
LaRouche to Mexican Youth

'Your Mission Is To Change The Planet'

The Mexican branch of the LaRouche Youth Movement hosted Lyndon LaRouche in Monterrey on March 19. He was introduced by Benjamin Castro and Harley Schlanger, to about 100 members and collaborators of the Youth Movement from all over Mexico.

I have assigned myself three missions to perform today. Since you are an inside organization, I will typify the fact, at the beginning, that you're going to get inside information. I shall tell you some things that I did not tell the press when they pressed me hard on this. You are permitted to know it, however, partly in reward for the toils of some of your long trips up here, your courage and endurance at getting here, and staying awake. So I have to give the kind of information that will keep people awake who wish to stay awake.

Synarchist Agents

All right, first of all, let's start with Marivilia [Carrasco]. Let's get the ghost buried.

Now, as you know, Fernando Quijano was an agent before the end of the 1980s. Now, while I was under government supervision, I was unable to take control of my responsibilities in this organization. And under those circumstances, Fernando and company were able to impose direction on the organization contrary to everything I believe in. Fernando represented everything I'm opposed to, and opposed everything I represent. So, you think of his role in the organization, including in respect to Mexico itself, as an expression of *nazi* occupation.

Now he, early in the process, managed to recruit Marivilia. Now, there's much I don't know about exactly how this worked, but there are some things I know. But what I do know is crucial: that at the time of the so-called Tlaxcala conference here, that Fernando induced Marivilia to go to Spain, to be educated by Blas Piñar. Now, Blas Piñar, as I've explained to various people—I'll just summarize quickly, I've gone through this. I was interviewed yesterday on Architect Benavides' program, where this part which was not broadcast, came up extensively, which I understand will be broadcast a week from tomorrow.

It came up in the press conference. It came up in the discussion with some of the people associated in this area.

The question was asked, can I name the people in Mexico, who represent the Nazi organization of Blas Piñar? I said, I

did not mention the names. But I did give a characterization, which anybody in the intelligence and security service would recognize what I'm saying. You see, the important thing about Marivilia, which was interesting—Harley and I smoked her out. And we smoked her out, because he trapped her into a telephone conversation with me, where she revealed her real identity. And she always avoided any conversation with me since that time. Because she just indicated certain things.

What happened is, she was recruited by Blas Piñar. Now, I'll just go through the facts of the thing, to get the picture. It's important that you know it.

The original penetration of Mexico and South America, by the Nazi organization, was from the Berlin office of the party, the Nazi party, by way of Spain, especially from the time of the Civil War in Spain, on. The major target was Mexico. From Mexico, the group, which became associated with the PAN, spread to South America. However, with information I have from the files of the U.S. intelligence services and other intelligence services, including French—these were files that were declassified for my information, in the early 1980s—this operation was heavily counterattacked by U.S. military intelligence, and others, as well as by the Mexican government. Shall we say, those Presidents in Mexico who were the enemy of the Buckley family. Remember the nationalization of Eagle Petroleum, in the 1930s. And remember the Buckley family, are part of this Nazi operation. Remember that William Buckley came into Mexico for a period of time, as a so-called CIA agent, under Allen Dulles.

Now, as a result of that, during the time of the last world war, the Mexican government, with the help of the American government, uprooted the Nazi organization in Mexico and South. However, in 1944, following the defeat of the Nazis at Stalingrad, a group around Göring, Hermann Göring, who was the money side of the Nazi party, decided to anticipate the possible defeat of Nazi Germany. And with certain financier groups in Germany, decided to take the stolen wealth of the Nazis, and plant it in other parts of the world, to create a permanent Nazi association, to live after the death of Nazi Germany.

This part of the German Nazi organization was not the Nazi party. It was a part of what was called the Allgemeine SS. The particular agency was that of SS General Schellenberg, who was head of the internal security services, of the Nazi party.

Now, what happened is, there were negotiations during the period of the war, especially from 1944 on, especially between Allen Dulles and the Nazis, through a man who became a well-known personal enemy of mine, François Genoud of Switzerland. Genoud later had a career as the personal custodian of the literary remains of Adolf Hitler, and certain other leading Nazi families.

Now, he was the channel through which Allen Dulles negotiated with Schellenberg. This is for the SS, the internal security division of the SS. These are the killers. These are



A major step forward for the LaRouche Youth Movement in Mexico: Lyndon LaRouche met a national representation of his youth movement, from all of Mexico, for the first time personally at this March 19 meeting in Monterrey. More than 100 young organizers attended, and peppered the American Presidential candidate with questions and greetings for several hours after his presentation.

not ideologues, they are killers. Military-style killers.

Now, what was already set into place—it was actually consolidated later—was that with the death of President Franklin Roosevelt, the United States underwent a right-wing turn, a very sharp right-wing turn, which had already been in progress since July of 1944. At that point, and immediately following, they used Franco, the *Franquistas*, in Spain, for a new penetration of Mexico. You had the old PAN, from the 1930s, that was essentially broken up, although some of it was revived later. The new operation was an SS operation, brought in through the courtesy of the United States and British. The agreement was, with the right-wing groups in the United States and Britain, that they would use this section of the Nazi SS as an ally against the Soviet Union. And through corrupt elements in the Vatican, they established a rat line, and took a lot of these people, to bury a lot of SS men in South America, in Argentina, Uruguay, and so forth.

Now, this is the organization you're looking at, as the principal security threat to every nation of South and Central America. The character of this organization was made clear between 1969 and 1980, involving such incidents as the train bombings, the Piazza Fontana, and the Bologna train station. All of the so-called left-wing terrorism in Italy, and other countries in Europe, during this period, were run by this SS operation. And naturally, they were blamed on the left, until they were caught. Many of the left-wing organizations are actually fronts for Nazi organizations. In Germany, and elsewhere, the same thing.

We know this group very well. It's a long story, I won't go through here, but these are essential elements you have to know.

Now, this Blas Piñar organization, based in Spain, is under his direction presently, not only the consolidation point of the Nazi assets in Spain. Remember, this is third generation. You

have the generation of the Schellenbergs—these were people who are about my age, or older. Then you had two other generations since then. So the active command, field command, of this SS organization, is now the third generation. But the organization and the tradition are the same. They are an intelligence operation, not a political movement. And the methods they use are typified by the 1969-1980 terrorism.

This is what Fernando Quijano was recruited to. This is what Quijano recruited Marivilia to.

What is she? Some of you know. She broke with me openly, in defense of synarchy, in Mexico and elsewhere. It was a very violent outburst. But *then*, a month or two later, she and her brother say, "Oh, that's a lie, to say we're synarchists!" Now she is going to various organizations here, and using phrases and slogans like she used to use from me, while denying she's a synarchist. She's an agent. She's not a political person any more. She's an agent. She's an agent of Blas Piñar. And Blas Piñar is the head of the organization which is involved in the recent Madrid train bombing.

I know of other people who fit the category. In Mexico, they're looking for a political organization. They're not looking for cuckoo eggs. The cuckoo lays its eggs in other people's nests, for the other birds to feed these cuckoos, and so forth. She's a cuckoo egg. She's a Nazi cuckoo's egg. That's what the whole crowd is. The pattern is, this is an intelligence operation, in which the hard core recruits people who become cuckoo eggs, and they put the eggs in everybody's nest.

In what party in Mexico will we find Nazis? The cuckoo's eggs infiltrate every party. Now that's why I didn't really answer the question that was asked of me, to name names, today. Because to mention any name is misleading. It's to imply that there's some party, or parties in Mexico, which are infiltrated. *Every* party is infiltrated. It's the method.

Now, who is behind this Nazi operation? Banana-mex.

That is, it's an international syndicate of financier circles. For example, André Manatt Meyer, who bought the *Washington Post*, whose daughter just recently died, he was a Nazi. We have the records. He was associated with Lazard Frères, which is the controlling operation inside France, for the Nazi operation in France. He was the man behind, or his crowd was then behind Banque Worms, which is the Nazi operation in France.

At the end of the war, he *bought* the *Washington Post*. He's also a cuckoo. The *Washington Post* is a cuckoo's egg nest. Sometimes by reading the articles, you know that. Cuckoo, cuckoo, cuckoo!

Anyway, so this is the world we're up against. Bankers, like Felix Rohatyn of the United States. It goes back to the British East India Company, in the 18th Century. There's a certain continuity, which is why I try to educate you in history, real history. What history really is. Not a gossip story. Because that's what the conflict is.

How the Postwar Generations Were Betrayed

Now, this leads right into the question of what a youth movement does, and why did I, in establishing the youth movement in the United States, protect it from people of the older generation. Why? It was necessary. And what I'll do is describe this; I've described it elsewhere, in order to get to the positive point.

There has been a cultural change of several generations in the United States. Remember, go back to the 1920s and 1930s, in your imagination. (I don't see any long gray beards here!) But go back in your imagination, and think about the experience in all those generations, since then. We're talking about the generation of Calles, right? We're talking about the 1920s, with the final great struggles, where Obregón was chasing a bandit, and trying to save Mexico.

All right, so, think about in Mexican terms, and North American terms, think about real history as experienced by a people *over* successive generations. The 1920s was a cruel and dangerous period. There were all kinds of efforts to destroy Mexico from the inside. The Cristero wars were orchestrated from the United States. And it was orchestrated over the same issue as the Eagle Petroleum later, to loot the country. *Synarchy*. It was a synarchist type of operation.

Now, think of the death, think of the movies, the pictures, the documentation, from the period of the 1920s in Mexico. Think of the Cristero wars. Think of how they were brought to an end. Think of the experience of Mexico in the 1930s. Think of Mexico being infiltrated by the cuckoos of the Nazi system. Think in terms of a certain amount of progress in Mexico, despite political problems in the 1940s, the 1950s, the 1960s, up until 1982. At this point the process of destruction of all of the countries, all the countries are being destroyed.

Look back, think back. Think back to 1970. What was the organization of each of the countries of the Americas? What

was the rate of improvement or deterioration of conditions of life? Think of Mexico. Troubled progress, yes; but progress. Hope. The possibility of improvement. The PRI's, in particular, power was based on this idea of progress, on these programs of improvement. They used to say, Mexico's not a banana republic, but Brazil is a *mañana* empire. These funny things were going on, but the overall characteristic was the political orientation, was to deliver improvements. Jobs, better conditions of life, public works, these kinds of things.

Now, think about how that was taken away in 1982, after October. Think of the pessimism which has gripped Mexico, increasingly, since 1982. Think of the steel industry, the related industries that used to exist in this city.

Now, look at the United States. We were lifted out of the mud by Franklin Roosevelt. Optimism. Optimism increasingly, as we went to war. A sense that our victory in war would mean an end to imperialism and colonialism. That the colonized countries would become independent. That economic development of sovereign nation-states would be a world reality,

Then, in the Summer of 1944, that turned around. The right-wing turn began, with the firebombing of civilian populations in Europe. All the way to the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, for which there was no justified reason. Japan was defeated. It was not necessary to firebomb Tokyo. It was not necessary to drop nuclear weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. No reason for this! It was a *crime* for which people should have been hung in those days. Churchill did it for Britain. Truman did it for the United States. A Ku Klux Klan veteran. We started a right-wing turn.

We were going to have a war with our ally, the Soviet Union. That was the excuse of bringing the Nazis in, into NATO. It was through NATO that the terror was run in Europe in 1969. It was called the Compass Plot. (Compass is the image of NATO.)

I came from a betrayed generation. We fought a war, we were betrayed, by a right-wing turn. By a right-wing turn by the faction typified by Dulles and company, who became what Cheney represents today. A policy of world empire, by means of the terror of nuclear weapons. The policy of Dick Cheney is *preventive nuclear warfare*, and has been his personal policy since 1991. What you see in Afghanistan, what you're seeing in Iraq, is that policy, that policy to spread preventive nuclear warfare. We were betrayed.

Now, what happened to my friends, who were victims of this betrayal? After the war, I went to see some of them. "No, no, no, no, no—my wife! My wife! We spent five years at war! We have to catch up! We have to buy a house! We have to build a family! Don't get us into trouble! Don't say anything! Don't say anything that will get you into trouble!"

We were living under a Nazi-like reign of terror in the United States. And 95% of my courageous fellow soldiers became stinking cowards. Everything we thought we'd fought for, was thrown down the sewer.



A sense of history: Mexican university students' theme for their conference, and invitation to LaRouche, was "surviving imperialism." Here LaRouche and Dennis Small sit before the students' metaphors: Aztec ruins; ruin of the Roman Colisseum; the U.S. Capitol; the Kremlin (not seen). LaRouche took them back to the Pelopponesian War for the root of the problem.

Now, the Baby-Boomer generation, the people in their 50s, early 60s, are the children of that generation. Their parents were cowards, stinking cowards, who said, "Don't get into trouble!" "Be careful! The FBI is listening! Be careful who you associate with. Don't be seen with that person. Don't read that publication." This is the way these children were raised, the ones that were born after the war, the ones who were raised in the 1950s.

Then what happened to them? 1962, the Missile Crisis. Now, what had happened in the meantime?

I don't know how many of you have ever seen the television from that period, and Hollywood so-called science-affliction movies. Nuclear weapons cause giant ants to eat the human race. You have to imagine a four-year-old, a six-year-old, looking at the screen, television set. "The Big Ants, the big monsters, are coming to eat us!" So, these children were not exactly happy children.

Then, the Missile Crisis came. That was the day the Great Ants were coming from outer space to eat us all. Now, those people for four or five days, especially in the United States, were sitting in a state of terror, expecting that the bombs, the nuclear weapons, were coming, and that we'd all be extinguished, in a horrible way.

Then you had the assassination of Kennedy. The assassination of Kennedy was done by this Nazi SS-like operation. They did it, because he was an obstacle to their policies. Their immediate policy was the war in Vietnam. And he had conspired with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and others, not to do

it—the traditionalists. So they killed him, because they didn't like his policies. His successor, Johnson, was terrified.

What happened to these children, the Baby Boomers? They took their clothes off, and went back to nature. "Technology is like nuclear weapons—it's bad! Progress is bad! We've got to go back to the trees!"

This became known as the rock-drug-sex counterculture. Now, this is key to understanding the Baby-Boomer generation, *internationally*.

For example, take the way they destroyed the Catholic cultural communities of say, Mexico, and Brazil, and elsewhere: existentialism. You had here, you had people like Jacques Soustelle: same mentality. "The mystique of the Aztecs." The same thing happened in Peru. It happened throughout South and Central America. The French disease spread, called existentialism. Intellectual syphilis.

So, you had a similar phenomenon—you had the Nazi ideology: Nietzsche, Wagner, Brecht, Bertolt Brecht, and so forth. Most of the left were actually fascists. So you have a generational transformation in the postwar period, of a generation which has come to the point, they no longer have, as a generation, optimism.

Now, admittedly, the rock-drug-sex counterculture was only a small—not a small part, but a significant part of the Baby-Boomer generation, internationally. Not just the United States. In Europe, same thing. There are differentiations, because there are cultural differentiations in these countries, but the problem is the same. Same form.

The Carrasco Cuckoo Eggs

A curious, revealing sidelight of Lyndon LaRouche's trip to Monterrey, was the coincident visit to that city by Mari-vilia Carrasco, a former leader of the LaRouche association in Mexico.

In August 2003, Carrasco broke publicly with LaRouche over her defense of Synarchism, in the face of LaRouche's forceful public attack on those circles, and in particular on the Spanish fascist Blas Piñar. And yet when LaRouche reported at the time that the "substantive issue" for Carrasco's split was Synarchism, she indignantly protested that this was *not* the case. "Our break with the organizations and publications of Lyndon H. LaRouche was not the result of discrepancies over international synarchism of the past, the present or the future," she lied.

Between August 2003 and March 2004, Carrasco and her cohorts in Brazil and Argentina attempted to keep up

that pretense in every which way. Their usefulness to their controllers as an anti-LaRouche countergang, depended on maintaining that fiction, while parroting LaRouche on this or that international issue. In a word, like the eggs of the cuckoo, who lays them in other birds' nests.

But then in mid-March 2004, LaRouche visited Monterrey, where he publicly exposed the role in the Madrid train bombings of Blas Piñar-linked synarchist networks in Europe and the Americas. When the Monterrey all-news radio station Tele Radio asked Carrasco on March 19 for her response to LaRouche's statements, she immediately jumped to the defense of Piñar et al.—the very synarchists she self-righteously claimed to have no association with!

What LaRouche implied in his statement is "absurd and groundless," Carrasco exploded. "I also have to say that it is obscene" because, she blurted out, I know the people he is trying to implicate in Spain, Mexico, and Argentina. "They would be incapable of doing something like that."

Thus did the Carrasco cuckoo eggs crack.

Now, what we produced by accepting the ideas of economics, other things that are taught in universities, we have a culture which is decadent culture. And the rock-drug-sex counterculture people are the leading edge of this culture. We went against nuclear energy, back to the mudholes. We went against progress, we went for free trade. All these things were accepted. We accepted political parties and candidates that would not have been tolerated before.

What we have created is a society which is called a "no-future" society. That is, this society under these terms, has no future. And that's international. There's no future for this culture, under these policies, and these institutions, *none*, because people are against the future. They're against progress. They're against scientific, technological progress. You know what free trade is? You see what free trade does to Mexico? You take a Mexican population, deny them the benefits of progress, because of what happened after 1982, with no opportunity for an income, work as slaves in the *maquiladoras*, often given an income they cannot support a family on, or they're squeezed across the border, North American border, to work as terrified slaves inside the United States. To live as a part of the drug-trafficking, as expendables in the drug traffic. Burning up a population, destroying their minds, destroying their character as citizens.

What happens with people who accept that? Say, "We have to learn to live with that." They don't say, "We're decadent"; they say, "We're practical."

Now, how do they live with themselves, having given up everything inside themselves, which is human? What they do, is they have fantasy. For example, Televisa. What is that but

fantasy? It's a perpetual sexual fantasy. The viewers drop from sexual exhaustion, without actually doing anything.

We have mass entertainment, and it becomes more and more decadent all the time.

So, you have a generation that goes into fantasies. If you look at people around you, ask yourself, what is their fantasy? Particularly the Baby Boomers, what is their fantasy? Their fantasies are sometimes rather strange, they're not necessarily luxurious fantasies. If you imagine something which is not real, and you keep imagining until you can fall asleep, every frustration—"Keep calm, keep calm, have a fantasy." You're at work, you don't like work. Amuse yourself with a fantasy. This is a characteristic of the Baby-Boomer generation.

Now, the important thing about a fantasy, is, you try to make it credible. You try to imbue a fantasy with a quality of reality. How do you do that?

Well, the obvious way, is to get other people to share your fantasy. To reinforce, to accept your fantasy. That is the characteristic of the Baby-Boomer generation. They come to the point, they say, "We're now 50, 60 years old. Hopefully we're going to live a few more years. And if I have to go, I hope it will be nice." They have a fantasy. To live, get through life, to get through the fact that the most horrible thing about their life, is it's meaningless.

The Historic Role of the Youth Movement

Now, look at the reaction between their children, who are now of university age, 18-25, and the parents. The parents are in a state of denial. You know something about the economic condition of young people who are 18-25, particularly who

do not come from extraordinarily wealthy families. They're living on marginal existence. They're watching the society crumble around them. The education is really non-existent, but it costs a lot, if you can get it.

They're saying to their parents' generation: "Hey, parents. You have given us a no-future society. We are young! We have a right to a life. In this society, there is no life for us. You're dying, parents. Maybe two decades from now you'll die, but you're already dead. You're not with us, you're not in the real world. You're living in your comfort zone, your fantasy life."

So, therefore, you have to have a reverse cultural development. *You* want a future. You want a future for society. You want the continuity of humanity, of the nation, and so forth, to be expressed a hundred years from now. You want to be able to participate in producing that. Not to get paid, although you might expect that, but you want the opportunity to have a meaningful human life. And when you start talking like that, your parents' generation *doesn't want to hear it*.

Now, the problem is, is that the parents' generation, as a generation, no longer believes in the existence of truth. Eh? They believe there are approved views, they believe there are views that you should adopt to become part of a certain circle. But you don't believe there's a difference between truth and falsehood, which is independent of somebody's else's opinion. Independent of the opinion of a teacher, a government official, and so forth. *Truth*.

I am basing my whole existence on some meaningful thing for my life, something that could be judged meaningful after I'm dead, other people's opinion is not satisfactory. You have to have some way of knowing that this is *true*. Independent of somebody's else's opinion. So therefore, I said, what you're going to do, when we had the opportunity, beginning in southern California, about four years ago, to build a youth movement, I began to participate in discussions, largely by telephone, and I saw exactly what was going on in the minds of these young people, of this entire generation; and I knew that if I didn't protect them from the older generation, of even our own members, they would lose it. They could not succeed. Because the object is to get young people, of *your* age, not to follow your parents, but to *lead* them. *Lead them back to reality*.

To give them the chance of seeing reality. Your weapon is essentially, you can always say, to your parents—you'll probably have greater luck with your grandparents—say, "We are your future. Our children are your future. Our grandchildren are the meaning of your life. Help us to assure the meaning of your life." And thus bring them back to reality.

This is not unusual. As we're often emphasized, do you know how old the leaders of the American Revolution were? How old was Lafayette when he became a general of the Revolutionary War? How old was Hamilton when he became the Inspector General of the U.S. military? You had a couple of old geezers like me—Franklin for example. You had a

Baby Boomer called George Washington, and a lot of younger people.

You, because you are committed to building your own personal future—that is, to define your personal adult identity, as a human being, which is what the purpose of a university education is supposed to be—you have in your generation, a special power to influence older generations, under these kinds of conditions. And my job is to help you understand that. Not as a teacher, not as a doctor, but as truth. You have to know it for yourself, that it's true. Because your ability to influence other people, depends upon your certainty that it is truth. It is not enough to *believe* that it's true; it *must* be true, otherwise it doesn't work. And that's why we picked the Gauss, as a test case.

Gauss and the Complex Domain

Gauss is absolutely indispensable. There are other ways you could get the same thing, but this is so exquisitely beautiful. So accessible, so immediate to today's classroom, today's science; it's perfect.

So, therefore, what does this involve? What Gauss's issue, Gauss' attack on these pigs Euler and Lagrange, and others, was essentially that they didn't know the difference between man and a monkey. So don't monkey around with the calculus! What is called a usual calculus course today, of Cauchy and other *cochons*.

So, what this deals with, essentially, what Kepler dealt with, what others dealt with: the secret of Classical Greek heritage. The question is, is sense-perception truth? Or is it merely a distorted shadow of truth, which ignores many elements of truth?

Well, a monkey only knows sense-perception. And many contemporary liberals are of similar disposition. They have a liberal indifference to reality. The point is, that our sense-perceptions are based on our biological sense-perceptual organs, but that is not reality. These are only living biological processes, these sense-perceptions.

Now, what is the question of truth in respect to sense-perception? Sense-perception does not show us the real universe. But there is a difference between truthfulness and falseness in sense-perception, that is, between a sane person, and one on LSD. In other words, is it relatively truthful as sense-perception? But you never saw a principle that runs the universe through sense-perception. You have to discover a universal physical principle, such as gravitation. This goes to the essence of what's the difference between man and a monkey. Many mathematicians are well-qualified as monkeys. They do their funny little monkey-like dances at the blackboard; they play with computers. The advantage of a real monkey—they can use the tail as well their fingers.

But, in any case, the principle involves the discovery of something beyond the senses, which you can demonstrate to be a principle, true, and by means of which mankind distinguishes himself from the beasts.



The 12th-Century Cathedral of Chartres. "The Roman Empire and medieval Europe were overall a cultural, moral catastrophe. . . . [But] the human characteristic, of the individual, is always manifest in this, the creative quality. Even in the darkest times, our minds are struggling to bring man on an upward course."

For example, if man were an ape, like some of my critics are, then the human species would never have had a population in the past several million years, which would rise above several million individuals. We have now 6 billion or more people on this planet. No animal could do this. Mankind, by making discoveries of principle, is able to increase man's power in and over the universe. We change the universe—by discovering principles that already existed in it. By using existing principles by acts of will, that is what it is to be human, to discover principles.

Now, when in cultural history—for example, when you study the history of physics, from the standpoint of Gauss' paper of 1799, you keep looking back, back, back, back, to personalities who discovered a principle a long time ago. You often know the name of that person. By research, you know that you can verify the actual re-enacting of that act of discovery. That person from the past now lives inside you, culturally. Each of these discoveries is a power of mankind.

We are the accumulation of the powers transmitted to us by previous generations. It is our destiny to push this further, to the next generations. *We are human!* We're not monkeys.

And every person has this qualitative potential. To be human is to develop this in oneself, and to develop it in others, and to cooperate in using these principles to change and benefit humanity. *For you, for your generation*, this is the only rope by which you can keep from drowning. You have to have a sense of truth. Truth in principles. Truth in the physical principles on which we increase man's power over the universe. But also truth in the sense of social principles, which we express by Classical forms of art. Classical art is to teach us politics in behavior, in the same way we teach science, through the same faculty.

One case, we're looking at man's mind's relationship to the universe directly; the other, we're looking at man's relationship to the universe through social processes. It's through cooperation in social processes that we're able to do that.

A University on Wheels

So, the idea of the youth movement is to bring back human beings, into the status of first-class citizens, and to rescue the older generation from the bestial careers of fantasy which they've adopted. Jerk them back from the jungles of savagery and fantasy. Pull your parents out of the swamp. Put them on safe ground, and march forward.

The way you have to do this, is, you have to practice the form of the classroom, the good classroom. Take a group of people, between 15 and 25. Now, throw a contradiction into the discussion. Then, you have enough people that some people respond to the presentation, but not so many that anybody's excluded from the continuing discussion. That is why we have the tradition of a 15- to 25-person classroom. You know, 500, 1,000 people in a classroom may have some function, but it is not this function. It is by your going through, creating a classroom for yourself, and have the idea of solving problems by defining the solutions, the concepts. It means that you must spend a good deal of time in organized classes in a sense, in this way. Such as Gauss, the classes on Gauss. Other related things. Just as a university should be organized in the old days.

So, you are the same thing as the university. Your political activity is an extension of that process. You are working in the laboratory of the social processes, to discover how to deal with the problems that you face in *that aspect* of the social process.

I could tell you a lot of things, but neither I nor anybody else can tell you what the difference is between the social processes in Monterrey, and those in Mexico City. In each area, you have characteristic problems, which are peculiar to that area. Different kinds of institutions, which interact. Now, if you're going to be politically effective, apart from the general things that are common to every part of us, you're going to have to understand the area in which you're working, which is experimental scientific work. The history of the area, what's the background, what do people think, how do they think? What are the institutional forms in which they are organized?

How can you most effectively influence them to recognize the truth about something?

And therefore, it's this conception, to see yourself as a generation of this type, to organize yourself in this way, and to use the platform that we as an organization represent, internationally, to be able to conduct the operation we have to do, to induce this sick world to save itself. And at the same time, above all, the greatest power you have, is the potentiality to take someone who says, "Well, man is only an animal," "I'm an animal like every other animal," "I have my needs, I know what I need—don't try to tell me anything. Life is short. When you're dead, you're dead," this kind of thing. If you can get that person to recognize that, minus a tail, they're not an animal. But they're a human being, which partakes of immortality, through the transmission of cultural principles, from millions of years before, to the future that comes after us.

When you have a sense of the immortality of the individual personality, starting with your own, then you have the power. Because you're incapable of treating other people as human beings unless you know yourself as a human being. You don't have any durable influence on other people, except by appealing to that within them, prompting them to discover that within them.

So, you are a generation, a small part of a generation, with a global mission in your life. It is to take the dead, who are called Baby Boomers, and say, "Lazarus, Lazarus, Lazarus, come forth!" And to build, with them, the future.

Thank you.

Dialogue With LaRouche

Q: [translator] We're very happy you're here. We have a question. Years ago, we were discussing about Martin Luther King, and we were saying that he had a whole philosophical and educational background, more than many people. So, the first thing I thought of is, that it's very important, this aspect of intellectual work, it's very important in order to be able to achieve a sublime state, to be able to reach a sublime state, the way Martin Luther King did.

But what we were also talking about is what happens in the case of Joan of Arc, because what is known about her, is that, being a very uneducated woman, I don't understand—I don't know how to pose the question—what is the relationship between intellectual effort, intellectual work, that you carry out, in its relationship to achieving a sublime state of mind?

LaRouche: Well, I would not exaggerate Martin's education. Martin's strength—many other people had as much education as he did, and they failed. When he died, was killed, there was no one to replace him. And they all failed. It was a failure of leadership. And some of them had more education than he did.

The same thing is true in the case of Jeanne d'Arc. Her

ignorance is exaggerated. She had a certain kind of spiritual education. But you see, the essential thing is this: It's a sense of what it is to be a human being. A sense of immortality, of the intrinsic immortality of the human personality.

This becomes obvious when you are dealing with principles rather than experiences. When you develop a principle, discover a principle, and transmit it, it's a permanent transmission of your personality into the future of society. This sometimes occurs in a more conspicuous way, sometimes in a less conspicuous way.

Now, what she understood was this: What was current at that period—you had movements such as the legacy of Augustinus. You had the legacy of Abelard, who represents these kinds of principles. So, the conception of man's nature, and man's relationship to the universe, as a Classical Greek conception, specific also to Christianity, was around. As I presented this in Talladega, in Alabama, where I addressed this meeting on the subject of Martin Luther King, the thing that was obviously the strongest thing in his mind, which was the strongest influence on him, was one thing: identical to that in Jeanne d'Arc. And remember, what did he do? The night before he was assassinated, knowing that the Nazis, the friends of Marivilla, were about to kill him in the morning, he gave this famous speech: "I've gone to the mountaintop." Longevity is to be desired, but if I have to die tonight, I will do my mission.

Now, where's the education in that? That's in Christ. That's the image of the passion and crucifixion of Christ. This is the characteristic.

The Hamlet phenomenon is the person who does not know that there is a meaning to their life. Life to them is like a bookends, with a beginning and an end. There are no books! When you have a sense of immortality, a sense of mission, you see yourself as living to perform a mission, and you die with a smile on your face. And that's what she had. That's what Martin had.

See, the important thing is that there's not only the formal education. Formal education fails if it does not include the moral education. The moral education is a sense of finding, "I have a mission." For example, a soldier in warfare, who faces death; but why does he face death? Why doesn't he run? For various reasons, he doesn't run. But the good reason he doesn't run, "If I have to spend my life here, doing this mission, my life will have served a purpose."

That person has tremendous confidence, and justly so. And that's what Martin had. I know, because I know his circles very closely. That is what the Rev. Jesse Jackson does *not* have, for example. And that's the problem with most politicians. They won't put their life on the line for a necessary mission. I've done it a number of times myself. It feels good, especially when you survive it.

Q: [trans.] I wanted to ask, when we study people in the right way, such as Bach or Mozart or Leibniz or Gauss, or

like you, it would seem that these people were born, seemed to have the right way of thinking coming out of nowhere, almost like a matter of luck, if someone's born thinking right, and some people are born thinking wrong. From what I've read, in your articles, that's not possible. It's not possible, to be born right, or to be born wrong. But my question is, what is it that made those people able to model their method of thinking in the right way? What made you think correctly, to see those things that others didn't see?

LaRouche: Quite simple, in my experience. As I've said many times, the birth of my wisdom came early in childhood. As soon as I was able to recognize that my parents lied most of the time. And then in recognizing that the teachers lied most of the time. I have a vivid recollection of one kind of experience in particular that's relevant.

Your parents have company, visitors. They come, they talk to each other. I, as a child, listening to the conversation, know my parents are lying. It's called polite lying, for company. So, the guests go to the door. The parents go to the door. They say, "Oh, we must do this again some time." I'm sitting there, disgusted.

I find the same thing in people at school, my age. I find it in society in general. I find in schools that things that I know, that most of the things that are being taught, gradually I find they're all lies.

Now, in this process, you have to decide whether you're going to go along in order to be "socially acceptable," or whether you're going to maintain your independent judgment. The problem in society is, most people capitulate rather young. And it's like corruption: One concession leads to another.

And then you become a "socially acceptable person," totally corrupt. So, your identity shifts, from what you know you are, to hoping that people will think about you what you hope they will. And then you become a "liberal." That is known as spiritual death. Liberally dead.

'Capitalism vs. Communism'

Q: [trans.] Mr. LaRouche, you mentioned at the beginning something that really impacted me: We're fighting for a monetary system, that will give us the hope in the future, a future of promise. What are the social characteristics, or political characteristics? What kind of organizations, and institutions, and mechanisms, do you contemplate we should have in the future, so that we can have the kind of monetary system that you're talking about? Are we talking about capitalism, or are we talking about communism? Or is this a mixture of the two? Do you think certain resources have to be controlled by the state? What should not? What are the elements of judgment that we should bring to this?

What indications which we would have, as an underdeveloped people, to be able to trust a proposal, a supposed reform, a supposed change, that you bring here and offer us, that would bring the kind of economic progress that we desire, if

we don't know those characteristics, if we're blind before the reality of what it is, what is economically good for our country? I would like to know, what kind of monetary system you're talking about, to be able to see that if in the future some thinker, some statesman, proposes it, to be able to say to my children, to be able to say, "look, that's right."

LaRouche: Of course, I've explained this in great detail, so there's no lack of explanation of what this problem is.

Take the case of Marxism, for example. Where did Marx get his education? By British intelligence. Yes, he was a member of a British intelligence association, which was called Young Germany, which was part of Young Europe of Mazzini. He went to London, where he was under control of the coordinator of Young Europe, a top British Intelligence agent, David Urquhart, at the British Library. He was miseducated under British intelligence, in British economics, by Urquhart. He never had any exposure to competent economics.

He accepted everything about British economics. He attacked the United States and its economic policies. He attacked Hamilton. He attacked Henry Carey. He never understood the ABCs of economics. He was always wrong. But the British System is wrong. So what is taught as economics in universities today, generally accepted, is complete trash, and useless.

What Marx did was simply take a feature of the British theory of economics, and draw a conclusion which is relatively correct, but positively is worthless. That's why the Soviet Union collapsed. Because the materialist conception of history, the materialist conception of man, as taught by Marx, which comes from British empiricism, is what the problem is.

The dialectics is nonsense. Hegel's dialectic is a fraud too. And Marx accepted it, it's a complete fraud.

Q: [trans.] From what I understand of Mr. Marx, as a thinker, as an ideologue: Marx, as far as I'm concerned, was someone who, on the one hand, exposes the excesses of the capitalist system, which are possible at a time when very few individuals in the population controlled the majority of the resources, the means of production, and therefore, they control the political and social circumstances of the country. That's what Marx says.

I distrust communism, because of the capacity it has of unifying the individual spiritual character of the individual. Just as with capitalism, with great ease and facility, given its means and structure and nature, it has placed in very few hands, the destiny of entire nations, including ours.

I'm not a party man, I'm not a party to anything. I'm a person who has fears, because I present myself before others as someone who's conscious, but I don't believe in banners or flags anymore. I don't believe in symbols. I don't believe in ideas, because I've lived surrounded by facts which go against everything which is knowable.

LaRouche: Well, maybe the facts you've been exposed to—you're not that old, after all. Your experience is not that



The problem of Synarchism in Mexico: It has much to do with the Carlist fascist Buckley family, including William F. Buckley, above, with Henry Kissinger. "Remember the nationalization of Eagle Petroleum, in the 1930s. And remember the Buckley family are part of this Nazi operation. Remember that William Buckley came into Mexico for a period of time, as a so-called CIA agent, under Allen Dulles."

extensive. You have a certain impression from what you've been exposed to, but I can assure you that this picture of Marx which you recite, is widespread, but it's incompetent. It is what will be taught in commentaries on Marx in universities. . . . Some people would agree with what you say, but I disagree with all of it, and that's why I've been able to be the best, most successful economic forecaster, in modern history.

The reason we're in a systemic crisis is because the people who are running the economy, they don't know what they're doing. We're in a systemic crisis, which is a systemic failure, because of all of the ideas of the economics departments of every variety.

[more back and forth, argument, inaudible]

LaRouche: Then, why are we in a crisis?

Q: [trans.] Maybe that's the intention.

LaRouche: You're looking for a world in a much too simplistic way. You have to look at the history of mankind. You can not take a few aspects and try to interpret it by your experience.

The point was, and I've written a lot on this stuff, this is not *terra incognita*. I've taught a great deal of this stuff, so I can say safely that I'm the most competent known economist living today. And my work is known internationally. It's also feared internationally, in many places. But there is a completely different conception of economics from that which

you're talking about.

Real economics has nothing to do with anything you said. What you're talking about as economics, you're accepting the assumptions of the British school of economics.

Q: No way!

LaRouche: Well, that's exactly what it is. Marxism is.

Q: [trans.] How relevant is it that Marx had been a brilliant politician, the repository against a system which is also shown in recent years—

LaRouche: He wasn't. He was a very bad politician, absolutely incompetent. But he was a political failure in every way. Marx was a creation of British intelligence. He was actually an agent of Palmerston.

Take, for example, the formation of the so-called International Workingman's Association. Who put Marx in that position? He was appointed by Mazzini, at a public conference in London. Who was Mazzini working for? Mazzini was one of the most famous agents of Palmerston in Europe. Marx politically was an agent of Palmerston. He was just another agent! He happened to have certain talents, which are worth noting, because they—. But Marx himself always said he was nothing but a student of Adam Smith. Smith was a complete fraud. The British school of economy, Jeremy Bentham, who was head of the secret intelligence service of the British Foreign Office, who orchestrated much of the Jacobin Terror. And the Haileyburg school of the British East India Company. All the Marxists affirm that he worked from them (except one, a Venetian, a Venetian economist of that period). It was the British Haileyburg school which educated him, took him into London, taught him economy, and all his work was done in that direction.

But that's the way things happen.

Moderator: [trans.] There are some other things by LaRouche written on exactly this subject, that go beyond the formulations which you're making, the sort of academic formulations that you're making here. Capitalism vs. communism, and so on and so forth. That's one of the frauds that's taught in universities, and there's a lot written that we have here, and at the end of this meeting, for those who want to participate in a course that we're going to be giving, we'll take down your names, we'll have an economic class. I would like to call on someone else who wants to ask a question.

How Can We Master the Complex Domain?

Q: [trans.] I had a discussion with Bruce Director, on the infinitesimal calculus of Leibniz, which is a task which Kepler leaves to be finished to determine the elliptical orbits, what Leibniz does is to not do the calculus step by step, based on the ellipse, but rather to determine the total, the entirety of the ellipse, and its trajectory. What I have a doubt about, is, how can we see this, how the future represents the present in

history, in universal history, and how can we, those of us who are youth, members of the movement, how can we look at this, to be able to have that kind of view, this vision of things?

LaRouche: Well, I went through a lot of this. A lot of it was done by others, but because of some of the work I did, I think I make it clearer than others have done. The problem has been that in modern civilization, we had, since the beginning of empiricism, which is actually the beginning of the 16th Century, there was a division between what we call Classical art, and physical science. There was the Venetian school, the Aristotelian version; and then with Paolo Sarpi at the end of the century, there was the empiricist group.

The problem is this: People look at physical science in terms of energy. Now, energy is a false concept. Energy is an effect, not a cause. In Classical Greek, and in modern science, *power* is the term you use, which *causes* an effect you may call energy. So, therefore, the problem was, empiricism failed to recognize that the human mind is capable of discovering principles in any aspect of human experience.

You find that, for example, in Kepler's *The New Astronomy*—there are lots of illustrations of this.

For example, take Classical art. I'll demonstrate. You know the problem of the discus-thrower. The discus-thrower has his arm out here, at the extremity. Now, this is a movement, which is back and forth, when you're throwing the discus. When you do a sculpture of a discus-thrower, or a painting of the discus-thrower, from what you see, you know whether that is beginning moving this way, or moving this way. The only way the arm will actually get into the appropriate discus position, is only by the motion back and forth in this fashion. So, that gives you a sense of motion. A sculpture, not as a gravestone, but as motion.

Or take the famous Mona Lisa. I laugh all the time about this. Why? Tell me, is she beginning to smile, or is she ending a smile? All the great sculpture, all the great art, involves the same sense of the inherent motion of what is represented. Nothing is stationary like a gravestone. Yet the Mona Lisa, she's alive, because you don't know whether she's ending her smile, or beginning it. It's not an enigma, it's a paradox. It's a paradox. All great Greek classical sculpture has that same quality.

This was made clear for painting by Leonardo da Vinci, with his concept of spherical perspective, rather than linear. You see this also in the reflection of the work of Leonardo da Vinci, on the work of Rafael Sanzio. You see a beautiful example in Rembrandt, the most famous and most expensive painting, of the most intelligent bust of Homer, looking at the stupid face of Aristotle. And if you just really let yourself think, you see. Here's this stupid Aristotle, all dressed up, draped up, while Homer's looking at this idiot . . . touching his head.

So therefore, you find in art, great plastic art at that time, you find a relationship between the geometric conception in art, as art defines it, and mathematics. It's a sense of the unity

of the two, which enables one to really understand how Leibniz's mind worked.

See, it is very difficult for people these days, who are educated in the idea of formal Cartesian geometry, and formal algebra and arithmetic. It's difficult for them to *think*, since they're so conditioned to say, "How do we derive this from this conception of space and time?"

For example, take the case of Leibniz's work and the work of Riemann. The principles that we do not see, like universal gravitation. You don't see universal gravitation—you see its effect, you feel its effect, but you derive it by experimental knowledge of its effects. Now, once you discover this principle, and can measure its effect, now you use the complex domain for thinking. Your mathematics is showing you two things in geometry: it's showing you what you can see, the experience of vision. It's also showing you the effect of something you can't see. That's what you have the complex domain. A world of shadows of sense perception, and a world of principles you don't see, but we know. And they participate together.

Once you understand that, as you do with Riemann, you go into a new conception. You say, we're going at this the wrong way. We have to accept what we have proven; we don't have to go back to old mathematics any more. We've discovered a new mathematical physics: Riemannian mathematical physics. Now we know what is primary, which comes out brilliantly in the opening paragraphs of Riemann's habilitation dissertation.

For example, take a very simple thing from Leibniz. Now, Leibniz's culminating work in mathematical physics, apart from a few particular things he dwells on, was the conception of a universal physical principle of least action. Which is another way of saying the infinitesimal calculus. Now, all the other forms of calculus are not calculus, because they deny the existence of this complex domain function. This is the reason that young Gauss attacked Euler and Lagrange on this issue. So, the problem here, what you describe, is you've made a partial step toward comprehension of this problem.

What Bruce is doing, and I've been pushing this, is to get to the other aspect of Riemann's work. I don't know whether he brought it in here, when he was down here the last time, on the Abelian functions. The understanding of the fuller implications of Riemann's work from the standpoint of Abelian functions, gives us a new way of thinking about physical geometry. What we try to do, is we try to get a program going, with Jonathan [Tennenbaum] and with Bruce and others, which will be a step-wise approach into getting into this, making this comprehensible. But the goal is to get to an understanding of a different conception of physics, in an elementary way.

Then when you look backward from that standpoint, to what you've done on the way up, now it becomes clear. That is, we're making step-wise progress toward understanding what the fundamental nature of the universe is, physically.

You go step by step, and you think you've solved it, and then you realize there's a question, which you pose here. Then you have to attack the next problem. And that's the way. You're doing fine; you've just got to get more work done. That's the direction you have to go in. You have to go to this sense, there is a higher standpoint, a different way of conceptualizing the universe. And the function of the "university on wheels," in a sense, is to graduate people who've gotten to the point they know that.

The 'Judas' Problem

Q: [trans.] Everything that we've seen in the organization, the whole question of Marivilia, a person who could be 30 years fighting for a sublime cause, a cause for the general welfare; all of sudden, or how such a person can somehow change and go completely to the other side, like in the *Martí* package [in *EIR*, Jan. 9, 2004], who now is part of these terrorist groups, and teams, and the factions that she's involved in. And at the same time, what path should a person follow, seeing such things inside himself, how do you know when you're becoming corrupt yourself, because there comes a point where you act in a certain way before the world, but there are small, very small corruptions. How do you recognize them, and how could they take you to that degree of?

LaRouche: I tell you, they do know they're doing it. They know. In the case of Marivilia, she knew. She was corrupt. This is the Judas Iscariot problem. It's Judas Iscariot, the same principle. And that's why it's very sad, because she probably will end up as Judas Iscariot, because she maintained duplicity for a long time. And it was being more and more artificial. And when Blas Piñar pulled a string on her, she fell. It was done partly by people from Argentina. But she spent a number of days with Blas Piñar in Spain, under Fernando. Fernando was the first one to introduce her to that. I know the whole picture. It could never have happened if I had not been in prison. The minute I was free, free of all controls, then it became impossible for them, and she had to leave. They pulled her out. And she's still functioning as an agent, as I said. She's not even herself anymore.

She's an agent of these guys. She's running around saying that she represents certain things in which she does not believe. It happens. The Judas Iscariot phenomenon is common. And the point is, if you step on the banana peel, you may fall down. And there were various influences on her. She was essentially a frightened person. She was a frightenable person, with a very sad marriage. Other problems. She was frightened. On one side, she would seem courageous, but on the other side, fearful.

You have to understand these guys. Their method is the method of the beast. Actually, in a sense, you can be killed, or to show you what they have done to some other people. It's done by induced terror, psychological terror. And the purpose of induced terror is to change people. It's called brainwashing. She was brainwashed, and didn't have the strength

to withstand it. She actually ran away from close association with people she'd been associated with. She would manifest herself in one place or the other, but she was never working closely with her associates. She would turn up here or there. But the daily work, with the daily social intercourse, and responsibilities of the organization, she wasn't here. It can happen. I've seen this in various places.

Q: [trans.] That's all in relation to, there were people who were in touch with her, who were in contact, who remain in the organization, and who didn't have the capacity to distinguish all of that.

LaRouche: Yeah.

Q: [trans.] So, how can we distinguish, how can we tell the difference?

LaRouche: See, this is in a sense my problem. See people depend upon me. It's not unhealthy; obviously, it's problematic. People who know me—I'm always involved in my work. I don't have much time for nonsense. I enjoy what I do. But, what happens is, when people thought I was—. See, what Fernando used to say to people, what Fernando used to say, "They put him in prison, he's never coming out alive."

Now, you go to an organization of people who depend upon me, because of my function, which is an essential function—I've done many things that are essential to the functioning of the organization. You take me out of action, and tell my associates I'm not there anymore, and I'm never coming back, and they feel weakened. That's their reaction. Their reaction is, "We've got to hold the family together." Like a family under attack. "We must hold the family together. We must avoid all dissension. We must put up with all kinds of things. We must keep the family together." And until I'm free, they're afraid to fight. When I'm free, "Ah! Okay, now I want to fight!" Now you can fight. I'm a fighter by instinct; my type. And when I'm around, people have the courage to fight.

It's that simple. That's the way life is. That's the way history is.

Real History vs. 'Information'

Q: [trans.] I come from a culture which is a counterculture, a culture which is in decadence here in Mexico. I realize the problems that we're living through, the problems of the Boomers, the problems of the cuckoo birds that you're talking about, but I'm just realizing that there's this youth movement, and I'm really struck by the fact that there's a solidarity among the youth. I've just known you for two or three days, this movement for two or three days, and I'm really struck by this solidarity—I'm criticizing myself here—they're critical of me, but that's good, I like that. There's a duality, as individuals were corrupt, and honest at the same time. But bringing this type of unity together, how can we do it, it's very difficult? That's what I would like to be able to become. This is one of the problems of humanity as well. It's not just a world crisis,

but it's also a crisis of individuals. A lot of the information—there may be thousands and thousands of books, concepts which will define for us, or will define this or that as a truth, but you can get lost in so much information. So, what's the guide on this?

LaRouche: Well, first of all, I don't believe in information per se. We've had too much information theory. . . . No, information theory is a fraud. You see, when you study, you recognize that you're trying to memorize a lot of details and facts. You say, what is this? All these facts, what do they mean? It doesn't mean anything. What means something is history. The process of history. When a fact becomes a part of the process of history, then you don't forget it. You understand it.

You say, "On this date, this happened. Memorize that as a fact." Nonsense!

I say, let's talk about the history of Mexico! Let's take the history of Mexico. Now, if you know the history of Mexico, in terms of all the various struggles that affected it from the immediate exterior and interior, then you find Mexico becomes an emerging *person*. A nation becomes a person! Which has all this experience, this development.

Now the events, now you understand, because there's a causal relationship that you're able to follow.

For example: When the Spanish occupying authorities—just to give an example—the Spanish at that point had instituted, under the Venetian influence, a new policy of African slave trade. Now, slavery had existed, had been practiced in Africa before this. But the new thing, as you see in the complexion of the people of Cuba, for example, is that the Spanish began to move African slaves, into certain parts of the Americas, especially the islands, where the slaves could not run away. They used them as slave labor.

The Spanish said, "This is all right, because these are animals, not human beings. They don't have souls. Therefore, this is all right."

Now they came to Mexico. Now, you had a fight, a big fight in Mexico, between those priests, and others, who acted like true Christians and said, "These are *people*. These people here are *people*. Therefore we have to defend them, help them, promote them."

Then you had the others who said, "No. They don't have the *theta* [of proper Castilian Spanish pronunciation of the letter "z"—ed.]. . . . [laughter] So, they say, "No; these are human . . . but not completely. They're irrational, incurably irrational. Therefore we have to have keepers for them." And this is how these big plantations, with the oppression of the peasants, occurred in Mexico. So you had a two-culture system.

So the history of Mexico is, how do you take the positive things from European culture, that are brought into this area, and integrate that with the indigenous population of Mexico, to make a single nation.

So, therefore, when you look at the history of Mexico that

way, that's one of the points. The struggle to give justice to all the people, because they had over 2 million people here. A large population. It's not a place for slavery. So, therefore, they used the indigenous population of Mexico, in place of slaves, but they used them in this system. And, except for Charles III, the tendency was always in Spain, up until the last part of the 19th Century, the Spanish monarchy continued to be the leading agency conducting the African slave trade. Isabella II was a proponent of the slave trade. Spain, together with Napoleon III and the British, were the people who brought Maximilian into Mexico.

Therefore, when you look at the history of Mexico, in a sense of that way, it becomes like the story of a person, a person struggling from, say, childhood, from the time of the fall of the Aztec system, to bring forth a nation of an appropriate character. In that case, the facts all fall into place. Instead of trying to put the facts together, like blocks, you have an organic process of development. Your emotions are involved. Your passions are involved. The struggle of people for justice, the suffering that occurred, the sacrifices that occurred in the struggle for justice, these things exist as facts and emotions inside you.

Now, it becomes clear. And you look at the world the same way. Look, Mexico is part of the world. Where did these funny Europeans come from? That's another story. It's their story. So history, historical views, physical science, the same thing. The struggle for progress, scientific progress, the struggle for knowledge of the universe. It's much simpler: You reduce the number of subjects. You wind up with one thing, called humanity.

The Universe Is Not Entropic

Q: [trans.] I'm a bit of an "empiricist," so I want to shake your hand. It's really fantastic that you're here with us, because what we really needed was this. What I want to ask you is, which I don't understand from what you've written, is the issue of entropy. Everybody laughs, okay. I always ask the same question.

I read an article of Jonathan Tennenbaum, on *dynamis* and *energeia*, and it there says, there it says that the laws of thermodynamics are a fraud. When I have studied this—not in any great depth, it's true, but I have studied some of this, and I always fall into the mistake that somehow this is correct, because I understand that the universe isn't entropic, but it works. Machinery works, things seem to work. So, I've tried to do this over and over again, and I keep falling back into this problem, and I seem to think that the three laws of thermodynamics are correct. So, give me a lead. How do I get at this, to get out of this problem?

Q: [trans.] I have a question that goes in the same direction. What do you mean by a multiply-connected universe?

LaRouche: Ahhh! Same question, that's right. Absolutely correct.



The LaRouche Youth Movement session finally ended with happy applause for the candidate and a sense of the ambitious mission ahead in Mexico, for the largest and fastest-growing organizing force LaRouche has ever had in the country. He called for more "cultural exchanges" with the youth movement in the United States, as well as for infrastructure cooperation between the two nations.

All right. Since ancient Greece, we have known something which was emphasized late in his life, by Vladimir Vernadsky, that the universe is, from an experimental physical standpoint, or, as Vernadsky would say, from the standpoint of experimental biogeochemistry, that the universe has three different phase spaces. These are distinct experimentally, but efficiently interconnected. One is *abiotic* processes. Second, is *living* processes. And third, peculiar to man, in the universe, are the *noetic* processes. All interact.

Now, here's the multiple connectedness. We know this very well—we know it experimentally. We know that we can combine a process which is living, with a non-living one, as an interactive process. Therefore, you will now have imposed the characteristics of a living process, on a non-living process.

For example, the Earth. The Earth, as you can define the Earth, or attempt to, as an abiotic process. But then you look at the fossils. Aha! Where do we get the oceans? Well, living processes created the oceans. How did we get the atmosphere? Well, living processes created the atmosphere. What is the stratification? Quadrillions of animals and many plants died. The Earth as a planet is being transformed from an abiotic process, into a living organism.

Now, especially with what *I* intend to do. We are going to transform this Earth, because we are going to do what Vernadsky emphasized. We're going to apply the noetic principle in a new way, to create a *new biosphere*. And we're going to manage the biosphere in a new way, which means we're going to manage the Periodic Table and its isotope pro-

duction.

We are now going to find out—for example, Mars exploration. That's not colonization yet. There are some people I would like to send to Mars once—like Vice President Dick Cheney, for example. We'll see how he survives in that environment. A good experiment. You know, he would starve to death. He wouldn't have enough rugs to chew.

You know about dogs? They chew rugs. Angry dogs—GRRRRR! Like Adolf Hitler and Dick Cheney. You see the way he is, when he scowls.

So, we are going to deal with the fact that the Solar System was developed in certain ways. Of which we know much, but not everything. So, therefore, we're going to explore Mars. Why? To discover certain principles of the Solar System, which are important for us for the future, but we don't know experimentally yet, from the limited experimental domain of Earth.

Now, this becomes interesting! Then, what about these three principles, these three phase spaces? Did the noetic principle exist in the universe before the existence of man? If it's a principle, it did. Did living processes exist in the universe before we know of their existence?

Therefore, when you're talking about the entropic process, what you're talking about is a self-contained, perfectly ideal abiotic system of a mechanistic character. Whereas it's impossible to conceive of the existence of the universe, without principles which also include the other two phase spaces. And our successful action on the planet, is a demonstration,

a crucial one, that it's true. That's exactly what we're doing, when man exerts his creative mental powers, to make an absolutely anti-entropic effect, on the planet as a whole. The development of the biosphere is anti-entropic. The development of the noosphere is absolutely anti-entropic.

So, what we experience, is a fallacy of composition, a fraud. We are taught our assumed axiomatic abiotic principles. Now, we say we're going to derive living processes from the abiotic. We're going to derive the human mind from the machines. Artificial intelligence is no intelligence whatsoever.

So the point is, we get into this fraud, by making arbitrary, doctrinaire assumptions, which don't correspond to our actual experience. So, it's not an abstract question. It's a scientifically practical question, which hangs on the definition of universal physical principle. If we deny—in order to sustain what Clausius, Kelvin and other say, you have to uphold that the universe is derived from a *single* phase space, an abiotic phase space. So, there's what the problem is.

A Time of Great Opportunity

Q: [trans.] Hi, Lyn, what's up? I'm from the Mexico City youth. Eight months ago, I was recruited to the LaRouche Youth Movement when it was just beginning with some Monterrey youth in Mexico City. Now, here, I see a change I never would have imagined to achieve after all the blows we received, from the leftovers from Fernando Quijano and the Baby Boomers who transmitted into our ranks some of their own internal problems.

But now I'm really happy. I would have been happy if we had had a meeting with you, even with just a small number of youth, but I'm even happier because with the number of youth that are here, people who are hopefully prepared to discover the truth, and to look at the fraud of everything that we've learned in the universities, the political parties, and to be able to act. So, I would like for you to state for us what our sense of mission is, of the sort which I had when I first joined the movement eight months ago. Our marching orders.

LaRouche: The mission is this, as follows: military-briefing fashion. We're out to change the planet! This involves a number of measures which will have to be taken. Number one, we have to recognize that there was a great effort which we are able to trace effectively from the birth of ancient Greek civilization. And particularly the Classical Greek, which we trace from Thales, Solon, and the Pythagoreans.

Now, the development of the work of Plato, which became essentially the cultural context of Christianity—all Christian theory that is competent, relies on Platonic method. Not Aristotle; *Plato*. Because the question is, as it has always been, the question of the nature of the human soul, which only can be understood by understanding the development of the discovery of principles of the universe, of the human mind.

Unfortunately, before the time of Christianity, a great evil befell Europe, which was the Peloponnesian War, which led

to the emergence of the Roman Empire. The Roman Empire and medieval Europe were overall a cultural, moral catastrophe. There's nothing good about the Roman Empire, and nothing good about the medieval system. However, to understand this, you also have to understand, that in this process, men are not simply dolls. The human characteristic of the individual is always manifest in this, the creative quality. Even in the darkest times, our minds are struggling to bring man on an upward course.

For example, you have in the medieval period, you had the Cathedrals of Chartres, a great Augustinian conception. So, you have great things in terrible times.

Then we came to an apocalyptic time, in the 14th Century, where one third of mankind was wiped out, by Venetian policies, by the foundations of British economics. But in that process, there emerged the Renaissance of the 15th Century, which gave us for the first time the modern nation-state, in which every individual—the idea of the Commonwealth, that every individual is human. The development of *all* persons, for the benefit of themselves and their posterity, is the obligation of society. It's called the principle of the Commonwealth, which is the principle of *agapē*, the principle of the common good.

So we had for the first time, the emergence of the nation-state. *The Venetian evil struck back*. It embedded Europe into religious war from 1511-1648, which the Cristero wars in Mexico were an echo of, among other things. But in this process, Europe discovered it could not, even after the Treaty of Westphalia, could not really develop a modern society consistent with the principles of the Renaissance. The difficulty was this: Especially with the triumph of the British in 1763, a new Venetian empire, the Anglo-Dutch liberal system, had become dominant, as a new Roman Empire.

So, in this process, the best minds of Europe turned to North America, turned to the efficient English colonies, and in the process, under Charles III of Spain, you had a similar effort into the Spanish Americas. We had in the Americas, the so-called newly discovered lands, the best influences from Europe had concentrated on trying to create new republics, republics which were free from domination by banking systems, by financier oligarchies.

Today, the world is in a situation in which the financial oligarchies are ruling the world. They've brought the world to the verge of self-destruction of humanity. There is one nation in this world, which is a power, which by its design, incorporates features which are necessary to deal with this problem. That is the constitutional intention of the United States. Mexico was, in a sense, an imitation of the United States, from a different standpoint. There was always this drive for Mexico to establish a true republic.

So, this is one of the areas of Mexican history.

Our job is this: Our job is to use the downfall of this system, use this opportunity, to set into motion a next step up for humanity. To use the severity of the crisis, in order to

mobilize much of humanity to come out of the bankruptcy of this financial system with an idea of a community of perfectly sovereign nation-states. We need a new monetary system, which must be a fixed-exchange-rate system. Otherwise, you cannot have development. There must be cooperation, there must be protectionism. Globalization must go. NAFTA must be buried on a dark night, in a place where no one is going to find it. Therefore, we in the Americas and those in other parts of the world, must be united to a common purpose, for the benefit of separate but fraternal nations. We must strengthen our ties in order to do this job. And if Mexico and the United States move in that direction, with the aid of the phenomenon which you represent here, that's the mission! That's the mission. And that mission is for the future of humanity, to struggle to create a foundation, an agreement so that the evils which have taken us now will never be repeated, which will make the lives of each of us meaningful for humanity for generations to come.

So the mission is, do the job, with as much possible understanding of where we come from, as possible. To see the birth of Greek culture, in the shadow of the Great Pyramids of Egypt. To see the struggle for the development of mankind. To see the gift of Christianity, grasping the root of the Platonic Classical Greek method, with conceptions of natural law. To see the struggle to realize this. We've come to a time, a time long overdue. It is time to do it, at last.

Develop U.S.-Mexican Cooperation

Q: [trans.] In an article of yours on the question of the historic individual, when you talk about especially Schiller's works and Shakespeare's works, one of the questions I've asked myself is, when something comes up and I can't quite figure out what to do, I'm very demanding with myself and I can't do everything, and then things fail. The Hamlet syndrome. In Hamlet's soliloquy, he can't break the chains, and everything he has inside himself takes over. Then look at Schiller, at age 17, 18, his first work was a success. I'm 20 years old, and what have I done? I've got to write something, I've got to do something! So the question is, how do you make sure you're not a Hamlet? Where do you get a sense of authority to break Prometheus' chains? That's my question.

LaRouche: I got it. The problem we have is this crazy U.S. government, because the first thing I would think is the natural thing to do—remember, the Spanish-speaking population of the United States is the largest so-called minority that lives in the U.S. The majority of them are of Mexican origin. You have long-time residents of two or three generations; you have recent immigrants of legal status; and you have those of illegal status. In the normal course of things, I would say the first thing is to have frequent exchange trips between Mexico and the United States. Because it fits!

The other thing, even incidentally, is to build a greater strength of functional unity between the people of Mexico

and of the United States. It's extremely important. It's a way of making the border respectable, making it honest, but also because there are many projects which Mexico and the United States must do together. The water projects, for example; mass transportation which is needed in northern Mexico, which is needed for Mexico's development; power generation and distribution which is state-controlled. These are great projects which are needed to transform the desert area, the poor areas.

The problem is the repressive character of the Bush Administration policy. Its security policy, so-called, is an impediment for getting people that I would like to have visit the United States, here. The other way is a little bit easier. It functions a little bit better.

So, what I would like to see, is a much greater sense of unity of a common effort on both sides of the border, which actually is, peculiarly, the way to build a greater strength of sovereignty on both sides of the border. Cooperation is the proper principle upon which to define sovereignty.

I think this cultural exchange, first of all on the Mexican side, is to make another aspect of the United States not unknown. To understand what are the common and different features of the culture on both sides of the border, because you can also use differences as an advantage. It's a peculiarity of life.

So, I think what we need is to accelerate the process of intellectual development, and to avoid a drift into parochialism. The more exchange of ideas, the more intensive. More good cultural shocks. The reality on both sides of the border is somewhat different. Actually, the reality of northern Mexico and of Mexico City is different.

Obviously, all parts of Mexico—because of the way the country is organized—there are many different cultural problems, different opportunities in different areas. Our implicit mission is to strengthen the unity of Mexico. The fact that there's no railway from Mexico City north to the border, means that the northern part of Mexico is deprived of its proper relationship to the center of the country.

So, I think all these things go together. The main thing you want to fight against, which is implicit in what I'm saying, are the dangers of induced parochialism. The more broad range of ideas you're exposed to, the more experience of that contrasting type, the more the faculties of the mind grow.

**WEEKLY INTERNET
AUDIO TALK SHOW**

The LaRouche Show

EVERY SATURDAY

3:00-4:00 p.m. Eastern Time

<http://www.larouchepub.com/radio>