

lation as a “colossal failure,” he nevertheless attempted to maneuver within the constraints of the deregulated system. Though there were private discussions of acting to re-regulate, putting the utilities into bankruptcy, and even use of eminent domain by the state to take over and operate the plants, state officials were told by lawyers and political and financial advisers, that such action would be tied up in the courts for years. It would, the advisers said, eventually pit the state against a Federal judiciary run by opponents of the General Welfare clause of the Constitution, such as Supreme Court Associate Justice Antonin Scalia; against the power of the federal government in the hands of Bush, and his Bush-league pals, such as Kenneth Lay, the chairman of the board of the leading “power marketer” robber-baron, Enron Corp.

Thus, instead of taking on these private interests, which were holding the state hostage under the deregulation laws, which legalize looting, the Governor stuck to the rules they had written, throwing state funds into their coffers, and preaching conservation as the alternative.

The rug was finally pulled out from under him, first with

a ruling by the Public Utilities Commission to grant a rate increase of between 23% and 46%, and then by the bankruptcy filing on April 6, PG&E, one of the three large utilities in the state. The Governor, who had tried to work with PG&E, felt betrayed by this action, by which PG&E expects to convince the bankruptcy judge to grant them even larger rate increases, leaving the state with few options but to hope for a favorable ruling from the court.

### ... To the San Bernadino Mountains

On the weekend of April 7-8, LaRouche again addressed the problem, with a kind of battle report, to another conference of some of the same young organizers, and many new student activists and others — this time, in the San Bernadino Mountains. He told them that abiding by the counsel of the lawyers and financial advisers not to act pre-emptively, California officials had lost time and position.” And, LaRouche explained from a strategic standpoint, how the battle to reverse the collapse of California, and of the nation’s economy, can still be won.

---

## ‘Facing, on the Surface, A Great Disaster’

*Lyndon LaRouche’s opening remarks to 50 new LaRouche activists in California on April 7, 2001. Following his remarks, LaRouche, who was speaking by phone, engaged them in a dialogue for two and a half hours.*

You are now sitting, you’re looking down at the situation in California. You’re up there, where you probably get the maximum amount of light, which is probably the safest place from which to seek light in California. But what you’ve seen recently, is that — remember the starting of the dereg crisis in California, which erupted, obviously was going to erupt, when Bush came into power, and did erupt right in that period, while he was coming in. Now at that point, we made a number of proposals, along the lines that I’d made earlier on, on energy policy, which were *not adopted* by the government of California, or others, even though they were not entirely unsympathetic to receiving some of these suggestions.

Now, the result of their failure to adopt the most immediately critical of the things we proposed they do, they’ve not only lost time, but they’ve also lost position. And we now are faced with, what is on the surface a great disaster.

The reasons for the disaster, as reflected in the reports there, is the legal and related advice, pressure on the government, to say, “Don’t do this and don’t do that because you’ll be defeated in the courts.” And that argument — that you

might be defeated in the courts if you do the right thing — has a basis in reality, though it is not acceptable. That is, if the government of California had proceeded with what we proposed, and the courts, under the influence of the Department of Justice, and the Scalia types in the Federal court system, had slapped it down, would that have been a mistake? *No*. It was a mistake not to take that risk. Because if the courts had slapped it down, then you would have created a Constitutional crisis around the dereg issue, the energy issue. Exactly what you want.

### U.S. Invaded by Cannibals from the Bushes

What’s the problem? We have a United States, which has been taken over, not by invaders from outer space, but by cannibals from the Bushes. Now, when you have this kind of invasion, which has taken over institutions of government — the majority of the Congress, the Supreme Court, the Federal court system generally, the Department of Justice, much of the party structures of both parties — what do you do? Well, you say, “These are invading cannibals who have occupied our country.”

What do you do? Do you sit back and say, “Is the case hopeless? Shall we submit? Shall we sit back and wait to be eaten?” Or, “What are we going to do? Can we make an immediate, instant coup tomorrow morning to get rid of the cannibals?” Well, perhaps not. Or do you make a strategic plan for overthrowing the cannibal invaders? No. You adopt a strategic doctrine, for mobilizing your nation to liberate itself from the occupying cannibal force. Now, that’s what we don’t get from most of the politicians, who are strictly short-term thinkers. They don’t think in terms of — they’re like what the argument I had with some of our people on

the question of the health care situation in Washington. We should not be campaigning around “issues.” Don’t organize around “issues.” Organize around doctrine. Around policy. Organize for policy, because an issue is something that’s today. You put all your bets on an issue, and you may lose the war. You concentrate on saying, here is the way we are going to fight the battle at this point, can we win the battle here? If you stake all your forces on winning a battle at one point, then, you’re like what the Russians did *not* do with Napoleon.

Remember, the issue about the strategy with Napoleon, is some of the Russians wanted to defeat Napoleon at the border, which would have been a mistake at that point, because Napoleon’s Grand Army would have overwhelmed them. Then, there would have been no Russian forces to prevent Napoleon from occupying Russia. They adopted a different strategy—a doctrine of in-depth defense. The in-depth defense included pre-mining Moscow, staging a graduated retreat to Moscow. Let the enemy occupy Moscow, and then destroy Moscow around his ears, which forces the enemy to retreat in the middle of Winter. Because his logistics are gone—and an army depends upon its logistics, its foraging capability, by and large—so Napoleon’s army had to retreat. And since the Russians had not expended their military forces in trying to prevent Napoleon from occupying Moscow, the very forces the Russians had held back, and not wasted, now fell upon the rear of the retreating army. And thus, you got to the point, that the great battle at Leipzig, at which Napoleon was essentially crushed—and then the problem was how to defeat Napoleon, to prevent him from getting back to France and raising a new army, and starting the war all over again.

And the situation you have here. That’s a strategic situation, of strategic events. We are engaged in an effort of strategic defense against the United States, which has been occupied by an invading force of cannibals from the Bushes. We’re trying to get our country back from this occupation, of this foreign cannibal army. Therefore, we have to have a strategic doctrine, which guides us, so that everything we do, no matter what the outcome of any particular battle, is going to strengthen our position, for taking our country back.

Now what’s the doctrine based on? The doctrine is based on, what is the essential difference between the United States—as defined by its Constitution and its Declaration of Independence—as opposed to this alien army of invading cannibals from the Bushes? Very simple. The United States is based on the concept of a sovereign nation-state, according to the principle of the general welfare. That’s the basic law of the United States.

What’s the issue in California? What are all the issues on energy? On regulation, and so forth? The issue is, the general welfare. The requirement of electricity, for example, and energy generally, for the very existence of life of the population, its industry, its economy. And it must be at a fair price.

So therefore, that issue is a Constitutional issue. It is not

a tactical issue. It is not merely a legislative issue. Legislative actions, court actions, are merely battles, which are trying to defend a Constitutional principle against an enemy, an enemy of the nation. That’s our battle.

So what we have to do, is fight at every step, to build forces in the United States, to win victories for a doctrine. That doctrine is, that the United States must be ruled, and self-ruled, according to the Constitutional principle of the general welfare.

## **LaRouche and the American Intellectual Tradition**

What’s the overall situation? Well, the overall situation centers around me. I am, by default, the only leading figure, who represents the forces, of which the United States was founded. That is, the so-called American intellectual tradition. I am presently the world leader of the American intellectual tradition. That’s my function. Therefore, my job is to assume that leadership, like Washington assuming the leadership against the British in the War for Independence. And to lead our nation around a doctrine, whose implementation is my duty to direct, so that everything we do, is mobilizing forces into positions, from which we have a chance of winning back, on a basis of a strategy of defense, to win back our country for its Constitutional principle. It’s that simple.

And that’s what we’re trying to do. And that’s what I’m trying to do. And it’s very difficult, when an American pragmatic, empiricist population, a population whose party leaders are infinitely corrupt—they’ve been terribly corrupted, especially over the past 35 years, since the cultural paradigm-shift in the middle 1960s. And there’s been corruption before then too, but the corruption relative to FDR tradition. So, the population is corrupt. It no longer believes in principled politics. It no longer believes in principles. It believes in issues. Therefore, what you have to do, is, you have to fight against the population, and even among ourselves, against an issue-oriented response to these problems.

We must have a strategic doctrine-based response to the problems, not an issue-oriented one. The issue-oriented thing is the way in which you lose wars, and, you know, fight every battle on every field, as it comes up. Choose your battles; not win your battles, lose your battles—that’s how you lose the war to the occupying force.

What you have to do, is wear the enemy force down, by building strength around a doctrine, to turn every tactical defeat we have, into a victory because it strengthens the forces’ resolve to achieve victory; and strengthens the forces in their understanding of the principle for which we’re fighting. That’s where we stand.

And this energy crisis in California, should not be treated as an issue. It should be treated as a national and global policy, in a war based on the strategy of defense, to take our country back from an invading army of cannibals from the Bushes.