

Japanese economic daily said that if Bush's trip was aimed at creating American jobs, he should have stayed at home, and that Asia was the wrong place to look for solutions to the U.S. economic slowdown, the causes of which are primarily domestic. U.S. exports to Asia were in fact already strong.

"Therefore, the 'job-creating trip' ought really to have been made inside the United States." Since the U.S. market is the most open in the world, truly competitive products should sell well there: "If American products don't sell as expected in their own market, the cause is the lack of competitiveness of the American products themselves."

Asahi Shimbun (Tokyo), Jan. 9: "What led the President to embark on an overcrowded schedule to the point of collapse, was the U.S. economic slump and Bush's own sinking popularity. . . . If we look at just the first round of summit talks, it would appear Bush's visit could end as just a fruitless election campaign."

Yomiuri Shimbun (Tokyo), Jan. 9: "This amounts to controlled trade. . . . The U.S. government must have concluded that Japan's annual trade surplus of about \$40 billion

cannot be reduced under the free-trade system. . . . Japan-U.S. relations are not a simple formula of Japan making concessions after being pushed hard by Washington."

La Croix (Paris), Jan. 10: An editorial titled, "Bush: The Fragile President" remarks that the medical diagnosis, intestinal flu, was not quite enough to erase the emotional shock caused by the image of a livid man being put back on his feet like a puppet. One wonders: "Isn't Bush a fragile man after all? His thyroid collapsed after the fierce stampede of the Gulf war. A bad virus makes him collapse in the midst of the recession. This repetition worries Americans who especially love the dynamic leaders: the triumphant youth of Kennedy, the warm robustness of Reagan. With Bush one hesitates: The character becomes fuzzy, unpredictable at the very moment where he would need the greatest authority and even a certain rage to govern. Because Bush has never been a real fighter, his physical problems take on huge proportions each time; one pardons disease more easily to a fighter type than to an undecisive one.

"To fall from a chair during an official dinner has never been a good political performance."

LaRouche identified Bush's mental problem early on

Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche has upon several occasions identified George Bush psychophysical problems. We excerpt from his statements.

December 1989: . . . George is a very shallow-minded person, very impulsive. He's a person of rage-driven obsession, and impulses flowing from rage-driven obsessions. Very shallow-minded. He's sort of a jock of one kind or another, in his mentality. He talks like it, he acts like it, his body language is that of it. He can't present a concept. The man is incapable of carrying a concept in his head. He's a poor fellow who's so rage-driven that very little intellectual activity can occur in his head; that's his conceptual type. He's a man characterized by sudden fits of jock-style rage, of obsessions which flow from seizure by that rage, and of impulses which flow from those obsessions.

Nov. 24, 1990: . . . There is no question that President George Bush is suffering a more acute form of implicitly schizophrenic paranoia than he showed during the height of the moments of uncertainty during the Panama atrocity by forces under his direction.

The President, in short, is *cracking*: *He is going nuts*. . . . When people lack access to a conscious, rigorous use of their higher mental powers, at least in any degree of concentration, they exhibit psycho-sexual impotence—in the sense of the man who may have a loving attitude toward his wife, for example, but is incapable of anything but a psycho-sexually impotent, i.e., erotic, form of the sex act; is incapable of anything *agapic*, in physical intimacy and related affairs with his wife. . . .

May 29, 1991: [During the invasion of Panama in 1989] I observed . . . that the President was in a dissociated state such that at least in that moment or in that context, the stresses of what he was doing had overwhelmed him, and he was to all intents and purposes virtually psychotic at that time. . . .

Many of us know, sometime, quasi-successful or successful business executives and others who are most unpleasant personalities to work with, precisely because they are given to obsessions, and can be set off into terrible states of rage if any of these irrational obsessions is disturbed. That is, if these obsessions are frustrated in any way, the obsession may erupt as a glower at work, on the job or elsewhere; it may take the form of the launching of a vendetta against some person on the slightest kinds of flimsy pretext; it may also take the form of kicking the wife, the children, and the family dog on the weekend, at home, to compensate for the frustration that is experienced in the week before. . . .