Europe.

Only a stable Strategic Triangle system, as a *partner* of Europe, represents a normal baseline, sufficient for a revival, of an otherwise doomed world economy. And, one would assume that the United States would—with the Americas as a whole—would cooperate and would participate in that kind of *new, international monetary system, financial system, economic system.*

So, the point is, the resistance to that, is what the problem is. But, the resistance comes, not only from the *opposition* by the parliamentary parties; *opposition* by the upper 20% of the populations, who are clinically insane, in Europe and the Americas; but also, the pure inertia of popular opinion. You have the Classical case of a true tragedy on a global scale: You have a society, which is *morally incapable of surviving,* as long as it clings to what is considers its presently adopted *values;* its presently adopted *assumptions,* axiomatic assumptions. This is tragedy: Tragedies are never caused by leaders of society. They're caused by the *lack of leadership* in society, leadership for change, for necessary change—which is what I'm doing: providing the leadership for necessary change, because, around the world, there *is* no other such leadership. Other people who are echoing what we are doing, as you see in the spread of the Strategic Triangle, which I proposed in 1998, is now a hegemonic tendency, among the leading nations of that part of Eurasia. Well, that's not exactly the lack of influence, and we're doing some good. We have influence in other parts of the world.

But, those who *resist* what I represent, represent policies of governments, and nations, which are doomed, if they continue with their present policies.

This is often the case in history. This is the true case of the fall of empires. This is the true meaning of all Classical tragedy. Don't believe any other interpretation of any Classical tragedy than the one I just gave you: They're all incompetent. And they're the babbling of fools.

These are the true elements to consider, from Europe. We must have the policies I've proposed, which are the only existing, feasible alternative, to the suicidal destruction, which is inhering in the present parliamentary systems, and in popular opinion. Especially popular opinion, deeply embedded, in those ideologically self-identified with the upper 20% of family-income brackets, in Europe, the Americas, and so forth.

These people are insane. Therefore, we have to *change* them. Now, even a few among us would say, "You have to go and *influence* them, by appealing to their existing values." That's like trying to give advice to a guy, who absolutely refuses to discuss getting out of the *Titanic,* when it's sinking. What you may have to do, is clobber the guy, put an arm-lock on him, take him up to the bridge, and throw him overboard! Otherwise, he will not possibly survive. And even that's precarious. But, that's your problem.

And, my problem is, I have to do that, despite the reluctance among many of you, among us, to do what I say what must be done. Despite the fact the evidence is all in: I've been right; those who have opposed me on this, have been wrong. But, they're still clinging, out of fear, to popular opinion, and trying to ingratiate themselves with leading institutions, which are themselves morally and intellectually bankrupt. And, thus, as many cultures in the past, plunge into a tragic demise, which is what faces us unless we change things.

So, that's where we stand. So, you're in a very interesting period in history. Times have existed like this before: The empires, like Mesopotamia, have collapsed repeatedly; other empires have collapsed. We're now at the point, that the present *world* system is on the verge of an early, rapid collapse, into a generalized Dark Age of the planet—*unless we succeed.*

In order to succeed, you have to be clear. You've got to be uncompromising, when it comes to dealing with clinical insanity of the type very prevalent today. You have to recognize the problem of governments, is not that this party is not that good; or this party is not that good. The problem is, *all* the parties stink. They *all* stink! They stink for one reason: because popular opinion stinks! And the stink is elected to parliament. And the parliament spreads the stink—which is what it's elected to do! And, if the stink doesn't work, therefore the governments don't work, and the *people* find that, they too, don't work!

So, that's a very interesting situation. To me, as a person of an historical bent, it is extremely interesting. I sit back, and I'm very sad about what's happening to the human race; but I'm very happy, that, in this best of all possible worlds, as Leibniz defined it, stupidity will not prevail.

Have fun!

Dialogue

Franklin Roosevelt and The American System

Q: First I wanted to remind you about Plato, saying in a dialogue, that the worst destiny you can have, is having a leader who's less capable than yourself; and that you have to enforce the people who are more capable than yourself, to become leaders. And that's what I think we should do with you!

So, you've been devoted to the Roosevelt solution, or program. And, my question is—because after he was in office, things were corrupted again. My question is, what measures do we need to make, to ensure that this wouldn't happen again? Is there anything we can do?

President Franklin D. Roosevelt with a young lieutenant in Sicily, Italy, in December 1943. Roosevelt was indispensable, in getting the United States out of the Depression and through the war. But after the Allied breakthrough at Normandy in June 1944, his enemies moved swiftly to impose the Anglo-Dutch liberal/ oligarchical model on the United States.

LaRouche: Well, that's what I keep worrying about. There's not much understanding of Roosevelt among Europeans, in general—and even Americans—because you get these things: "But, what was Roosevelt's position on this?" "What was Roosevelt's position on this?" And so forth. That's all nonsense. History is not a sequence of votes on positions. History is a process, in which certain characteristic development is morally positive, and the lack of that development is morally negative.

Now, Roosevelt inherited a destruction of the United States, which occurred under the Presidencies of Theodore Roosevelt, a very, very distant cousin—distant morally, intellectually, as well as biologically; Woodrow Wilson, who was the co-founder of the revival of the Ku Klux Klan in the United States; Calvin Coolidge, who was a complete wretch. And, so you have, from 1901, with the successful assassination of President McKinley, who was a human President, as opposed to Teddy Roosevelt, Wilson, or Coolidge. You had in 1929, a collapse of the international monetary system, in something between a cyclical and systemic collapse—it had the qualities of both: It was cyclical in form, but it was systemic in the sense, that what had happened leading into World War I and its aftermath, essentially Versailles, had introduced a *systemic* feature of doom, into the international monetary-financial economic system.

So, Roosevelt came to power, in 1932-33, in the election of 1932, on the basis of a Hoover, who had refused, like many of today's politicians, to face—. Hoover knew what the reality was. But Hoover refused to face it, and tried to adapt to prevailing opinion of his party and institutions. It wasn't because he was stupid; it was because he was *morally weak*, and didn't have the ability to step over his predecessors.

Roosevelt did.

Failure of the Anglo-Dutch Model

Now, Roosevelt was a man, who had deeply embedded in him, the legacy of the American Revolution, which is distinctly American, and it's not European. The ideas were European. But there's nothing in the American Revolution, which was a copy or reflection of European political government institutions, and many Europeans don't understand that. They don't understand that the European model—put aside the Hapsburg model, which is obviously garbage; the Spanish and Austrian Hapsburgs: Forget them. But, look at the model which came to the fore in Europe, over successive periods, the Anglo-Dutch liberal model, which emerged successfully, triumphantly, in the aftermath of the Treaty of Westphalia.

This was inherently a failure, from the beginning, for reasons which I gave in my presentation, just shortly before, here. The United States was founded on a rejection of the Anglo-Dutch liberal model. Now, the *idea* of the American Revolution came from Leibniz, or came through Leibniz, and reflected the 15th-Century Renaissance. It did reflect the influence of Mazarin, the influence in forming the Treaty of Westphalia, in 1648; these things were reflected. But the governmental model of Europe, the disintegration of the Hapsburg system, over the century or so, emerged as triumphant, as the Anglo-Dutch liberal model—which Denmark and Swe-

den know very well. That's what you've been subjected to—your grandparents' and great-grandparents' lives, and so forth—ever since Baring.

So, we were distinct. And we were distinct in the sense, that we did not believe, did not accept the idea of a financier-oligarchical rule. And, we were opposed to setting up what we would call today, the equivalent of an independent central banking system. We believed that the government had to have the authority, the power, and responsibility, to shape financial, monetary, and economic policy, to conform to the requirements of the principle of the general welfare. And, we believed that we had to *promote* the creative impulses of the individual, the cognitive impulses of the individual, to that end. We had to provide the basic economic infrastructure; we had to promote the individual and his freedom, to make the innovations, which would make the system work. That was our system.

So, Europeans *do not* know that system. Some don't as a matter of information, as a matter of education. But, in terms of the parties, in terms of the policies, *they don't know it.* And therefore, they're very confused about this kind of thing. And therefore, their judgment on Roosevelt is often mistaken, because their conception of history is completely absurd. It's contrary to actual reality: because they try to impose an arbitrary model, of opinions, and do's and don't's, and of specific issues, on history, rather than understanding history as a process of development.

FDR's Fight for the General Welfare

Roosevelt did understand it as a process of development. And he unleashed a series of revolutionary changes, to *save* the U.S. economy, under the guidance of principles which would restore it, to its original intention, original Constitutional intention: the principle of the general welfare. All of the fights, that Roosevelt had, *in* the United States, against his *internal* opponents, and his fights with Churchill up to the last moment of his life, were based on that single issue: the general welfare. His opponents *inside* the United States, which are the so-called "free traders"—or we used to call them the "free traitors"; not "traders," "traitors"—always expressed that.

Now, Roosevelt's power was based partly upon the support he got. But, also, was conditional, because the population in general was still rotten. Generations of the population in the 20th Century, prior to his Presidency, had been corrupted, turned rotten, by what had happened inside the United States. And therefore, the reason for Roosevelt's power, in part lay in the fact that *he was saving the nation,* from a catastrophe, which was the experience of the people; that the opposition to him was there: in the people, in popular opinion, as well as in certain financier circles.

Now, Roosevelt was indispensable, in getting the United States out of the Depression, and getting it through the war. But, after June 1944, when the Anglo-American breakthrough, in Normandy, indicated the final defeat of Nazi Germany was now inevitable; at that point, in the Summer of 1944, Roosevelt's enemies moved to install a pig as the Vice Presidential nominee, in the hope that Roosevelt would die soon, and their pig would become President. That pig was Harry Truman. And, that is the essential pivot in the history of the United States after Roosevelt.

So therefore, to understand Roosevelt, you have to understand him as representing a certain body of *principle,* not a set of issues, but a principle: The principle was to restore the American System, and to free the world from the grip of the imperial maritime power of Anglo-Dutch liberalism. So, if you look at the thing as a process, in those terms, and realize that Roosevelt did *not* have a population which was intellectually developed to the point that it heeded commitment to its own best interest; but that the American population was a *fickle* population, which loved Roosevelt when he saved them from poverty and defeat; and when he saved the world from Hitler: They loved him for that. But the minute Hitler was doomed, they said, "Get rid of this guy!" And, that's what happened.

And, it took a generation, to get that legacy of Roosevelt out of the system, and the American people. Until Kennedy's assassination, the missile crisis, and the launching of the Indochina War, the American people were still enough committed to the Roosevelt legacy, they would not tolerate fascism. But, *with* the missile crisis, *with* the assassination of Kennedy, *with* the launching of the war, the American people became pigs, opportunist pigs. And, their children were educated to be pigs. And the rock-drug-sex youth counterculture, as it was reflected, for example, by environmentalism, is a reflection of the moral degeneracy, which spread around the world, over the past 35 years.

And that's the way to understand Roosevelt.

Going Beyond Roosevelt's Idea

So, what am I doing? Today, I know this—what I just said to you. Okay. Am I going to fail, as Roosevelt, in one sense, failed? That's my concern, that I shall not fail. I can not predetermine what the result will be. But I can pre-determine what *I will do* about shaping the result. And therefore, you will see, in all my writings, I do something that Roosevelt never did: Roosevelt expressed ideas, but he was not a *man of ideas.* He was a man who acted on ideas, who had ideas, who developed his understanding to *use* them, with good executive power, with leadership capability. But, he was not a *creator of ideas.* He was not a scientific discoverer, as I am.

So, I know everything Roosevelt knew, in terms of how to govern and how to lead. But, I, also, am a creative personality, a scientific discoverer. And recognize, that you must have, as Plato emphasized, with the idea of the philosopher-king, that a world in crisis needs the leadership of a philosopher-king, not merely a good President, under the present circumstances. And my job is to provide that necessary quality of leadership, of a philosopher-king.