

A Dialogue With Lyndon LaRouche

Following his keynote, Lyndon LaRouche answered questions from among the audience of about 1,000 at the Schiller Institute conference, and questions submitted from among those listening on the Internet. Prior to the questions, a statement received from the Presidency of the Republic of Macedonia was read by Debra Freeman, spokeswoman for Presidential pre-candidate LaRouche in Washington, D.C.

Embattled Macedonia Backs LaRouche

Debra Freeman: I'd like to begin by reading a message that has come in to the conference, and for Mr. LaRouche specifically, from the Office of the President of the Republic of Macedonia:

"My warmest greetings and wishes of success. The eyes of the world are concentrated on your conference, and much is expected from you—much, very much, Lyndon LaRouche, and you have already accomplished some.

"Now, despite the war dangers and the financial earthquakes, many in the world begin to see the potential light at the end of the tunnel. Many, in positions of institutional and political responsibility, begin to see concretely, that Lyndon LaRouche was right. . . .

"At this moment, Macedonia is in the middle of an electoral fight. The so-called 'international community' has deployed everything they have to try to defeat the Macedonian government, that, in their eyes, is responsible for not obeying their orders. The whole Soros organization, helped by the International Crisis Group and other components of what is now known in Macedonia as the 'fifth column,' has unchained a vicious campaign of slanders and self-made scandals. But Macedonians are not responding to the profile.

"The terrorist assault against Macedonia is being pushed again. Our policemen are being killed in ambushes. The UCK [Kosovo Liberation Army] terrorists kidnap our men. We know that, as Mr. LaRouche has said, terrorism is irregular warfare by powerful international forces, that want to keep Macedonia destabilized, and precipitate the world into a Hundred Years War.

"Dear friends and Mr. LaRouche, please help us fight against these interferences. Please, help us fight for our development, for our dignity, and for our future. Our Prime Minister said, just yesterday, publicly, 'Dear NATO ambassadors: Stop these bloody scenarios! Let Macedonia live in freedom. Let Macedonia develop freely, and you will witness a miracle in the Balkans.'

"Dear friend, as you know, your ideas, the ideas of LaRouche, are being discussed and have become part of this

debate. Your last interview to the new magazine *Manifest*, is still creating powerful and increasing waves. The enemies of Macedonia are very scared of our resistance, and are particularly concerned for this alliance of Macedonia's best tradition and the ideas of Lyndon LaRouche.

"I promise you, that we shall continue to scare them. People now understand the crucial importance of the New Bretton Woods reform, and of the Eurasian Land-Bridge. Your friends are in the United States, where a battle of ideas and conceptions is raging, whether the basic idea that led to the creation of the United States, with a successful revolution against the British colonial empire, shall triumph now, once again.

"I have no doubt that you shall win. And you shall win for your country, and for all countries in the world, so that we shall have a world, based on an alliance of independent, sovereign, and prosperous nations, collaborating for the common good of all humanity."

It is signed, Emelija Geleva, Adviser on Foreign Affairs to the Government of the Republic of Macedonia.

Sept. 11 and the Threat Now

Lyn, the first question that we have comes from somebody who has a history of government service. He has served in cabinet positions, and is currently seeking office in the State of New York. His question is as follows:

"Mr. LaRouche, As you know, New York City was shaken by the events of Sept. 11, last year. You've had a great deal to say about what was behind the events of Sept. 11. But you also have said, that you are concerned of new terrorist incidents.

"My question to you is: Would you please say a little bit more about this? Do you believe that the source of this potential threat is the same as what perpetrated the attack on Sept. 11? If not, who are they, and what is their ultimate objective?"

LaRouche: Well, the concern I have right now, is essentially the same. The same problem, the same interest, is behind the threat now, and what actually happened on Sept. 11. As to whether the same personalities are involved, I don't know.

The point is, is that, with the death of Roosevelt, the opponents of Roosevelt were determined to eliminate the base for the kind of government that Roosevelt represented. Because Roosevelt came as a surprise. Remember, with the assassination of—shall we say, the successful assassination of President McKinley, which was done on behalf of the incumbency of Theodore Roosevelt. Theodore Roosevelt was a pure Confederate, as Woodrow Wilson, the co-refounder of the Ku Klux Klan, was also of this Confederate tradition. These were the "born losers," as I guess they call them. They and their alliance in Wall Street took over control of the United States.

So therefore, what happened with Franklin Roosevelt's election, in 1932, and his initial actions as President: A momentum was set into motion, under which Roosevelt recaptured the United States from this faction, not entirely, but



Members of the Schiller Institute from Chicago perform a Haydn string quartet.

on momentum. And what Roosevelt accomplished was so powerful, that only his death prevented him from continuing his program, which he intended for the immediate postwar period.

These people, at that point, after Roosevelt had been elected for four terms, were absolutely hysterical. They were determined this would never happen again. And they recognized that the source of Roosevelt's strength, was his appeal to the American people, and the evocation from the American people of a recognition of what they had lost, up to that point, especially since the assassination of McKinley. And therefore, they were determined to destroy that system. And, they couldn't do it all at once, because a lot of us had been in military service; a lot of us had been through the experience of the 1930s and the early 1940s.

We had come from despair, in 1932-33, as a nation, and I can tell you about the gray faces on people, adults, I knew in 1931-32-33, and even later: gray faces. I saw people going into work, going back to their profession, or their career, their skill, for the first time in 1939, 1940. And they still had gray faces. And they fumbled and they stumbled, but within a year or two, they got the hang of it. And Roosevelt's program for preparing for the war, took off. And we had a rebirth of our power, as a nation.

We emerged from the war, as the *only* power in the world, the only world power. And all of that was dissipated. The American people were trampled upon. A false war was created by this faction, with the Soviet Union, a false war that Stalin himself didn't want. For no reason, except for this purpose.

A *terrible witch-hunt* was launched in the United States,

from which most Baby Boomers have not recovered to the present day. Because what was done to their parents, to terrify their parents, the parents passed, as intimidation to their children: [whispering] "Psst! Be careful, be careful, be careful!" The fear of police-state, Gestapo-type mentality, radiating from J. Edgar Hoover inside the United States, was the environment in which the Baby Boomers existed. More and more. So that, by the time of the assassination of Kennedy, the Baby Boomer generation, which was just coming into adolescence and maturity, was almost destroyed. The Indochina War destroyed us: Living men returned from Vietnam, but they were no longer the soldiers that had gone to Vietnam. The nation and its character had been destroyed.

So, out of this process, the enemies of MacArthur—and to a lesser degree, but seriously, Eisenhower—took more and more control of the United States. And when Eisenhower left office in 1961, and he delivered the speech on the so-called "military-industrial complex," he didn't say it was what it was: It was the *fascist system* of Brzezinski, and Huntington, and Kissinger, and so forth, already at that time. These people have been determined to establish a dictatorship, an English-speaking dictatorship over the world, and they have become more and more arrogant, as they think that it's sufficient for them to control the United States, to control everything. And we have been destroyed, to a large degree.

So, that's the root of this problem.

How we can solve it? First of all, I think we have to understand the problem, and I addressed that already today: To understand what we've lost. We've lost a sense of our nation. We've lost a sense of our history. We've lost the confidence and optimism. We've become petty, we're concerned

with small things all the time, and so forth. So, I think that's where the problem lies.

The question, beyond that, I think is self-answering: Is that, our nation was destroyed, because a group of people wished to destroy it, and because there weren't enough of us who stood up. I know I was one of those, who, in my own small way, at the time, did stand up. I did a number of things to try to fight this, and stop it. I didn't succeed. But, by making the commitment, I developed a capacity to do something better about it, at a later point, which is what I'm doing now.

I *know* that history. I've lived through it. I know what happened. I know the minds of the people, who went down, shall we say, like victims, like casualties—intellectual casualties, at the end of the war. I know the state of mind that the American people have gone through. I know the generations. I probably understand you Americans, in various generations, better than probably any of you do. Because I've looked at you, from a certain standpoint all these years.

So that's the problem: We were destroyed, because this crew, that *hated* Roosevelt, that was embedded in the tradition of the Confederacy, took over control of the United States for a time. Roosevelt got us out of it for a time, but not completely. He wasn't a total genius—he was a true patriot, but not a total genius. Then he died. And when he died, these guys moved fast. And they're out to *destroy the United States' character*, and to destroy the character of the American people. And, if you look at the rock-drug-sex counterculture, and similar things that were unleashed, during the middle of the 1960s, *you know how the morals and intellect of the United States' population was destroyed*. That's how it was done.

And the only way to cure that, is, as in history: Mankind has gone through great disasters in the past. There comes a moment, when there's a sublime opportunity, when a people are down on the ground, and realize that what they've believed and what they've done *was wrong*. And they see the way out, as many of the young people today, as people who are between 18 and 25, are people who know, unlike their self-denying parents, that they're living as part of a "no-future generation," they can not "go along to get along," as their parents tend to do. The parents say, "Be realistic. Go along to get along. Don't fight. Learn to live with it. Learn to put up with it." The kids can't! Because their entire life is before them, and it's a life with no future. And, if these young people start moving, we will probably retake what we lost when Roosevelt died—and much more besides. Because these young people *have* no future; they have no alternative, *except up*. And I've seen the temper of some of them: I think they can do the job.

The MacArthur Factor in the 2004 Campaign

Freeman: Okay. The next question . . . comes from a national officer of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, who is also on the state executive board of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. He says:

"Mr. LaRouche, I was very interested by your remarks.



Sohair Soukkary, an Egyptian-American journalist and linguist, and the representative to the United Nations of the Arab Women's Solidarity Association, addresses the conference. "Mr. LaRouche," she said, "we are all so very proud of you. You just gave us hope. Whatever you say, is not only educational, but definitely inspiring." She compared LaRouche to Akhnaton, who ruled Egypt 3,500 years ago: "Your striving to abolish oligarchies, and to abolish exploitation of human beings by other human beings, help each other for the common good . . . in many, many aspects, you remind me of Akhnaton." Presenting LaRouche with a poem written by Akhnaton, she concluded, "Mr. LaRouche, America needs you. We need a strong, intellectual, educated, good American, to become President of this country!"

And even more interested by the title of your conference. The fact is, that Franklin Delano Roosevelt was able to dictate policy to President Hoover, long before he actually became the President of the United States. But Franklin Roosevelt did it by virtue of a popular revolt.

"Your supporters told me that you came back to the United States, because you wanted to dictate policy, and that you intend to do it two years before the Presidential election. I think it's a fine idea, but for you to do that, it's going to take nothing less—and probably a lot more—than the kind of revolt that Roosevelt was able to effect. Just how are you going to do that?"

LaRouche: Like MacArthur did. Like he won the Pacific war, with a lot of courageous young people.

As I said just now—Debbie's right about the connection: We have a "no-future generation" in the United States. People

who come out of adolescence, they're no longer adolescent, they're no longer childish—sometimes they experiment with it, but—. They're poorly educated. They've been cheated. But some of them are bright, and they'll learn fast, because they're not particularly impressed by the garbage that was put on them, in the name of education. Therefore, *they'd rather know the truth for a change*; and we have a method for getting the truth out, a method for understanding what is truth, as opposed to mere opinion. And they respect that. But they have no future.

Now, the key thing here, is leadership. How does leadership function? Well, the first quality of leadership is what I said to you at the outset today, in my remarks: It's courage. A sense of immortality. A sense of your place in immortality—that you do something, in which you can't be afraid. You're afraid of losing the *purpose of your life*, not the life itself.

And thus, if you can give that kind of leadership to young people, who want that, who want a sense of “how can we change history?” we can win. Because the rest of you *have nothing!*—except the denial of the reality which grips you. Therefore, as it always is in many generations, it is young people in that age group, 18 to 25, who have escaped from adolescence alive, who have not yet entered the senescence, which usually strikes about the age of 28, and who are determined to have a future. When you are at that age, you are *thinking about the future*. You're in between adolescence—childhood and adolescence—and the full responsibilities of raising children, and so forth, and the other things that depress you. *You're now in a time to make a choice*. It's a *life choice*. For some people, it's a career choice—but now, there are no more careers, so you have to make a life choice!

So therefore, this generation, given proper leadership of someone who's not afraid, who can not be bought, *they will take off*. And the pressure they will put on anyone in leadership, is tremendous. They will demand everything. They say, “We're going to fight a war, for humanity: *We have a right to know everything!* No secrets!”

What you have to recognize in this process, speaking as a trade union activist, and so forth, you have to recognize that the habits of the trade union movement stink. And therefore, do not be governed by the traditions of the American trade union movement. They've been largely corrupted. There were some courageous leaders. There were some courageous people, and talented people, who made great sacrifices. But the movement itself was corrupted: by making deals—this here deal. This agreement. Cut this deal. And therefore, the morality of the trade union movement was weakened.

What you have to get, is the spirit of “taking charge”: that, if you are an organized force in society (which a trade union movement is), because you are an organized force, you can do something. But you will not do something by somebody whispering to you “advice” on what to do next; someone suggesting, “Why don't you use this program?” “Why don't

you take this suggestion?” “Why don't you do this?” All this little bit of “communities” kind of stuff, “issues” stuff: It doesn't work!

You have to choose a strategic approach. You must look at it as a war, to win. You must realize, the bulwark of winning the war, is young people 18 to 25, who want a future. You've got to get the young people, 18 to 25, inject energy into these decadent, flopping old people, of 30 and 35. And, because the young people will push you! And you're not going to take their advice, and help, and do what you think, accept some of their suggestions—no, they're not going to accept that! You're going to do what they want you to do—not exactly what they tell you to do, but they're going to want some *action* out of you, some real action and commitment. And that's going to be the change, because the trade union movement itself is about to undergo a necessary, long-overdue revolution. Which is what happened in the '30s, with John L. Lewis.

Now, John L. Lewis wasn't a great guy. He and the Lewis brothers were a tough bunch, coming out of the coal fields. But they were not great people. But they were fighters. They weren't always too honest, but they were fighters. And, what they did, when John L. Lewis punched [AFL leader William] Green in the nose, at an AFL convention, that changed history. And the reason he could punch Green in the nose, is because Franklin Roosevelt was behind him; and the Committee for Industrial Organization. And it was the Committee for Industrial Organization, as an *idea*, which John L. Lewis took the lead on, which created the energetic base for the Roosevelt machine, into 1936-1938 and beyond.

So, today, it's a similar thing: The trade union movement, as a whole, is moribund, it's corrupted, it's decadent, and whatnot; all these good things: 401(k)s have just wiped out the credibility of the trade union leadership!

So therefore, the youth are going to push. People in the trade union categories have no hope, really, any more than the kids do. They have a common cause. People who are my generation, also, most of whom are not working, also have a common cause. They'd like to go out of this life, seeing a future for this nation, among other things.

In my view, that's the way it works. And my job, is to do my job. And the way it's going to work, is: I'm doing my job. I'll do it with *my* powers. I'll do it *my* way, but I'll meet my responsibilities.

Reparations: A Police-Agent Scam

Freeman: The next question is from a person who is on the staff of the Congressional Black Caucus, and the question, Lyn, is on reparations. She says:

“Mr. LaRouche, African-Americans have suffered under the yoke of slavery, and have been deprived of the fruits of freedom in America. You have been a long-standing supporter and fighter for every aspect of civil rights in America. Yet I am told that you oppose the fight for reparations. Please explain your position.”

LaRouche: Well, I think a lot of good fellows have been taken in by Moon-shiners.

First of all, there never will be a reparations payment. There may be payment for some people who are engaged in organizing people around reparations.

What you're seeing, with the reparations movement, is a typical operation, a counterintelligence operation; you might have said this was run by the famous Colonel Zubatov, the guy who created a fascist Zionist movement, for the Russian Okhrana, at a time when the Jewish population—and many others—of Eastern Europe, were struggling for the cause of freedom inside Russia and occupied parts of Russia.

There was an organization called the Bund, which is known in the United States, as the Workmen's Circle. This organization was a heroic organization, which was generally fighting for human rights. It was led by people, usually Jewish, who were inspired by the influence of what was called the Yiddish Renaissance, which, in part, was a spillover into Eastern Europe from the influence of Moses Mendelssohn in Germany, as a precedent. This was the core of Jewry: The German Jew, in the following of Moses Mendelssohn, and the Yiddish Renaissance Jew in Eastern Europe. This was the core of Jewry. These were not only Jews, these were people who made a vital contribution, as in the case of Germany.

Take the case of Germany, for example. Until Moses Mendelssohn, and his fight, the condition of the Jew in German-speaking Europe—until 1780-82—the condition of the Jew was, most Jews were virtual human cattle, hunted human cattle. They were allowed to sneak around as peddlers, but only if they had a special patent from some noble family, did they have the right to reside and maintain a household, and live as human beings in that area. The right to marry—it was a condition of slavery, or quasi-slavery! So, this population of Jews, inspired by the political humanization of the Jew, by the order of Joseph II of Austria, under this influence, and similar movements in Germany itself, associated with the Humboldt brothers, the friends of Schiller, and others, unleashed in Germany, a role of the German Jew as a major contributor, to medicine, science, and so forth, in Europe. They were a precious, integral part of European culture, and German culture, in particular. In music: Mozart was part of this movement; he wasn't a Jew, but he was part of the movement, the Moses Mendelssohn movement. Beethoven was an integral part of this. The whole circles of Felix Mendelssohn, the grandson of Moses, are an example of this. Science, physical science: The role of the Jew, in physical science in Germany, and other professions, was a tremendous contribution, an integral contribution to the advancement of German culture, and German economy. The role of the Yiddish Renaissance Jew, in Eastern Europe, was similar.

So, the British and the Russian Okhrana said, "What are we going to do, about all these Jews? We're going to turn them into Zionists." So, you have the secret police, the Okhrana, which was taken over, in 1895 approximately, by

this Colonel Zubatov, and he remained in the leadership of the Okhrana, until the 1905 Revolution, when the Tsar fired him for organizing the 1905 Revolution's attack on the Winter Palace of the Tsar.

During this period, Zubatov used police methods to capture Jews, put 'em in prison, beat 'em up, threaten 'em with death, so forth—and say, "Now, you work for me." Exactly like the case of Murawiec—exactly. And they would turn a guy into a piece of mental mincemeat, coward; and he'd work for them.

Now, what happened is, Zubatov would send these Jews, whom he had indoctrinated, as police agents—and Jabotinsky was one of them—he would send them into Jewish organizations or political organizations, like the socialist organizations of Europe, and they would operate there as agents of the police. The case of Helphand, Alexander Helphand Parvus, was one of this guys. Jabotinsky, the fascist, from the beginning, was part of this.

So that's how they destroyed—with the aid of these Zionists who were nothing but police agents, and turned out later to be fascists, like Jabotinsky—they destroyed the gut of the Jewish movement. They did more damage to Judaism, as Zionists—and there were some good people who were Zionists, actually. They meant well. I knew them. They were decent people. But this particular variety, this police-agent variety, was a menace. And they effectively destroyed the unity of a Jewish reform renaissance movement, which was a precious part of European civilization.

When you talk about reparations, black reparations, *you're doing the same thing*. And you look at the Cynthia McKinney case, and you look at the other cases: Look at the number of people, who are African-American leaders, political leaders, who are being isolated and destroyed, by an operation, because people are off on a "reparations" kick, when they should be maintaining the unity of the civil rights movement.

There's a precedent for this—the Stokeley Carmichael precedent, which Amelia can attest to. She knows a good deal about that. Stokeley Carmichael was a police agent, in effect: He came out of the socialist movement, and he was controlled by them. And, when this fight was on, in Alabama, Stokeley was deployed to try to bust up Martin Luther King's role at that time. That's the same thing: You take a phony issue, that is, an issue which has no merit in terms of its achievability, and you use that as a dangling bait: "Hey, yer gonna get a million dollars. Yer gonna turn down a million dollars? Yer gonna get a million dollars." You're not going to get a million dollars. But, what you'll do is, you'll lead the sheep off, into the slaughterhouse! And, they'll come out without anything.

That's the way it's been done before. It's being done again. I *know* these methods. I know how these things work. And reparations is a fraud. You're not going to get justice for anybody in the United States, unless you *first change the quality of the government of the United States*.



LaRouche with young organizers at the conference. "What you have to do," he told them, "is get the Baby Boomers to put on a set of asbestos underpants, because you're going to set a fire under them!"

And, up to this time, until the reparations movement took the gut out of the civil rights movement, the fighting edge, the cutting edge of the civil rights movement was taken out, at the end of the 2000 election campaign, when this occurred. And the gut's been taken out: There is no longer the degree of effective civil rights movement that existed in 1999-2000—doesn't exist. And what has destroyed that, is this will o' the wisp, this police-agent-style movement, called reparations; which will bear no fruit—the tree that bears no fruit, when people are standing under the dead tree, waiting for the fruit to drop.

What Is a Discovery of Principle?

Freeman: I'd like to take a question from our audience, gathered here.

Nick Walsh: Hi, Mr. LaRouche. I was wondering about a theory of knowledge: In reading your writings, there's a tendency to look at it, as a kind of really in-depth historical narrative. You have Plato, and then Riemann, Gauss, Leibniz. And it's an overview of history. But, what I'm wondering about is: I'm wondering how your discovery, the principles in economics you discovered, organized this overview of history, and changed it.

I've read a few times in different things you've written, about how a theory, a certain level of theory of knowledge is available to us now, through your discovery, that wasn't available to us before. I'd like you to elaborate on that. Thank you.

LaRouche: Well, I've often used, as a pedagogical device, I've referred to the Raphael mural, *The School of Athens*. And, if you look closely at that—I think it's an excellent

pedagogical device—you look closely at that, you'll see faces in there who are not contemporaries, in totality, but who are in the same room. And people, who were often adversaries of one another, in their ideas, in the same room. Now, you say, "What is Raphael portraying?" As I've explained a number of times: That, all of us, who have gone through the experience of reliving the attempt to rediscover the actual, or alleged discoveries of famous people in many parts of history—especially in European history, which is a fairly integral phenomenon—come away from that. We know the name of the person. We've probably seen a picture or a portrait of them, or some depiction, which passes for a portrait. We know the time and place in which they lived. We know the culture, the issues of that time—I mean, that's what you do, when you study philosophical history, the history of ideas—that. So, there are all these people: You experience the thought that they experienced, because you replicate the experience as described.

And, if you read a book, or you do a study, and you can't get the replication of that experience, you say, "I don't know that." You only know something, as an idea, if you can replicate it on the basis of the evidence that you can adduce. Place, time, circumstances, precedents, contemporaries.

Now, to the extent that any of these guys are capable of being replicated by you, it is as if you were speaking to them, alive, inside your own mind. Because you know the ideas; you are thinking the thoughts that are described by them, as thoughts, as concepts—not as descriptions, not as something you can look up on the Internet, but as an actual experience, a cognitive experience.

So therefore, these people live in your mind. Now, the

way it happened to me, as I suppose it happens to most people: When you're looking at these people, historical figures, historical figures of ideas—famous or less famous names in history, whose ideas, whose mental life you've re-experienced in some important part; you've relived the thought they thought, at a great distance of centuries, or even millennia.

And, then, you'll have the experience of a child. What's a child's experience? The oldest ancestor I knew living was a great-grandfather. And the most famous person, was of a still-older generation, whom I didn't know, but who was a dominant figure at the dinner table of my maternal grandparents' family dinner table: Daniel Wood, who was a famous abolitionist and so forth, in the United States. So, these people, family people and friends and acquaintances of the family circles, also to a child, and a growing child, their ideas as a discussion with these people, form a part of something like the *School of Athens*, with all these figures who live in your mind, or live in your imagination, as re-created experiences, whether historical or by direct discussion.

And that's what's memorable. So, as I keep telling people, I said, "If you want to understand me, you have know I'm 200 years old, because, in my own family circles, the living connections I have, to actually living people, go back 200 years. Today. I'm 200 years old." You thought I was younger, didn't you?

When you start from that standpoint, then, if you've studied history—as I was fascinated with history, ideas, and so forth, early in life; and my adolescence was largely occupied with that, as opposed to the stupid thing called school, I was opposed to; and therefore, these people live inside me. Now, I recognized something from this, that's not merely an experience that I can recall, but I recognize from reliving that history, with that kind of integument in it: I recognize that there are no such things as linear lines of development of ideas. There are interactions. There are interactions like mine, which transcend time and space. To me, Plato is as immediate a living person, more of a living person, than most people I could meet in the Congress today. He's more alive to me today, than they are! And I think many of their voters think so, too.

So, this is the point. You have to understand ideas, first of all; you have to locate the idea as *irony*, *paradox*, *metaphor*, never literal. If you look it up on the Internet, it's not true. You have to *experience an idea*, which is never a literal, deductive experience. It's always an interaction, a tension: How does the world work? How does the world work? How does the world work? And you get this sense of the interaction of many people, in many fields:

For example: Take the case, just before our dear friend Warfield died, the last time he had an illness was here, at the last conference we were having here. And so, I was upset by that, and I thought he should probably manage his life a little bit better; not so much to emphasize the performing person, and more the teacher. Because, here we are, most people that

I know in music, don't know what music is: They think it's notes. They think it's technique, or something. They don't realize it's ideas. So, I suggested to him—I knew that he very much liked the *Vier Ernste Gesaënge* [*Four Serious Songs*], which is one of my great, really powerful, favorites. It has been since 1953—it's a real favorite for me. *This* is one the most powerful pieces of composition in music. It's Brahms' last will and testament. Really, musically. It expresses a powerful idea, the power of *agapē*. It's developed in a powerful way, and the way that Fischer-Dieskau has performed it and recorded it; and the way a friend of ours, who was deceased a few years ago, Gertrude Pitzinger, an alto, performed it, is *absolutely magnificent*. You could have access to this thing—magnificent. So, the interesting thing about Furtwängler, of course, was that he always advocated what was sometimes called "playing between the notes": That you do sing the notes; you hear the idea. And the idea is located by the *irony* of the counterpoint, the *irony* in the thing.

So, what you do is, it's just like a great actor on stage: You never see a great actor on stage—never. Only after the play is over, and the applause begins. But you never see an actor, when they're really performing. You see the *idea* they're projecting. You think the idea they're projecting. They exist for you in your imagination—their idea, they're creating a character; they're creating an image, an idea. And you see them in your imagination, on the stage of your imagination. Never look at the actor. Remember the great Greek tragedians: They wore a mask! Two or three players would play the whole play—with masks! You never saw their faces. You never saw *them*: You saw the part they played. You saw what they created in your imagination, on the stage of your imagination.

So, I noticed that Bill was devoted to this, and I suggested, "Why don't we get a bunch of people, let's really work this thing over, discuss this *Vier Ernste Gesaënge*, as to what it means. And get across the *real idea* of the *Vier Ernste Gesaënge*, not as something that you sing and interpret in a certain way."

And that's what most musicians today lack, and most musical audiences lack: They don't know ideas! The don't live it. It's externalized. It's something to look at, something to hear. It's not something that *moves you*, to move you to tears or expressions of joy, and you don't know quite why. But it gets the message across. And, that's what this is: You have to see ideas in that way. You have to read between the cracks, sing between the notes, and hear the music between the notes.

And therefore, it's only when you get a congregation of many different minds, in your mind, all singing their particular message, in a vast counterpoint, that you can extract from that a sense of reality, a sense of truth: That this is humanity. Because humanity is not one person coming on stage after the other. All humanity has this sort of timeless connection, all on the same stage, all responding and interacting with one

another. And you have to say, “What is the message? What is happening?”

It’s the same thing that a great military commander—has the same problem: He’s got vast armies, for which he’s responsible. All kinds of details, for which he’s responsible. All these things are singing to him, like music, and he has to find out what he’s going to do, amid all that, and what their interconnections are.

So, that’s the essence of it: There is no simple, mechanical solution to ideas. That’s why we must have—for a child—must have a Classical education for all children. They must live the great ideas, live the experiences, of many generations. They must reach maturity, with a sense of what humanity is about; or at least the extent of a whole culture, what it’s about. They have to come out with an instinctive sense of that culture. Then, they know how to act, whereas the other ones say, “Explain it to me. How do I write it on the blackboard? How do I explain it? How do I pass a test on it?” Like multiple-choice questionnaires, “how do I beat the racket?” as opposed to really understanding.

No, there’s this aspect of knowledge, which is not explicit. It’s a kind of tension, and it’s a tension which is focused by the interplay among conflicting ideas, ironies, and so forth. That’s why great poetry is great poetry; why great music is great music. There’s no rule. There are rules you shouldn’t violate, except for a purpose.

‘My Song Is Hopeful’

Freeman: This is a question, Lyn, from somebody who actually lives in D.C., but who had to be out of town this weekend. She says:

“Mr. LaRouche: I live and work in Washington, D.C., on the staff of a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, who’s supported your group and Dr. Abdul Alim Muhammad, in the fight to save D.C. General Hospital. You know, Mr. LaRouche, my grandmother is very fond of the old saying, ‘What goes around, comes around.’ And so am I.

“[Mayor] Tony Williams’ troubles, I believe, are because he betrayed the citizens of Washington, and I don’t think he’ll ever hold office here again.” (I think she’s right) She says, “Mr. LaRouche, isn’t there some way that we can use Tony Williams as a national example of what happens to elected officials, when they betray their constituents?”

LaRouche: You know, I’m not strong on vengeance. When you have to kill somebody, you don’t hate them. You don’t. The point is, you’re faced, in a conflict, you have to do something, but you don’t do it out of hatred; you do it out of necessity. It’s like justified war. You don’t do it. You don’t do it for satisfaction. You never seek revenge. Revenge is a very poisonous motive. I have nobody on this planet, against whom I seek revenge, and never will. There’s no point to it: It’s a waste of time.

My song is a more hopeful one: How many people can we save?

Tony Williams is a pitiful wretch, jetsam on the shore of the Anacostia. He didn’t get what he sold the hospital for, the Olympics; he didn’t get it. The real estate swindle—the giant multibillion-dollar real estate swindle they were going to run on the Anacostia, that thing is now spoiled: You don’t need revenge.

What we need, is the hospital! So, if he is to be humiliated, let the humiliation be the spectacle of his having to look at the revival of that hospital.

Who wants revenge? I don’t recommend revenge to anyone. It’s not a good emotion; it’s not a good cause. Humanity is our cause. And if we can bring the prodigal back, take the prodigal. But I don’t think Tony’s going to make the application.

Freeman: This is a question from Erin Smith, here at the conference. “Mr. LaRouche, how does an individual know when they have made a new discovery or idea, which will benefit humanity?”

LaRouche: Well, that’s fun! I’ve made a number of discoveries in my time. I knew they were right, because they were fun.

No, you have right ways to know they’re valid. My challenge has always been, not merely to reexperience things that other people have already discovered, but discover things that they haven’t discovered. And, the trick to doing that, is, first of all, you must go through the business of re-experiencing discoveries, that have been validated, and that gives you a gauge as to how to approach the unknown. Once you’ve learned to explore the known area which was unfamiliar to you, you couldn’t navigate through, then you may be good at navigating in the unknown. It’s like going from navigating the unknown seas, the uncharted seas, to navigating in space—a little bit different, but maybe what you learn from navigating the seas will help you navigate space.

The thing that I’ve concentrated the most on, which probably is relevant to what’s behind your question, more than what you’ve asked, is: The most difficult thing, the thing that Vernadsky never understood, which is the principal shortcoming of his work, is—the principal one—he would accept the idea that mankind’s discovery of a universal physical principle, enabled man, in practice, to transform human existence and the planet, forever. That he would accept. But, the idea of how a principled form of *social relations* has the same benefit, as a principled discovery in physical science, so-called, that would escape him. See, Vernadsky’s view is adequate, when he says: The individual in society makes discoveries; they discover principles; they apply the principles; they transform the Noösphere. And by transforming the Noösphere, it creates a new physical condition, and that itself, since it creates a new physical condition, which is not generated in any other way, that is a proven universal physical principle.

But, can social systems, or the principles of social sys-

tems, such as Classical artistic composition—can that be appreciated in the same way, that Vernadsky would appreciate the individual role in discovering a universal physical principle, and applying it to nature: *That is the area, which has fascinated me, all my life*, at least since adolescence. And that's the area, in which I was able to, shall we say, on my own, really make a number, or series of discoveries, which uncorked a whole lot of other series of discoveries as a result.

But, it's that simple thing, that conceptual grasp. It's the same thing as you get in great poetry; or great drama—the same thing. For example: Let's take the case of *Hamlet*. Every Romantic idiot, who teaches in universities or writes crazy books, or for the *New York Times*, or whatnot, will tell you that the tragedy of Hamlet, is the tragedy of Hamlet's failure. It is not: The tragedy of Hamlet, is the tragedy of the culture of Denmark. Just like the tragedy in *Don Carlos*, by Schiller, is not the tragedy of Posa; it's not the tragedy of any of the characters, as such: It's the tragedy of the Spanish culture. As otherwise described, in *Don Quixote*—the same thing. Spanish culture, 16th-Century Spanish culture was morally rotten. And morally rotten Spanish culture destroyed itself. Philip was as much a victim of the culture, as he was a perpetrator. The *culture* was rotten.

Now, the Romantic doesn't accept that. He says, "The people are good." But a bad culture is bad. And, it's just like the problem of the politician, who is acting as a prostitute, being controlled by his clientele, the ones who admire him and vote for him. That's the corruption: the people, not the politician. The people. The corruption of Hamlet, is not Hamlet: It's *Hamlet fails to change the people*. As Horatio says in the last scene of *Hamlet*, as Hamlet is being carried off stage, as a dead corpse. And Horatio is saying—while the others are saying, "Charge! Let's go out and do it again!"—Horatio says, "Let's stop, and reenact these things, while they're fresh in our mind, so we don't make the same mistake again." The mistake lay in the people of Denmark, not in Hamlet. The mistake lay not in Philip or Posa: The mistake lay in the Spanish people, in the culture of that century.

This was *always* the case. Tragedy can come from *inside* a society only through the corruption, the moral corruption of the people. What you're dealing with, for example, today, in the United States, is the moral corruption of our *people*, not bad politicians. We have bad politicians, but who makes them bad? The people! Who elect them!

So therefore, the key thing, which is very difficult for the Romantic and others to understand in society, about ideas, is, from this standpoint, they think of the individual, in the way that the Romantic, like Coleridge or others, would appreciate Shakespeare, or mis-appreciate Shakespeare: Romantic view of the *tragic figure*, the tragic individual, who misleads a nation; as opposed to the tragic figure *who can not resist the folly of the nation*, and doesn't correct it, doesn't resist it. The person who *capitulates* to popular opinion, is the victim of the people. And that's the lesson of tragedy. That's the purpose of

Classical tragedy, is to teach that. And the purpose of bad education by Romantics, is to tell you that's not the case—it's the tragic individual figure, who's the problem. And it never is.

And that's true with this society, right now. Can you *see* that? The problem of the nation of the United States, is not George Bush: But the dumb-bunnies who elected him! Or Al Gore, or the two—makes no difference. One is as bad as the other. *It was the people, who committed the crime!* You elect an idiot, to President, or inaugurate him, when the alternative was another idiot—or a babbling variety—who do you blame? The idiot? Or the people who elected him? Couldn't the giant powers of the Democratic Party and the people of the nation, in all their exertions, find the ability to select something better than these two dumb-bunnies?

The tragedy lies in the people. The key thing in society, in ideas, is exactly that, from my standpoint. My key work, essentially, was to understand the social process, to understand how it works. That it works in the same way, that we would think of physical processes, as taught as physics, would work. And, to see a process, a social process, to understand it *as a social process*; to operate on it *as a social process*, which has *principles*. That's where the great shortcoming has been. That's what I've been trying to correct. And, I'm still at it.

Where Does Homosexuality Come From?

Freeman: I'll take a question from the audience here.

Victoria Overing: Someone out organizing had said that you think homosexuality is genetic. In relation to this, and also like mental disability, and mental disorders, and also in general, what is your opinion on genetics versus like effects of society? And where do you kind of drawn the line?

LaRouche: Well, that's a long question, but it certainly is not genetic. There's no indication of any genetic determination. There could be physiological cases, which would confuse, shall we say, the biological sense of sexuality. But that is not the phenomenon that we see in general, in dealing with homosexuality, in society today. It's entirely a—I wouldn't say it's cultural; that's too crude a term. Largely, homosexuality was induced by bad, evil, in a sense, psychologists.

There was a determination, which was made as part of the countercultural operation, to try to find ways to promote strange kinds of sexuality, which had been fringe in society, and promote them on a large scale. For example, the production of homosexuals by the divinity and theological schools in Berkeley, California, which is one of the great engineering places where they mass-produced homosexuals, from divinity students. It was a deliberate project, an experiment. And, that's why you had this concentration on the West Coast.

So, what they did is, they operated on factors. For example, Freud and others—Freud, who also had a homosexual relationship with one of his fellow Hungarians, was one of the people who practiced in this area of therapy for homosexuals. You had others who also practiced that. And, from this work,



Organizing in Philadelphia, Aug. 2, 2002. “Mass outreach,” said LaRouche, “is taking real politics, the politics of ideas, into the streets, and turning the streets into a political forum.”

which was centered in the London Tavistock Clinic, where Freud spent the last years of his life, there was a lot of study of homosexuals, who would come to psychiatrists and say, “I’ve got this problem. What do I do about it?” Homosexuality, “how do I get rid of it? How do I cure myself, psychologically, of homosexuality?” And, from this, in the London Tavistock Clinic and similar institutions, there was a program to say, “How could we synthesize, reverse the process, and how could we use the experience of study of homosexual case-histories, to reproduce them?” with people at a suggestible age of adolescence, or young adulthood.

Generally, homosexuality seems to occur largely in young people, in the period of the transition from—either molesting young children, for example, will do it, will cause problems; sexual molestation of children is a real problem, and it produces all kinds of side-effects. But, generally, it seems to come where there’s an attachment, when the sexual activity emerges in early adolescence; but an attachment, or what is called a “cathexis” to homosexuality may be induced. And, if it’s accepted by the person who’s “cathexized,” shall we say, they will tend to continue, throughout life.

So, from everything we know, homosexuality is not genetic. There may be marginal cases, in which the biological element is there. But it’s not intrinsically genetic, and it’s not a commonplace. It’s actually functional.

But why and how it occurs, we don’t know, entirely. There’s much literature on the subject. I’ve studied some of the stuff, and it’s plausible, but it doesn’t really answer the question for me. So, I’m just left with the only answer I have—it’s functional. And the way I deal with it, politically, is not on a personal level, in dealing with people who are or are not

homosexuals, is, I deal with it: “Well, they’re a person.” And I just deal with them as people. And hope for the best. I don’t try to cure, or whatnot. I’m a bit too busy with other things—but I know it’s functional. And, therefore, I just take that into account, and say, “There are a lot of questions I can’t answer; so I can’t answer them, so I don’t answer them.”

The Hilliard, McKinney Defeats

Freeman: The next question is from someone in Alabama, who works for Congressman [Earl] Hilliard. What he says is:

“Mr. LaRouche, I know you’re aware of the fact, that two senior members of the Congressional Black Caucus—my Congressman, Earl Hilliard, and also Cynthia McKinney, from Georgia—were systematically targeted by AIPAC [American Israel Public Affairs Committee]. Both of them lost their Democratic primaries. Based on following some leads that were provided by your organization, the trail led, not only to AIPAC, but to the Democratic Leadership Council, and specifically, to Joe Lieberman. Cynthia McKinney is now faced with the option of running as a third party candidate. She has been offered the nomination of the Green Party, and because Cynthia has served her constituents well, she probably could run on that ticket and win. “My question to you, Mr. LaRouche, is: Has the Democratic Party abandoned us? Should we look to third party candidacies, and avoid the Democratic primary process altogether? We don’t have very many resources or much money, and my fear is that black candidates are wasting those resources and money in Democratic primaries, where the party apparatus is against them. Would you please comment?”

LaRouche: Well, I think it's a mistake, at this point, with all the lessons we have, to engage in strictly skin-color kinds of categories in politics. Now, see, there's a reason, when fighting for their rights, that those whose rights are in jeopardy, must take an independent position, and clamor for justice. But that should not become a marriage. That should become an effort. That, we have gone to the point that, it is obvious that there is no justice for anybody in the United States, worth mentioning, unless we can restore the principle of the general welfare. And, therefore, getting caught in a bag, of any kind, is a problem.

The problem is, is that, what Joe Lieberman represents, and his associate Michael Steinhardt, who is the founder of the Democratic Leadership Council, represents an organization which was created because of the threat I represented, in 1980, in my 1980 candidacy for the Democratic nomination. And Michael Steinhardt in particular (this was before Joe Lieberman got out of the cocoon, or something), founded the Democratic Leadership Council, with a number of people in the Congress, to stop me. That is, to eliminate my rather successful efforts to tickle interest from among those in the party, who still represented the Franklin Roosevelt legacy, because I was standing for what essentially *was* the Franklin Roosevelt legacy. That's where I was pigeon-holed, in terms of the Democratic Party.

And, if I caught fire, as I tended to in 1984, and as you

saw in Chicago in 1986 and some other places, if I caught fire, that would be that that particular policy, the FDR kind of policy, would come back into the party. Because there were a lot of constituencies within the Democratic Party, and among so-called "Reagan Democrats," who had run away, vomiting in disgust from Carter, who would come back to the party, immediately, on an FDR approach—constituency people.

So, this organization was created to try to eliminate me from the Democratic Party. It was based on a racist conception of the middle class, the so-called "suburban phenomenon," or the "third way." Now, when I was talking about different sexes, this was one I never did quite figure out, what the "third way" was. No known sex, or sexual preference would claim it, but it seemed to be there.

So, the point is, the solution to all of these problems, is to stop this cleavage, that we've got to come in with labels on us, saying we're "African-American" or something like that, and say, we're "human." And recognize that the labels represent *injustices*, not justice. We're not fighting for injustice; we're fighting for justice. So therefore, you must create a force which is not *divided*, or *self-divided*, which is committed to a principle: That principle is the general welfare. And an injury to one, is an injury to all. And we have to react accordingly.

The point was, that because of the way the party had been structured—. Remember, we came to a high point, up to a point that Joe Lieberman and McCain met with Daschle, right after the Jeffords resignation from the Republican Party. At that point, the Democratic Party leadership was seriously considering intervening on the question of the D.C. General Hospital. Now, remember, D.C. General Hospital, the attack on it, was largely financed—from Arizona. Ha, ha, ha, ha! Guess what? From the Keating Five state. Organized crime state: Because the Keating Five is organized crime. That's where McCain's money comes from. That's where Lieberman's backing comes from. What do you think them Cubans are, down there at the tip of Florida, the old anti-Castro Cubans? Lansky's mob, with the right-wing Cubans on the tip of Florida? Lieberman's supporters: They were the ones who gave the largest amount of money to put him in the Senate for the first time, in 1988.

Organized crime. Or, organized slime, if you prefer. So, that's what the problem is.

So, now, we allow ourselves to be divided. Because people say, well, they won't work with me; or they keep their distance from me. They're *fools* to keep their distance from me! They say, "But you're a liability." "A liability, in what sense? You mean, AIPAC doesn't like me? So, you don't reach out to make alliances against AIPAC? Which is essentially organized crime/organized slime? Sharon, and similar kinds of not-so-good things? And you can not, openly, work with people, to bring forces together, to prevent what happened, where a Republican woman crossed over to be a patsy against Cynthia McKinney? To what happened to Hilliard?"

Kepler's Revolutionary Discoveries

The most crippling error in mathematics, economics, and physical science today, is the hysterical refusal to acknowledge the work of Johannes Kepler, Pierre Fermat, and Gottfried Leibniz—not Newton!—in developing the calculus. This video, accessible to the layman, uses animated graphics to teach Kepler's principles of planetary motion, without resorting to mathematical formalism.

"The Science of Kepler and Fermat,"
1.5 hours, EIRVI-2001-12
\$50 postpaid.



EIR News Service
P.O. Box 17390
Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
To order, call...
1-888-EIR-3258 (toll-free)
We accept Visa and MasterCard.

These things could have been prevented! They would have been prevented, if people in the party, who are allied to these causes, would not have distanced themselves from me publicly. That's what happened.

So, they divided themselves—*divided us*, while the “right smart thing to do is this”; and “the smart thing to do is do this”; and “the smart thing to do, is this.” And that's how we lose! If you do not unify around a *principle*, you're going to lose. You're trying to organize people for a principle? Then you have to *organize* around a principle! You can not let other considerations get in the way of organizing around principles. And that's where the problem lies.

This idea of Green Party, and so forth, is hellish—I know it's a hellish problem for McKinney. We've got to do something about it. But the only way we *can do* something about it, is to stop this pussy-footing, about people being afraid of openly being associated with me: That is the problem!

Creating Water for Africa

Freeman: Okay, this is a question, Lyn, that has come via the Internet.

“Dear Mr. LaRouche, I'm very glad to hear and participate in your Labor Day conference by Internet, from your office in Houston, Texas. My name is Nicholas Nibikora, I'm from East Africa, specifically from Burundi. My country is in trouble, with civil war. And I have some questions that I'd like to ask you very quickly:

“What are you planning for the African continent, where there is war everywhere, because of the lack of good leadership?

“What do you think you can say to Africans, to help us end these wars?

“You talk about water, and especially River Zaire, but on my understanding, the water you talk about, is for transportation. But, for Africans, we need clean water for drinking and for other kinds of uses. So, are you planning, if you become President, to provide the means and techniques for bringing fresh, clean water to the populations that are in need of water? What do you plan for African development?

“The African countries are in wars, because we have been used by Western countries for different benefits, and it is destroying *our* nations. The West is providing us guns and money, instead of giving money to build hospitals and schools, to develop clean water. So, what do you think we can do, to stop all these kinds of manipulations, that I have to call a ‘new colonialism’?

“Listening to you and reading your publications, I really think that you are the great man, who is going to change the world. And I wish to thank you.”

LaRouche: Well, the water from the basin, in Congo, is not just for transportation. There may be other plans for it, but the basic business is this: You look at the map, and you look across to Chad, the Lake Chad area. And you look at the entirety of that Sub-Sahel region of Africa, and you see that, if we can bring enough water into the area—just water; fresh

water, don't worry about whether it's clean, at first. Because the main thing we've got to do, is, you've got to get water in there, not only for immediate human consumption—we can deal with that, because we can have water purification; for drinking purposes, that is not a major problem, if we get the water. The point is, we've got to get it to the plant-life. You've got to think clearly—I'll answer two parts to your question; but there are two things.

First of all, you've got to think about Biosphere/Noösphere. The way this planet is organized, as Vernadsky described it, is: You have a part of the planet, in which processes can appear to be described adequately, up to a certain point, as “abiotic,” non-living processes. Then, you have another part of the planet, the upper part, the crust, which is called the Biosphere, in which you have—part of the planet has been transformed into living processes, and its fossils. For example, the air is a fossil of living processes, the atmosphere. Water is a fossil of living processes: It did not exist naturally on the planet, in any significant amount. The oceans are a fossil; the atmosphere is a fossil. Most of the material we get, down to several kilometers' depth, of mineral resources and so forth, are actually fossils, which are organized in the form we find them, through the activities of living processes. On top of that, you have the role of plants, and other living processes.

Now, the first thing you have to do, therefore, for man, is, you have to create the ground for human existence: Now the ground for animal and human existence was created by the development of biological life, in the form of plant life, and similar kinds. Therefore, we have to, first, in these areas, like desert areas, or arid areas, we have to build up *living processes*, the so-called “Biosphere.” Therefore, we've got to get water into these areas, first of all, because without water, you can not get a successful Biospherical development of living plant life.

If you get the Biosphere functioning in this area, like the greater Lake Chad area, in the southern part of Chad—that whole area and across there. If you begin to manage the water across from West Africa, across to Djibouti—that route, with transportation routes; if you do that, you begin to create *micro-climates*, if you do it on a large scale, which is what this project can do: *micro-climates*.

So, now you transform a desert, into something which is *semi-arid*, or something which is even not arid, through managing water: just good farming. You might call it that.

This creates a future for this area, and changes the characteristics of Africa. *If you do that*, then you will find that various other benefits occur. And then, you get to the point, you say, “Now, let's bring in the technology, for water purification for human consumption,” so forth and so on.

Now, on the other side of this process: The problem is not neo-colonialism. That's too kind. This is much worse: The problem is Henry Kissinger's National Security Study Memorandum 200, and Carter's *Global Futures* and *Global 2000*. These policies, of the United States, explicitly policies of genocide, with the greatest emphasis in their targeting in



LaRouche Democrat Nancy Spannaus campaigns for Senate in Virginia, at the annual Buena Vista Labor Day parade, Sept. 2, 2002. Her float shows a magnetically levitated train: transport modalities for the 21st Century.



1974 and 1980, the greatest emphasis was *on Africa: genocide against Africa*.

What's the argument? The argument is: The planet has limited natural resources, mineral resources, and so forth. Therefore, the white, English-speaking races must *take this property over, now*. That all natural resources, on the continent of South and Central America, and Africa, and Asia, *belong to the English-speaking white oligarchy*. "It's our property, because it's ours. We run the planet, it's ours. And the future of the white race depends upon it. Therefore, we must prevent the indigenous populations of Africa, and South America, from growing. Because, if they increase their numbers, they will use up natural resources more rapidly. We must prevent the indigenous populations of Africa, from using up the raw materials—because we want those, for the future. As a matter of fact, we want to reduce the population of these countries, *by natural processes, such as diseases, and similar—hunger, famine, war, whatnot*. Start a lot of civil wars, and see the effects of warfare of that type, in that kind of condition, on the population-density. See the destruction of what were once cultures, like Burundi and Rwanda."

Which are high mountain areas in Central Africa, which are ideal places for settlement—of Europeans! Of the type that like to have gambling resorts out on the lake there, near Uganda, and similar kinds of things. All these wonderful Europeans would be out there, enjoying themselves—keeping enough black people alive to wash their shoes and sweep their floors!

Now, what they've done, therefore, they've put in armies, George Bush Sr., "#41," has part of Barrick Gold, set up with the former Prime Minister of Canada. They run Barrick Gold. And they run private armies. What do you think happened in Angola? What do you think is happening in all these things? What happened from Uganda? There are all these puppets, running private armies, run by Anglo-American interests, in this area, setting up civil wars, the way they set up the operation in Rwanda! Then, they get a so-called official UN investigation thing, which is framed to cover up the truth about how the whole civil war in Rwanda started.

This is the problem! So therefore, what's the solution? Remedies? No! The remedies are not lacking. What is lacking, is the key to opening the door to the remedies. The key to opening the door to the remedies, is to destroy those forces, political forces, which are behind NSSM-200, *Global Futures* and *Global 2000*.

The problem in politics, is people always say, "Can you come up with a suggestion, which will end the civil war in Africa?" Well, if the civil wars in Africa are being orchestrated from the United States as a matter of policy, as a matter of imperial policy, and anybody who interferes is going to get shot, then you're not going to say, "Come up with a suggestion to stop the civil war." Those who are trying to stop the civil wars in the Great Lakes areas, as such, are a bunch of fools—or worse. Because the issue is, to stop the people who are *organizing* the civil wars, and have the power to do so!

If you haven't got the guts to do that, shut up! Because

that's what it's going to take. Otherwise, you're fooling people—like the reparations nonsense—you're fooling people, by holding out as bait, a promise of something that would never be delivered; and using that bait, to lead them around like leading somebody to the slaughterhouse. And that's the problem.

So, what we have to do, as leaders, is: We have to have the courage, first of all, to stand up and tell the truth. Do not say, "Well, don't say that, because you won't be liked much. Why don't you put it in another way? Make a little suggestion." Forget it! It's a waste of time.

We've come to the point—. Let me just emphasize one thing, which comes out of what I said, in my remarks today, in my presentation today. That, what is in store for us, *is not a depression*. What is in store for us, is something resembling what happened in Europe in the 14th Century with the New Dark Age. If these swine insist on trying to collect the debt in full, from Argentina, Brazil, and other countries; and in the United States itself, when the bankruptcies really begin to sweep through here in September; if they do that—if they are allowed to do that, you are going to have the same kind of effect throughout much of this planet, that happened in Europe during the 14th Century New Dark Age, when 30% of the human population *was wiped out!* By bankers' policies! The same thing is true, in this case, in Africa.

We've come to the point, in history, that this fooling around, with suggestions—with "nice, little neat ideas, that might be acceptable at tea parties"—*that is no longer the case!* We've come to the point, where we've got to decide whether this human race is going to continue in a civilized form, or not, despite all previous imperfections. And the question is: Do we have the courage—recognizing that it is now in our hands, in our time, while we're alive, to do something to prevent that horror from happening, *to do it*. And, it means naming the names. Saying what has to be said. Withholding nothing. And having the courage to stand up, and be shot at, as Martin Luther King was.

The LaRouche Youth Movement

Freeman: I have one more question that came in, that I want to ask you, because it comes from a young woman, who is in Berlin right now, with a brigade of young people there from the United States, organizing for Helga [Zepp-LaRouche]'s electoral campaign, which we will hear a lot more about over the course of the next couple of days.

This is from Elke Speis, and she says:

"Mr. LaRouche, I'm writing to you, because I'm a fairly new organizer from the West Coast of the U.S.A., and I am currently in Berlin for Helga's campaign. Erin Regan got here about three months ago, and I arrived here three weeks ago, with a bunch of other people. And we've been having a lot of student meetings, and they've gone really well. And we brought eight students from Berlin to the Oberwesel conference.

"At Oberwesel, Erin called a meeting of all the young people from the European movement, and their contacts, and we discussed the question of the recruitment of youth in Europe, and we were really happy, because Helga was there, too.

"But my question to you, is this: How do you approach student recruitment in Europe? And importantly, what role do, and should, the Baby Boomers play in that process?"

LaRouche: Well, what you have to do, is get the Baby Boomers to put on a set of asbestos underpants, because you're going to set a fire under them!

That's generally the best suggestion I can make, because: Don't underestimate the power of people in the 18- to 25-, and the vicinity of that, if they're mobilized as a youth movement.

See, one or two little youth out there, by itself, feel they can't get much done. But if you can create the impression there's a mob coming—. The heat is on. Uh oh! These kids are all over the place! Oh my—wrrr!

That's the way you do it. That's the way, I just insisted, when we got into this discussion about outreach. I said, "This is what I'm talking about! You dumbheads! I've been telling you for over a dozen years: 'Get back there, and do mass outreach!'"

Mass outreach is not standing on the corner, limply with a leaflet in yer hand.

Mass outreach is taking real politics, the politics of ideas, into the streets, and turning the streets into a political forum. The way is, you don't say, "Pleeze, would you like to hear this?" You say, "Hey, you dumb baloney, how'd you live this long?" Not that, but, you know: You have to go out with that sort of idea in mind. Then, you have the right idea, because, this guy's coming up, and you say, "Ehh! How much money did you lose in the stock market?" You know, particularly in areas like Washington, D.C., downtown Washington, D.C.; or New York City downtown, and so forth:

"Hey! How much money'd you lose last month?"

"I didn't lose it last month: I lost it all two months ago!"

"Why do you think you made that mistake. What was wrong? Didn't you know? Didn't you know that you'd been warned, not to do that? You been warned, not to lose that money?"

"Who warned me!?"

And you do things like that, and you get a discussion going. And you be provocative: Because, the guy's coming along, he's coming along, he's in a state of denial. His mind is in a total state of denial. He's pretending, he's ugly, he's unhappy, he's miserable. The world stinks: But he's not going to admit it! He's talking about the recovery! "Oh, you've been talking to Dracula, again, huh?" So, in that state of denial, you have to break through the shell, right? And you have pull the string. So, if you've got a bunch of you, out there—if one guy can't get under his skin, maybe the next one will, and by the third one, he's going to give up and say, "Oh—!"

Freeman: Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in thanking Mr. LaRouche. [applause, ovation].