

*'Convict him
or kill him!'*

The Night They Came To Kill Me

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. March 2, 2004

On October 6, 1986 a virtual army of more than four hundred armed personnel descended upon the town of Leesburg, Virginia, for a raid on the offices of *EIR* and its associates, and also deployed for another, darker mission. The premises at which I was residing at that time were surrounded by armed force, while aircraft, armored vehicles and other personnel waited for the order to move in shooting. Fortunately, the killing did not happen, because someone with higher authority than the Justice Department Criminal Division head William Weld, ordered the attack on me called off. The forces readied to move in on me, my wife, and a number of my associates, were pulled back in the morning.

That was the second fully documented case of a U.S. Justice Department involvement in operations aimed at my personal elimination from politics. The first was documented in an FBI internal doc-

ument dated late 1973. The first was an internal U.S. operation; the second, of Oct. 6-7, 1986, was international, including the involvement of the Soviet government of General Secretary Gorbachev. To understand the higher level of command behind the way in which the Democratic National Committee bureaucrats have used the Party's nullification of the *Voting Rights Act* to attempt to exclude me from this election, we must point to the crucial features of the 1973 and 1986 attempts at my personal elimination.

This is not only my cause for complaint. The great majority of Americans are as much the intended victim as I am. They have a right to know what is being done to them in this connection. I explain.

Those events of Oct. 6-7, 1986 began in Sweden, when someone killed that nation's Prime Minister, Olof Palme, and immediately, fraudulently, assigned blame for killing action to me. That libel was promptly adopted by my long-standing,

usually lying enemies at the *Washington Post*, and copied by other well-known news-media cesspools. This killing occurred in the context of a massive outpouring of preparatory hate-propaganda against me, world-wide, from the government of Armand Hammer associate Gorbachev. The issue behind the Soviet participation in the attack, was Soviet inside knowledge of my role in introducing what President Reagan had named publicly, "A Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)." Gorbachev, like his former sponsor, Soviet General Secretary Yuri Andropov, hated me on account of my international, as well as U.S. role in the development of the SDI proposal.

It became clear in the course of that year, that the killing of expendable target Palme was used, and therefore probably intended, to set into motion an environment for what would later pass as a "justified, retaliatory" killing of me; no other plausible motive for the killing of Palme has been presented to the public, up to the present day. Tracing all the relevant developments, over both the interval from that shooting, to the Leesburg events of Oct. 6-7, later that same year, all of the relevant events in the pattern of action, including the preparatory steps taken by Boston's William Weld, represent a systemically functional connection between the killing of Palme and the referenced events of Oct. 6-7.

When those two Justice Department "elimination" operations against me are considered, the obvious question is: "Are the two actions, those of 1973 and 1986, related?" They are, in fact, both closely related, and are key to under-

standing why the financial powers behind Democratic National Committee Chairman Terry McAuliffe's actions against me, have been so hysterically determined to exclude the one Democratic Presidential candidate who now represents, presently, officially, the broadest popular base of financial support of all current Democratic contenders. Why do the forces behind these actions fear me so much that they would take such extraordinarily high political risks in running these kinds of efforts to bring about my personal and political elimination?

In the second case, Oct. 6-7, 1986, the obvious motive for the projected official killing of me, my wife, and others on that occasion, was my role in the development of the SDI. Ironically, but not accidentally, this operation was unleashed at the time President Reagan was meeting Gorbachev in Reykjavik, Iceland, where the President, once again, firmly restated his commitment to SDI.

However, there is a direct connection to the earlier 1973 FBI operation. The 1973 campaign for my "elimination," the near-slaughter of Oct. 6-7, 1986, and the stubborn effort to exclude me from the debates now, are each and all products of the same issue of my fight against the effort of certain liberal economists, and others, to put the world as a whole under the thumb of the policies of former Nazi Economics minister Hjalmar Schacht.

The ultimate origin of these and related actions is not the U.S. Department of Justice, but a much higher authority than the U.S. government, the same assortment of Venetian-style international financier-oligarchical interests, and their associated law firms, which unleashed the wave of fascist dictatorships in continental Europe over the interval 1922-1945. The common feature of those international financier interests, then, back during 1922-1945, and today, is their present commitment to imposing Schachtian economics upon both the U.S.A. itself, and also on the world at large, as the presently ongoing looting of Argentina typifies such



Democratic Presidential Candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr.

fascist practices in action.

The intention of those financiers behind the demand for my exclusion from the Democratic Party proceedings, is to attempt to ensure that the next President of the U.S.A. is nothing but a pro-fascist banker's office boy in matters of national economic and social policy. A notable number of these pro-Schachtian financier interests are the proverbial "big bucks" behind the Democratic Party.

Three Linked Issues

Behind all of the operations against me, from 1973 through the present day, is a reflection of the common characteristic of three tightly linked issues. The first, my pro-FDR opposition to Schachtian economics. The second, my opposition to the so-called "utopian" military doctrines currently associated with "beast man" Dick Cheney. Third, my intention to reverse the folly of the past forty years downward drift of the U.S.A., from the world's leading producer nation, to today's predatory mess of Roman-Empire-style "post-industrial" bread and circuses.

Go back to the late Summer and Fall of 1971. When the breakdown of the Bretton Woods system was ordered by President Richard Nixon, on August 15-16, 1971. I responded, denouncing the incompetence of those leading economists who had insisted that such an event



FBI agents carry off documents from LaRouche headquarters in Leesburg, Virginia, October 6, 1986.

Fate of U.S.A., World Hangs on LaRouche

From Page 1

over-ripe to explode; if it does so before the July Boston Convention, the renowned economist LaRouche himself has an excellent shot at becoming the nominee.

The U.S. Presidency

There is another crucial difference between the two men. For many years now, LaRouche has been acting as a crucial member of the *Presidency*, that uniquely American institution centred on the office of the President of the United States, as the head of a separate Executive branch of government (unlike the Anglo-Dutch parliamentary system, which has no such office). The Presidency reaches beyond the President and his immediate staff. It includes former Presidents, the Vice President, military and intelligence figures, key figures from academia, some Presidential candidates and other influentials. This institution has allowed the U.S.A. to survive the many mediocre, or even treasonous individual Presidents it has had in its over 200-year existence.

As a member of this Presidency, LaRouche has carried out two decisive functions in recent years, among others. First, he has campaigned around the world for the establishment of a New Bretton Woods international monetary system of sovereign nation states to replace the present disastrous globalist system, and for the creation of the now functioning Eurasian Land-Bridge (ELB) as the engine of world economic growth. The ELB is a series of transport,

energy, communications and economic development corridors spanning all of Eurasia from the port of Rotterdam across to the east coast of China, uniting the advanced technological potentials of Europe with the great population centers of Asia.

LaRouche vs. Cheney

Second, LaRouche initiated the campaign to drive Vice President Dick Cheney from office. It was launched in early 2003 with the publication of the first of LaRouche's "Children of Satan" pamphlets, exposing Cheney as the kingpin of a *Synarchist* grouping (of the type presented in the *New Citizen* Special Report, beginning page 17). If Cheney goes, LaRouche has stressed, then the cabal of fascist neoconservatives around him will also go, such as Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, Rumsfeld adviser Paul Wolfowitz, former Pentagon Defence Policy Board chief Richard Perle, and others. In early 2004, Perle became the first of this clique to be dumped from his influential Pentagon post. In numerous writings and in millions upon millions of pamphlets distributed throughout the United States and abroad, LaRouche has exposed this cabal's designs to establish the U.S. as a world imperium on the model of the ancient Roman Empire, using wars and "terrorism". The same grouping has supported Ariel Sharon's genocide campaigns against the Palestinians, and potential Israeli strikes against Syria or other Arab

states.

Under the pressure of LaRouche's continuously escalating campaign, Cheney has fallen from the status of a much-feared, all-powerful de facto President, running George Bush as his dummy, to the position of being under investigation by U.S. Congressional committees, by the U.S. Justice Department, and by foreign governments in half a dozen different scandals, ranging from his corrupt former company Halliburton's profiteering in Iraq, to Cheney's leaking of the identity of a covert U.S. agent, in order to punish his own domestic political enemies.

The United States has a unique status in world affairs, dating from its founding as a "temple of hope" and "beacon of liberty" for all of extended European civilisation; thus, as the U.S.A. goes, so goes the world—including, of course, Australia. Therefore, LaRouche's campaign for the President of the United States is something on which your own life will depend to an extraordinary degree, in the near future. Without a Franklin Delano Roosevelt-led United States, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur's collaboration with our own courageous John Curtin, what language do you think we would be speaking today? So, in a period of extraordinary crisis, the affairs of the great and the mighty, and the affairs of the humble and "ordinary" intersect to determine the fate of civilisations. This time, as in World War II, you the "ordinary Australian citizen", are called upon to act in a decisive way.



Lyndon LaRouche (left, with pipe), debating Establishment economist Abba Lerner in New York City, 1971. LaRouche crushed Lerner, and no economist has dared to debate LaRouche since then.



LaRouche and soon-to-be President (1980-88) Ronald Reagan in New Hampshire, 1980. LaRouche designed Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), panned by the media as "Star Wars".

TABLE 1
LaRouche Is Number One in Individual Itemized Contributions

	# of Cumulative Itemized Contributions	Cumulative Individual Contributions*	Matching Funds Received January 2004
LaRouche	36,281	\$ 6,735,378	\$ 838,848
Kerry	25,899	23,611,216	—
Edwards	18,836	17,724,534	3,368,039
Kucinich	6,215	5,430,327	735,665
Sharpton	1,859	416,190	—

Source: Federal Election Commission.

* Total individual contributions, inclusive of February 2004 Report.

LaRouche leads all other U.S. Democratic Presidential candidates in individual itemized contributions—a key indicator of popular support—but has been kept out of public debates by a terrified Establishment.

could never happen under so-called “the built-in stabilisers.” Since the mid-1960s I had warned repeatedly, publicly against such a highly probable trend, of a series of international monetary crises leading toward the consequent breakdown of the present world monetary system. It had happened. Once again, I had been proven right as a long-range economic forecaster; virtually every university economics textbook, virtually every professor or similar type had been proven totally wrong on this issue.

Therefore, my associates and I launched a campaign against “Quackademic” economics professors. The turmoil this campaign produced on the campuses, and elsewhere, impelled the pained economists and their owners to select a champion of their cause, selected to defeat me in open debate. What soon proved to be the luckless Professor Abba Lerner, reputedly the leading resident Keynesian economist in the U.S.A., was selected for the contest.

We faced off on the premises of New York’s Queens College campus. Professors and comparable notables chiefly gathered in the front rows, and students and others chiefly behind them. My challenge to Lerner was that his current proposals for Brazil were an echo of the doctrines of Nazi Economics Minister Hjalmar Schacht. I warned his policy toward Brazil was typical of the kinds of fascist-like austerity policies which would be pushed under the new conditions created by Nixon’s action. For the allotted time, and more, Lerner squirmed and wriggled, seeking to change the subject from the concrete issue I had posed as the test question of the time, Brazil policy. Then, the debate closed when Lerner whimpered, “But if Germany had accepted Schacht’s policies, Hitler would not have been necessary.” The body assembled reacted to this whimpered utterance as if stunned. Lerner was, figuratively, carried, *hors de combat*, from that day’s field of battle.

Since that occasion, no leading economist in any part of the world has found the courage to challenge me in a debate on these crucial issues of Schachtian economic policy being pushed by the U.S. since that time. As Lerner’s friend Professor Sidney Hook stated the point: “LaRouche won the debate, but” he will lose much more as a result of that. It was his way of saying that the “establishment” would unite against me; it did.

There was no coincidence in any of this. The shift of the U.S. and British economies away from the U.S.’s leading role as the world’s greatest producer nation, toward a pro-Schachtian “post-industrial” utopianism, was the hallmark of the 1966-1968 Nixon campaign for the Presidency. The follies of this “post-industrial” shift into wild-eyed monetarism, led the U.S. government to

the point, that it must abandon its foolish post-Kennedy economic and cultural policies, or make exactly the choice I had warned that I feared they would make. Nixon’s decision of August 15, 1971 made the march in the direction of ruin and fascist-like dictatorship inevitable. Nixon’s mid-August decision thus made the issue of the 1971 LaRouche-Lerner debate the inevitable continuing, leading issue of U.S. economic policy, from that date to the present neo-Schachtian days of Lazard Freres-associated Felix Rohatyn

Nixon’s decision put the leading institutions and voters of the U.S. into a virtual ideological-economic fish-bowl. That is to say: the poor fish might think he can rule the universe by choosing that part of the interior of the fish-bowl to which he might wish to swim, but the bowl itself was being moved without his consciousness of the direction into which the bowl was being carried. Such are the sometimes tragic, utopian delusions of Cartesian and other true believers in what they define as “self-evident” definitions, axioms, and postulates. The universe in which they believe, is only a fish-bowl filled with those fools who believe that their own free choice, according to such beliefs, controls their destiny.

Most ordinary people today have little appreciation of the fierceness with which pro-Schachtian liberal financiers hate the memory of President Franklin Roosevelt. Most corporate and kindred Baby Boomers, such as my rivals for the Presidency, do not even know what a Schachtian tactic is. Nonetheless, the defeat, chiefly by Roosevelt’s U.S.A., of those pro-Synarchist, pro-Schachtian financiers’ effort to create a fascist internationalism during the post-Versailles decades, has prompted the financiers of today to seek every possible means to uproot and destroy the kind of agro-industrial constitutional republic which Roosevelt’s victory over Hitler et al. represented. So, in August 1944, as soon as the U.S.-led breakthrough in Normandy had sealed the early doom of Hitler, those financier circles which had temporarily supported Roosevelt’s war-effort, launched the right turn represented by Bertrand Russell’s leading role in putting forward a utopian strategic doctrine of imperial world government through preventive nuclear war.

During his two terms in office, military traditionalist President Eisenhower defended our constitutional order from the rampaging utopians he labelled a “military-industrial complex.” Kennedy’s assassination broke the back of the resistance to those utopians; the U.S. official plunge into the quicksands of asymmetric warfare in Indo-China, and the parallel, mid-1960s “post-industrial” shift, were the concomitant of that victory of the utopians.



The “Nine Dwarves” (aka Democratic Party Presidential candidates) convene for a “debate” in early 2004, LaRouche not among them.

The murders of Martin Luther King and Bobby Kennedy, were crucial elements of march toward ruin of our economic culture, and worse beyond.

The mid-1960s cultural-paradigm down-shift, merely typified by the dionysiac rock-drug-sex counterculture, was the destruction of the mind and gut of what had been the world’s greatest economy, the U.S. economy. The purpose of that induced cultural-paradigm shift was to uproot everything about the U.S. which was reflected in FDR’s achievements as President.

My proposal for what President Reagan was later to name his “Strategic Defense Initiative” was prompted by a recognition of the growing actual risk of general thermonuclear war, in the doctrines of James R. Schlesinger’s cabal around the theme of the “present danger.” I reacted out of my conviction that the nuclear madness of Trilateral Brzezinski’s cronies, Schlesinger et al., showed that the U.S. must find ways to engage the Soviet Union in a long-term alternative to the thermonuclear war implicit in a continuation of the Russell-like, so-called “detente” policies of the 1970s. Thus, when the Reagan National Security Council entertained my back-channel discussions with the Soviet government, to explore what I proposed as the relevant alternative, I became a grave danger to the policies of the utopians inside and outside our defense establishment. At the close of the President’s televised address of March 23rd, 1983, they decided I was too capable a political force of opposition to their schemes to be allowed to live. It is the same issue I represent against Cheney and his pack of neo-conservative lunatics today. That was the principal motive behind the indicated events of 1986.

In this way, the issue of my opposition to Schachtian economics, to utopian military madness, and to the past four decades cultural-paradigm down-shift of the economy, mind, and morals of our nation, are three aspects of the same issue. For that, they wished me “eliminated” in 1973, sought to eliminate me by shameless open actions in 1986, and wish to eliminate all traces of my international influence today.

“Prison, Anyone?”

The abortion of the shooting assault intended for Oct. 6-7, 1986, led to a subsequent, high-level, intense debate in relevant circles. “Shall we kill him, or imprison him?” was the tenor of that debate. The threat from the utopian faction was, “If you allow him to beat the legal frame-up we are conducting, you will not stop us from killing him this time!”

That decision was in debate from no later than the evening of President Reagan’s televised address of March 23, 1983. After a few days, the utopians had regrouped their forces around circles including the right-wing utopian, and fervent SDI

(and LaRouche and Edward Teller opponents) Daniel P. Graham and the utopians of the Heritage Foundation. So, the name of SDI was continued, but, under, the influence of circles backing Graham, the content was changed radically to emphasize obsolete, chiefly “off the shelf” technologies of no use for the indicated type of mission-assignment.

On Oct. 12, 1988, I delivered a memorable address in Berlin, which was taped there for later broadcast, that same month, on a nationwide TV campaign feature. I forecast the imminent collapse of the Soviet alliance, beginning probably soon in Poland, and spreading into other parts of eastern Europe and the Soviet economy itself. I proposed a course of U.S. action to deal, through affirmative economic action, with the opportunity to uproot the embedded institutions of major military conflict throughout the world.

I was soon hustled off to the hoosegow by the fastest, if perhaps the most crooked railroad in the

U.S.A., the Alexandria, Virginia Fourth District courtroom. So, in effect, the newly sworn President George Bush put me into prison, and, a little more than five years later, Bill Clinton pulled me out. Now, the world makes a new turn around the circle of crisis. This time, those bankers who wish to put a Democrat who would be a virtual office-boy for their Schachtian policies into the White House, are at it again. They are terrified at the thought that I, no office boy in these matters, would come even close to the White House.

Some leaders of nations are elected, others are either killed, or sent to prison to be defamed. So, powerful financier cabals have often ordered the fate of nations and the people, if the people let that happen. Thus, in today’s world, the ultimate feat of importance for a republic, is to get competent leaders elected, and keep them from being killed at a sign from the hand of a pro-Synarchist financier mafioso.



Lyndon LaRouche speaks in Washington, DC, April 1983. A crowd of 800 diplomats, scientists and citizens turned out to this event, a few weeks after President Reagan adopted LaRouche’s policy for the SDI.

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (100-39623)

FROM: SAC, NEW YORK (100-123674) (P)

SUBJECT: LYNDON HERMYLE LA ROUCHE JR., aka
Lynn Marcus
SM-NCLC
(OO:NY)

ReBulet, 10/29/73.

In viewing New York case file it is noted that information has been received that the CPUSA is conducting an extensive background investigation on the subject for the purpose of ultimately eliminating him and the threat of the NCLC, on CP operations. Several sources have furnished this information to the New York office, and this information has appeared in the Daily World newspaper several times.

NCLC sources have advised that the subject is the controlling force behind the NCLC and all of its activities. A discussion with the New York NCLC case agent indicates that it is felt if the subject was no longer in control of NCLC operations that the NCLC would fall apart with internal strife and conflict.

New York proposes submitting a blind memorandum to the “Daily World” CP newspaper, in New York City which has been mailed from outside this area to help facilitate CP investigations on the subject. It is felt that this would be appropriate under the Bureau’s counter intelligence program.

The blind memorandum is attached.

Bureau comments are requested on such a proposal.

2 - Bureau (RM) (Encl. 2)

1 - New York

(3)

1 - Supervisor #346

A declassified FBI document from 1973 discusses using the Communist Party U.S.A. for LaRouche’s “elimination”, one of several assassination threats he has faced.