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glove the gardeners clipping hedges, the footmen and the maids. A craftsman might have spent a year carving this one chair. An army of his col leagues must have worked on that one house. The genteel conversation heard there round the table, the laughter of the ladies and the glitter of their jewels, here are represented by a single too-big chair.

That's the trouble with this show. In a sense it is defeated by the scale of its subject. There are 300 objects-bronze statues, paintings, tables, architectural drawings, stained glass windows, silver trays—and still this exhibition remains but a sketch.

This exhibition portrays an era not only of gilt, but of steel and bronze and mother-of-pearl; it was the age of the 400, and of the robber barons, the Astors and the Morgans, of monuments, basins and 25-course meals. Capitalism had triumphed, and despite unseemly slums, the industrial revolution had begun producing what seemed endless wealth. Members of the American establishment of those days, untroubled by doubt, buried themselves building a new world.

Through photographs and drawings,
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Lynden LaRouche! A Most Unusual Candidate for President

By Megan Rosenfeld

The candidate's aide, offering a nugget of small talk, tells him that the fireman about to give him a tour of the Blanchester, N.J., fire station is also president of a mountain-climbing club. The candidate grins, offers his 10-gallon cowboy hat, and starts to chitchat. He used to put more energy into himself, the candidate confides, but you know how political life takes up your time.

A local television reporter interviews the candidate about his chances in the Feb. 28 Democratic primary. Putting down his pipe, he says they are excellent, that he will probably come in second after Carter. What about those private security guards he travels with, the reporter asks—why armed guards?

Well, he explains without a flicker of emotion, his thumb hooked casually into the vest pocket of his suit, terrorists have targeted him for assassination. His enemies are freaked out by his candidacy, he says, and President Carter is helping petty and immoral in denying him Secret Service protection.

Lynden H. LaRouche Jr., who says most of his opponents are "looney" and "bucking," is running for president.

The New Hampshire campaign headquarters of Citizens for LaRouche looks like any other campaign headquarters—the volunteers sitting at cluttered tables working the telephones, the charts and maps of New Hampshire, the bathroom with the burned-out light bulb that everyone is too busy to replace. Clean-cut workers come and go, some carrying boxes of campaign literature that get stored on the floor.

Campaign literature such as one bound brochure entitled, "The American Friends Service Committee: Sodomy and Terrorism," or, "LaRouche Policy Statement" opposing repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act, in which Republican George Bush is described thus: "George Bush, a member of a weird Yale blue-blood death and resurrection cult."
Lyndon LaRouche: A Most Unusual Candidate

LYNDON LAROUCHE, campaign manager for the New Hampshire State Labor Convention, a member of the national advisory board of (Philip) Crane for President and a former member of the New Hampshire American Party, Johnson said he is none of those things.

Quick and Confusing

LaRouche’s press secretary, Laura Cohen, is on the telephone. “Look,” she says icily, “we know you wrote your story before you even talked to us. We have made a record of everything you have said while you’ve been here. We’ll decide what to do with it after your story appears.”

“The security guards can decide to terminate the interview at any time,” warned campaign aide Scott Thompson. The interview was scheduled for early evening at a rambling modern house LaRouche rented from a Manchester builder “who likes to go South for the winter.” (LaRouche himself has recently moved from New York City to a suburb of Detroit because a newspaper printed his address—and he no longer felt safe in the Bronx.)

A tall, balding man with a strong New England accent, LaRouche speaks quickly but in complicated sentences that can leave a listener almost immobilized with confusion.

During this interview, attended by his wife, press secretary Laura Cohen and a bodyguard, LaRouche seemed relaxed, talking for several hours without the examination being terminated by anyone. One exchange:

Q: Mr. LaRouche, on what basis do you say you’re one of the leading economists in the world?

A: Oh, there’s no question about it. I am the leading economist of the century.

Q: Do you realize that to the average person that might sound a bit arrogant?

A: So what? It’s true. Everyone who is not arrogant is just as bad as those who lie out of bravado. It’s a practical point: I am the world’s leading economist and in Europe, among leading circles in Europe, I’m considered the intellectual author of the European Monetary Fund.

For the record, here is what LaRouche said was his key achievement:

The characteristic problem in economics is how do you determine where the growth must go? The determinism of economic control is as much a problem as the determinism of technology and how you define technology and how you define growth in those terms. That one I solved in about ’52.

The Nasty Duckling

LaRouche was born Sept. 8, 1922, in Rochester, N.H., according to his own account. During an election for president, he commands a cadre of maybe 2,000 followers whose intense devotion has been described by ex-colleagues and
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Lyndon LaRouche and his wife Helga; by AP

Inusual Candidate for President

Marcus Raskin, and, basically, a lot of others who aren't members of the NCLC, are responsible for everything in the world that is bad.

• Adolf Hitler worked as a correspondent for The New York Times.
• The Abscam scandal is really an FBI plot to undermine the Democratic Party machine in order to control it.

Food & Foreign Affairs

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, 31, has been campaigning full-time for her husband. She is a citizen of West Germany and said she has not thought yet about whether she would become an American citizen if her husband is elected president. She travels to the college-classroom, forums and senior citizen centers that make up the daily grist of campaigning.

Dressed on one occasion in a red plaid skirt and a red sweater, she looked rather like an aging coed, earnestly promoting her husband's ecologic theories and promises of a prosperous future. Like other LaRouche supporters, she answers questions with an edge of condescension, as though there can be no other response.

In an interview (monitored by three aides and a bodyguard) she said she worked for three years as a newspaper one of the students. Press aide Laura Cohen is right by her side.

"I'd like to interview this student and then I'll join you," the reporter says.

"Go ahead," says Cohen, not moving.

"I'd like to interview the student privately," the reporter says.

"I'd like to stay," says Cohen. "I always do.

"Well, I'd rather you didn't," says the reporter, ushering the confused student to another part of the classroom.

The interview proceeds. The student's name is Sandy, she's 19, and a nursing student. She wants to hear every presidential candidate she can, although she's leaning toward Ronald Reagan. As she talks, both she and the reporter notice that the woman who had been greeting people at the door is standing behind the reporter.

Sandy says she didn't agree with much of what Zepp-LaRouche said, but had expected more specifics, as she had from John Anderson the week before.

The interview is concluded a few seconds later. The reporter collects her gear and rejoins Cohen. As they walk down the school hallway, Cohen says, "That was Helga's speech for student audiences. Usually she's more specific.

Devotion and Lawsuits

Major questions about LaRouche and his followers baffle long-time observers: how did he get from being a Marxist to a "conservative Democrat," and where does his money come from?

"There is no one as odd as LaRouche," said history professor David DeLeon, author of "The American Anarchist," and a student of fringe political groups. "There is no parallel. You can't talk about it rationally."

Neither the left nor the right of the mainstream political spectrum wishes to claim them. Many "LaRouchies" display many of the characteristic features of a cult—an almost total dedication to the ideas of one man; even when they are not logical, a belief that everyone else is out to get them; a life style that isolates them from association with non-LaRouchies, and an intense, humorless devotion to their cause.

They vehemently deny the label of cult, and hurl it back at their most regular targets ("Zionist cult," "environmentalist cult," etc.). They also deny being anti-Semitic, and have filed a suit against the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith for accusing LaRouche and other NCLC members of making anti-Semitic statements.

LaRouche announced that a British member had been brainwashed, and party members were told to alert the national media to this threat. As the years passed, assassination threats against LaRouche became a regular alert, chronicled in the party paper New Solidarity.

"Security" became more important, and members of the party were trained in self-defense and "anti-terrorism techniques" at their own farm and later at a private camp in Georgia operated by International arms manufacturer Mitchell L. Werbell III.

In 1974 they launched "Operation Pop-Up," a retaliatory move against the Communist Party. For about a month Caucus members attended Congressional meetings, provoking both physical and verbal fights.

LaRouche harassed prominent figures like Marcus Raskin of the Institute for Policy Studies and linguist Noam Chomsky, calling them "scoundrels" and "fascists," among other things.

"Although the Labor Party has developed a new configuration of tactical alliances since January 1974," in an unsigned article in the Oct. 1979 edition of New Solidarity, "it is nonsense to argue that the party's look or method have changed over the period of its existence. Developed greater richness, yes; changed in an essential feature, no."

The source of the operation's estimated $3-million budget is not completely clear. There are a variety of sources:

• Airport sales of publications, including the Executive Intelligence Review, which costs $10 a copy.
• Donations from members and wealthy supporters. The New York Times, quoting former members, reported that October that at least five members have given more than $100,000 of their own money to the organization.
• One ex-member told Business Week that the group hoped to get $1 million from an Iraqi group. LaRouche was quoted as saying, "We tried to get money from the Arabs but we never did."

Again, quoting former members and pending lawsuits, The New York Times reported that three profitable businesses in New York that are dominated by LaRouche supporters funnel money to the political operations. This was denied by corporate officers for the businesses.

Campaign treasurer Felice Gelman said The New York Times story was "total fabrications and lies." She said that neither LaRouche nor the U.S. Labor Party has filed a libel suit against The Times yet, as they announced in October they would do, because "The New York Times has..."
Helga Zepp-LaRouche, 31, has been campaigning full-time for her husband. He is a citizen of West Germany and said she has not thought yet about whether she would become an American citizen if her husband is elected president. She travels to the college classrooms, forums and senior citizen centers that make up the daily grind of campaigning.

Dressed one occasion in a red plaid skirt and a red-sweater, she looked rather as an aging coed, earnestly promoting her husband’s economic theories and promises of a prosperous future. Like other LaRouche supporters, she answers questions with an edge of condescension, as though there can be no other response.

In an interview (monitored by three aides and a bodyguard): she said she worked for three years as a newspaper reporter in Germany, and in 1971 was the first Western journalist to visit the People’s Republic of China, where she spent three months.

There she saw first hand the “absurdity” of thinking that China could be a “viable ally.”

She met LaRouche after being introduced to his economic theories at the Free University in Berlin, she said. She decided to visit the United States in 1973 to pursue these ideas further, met him, and eventually married him two years ago. She is working on a dissertation on Nicholas of Cusa.

She is also a student and translator of the poet Friedrich Schiller, whom she admires for “his notion of the beautiful soul.”

“Kant says that if there is a conflict between duty and freedom, people have to choose duty,” she said. “Schiller says that is not for us—duty is for the Knights. For us the necessity is love, beauty and passion.”

Her influence in the White House would be primarily in foreign affairs she said, in which she would help her husband “to improve.” She would also promote good music and education, and good wines.

One of her main projects as first lady would be the development of the culinary arts. There would be “a lot of good cooking” in the White House, done by the best cooks in the world.

“Next day we would give a press briefing, and have the publiski (sic) the recipes, so the American housewife could share what is going on at the White House in these banquets.”

Zepp-LaRouche was speaking to an audience of five students and eight campaign workers at a community college in Concord, N.H. After the speech, a reporter moved to interview De Leon, author of “The American as Anarchist” and a student of fringe political groups. “There is no parallel. You can’t talk about it rationally.”

Neither the left nor the right of the mainstream-political-spectrum claims them. Many “LaRouchies” display many of the characteristic features of a cult—an almost total dedication to the ideas of one man even when they are not logical, a belief that everyone else is out to get them; a life style that isolates them from association with non-LaRouchies, and an intense, humorless devotion to their cause.

They vehemently deny the label of cult, and hurled at their most regular targets ("Zionist cult," "environmentalist cult," etc.). They also deny being anti-Semitic, and have filed a suit against the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith for accusing LaRouche and other NCLC members of making anti-Semitic statements in their publications since 1978.

The circulizations of LaRouche’s intellectual theories defy description. “For a long time I thought I was just stupid that I didn’t get what he was saying,” said Wes McCune, who studied with the right-wing group. “Then I realized—it wasn’t me.”

“People hesitate to comment on him because at one time or another he’s been at every point on the political spectrum, from Rosa Luxemburg to Alexander Hamilton,” said DeLeon.

“The psychological motivation of the U.S. Labor Party is endlessly fascinating to me,” said William Risher, publisher of the conservative National Review. “Nobody seems to know really what they are. It really boils down to a psychological history of Lyndon LaRouche. Maybe he’s just a free-lance megalomaniac.”

(National Review published an article by a U.S. Labor Party defector, Gregory Rose, for which it is being sued by the ultra-right-wing Liberty Lobby over charges that it funneled money from the right wing into Labor Party coffers. National Review is countersuing.)

Historically, the group began as a “tendency” in the SDS in 1966. Compared to other SDS factions, it was studious, Marxist-Trotskyite rather than Maoist, and, then, as now, frowned on drug use, promiscuity and rock ‘n roll.

When SDS dissolved in 1968, it became a separate group called the National Caucus of Labor Committees, and for several years held fairly closely to Marxist ideology. The U.S. Labor Party was formed in 1972 and ran candidates in municipal elections in several cities.

According to former members, the turning point came in 1974, when LaRouche was quoted as saying, “We tried to get money from the Arabs but we never did.”

Again quoting former members and pending lawsuits, The New York Times reported that three profitable businesses in New York that are dominated by LaRouche, which use money to the political operations. This was denied by corporate officials for the businesses.

Campaign treasurer Fellice Gelman said The New York Times stories were “total fabrications and lies.” She said that neither LaRouche nor the U.S. Labor Party has filed a libel suit against The Times yet...as they announced in October they would do, because The New York Times has an almost unlimited budget for litigation.

It is one of the most difficult organizations to litigate because of this, and we don’t file unless we feel it is absolutely locked up... truth and libel, law bear very little relation to each other."

LaRouche charged The Times stories were linked to “organized crime.”

At any rate, LaRouche is now seeking the Democratic nomination for president, saying that he represents the mainstream, conservative Democrat who is the heart of the party. His people predict he will get about 1 percent of the vote in New Hampshire, based on their polls despite the dirty tricks, assassination threats and media distortions they allege.

“It’s a very unhappy state of affairs,” said New Hampshire Democratic National Committeeman J. William Cox Brown. “If people don’t know who they are—I mean when they are—then people wonder what the regulation? I think they’re laying the base for times that are so disrupted that an anguished populace would turn to the type of leadership found in Italy and Germany after World War I.”

The Fireman’s Verdict

Two firemen in the Manchester firehouse, obviously accustomed to the visits of politicians, watch LaRouche’s tour with polite indifference. The candidate commiserates with them on the “water problem” in town, promising, “we’ll have to do something about that.”

One of the firemen is a Democrat for Reagan; the other is a Democrat who hasn’t made up his mind yet. He has never heard of LaRouche.

“But I’d never heard of Jimmy Carter four years ago, either,” he says.

“Why don’t you write that down?” says Laura Cohen.
This is a campaign with a script by Kurt Vonnegut and Robert Altman in which many of the roles are played by LaRouche. It is a campaign in which the candidate does not merely disagree with his opponents but calls some of them vermin and terrorists, travels with armed bodyguards trained at a private military training camp, and regularly predicts attempts on his life—the most recent being an assassination plot by the mayor of New Hampshire, a former�Keene, N.H., and the governor of the state.

"It's living proof that in a free country any idiot can run for president," responded Keene Mayor Richard P. Peloquin.

But LaRouche is different from the usual fringe candidates who surface during an election. For one thing, he commands a cadre of maybe 2,000 followers whose intense devotion has been described by ex-colleagues and observers as cult-like. For another, they have to raise the requisite $5,000 in 20 states in amounts of no more than $250 per person to qualify for federal matching funds. He is the only fringe candidate to have done so.

"This is the most bizarre thing I've ever seen," says Patricia McMahon, executive director of the New Hampshire Democratic Party. She says that some "LaRouchians" as they have been dubbed, harass people on the street to buy their literature and have besieged her and other party officials with petty phone calls, a complaint echoed by others who have had dealings with LaRouche's devotees over the years.

Campaign spokesmen deny charges of harassment and complain on their own of "dirty tricks" perpetrated by LaRouche and his associates. LaRouche charged that the state Democratic Party chairman tried to prevent him from being declared a "bona fide Democrat" on orders from President Carter.

"At first I could buy what they said because they were things any good businessman would agree with," says Ralph Johnson, a conservative Republican in Keene who signed a statement endorsing LaRouche that the campaign is distributing. "But the more I knew of him the less enthusiastic I was. I disassociated myself from the campaign several weeks ago. The language he used just grated on me—calling people swine andbums. The man doesn't have any class. And they are more interested in getting Secret Service protection than in running a campaign. They kept asking me if I'd received any threats!"

The flyer the campaign distributes identifies Johnson as a delegate to the New Hampshire Democratic Convention and asks, "How much real work is being done?"

LaRouche wrote that he had almost no friends in high school, no social life, a bitter and unhappy family life. Over his Quaker family's objections, he joined the army near the end of World War II.

Later, he attended Northeastern University, "resigning" after finding it inadequate to his superior mind. In other words, he has no college degree. He 

"I walked out in disgust," he explains. "I would never let anybody who wanted to be an economist study economics at a university."

In 1948 he joined the Socialist Workers Party, which he now says was filled with "mediocre minds." But, "one had to start somewhere."

At the few groups objecting to sell Joseph McCarthy's anticommunist vendetta.

He was married once before his current wife, he said, to a woman named Jane who with whom he had a son. However, former members say he lived for years with another woman, who went by the name Carol LaRouche, who was active in organizing the party with him.

He headed one of numerous leftist splinter groups within the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). He and his few followers formed what became the National Caucus of Labor Committees and its political arm, the U.S. Labor Party. LaRouche ran for president in 1976 on the Labor Party ticket.

Their outlook is described by them in the LaRouchian term: Neoplatonic.

Detractors say that their views are cult-like, anti-Semitic, and paranoid. The party faithful vehemently deny these charges.

Aside from discovering that his brain was superior to Karl Marx's, LaRouche discovered something else in the years before he decided only he could save the United States from disaster.

"Making men in my own image was the conscious articulation of my central purpose from approximately 1946," he wrote.

The LaRouchian Creed

Here are some of the things LaRouche and his associates believe, according to him or their literature:

- Britain is waging a drug war against the United States to destroy us, aided by "Italian surname organized crime syndicates", "Jewish name" financial figures and Zionists, and Chinese intelligence agents.

- Jews founded the Ku Klux Klan.

- The Temperance Movement was founded as a violent cult and those who worked with it became members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union who attacked "dirty tricls" perpetuated by the WCTUsays is saw out my myth) were really "aljglesbis-she outcast," onesaying that he was not an ugly duckling, but an nasty duckling.

- "It's living proof that in a free country any idiot can run for president," said the state Democrat

- The party faithfulvehemently deny these charges.

- The United States should establish "universal military training" that would turn the "entire citizenry" into an army from which only those with physical or mental disabilities would be exempt.

- Economist Milton Friedman is a fascist.

- Environmentalists, "zero-growthers," and "small is beautiful" types are really trying to commit genocide on the human race.

- Bach, Beethoven, Mozart, and geometry are the main things children should be taught in school.

- The Rockefeller family and their stooges, the CIA, the FBI, the Kennedy family, William F. Buckley Jr.,