



"In order to be effective, don't be like Sancho Panza. Be able to govern, get the qualification to govern." Here, a drawing by Gustave Doré.

build an assortment of forces which could influence the decision-making process around the president. And we succeeded. Despite the ugly things he said, the President for the time being has acceded to things which are, shall we say, promising. Not reassuring entirely, but promising. And we're going to have to work from there, to deal with the next stage of the crisis, because there will be a next stage. This President may have probably learned something from this experience, or he may not have. I don't know, but that's where we stand.

So, this is typical of society. Of course it's awful. But also, you said something else, really. Think about it. What you are really talking about is the influence of the present older generation, that is, those who are in their 50s and 60s. They and the people they influence, are reacting with indifference to the reality of the present situation. That's why the youth movement is so important. As a youth movement, you have to be the conscience of the nation; you have to be, in a sense, like Cervantes was in the case of depicting the self-destruction of Spain by a crazy monarch typified by Philip II, and the crazy Spanish peasant, the Spanish people, typified by Sancho Panza. You have to have a certain sense of humor of a higher kind, about the reality of the situation. We've got a stinking society. We poor fellows have to solve the problem. And the youth generation actually has the power to reach the older generation. That's how youth movements work.

But sometimes the youth movement is not adequately developed, and it only works badly or doesn't work at all. My insistence is that the youth generation must not only be dedicated to arousing the conscience of the older generation—of their parents' generation in particular—but the youth movement must develop in itself the competence of knowledge to become policy-makers of society. And that's the difference I'm trying to make with this kind of youth movement, is to create a youth movement not only capable of provoking the adult population into sensible responses, to stop their silly indifference to reality of the type you describe, and others, but to actually be qualified to assume the responsibility of government.

If you don't like government, make yourself qualified to assume the responsibilities of government. Not like poor Sancho Panza, who couldn't resist his belly's demands long enough to govern an island. So, in order to be effective, don't be like Sancho Panza. Be able to govern, get the qualification to govern. And I think that's what we're doing. So let's have confidence in ourselves. I think that we can do the job, and have fun. I keep telling people all the time, have fun. Cognition is fun. Spiritual exercises are fun, they're the highest form of pleasure. Have fun. I think we can do the job.

Peruvian Youths in Dialogue With LaRouche

Here are excerpts of the Peruvian youths' and other supporters' discussion with Lyndon LaRouche, by telephone, on Dec. 27, 2002. The questions are transcribed from the simultaneous translation.

The Heritage of the Monroe Doctrine

Q: I'm a representative of the Peru LaRouche youth movement. I want to ask a question to clarify things for all the young people here, and all the other invitees, who are beginning to learn about your work, especially regarding the real historical relations between the United States and Latin America. Basically, the heritage of the Monroe Doctrine, and how that principle really represents the original tradition of a hemispheric policy in all the Americas. I would like very much to address this. Thank you very much.

LaRouche: Let's not talk so much about the Monroe Doctrine. Let's talk about the Monroe Doctrine as a symptom of a long process, which goes back to the 15th-Century Renaissance.

First of all, the American Revolution, which was a product, largely of the influence of—well, you had two things: The Renaissance, first of all, in the 15th Century, which was an absolute miracle, which saved Christianity, in the sense

that the Church was dead at that point. It also started the first modern nation-state, first in Louis XI's France—partly, of course, as a result of the role of Jeanne d'Arc. In an inspired act of heroism, which set the stage for both the freedom of France from the Norman ultramontane dictatorship; and also, the intervention of her death and her heroism, in the discussions in the Councils, resulted in the restoration of the Catholic Church, which otherwise was, at that point, disintegrating, under the Papacy. And her intervention inspired some of the Popes, and others, to not only re-establish the Catholic Church, as a functioning church at that time, but also to set into motion the processes which led to the formation of the first modern nation-states in France, and later in Henry VII's England.

Now, the key here, was that for the first time, the idea of a state was no longer one group of people dominating another. But, the idea that all the people in the nation participated in a process of self-government, represented by a government which was morally obliged to promote and defend the general welfare of *all* of the people of the nation, into coming generations—not just the present generation, but coming generations.

So then, you had the reactionary forces, organized by Venice, which had been functioning for some time as an imperial, maritime power, a financier oligarchy dominating Europe and the Mediterranean in that period. So, they reacted. And they started the great period, from 1511-12 to 1648, of religious and related kinds of warfare, cultural warfare, which almost destroyed civilization.

Through the work an agent of the Pope, Mazarin, who later became a Cardinal in France (he was chief negotiator for the Pope before then), Mazarin organized what became the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. And Mazarin also adopted a protégé, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, who set into motion in France, the beginnings of a modern economic nation-state. In the setting of the Colbert reforms—before the Louis XIV degeneration—in that setting, Colbert was a sponsor of a number of people, including Leibniz. And, Leibniz emerged very quickly, in the context of both his German background and his background in France, in French institutions, in becoming the leader of civilization in the post-1648 period. Remember, he was born in 1649. He enters France in 1671, as a protégé of the scientific institution of Colbert, and from that point on, emerges very quickly as the leading intellectual force, in France, in Europe, and becomes the center of the ideas of modern science, following Kepler; but essentially, he becomes the epitome of modern science. And he also becomes the inspirer of the idea of the modern nation-state—under those conditions, that is, the post-1671 conditions. He almost becomes the Prime Minister of England—doesn't succeed, but he was a great influence.

His influence, especially against the Anglo-Dutch liberalism of the neo-Venetian crowd, becomes the rallying point, in which they pick the North American English-speaking col-

onies, as a place to organize the founding of a model republic. And, as you'll see in the February publication of *Fidelio*—where a summation of some new information on this occurs—you see exactly how the United States was developed, as a direct product of European concentration, through, chiefly, Benjamin Franklin—after Cotton Mather—of developing the United States as the model republic, based on true principle, as a model for all civilization. That is, the model of a modern, sovereign nation-state, and a community of modern, sovereign nation-states.

So, this is what Benjamin Franklin represented. John Quincy Adams was a protégé, a student, given by his father John Adams, to the instruction of Franklin, in Europe. John Quincy Adams underwent a development. He was a young man, and young people, as you know, develop. They're not like Athena, born from the brow of god. They have to develop. So, he developed. And, he played a key role, both as foreign minister—Secretary of State—and as President, and afterward, in shaping the relations among the states of the Americas.

The Monroe Doctrine was an expression of this. The policy of the United States was, among the patriots, that we should create, both in the Western Hemisphere in particular—in a period in which there were emerging republics in the Americas—a community of republics in the Americas, each of which would be respectively sovereign, but, would be united in a common defense. The policy of the Monroe Doctrine was, that the United States, as soon as it had the strength to do so, would intervene to kick all of the colonial powers of Europe—the Hapsburgs, the Spanish, the Austrians, the Dutch, the French, and so forth—kick 'em all out of North America, not allow them; and defend the Americas, as a community of sovereign nation-states, against any colonial overreach from the powers of Europe.

In a later period, this policy, after Lincoln's victory over the Confederacy, became a much broader conception, with our friends in Europe: That we should establish a global policy of the same type, to bring the nations of the world, as sovereign nation-states, into a community of principle among sovereign republics, who would have certain missions in common, but would be sovereign as individual states, and would cooperate in mutual defense, of each other's sovereignty and common interests.

WEEKLY INTERNET
AUDIO TALK SHOW
The LaRouche Show
EVERY SATURDAY
3:00-4:00 p.m. Eastern Time
<http://www.larouchepub.com/radio>



A young organizer asks LaRouche a question at the Lima meeting. LaRouche addressed meetings like this one in half a dozen countries at the end of 2002—in person, by telephone, and by webcast—engaging in a Socratic dialogue with several hundred youth.

So, that's what the Monroe policy should mean.

Now, as we know, the problem was, as you see in the history of Mexico, that Mexico was invaded by the Spanish, French, and British, as a part of the operation by the Spanish, French, and British, to destroy the United States, at the point that the United States was involved in a Civil War, which had been organized by the French, British, and Spanish, in particular. The same forces invaded Mexico, and took over Mexico, in a dictatorship, and looted the country.

As soon as President Lincoln had achieved a victory over the Confederacy, the French troops were kicked out of Mexico. And, in due course after that, Mexico achieved its sovereignty, with the restoration of the government of Benito Juárez, and the kicking out of the Hapsburg puppet, Maximilian.

From that point on, especially after about 1876, all of the states of the Americas, were more or less influenced by the model of the United States; that is, the model of Alexander Hamilton's idea of a national economy (as it was called by Friedrich List), or the American System of political economy.

So, the American System of political economy influenced the states of the Americas directly, and also, indirectly. Even

though none of these states developed a constitution like that of the United States, they developed constitutions, of which Mexico's is fairly significant: It's a combination of a European style of constitution, and some idea of a North American conception; but, it's not a true constitution. There's a joke in Brazil I heard down there, someone said, he went to a Paris bookshop, and said he wanted a copy of the Brazilian constitution. And, the bookseller said, "We don't sell periodic literature." Because, in most of these countries, the constitutions are changed often.

But, despite that, as you know, there are certain ideas of national sovereignty, certain ideas, which are considered more or less constitutional in Mexico and states in South America, which do function, and do echo, in one degree or another, the same purposes as the Preamble of the Federal Constitution of the United States. So, in that sense, we have a similar philosophy, which I know very well, from my experience in dealing with these countries—especially as in the 1982 crisis, for example, the Malvinas War period and so forth—to the present day.

So, we do have certain common principles *implicitly* expressed in this aspect of European culture, which the United States, in its best aspects, typifies. And, the constitutional ideas embedded in the Preamble to the Constitution, essentially are ideas which would be accepted by all the moral and good people in Central and South America.

So, on that basis, we have two things to consider: First of all, now, we have a world crisis. And, we in the United States and the Americas have to look largely at the world crisis: The dominant part of the world population is in Eurasia, not in the Americas. And therefore, we have to be concerned with the affairs of Eurasia. On the Eurasian continent, we have the situation presently, in which Russia, China, India, are becoming closer and closer aligned, in what I described some years ago and proposed in 1998 as a "Strategic Triangle." That is, if these three similar nations, large nations, could agree on certain common principles, which transcended their cultural differences and traditions, that could provide a nucleus for a system of cooperation among all of the smaller nations in Asia, with this group of nations. And in conditions of the present economic crisis, the mission of Europe should be to cooperate with this emerging Eurasian bloc of nations, for the general development of Eurasia—economic and related development.

This would be done in cooperation with the United States. It should be done, also, as an adjunct of U.S. responsibility for development of the Americas. That is, in the Americas, we have a fairly small population, by Asian standards, but, we have a large population nonetheless; we have lots of resources, many undeveloped resources waiting for us to grab and develop; and therefore, we have a very special mission for restoring and developing the nations, the economies, of the Americas, as a cooperative venture. Presumably, a cooperative venture, done as a part of the Americas' cooperation

with Eurasia, and also, with (as Brazilians will emphasize) also the development of Africa, especially Sub-Saharan Africa.

So, we have a certain kind of world perspective, which is an extension of what is reflected in Monroe. And, we have to have a sense of what is required in each case, to maintain the sovereignty and sovereign development of a nation such as Peru, while, at the same time, having a sense of international cooperation among these forces, in the common interests of the development, of both our hemisphere, and cooperation in the development of Eurasia and Africa.

That's an outgrowth, to sum it up: That's an outgrowth of what the American Monroe Doctrine represented, in 1823; which, as I said, is not something that started with Quincy Adams, in 1823. But, it's a reflection of the whole process, which led to the formation of the United States, as the first modern, sovereign nation-state republic of a constitutional form. And, which led to many other developments in relationship to Eurasia, and within the Americas, over the past period. So, we should see ourselves as part of a process, a tradition, a process of development, in our own hemisphere and abroad, and this should be the basis on which we should think as citizens of individual nations, and also as our nations' are a part of a community of nations.

What Do You Mean by 'Physical Economy'?

Q: You might know about the collapse of many economies in our countries. You have seen the economy of Argentina is coming down. The situation in Colombia, Ecuador, the breakdown of the economy is Brazil, the situation in Venezuela, but also, the apparent and false situation in Peru. It's an illusion: We have no industry and we have a policy of imports that is taking over the country.

We would like you to speak a little bit more on what you mean by "physical economy." Myself, as a student of economics, I have read a lot about the workings of classical economy, and now I have read about the marginalist theory. But this idea of the physical economy breaks down all the ideas, by means of which the world is being guided.

I would like you to speak a lot more about what this physical economy represents and how to apply it, in this part of the continent, and the great projects of the Amazon; and how we can join the Atlantic and the Pacific together; the hydroelectric plants; how to take advantage of the energy in Brazil; and mines in many places in the American continent. And I can think of many routes for development, and many roads—as we have seen in the United States—and how this system of interconnected transport can be more efficient.

And also, as a student in San Marcos, a university here in Peru, I would ask you very much for you to come soon to Peru—you personally. For the LaRouche youth movement, you would be an inspiration, as we have seen from the video of conferences that you have done before the California youth movement, we would like you to be here in Peru. And we want

to "do the impossible," where we could organize a conference where we can have you here, to talk about these themes, and many others. . . .

LaRouche: There are three areas—actually four, but, there are three areas in principle—to cover preliminarily before getting to this question of a prospective visit to Peru.

First of all, what do we mean by economy? Economy, as we know it, civilized economy, began in the 15th-Century Renaissance. Why? Under the feudal period, and under the Romans, and even earlier, most of humanity, in most countries, or most parts of the world, were essentially treated as human cattle, in which a relatively small, dominant group of people dominated the population and used them as human cattle, precisely as, for example, the Physiocrat François Quesnay puts it.

Now, the first time you had a modern nation-state, in the sense of a true state—that is a *nation*-state—was the time in which finally, the law was understood to be the law, that *you do not have human cattle*. That all human beings are human, And therefore, the principle—which is the principle of Socrates, in Plato's *Republic*, for example—called "*agapē*"; or which is called, in Christianity, variously "*agapē*," "general welfare," or "common good": That no state, no government, has legitimacy except as it is committed to service of the general welfare, the common good, of all of the population and its posterity.

NOW, Are You Ready To Learn Economics?



The economy is crashing, as LaRouche warned. What should you do now?

Read this book and find out.

ORDER NOW FROM
Ben Franklin Booksellers
P.O. Box 1707
Leesburg, VA 20177

We accept MasterCard, VISA,
Discover and American Express

OR Order by phone:
toll-free 800-453-4108

OR 703-777-3661 fax: 703-777-8287
\$10 plus shipping and handling. Virginia
residents add 4.5% sales tax.

Shipping and handling: \$4.00 for first
book, \$.50 each additional book.

Now, that's the beginning of economy. There was no economy before then, because you had a situation, in which most people were being treated as human cattle, existing for the convenience, benefit, and disposal of a relatively small group of people, as in the Roman Empire, as in Mesopotamia, as in Sparta—as under feudalism, especially ultramontane feudalism. So, it was only with the great revolution in the 15th Century, that the Graeco-Christian idea of the general welfare, common good, or what is called in Greek *agapē*, as in I Corinthians 13, was accepted as a principle of statecraft, and of national practice. It is the point at which the nation, constitutionally, or in a similar fashion, recognizes the obligation of the sovereign to serve the general welfare interests of the population, and its posterity as a whole, that the question of a functioning national economy comes into existence. And, of course, a functioning world economy as a result.

Now, this worked, but it also failed. Because, beginning with 1511-1512, when the Spanish went over to the Venetians, and began the war by the Hapsburgs, essentially, against the rest of Europe, to *prevent* cooperation in Europe, then civilization broke down, over the period from about 1511 to 1648, a period dominated by religious wars, or similar wars. And, it was only in 1648, with Mazarin's successful intervention to bring about the Treaty of Westphalia, that the modern nation-state came into existence, and Spain was a piece of garbage by that time, as a result of the Hapsburg rule of Spain; which had destroyed Spain through these religious wars, exhausting it, in that form. And, then the War of the Spanish Succession and so forth. But anyway, the Hapsburgs continued to dominate Europe, into the period of, and beyond the 1812-1815 period leading into the Congress of Vienna.

But, in this process, the Venetians' operation in the 16th Century led to a division in Europe between the so-called traditional, ultramontane faction, led and typified by the Hapsburgs and their associated families, the continued feudal tendency; and a tendency which became known as the Anglo-Dutch liberal system.

Now, the Anglo-Dutch liberal system was modelled on the Venetian system. Venice, from about the time of the Emperor Otto III, had consolidated such power as an imperial, maritime power, based on a kind of a slime-mold of financier-oligarchical interests, which was dominating the Mediterranean region and Europe, increasingly. At the end of the 18th Century, Venice's power had declined. Venice, in the meantime, had developed—in Northern Europe, on the northern shores of the Netherlands and the Baltic region, and so forth, the so-called Scandinavian countries, and also in England—had developed a form of society which was modelled on the Venetian system; that is, modelled on the idea of a ruling financier oligarchy, like the Venetian oligarchy, which was exerting an imperial quality of *maritime* power, in the financier interests of a financier oligarchy. This form became the Anglo-Dutch liberal model

Now, the United States was founded *not* as a result of

what the British call “capitalism,” or what Marx called “capitalism”: What Marx called capitalism, is nothing but his rationalization of what the British identified as the Anglo-Dutch liberal model; which is typified by the fact that government is dominated by a financier-oligarchical interest, whose power is centered in a central banking system or the equivalent. That is, a group of financier interests, like a slime-mold, controls the central banking system. And, the central banking system, as a central banking system, then exerts its power over government. And therefore, that's what Marx called the “capitalist system,” otherwise, the Anglo-Dutch system.

Now, the American System has nothing to do with that. The American System as such was a nation-state system, as, for example, Friedrich List emphasized. Under the national economy system, or the American System of political economy, the *nation-state*, the sovereign, is absolutely sovereign. That is, there is no authority, in the nation, which has any higher authority than the nation-state as such. The nation-state is obliged to serve the general welfare, as the Preamble of the U.S. Federal Constitution specifies. There are three principles—two fundamental principles, and one qualification, which are set into the Preamble of the Constitution: 1) The state is absolutely sovereign. There is no other sovereignty. 2) The function of the state is to serve the general welfare. 3) The interests of the posterity *shall rule* in defining the interests of the general welfare.

So, those are the principles. Therefore, in a nation-state economy, you will find that most of the nation's economy involves basic economic infrastructure, which is either maintained and conducted by government, or by franchises from government, such as public utilities. And the rest of the economy is *regulated* by that. The currency and banking system of the nation are *controlled* by the Federal government, and regulated. That's the nation-state, the system of *national economy*. Which is totally opposed to the Anglo-Dutch liberal model, which is the neo-Venetian liberal model.

So, most of the problems that come up, about so-called “traditional” this, “traditional” that—it's all hogwash! There's no truth to it. There are only two real versions of economy, in modern Europe: One, is the Anglo-Dutch liberal model, of which the Marxist or Soviet system is a variant. That is, as Marx himself insisted, what he saw in socialism, and what the Soviet authorities interpreted as his interpretation, is nothing but a variation of the Anglo-Dutch liberal model. Whereas the American model is the completely different model, the system of national economy, in which the *nation-state* is primary—and in which all financial authority is subordinate to the enforcement of the principle of the general welfare, for the existing and future population of the nation.

So, these are the conceptions, which you have to start with, in economy. And, in debating these with other people, you have to emphasize this clearly, in order to get the decks



Sara Madueño, EIR bureau chief and president of Peru's Schiller Institute, illustrates LaRouche's conception of infrastructure corridors of high-technology development, along the rail lines of the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

cleared from all this garbage interpretation. Because, you look at the axiomatics: Axiomatically, the others are all variants of an Anglo-Dutch liberal economy, which is the neo-Venetian model—as opposed to the American System, which is essentially a national economy system, consistent with the principle on which the nation-state was founded, in the case of Louis XI and Henry VII back in the 15th Century.

That's the great conflict on this planet. You take the Soviet system, the so-called "Marxist" system, which is generally susceptible to, and reflects, a kind of special effect, a special reaction, to and within the context of the Anglo-Dutch liberal system. It's a sort of a "non-liberal liberal" system. We look at things in those terms.

Now, once we make that clear, then the idea of physical economy becomes obvious. The function of economy is not monetary. The function of economy is to maintain the general welfare. Now, the general welfare is not measured in money: The general welfare is measured in the conditions of life of people, and the future welfare of the entire population of the nation, and of other nations, as well. So therefore, how do we improve the productive powers of labor? How do we improve the standard of living? How do we increase the potential population-density of a nation, in terms of standard of living? How do we increase the level of education? Because in a poor population, you can't educate people at a university level, because they've got to be working, long before the age of 25, because they're going to die at the age of 40 or 45! So, how can you have full education up to a university level, in that kind of population?

Therefore, the physical development of the nation, of the

infrastructure, of the conditions of life, of the productive powers of labor per capita, these things are predominant. And the monetary systems, and the credit systems, should be simply subordinate, instruments of administration, to those ends. Therefore, in defining economy, you don't define laws of monetary systems, or laws of credit systems: You define laws of *physical systems*, of man's relationship to nature. With these kinds of objectives: How do you increase the potential population-density of the human species? Increase life-expectancy, with the effect of increasing the standard of living that you can provide, in terms of intellectually and otherwise, to all the members of society? That's physical economy, to which monetary and credit systems must be subordinated, *under national government*. Or, a consortium of national governments, who agree to come to common purposes through the exercise of their individual sovereignties.

Now, what we can do—I don't know in Peru, exactly. Obviously, you know, I'd like to be there. That's not a problem! They're keeping me kind of busy lately—which is good (it's also bad, because it prevents some things from happening).

No, but we have to think in terms of strengthening the youth movement, in many ways, including whatever my presence might contribute to that—by writing, by discussion. And also by some exchanges, temporary exchanges of people from one part of the world to another, so that you have a sharing of the experience of the youth movement and its educational ventures, in different parts of the world. So, you have a world-sense, of what we're doing. I think it's very important. I think, perhaps, that we should be thinking of some kinds of goals,

in terms of institutional activities, which will actually further that step, in the case of Peru and other countries.

How Can We Deal With the Debt Crisis?

Q: I am a labor leader with the electrical workers union. My question is the following: How can we fight against the crisis, in which we are tremendously indebted, and the people we owe money to? Tell us what path we must follow. That is to say, they put our government representatives, or tell our leaders, what they must do, in economics, in the social sphere, in politics. What must we do, so that we, in some way, understand that our countries are totally dependent, in a certain fashion—how can we get across, so that we change this? I don't find an answer to this question: I wonder if you can give me one?

LaRouche: Okay good. Well, it's not so simple, but it's not that complicated. What is not so simple, is the fact, that if you accept the idea that these debts have to be paid, and that you can do nothing until after they're paid; and then you, at the same time, find you don't have the means to pay, you're in an impossible situation. And, the question is: Here's the debtor and here's the debt: What is justice between the two? According to natural law, in that case, the debt must suffer. But, since the debt has no nervous system, how can it suffer? Therefore, it's a painless suffering, that it must experience.

Now, first of all, the debt is largely artificial. It was created by fraudulent means. It's essentially artificial. I've gone through this: We know the debt of the Americas is such, that South and Central America have more than paid *all the debt* they've actually incurred, honestly incurred, during the past 30-odd years. So, as far as I'm concerned, there *is no significant debt*. It doesn't exist.

Well, who is going to say it doesn't exist—that's the question? Ah! Can Peru say it doesn't exist? Well, in a certain way, it can say it. Can it say it effectively? Well, not so effectively. Why!? Because you have powerful governments, and concerts of governments, who have agreed to collect the debt, even if it's not payable, and if it's not legitimate!

So therefore, now, we come to a political question, not a financial question. Now, you've got to a point, where not only are the countries of South and Central America hopelessly in debt, they could never pay these debts; and, they could only be collected by *murdering* many of the population of these countries. So therefore, it's immoral! But, who's going to stop it? So, your question is: Who is going to stop it, and how? There *is no formula*. There is no literary formula: *It is a question of power*. All right.

Now, the power lies here: That *all of the countries* of the world are hopelessly in debt. *All of them*. So, what you have is, you have a group of financiers, who have committed fraud; who have used consent of government to commit fraud; and now, there is no government in Europe or the Americas, which could ever pay its existing debt. What if these countries decide not to pay this unpayable debt? What if they decide to put the

whole thing into bankruptcy reorganization? *Who* is going to collect the debt? There's no one there to collect the debt! If the governments say, it's not going to be collected, it's not going to be collected! It's over!

Now, a country like Peru has a problem. You say, "We're a small country. We can't make this decision unilaterally." Ahh! That's where the question of alliances comes in; where movements of understanding, come in; cross-border movements of understanding. And, that's the only way the thing is going to be solved—no other way.

Yes, Peru can not make a unilateral decision, and get itself free of the debt, because other countries would crush it. But, what if the other countries don't crush it? Then, it can make a unilateral decision. However, it would prefer *not* to make a unilateral decision. It would prefer to make a decision *in concert* with other countries, so you come to an agreement, under which the essential business of the economy continues without stopping, while this negotiation is going on. So therefore, the question is, we have to mobilize a concert of international forces of national patriots, who agree that this joint action must occur: And, it *will* occur. Our big advantage is, there is no government in the world today which has, as a nation, an honest interest in enforcing the debt collection. None. So therefore, in a sense, humanity is on our side. And, we simply have to make that fact, political reality. Which means, that you have to get some big nations in.

You see, one of the big problems here, is: When people look at the Americas, they look at the United States, and they say, "That's the Big Yankee Power. And the Big Yankee Power can crush us any time it wants to. Look! They tossed our President out of here! Tossed him out! They said they had a pretext, but it was just an arbitrary pretext. They decided to throw him out, so they threw him out. And they put another President in."

So, the Peruvian says, "Well, ha ha! What do you mean? We can't make a sovereign decision. These guys run the show!"

Ah, but you've come to the point at which some of us, in various countries, know the system is coming to an end. You're going to see in the coming weeks, the entire system is now collapsing: in Europe, and in the Americas. The whole system is coming down! When the whole system is coming down, who is going to collect the debt from all of the people who can't pay? Therefore, we have to be together. We have to, first of all, *think* together; discuss together; and then, bring international forces, as a fruit of our discussion—bring them together, to do what I've said: a New Bretton Woods system. A reorganization of the present international monetary and financial system.

We *will* do it, because we *have* to do it. And Peru is not a nation, which is going to have decide this, by itself. Peru is going to decide this, together with other nations. But *each* of us, in our nations, must understand the issue, and thus, be prepared to act in concert, at the appropriate moment.

The Defense of National Sovereignty

Q: Good afternoon, greetings from a worker, from the union of electrical workers in Lima. I have read some of your magazines in the last few days, and there is a diversity of subjects, about which I'm very excited. One of the main ones is regarding the article on the international labor code, in Convention 169, which gives indigenous people certain faculties, which includes the government, in terms of controlling the natural resources. Those natural resources, of which we have a lot in Latin America, could be used for the welfare of the nations, if we have an ideological current will arise as a force, at the Latin American level. In any regard, the governments at the moment are in the condition of generating proposals to use those resources for our economy.

LaRouche: The problem is, you have a policy in the United States, which was, among other things enunciated by Henry Kissinger in 1974. It was called National Security Study Memorandum 200 (NSSM-200). This states that the policy of the United States is: that the natural resources of regions such as South America and Africa, are to be preserved for the future consumption of the people of the United States and the United Kingdom; specifically, in this case, the United States.

This is already going on in Africa, in which there is intentional genocide, against the population of the inhabitants of Sub-Saharan Africa, with the intent of depriving them of *use* of the natural resources of their continent; and also, of reducing the population, so to reduce the number of people who will be consuming anything, in that area. The same policy now exists for South and Central America. The function of the World Wide Fund for Nature—the World Wildlife Fund and so forth—that this crowd, as in Brazil, has moved to ensure that none of the countries of South America will be allowed to use their own principal natural resources. The whole Amazon region, for example, is under the control of agencies of this type. You have, in the case of the border, of Brazil with Bolivia, Paraguay, and Uruguay, you find that the Moonies, who are actually part of this kind of swindle, have taken control of much of both sides of the border, of Bolivia, Paraguay, and also Uruguay, in the idea of preventing the nations from having any sovereignty over their own borders—and specifically in respect to natural resources.

Brazil has no sovereignty over the Amazon, right now, due to these private forces, like the WWF, the World Wildlife Fund. In Africa, you have the same thing: You had the British monarchy moved in, with elephant parks, with gorilla parks, with natural preserves on borders. It was the use of these border areas, which was Uganda to invade Rwanda, and start the genocide which has gone in Rwanda, and in Burundi, and in parts of neighboring Congo, since that time. You look at the map of Africa; put the map of these non-governmental organizations, which are running parts of the world.

No, there *is* no, presently—there *is* no authority, for gov-

ernments, of South and Central America, *to actually use* natural resources to develop national income. You may think you may have it, in one part of a code; but, you have to look at the UN code, and the UN code says, “You can't”; and the U.S. policy says, “You can't.” So, there's no way to cheat. You can not find some loophole in a current law to overcome these oppressive policies. We have to bring the oppressor agency, itself, to boot. That means, that the provisions of the use of non-governmental organizations, and similar institutions, in the Americas—as in Brazil, on Brazil's borders, and in the Amazon area—to prevent these countries from using their natural resources; that these agencies must be, in effect, neutralized or virtually shut down.

Until that's done, I don't care what they say about some code, you don't have the authority to use natural resources to benefit Peru. You don't have it. You may think you do. But, if you look where the non-governmental organizations, of the type that were behind the coup against Fujimori, for example; like the international drug cartels, for example, which are supported by the New York Stock Exchange, for example—as long as these agencies exist, you don't have that authority.

If we get rid of these things, we would find how to utilize the development of natural resources, as a way of solving some of these problems of these countries—as you propose. But, under present circumstance, until you *break* that authority, you don't have it.

Kepler's Revolutionary Discoveries

The most crippling error in mathematics, economics, and physical science today, is the hysterical refusal to acknowledge the work of Johannes Kepler, Pierre Fermat, and Gottfried Leibniz—not Newton!—in developing the calculus. This video, accessible to the layman, uses animated graphics to teach Kepler's principles of planetary motion, without resorting to mathematical formalism.

“The Science of Kepler and Fermat,”

1.5 hours, EIRVI-2001-12

\$50 postpaid.



EIR News Service

P.O. Box 17390

Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

To order, call...

1-888-EIR-3258 (toll-free)

We accept Visa and MasterCard.