

LaRouche Tells Youth Mock Convention: Founding Fathers Were No Older Than You

Lyndon LaRouche spoke to 1,000 or more students from the Northwest states of the United States, at the Northwest Model Democratic Nominating Convention in Portland, Oregon on March 11. The convention, a 40-year tradition organized by Portland State University, was addressed only by LaRouche personally among the Democratic Presidential candidates, and by Rep. Dennis Kucinich by telephone.

The candidate was introduced by two students who had volunteered for the role of "LaRouche national convention delegates."

First Delegate: In such speeches, LaRouche defines the interrelations of empires and explores formerly under-investigated, and largely historically overlooked historical fallacies. His commitment manifests in his intractable opposition to the policies of the Bush Administration and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. He encourages the investment in scientific and technological progress, and the development of a basic economic infrastructure, to replace the one which is presently in constant demise. But, despite what we can tell you, and what you may read, you do not quite know LaRouche, until you have witnessed him speak.

Second Delegate: LaRouche was born on Sept. 8, 1922 and was educated among public schools along the East Coast, until pursuing with his formal education at Northeastern University in Boston. He was interrupted for a two-year period of military service. He has been married to Helga Zepp-LaRouche, an international political figure from her native country of Germany, since 1977.

In 1971, he organized the founding of the international news bureau first known as the New Solidarity International Press Service. He also organized the weekly news magazine known as *Executive Intelligence Review*, the publication of which he is currently employed as the Contributing Editor.

According to official government documents and other legal evidence, presently in the possession of the candidate's legal executives, the U.S. government has made two clear attempts to eliminate LaRouche as a political figure.

First Delegate: Despite this foul play, the laws of economics and moral righteousness will prove extraordinarily damaging to the United States within the quickly upcoming months. But, in a statement void of room for any questionable doubt, LaRouche urges the people of the United States to take responsibility for the power they possess. A civilization can be saved, and we are going to do it. The speech you are about

to hear, is a lesson in history, prevailing philosophical thought, and economics. It is in your best interest to listen carefully. Thank you.

Lyndon LaRouche: Good evening. This is an unusual occasion. I understand it goes on periodically here, but I think it's important. I shall give you a summary of what I see is going to happen with the election campaign, leading into the inauguration of the next President in January of this coming year.

At present, we're in a grave crisis. At present, in the Democratic Party, only two major candidates are still running: Kerry and I. Kerry and I are rivals—but not opponents. The issue is, what is the Democratic Party going to do, between now and the convention? And what is it going to do between then and November? And what is it going to do, in case we get a jam-up in November, as we had in November of 2000? Those are the problems.

What We Must Do

We face, immediately, two great issues. One issue: *Never again must the Constitution be violated in taking the United States to war.* [applause, cheers]

Second: We now face a worldwide economic crisis, a financial-monetary crisis, which is worse than that of 1928 through 1933. In short, we will require a President who thinks much like Franklin Roosevelt, to lead this nation out of a Hoover-like administration now, into a recovery of all the problems.

At present—on the present level of the economy—it is not possible to balance the budget in at least 48 of the Federal states. The reason is, the income is simply too low; the jobs are too low. The jobs have been exported—this kind of thing. What the next President is going to have to do, is act as Roosevelt did, in March of 1933 when he first went into office, to take a number of drastic acts which reorganized, in effect, the world economy. And I can tell you, that if the President of the United States were to make the kind of decisions I would make, that nations around the world, in general, would support us.

And therefore, we could reorganize the present world economic situation, and start an immediate process of recovery. It would be difficult, but it can be successful. The basis of this, the President of the United States must use the provisions of the Preamble of the Constitution—on the issue of sover-



In this shot from a video of the event, Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche addresses the traditional mock Presidential convention organized by students in a hall at Portland State University in Oregon. LaRouche's March 11 speech was greeted both with respect and frequent applause, by more than 1,000 student "delegates" from Northwest states.

eignty, the general welfare, and posterity—to deal with a major economic crisis. This means we must reorganize the national banking system; we must reorganize the IMF [International Monetary Fund] system, in order to go back to the kind of thing which we did under the weight of the Roosevelt legacy.

This means, that we're going to have to do things like investing up to \$6 trillion in large-scale infrastructure development projects in the United States over the coming four years. This means that we must have a target of creating an addition 10 million jobs. This means that we must end free trade, we must end globalization [applause, cheers]. We must go back to the kind of *fair trade* policy we had in the post-war period, when we, as the leading economy in the world, were cooperating in rebuilding a war-torn Europe. We need that kind of fair-trade policy.

We need, also, a driver, in terms of a science-driver for new technologies. It means that we have to recognize that no longer is a high school education, as bad as it is today, acceptable as a standard for training young adults to enter economic life. [applause]

Now, this means something else: You saw, in the New Hampshire primary, that there was a larger turnout in that primary than had been true, as a percentile, in recent years. Since that time, there has been a growing disinterest in the primaries: The percentile of the vote turning out, is less. Now, from my experience, in dealing with elections—as we dealt to try to defeat Schwarzenegger in California, as we did win in re-electing [Mayor John] Street against Ashcroft's effort, in Philadelphia—is that the problem is, the party is not mobilized to *fight to win*, as is desired, apparently, by Kerry, and by me, for this coming year. The Democratic Party is not a fighting party, in a real sense—no longer.

Young People Have To Take Party Over

What I have found out, that the only way you can put life back into the Democratic Party, is with young people, especially those between the ages of 18 and 25, the university-age group. I have found that my people, working with me, in that age-group, are the most effective political force per capita in the United States today. And you assembled here, typify that same age-group. If *you* turn out, if you take a lead—in pushing the Democratic Party, putting fire under its tail!—we can get the older generation to move, to act on these proposals.

The older generation, you know, tends to live in a state of denial. I don't; but, I guess, because I'm older than old. But, they live in a state of denial. They're living in their "comfort zone." They're trying to deny the reality which threatens us. They're trying to ignore poverty; they're trying to ignore homelessness; they're trying to ignore the bankruptcy of the states; to imagine that somehow, some miracle will get us by. It won't! It's going to take government leadership to get this economy out of the present mess it's plunging into. [rolling applause]

You, young people, you must mobilize. You must, in a sense take over the party—not by taking it away from the older people, but by being a new force that the older people have to reckon with. You are saying, this nation gives you no future. You want a future. You turn to your parents, and say, "We are your future. Our children, your grandchildren, are your future. They are the meaning of your life. Give this nation a future. Give us a future." [applause] And, if you do that—and I've had some experiment with this process in the past four years. I'm trying to see what an appropriate youth movement conception was, and an educational policy was, for these times and conditions. And, we've had some successes.

They're not big successes, but they're important ones, and they teach a lesson.

If you take the people in this room today, and similar groups of people around the country, and if you get them *involved* in politics, around these kinds of issues; if you educate yourself on these kinds of issues—you're not just sloganeering: you understand the gut of the issue; you understand why you have to do it; you're able to argue with the professors and the politicians: If you do that, and if you would deploy, regularly, as volunteers, into the streets, into the community, you can turn this country around, and create a movement.

Let me remind you of one thing, which you probably may know about, or maybe not have emphasized it: Do you know that this nation was founded by a youth movement? You had an old fogey like me, Benjamin Franklin, one of the leading scientists of the 18th Century, worldwide: He led a bunch of people. Do you know how old the Marquis de Lafayette was when he became a *general* of the Revolutionary Army? Do you know how old he was at Yorktown, when he played a crucial part in determining the freedom of this country? Do you know how old our first Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton, was, when he played his role? Do you know how old Jefferson was, when he began working under the leadership of Franklin? They were no older than you! When they began to enter politics, and played a decisive role. Study that! Learn that!

That's what your potential is. Think about the future. Think about what life means. Life comes and it goes. We are born and we die—the question is, what do we do with life, while we have it? What do we do with our life, which we leave to future generations? What do we do, in showing respect for those generations before us, who have made possible what we've achieved?

Thank you very much. [applause, cheers]

Questions and Dialogue

Moderator: Do you want to take some questions?

LaRouche: Sure.

Moderator: Would you like to take them directly from the floor, yourself? Or would you like me to—

Okay, you're going to state your question, and then I will repeat it for Mr. LaRouche, and he will answer.

Q: I understand that you served time in prison, and your cellmate was James Bakker, the televangelist. I would like you to describe that.

Moderator: The question was, how well you knew James Bakker?

LaRouche: [laughing] There was no particular problem there. It's all been documented on my website. I was put into prison; I wear it as a badge of honor. In short, George Bush put me into prison, and Bill Clinton got me out. [applause] And therefore, what you do, when you're in a situation like

that, it's like being a prisoner of war—comparable to that: You do what you can for the people around you. And I found I was able to go some good for the people around me, and that was good. It was some compensation for the other side!

Moderator: All right, next question.

Q: I believe there's a current misconception going around that you're anti-Semitic. I was wondering if you could elaborate on that?

Moderator: The question is, could you comment on some people's misconceptions about you? What have you found are misconceptions people have about you? And, when have you responded to them?

LaRouche: Oh, the point is, I've dealt with all this stuff on the website. It's organized, and I put out a paper on this subject: That in 1971, something happened which I had forecast, and I challenged leading economists of the United States, and charged them with "quackademia," being "quackademics." They had said, that what Nixon did, in middle August of 1971, could not happen. That the system was so built, with "built-in stabilizers," we could never have another crisis. I had warned that the way things were going, especially in the second half of the 1960s, we were headed toward a breakdown crisis, in the present monetary system. It broke down! In 1971-72.

I accused the economists, the academic economists, of being quackademics; that they had been teaching buncombe; that the economy had collapsed, when they said it couldn't collapse. And I challenged them to debate the question. And to get some decent economics going in this country.

So, the economists from academia were very upset. I had challenged them of being "quackademics," which they were. So, they decided they had to do something about this. So, they picked a champion—to take me on in debate! And floor me, once and for all! Well, they picked a poor fellow called Prof. Abba Lerner, who was by reputation, the leading Keynesian economist resident in the United States at that time. And I charged him: I said, "The problem is, you guys are like Schacht." Hjalmar Schacht was Hitler's economic policy-maker. "Your policies are those of Schacht. And what Nixon is doing, and what you're doing, is you're going in the direction of Adolf Hitler's Schachtian policy."

At the end of the debate—it ended when he said, "But, if Germany had accepted Schacht's policy, Hitler would not have been necessary"—end of the program!

So, these guys decided I was too dangerous. And so, I began to have a lot of problems. So, there has been a bit controversy about me, over SDI, over many other things, over years. And, what they'll try to do to you—and you have to get the guts to stand up to them—they'll try to kill you; they'll try to beat you up, or intimidate you; they'll try to slander you out of existence, with all kinds of libels. I've gone through it; if you're going into politics seriously in a time of controversy, *you have to risk it, too.* [applause]



A group of LaRouche supporters in the student audience cheer the candidate's speech. He told the students to "put a fire under the Democratic Party's tail," and said, "It's going to take government leadership to get this economy out of the present mess it's plunging into."

Moderator: Okay, we've gone through some good questions on past issues; now let's stick to the present, because we're at a delegation for 2004, so, let's discuss current issues, shall we?

Q: Is it true that you'd like to colonize Mars?

Moderator: The question is, how do you feel about George Bush's recent announcement that he wants to send someone to Mars, etc.?

LaRouche: Oh, I was thinking of sending George! [cheers] Unless you had some other intention on the question.

Moderator: Okay, next question.

Q: Yes, I was wondering how you feel on the issue of gay marriage?

Moderator: The question is, how do you feel about the current issue of gay marriage?

LaRouche: I think it should be a state issue: That our Constitution has three Federal institutions, but the states are also an essential institution. And those powers which do not belong to the Federal government, must belong to the states. Social relations, within the states, should be a matter of the right of the state. And the state is independent in that, except as it may violate some national law. So, unless national law has taken over an area of social policy, the states are the primary location to deal with all these questions.

What happens is, you have a lot of issues, which are called "wedge issues." And, you see what's happened, when wedge issues are driven into the national electoral campaign—and this is the danger now. And I wish to improve the Republican Party, without DeLay: We've got to get rid of these wedge issues. We can not divide people on a national basis, on wedge issues. They may be legitimate issues, but if they're social

issues, which are not part of the Federal law area, they must be reserved to the states. And we must not let these things become a football, *precisely* the way that George W. Bush has dealt with it, in the worst possible way.

Q: How do you feel about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?

Moderator: The question is, would you comment on how you feel about the Israel-Palestine conflict?

LaRouche: Yeah, well, the United States has been a gutless wonder on dealing with the issue of peace in the Middle East. Now, peace in the Middle East has many aspects to it. We have to be involved in all of them.

But: We know, that unless there is, at this time, a serious effort to bring about peace in the Middle East between Israel and Palestine, there's no chance of peace throughout the region. The issue of peace is not simply a formal agreement not to shoot each other. That doesn't work. The problem is largely economic: If you're going to have peace between peoples, you have to have the economic basis for peaceful life, and therefore, a Middle East development program. This means, also, of course, that—I've dealt with this issue over many years. I dealt with it back in the '70s, when there was a Labor government in charge in Israel, and a lot of our friends then said, "Okay, fine, we'll try to do it." I've worked with Palestinians; I worked with Israelis on the issue. I had problems from Palestinians; I had problems from other Israelis. But, generally, the Labor Zionists were generally positive on this idea of a negotiated peace settlement for the Israel-Palestine relations.

When the Likud came in, there was a change. And, on top of that, people from the United States began playing games with the Middle East, in addition to the traditional game, of

the oil games, that are played in the Middle East.

If the United States had the guts, we could intervene. This would mean, that if I were President, I would have to deal, not necessarily with Sharon (I think he's on the way out); but with the hard-core Likud, the anti-Palestinian faction.

If you're going to bring about peace, you have to go to the precedent of the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, where people who had been killing each other for 30 years, suddenly came to peace around the Treaty of Westphalia, which is the basis for the modern, civilized nation-state. We have to go in, with people who are bitter adversaries; we have to bring them to peace; we have to create the environment, with the help of other nations, that they be willing to sit at the table.

I'm for that. That's my approach to it. [applause, cheers]

Q: Hello. I'd like to direct this question directly to Mr. LaRouche, as I think it would be difficult for the chair to translate. Essentially, I have a magazine, *21st Century Science & Technology*, Winter 2003-04 issue, in which you, Mr. LaRouche, submitted an article, entitled "The Pagan Worship of Isaac Newton." In this article, there's a quote from you, about your political Democratic contenders, that I would just like to ask you about. In this, you say that, "In today's politics, I am confronted currently by nine pathetic rivals for the Democratic Party's 2004 U.S. Presidential nomination. They have been so far, a pitiable pack of pure disaster."

As clever an alliteration as that is, I was wondering if you could flesh out why you have such harsh invective against members of your own party, who are fighting against George Bush?

Moderator: Well, as clever as your alliterations were, it's hard for us to hear on the stage, exactly what you said, so, I'm going to summarize: In a magazine article, you made comments about your Democratic rivals in a fairly negative way—[addressing questioner] Is that a correct characterization, sir? That he made negative remarks about other candidates in the race?

So, comment on your perhaps negative comments in magazine articles about the other candidates.

LaRouche: Well, I believe in one principle: Truth. And, in the case, you will observe how I dealt with Kerry, and compare it with what I said would happen to the other candidates. It has happened to them. So, I made a forecast, because of the errors in their policy, and the errors on which they were campaigning, they were going to be out. And, I said that Kerry and I will be the last ones standing, when the crop is culled. And that's the way it stands today.

Kerry and I are rivals; we are not opponents. I'm not his personal opponent in any sense: I think he's a fine man. I think he's, under normal circumstances, qualified to be President. I think he certainly would be a beneficial replacement for the current incumbent, beyond doubt!

The issue is, what about his economic policy? The prob-

lem today is, you have powerful financial interests in the world, and you have the same problem, but on a more intense scale, than Franklin Roosevelt faced. In 1932, Herbert Hoover was applying policies which are comparable to those of Nazi Germany, in the United States! And the choice was, was between re-electing Hoover and Roosevelt.

Today, Kerry's a fine guy, with instincts which are pro-Roosevelt, in terms of his tradition. *But:* When the party gets control of him, is he going to find himself a prisoner in the White House of a party organization and a Congress, which is going to condemn this nation, and condemn him, to swallow Schachtian policies—that is, right-wing policies of Hoover type?

So, my function with him, is precisely to get *him* on the line, in understanding what he's really up against—he's not trained in economics; I am—to get him to understand the issues, and to get him to understand the importance, now, in the remaining period between now and Boston, and going into November from Boston, to understand what the program of the Democratic Party must be: What a Franklin Roosevelt program for this time, in this circumstance, must be.

And that's what the purpose of my running, right now, chiefly: Is to make sure we keep the campaign alive. We keep it alive, for the purpose of, "Now let's discuss what the policy is." There're only two guys who agree in moral principle. Let 'em fight it out. Let's get the policy clear: And the policy against war, the policy in economics. That's my point in the whole thing, and always has been.

Moderator: All right, we will take one more question.

Q: Hi, Mr. LaRouche, as a wealthy American, I was wondering if you think that I don't pay my fair share in taxes?

LaRouche: I always did.

Moderator: That wasn't the question. Try that again.

Q: Do you think the wealthy in America, don't pay their fair share in taxes?

LaRouche: Oh sure! It's true. Look, this is a swindle! This is a country which is run by people who would rather take money than earn it. The case of Cheney and his role with Halliburton: Halliburton is in difficulties—in legal difficulty in foreign countries, as well as the United States, as in the case of Nigeria. The tax policy is rigged, by the gang, today, by the gang which are profiteers. And if you look at the condition of life of the lower 80% of the family-income brackets in the United States—trace that, especially from 1977; look especially at the lower 20% of the family-income brackets; look at who gets taxed and who doesn't; who gets benefits, who doesn't. Of course the thing is unfair! It's grossly, cruelly, unfair. [cheers, applause]

Moderator: Let's all give Mr. LaRouche a big hand. Thank him for coming. [applause; members of the LaRouche Youth Movement present, are singing the Spiritual, "Oh, Freedom!"]