



A unique conference with a unique task

The world verges on the precipice of thermonuclear war, or at best, a new Dark Age, the international audience of over 600 was told. This situation can be altered, however, by "tilting the internal processes in the United States" away from the policies and policy-makers characterizing the Carter administration. And the persons in the audience and on the podium understood how to do that.

The keynote speaker was Lyndon LaRouche, a 57-year-old New Hampshire Democrat, currently running for President of the United States. His immediate audience was the International Caucus of Labor Committees, whose delegates and supporters filled Detroit's Cobo Hall the weekend of Dec. 27-Jan. 1.

The ICLC, which LaRouche founded over a decade ago, punctuated its conference proceedings with musical

performances of the works of the great composers, Beethoven, Bach and Mozart. It has branches in the U.S.A., Canada, Latin America, West Germany, Sweden and Italy, where it functions in scientific, artistic and political-intelligence capacities with great and growing influence.

LaRouche likens the organization to nothing else that has existed in the 20th century, but to Plato's Academy at Athens. And as the Academy at Athens defined its tasks, to create the scientific concepts needed for human progress, and to ensure the political rule of those dedicated to such concepts—e.g., Alexander the Great—so the ICLC defined its tasks.

That theme was the conference theme. Because from its inception in 1966 the ICLC was consciously based on the conceptual breakthrough recorded by LaRouche in applying Riemannian mathematical physics-conceptions to the domain of human political-economy, the organization has uniquely situated itself to lead in the creation of a new Golden Renaissance.

Hence the ICLC's emphasis, in its international work, and in its conference proceedings, on music, which Plato called the key to children's education, and LaRouche called essential to evoke every child's "potentiality to become a genius."

Of overriding immediate concern was the world strategic crisis defined by Afghanistan and Iran. The ICLC intends to function exactly as did Plato's Academy in a similar crisis. And LaRouche, driving for the presidency, pledged to perform as Alexander had in "compelling evil generals to do good."

LaRouche on Alexander

The following is an edited transcript of Lyndon H. LaRouche's keynote address to the conference of the International Caucus of Labor Committees at Cobo Hall in Detroit on Dec. 28, 1979.

Perhaps the best string to pull to get at the whole in this tattered fabric of present circumstances is to emphasize that U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance willfully, and with malice aforethought *caused* the taking of U.S. citizens as hostages in Iran, and that forces allied to Vance to this day, have been playing out that ugly scene with hostages in just the same manner that we saw earlier when a significant figure in Germany, Hanns-Martin Schleyer, was seized by the Baader Meinhof gang, held captive week after week during negotiations, and then *killed*. Some months later in Italy a former Prime Minister, Aldo Moro was seized also by the friends of Ramsey Clark, the Red Brigades, held captive, and then after the negotiations with the terrorists day after day, week after week, he was killed.

Similarly we see the United States being held hostage by the friends of Ramsey Clark, the Khomeiniac regime of Iran. And day by day our whole nation is being brainwashed by this Iranian crisis. The friends of Ramsey Clark, of Cyrus Vance, of Warren Christopher, of Arthur Goldberg, of Senator Edward Kennedy—the people that own Governor Brown—sit there holding our citizens hostage to a policy.

This was done by the Secretary of State of the United States, Cyrus Vance, *against* the United States. And the Carter administration asked us for "national unity" behind this policy.

Last spring, another member of the Carter administration, Harold Brown, together with echoes from Zbigniew Brzezinski, (who does make political statements when he's not attacking waitresses) said they had a plan to develop a 110,000 member U.S. strike force that will be targeted into the Middle East Persian Gulf area. During last spring they proposed to European governments that this policy be supported. Every government in Europe except the British said "You're insane." The

American people wouldn't go for it, particularly over the European opposition. But Mr. Vance, the Carter administration, were determined to put a U.S. military force in the Middle East.

So they said, "Let's have a mini Pearl Harbor. We'll psych out the American people, and then they'll *scream* for us to put military forces in the Middle East." That's the immediate reason that Secretary of State Cyrus Vance orchestrated the seizure of the U.S. embassy and the taking of hostages, with full foreknowledge that bringing the shah into the United States would probably cause that action at that time.

Now, why do they want to put a military force in the Middle East?

Well, to shut off the world's oil supply—why else? To overthrow the government of Saudi Arabia. The Saudis have complained that the U. S. government, led by the *Kennedy* forces in the Congress and Justice Department, with fake scandal-mongering, are trying to do to Saudi Arabia what they did over the past year and a half to Iran.

After Treasury Secretary Miller was kicked out of Saudi Arabia, and told, "Cut this out," Kennedy upped the ante. And the scandals started to pour out of the New York Times and so on.

The Kennedy forces want to destroy Saudi Arabia, to cut off the world's oil supply from Saudi Arabia, just as they are doing in Iran. They want to engulf the entire region on which the bulk of the world marketing supply of petroleum now depends in chaos and cut off the oil.

So the day those forces go there, don't cheer, "the boys are landing!" Say, "Boy, that's the last time you saw oil for a long time to come." That's what's at stake.

This policy was decided this past spring, at the Arden House mansion of former New York governor Averell Harriman. All of the big oil companies were there—British Petroleum, Royal Dutch Shell, Mobil, Exxon.

The policy was argued at Arden House. Herman Schmidt of Mobil Corporation took the same position that British Petroleum and Royal Dutch Shell did. And Exxon capitulated. Since that time, the oil companies have been dedicated not *only* to ripping off the United States, but to cutting off a good deal of the world's oil supply, knowing that the consequences of this are death, famine, epidemic, and social chaos for a great deal of the world's population.

The oil companies cold-bloodedly made a decision which makes Adolf Hitler look relatively like a humanitarian. And the Carter administration, the people who own CBS, the people who own ABC, the people who own NBC, the people who own the New York Times, the people who own the Detroit Free Press—these people are wittingly complicit in this treason against the United States, and this willful genocide against most of the world's population.

Now, for some period of time, particularly since the Carter administration was inaugurated, the only thing that's prevented the world from going to war—and I mean thermonuclear war in all probability—has been a developing coalition led by the President of France, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, and a somewhat progressively developing figure, Helmut Schmidt, the Chancellor of West Germany. The Paris-Bonn alliance and the creation of the European Monetary System has been the *only thing* holding up the value of the U.S. dollar while the Carter administration has been trying to drive it down.

Similarly, the Europeans have been the only force which has been preventing the implementation of full-scale genocide in the developing sector. The policies of the Carter administration are for genocide. Let's not make any bones about this; let's not be polite. Let's call a murderer a murderer. The Carter administration is the most immoral thing, second to Peking, which the 20th century has seen in the form of an administration of any country. Carter doesn't know what he's doing, he's too dumb to understand. It's the people who are running him that are the trouble. The Carter administration is wittingly dedicated to a policy which the designers of the policy *predict* will reduce the world's population from its present level of above 4 billion to a level of between 1 and 2 billion by the end of this century—in two decades.

They are *pure evil*, in the Biblical sense of *Satanic*. There's no morality which justifies anybody supporting the candidacy of Kennedy or Carter or Connally or Brown or Bush or Reagan. They're all supporting the same policy—whether it's the dummies because of the people that run them, or because they're conscious of what they're doing, like John Connally. There's no morality in a citizen who supports such people.

War by miscalculation

That's the reality we face. With the capitulation of Paris and Bonn to national unity, and with the treasonous and genocidal character of the Carter administration, the Soviets have gone crazy. The forces in the Soviet Union which were cooperating with Schmidt and Giscard have just been set back, in what amounts to a virtual coup d'état.

At this point, the dominant force in Moscow is associated with a formerly deposed president of the Soviet Union, Podgorny, who is for a confrontation policy against the United States in the Third World. In the United States we have a Carter administration, which, when it's not committing treason and genocide, is seeking a confrontation with the Soviet Union. We are on a collision course in which the general policy of the world is now toward genocide worse than Hitler's. As an added feature, you have the two principal powers in the world, the United States and the Soviet Union, on a

collision course which leads directly toward thermonuclear war by strategic miscalculation.

There's only one way that is clearly visible, by which the world at this time can be swerved off the present course, the present plunge into a genocidal new Dark Age of humanity, and that is to tilt the internal political processes, the institutionalized political processes, inside the United States.

The only way you can tilt the process in the United States is to tilt it in terms of the election campaigns. As long as the world believes that Bush, Reagan, Connally, Carter and Kennedy are the choices for the presidency in 1980, the world will probably not survive—at least, civilization as we know it. Therefore unless we have a candidate who is perceived to have institutionalized momentum and potential, who represents an opposite policy, we cannot straighten the world out; we cannot prevent the continued plunge toward a new Dark Age.

As President of the United States, I will compel evil to do good, moving the world on momentum, around the leadership which consciously understands how to do that. . . .

Unless you get, in the United States, the kind of policy that says: "Send Cyrus Vance up the steps of the gibbet, and hang the creature for treason," we are going, perhaps to World War III, but certainly into a new Dark Age. And the masses of people behind their accepted leaders, in their considered judgment, in their democratic opinion, are right now marching into the hell of a new Dark Age, led by Satanic forces.

Maybe half the world's population, maybe more, will die over the next 20 years, in a new Dark Age like that spanning the middle of the 13th to the middle of the 14th Century.

The only thing that can change this at this time has to come from within the United States. My campaign has to become the institutionalization of a new force, challenging credibly such swine as Bush, Reagan, Connally, Carter and Kennedy for the presidential nomination and election.

The Alexander model

The way to look at the world today in terms of these problems, is with the example of Alexander the Great in mind. It's obvious Schmidt can't do much more than he's doing. He's a limited man. I appreciate what he repre-

sents, but he's not a world leader. He's just a competent statesman, better than what we feel we might get otherwise. Giscard is a little higher quality, in terms of culture and intellectual development, but he's no world leader. He's just the best we've got. Indira Gandhi is a very good indispensable person, but I know her limitations.

They're not going to lead the world out of this mess. *They have already failed.* They had the opportunities. We told them in many cases what the opportunities were. They lacked the courage and perception to act. And it's their failure when they could have *won* this fight, and stopped this hell, that's brought us to this mess.

Don't tell me about the rest of the leaders of the world—*I have measured them and they have all failed.*

Don't talk to me about nations. Don't talk to me about "the Soviet Union is not going to go along with genocide." They will. Nothing will prevent it. Don't talk to me about "mass movements," don't give me any of the pragmatic things. They don't work. In fact, they have greased the skids.

So, let us look back, to the fourth century BC and the case of Alexander the Great, because that's the key to what I must try to do now, the key to the only thing that is going to prevent this sick human race, this civilization, which has declared itself morally unfit to survive, from dying. In the fourth century BC, the world was in a horrible mess. The ugliest obscenity up to that time, the Persian Empire, dominated the world. The allies of the Babylonian cults, which ran the Persian empire, were running Egypt—the cult of Isis, the cult of Thebes. The city-states of Ionia had been crushed. The majority of the forces in Athens were corrupt and rotten. The evil cult of Apollo, of Delphi ran much of Greece, and was already running Rome which at that time was little more than an obscure hick town in the Mediterranean.

The preponderance of forces in the world was evil—as it is today. There was a great scheme afoot, very much like the One-World scheme of Bertrand Russell, H.G. Wells, Aldous Huxley, and Robert M. Hutchins, and all these other United Nations type kooks. They were going to divide the world. This "all one Persian empire" thing wasn't working out. They had to make two Persian empires.

Philip of Macedon, aided by the *cult* agent Aristotle as well as others, had the scheme of conquering Greece from Macedonia and then using the Greek forces, which were the only qualified fighting troops in the world at that time, to carve up the world between an Eastern Persian empire and a Western Persian empire, or a Western empire based on what was called the oligarchical or Persian model.

It was in this setting, that the work of Plato, the conspiratorial organization known as the Academy at Athens, developed. Philip of Macedon, with his homo-

sexual generals, was about to go down to Asia Minor to accomplish this great project, the creation of two Persian empires, that is, a "One World" arranged into regional sections. At that point Philip was assassinated. In the ensuing affray, Alexander the Great, a protégé of the Academy of Athens and advised by them, took over. He led the pederastic generals—who never improved their morality—to destroy the Persian Empire.

During the brief period of his remaining life Alexander set into motion the greatest city building project, the greatest project in human development, that mankind has ever seen. There were Alexander cities all over the world and more planned, great trade development and great cultural development. Then Aristotle's agents poisoned Alexander, and the pederastic, sodomy-performing generals took over again. They destroyed most of his work, and that great hideous obscenity called the Roman Empire took over, flinging humanity, in the

Unless you get in the United States the kind of policy that says send Cyrus Vance up the steps of the gibbet for treason, we are going perhaps to World War III...

course of its existence, into a genocidal dark age. But the process of Neoplatonic conspiracy managed to save civilization, such as we have it today.

We must look at the world today not in terms of "which good countries as objective entities has the right presidents, and ruling parties, and do they represent the majority, and can they run the world, and are we safe." It cannot work that way. The people are ignorant, including the people in the United States. The population of the United States is morally unfit to survive in terms of its political behavior—what it tolerates from the media, what it tolerates in making homosexuality a political *cause*, the fact that it tolerates drugs.

Don't tell me what candidate the people like. Their opinion has no weight with me. The question is, do the people have the ability to overcome such stupidity and manifest those better qualities which lie within them waiting to be evoked, and can I help evoke them.

The only way to move the world is to move it just as Alexander moved armies, which were full of sodomy, and kept them too busy to become pederastic at the moment. He engaged them in battles which they could not conceive, and which they did not want to fight, but the very force of motion compelled them to do that. And

so by keeping the forces in the correct motion, evil was compelled to do good because it was so moved to do against its will. And that's the way we're going to move this world—on momentum, momentum around the leadership which consciously understands how to do that. That's why I must become President of the United States.

I do not propose to make the United States an empire. I am not an ambitious person. I am merely hubristic. I propose, that by taking the presidency, over the next eight or nine years I shall take nations, and heads of state, unwilling instruments, and I shall *compel* them to do good, by forcing them to move in the direction where I know how to use the power of the United States to force them to move.

I am going to do what Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of all people, promised to do in 1944. Roosevelt promised to Churchill, at the Casablanca meeting: "No more will the United States fight world wars to save the British Empire in any shape or guise."

No more will the United States tolerate the British system, whether colonial or neocolonial. No more will the United States tolerate the economics of Adam Smith in any part of the world. We are going to take the aching, poor, hungry world, and we're going to transform it with American methods. We're going to transform it with export of American development and high technology. We'll have Manhattan projects and NASA projects and every dirigist, federally directed scientific crash program that we deem necessary.

The creation of geniuses

Now that brings me to the point about the International Caucus of Labor Committees. Although we did not set out to do so consciously back in 1966, for very lawful reasons, this organization became a replication of the Academy of Athens, in terms of the scope and direction of work. This developed over a period of years, largely because of the fact that from the inception, the organization was based on the conception of political economy and method, in which the conception of multi-connected manifolds associated with Riemann was the central determining conception which shaped the way our judgement developed. And as we came in contact with opposing forces on this, ripping behind the stage props to find out what the reality is behind the appearance, we sorted these forces out, and we found ourselves becoming like the Platonic Academy. We have therefore found our activities variegated beyond the domain of political science. One of the things we are emphasizing is education of children, and certainly not because of the Year of the Child.

We have two problems: first of all, drugs; and a miserly, dastardly, treasonous destruction of the process of education. We are turning out increasingly from our secondary schools students who are not qualified to graduate from the third grade. The mind, the productivity, the potential of our society is being ruined. Some say, "Well, let's at least get back to what we had in the 1950's, something that works, even though it may have imperfections." But that is not adequate. We have to make reforms, not in the direction of socially relevant basket weaving and sensitivity courses, or "mainstream education" as they call it now. We need to come up with new approaches which facilitate the development of the potential genius of every child. We are tired of producing mediocrity.

The reality is that most children have the potentiality to be a genius, if that potentiality is developed and seized upon early enough and given the correct direction. We took seriously the question of focusing on music, because we recognized that Plato was right, as Al Farabi also knew, that the first thing that a child is capable of mastering in the sense of organized education is the well-tempered system of counterpoint. This is the first thing a child's mind can master, in terms of a comprehensive knowledge of lawfulness on the one hand, and freedom, i.e. creativity in the context of lawfulness on the other. The child now understands something that he or she never understood, that to be creative is *not* to violate the laws of the universe but to develop new qualities of solutions in terms of the basic law of the universe. Once the child's mind grasps that freedom and creativity and law are not antagonistic unless you misunderstand law, then the foundation of reference is laid for the child to understand anything. After the child's mind has been given a foundation by learning the music of Bach and Beethoven the next thing is geometry, but not the way it's taught in school. We're talking about geometry taught without Q.E.D., without *logic*, without Aristotelianism. Because Aristotelianism destroys the mind. And once they've learned geometry we're going to teach them physics—at the age of 8, 9, 10. I do not want a single child in this nation to reach the age of 16 in the future without being a qualified genius in physics. We need that, and it can be done.

Look back to the aftermath of the last Dark Age in the 14th century. Out of the bowels of the Black Death, after half the population of Europe had been wiped out within a century by the same policies that Vance and Kissinger represent today, a group of people like us saved the world by organizing the Golden Renaissance.

The only way to resist the Dark Age is to generate the additional, vital resources of knowledge through which the world can be steered into a new Golden Renaissance.