” for a “successful summit this year”: Moscow wants the Reagan administration to silence LaRouche and to smother the Strategic Defense Initiative program.

Bush's outburst also underscored that those two issues are in fact one. Without LaRouche there will be no SDI—and after 1989, no United States.