LaRouche: 5 Million Leaflets To Stop McCain-Lieberman Is the Strategic Flank

Here is an edited transcript of The LaRouche Show Internet radio program on July 27, 2002. The LaRouche Show airs weekly, on Saturdays, at 3-4 p.m. (Eastern Time), with Lyndon LaRouche as occasional guest. It can be accessed from www.larouchepub.com.

Michele Steinberg: Welcome to The LaRouche Show, the weekly webcast dialogue over the Internet, and this is Michele Steinberg, your host. I want to introduce today's guest: The electable Lyndon LaRouche, the economist who forecast the economic rumblings, the earthquakes that are shaking the globe; the economist who is running for the Democratic Party Presidential nomination in 2004.

As we speak, a campaign leaflet, called "The Electable LaRouche" is being distributed across the United States. Today, Mr. LaRouche is going to give us a strategic briefing, the kind of briefing that he has given in Rome, Italy; Brazil; in the United Arab Emirates.

Lyn, are you on? Go ahead, please.

Lyndon LaRouche: Yes. Well, I can announce, that a decision was made today, that the leaflet distribution will be—in the near future a total of 5 million will be distributed throughout the United States. There will be some modifications in the leaflet, as events which have developed in the process will need to be referenced or reported in the course of it; but, essentially, it will be the same leaflet. It will be out over this period, in the weeks immediately ahead, and it will cover at least 5 million distribution.

And that should, actually, if done properly, should make a change in the strategic situation of the United States. And I'll explain why: We have evidence—it's essentially all in the public domain, it just has not been put together before, in this way, and presented—that Senators McCain and Lieberman, have been operating since, essentially, July of 2001, if not earlier, as a team, aimed to push the United States into the kind of war which we've discussed, in terms of the idea of a Clash of Civilizations war. Now, this decision to go to that war by these circles, was made *before* Sept. 11, 2001—months, or actually years before, in some cases. So, that this was not a surprise. But, Lieberman and McCain began to come to the surface as something much more significant.

In the course of time, we had a report from the *New Yorker* magazine, which indicated that Lieberman and McCain were involved in what was called a "Bull Moose" campaign to outflank both George Bush and whoever the Democratic nominee might otherwise be, in the year 2004. This would be run, from the McCain side—Our investigation showed that McCain's operation, the "Bull Moose" operation, was running, in fact, through an organization known as the Hudson Institute, which is an Indianapolis-founded think-tank, or something (I don't think the "thinking" is so good, but it's a tank, anyway). And it's operating out of Washington, with this Bull Moose campaign, as the *New Yorker* had reported.

Now, the two characters are interesting. Of the two, Lieberman is the important one; McCain is less important. But it's the combination of McCain and Lieberman, and what that combination reveals, in terms of the people behind them, and the motives behind them, is what is significant.

Economic Crisis and War

The point is: That we are now headed toward a war, an Iraq war, an expansion of the current war going on in Israel. That's the way it is. It might be extended to Syria; it might involve operations in Lebanon; it might also include, even, a nuclear missile dropped on a nuclear energy site in Iran, or something else. It is intended to go into a full-scale conflict against the Islamic populations of the world, either *against* them, or in stirring up wars, in which they fight one another, or fight other groups.

So, this is the thing we have to stop, because this would mean the end of civilization.

Now, the timing of this present crisis, is determined largely by what was happening last Summer, that is, the Summer of 2001: At that time, the financial crisis, which we have been talking about, was coming to a head. As of September 2001—before the bombing of the New York towers and Washington, by these planes—it was already clear, that this crisis was about to hit with full force. Despite the Treasury Department, and the Federal Reserve System, and J.P. Morgan Chase, and Citigroup, and others, running what was called a "Plunge Protection Committee," it was obvious that the ability of these banks and other financial institutions, *and* the Treasury, and the Fed, to control the dike—that is, to keep this wall of crisis from overrunning the United States—their power was limited; and sooner or later, this system was going to go down. We'd run to the end of the scheme.

So, what had had happened is, the Sept. 11 events triggered an attempt to cover up the financial crisis, by unleashing

A LaRouche organizer speaking with students in Washington, D.C., about the importance of putting LaRouche's ideas up front in the Democratic Party's 2000 election campaign. His 2004 campaign is issuing 5 million leaflets, which will require 2,000 activists a day on the streets, exposing the strategic threat to the country from the fascist- and mob-backed combine of Senators Joe Lieberman and John McCain.

this attack on Afghanistan and the targetting of al-Qaeda as the "Enemy #1 of the Universe," or something. This attempt, to keep the reality of the financial crash out of the public eye, and to somehow control the world by putting the United States into a period of perpetual war and police-state measures, under which the explosion of the population against the financial crisis could be kept under control. That's been the general situation.

Now, in general, as most of you probably know, you've picked up here or there, that there's a lot of resistance to going ahead with the Iraq war; there's a lot of doubt, about what's going on in Afghanistan. There's a lot of doubt about other things. And Bush's popularity is sliding. Actually, it was not *his* popularity, it was the popularity that any President attracts when the American people sense that the nation is under attack, and therefore they will tend to rally around the President, even if he was some stuffed dummy. So, Bush has a certain popularity, which is not to his credit, as much as it is to the circumstances. But that's wearing down.

Now, immediately, Bush was pushed into tolerating not only what Sharon is doing in Israel, against the Palestinians, but also, to push ahead with this proposed Iraq war. There's *tremendous* opposition to this idea of an Iraq war, from continental Europe; Russia, as well as Western Europe; from Turkey itself, which does not wish to be pushed into participating in such a war with Iraq—for many reasons; even in the United Kingdom, despite the fact that Blair, the Prime Minister, is fully on board *for* the war at an early, the fact is, that high-level people *in* the United Kingdom, who are opposed to the war, from Labour and from some of the old crocodiles: They think this is stupid; they think the United States has lost its mind; and they're against it.

Our own military, in general, has made it clear, that they think that what is being talked about by people like Wolfowitz and others, for a planned Iraq war, is totally *incompetent:* It's overreach, it's erroneous, the risk is beyond belief, and it's not worth it.

We have, from people in the U.S. intelligence community who have been involved in this, saying, there is no danger from weapons of mass destruction, as such. Maybe a little mustard gas, or something, but no real horror-show of modern, sophisticated mass-destruction weapons coming from Iraq: They just don't have them. The idea, that there's a suspicion they might have them, is not substantiated by *any* expert, who's frankly speaking on this thing. And no one has given a report, yet, *to anyone*, nor is there indicated that a report has been received—even under security wraps—which would indicate there's *any* evidence, that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction it's about to deploy.

But, nonetheless, they're pushing ahead with this war. And many in the world, more and more, know this is a hoax, this is a fake. And they want to prevent it. But nonetheless, this thing keeps crashing on.

Bush is not the big problem. Bush *is* a problem, his limitations are spectacular—if nothing else about his qualifications! But, he is not really the author of this drive toward war; he's the man who is being pushed into becoming the "author of record" for the war, and there's nervousness in the Bush camp, about what this means. But the pressure is great, with the November general election—that is, Congressional and other elections coming up, on the state level—they're nervous. Karl Rove, who is probably a roving idiot, actually, is pushing the President as hard as possible, to say, "You've got to go with the war. You've got to back Sharon, and go with the war, otherwise you might lose the Congress, with the coming November elections."

Replay of Hoover's Last Years

Steinberg: You're listening to Lyndon LaRouche, Presidential candidate for the Democratic Party nomination in 2004.

Go ahead. You are hitting the topic that many of our questioners are already asking: "How can we intervene to stop this Iraq war? What's its relationship to the economic collapse?"

LaRouche: Okay. So, now you've got a situation, in

which Bush is actually, in sense, somewhat reluctant; or people around him are reluctant, the intelligent ones, the sane ones, and are saying, "Let's not do it. How can we get out of this thing?" or, "Let's make it a quick air strike. Maybe we can cover ourselves by running an air strike, even if it's not a full-scale war; at least we'll show people, we're trying." That would mean, like B-2 bombers, flying in relay from between the United States and Iraq. You know, the chickens leaving the United States, flying over Iraq, dropping their bombs, and the chicken flies back to the United States, gets maintained (*presumably*, if there's the money to do that); gets reloaded with bombs and goes out again—maybe with the same crew, maybe with a different crew; who knows what?

But this kind of thing is what's in the wind, right now, for as early as late August, or by early October—somewhere in that timeframe. And the smell of an early-August *possibility* is getting stronger, and people in Europe and elsewhere are talking about the smell of an August launch of air attacks on Iraq; with a small force deployed in the area, not to take Iraq on, but to make a feint, see what they can do. But the idea is, to show that we're really conducting the war, by doing a spectacular bombing, which CNN will assure the American people is spectacular, whether it's spectacular, or not.

Okay. So, the point is: Serious people, probably like Paul O'Neill, the Secretary of the Treasury, they've put under wraps, think two things: First of all, as you may have picked up from *some* of the press and some commentary, some people are echoing me, when I say that what the Bush Administration has been doing—and also, the Democrats who are going along with this, even some of the Clinton Democrats—what they're doing, is, they're acting like Herbert Hoover, back between 1929 and 1932, particularly during the period that Hoover was running for reelection (unsuccessfully, at that time), when he was promising everybody a "chicken in every pot" and two cars in every garage, and similar kinds of things. And the world was going down, and the United States with it.

So, Hoover, by promising, there was going to be a recovery—"there will be a recovery"; "there will be a recovery"; "there will be a recovery." "The recovery is on: You just have to wait and see it." "The circus is coming to town: It's called the recovery." "Line up on the streets. Be first in line, to see the circus—the recovery coming into town" (not describing what the recovery would look like). Well, Mr. Hoover's behavior elected Franklin Roosevelt. That is, beyond doubt, Hoover's attitude of negligence and denial, in respect to the reality of one of the greatest financial crashes in modern history, was the thing that wiped Hoover out, and made it much easier for Franklin Roosevelt to lead the people through a revolutionary change, back in the direction of the principles of our Constitution, as opposed to the kind of fun and games that had been going on for most of the century, up to that point.

We're now in a similar situation. We have a new Hoover Administration—a Hoover remake, and a poor example of a Hoover remake at that—which is promising a "recovery," "a recovery," "a recovery." We have banks, major banks, are about to go under, largely because of financial derivatives, because of the imminence of a real estate collapse, especially, say, in the Northern Virginia area, where we're already seeing the chain-reaction effects of a real-estate collapse, as a result of people losing their jobs, as a result of the collapse of things like WorldCom, and so forth.

So, the collapse is on. Some people say, in the administration, and elsewhere, "Well, let's face the fact that we've got a collapse on our hands." The others are saying, "No! We've got to cover this up. We've got to conceal it. I don't care if we have to throw the kitchen sink in. We're going to throw it in, up to the last ditch, the keep this appearance of the promise of a future recovery on the table." But it's not there.

The more desperate they become around the economy, the more desperate they become about having a war. They have the silly idea, expressed by Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, that you don't have to worry about the economy, because "we're going to get a nice, big war going for a long period of time, and nobody's going to worry about the economy, because the war's going to keep their minds occupied." Well, that's not going to work. And intelligent people in the world, who are less panic-stricken than Donald Rumsfeld is, know it.

The Roosevelt Alternatives

So, the question is: How do we get the country out of this mess? We have a President, who's no great shakes. But, he's an elected President. And our institution of the Presidency is extremely important, as I explain in this leaflet, which many of you have probably seen, or seen advance material on. So, the situation is, that if we save the Presidency as a functioning institution, and free the Bush Presidency from the grip of two things: the grip of lunatics within the Bush camp, such as Tom DeLay, or good old stupid Phil Gramm—the Senator—people like that; and, if we get realistic people on the Republican side, in the administration, freed, *to be realistic;* and, if we get a bipartisan pressure, from a bunch of Democrats who are influential in the Congress and elsewhere, who will face the reality of this financial crisis, and think about the Roosevelt alternatives to a Hoover Depression, then, maybe we can come out of this. It's the only shot in town.

Now, actually, the crash, which is coming on fast, is an advantage: Because, it's obvious that, with a crash of the type that's coming—major banks going under, and so forth—you're going to start a war, because you don't have the logistics, you don't have the economic basis to conduct a large-scale war. Europe won't go with it, others won't go with it: not under conditions of an actual, systemic collapse. So, the war would be off.

But the *pressure* of the financial collapse, must be brought to bear now. We've got to have a vehicle, to shift the chairs around Washington, around the Presidency—both from the Democratic side and from the Republican side, from the administration side—so that they will sit back, and say, "Okay.

The Depression is here. We're not going to act like *Hoover*. We're not going to be fools like Hoover was"—and Hoover was a very bright guy, brighter than George Bush. But he was stupid in his policy. And, this administration has got to realize that it *must not be stupid* in its policy; not merely to keep its power and credibility, but to perform its function *for* the United States as the U.S. Presidency. That needs Democratic pressure.

Now, the problem on the Democratic side—there are many problems on the Democratic side. The Democratic Party is a mess. But, the problem is, largely, that we have this guy Lieberman, running as sort of—he's the straight-man, running behind the clown, Gore. You know, Clinton could have elected almost anybody—except Al Gore. And Gore is unelectable, because he's not capable of getting elected! But, Lieberman is dangerous. The feature is this: Lieberman, together with McCain, represents a margin of influence, in both parties, in the Senate and in the Congress in general, which is now controlling the situation, under the direction of a group which is headed in New York, called the "Mega" group. This is the hard core surface of the problem. Now, Lieberman is not what most people think he is. The evidence which we have, and which we've been reporting in part, evidence which is on the record—not speculation, but hard, documented evidence, on the record: Lieberman was brought into the Congress, by whom? By the combination of William F. Buckley, of *National Review*, the nation's #1 fascist; in cahoots with a friend of Buckley's, Michael Steinhardt, the son of the one of the bosses for Meyer Lansky's mob. He was brought in with the collusion with the *gusanos*, so-called—that is, Lansky's former mobsters, who moved to Florida, away from Castro, and did terrorist acts and so forth—generally nasty people, about as right-wing as you can get, and about as nasty as you can get. But also, their existence—they were tools of Meyer Lansky's mob, when Meyer Lansky's mob, through Batista, was running Cuba.

So, these mobsters—right-wing killers, or fascists like Buckley—are the actual people who put Lieberman in the Senate. And, Buckley acted with support from Michael Steinhardt, who was the co-founder of the Democratic Leadership Council, on the Democratic Party side, which has taken control of the Democratic Party.

So therefore, you have a man, who is connected to organized crime; to fascists, who are sometimes a little bit of both; who represent the Lansky mob: That's Lieberman.

On the other side, McCain: McCain, in Arizona, his entire personal wealth is chiefly the result of association with what became known as the "Keating Five," some years back, back in the 1980s. And this crowd, was a crowd which was working with Sam Bronfman's "Joe Bananas," that is, another part of Canadian-American organized crime, which set up its operations in Arizona. And it was these guys, tied to this mob, organized crime, into which, shall we say, McCain married, and got the backing to have his personal fortune.

So, McCain represents exactly the same people, that Lieberman represents. And what Lieberman *pretends* to represent, in public, with his profile, is not what he is. Furthermore, no one, no Democratic Party majority—or even a minority—is ever going to nominate for President, a Joe Lieberman, with Joe Lieberman's open credentials, of ties to Cubans—that is, these Lansky thugs in Florida; with ties to Michael Steinhardt, part of the Lansky mob's son, who continued his father's business, when his father went to jail; or, to this leading fascist in the United States, William F. Buckley. You might elect that for nomination to something. But you're not going to elect it as the leader of the Democratic Party, or the Presidential candidate.

So therefore, the point is this: If we make clear, what the facts are about the connection between McCain and Lieberman; if we make clear their connections to organized crime; if we make clear the fraud of Lieberman's Democratic profile; if we make clear, why Lieberman, as a Vice Presidential candidate with Al Gore, went down to Florida to try to get the help of the Cuban Lansky mob, to help win the election for Gore—ah! Things all begin to make sense. And, the Michael Steinhardt case in general.

'The Only Shot We Have'

So, now you've got a picture. If this dirty picture, which is all hard fact, and there's a lot more, can be presented succinctly, and for a purpose—that is, with a mission-orientation to it—I think we can eliminate the McCain-Lieberman factor in the American politics, at this time, in a *fairly short* period of time; and it *must be* a short period of time. That's why we talk about 5 million leaflets. We must have an immediate, hard impact, within the immediate future, to knock out the illusion about what the McCain-Lieberman connection is.

If we knock them out, what happens? Immediately, there are a lot of sharks in the Democratic Party, who have been sitting back, and watching the Gore-Lieberman show, in the Democratic Party. Saying, "Well, Gore and the DLC, and Lieberman, they've got this thing locked up. We really don't have a chance to win the Presidential nomination." Well, if you knock out Lieberman, and knock out McCain—who are big factors in the Senate, representing a tilt factor, or margin—then, you suddenly have loosened things up. What happens is, you get the constituencies, in the Democratic Party, and around the Democratic Party—the so-called African-Americans; civil rights groups; labor, traditional Democrats, and some leading politicians who have political ambitions: And if they think that Lieberman, Gore, and so forth, are out of the picture, they're going to start thinking about which among them might be the contender for the nomination?

If you get that kind of picture, if you get a picture in the White House, that this is what's going on around them, you get a clear picture, going throughout the political process, of what the financial situation is, and what can be done about it: You have, then, *new politics in Washington.* You have a

In cahoots with "Catholic" fascist William F. Buckley to put Joe Lieberman in the Senate, was Democratic Leadership Council co-founder Michael Steinhardt (left), whose father was a boss for Meyer Lansky's (right) National Crime Syndicate.

bipartisan combination, around which the nation can assemble, for a great national, ongoing, functional debate. That is, in which we are debating, more realistically all the time, what the issues are that we should deal with, and not have these things rammed down our throat.

It is, in short, the only shot we have. And, because I am what I am, I do this kind of thing often; sometimes it's less significant; sometimes it's more significant. This time, I think it's *really* significant. I think we're at a crucial point: We're going to have to decide, are we going to save this nation and the world, from the Hell, which would be unleashed if you have a Hoover state of denial, still continuing, about the economic crisis in the United States and worldwide? If you have a *commitment to this perpetual war*, this pointless perpetual war, of which the extension to Iraq is only one example. If you have that, then we may have lost civilization, for some time to come.

So, we're now at a point, that we, in our situation *inside* the United States: If we can change the situation in Washington, and shift it, with the effort which is within our means, then we can create a situation in which there are options. Otherwise *there are none. And, Lieberman and McCain represent a challenge we are capable of dealing with.* So, we hit that flank. If we can turn that flank, we create new political openings, in the U.S. population as well as in the political parties. That's our *only chance*, and that's what I'm committed to doing.

Dialogue with LaRouche

Steinberg: . . . You're listening to Lyndon LaRouche, candidate for the Democratic Party Presidential nomination in 2004: the electable Lyndon LaRouche. And Mr. LaRouche has just announced that his campaign will be putting out 5 million copies of a leaflet, which has a form, at this point, that people can read on his website, which is: www.larouchein2004.com. . . .

Again, Lyndon LaRouche has spoken about his Presidential campaign, for 2004 in the Democratic Party, and knocking out the leading figure right now, Joseph Lieberman—who, it turns out, was put into the Senate by the right-wing fascist, William F. Buckley, and his *National Review* crowd. And, this has been documented, Lyn, in an EIR Special Report, called "The Real Scandal: McCain and Lieberman." People can get that on the www.larouchepub.com website.

Getting Congress the Message

We're going to go ahead and take some questions, at this point, that have come in by e-mail. The first one [is] from an individual, F.H. in California, which gets to the point of the near-term war danger that you have raised.

"Dear Lyndon LaRouche,

"Next Wednesday and Thursday, July 31 and Aug. 1, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will hold hearings on the Bush Administration's war plans for Iraq. These hearings will be the first public Congressional debate on war with Iraq. Unfortunately, the hearings could be used to further war plans, by only calling pro-invasion witnesses, or by those present only asking superficial questions. In order to ensure, fair and balanced hearings, Congress needs to hear from you. Sen. Barbara Boxer [D] sits on the committee. She is my representative here in Sacramento. What question should I suggest to her. Senators Helms [R-N.C.] and Biden [D-Del.] will hear from me, although I am not in their district.

"Thank you for your attention."

LaRouche: Okay. Well, Barbara Boxer is not a bad person. I think the best thing to do, is to get exactly what is in the leaflet, and indicate the other publications we have—if we get it to her fine; the other stuff, too—*on this question.* If she sees, and understands what I'm saying, and what's documented in this printed material, then she is going to understand, as others will, *exactly* what the real issue is, that has to be addressed in dealing with this so-called "military operation."

The whole thing is, in a situation like this, to deal with the military operation, as such, may be a loser. In other words, you're going in there to argue, "Well, this is no good"; or "this is wrong." Or, "you have no grounds." But you have the argument that's already being made, from top military people, to the administration, saying, "This is incompetent; we shouldn't do it." You have the argument, that is being made to the White House from London—not from Blair, who's for it—but in terms of all the other people in the United Kingdom, who think they have some influence in the United States. The majority of them—which includes not only Labour opponents of Blair—leading people; old people, senior; but also, senior crocodiles, the hard-core British military types, who are saying, "Don't do it!"

So, just going in with the military evidence, is not going to stop it. So, don't argue the war. Change the subject. The subject is: We're going to this war, only to attempt to run

away from a Depression, and we're going into this, because the administration is afraid of the Lieberman-McCain problem; and what's behind Lieberman and McCain, in terms of Mega, and so forth.

If that gets across, if the American people get a sense, that this is corruption; if the members of the Congress realize that we're coming at them on the issue of a corruption that *really stinks;* and if they *don't* deal with the McCain-Lieberman problem, the stink of corruption, combined with the impact of an onrushing depression, *is going to wipe their careers out!*

And, that's the way to deal with them. And, those who are friendly, while they may be stubborn about it, give them the information, focus the thing on the Lieberman-McCain angle, and you cause enough confusion in the flanks of the guys assembled for the hearings, that you have an effect.

And *we*, of course, *will be deploying*—I hope we can get up to 2,000 people deploying daily, in the streets of this country; that will be enough, with this kind of leaflet distribution—to stir things up, and force a shock effect which will change the way the discussion goes.

How to Beat the Depression

Steinberg: Lyn, we have someone from our organizers' conference line, who has a question. Actually, we have a number of those. Let's hear first from Gene in Washington State. Gene, can you hear me?

Q: Yes. To consider this meltdown of our money system, why don't they go back and use the notes that Roosevelt used during World War II, to use United States' interest-free notes for all infrastructure? Especially here in Washington State, where unemployment is rising, because of the Boeing layoffs and the effects on down the line?

LaRouche: Yeah, exactly. The key thing is, we've got a labor force—We're going to have a lot of unemployment. The unemployment is going to hit hard in areas of employment, which are essentially useless. That is, a lot of the employment in services, unskilled services, or so-called "tech" services, are not exactly employable today. The tech industry is never going to come back, in that form. Though you have a lot of other unemployed, or *under*employed, or *mis*employed. What are you going to do?

We know, from past experience, that the only way that you can get a fast increase in employment, is largely through public infrastructure. Now, this means government spending on the Federal, state, and local level, according to the jurisdiction and the nature of the situation. But, with Federal government-backing for the states and municipalities, on these programs, just as we did back in the '30s.

If you have useful infrastructure—and we certainly have a lot that needs to be fixed; that is, economically essential infrastructure. We have a health-care system that is disintegrating, as a result of the HMO policy. We need to put it back into effect. People are worried about disease, protection against disease; against other kinds of disease problems. Without a health-care system, you can not deal with it. So, put the health-care system back to work.

Put our transportation system back to work—modernize it. Increase our investment in power plants; and so forth. These things are either directly government expenditures—that is, at the Federal, state or local level—or, they are public utilities, which should be regulated. And we need more power plants, so let's start putting them in.

Now, the program is not simply to limit growth to public utilities, and these kinds of things. The point is, to use the growth of employment in public utilities, as a way of stimulating the market for the growth in the private sector, especially in the entrepreneurial sector. And, that's the way we can get things started again.

That's what we *must* do. And there's no reason we *shouldn't* do it.

International Leadership

Steinberg: Let's stay on this economic issue. We're getting questions all over the world on this, as you had, when you were in Brazil and spoke to the Argentina friends, and also the Brazilian diplomats and VIPs who sponsored your tour there.

This question is from one of our long-time *EIR* supporters in Philippines, C.V. and he says, "The economic situation is desperate. We have been approached by many people, who, though they acknowledge LaRouche's expertise, are still concerned with 'my money, where to put it in a depression.' How do we advise them and convince them that supporting you, is the only real solution?"

LaRouche: This is a real problem, because you have a populist tendency—and, of course, there's a lot of populism in many countries—to say, "Well, let's find an issue, and let's mobilize popular opinion around an issue. And that's the way we're going to fix things." And often, they will start with, "let's take things that everybody can agree upon, like local gripes." Well, that is the best way to fail I can imagine.

To make a turn in policy, means you have to force a change in the ruling principles, by which policy is made. The change in principles requires leadership, by people who are actually leaders, or who become leaders in the process. Leaders do not go around trying to play up to people's gripes. They may take note of them; they listen to them. They say, "Well, let's look at the solution to all these problems. There are other problems like this. What is our solution? How can we change things, so we can get a solution? What do we have to change about this society, to allow this solution to occur?" And therefore, the crisis in every part of the world, is leadership.

Now, what we can do—obviously, in the Philippines, that's obvious: leadership. There are a limited number of leaders. What's happened to the Philippines over years, there has been a loss of leadership, that is, entrenched leadership, in-depth leadership. This is the problem. But, we have also the problem throughout the developing sector in general. We

have it in continental Europe. In country after country, in South Asia, in East Asia, we have a sense, "We can do nothing. Let's concentrate on local issues." Well, that's not going to work. It's not going to work in Indonesia, it's not going to work in other parts of Southeast Asia, it won't work in the Indian Subcontinent, it won't in Africa. These are dependent countries. Their existence depends upon orders passed out, passed down the line by international financial institutions, monetary institutions, and chiefly, in the end, the British and American government—the British monarchy and the U.S. government.

So therefore, if you don't change the leadership initiative, from the U.S., you won't do anything good for the Philippines. You can't. *It's impossible.* Therefore, we have the responsibility, being the so-called "official world power" (which we are in a sense), that we, from the inside must give the signal. And, there are people in the United Kingdom, who are opponents of these crazy policies. They will tend to cooperate with us. We've got to have an initiative from the United States which they can latch onto. We have people in Europe, on the continent of Europe, all throughout continental Europe: They will work with us. But, *they will not take the initiative.* They will follow, if we give them the chance to cooperate, and they will, then, give their *initiative* within the context of cooperation with us.

Africa is a hopeless situation: Don't blame the Africans—they're totally controlled. The Middle East: For example, my invitation to speak at the Zayed Centre in Abu Dhabi, which was done, actually, by a whole group of Arab nations, was to have my voice there. These countries, which have some capability, want international leadership to provide options within which they can work.

The Philippines needs options, within which the Philippines can work. This means, essentially, a *regional* development approach, with new credit and new projects, around which the economy can be rebuilt. And, that will be credible to people in places like the Philippines, because, if they try to get some local issue, push a local issue, they'll find they fail. Or they get shot down, because somebody says they're rioting. Then they give up, discouraged. And, because they picked the wrong fight, a fight which they could not *win,* they were defeated and crushed. This has happened, often.

What we have to do is, concentrate on building leadership, international leadership, among international circles, who can be looked at by people in various countries, as the friends to whom they turn to provide leadership in their own country, knowing that there are people from *outside* their country, who are also fighting against the big institutions, for the same cause. And that's the way it has to be done. It's simply leadership.

The point is, that the way the word "democracy" has been misused: Democracy has been misused, increasingly, since Roosevelt, in the United States, to say that anybody who actually shows leadership is some kind of a tyrant. And what you have to do, is, you have to appeal to popular anger and go with the wave of popular anger, and you're a "leader." You respond to "community issues"—this kind of fakery. And, they're always defeated. As long as people cling to community issues, *they're going to be defeated,* even if the issues themselves are legitimate. Because the problem is not the community problem; the problem is the *system,* and the world system is run from the top-down, largely today, by the Anglo-American oligarchy.

And so, we have it right here. If we show, that we are willing to fight that, and come up with approaches which *will work,* we will find people in these countries will be inspired, justly, with the confidence to think about how they should approach the thing, *in* that context. *We must create the context.*

Socratic Dialogue Breeds Optimism

Steinberg: . . .I have a question, Lyn, about the movement we need to create, that international forces could hook up with, that you were discussing before.

This is from a student, Richard, from Iowa State University: "Firstly, thank you. You've had a profound impact on my life. I know I am well on my way towards becoming a sane human being, and for this, I'm indebted to your efforts and the efforts of your associates.

"I'm a student at Iowa State University, and I am involved in the distribution of your campaign materials, and ultimately your ideas, and the ideas of your revolutionary ancestors: Plato, Gauss, Leibniz, etc. I'm sorry to say, that I'm frequently hit by a debilitating doubt as to the value of my efforts. My question is, what is the reason that I can apply to my thinking to permanently expel this type of doubt from my mind, especially, when *you* face such opposition, and remain so full of hope? What principle can I apply to my thinking?"

LaRouche: The best principle is to find somebody who wants to know something, and engage in the kind of dialogue, a Socratic dialogue with them, by which they actually come to—not merely to be able to repeat after you; but to actually know what you're both talking about.

Leadership—Let me just go back to what I said otherwise, but I think it's the only honest, effective answer to this question: What's the difference between man and an ape? Man has been able to develop discoveries of principle, to transmit the experience of making those discoveries of principle, from one generation to the next, and from one society to the next. This is the reason why we have billions of people on the planet, whereas, if man were an ape, the human species would never have exceeded several million living individuals on this planet, under the conditions which we know to have existed during the past 2 million years.

So man is different. And human relations are essentially, those relations which define the difference between the beast and the human being. A human being can make a discovery—an experimentally valid discovery, of a universal principle; and then, present that act of discovery to someone else, and

LaRouche explained how he remains an optimist: You have to engage a fellow human being in a Socratic dialogue, which defines the difference between "the beast and the human being. A human being can make . . . an experimentally valid discovery, of a universal principle; and then, present that act of discovery to someone else, and work back and forth with them, until they are able to reconstruct, in their own mind, the same experience." Here, the children of LaRouche organizers construct one of the Platonic solids, a dodecahedron.

work back and forth with them, until they are able to reconstruct, in their own mind, the same experience. Thus, you are imparting knowledge in the only way knowledge can be. Not by textbooks. Not by lectures, as such. But actually engaging in discussing specific problems, which involve discovery of original ideas.

So the way to feel good, in a sense, when you're fighting against the toil of the so-called philistines, is to simply concentrate on the fact, that there are people in the environment, who *are,* in one sense or another, responsive to problems, which involve ideas—ideas like fundamental physical principles, for example. It's the exchange of those ideas between one person and another, whether it's in physical science or Classical art, or anything else; or politics. Those ideas, that exchange, defines *a truly human relationship.*

The problem is, in society today, with the way the thing is structured, we don't have really human relationships, running around loose in society. We have *in*human relationships; bestial-type relationships; relationships, which could be replicated by any band of Rhesus monkeys, rather than human beings.

And, the source of strength, is the strength and joy of sharing with another human being, the kind of act of discovery, the kind of knowledge, which can be passed on to someone else, and passed on to generations to come: That kind of relationship is the one that gives you a sense of joy and strength. And that's the thing you have to keep turning back to, as I do, when you run up against the notorious Yahoos.

Justice for Victims of War Crimes

Steinberg: Lyn, I've seen over the years, that that question of hope, that you bring into the political situation, goes across many borders. I have a question from a Palestinian friend, a diplomat, who is not on the call today, but asked this during the week. He said, "Your input into the Middle East situation has been most welcome. Do you see that the latest atrocities against the Palestinian people in Gaza fall under the categories of 'war crimes'? And what do you suggest, to move the world community, which appears to be so indifferent to this tragedy?"

LaRouche: What I've done is, I've said, "Yes, this is horrible." But these crimes carry a penalty with them. Some people say an International Criminal Court, but I wouldn't trust an International Criminal Court. It's not the right idea. Obviously, these are war crimes, and war crimes and crimes against humanity come, actually, under a provision that was used already in the Nuremberg proceedings, especially in the attempt to define this as a matter of principle by Robert Jackson, who was a Supreme Court Justice, who was on the commission there. That, in war, a nation which wins a war, has a right to impose certain conditions of peace upon the defeated nation, in negotiations. Crimes against humanity fall into the same category: A crime against humanity, is actually an act of war, which may or may not be the cause for going to war, but it has the legal characteristics of an act of war, under international law. It is a rational kind of international law, moral law.

So thus, the case of crimes against the Palestinians is a case of crimes against humanity, and they are actually war crimes, at the same time. Some of them may not call it a war, but actually there is a *war in fact* being conducted presently, against the Palestinians. You have a military occupation force—the Israeli military occupation force, is occupying the territories of the Palestinians, that is, the recognized territory; occupying the cities; imprisoning the victims, as if they were captives in a war; and perpetrating atrocities upon those citizenries, as people in possession—that is, military force in possession, under conditions of *an act of war.* The fact that the Palestinian state was not constituted, does not make this less an act of war!

All right, so, that has to be recognized. Now, where do you go from there? The first thing is, to state the fact, and insist upon the fact of the matter. You've got to think about

the person who's dying, or the person who's lost a member of their family, as a result of these atrocities. What do you say to them? How will you look in the future, when somebody asks you, to account for your part, in that suffering, of that victim? You have to say, "First, one thing we can not do: We can not reverse a killing. You can't bring a dead person back to life. But, we must not let their loss go unjustified. We must do something that makes the loss of that person, by that family meaningful; something that brings tears of hope to their eyes, at a later point." If we bring justice in the Middle East, then, there will be tears, not so much of anger (also anger, of course), but also hope. This struggle, this suffering, this decades of suffering, *was not for nothing.* In the end, there was a purpose, and the purpose is what we have today. The price we paid, in this suffering, was a purpose, which we accept. And, you've got to provide that.

And, our job is, while having that attitude and expressing that, and acting on the basis of our capabilities to try to intervene in the situation, to stop the crimes—that means intervention; it does not mean acts of protest, it means *intervention,* of one kind or another: shutting down recognition of Israel, those kinds of things; *acts tantamount to the brink of war* are required to deal with that.

The other way to deal with it, is outflank it: I believe, that if we sink—*we really expose,* internationally, the *filth* on the Lieberman-McCain connection, and what that expresses, like the Mega group in U.S. politics—this will cause a *revulsion* to explode from within a population, which is already disgusted with this—internationally—but afraid to say so; and under those conditions, we will find effective remedies we can take, not as revenge, but as justice. Because we have to think about the soul of the dead person. We have to think about how their suffering looks to the eyes of the future. Did they suffering for *nothing?* Or is their suffering, does it have a reward for their descendants? For their family; for their people? Does it mean something? Is it a suffering, which makes them a hero, in the eyes of the future?

Our first job is to make heroes of those, who suffer injustice.

How To Get a Mule's Attention

Steinberg: . . .Lyn, we have less than five minutes, but we do have a question from the LaRouche movement organizers' conference line. Can we go to that now?

We have a question from Cyril, in Missouri.

Q: The Lieberman-McCain thing is a priority, of course. But, beyond that, I'm trying to contact, through my contact with Senator Feinstein of California, who wrote me a letter about the Attorney General. I'm trying to get them to understand insight into physical economics, and I think that's a long-range priority, to understand how the economy can and must be run on those principles. And, I've got copies of the book, Mr. LaRouche, and I've been trying to get these copies into their hands—Senator Feinstein and eight other Democratic Senators that I've written to. I haven't gotten a response yet, but that's the way I'm going. Don't you think this priority of understanding physical economics is a long-term priority?

LaRouche: Oh sure! But the important thing, in a case like this is, how do you get their attention? So therefore, we figure that 5 million leaflets, with this information that I've just referred to, today, will certainly get their attention.

Look, just think of the impact of what I'm doing; what I've decided to do. A lot of people working with me, did the research and checking and so forth, and we made a collective decision to go with this. But I pushed it, and said, "This Is what I want to do."

The point is, we have the evidence: You've got a guy who is running, putatively as the leader of the Democratic Party; putatively (if you discount Al Gore, who's effectively out of it anyway, sooner or later), he was to be the putative nominee, for President, in the year 2004. The Presidential campaign for 2004, is already under way, the process of developing that. It's not waiting until after November of this year, 2002. Okay.

Now, the way the Democratic Party is thinking, right now, including Senator Feinstein, *they're thinking in terms, that Lieberman is, in point of fact, pragmatically, the probable nominee for Presidential candidacy of the Democratic Party for 2004.* They're thinking that, therefore, the way *they* play, within the Congress, within the Democratic Party functions as a whole, that they have to go along with the Lieberman equation. And have to not get too nervous about the Lieberman-McCain connection.

All right, now, if we go out with the record, on how Lieberman came into the Senate, through the backing of Bill Buckley, who was financed in this, by the son of a famous Lansky gangster, who himself is not too clean: Michael Steinhardt; who's part of the Mega group that is behind the war effort, right now. It was this guy, who is tied to these Cubans in Florida, who are part of the old Lansky killer mob—the thugs: This guy is running, as the Democratic nominee for the year 2004?!

Tell a Democrat that they're thinking of nominating a guy with those credentials, with those connections to Buckley, and to McCain, who's also deeply involved in organized-crime associations: And they're going to vote for him? No. Suddenly they have to change their way of thinking! They're no longer thinking about Lieberman as a candidate. "Well, how do we get rid of this guy? We gotta get somebody else in there!" And, that's the way you get their attention.

What you have to do, is convince them, first—you know, it's like the old story about the two-by-four and the mule. One farmer's trying to sell the mule to the other. The first farmer, who's trying to sell it, said the mule is—you know, it's a famous old gag—said, "This is a very obedient mule." So, he said, "Tell him to move." He wouldn't move. So, the seller said, "That's easy." He picked up a two by four, and whacked the mule over the head, and the mule did as he wanted. He said, "You've got to get his attention first." And that's the case with the Democratic Party leadership, including Senator Feinstein.