

# LaRouche movement debates 'heavy ideas' to save civilization

by EIR Staff

About 1,200 political activists from around the United States and many foreign countries met in Vienna, Virginia over Labor Day weekend, for the semi-annual conference of the Schiller Institute and the International Caucus of Labor Committees. Under the banner of "1995-1996, The Year of Decision," leaders of the movement led by economist and Democratic presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche presented what LaRouche himself, in his keynote speech, called the "heavy ideas" required to prevent the destruction of human civilization, in the coming 18- to 24-month period of inevitable financial collapse.

LaRouche's keynote presentation situated the political tasks of the period from the standpoint of "universal history," the centuries-long battle between the forces of the Renaissance republican movement, and the Venetian-British oligarchical system. Provocatively titling his speech "How to Tell If the News Is Newsworthy," the candidate stressed the need for individuals to challenge the false assumptions of their fellow citizens, and to act to shape the policy of the U.S. government in the direction of the bankruptcy reorganization which he has outlined.

"We've come to the point," LaRouche said, "that the collapse of the economy, the change in the form of our economy, has brought us to the inevitable doom of the existing world monetary and financial system. *Nothing can stop the imminent doom of this system within the next 18 to 24 months, and it could come earlier.*

"That is, within 18 to 24 months, the entire world financial system and monetary system in its present form, *will have ceased to exist*, and nothing can prevent that. The only alternatives are that the government, if it has the guts, particularly the government of the United States, intervene to put the Federal Reserve System and the attendant banks and financial institutions into what is equivalent to a Chapter 11 bankruptcy reorganization, in order to freeze the situation and put it under bankruptcy control."

What can we do, LaRouche asked, to prevent this crisis from leading to the destruction of human civilization? This is a question of mastering *ideas* that can change the world, of learning the lessons of universal history.

"If we have the power to influence the course of history, as individuals," he said, "and the choice is between the doom of civilization and recovery from the grip of this crisis, then

each of us has a corresponding moral responsibility to muster from within ourselves those capacities which enable us to do our part in shaping the course of civilization.

"Now, under that rubric, I say, the question is: What kind of news is newsworthy? Because if what I'm saying is true, that *you* represent, as an individual person, a force which can change the course of history under conditions of crisis, then what kind of news do you need? What kind of news do you need to do your job as an individual, first to understand what's going on, what's happening to the world, and to locate yourself in such a way that you can say, 'Well, here's what it is I can do, under these circumstances.' If enough of us each do our particular part, we can get out of this mess. Therefore, the only news that's worth having, is news which performs those functions: which enables government, which enables you as an individual, *better to understand what is happening to this planet, to understand what the developments are that are shaping the course of history*; and, finally, to indicate to you the facts which you need to look at, so that you can judge what it is that you might be able to do, which can contribute to bringing about a solution, an escape from the collapse of civilization."

Modern history, LaRouche said, is a conflict between two forces. One is the force of the Golden Renaissance of the 15th century, typified by the development of the nation-state in France under Louis XI, and more generally by the Council of Florence. The other, opposing force, which emerges at the end of the 16th century as an organized force around Paolo Sarpi, is called the Enlightenment. "The Enlightenment," said LaRouche, "is typified by Sarpi, by Galileo, by Thomas Hobbes, by Francis Bacon, by René Descartes, by John Locke, by Isaac Newton, by David Hume, and so forth and so on. That's the Enlightenment. That's the enemy. That's the intellectual force created by the oligarchy, to undermine the ideas upon which the Renaissance is based." Today, this force is represented by the British monarchy.

The conflict between these opposing forces has now reached a turning point. If we, upholding the ideas of the Golden Renaissance, do not defeat the evil that the British monarchy represents, we are doomed.

"My job and our job, as an institution," LaRouche concluded, "is to get out the ideas which enable people who are good people, that is, people willing to be good, to devote

their lives to good, to make their lives meaningful, to give them the ideas, the knowledge they need, to situate themselves in current history, in modern history, in universal history, and in the current process of history, linking the present and the future, as individual persons, who each can find, through their own devices, where they stand, what is appropriate for them to do, to help the process of spreading the ideas which will ensure, that out of past history, at this junction point, comes the possibility of an acceptable form of future history.”

## History as tragedy

The moral demands on the citizen who wishes to prevent a collapse into a Dark Age, were next addressed from a different perspective by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, in her keynote address on “History as Tragedy.” She chose William Shakespeare’s play *Richard III* to exemplify the principle of oligarchism and corruption of character which must be fought, if the evil which is so prevalent in the world today is to be defeated.

“Shakespeare makes this point emphatically, that it is the character which defines the action,” she said. “Friedrich Schiller and von Humboldt, especially after the French Revolution, were absolutely convinced, that only through the ennoblement of the character, could there be an improvement in politics. Only through the ennoblement of each individual, could there be a political change. And for me, the lesson from history as tragedy, is that.”

The keynote panel included three other prominent figures, who gave brief remarks.

First was Amelia Boynton Robinson, a vice chairman of the Schiller Institute, who enlivened her introductions of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche by leading the audience in choruses of “This Little Light of Mine.”

Second was Prof. Josef Miklosko, former vice prime minister of post-communist Czechoslovakia, who now heads the Schiller Foundation in Slovakia. He spoke of his collaboration with the Schiller Institute against the International Monetary Fund, and noted that LaRouche is known in eastern Europe as the “American Sakharov.”

Finally, former South Carolina Congressman James Mann reported on hearings on prosecutorial abuse committed by the U.S. Department of Justice, which had been held Aug. 31 and Sept. 1 (see article, p. 54).

## Economic crisis and the threat of fascism

The Sunday morning panel on economics (which constitutes the *Special Report* in this issue of *EIR*) documented the systemic crisis of the world’s financial institutions, and of the physical-economic condition of the United States, in particular.

The final presentation was given by special guest Jacques Cheminade, a LaRouche associate who ran in this past spring’s French presidential elections. Cheminade reviewed

recent breakthroughs toward collaboration between Presidents Chirac and Clinton, situating this in the context of the economic relations developed between Presidents de Gaulle and Kennedy in the early 1960s. The success of Cheminade’s own presidential campaign in bringing about the shift in France was clearly inspiring—as the activists at the conference anticipated the 1996 U.S. election, and LaRouche’s own campaign.

The final panel of the conference was devoted to the threat of fascism today, starting with London’s Newt Gingrich. It was keynoted by Nancy Spannaus, who took on Newt’s pretensions to an agenda of “saving American civilization,” and showed them to be a most thinly veiled cover for British free trade, New Age policies of “every man for himself” murder.

The implicit question posed by the panelists, was: Will Americans get smart about what this republic is really all about, in time to reject this fascist demagoguery? Newt is a buffoon, but he is dangerous because the typical American is stupid enough to fall for him.

The same point was addressed from different angles by five other panelists: 1) Graham Lowry, on “The Mandeville Model” of British-Dutch Satanist Bernard Mandeville; 2) Linda de Hoyos on “Britain’s French Revolution Paradigm”; 3) Jeffrey Steinberg, on “Friedrich von Hayek’s Free Trade Economics”; 4) Dennis Speed, on “How the Newtoids Use Race and Racism”; and 5) Ed Spannaus, on “The Plot to Destroy the U.S. Constitution.”

## The organizing process

There was an air of increased seriousness at this conference, compared to past ones, reflecting the composition of the participants. Many are members of the nearly 100 Schiller Institute chapters which have been formed around the country during the last six months. They were particularly attentive, because they had the intention of *organizing* with the ideas being presented.

Again and again LaRouche stressed the need for activists to take on the illusions of their fellow citizens, who have abandoned the fundamental premises of the American Revolution, for false ones. He was repeatedly called upon to discuss his political relationship, and that of his presidential campaign, to President Clinton, as well as his view of government.

His answers were unambiguous: First, “Only government can save us, because only government can do what has to be done.”

Second, the solution “is going to have to come, in large part, from the United States. It’s not going to come from the Republican majority in the Congress, is it? It’s not going to come from the news media, is it? It’s going to have to come from leadership, and the only leader in sight with power, whatever you think of him, is this guy who’s President, and what’s immediately around him.”