

LaRouche: Aristotle is the root of the evil we confront today

Lyndon LaRouche made the following remarks in a taped message to the annual conference of the International Caucus of Labor Committees on Aug. 31.

Let me begin here by saying once again, as I've said on a number of earlier occasions, that since approximately the time of the assassination of President Kennedy, this planet of ours has been plunging at a generally accelerating rate into a general economic, social, and moral collapse.

What we've been plunging into, is a global holocaust of famines, epidemics, pestilences, local wars, outbreaks of mass insanity, and general population collapse.

Taking these things all together, what we have is a New Dark Age, like that of 14th-century Europe. Let me also say once again, that the primary cause of this onrushing global disaster is to be found in the fact, that as U.S. policies have been successfully changed many times, the net effect of every such new reform during the past 25 years, is a radical worsening of the situation—whether we're talking about economics, tax policy, banking policy, monetary and trade policies, all or any aspects of regulatory policy, educational policy, health care, civil rights, criminal justice, and so on and on and on.

Given this record, anyone today who is proposing to address these problems by soothing forms of useful, practical suggestions to Washington, is displaying nothing more than his own self-degrading, cowardly delusions. The problem of a homicidal lunatic is *not* that he lacks directions to his destination.

We must follow a more dangerous, more abrasive profession than producing political, practical suggestions. We must address directly that insanity which permeates the U.S. government's policy-shaping processes. We must detect, we must expose, we must publicize, and we must *uproot* those deep-rooted weeds of madness which have become the politically correct axioms of neo-malthusian, free trade policy-shaping.

What official Washington needs, is not helpful suggestions; what it needs is a new Moses to pelt the Pharaohs of the Potomac with a succession of plagues, meteorological horrors, and a grand assortment of creeping, crawling, flying, hopping, and slithering pestilences.

With that said, let's turn our memories to March 23, 1989, when two of the world's leading authorities in electrochemistry, Professors Martin Fleischmann and Stanley Pons, issued the shattering announcement that they had achieved nuclear fusion of hydrogen isotope deuterium in a room-

temperature environment by means of an experimental apparatus which might fit upon a kitchen table-top. After a few stunned outcries of admiration and curiosity from some circles, the subject of cold fusion and the hundreds of cold fusion scientists, have been subjected over the past two-odd years to one of the nastiest political witch-hunts in recent history.

Today, nearly 30 months after the first cold fusion announcement, the findings of approximately 600 scientists working in various parts of the world, is that the essential original claims of Professors Fleischmann and Pons are validated. Whatever the cold fusion experiments lead us to discover in the end, it is clear now, that the cold fusion experiment is what science calls a *crucial* or *unique quality* of discovery. It is the kind of discovery which will force much of the physics textbooks to be rewritten sooner or later.

It is not my purpose here, today, to dwell much longer on the subject of cold fusion. My subject today is a major policy problem, which the fight over cold fusion helps to put into clearer focus. I became involved in the cold fusion matter shortly after the initial 1989 announcement. It was already clear to me then, and to some scientists in a number of other countries around the world, that if the results of the experiment were validated, what we had on our hands was the beginning of a first-rate scientific revolution. It happened that the area cold fusion touched most significantly had been the principal area of interest of an international science seminar in which I had participated for the Fusion Energy Foundation during the 1983-1988 period with the Fusion Energy Foundation and others. From the standpoint of those Fusion Energy Foundation seminars, the features of the cold fusion experiments which were of leading interest to us during 1989 and today, are the following.

First, the leading theoretical issue posed by the cold fusion experiments is the continuing fight: whether physics on the approximate scale of an atomic nucleus behaves as the followers of Aristotle and Isaac Newton would wish to believe. I, for one, am certain that it does not, and my recently deceased dear friends, Professors Robert Moon and Winston Bostick, are among those who have done very much to make that point clear.

Secondly, cold fusion, like all of the work on nuclear fusion and nuclear fission over the course of this century, belongs to a very specific part of physical chemistry: the perfection of the so-called Mendeleyev periodic table of the elements. The members of the Fusion Energy Foundation's

seminars, working intensively on this problem, the foundation's associated scientists, had done much to go beyond Prof. Arnold Sommerfeld's tentative efforts to show that nuclear space-time in the very small is Keplerian, not the space of Newton and Maxwell. Professor Moon, who himself was an accomplished former student of the pioneering professor William Draper Harkins, was working at the time of his death on a revolutionary improvement in the design of the periodic table.

The aspect of the cold fusion experience which brings me to the principal subject which I wish to present before you

What official Washington needs, is not helpful suggestions; what it needs is a new Moses to pelt the Pharaohs of the Potomac with a succession of plagues, meteorological horrors, and a grand assortment of creeping, crawling, flying, hopping, and slithering pestilences.

summarily today, is twofold.

First of all, the cold fusion experiments have created a crisis within science: a legitimate crisis, that once in awhile, some fact turns up, some discovery, which shows us that science as we have understood it, has to be sort of re-written, and scientists have to find out where the mistakes are, and the blocks in their thinking, and be prepared to make a revolution. Let's call this *an epistemological perplexity* for science: that the general assumptions about scientific method up to this point, *may break down* in the effort to find a solution to the questions posed by the cold fusion experiments.

The second aspect of the cold fusion experiments, which leads to my subject here today, is the viciousness, the irrationality, of the political witch-hunt which has been run against the cold fusion scientists over the past 30 months (or nearly so) not only by the *New York Times*, but by the editors of *Nature* magazine joined by the editors of *Science* magazine and many others, echoed in many fields by many scientists (or people who should be scientists), who are babbling like some kind of members of a mob recruited from an Oriental cult, or something of that sort.

The cult of Buggery vs. Cusa and Kepler

Let's situate the problem in terms of science as such.

What we call modern science—that is, the idea of an integrated, comprehensive mathematical physics, or physical science, began during the second quarter of the 15th century—we might say, in effect, at about the time of the

1439 Council of Florence. From inside science itself, the policy and perspective, the Christian Platonic approach to science typified by the work of Cusa, who is the virtual founder of modern science, by Leonardo da Vinci, and by followers such as Kepler, was essentially uncontested, that is, within science itself, up until about the beginning of the 17th century; and after that period, the foundations of science laid by, principally, Cusa, Leonardo da Vinci, and Kepler, were continued by people such as Desargues, Fermat, Huygens, Leibniz, the Bernoullis, and so forth, into Monge and Poncelet, Riemann, Gauss, and Cantor, in the 19th century.

The problem on which we should focus, both in science—that is, the problem of lack of understanding of what the cold fusion experiments signify, the crisis in science, the epistemological crisis in science prompted by the cold fusion experiments' results, and the witch-hunt itself—both go back to something which happened essentially during the 17th century in England and France. On the British side, the problem was the establishment of what became known as British empiricism by a group of Rosicrucian cultists associated with Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, Elias Ashmole (the founder of British Freemasonry), John Locke and, of course, including Isaac Newton.

These people introduced an anti-Renaissance, what was considered at that period an anti-science, Aristotelian method, which was infused in a very peculiar with one element. This element was the introduction into science of what became known as empiricism, but was originally the central feature of the most notorious, sexually perverted religious cult in the history of medieval Europe—that is, the Cathar, Bogomil, or Buggery cult from the district of southern France associated with Albi and Toulouse.

The same thing happened in France itself. Buggery, in the form of the influence of this cult upon science, manifested itself in the work of René Descartes, particularly in Descartes's notion of *deus ex machina*. This established Cartesianism as a form of Buggery which had been traditional in French science and poisoning it or buggery it to the present day. This is quite literally the case: a Rosicrucian cult (which featured alchemy as one of its claims to fame), which was Aristotelian, cabbalistic, and Buggery (that is, it featured this split between spirit and flesh, as the new materialistic doctrine), which is characteristic of the Buggery cult of south France, of the Rhône district and Albi-Toulouse centuries earlier.

This cult merits a little bit of attention just so we know what we're talking about. Most people don't know this.

Before Christianity, there were established some very vicious cults in the area near Babylon: Oriental cults. These cults led to the various manifestations of a particular form of cult called *Manicheanism*. Now, one of these Manichean cults was situated in the eastern part of Turkey in the mountainous areas. For awhile, this cult was used—it was a very vicious, bloody-handed cult—by the Caliphate against the Byzantine Empire. Later, according to Gibbon and others, a



Aristotle on All Fours, in a drawing by Hans Baldung Grien, a German artist in the school of Dürer, dated 1503. A popular medieval tradition portrayed the "great philosopher" allowing himself to be ridden like a beast and whipped by the courtesan Phyllis—a rather insightful glimpse into the psychology behind Aristotelian "science."

Byzantine Emperor called Constantine Copronymous took the cult, transplanted it or a good part of it from eastern Anatolia and stuck it in what was then Thrace, which is today modern Bulgaria. This cult was given the position of guarding the northern borders of the Byzantine Empire against these Slavs who were coming down into the area at the time.

As a result, as the cult became embedded there, sponsored by the Byzantine Empire, no less, the cult took a Slavic name, and became known as not only the Cathars, but also the Bogomils. The cult was spread by Venetian bankers working on behalf of the Byzantine Empire, into the south of France, where it was known variously thus, as the Bogomil cult, which is what the Bulgarian branch of the cult called

itself, the Cathars, which all called themselves, that is, the Cathars, the "pure," or the purified, and it was also known in France as the Bulgarian cult. So we had the French *les bougres*, which was translated into English for the convenience of the English speaker, as "the Buggers."

Now, because of this cult's peculiar sexual perversion—that is, the belief that a man putting semen into a woman to impregnate her, was propagating the flesh, and that was evil—it resorted to various other kinds of sexual recreation and thus the name "Bugger" in English became associated with what it has become associated with in English to this day. So quite literally, Francis Bacon and his tribe buggered science—and the result of this was empiricism. And a similar thing happened in France, in the form of the cult of Descartes,

of Cartesianism.

This cult, this pseudo-alchemic cult called “Rosicrucian” during that period, and later called Freemasonic (based on the Freemasonic orders which were spun out of Rosicrucianism by people such as Elias Ashmole, Bacon, Hobbes, Locke and so forth), has been the dominant influence in what is called (or was called partly during the 17th century and more so during the 18th century), “the Enlightenment.”

The characteristic of the Enlightenment is that it was anti-Renaissance, and that it promoted materialism. Now, let’s look exactly at what that means, and how that affects the kind of problem in science we’re dealing with in cold fusion today, how the two things intersect. First, as I said, we’ll look, from the scientific side, at the epistemological crisis, and secondly, let’s look at it from the standpoint of the cult aspect of the crisis.

The Platonic method

In reality, what we call “modern science” is a highly subjective business. People who run around talking about “objective science” really show that they don’t know much about the history of science.

What do we do in science?

Well, science is something which can happen only to a human being—or human beings. Only human beings, as distinct from any other kind of animal, can change the behavior of the human species to such effect, that we not only change our behavior, but through these changes, we increase the potential population-density and the quality of development of the members of the species.

By testing the results of our changes, or our methods of making these changes, against their effects in terms of increase of potential population density, we are using nature, or testing our ability to increase our power over nature, and using that kind of experiment, to determine whether the method we are using to make these changes is a sound method (not necessarily a perfect method, but a *sound* one). And thus science is based on *testing not* particular experiments, not whether *A* causes *B*; but what science actually tests is whether the method we *used* to attempt to understand the relationship between *A* and *B*, and to generate successive ideas above *A* and *B*, whether that method, by virtue of the fact that it leads to increases in the potential population-density of mankind, is an effective method.

By *method*, we mean what Plato called the *principle of hypothesis*, or the *higher hypothesis*. And Plato also referred to things such as *improving the higher hypothesis*, which is known as *hypothesizing the higher hypothesis*. (Much of this material, I should note incidentally, is the subject of a very special campaign paper on science policy, which I hope will be issued in the not-too-distant future, so you can refer to that as the time comes to do so, but in the meantime, just to indicate what we’re doing here.) The result is that science represents, thus, *mind over matter*. It represents man’s cre-

ative powers of mind, the powers of valid creative scientific discovery, or the powers of creation in classical musical composition—not in rock, but in classical music composition. These powers of the human mind exert *power* over the lawful ordering of the universe through scientific and technological progress, as manifest by the increase of man’s power per capita over the universe, as measured in terms of potential population-density’s increases. So that’s what science is, and that’s what science was understood to be, by the founder of modern European science, Nicolaus of Cusa,

The leading theoretical issue posed by the cold fusion experiments is the continuing fight: whether physics on the approximate scale of an atomic nucleus behaves as the followers of Aristotle and Isaac Newton would wish to believe. I, for one, am certain that it does not.

back in the second quarter and a little bit later of the 15th century, by Leonardo da Vinci, Cusa’s student, in a sense, his immediate follower of his ideas in the latter part of the 15th century and early 16th century; by the great follower of Cusa and Leonardo, Johannes Kepler, and so forth, and so on.

Science has always meant that; science has always been subjective in the sense that the subject of science is to look over our own shoulders, as we are developing improved methods of scientific investigation, and to determine what direction of improvements are successful in terms of potential population-density, and which methods are not provable. But essentially, science is the study of the human mind’s capability of generating valid science. It is not a study of what happens outside our skins in nature—except through the medium. The only way we can understand nature, is through the creative powers of mind, and therefore, those creative powers of mind, which we watch as we work on nature, and watching our minds work more or less successfully as we work on nature, is the essence of science.

Now what the Bogomils did, and what their followers did, the Rosicrucians, the empiricists, is that they said we will tolerate none of this. We must separate the human mind, i.e., the human spirit, entirely from those things which involve the human flesh, its emotions, its appetites, and so forth—in other words, from the material side. We must have a separate doctrine for the material side, separate from the spiritual side, the mental side. In other words, to use modern Enlightenment language, we would say we would separate

the subjective realm from the objective realm—or, in 19th-century German, we would say we must separate *Naturwissenschaft* from *Geisteswissenschaft*. That's the essential separation. That is the mark of the Enlightenment. That is the mark, for example, of Immanuel Kant, who, while he was not recruited directly to my knowledge to Buggery, nonetheless, by virtue of his defense of both Baconian empiricism and Cartesianism against Leibniz, was actually the lawyer for the Buggers, and thus a Bugger in principle. That's the nature of the problem.

We come to cold fusion. We touch a very special part of this problem, as we do also at the other extreme of the scale in astrophysics. Go back a step to Leonardo, just to remind those who are not familiar with this.

Leonardo da Vinci demonstrated that physical processes, which, in geometric harmonic ordering, are *congruent* with what's called the Golden Section, are living processes, and that *only* living process have this harmonic ordering, whereas all processes which are not living processes, have a different harmonic ordering. That's one of the great discoveries of Leonardo da Vinci. It was the central discovery by da Vinci used by Kepler to found modern mathematical physics. In a paper, for example, entitled *The Six-Cornered Snowflake*, whose publication dates from about 1620, Kepler summarized this case, showing why snowflakes have to be hexagonal in their essential architecture, whereas living processes are different, are pentagonal, etc., and why that is necessarily the case. It's a beautiful paper, and anyone who wants to really pass the equivalent of what would be a good secondary geometry course, would, of course, have mastered that paper. When we get to the large scale, the astrophysical scale, as Kepler shows; or, when we get to the very small, down to the size of an atomic nucleus, or something of that sort, down below 10^{-10} meters; at these extremes, matter behaves with the same harmonic ordering, that we would otherwise expect from Leonardo's standpoint of living processes.

Now, this would mean that the universe as a whole is, in its astrophysical scale, what we call negentropic, not entropic as most physicists will insist today; that the universe as a whole does *not* conform to the so-called Second Law of Thermodynamics, and that also in the very small, as we've seen by the work of our collaborator, the late Prof. Winston Bostick and the work of Professor Moon and others, we've seen the same thing is true in the very small. In the very small, the organization of nature is that which conforms to Kepler's physics, not Newton's or Maxwell's, just as is the case in astrophysics: the Second Law of Thermodynamics works nowhere, except to increase the salaries of professors and to get good marks for students of those professors. Otherwise, the Second Law of Thermodynamics, except for bamboozling people, does not work at all. It works only as rhetoric.

As a result of this split—the rejection of Kepler by the empiricists and by Descartes, and the attempt to establish a

mechanistic or Aristotelian system, that is, a non-living system model, so-called objective science—science since the 17th century has been split into two camps.

What is at stake in the cold fusion is essentially this. If one says, that on the scale of the nucleus, the universe is organized as the students of Newton and Maxwell would have us believe, then cold fusion is virtually impossible—at least, cold fusion of this type. Whereas, if we would say that physics in the very small is organized as Kepler said of the universe generally, as Leonardo said, and as Arnold Sommerfeld, for example, was attempting to explore, then cold fusion is possible.

Well, cold fusion has happened. And this, again, would say that physics in the small—that is, in the area of the scale of the nucleus, or half an Angstrom unit, or something of that sort, or an Angstrom unit—but in this scale, nuclear physics is much more interesting, much more as our dear friend Dr. Moon would have suggested.

What we are talking about in physics, or physical chemistry, belongs to the periodic table in this sense, and this goes back actually to Nicolaus of Cusa, who laid out a concept of universal evolution along these lines.

The idea of the periodic table, as Mendeleev developed it, indicates that the existence of elements, or what we call elements, starts probably from very simple ones, such as hydrogen, or hydrogen and helium, as Dr. Moon's professor, William Draper Harkins, argued, and that it is the combination of the fusion of hydrogen and helium, or something of that sort, out of which all of the elements in the universe that we encounter are built up. The other side of the process, of course, which has been documented by Dr. Tennenbaum and others recently, is that we have a contrary process, that we can also form elements, not only by putting elements together, to build up from those of small atomic number to those of large atomic number, but we can also, by fission, go down the ladder again, and get to smaller elements, from higher numbers. So, to have this kind of process requires something—a universe which, in the small, is Keplerian, not the universe of Aristotle, Newton, and Maxwell. And that's where the teaching of a doctrine derived from empiricism and Cartesianism, a doctrine derived from Buggery, leads science to use a kind of mathematical procedure or mathematical method, which constantly comes into crisis whenever an experiment with the anomalous implications of cold fusion comes along.

So the fact that our students in the schools, to the extent that they're taught mathematics at all, are taught defective mathematics, means that we are producing scientists and others, who lack the intellectual capacity to cope with something like a cold fusion experiment. So that's one of the problems which science policy has to address, and that's an area in which the cold fusion experiment's success shows that our science policy in education and so forth is breaking down, and we will have to rebuild the science policy entirely

from the beginning.

The second aspect in which this same historical background is relevant, is on the characteristic, the cult features, of this *hideous* political witch-hunt, completely fraudulent attack, made against cold fusion and the cold fusion scientists over the past 30 months, by people such as the editor of *Nature* magazine and the *New York Times*.

Where does this come from? How is it possible, that in an area where we say that people in science are trying to find out the truth about nature, are trying to find out how to do things better, trying to correct their errors, that a completely fraudulent attack, like this political witch-hunt, could have been started and sustained for so long?

Buggery and British empiricism

To understand that, we have to go back again to the case of Bacon and Descartes. Let's concentrate just on Francis Bacon, in order to simplify the discussion for our purposes here. *British empiricism was founded by a homosexual cult which is called the Court of King James I*, whose big homosexual was Francis Bacon. Now the significance of the homosexuality, is that this was a Buggery cult, a bunch of Rosicrucians; a Rosicrucian cult, whose features were Aristotelianism as to method; cabbalism, another kind of Satanic belief, and thirdly, the spirit-from-matter separation, which has led to modern materialism. This was the Enlightenment.

If you realize the degree to which the teachings of the followers of Bacon, of Hobbes, of John Locke, of cabbalist Isaac Newton—who really discovered almost nothing—and of similar people, dominate the institutions of science today, universities, educational policy, major magazines, such as *Nature* magazine, the science [mafia's] magazine, we have to realize that, like music, which is administered by a music mafia of about the same morality and disgusting depravity, that science on the administrative side or the institutional side, is effectively under the control today predominantly—not entirely, of course—but predominantly, of a *priesthood*; a *heathen-cult priesthood*; a Rosicrucian-Cathar-Bugger priesthood, which responds to the attacks on its interests, that is, its religious dogma, its cult dogma, called empiricism, or Enlightenment views, in the same way that the Buggers as religious fanatics would *kill* a person who offended their doctrine. And so, to understand the world today, we have to first of all, in this area, in a narrow sense, look at the fact, that science is dominated, not by honest scientists, but by people who are predominantly, when push comes to shove, representatives of a heathen-cult priesthood, rooted in the doctrines of Aristotle, cabbalism, and Buggery; that the same situation exists in the arts; you have an arts mafia, a music mafia, an art mafia, who are a collection of Buggers, pure and simple. The same group, the same crowd, the same faction. And that there is a Freemasonry, a higher-order Freemasonry, which is connected to this process.

There's another lesson which is to be learned from this,

and that is a lesson which I've insisted upon many times, but not with as much success as I might have admired. That is, history is not made by the way people respond more or less spontaneously to events. There is no *tabula rasa*; each person that is born is *enculturated*; enculturated by language, enculturated by all kinds of ways; so that we step forth into this world, from early childhood, not as a *tabula rasa*, but as a person who is imbued with all kinds of historical legacies.

For example, let's take the Indo-European language. You speak here, each of you, an Indo-European language. Or you may speak other languages, but you speak an Indo-European language. How old is Indo-European language? Well, obviously, we can go way back to about 8,000, 10,000 or more years! We can find in the ancient Vedic, and there's evidence to show that this record of the Vedic is not too far off today, at least the people at Poona, in India, have a pretty good picture of it; that that language, was used 8,000 years ago—the immediate ancestor of Sanskrit. We can also show, of course, that all of European languages are essentially dialects of Indo-European, that is, the language from which the Vedic springs. So every time you think, in words, in the form of language, you are using a way of conscious thinking which is thousands of years old, and the way you will respond, consciously, particularly because you have to communicate with others, you respond in terms of a heritage of language, which has features in it affecting your judgment, which are thousands of years old.

The same thing is true of other forms of language, such as geometry, which is a language. You think in geometry; the kind of geometry you use, will determine the way you think. And that is a heritage which is thousands of years old.

The same thing is true in every other respect. If you accept Buggery in the form of mathematics, mathematical physics, that is, Newtonianism, Cartesianism, empiricism generally; the separation of art from science, the separation of *Geisteswissenschaft* from *Naturwissenschaft* in German; if you accept that Kantian principle, if you are a follower of Kant, you are a Bugger! Because your mind is bugged; you have adopted the separation, what is called, of the subjective from the objective, which is traced back to the Manichean cult called the Buggers in southern France, nearly 1,000 years ago. And to the same Buggery in eastern Anatolia hundreds of years before that.

The way we must fight

The important thing to understand about history, is that we get into messes because society is responding to deeply embedded, historically embedded, false assumptions, which cause the normal reaction of public opinion as well as other institutions to be the wrong one.

Over the past 25 years, we've seen that concretely: Twenty-five years ago, approximately from 1963 on, there was a mass recruitment in the United States to the rock-drug-sex counterculture. You can't separate them; they're all one

package. A deliberate cult dogma, created by a Satanic cult—the Crowleyite cult in England—and put into the United States as the rock-drug-sex counterculture, which is really a form of Satanic religion, which changed the values of our people. At the same time (approximately the same period), this was coupled with a neo-Malthusian cult. If you look at our policy today, you see that people today, in contrast to what they believed 30 years ago, believe today that a post-industrial society is good, that technology is bad, that man must adapt to the animals and to all kinds of strange species

We were not stuck into prison because we said things which displeased somebody. I was stuck into prison with others, and we were subjected to all kinds of evil harassment, terrible lies spread through nearly all of the press repeatedly over and over again—why? Not because people didn't like what we said, but because we were effective with our methods.

we never knew existed, and so forth, and so on. The nuclear family is considered bad, all kinds of things have happened. We no longer behave the way we did; we no longer have the values. We have been subjected to what is called a cultural paradigm shift. The axioms and postulates of our underlying assumptions of belief, have been dramatically altered by these means. Similarly, over the past 400 years, Western civilization has been in the process of being de-civilized, by the influence of a Buggery cult based on the intermeshed beliefs of Aristotle or followers of Aristotle, of cabbalism, and of Buggery: the Cathar doctrine of the separation of matter from spirit, objective from subjective, and so forth and so on.

Therefore, we should see in this lesson, an identification of the problem which faces us: the Evil problem. It is not enough for us to respond to particular evils around us, to try to correct problems. That's not good enough. It won't work. If the majority of our population and our institutions are committed to policy assumptions, which policy assumptions are causing these problems, you will not be able to succeed in getting through any remedy which contradicts those policy assumptions. In order to shape history, one must address directly the underlying policy assumptions, the cultural assumptions, which underlie the characteristic response of institutions and populations. That is what we have done, I

believe, with more or less effectiveness, over the past couple of decades or so that this association has been in existence.

The reason I'm in prison, is because we're good at it, and because it works. We were not stuck into prison because we said things which displeased somebody. I was stuck into prison with others, and we were subjected to all kinds of evil harassment, terrible lies spread through nearly all of the press repeatedly over and over again—why?

Not because people didn't like what we said, but because we were effective with our methods.

What has the enemy said? The enemy has said we will cease to harass you, if you will give up your method, if you will stop doing that, if you will play ball on our terms, if you will make your criticisms or suggestions, within the confines of the kind of behavior which we consider acceptable. You want to say something in science? Say it in Baconian language; use the mathematics of Francis Bacon and Descartes's followers, and we'll listen to you. If you don't want to use that kind of argument, we won't listen to you. But if you use that kind of argument, and you succeed in influencing somebody, we're going to *kill* you. Because you're taking us back to Cusa, Leonardo, Kepler, and Leibniz, and so forth, and that we will not tolerate.

We attacked the underlying assumptions of the problems in Central and South America, and the result was Operation Juárez. We came within an ace of winning that battle in 1982; if we had won, the world would be vastly different than today, and all of Henry Kissinger's backers and George Bush's backers would be out of business. We were a threat. In the case of the SDI, which was a product of our influence upon the Reagan administration (a part of it), we changed the world somewhat, and had the proposal been in effect, why, then everything that Henry Kissinger's backers and those of Bush represented today, could not have been possible. In these cases, as in Operation Juárez, and our conception of the war on drugs back in 1978-79, where we invented the war on drugs; in each of these cases, we succeeded because we went back into history, went into the fundamentals of science and other things, to search out the *underlying assumptions which determined the theorems*, so to speak, upon which people were acting. And because we selected our action to attack and to change those flawed, underlying assumptions which were the causes of the problem, rather than to try to patch up the problem after the fact.

That is our contribution so far to history. That is a contribution which today, obviously, is much more needed, or much more *urgently* needed, than at any time during the past 20 years.

I would hope that in this time frame, that the lessons of that experience, as freshly illustrated by the case of cold fusion's implications, will be assimilated, and that people would find the courage to act, and to act on the basis, not that we are assured of success, but that there is no acceptable alternative but to do what we must do.