which he could not make if he were too closely wedded to Vice President Gore’s utopian agenda. The future of this nation will probably be determined by the choice of decisions, or non-decisions, which the President faces long before the year 2000 arrives.

“Additionally, the tacit assumption, that the ‘succession’ within the Democratic Party is a settled matter, stifles discussion of policy precisely at the moment that the most vigorous possible discussion has become a life-or-death matter of choices for this republic. As patriots, we must state candidly, that although the Democratic Party has crippling internal defects at this time, the Republican Party’s internal situation is presently far worse. Thus, warts and all, whether the U.S.A. emerges safely from the financial and monetary tornadoes which are now approaching virtually every market on the planet, will depend upon the quality of bipartisan crisis-leadership rallied around President Bill Clinton.

“In contrast to the state of affairs as recently as Spring 1996, there is virtually no capital of any leading nation, in any part of the world, which would deny the warnings of financial crisis which I delivered at the close of 1995, and during the Winter-Spring 1996 phase of my Democratic Presidential pre-candidacy. There is no significant leader of the financial world, who does not presently know, that the worst financial crises of the Twentieth century are bearing down upon the world’s financial centers now. There is, however, no clear consensus on what action must be taken, even among a majority of those leaders.

“Therefore, I must intervene in this situation, to break up the present Hamlet-like pattern of worsening indecision in our nation’s capital, and in the Democratic Party. It is President Clinton who will be called upon, repeatedly, years and months before the 2000 primary campaigns, to provide paramount world leadership in this presently worsening global crisis; however, his ability to provide competent leadership depends upon breaking up the present trends around his administration, and in the Congress generally. He must be freed to make competent decisions, without disabling political encumbrances.”

Helga Zepp LaRouche held a series of public and private meetings in Los Angeles in mid-June, in which she stressed that the battle to establish a New Bretton Woods system, and implement, in full, the design for the Eurasian Land-Bridge, depends upon the exoneration of her husband Lyndon LaRouche.

The public events were opened by two press conferences, one in Koreatown, the other in Chinatown. The first was attended by four Korean newspapers, and leaders of the Korean community. Here, Mrs. LaRouche issued an urgent appeal to President Clinton to reverse the depletion of food reserves in North Korea [see article, page 84].

“Any delay is criminal,” Zepp LaRouche said. “The line that there is no serious famine, or that aid will only help the military, is morally criminal and unacceptable. . . Without emergency aid, 2.6 million children under six years old will die this year. To say they represent a military threat is absurd.”

Her statement was seconded by a leader of the Korean-American Chamber of Commerce, and Simon Lim, a community leader who hosted the event. Lim reiterated that the U.S., as the leading nation of the world, must act.

The second press conference, in Chinatown, drew three newspapers, a radio station, and a television station. At both events, reporters engaged in a lively dialogue, which largely revolved around the following point: What you are proposing with the Land-Bridge and New Bretton Woods is beautiful, but can you do it?

“The reason it is realistic,” she answered, “is that the alternative is so horrible: Human civilization can collapse into barbarism. . . . It is true, we have to move mountains; but, I am optimistic that these programs can result in the biggest economic boom in the history of mankind.

“If we combine this,” she continued, “with a new cultural renaissance, there will be a new golden age for mankind.” She concluded that, unlike Samuel Huntington, who peddles his “Clash of Civilizations” nonsense as a justification for the British policy of destroying the Chinese nation, “I agree with Leibniz, that it is easy to find common understanding.”