

LaRouche in '92 campaign sets third national television broadcast

"Democrats for Economic Recovery—LaRouche in '92," the campaign committee for Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, has announced that it has purchased time for its third nationally televised half-hour broadcast. The campaign said that the program will air on CBS national network on Saturday evening, May 30. In the week before the April 28 Pennsylvania presidential primary, the show, along with LaRouche's earlier broadcast, "The Industrial Recovery of the United States," has been airing in Pennsylvania media markets.

"There is no need for this depression. By a few simple actions which I would take within the hour that I were inaugurated President—and with your support to whip the majority of the Congress into line—I would set into motion the same, general economic recovery, which Roosevelt accomplished between 1939 and 1943," the candidate says in the opening of the show.

To the sound of prison doors slamming shut, the announcer breaks in, "Lyndon LaRouche is the only presidential candidate who has had the guts to call our current economic mess a depression; and who has the program to get us out of it. That is why Lyndon LaRouche was put into a federal prison, on the initiative of Henry A. Kissinger and his friends.

"Lyndon LaRouche is a political prisoner: he committed no crime; he is in jail because his ideas represent a political danger. Evidence already placed before the courts—including government documents, and the testimony of government agents—proves conclusively that LaRouche is innocent.

"The government has admitted that it holds tens of thousands of additional, unreleased documents from its secret war against LaRouche. George Bush has been repeatedly asked to release those files which would show LaRouche's innocence but has refused."

Why is LaRouche in jail?

LaRouche goes back 10 years to explain the reasons for this. "During the spring of 1982, I was the first to use the term 'debt bomb,' to describe the debt crisis which was about to explode. During June and July of that year, I conveyed to various governments of Ibero-America, and to our own government, my recommendations for immediate action to prevent this debt crisis from triggering a collapse in the sol-

veny of the U.S. banking system and thus triggering the conditions for a new world financial system was on the edge of a total collapse.

"During August 1982, the 'debt bomb' exploded in Mexico. For a period of approximately an hour that month, the entire world financial system was on the edge of a total collapse.

"However, the Reagan administration refused to accept my proposals, which could have stopped the world financial crisis right at that time. Instead, the Reagan administration brought in Henry A. Kissinger and adopted Kissinger's policies. My proposal for solving the financial crisis of the Western Hemisphere is called *Operation Juárez*. This is the name of a report which I prepared at the request of leading circles in South America and Mexico, a report which I submitted to those governments and to our own government at the beginning of August, just weeks before the Mexico crisis exploded. Since August 1982, Henry Kissinger, Kissinger's associate Lane Kirkland, and officials of the State and Treasury Departments have concentrated the major part of their political efforts in Washington and in Mexico and South America in an effort to prevent the policies I present in *Operation Juárez* from being adopted."

LaRouche also influenced the Reagan administration to adopt what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. The show details how the Kremlin leadership reacted strongly against him for these initiatives.

The show points to testimony by Mira Lansky Boland, a former employee of the CIA, now an official of the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, who said that planning meetings to stop LaRouche were conducted at the New York City apartment of investment banker John Train, starting in 1983. The meetings included representatives from the National Security Council, the ADL, the *Wall Street Journal*, NBC television network, and others, and planned a campaign to label LaRouche in the news media as a "political extremist." Prejudicing public opinion in this way was necessary to justify the secret government's already planned railroad of LaRouche.

The Soviet communist leadership put out its own propaganda targeting LaRouche, including, on Sept. 30, 1986, an article in a Soviet journal warning, "LaRouche is now clearly going through a definite period of growth. . . . How is it

Improve quality of schools, says candidate

In response to a query from a candidate for California State Assembly, where an initiative is on the June ballot for the voucher system for private education, Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche offered the following comments on April 6.

First, the parents and the children have the right to expect to be entered into a program of *compulsory*, good education through the secondary level. That has been an American principle, since *before* the establishment of the Constitution—notably, for example, the Massachusetts Bay Colony, or the ideas associated with the society of which Benjamin Franklin was founder and leader in Pennsylvania, the Junto.

Second, should the parents have the right, being denied that quality of education in the public schools, to not only send their children to alternative schools, presumably private schools, but to receive compensation from the government for the tuition in those private schools?

Generally, if we had a quality public education, my answer would be, to the question of public funding per student of private schools: No, we must not undermine our commitment to a sound public school system.

But this brings us to a third consideration, which I think the National Education Association and some others must face up to, and not just howl about the threats to the public school system. *They themselves, through many of their radical reforms in education*, together with others, such as publishers of textbooks, are acting *immorally* to destroy education in the name of providing it, in the public school system. This situation is driving parents into just

rage against the public school system.

The ultra-liberals and radicals must consider that if they want a full commitment to a public school system in these days of contention for funds, they better make sure that a classical humanist education of the type which we would have considered normal or desirable back in the 1930s, '40s, or '50s, is provided. This means classical geometry; this means history; this means literacy; and this means an elimination of all of these wild-eyed programs, of "conflict resolution studies," "current events studies," and so forth, these innovations which can be studied over the class and teacher jointly smoking joints in the classroom.

We should have, in sum, a public education system which is publicly funded. And although it is not improper, in my view, to give assistance to private schools of a certain type meeting certain standards under certain conditions, it must not be done at the expense of maintaining a quality public compulsory education system.

The problem, however, is that we do not have a quality compulsory education system, not merely because of the lack of money, though that is a factor, but because we have a lack both of quality teachers, and radical reform programs now afoot in the school system, which are so destructive of the child, as to be considered virtually satanic.

I think the only thing a candidate can do is to pose the issues clearly, and say, the discussion on this proposition is falsely posed. There's a fallacy of composition. The right of the child or the parents, to have for each and every child a quality compulsory education, in an objective sense, and be free of this radical junk, is a right without question. It's a moral right. And the people who say we must defend the public school system had better agree that the public school system will cut this junk out, and get back to a quality compulsory educational standard.

possible that the LaRouchites can act so openly and fearlessly?" The journal quoted the *Washington Post* to urge, " 'Why isn't the Internal Revenue Service interested in the affairs of this man?' "

The show continues: "One week later, on Oct. 6, 1986, the IRS, along with 400 members of the FBI, Secret Service, and Virginia State and local police, armed with automatic weapons, helicopters, and armored cars raided the offices of three organizations identified with LaRouche. The purpose was to seize hundreds of pounds of documents, and to deliver indictments which had finally been manufactured in Boston." When the government failed to convict LaRouche in Boston, it shopped for a more corrupt jurisdiction, and railroaded him with six associates to jail in late 1988 in

Alexandria, Virginia.

Ironically, the campaign of negative propaganda which turned LaRouche into a devil in the United States, has turned him into a hero in the former communist countries, where people understood that the media was controlled. The broadcast quotes a leader of the Ukrainian freedom movement, Taras Chornovil in late 1990, while on tour in Canada: "To the degree that the Soviet press primarily covered major developments of the West, such as the SDI program, then the name of Lyndon LaRouche was portrayed in a severely negative light. We, however, have learned to read between the lines of the official press and understood that if the name of a political dissident is caricatured in such a negative way, then the individual must have serious political views."