

LAROCHE TO LOS ANGELES DEMOCRATS

Four-Nation Accord On FDR Model Can Save Civilization

Lyndon LaRouche addressed by telephone a town meeting in Los Angeles sponsored by the LaRouche Political Action Committee (LPAC) and the Los Angeles County Democratic Party Central Committee FDR Legacy Club on March 31. Here are his opening remarks, and excerpts from the dialogue that followed. (Sub-heads have been added.)

Harley Schlanger: Welcome to our town meeting today. I'm Harley Schlanger, I'm the Western States spokesman for Lyndon LaRouche and this is a town meeting sponsored by LaRouche PAC, and the L.A. County Democratic Party Central Committee's FDR Legacy Club. And today, we're going to examine a potentially fatal disease for our civilization, with the intention of eliminating the disease. It's a disease that's associated with the re-emergence of Al Gore: It's called Sophistry. And throughout the history of Western civilization, Sophistry has been the greatest threat to the advance of civilization and the security of mankind.

Today we'll have a panel of speakers from the LaRouche Youth Movement, who will, first of all, assure you, that human beings are not responsible for global warming. And secondly, they'll present the cure for the disease, which is rooted in real science, in particular, the study of Johannes Kepler.

But we do have a special treat for you this morning, in that we're going to be hearing from Lyndon LaRouche, the greatest philosophical mind of our time, and the most accurate economist on the planet. He's recently written a piece for the March 30 *EIR*, which is available in the back, for a modest fee; his piece is called, "The Cult of the Oligarchy: The Gore of Babylon." And in it, he makes a very striking statement: that what Gore is pushing right now, in this global warming/climate change argument, is the greatest scientific hoax from ancient through modern civilization. That's a fairly strong statement. And it's a hoax which threatens the lives of up to 2, to 3, to 4 billion people on the planet.

And so, it's crucial that we take this topic up today, to free the Democratic



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

In order to escape a presently onrushing new dark age, there must be a change in the leading values of the Baby-Boomer generation, toward a new perspective of global growth and development, LaRouche told the Los Angeles meeting. He is shown here at an international webcast on March 7.

Party of this albatross around its neck. And to open the discussion, I bring you, via telephone, Lyndon LaRouche.

Lyndon LaRouche: Thank you.

You have observed, I think, that there is a problem, a political problem inside the United States: That is, the generation—including the Democratic Party which belongs to the Baby Boomers—that is, people essentially between the ages of 50 and 65 years of age, the generation which was born into the white-collar stratum of society, chiefly, between the death of Franklin Roosevelt, the Summer of 1945, until the beginning of 1957, when the United States was struck by a very deep recession, relative to any previous experience since the Great Depression, in which the charm of the Baby-Boomer cult during the 1946-1956 period, that charm was taken off by this stubborn recession, which was deep, and which destroyed much of the credibility of the indoctrination which was being done to the young fellows of the white-collar families during that previous decade.

Now, that generation, born into these white-collar strata, who often went to the leading universities of the United States during the relevant period of their life, are known as the 68ers, that is, the people who took their clothes off and declared permanent Summer, and similar kinds of things, and if you took enough LSD you believed it. But these people broke the political system of the United States, by tolerating, as a characteristic feature of that movement—not everybody in it, but the movement as a whole—the attacks on blue-collar

workers and farmers, attacks on physical science, and the demand of some kind of sexual revolution or something or other, which would be infinite pleasure in all kinds of varieties, previously identified by mankind.

Boomers in the ‘Caboose’ of Politics

Now, that generation has reached the point, that its system is hopelessly bankrupt: That is, all the values which are generally accepted among the white-collar class, sociologically, now between about 50 years of age and 65, all of the values they have been conditioned to believe, increasingly since 1968 especially, these values don’t work any more. The system is now doomed in its present form. The present international monetary-financial system is in the process of disintegrating, and also blowing up, in the process of disintegrating.

What has happened with the emergence of the New Politics around the most recent midterm election, as echoed also by something you could see coming in the last general election, is that the generation of people, especially those who tend to go to college, or who have that orientation, in terms of educational life, between the ages of 18 and 35—two groups, generally 18 to 25, and then 25 to 35—these two strata combined, are now setting the pace for underlying trends in public opinion and action among leading strata within the political process. At this point, with some individual exceptions, people who represent the generation between the ages of 50 and 65, that generation no longer has a grip on reality.

Now, real politics today, has undergone, therefore, a

change: And the change was typified by the last midterm election, where the generation between 18 to 35, in age-group, that generation made the difference which gave the Democrats a landslide victory in the House of Representatives. However, the Baby-Boomer generation, which was, in a sense, part of them, was carried to victory because of the margin represented by the 18-to-35 surge, has again tried to resist it. Now, the resistance against this, has taken the form of stubborn refusal to face issues that had to be faced, and also by a panic-stricken embrace of a piece of clinical insanity, and mass-murderous insanity at that, associated with Al Gore and his program of, destroy everything.

So, now, if you try to influence politics by going to the Baby-Boomer generation, and assuming that if you can influence *them*, you can then influence the society as a whole, you are making a mistake. If you want to influence the society as a whole today, you must mobilize leading strata, from within the 18-to-35 age-group. You see some of that already: The younger generation, the ones who are going to be running the world, if there is a world to run ten years from now, that generation is now taking charge. Not in the sense of saying, "We're taking charge," but in the sense of moving in, to shape anything that's good in politics, they're tending to shape it. In the meantime, the generation which is between 50 years of age, and 65 years of age, as the white-collar sociological type, they are going out of business. They are going out of business in the next election: For example, a general election of a President means a possible eight-year term. Well, eight years from now, or nine years from now, when that next President, whoever it is, leaves office, the Baby Boomers aren't going to be running the United States—if there is a United States to run. The United States is going to be run by the popular impetus registered from the 18-to-35 age-group, now, today.

So the problem that people have, in politics, even among us, is the failure to accept the implications of what I've just said, even though most among you have some sense of what I've just said. So, your job is to convince the Baby Boomer that you have mobilized the 18-to-35 generation out from under them! And that if the Baby Boomer wants to survive, the Baby Boomer has to get in, shall we say, the caboose of politics, where the engine of politics is now shifting to the leading edge of political thought in the 18-to-35 age-group generation.

If you take that approach, and you convince the Baby Boomers who are riding in the caboose of history, the tail end of the train, that you're doing that, *they will respond to you*, because they know *you are the boss*. However, if you go to



National Archives

Franklin Roosevelt's intention for the post-war world was to free all people from colonial authority, to liquidate the British Empire, the French Empire, the Anglo-Dutch Empire, etc. The President is shown here meeting with King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia, at Great Bitter Lake in Egypt, February 1945.

the Baby Boomer and try to organize politically by getting the Baby Boomer to make a movement, hoping that this will drag the youth along, you're making a fundamental mistake. Now, that's the general situation.

The Lessons of Franklin D. Roosevelt

Now, what is the world situation? Right now, the only hope for mankind getting through the next couple of years ahead, the only hope is something which I'm demanding which most people would think is absolutely impossible. What I'm demanding is this: I'm saying, let's take the tradition of President Franklin Roosevelt, let's look at what Franklin Roosevelt intended to do with the post-war world, had he lived, as opposed to the ruinous effects of Harry Truman et al.

Now, Roosevelt's intention was to eliminate colonialism, to free all people from colonial authority, to liquidate the British Empire, the French Empire, the Anglo-Dutch Empire, and so on and so forth. All colonial systems were to be disbanded, and replaced by a system of sovereign nation-states, whose development as modern economies would be greatly assisted by the United States taking the powerful war machine we had built up, a war machine beyond anything anybody had imagined before Roosevelt's inauguration, and convert that war machine as a productive machine, into the tools of not only improving the United States, our economy, our physical conditions of life, but also as a driving force, a machine-tool driver, to assist the people who had been colonized earlier, such as India for example, to assist them in becoming rapidly,

truly sovereign nation-state economies. Roosevelt's intention was expressed by his view of the United Nations. That view of the United Nations, was that that should be an organization of *sovereign nation-states* in a world in which colonialism *no longer existed in any form*, or approximation, or disguise.

What happened is, we didn't do that. The British Empire, which *hated* Franklin Roosevelt—Churchill hated Roosevelt—took people who hated Roosevelt inside the United States, *like Harry Truman*, and what they did, is to the extent they were able to do so, did everything possible *to wreck the policies of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.*

Now, Roosevelt's intention had been to take the powers of the world which did exist at the time of the end of the war, and to group them as a leading group, to set the pace for a global agreement on the kind of development program, which Roosevelt envisaged for the post-war world: a world of *developing nation-states, sovereign nation-states*, instead of colonies or semi-colonies. A system under a fixed-exchange-rate system, of *interchangeability* of production and trade, of the ability to have long-term loans of 25 to 50 years for the development of infrastructure and new industries and agriculture; and have these loans secured at a fixed interest rate, such that the loans would be within, say, the 2% ratio per annum, simple interest rate, and therefore, you would be able to have secure loans at fixed interest rates, and fixed charges, so that everybody could participate in the process of development.

That system, and part of it, was preserved at the end of the war. It was preserved for about 20 years, until the aftermath of the assassination of John Kennedy. But, with the introduction of the Indo-China War, from the end of 1964 on, the United States, as Roosevelt had designed it, was rapidly destroyed, especially from '67-'68 onward. And what happened is, at that point in '68, the arrival of the Baby-Boomer generation, as the 68ers, who were against blue-collar workers, who were against farmers, who were against scientific and technological progress, who were soon against nuclear power, and so forth and so on, this generation took over. Because of the Democratic Party, which was largely based on farmers and blue-collar workers, as a social-economic factor, was torn apart! In 1968, by the 68ers! As a result, the Democratic Party not only lost the election to Nixon, but has never had an effective role in leading the nation, as it did prior to that time, again, up to the present time.

What you have is a Democratic Party which is dominated by the sense that it's a club of Democrats who are over 50 years of age, especially those over 60 years of age, and especially those in the upper 3% of family-income brackets: the money crowd. That the lower classes, the lower 80% of family-income brackets, whose standard of living and conditions of life and communities have been *ruined*, increasingly, over the last 35 years, they don't count—and preferably will not be counted in elections—while a closed, small group of less than 20% of the population, managed by the upper 3% of

the population in terms of income-brackets, runs the world: That's the scheme.

So you're now at a point, that you have a revolt, against the Baby-Boomer generation, not because it's the Baby-Boomer generation, *but because of what its habits are.* Its habits are associated with the ideas of the system which has brought us into this ruin.

Four Key Nations Must Ally

Therefore, you're in a situation where, objectively, the United States, and the rest of humanity, has no chance of escaping what is presently an onrushing new dark age, unless there's a change in leading values, from the habits of the Baby-Boomer generation, their ideology, their indoctrinated ideology, into a new perspective of global growth and development. This can be done, only if we take four nations of the planet, four nations, that is, relatively great powers in their own terms, which don't agree with each other, but agree on one thing: The world has to have a chance. These are: the United States—we are the leading power in the world, because of our tradition, not the recent tradition, but a longer-term tradition, our pre-Kennedy-assassination tradition; secondly, Russia; thirdly, China; fourthly, India. If these four nations agree, as a diplomatic agreement, that we're going to change the world system, and if we take these four nations as a fulcrum to bring other nations to join with them, we will have a global force, a political force of agreement on one thing: *to save the planet from Hell*, and to rescue the world from the presently onrushing, general physical economic collapse of the planet.

We can then go back, and say, we agree, as the government of Russia has said, repeatedly recently: If we agree that the Franklin Roosevelt model, which defeated Hitler, is the model of reference which nations otherwise differing in cultural outlook and so forth are going to agree upon, to bring this planet back in order, we now have the ideal conditions, preconditions, for making that agreement. If we change, now, if we change the United States' leadership, if we turn a whole upheaval, in the Democratic Party *and* the Republican Party, against the Rohatyns, and against the Gores, and all the other pigs that we have to deal with, if we get the agreement that the United States is going to play the role of a pivotal nation, to bring Russia, China, and India together, together with other nations, of less power but importance, for a common purpose of saving this planet from Hell, in the way that Roosevelt intended in 1945, while he still lived, then, I know, that with the United States' initiative of that type, we can save this planet from Hell. And we can bring the United Nations into a reformed institution, which will function in this new perspective, which is the perspective that Franklin Roosevelt had at the time he died, a new perspective for the planet, in which we can get *enough* cooperation, among nations of different cultures, and different particular objectives, that this planet can survive, and progress.

But the impetus is going to come, not from the Baby-Boomer generation. It's going to come from what's left of my generation, and the generation between the ages of 18 and 35, today.

Now, to do this, to make it work: Do not be intimidated by the Baby Boomers! *They have no guts!* They all know the war in Southwest Asia should be stopped, but they won't do it! They'll say, "Well, maybe. . ." "Maybe when the time is right, we'll do it." "Maybe, we'll hope we'll do it." "Maybe we'll denounce the war, but continue to support it, or we won't block it any more."

That's your Baby Boomer! Hmm? It's a wonder that any of them were able to make children at all. They don't know how things work in this world.

So therefore, the impetus will come *not* from the voice of the Baby Boomer. *Not* from the politicians in office. The impetus will come from the people in the 18-to-35 age-group, who are mobilized, to say, "*We are going to have a life, for ourselves, and our descendants!*" And tell the Baby Boomers, "C'mon! Come along, boy! You're going to join us." And under those conditions, since the Baby Boomers don't really have any perspective, as a generation, they don't have any good ideas at all! About what to do with this planet! They'll only make a bigger mess of this thing than ever before, if they're allowed to run this thing. *But!* The Baby Boomers can be useful, if you convince them that their authority for acting, depends upon the *consent*, the active consent and impetus, supplied by the 18-to-35 age-group in society. That's what we have to do.

We have a few old geezers hanging around, like me. Some younger, but still, old geezers: We are a force, an intellectual force. We have the confidence that the Baby Boomers don't have; we know what works; we can discuss these things rationally. But the impetus, the political leadership, as in the forming of the American Revolution, will come from the young adult generation, those today between 18 to 35.

And that's where we stand. And that's what I'm pushing. To many people, who believe in the Baby Boomer—and I don't believe in Baby Boomers, I think it's just an act that they're putting on—but to people who don't believe in Baby Boomers, and understand what I'm saying, there is nothing impossible about the solution I'm proposing. There's nothing impossible, if I get the support I need for this, to bring together some of the Baby Boomers and others, and to say: We're going to set up a discussion, a dialogue, with the leadership in Russia, China, and India, and other nations, we're going to set up a dialogue—a conspiracy, if you like! Ha! A conspiracy! Ha! They exist!—in order to bring this planet into some kind of order. We don't have to agree on every jot and tittle of every proposal. We have to agree on a principle of cooperation, as Roosevelt understood. We can do it.

You, the American younger generation, 18 to 35, and some people in Europe, too, can play that role, *you* are the leadership: You are the mass base for making this happen. I have the idea. You have the authority. Let's make it happen.

Dialogue With LaRouche

Schlanger: Lyn, do you have time for a couple questions?

LaRouche: Yeah, sure.

Role of the Trade Unions

Q: Hello Lyn, I'm a member of the Baby-Boomer generation, so don't hold that against me. [laughter] But I'm a member of the Building Trades union; we build nuclear power plants, computer-chip factories, medical-research facilities, oil refineries, heavy infrastructure, heavy industrial construction. We have considerable resources: My particular union is 4,500 members, we spend a quarter-million dollars a year on supporting political candidates. We're disappointed with the quality of candidates, so we began running our own members. We've made quite a few inroads into city councils, state senate and state assembly. But our goal is, we'd like to get better quality candidates in power, and we're the ones who will build infrastructure that will hopefully last for centuries, because that's what we do for a living. So: What is the appropriate role of the union movement and building trades in general, for changing the leadership of the existing political parties?

LaRouche: Well, essentially, you've answered the question in a practical sense, already. You need a constituency. And now, the skilled people in the building trades and similar kinds of technology, machine-tool design and so forth, this is an older generation within. I mean, these people generally are in their 40s and 50s, or older. They are the people who embody a matured experience of the kind of skills and programs which are necessary. What they need, is to recognize they require a constituency. You know, work sometimes requires a constituency. Sometimes, a few, or a relatively few skilled people, a cadre of people in that more matured and more experienced age-group, requires a constituency. What is the constituency? The constituency is essentially a social-political constituency.

What you need is, a population, especially from the 18-to-35 age-group, which says, "We're going to do it!" And if we take this age-group of 18 to 35, and do what I'm doing with it: having it go through the hard work of understanding what the foundations of science are; what the foundations of science and technology are: If we give these younger people a grasp of what the foundations of science and technology are, *then* you have a population which is politically mobilized for the great projects we need, and you have a political constituency which *understands*, and is able to assimilate, effectively, the kind of leadership that skilled people can contribute for these great projects we need now.

It's a small handful, you know. It's a small percentile, of the so-called blue-collar labor force, even in our best days. A small handful of the machine-tool designer and similar types of skills—these were the drivers, which enabled us, with a relative handful of them, to employ thousands of other people in the factories and so forth, in which they worked. We have a similar situation today: The cadres of the skilled building

trades and similar types of people, or machine-tool-grade skills—these people are the people who, tied together, with a younger generation, 18 to 35, which wants to get on with this job—that’s the winning combination. And what we have to do, is think of politics, not as “blue-collar politics,” or “18-to-35 age-group politics”; we have to put the society together around the essential leading components, of science, and commitment, and culture, to rebuild a nation and rebuild the world.

So, what we have to do, is, yes: We have to, in a sense, get this combination, of farmers who still believe in farming, and so forth—this combination working together, *to form the base of actual politics*: Those who are going to make the decisions on what we’re going to spend money for, what we’re going to invest in, that sort of thing. And how we’re going to mobilize the population, not to just get a job. Getting a job really doesn’t mean much any more. Morally, getting a job really means, participating in building a nation and building a world. And that kind of mentality is required.

Cheney, Gore, and the War Danger

Schlanger: Time is short, and there’s no one else at the microphone. I’ll pose a question to you, that a number of people have been asking.

In the last couple of days, you’ve come back to the importance of getting rid of Dick Cheney, and the question is two-fold: First, what is the actual danger right now of an escalation to war against Iran? And secondly, what’s the relationship between this mobilization to destroy the fraud of Al Gore, and getting rid of Dick Cheney?

LaRouche: Well, first of all, you have to realize that the President has just become Julius Caesar—Keystone Cops-style. The President of the United States, George W. Bush, is a disgrace. Nobody wants him, essentially. You have Republicans who are lining up, trying to find excuses for dumping George W. Bush. Reasons why they should dump him, or reasons why he should be dumped. It reminds me of the friends of Julius Caesar, in the famous play—including Dick Cheney, otherwise known as, Marc Anthony—going up, to each put the dagger into Caesar!

Now, I don’t think the Republicans are going to actually physically stab George W. Bush to death. But I think they’re prepared to stab him to political death, *politically*, now.

The danger is, therefore, in a situation, in which you have a discredited President, and a self-discredited Democratic Party, by what it’s done with Gore, this combination leaves the door open for coups d’état, overthrows of governments, and establishment of dictatorship. *That’s the danger*. And leaving Cheney loose, under these conditions, is actually inviting putting the United States under a fascist dictatorship, which could happen just because of this combination.

Now, the Gore problem. To assess the Gore problem: I think the Gore problem is a will o’ the wisp. Because, you see what’s happened with, for example, *Bildzeitung*, which is the largest circulation publication in Germany, a daily newspa-



White House/Eric Draper

The President has become Julius Caesar—Keystone Cops-style, said LaRouche. The Republicans are trying to find excuses for dumping Bush. As in Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar, with Dick Cheney as Marc Antony, they are lining up to put the dagger into Caesar!

per, has really attacked Al Gore, on the basis of what we said, but also more directly on the basis of what came out of this British Channel 4 broadcast on the “Great Global Warming Swindle.” Gore is not going to last much longer. The only thing Gore has, is, he’s an agent of the British monarchy. He’s not an agent of the United States, he has no intrinsic loyalty to the United States. He’s an Aaron Burr—he doesn’t have the honor of Benedict Arnold—an Aaron Burr: a traitor to the United States! A traitor to the human race!

And he doesn’t wear well. There’s no substance to him. Those who go with Gore, are going to go down. People who become involved with endorsing Gore, are going to become *dead political meat*, in the electoral process. Republicans are desperate! They’ve got dead meat in the form of the Presidency. They’ve got Dick Cheney—who’s not theirs, really; he’s owned by George Shultz and the international bankers. So the Republicans are now getting restive, and more and more independent Republicans are showing up in the ranks of the Senate and elsewhere, because George Bush is dead meat, and Dick Cheney is something worse.

So therefore, the Republicans now are looking for a cause. And to the extent that the Democratic Party is running on the basis of trying to adapt to Al Gore’s crazy policy, any Democratic would-be candidate, running for President, who does not urinate on Al Gore publicly, now, is dead meat as a candidate in the coming election!

And this is a fun time. This is a time when dues are going to be paid. Democratic candidates who attack Gore, denounce him and break with him, have a chance of becoming President in 2008. Those who don’t probably have less than zero chance! They’re lucky to get a job on a junk pile.

Impeaching Cheney Is Necessary, But Not Sufficient

Q: Hi Lyn. My question is, basically, you say we need to get rid of Dick Cheney and such, and my question is, what exactly is that going to do? Because, I know since 9/11 happened, and all the candidates—even the Democratic candidates and everybody—they’re all saying, “We need to stay in this bipartisan thing, we all need to fight the war on terror,” which is a fraud, because 9/11 is an inside job, and they’re using this war on terrorism as an excuse to basically do anything. And I don’t see any of the Democratic leaders saying that they need to stop the war on terror, that it’s a fraud, or that they want to stop torture or anything like that. So what exactly would getting rid of Dick Cheney do, since even the Democratic candidates aren’t willing to go through with debunking that fraud? That’s my question.

LaRouche: Imagine you’re up in your bedroom, and downstairs in the kitchen, your house has just been broken into by an assassin, Dick Cheney, who’s coming up to get you? What’s your objective? Get rid of him—*while you still can!*

So, there’s no reason to have a campaign about Cheney: The only thing to do with him, is get rid of him. Get him out of there. And it simply takes a commitment. You can get him out of there very easily, but you have to have people who are *committed to do it*.

And what you have is, you have some very serious corruption, which I understand fairly well, what the corruption is inside the Democratic Party in particular. Look, you’ve got a fascist in California: Felix Rohatyn. The guy’s a fascist! He, and George Shultz, and Henry Kissinger put Augusto Pinochet into dictatorship in South America, in Chile, and extended that thing by supporting an Operation Condor which committed Nazi-like murder, with the help of Nazi advisors throughout the Southern Cone. That’s Felix Rohatyn! That’s George Shultz. That’s Henry Kissinger. That’s these types. And then, you have another case, Soros, who’s a different case; he likes drugs, he likes chaos, and so forth. He’s not quite like Felix Rohatyn—he probably hates Felix Rohatyn, for all I know.

But, in any case, as long as the Democratic Party is allowing itself to be controlled by the moneybags associated with a fascist—and I say *fascist*; I mean “fascist,” like in “Nazi”: Felix Rohatyn—as long as Democrats cohabit with this guy, and look at Soros as an alternative in real terms, the country doesn’t have much of a chance.

The problem is not Cheney. The problem lies with the fact that the Democratic Party does not clean its own act up! The leadership doesn’t. I’ve been complaining about that since they sold the auto industry, the auto workers, the whole industry, down the tubes in 2005! I was pushing it, and they said “No, No, No!” Why? “Because Felix Rohatyn said, ‘Don’t!’” A *fascist*, Felix Rohatyn, told the Democrats, “You will not support LaRouche on this program!” And they didn’t! Look what we’ve got now: The state of Michigan, the state of Indi-



DOD/Staff Sgt. Garry Hilliard



Carbon Disclosure Project

The danger is, you have a discredited President, and a Democratic Party which has discredited itself, by what it’s done with Gore: This combination leaves the door open for coups d’état. And leaving Cheney loose, under these conditions, is inviting putting the United States under a fascist dictatorship.

ana, the state of Ohio, are going into the dumps, *because the Democrats would not mobilize behind me on this issue!* Why? Because they were kissing the butt, the money butt, of Felix Rohatyn and people like him.

That’s the problem! The problem lies with the people. We the people have to, in a sense, rise up on our hind legs, and have the guts to say it like it is! Because the situation is so bad.

Look at the housing crisis. Do you realize what’s happening with this housing crisis? Do you realize that you’ve got shacks all over the country, on the market at \$700,000 mortgage, which are probably not worth \$200,000? Or what the values are going to be in the coming period? The only thing that’ll save those shacks is hyperinflation, which will wipe everybody out.

So therefore, you have a situation, in which *people who are sane, can not afford to support Democratic leaders, who do what the associates of Felix Rohatyn represent*. And under those conditions, where they stand up, as men and women, not as butt-kissers for these Shylocks, then we have a party. Then people respond. The problem is, the people don’t see leadership. They see the Democratic Party candidates as a joke! And they *are* a joke! Now, many of them, as individuals are not jokes, but the way they’re campaigning, their campaign is a *joke!* It has no relevance to anything that affects the future existence of this nation. I don’t know what they’re talking about. Why are they talking? They’re not saying anything worth any importance!

So, it’s our indignation, at the fact that the present leadership we have is not functional, and the fact that we have to provide the alternative, from the ranks of society, and kick some people in the butt, who can become leaders again: Then we can survive.

Look, there’s no guarantee, there’s no magical formula that can guarantee the survival of civilization right now. I can’t guarantee it, nobody else can. But we have a shot.



EIRNS/Scott Rufsvold

What you need is, a population, especially from the 18-to-35 age-group, which says, "We're going to do it!" Then you have a population which is politically mobilized for the great projects we need. Shown here, LaRouche Youth Movement member Ian Overton addressing the town meeting.



EIRNS/Scott Rufsvold

LaRouche proposed, in response to a questioner (as shown in the photo): "Let's bring back Franklin Roosevelt. Let's pick up today, the fallen chalice of Franklin Roosevelt, and let's put it back to work."

There's something we can do that might win. And it's the only thing we can do. So therefore, we're going to do it.

Why These Four Nations?

Schlanger: Lyn, we have one last question.

Q: Hey Lyn. Something that you've mentioned quite a bit in some of your papers, and also today, is that, in order to create a change in the world, there needs to be cooperation between, you said, four specific nations: United States, India, China, and Russia. And I was just wondering, why specifically those four? What would each of those four bring to the dialogue?

LaRouche: Russia does not have the population the Soviet Union had; *but!* Russia on the move, today, and it is on the move, represents implicitly—not actually, not explicitly—but implicitly, represents the social forces which were associated formerly with the Soviet Union. That is a big part of the planet. And it's a big part of the mineral resources, on which the continuation of civilization depends.

South of that, you have China: over 1.3 billion people! South of that, India: over 1 billion people. You have Southwest Asia generally, heavily populated; you have Europe—isn't worth much any more; Central and Western Europe. But it's there. But the United States is key.

You also have something else, which I know very well. First of all, I know what's going on in Moscow, and Putin is saying it. They're saying it: *Franklin Delano Roosevelt! Franklin Delano Roosevelt's United States.*

Now, China's different. China has a different perspective. But I'm well known in leading circles of China. I'm well known in leading circles in Russia. I'm well known in leading circles in India. I'm rather well known in the United States, as a matter of fact.

Therefore, I say, "Let's do it." And I say it to people, to nations, which are inclined to do it, as Putin has made clear, as China has made clear with its attitude toward the United States; and India, even though it's softer on the British, has also made clear in large degree. Those nations, which represent a *major part of the total human race*, if they agree with me, on this: We've got a show! It has to come from the United States, and it has to include these four nations. Without these four nations, *you can not have civilization on this planet, now!* What I'm proposing, very simply, is taking the reality of the present situation, and saying, "Let's bring back Franklin Roosevelt. Let's pick up today, the fallen chalice of Franklin Roosevelt, and let's put it back to work." Why? Because Russia knows there's no alternative but that. Russia is saying, "The United States must change. We want to cooperate with the United States." Great! Great asset. China: "We want to cooperate with the United States." Great! India, to a large degree, wants to cooperate with the United States. Other nations want that.

The United States government, at present, doesn't want it; the British government doesn't want it. But to hell with them! We represent the majority of the human race! We represent the interests of the majority of the human race! Why should these guys hold us back?

What you need, is the guts to get up and say it, just as I just said it now. And you'll find out, that there are people, in these parts of the world—I'm not just talking about an abstract formula—I'm talking about governments *which I know*; at least know well enough to make this kind of proposal. I know what their tendency will be: If the United States makes the offer that I propose be made, *they will respond!* If we don't make that kind of offer, we haven't got a damned chance.

Therefore, we're going to do it, because otherwise, we're finished. We are, as some people say, "history."