

## Prof. Ernst Florian Winter

*Professor Winter, a distinguished veteran of world diplomacy and former director of the Diplomatic Academy in Vienna, Austria, released the following endorsement on Nov. 5, titled "Mr. Lyndon LaRouche for U.S. President. An interview with Professor Winter appeared in EIR, Sept. 3, 1999.*

The American people have countless friends over here in Europe. We appreciate the recent help by Americans to rebuild a badly victimized continent. We appreciate their interest in current developments in Europe, inspired by the example of the founding of the United States of America.

However, many of us friends are also increasingly concerned and worried about developments in the U.S.A. Can current global policies and actions of the U.S. government really promote peace and help continue to develop economic prosperity worldwide? History has taught us that all attempts to force a "one world" on its inhabitants were destined to fail. A "unipolar" world can only be maintained for a short period of time by military might alone, provoking today universal armament, eventually leading to wars. A multipolar world requires diplomacy and needs economic development for its peaceful success.

Americans are going to elect a new President. Many of us friends think that this new man will have to display a high degree of personal integrity, set on the conviction that mankind is created in the image and likeness of a transcendent God; command a vast knowledge in politics, economics, science and culture. The next President must be able to gain the confidence of friends and enemies. He will have to work towards the moral rearmament of the entire nation, so that America can rededicate itself to the high moral standards admired by the whole world, and which made America great!

Many of us friendly observers have met such a man and heard him talk very positively about the America he loves. There is such a Presidential candidate in Lyndon LaRouche. He has the habits of a Renaissance man. He is a much respected, worldwide known economist, whose economic predictions over the past years proved flawless. He is personally liked by statesmen in many countries, because of his brilliance and affable habits. Above all, he believes in the virtues of the American way of life being able to overcome its darker sides.

As one who has been involved in international diplomacy since 1960, I commend to the attention of American voters to familiarize themselves with the candidate Lyndon LaRouche, and, if found worthy, to elect him to the Presidency of the United States of America.

## LaRouche in dialogue with labor movement

*The following are excerpts from Lyndon LaRouche's Nov. 4 live campaign webcast with members of the U.S. labor movement. LaRouche spoke by telephone from Germany. The full transcript will be published in the Nov. 15 issue of the weekly newspaper New Federalist and is available on the campaign website ([www.larouchecampaign.org](http://www.larouchecampaign.org)). The moderator is Debra Hanania-Freeman. We begin with the candidate's opening statement.*

**LaRouche:** There are several constituencies which must come together. We used to have farmers, but they're almost wiped out. We have labor. We have African-Americans. We have Hispanic-Americans. We have senior citizens. And we have concerned professionals as well, in significant numbers.

The power in this country has to be taken away from the machines which run in cooperation with Wall Street and the news media. The country has got to be taken back from election campaigns controlled by money. Election campaigns' money is supposed to go to mobilize voters for national interests. We don't *need* the news media, to mobilize voters, if we have these constituencies together, and the natural leaders, organic leaders, of these constituencies, working together. We can turn out the vote, whatever the news media says.

So, let's stop giving in, to a so-called system which takes the power away from the people, and gives it to those who manage so-called public opinion. And that's what I think my purpose is right now, in addressing any questions you have to throw at me.

**Freeman:** Ladies and gentlemen, if you have questions for Mr. LaRouche, this is the time to ask them. Why don't we start with the southeastern portion of the United States? If anyone from the Southeast has a question, please identify your union and your state, and ask it.

**Rudy Feagin:** I'm with the UAW local 5841, in Waynesboro, South Carolina, and I would certainly like to ask Mr. LaRouche, with all the anti-labor, especially created by the National Right to Work Committee, if there's anything we can do to curb some of this? Thank you.

**LaRouche:** Well, I think what we have to do, is we have to get a concept of what kind of politics we're going to run.

My conception is, that the precedent which many people remember directly, or indirectly, on which most of us can agree, is the fact that whatever criticisms we have of Franklin Roosevelt as President, he led the country out of the worst

aspect of a Great Depression, and led us through the wartime period.

So, what we have to do is emphasize what Roosevelt emphasized in his fight with Wall Street, back in the 1930s, in particular.

Roosevelt, as you remember, had a constant fight over the issue of the General Welfare. And Wall Street was screaming that the General Welfare doesn't mean anything, it's just a bunch of words in the Preamble of the Constitution. Roosevelt thought differently. So do I.

The problem today, is that those who want to impose right-to-work legislation, and similar kinds of anti-labor measures, anti-African-American, anti-Hispanic, anti-medical, and so forth—those who want to do these, are people who are opposed to the concept of the General Welfare. *We have to get ourselves together as power*, and insist, together with the memory of Roosevelt, that the dedication of this country to be a republic governed by the commitment to the General Welfare, is the basis for this republic, and there's no other kind of law, no other kind of politics we should put up with as voters. . . .

**Ken Rice:** I am secretary-treasurer emeritus of the New York State building trades. . . .

My question would be: When are we going to see you here as a *physical person*, so we can start putting a lot more weight behind you? People like to see the *person*.

**LaRouche:** Well, they will. I'm dealing with this.

But let me just say what my policy is on the campaign.

Remember, that we had two Presidents at the end of the last century, and in this century, who were anti-Wall Street Presidents. One was McKinley, who was shot, bringing in Teddy Roosevelt, which was a disaster. The second was Harding. And both of these men, campaigning for President, campaigned essentially from the front porch, especially McKinley, who had train-loads of voters coming down to McKinley's front porch, from Cleveland and other places, organized by Mark Hanna, at that time.

If we see that pressing the flesh, and these kinds of tribal dances that we do in election campaigns, haven't worked—we have not gotten the candidates we need. The voters have not been able to select the right candidates, or the right policies on many issues. Because they've counted upon the sideshow, carnival effect of the pressing the flesh, the sideshow of the oompah bands passing through the town, or something equivalent, instead of dealing with the question of the ideas.



*An 18-wheeler on cross-country tour promotes LaRouche's "Triple Curve" graph, showing the hyperbolic increase of speculative financial paper and money, as the physical economy goes crashing.*

What a voter should want to see—and I would hope I could persuade them of it—is they should look into the *mind* of the candidate, eh? Not just listen to the words, don't listen to the slogans, don't listen to the oompah bands, don't talk about what he looks like. Concentrate on what is the mind that's inside that candidate. Is that a mind that has concepts we want? Is that a mind that can be trusted, once in office?

Now, that's where I'm putting the emphasis.

The other thing is a mechanical problem, that in order to run an election, particularly without the consent of the leading news media, you have to get to people like you, the organic leaders of constituencies throughout the country. And you have to discuss with them, not slogans, but ideas, concepts—where do we stand, what are we going to do about it? And it's through the organic leaders, and the people around them, and bringing them together, as fast as possible, in a matter of weeks and months, because the primary elections are coming up fast. Between the first of February into March, you're going to have a big slug of them. And in that period of time, we have to reach the better part of over 200 million adult Americans. Well, you can't do that by pressing the flesh.

I shall make appearances, and I intend to make a few, especially very special ones, with constituencies, with local constituencies, and national constituency representatives, where we can talk about ideas, not bite-sized slogans back and forth. I'm going to do something. But my concentration is, to use the Internet and other means, electronic means, to get directly, to talk with, directly, as many organic leaders of organizations, particularly the ones which we know are our national constituency, now, quick. And get a movement going.

And it depends not just on me as a candidate. It depends on *you guys*, and others, to pull this together, so we have a national machine, to go in there, and regardless of what the news media says, or what the polls say, we're going to take the election. That's the way we're going to go at it.

But, as I say, I agree with you in the sentiment. I want to meet as many people as possible, as soon as possible. And I'll be doing something about that. . . .

**Mel Logan:** I'm from Wyoming, with the United Mine Workers, AFL-CIO. I live in one of the most conservative states in the United States, and here we have a lot of minimum-wage workers. The majority of our workers are minimum-wage workers. And they're all conservative, and vote Republican. They tend to believe that investment in education, or social security, or infrastructure, as an expense, is too much for us to pay for, rather than a security for the United States' future.

What can we do to educate those people who don't want to be educated?

**LaRouche:** Well, you know the history of Wyoming. Maybe many of the people on the call don't. But Wyoming was one of the areas which, under the conditions of the 1870s, 1880s, was targeted by the British, through Canada, for checkerboarding. Originally this involved mining rights, involved agricultural systems. So they had a system of checkerboarding the state, in order to ensure that these British investors, sometimes by way of Canada, would control that area. As a result of that, some of these people who maintain that tradition, from that time, have tried to keep the citizens of Wyoming, which is physically a beautiful state, with many advantages, natural advantages, to keep it as a place where you keep the ordinary people pretty much down, low to the ground, or close to the curbstone, if there is a curbstone.

Now, how do you deal with a situation like that? We've had situations like that in the world, parts of the United States, parts of the Deep South, for a long time. And under certain conditions, we were able to break that, break that chain, a chain of self-imposed submission to those kinds of conditions. And the way you do it, is generally, it happens only in a time of great crisis.

Now, we're on the verge of the greatest financial crisis in history. Don't let anybody kid you—it's coming. The question is—we can deal with crisis—is, can we *handle* it. But if we don't handle it, this is the worst financial crisis in all modern history, and the effects will be felt accordingly.

The shock of this crisis hitting, which will happen on Clinton's watch—it may happen before the year's out, it may happen early next year, but this crisis is going to hit, as I've said many times, like the Pearl Harbor bombing, the bomb that dropped. In those times, these people who think that they have to submit, like dutiful serfs, to their masters who run the territory, they're going to change their attitude, as many

people changed their attitude when they realized that World War II was actually on, at the time the Pearl Harbor bomb was dropped.

And that's the situation. So, my view of this, from a historical standpoint, as well as personal experience, is that: don't give up the fight. As long as the message is out there, and kept out there, when people are faced with a crisis, a great shock, *suddenly* the same people who seemed obdurate in *refusing* to see the immorality of their situation, suddenly change their mind. And if the ideas have been presented to them, if the leadership is presented to them, they'll rally to it. That's the way every great movement in history occurred. It was a sudden rallying of a mass of people, who got up out of the ditch, because they were hit by a crisis, they were hit by what they recognized as an opportunity, and they had some leadership to show them the way, and they would go that way.

And that's—every good thing, for changes for the better, in history, in modern history, in particular, has happened that way. Why shouldn't it happen in the state of Wyoming? . . .

**Ken Rice:** I just remembered one my brother-in-law asked me to ask: This was pertaining to the military. About 50% or 60% of the military people of the rank of sergeant and under, who are actually the grunts and the hard workers, their level of pay is well below the poverty level. As President, would you take a look at that, and bring those people up to where—if they're serving us, and they're defending our country, I think they should be paid properly?

**LaRouche:** Well, you do not want a Roman Legion of people who are killers, who are not thinkers.

This is an important point, so I'll try to summarize it very quickly. But in Germany, for example, under the influence of the famous founder of the German military system, who was a republican by the way, Scharnhorst, you had the institution of what's called *Auftragstaktik*, the mission orientation. And the idea was to develop the individual officer, and non-commissioned officer, to a very high level of quality of education and culture, so that, in combat—as you saw, one of the things the German army was best at, even under Hitler—as a relic of this, not because of Hitler—was the best fighting ability per capita of any army in the world. And that is because the junior officer, and the senior officers—not just the top ones—and the non-commissioned officers, were capable of continuing the mission under all kinds of circumstances. And that was because of the quality of education and development and training of the officers.

When you see what's going on today, with the military today, if I'm President, I want an officer corps, and a non-commissioned officer corps, especially, which is of that quality. The best quality in the world. The people who can take a mission orientation, and not make a mess of it, or not make a butchery of it. . . .