

LaRouche Youth Movement Pokes at Soros' Dems

by Matthew Ogden

Lyndon LaRouche has dedicated his youth movement to the study of knowable truth, through historical discoveries such as Gauss' proof of the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra. As a Platonist, he teaches that if you run across something furry in your path and you want to know what it is, you don't stand and objectively look at it; you poke it with a stick and see what it does. So, when we heard that the world-renowned "philanthropist" George Soros was coming to town, we decided to poke this furry creature and see what he really was. On June 3rd, in an East Coast LaRouche Youth Movement Day of Action, six members deployed into the George Soros-sponsored "Take Back America" conference. (Two other crews visited the House of Representatives to assert LaRouche's leadership against Dick Cheney, and had rallies circling the White House and the Executive Office Building).

We tried to poke these pragmatic Dems as hard as possible. Dressed in jackets and slacks (not normal garb for youth revolutionaries) we seated ourselves in the front row of the Ballroom at the Windham Park Marriot, just in time for Hillary Clinton to introduce the featured speaker, Soros. Clinton was a bit defensive about the support being given by Soros, warning the audience that they would hear many attacks on him—apparently pre-empting any intervention by the LaRouche Youth Movement. She justified what her party was doing by arguing that since the right wing has been funded by "successful businessmen" for 50 years, why shouldn't the Democratic Party employ the same fund-raising tactics to take the nation back?

Soros Claims 'Bush Boom' Is Bust

Soros was very ponderous, choosing his words carefully. He said that in his mind, this election is a referendum on the Bush Doctrine, an ideology which first expressed itself after Sept. 11 with the invasion of Iraq. The Bush Doctrine, he said, consists of two points: The United States must maintain absolute military sovereignty; and America has the right to pre-emptive action. Those two points taken individually are valid, Soros said, but together they impose an idea of sovereignty which he likened to the idea in Orwell's *Animal Farm*—all animals are equal, but some are more equal than others.

Apparently, Soros is a great scientist, and he used his scientific method to apply his theory of "Reflexivity" (the relationship between perception and reality) as a crucial ex-

periment in the domain of the market place. He discovered that there was no such thing as equilibrium, but that the boom-bust cycle is a principle, and he exploited that discovery to become the successful businessman he is today. He now applied his discovery of the boom/bust principle to politics. Public opinion grasped the reality of terrorism, which its perception then greatly exaggerated, which brought Bush's boom. The moment of truth with the pictures from Abu Ghraib, reversed that perception, turning the "victims of terror into its perpetrators," and making the public realize it had been deceived. There were no WMD, there was no connection to Al-Qaeda, and we were not welcomed as liberators of the Iraqi people. This is Bush's bust, which Soros now wishes to exploit.

Soros also hit on some points around the failure of globalization, and the problem with Bush's ideology of "crude social Darwinism, survival of the fittest, competition." He said, we can't depend on the market alone to allocate resources. It works for the private sector, but not for the public. Making a comment on Kissinger's "geopolitical realism," and the neo-cons (whom he calls American Supremacists) who believe in the false concept of political power, he drew applause. The idea of power, he said, is borrowed from natural science, and it doesn't translate into social science. He ended with a call to have a "regime change" in the United States, to re-establish our position in the world and correct the deficiencies of globalization, by working together with other nations, and figuring out new solutions to the question of how we intervene on the Saddams of the world.

Unfortunately, Soros dove off the stage immediately afterwards, accepting no questions!

Although Soros's crusade for an Open Society and against totalitarian regimes sounded attractive on the surface, after doing some research it turns out that Soros's idea of fascism and a "closed society" is directed toward Plato's *Republic*—the very tradition on which the United States of America was founded!

Although these Dems say they want to take America back from the right-wing Bush/Cheney neo-conservatives, whom LaRouche exposed in his March 2003 *Children of Satan* pamphlet as followers of fascist Prof. Leo Strauss, it turns out that the Democrats' major funder, "philanthropist" Soros, shares Strauss's view of Plato as a want-to-be philosopher king who would use lies and deception as a means to rule. As the neo-cons hail Leo Strauss, Soros hails his London School of Economics professor Karl Popper, whom he praised throughout his speech.

Strauss and Popper share one thing in common: a twisted view of Plato as an authoritarian personality who uses "truth" and "morality" as Delphic magic formulas to control the stupid masses. Soros's mentor Popper discusses this in his book, called *The Spell of Plato*.

The Democratic Party of Athens killed Socrates, because he organized youth around knowable truth. The Democratic



George Soros' tens of millions of dollars to the Democratic Party got a hug from Sen. Hillary Clinton at Soros "Take Back America" confab on June 3; but despite all that "progressive" money thrown at the Party, young people attending were still looking for LaRouche.

Party of today is excluding LaRouche from the Presidential debates, in the interest of the sophistry of John Kerry. Is Soros using the Democratic Party as a way to continue Popper's mission to free the world from the "enemies" of an Open Society—to free the world from the "spell of Plato"?

The Impact of LaRouche

Despite George Soros, the influence of LaRouche's ideas on the Democratic Party was apparent, as was the fight behind the scenes to bring him in. The rest of the conference consisted of plenary sessions and workshops, which gave us the opportunity to intervene on some of these with questions, and also to mingle and organize.

Former Labor Secretary Robert Reich gave a presentation, saying globalization is anti-patriotic, and calling for tax penalties on companies that outsource American jobs. Reich attacked the "low-road" idea of lowering our standards to produce things for cheap, cheap, cheap. "We'll never be able to compete with Bangladesh." It's not about being cheap, he said; it's about having the best, most educated, healthiest, and most productive labor force in the world. But the clear problem was that these panelists were presenting a "Non-Euclidean Economics," whereas LaRouche presents an "Anti-Euclidean Economics".

A hubbub in the room, produced by the report that Tenet had resigned, brought us in contact with a young lady independently trying to figure out how to organize youth for the Democratic Party. She said that she has been studying LaRouche's writing deeply, because of her ongoing debates with her financial establishment parents on the subject of LaRouche.

The sticking-point is the reality of the onrushing worldwide financial blowout. No matter how much money the Democratic Party throws at these young people, they still remain intrigued by LaRouche.

"I remember when you guys busted up the CBC Morgan State debate last year" said one; and another, "I saw 100 of you guys in downtown Washington the other week!" During a panel on the Iraq war, most of the panelists attacked Kerry for his position, saying he should remember his statement, made upon returning from Vietnam, about how much he despised war. One younger military man on the panel, who had been on the ground in Iraq, called for economic development as the road to peace and stability. He told us afterwards that he had already read the LaRouche Doctrine, and had friends who were "really into LaRouche."

Governor Dean entered like it was the comeback of the Rolling Stones, with music playing, cameras flashing, and women screaming. He said the two issues of the election are Bush's lies, and the economy. Dean recalled that he had called for Tenet's resignation during the primary campaign; but he took this opportunity to bring attention to

people in the office of our Vice President, and to list the name of the four neo-cons on the cover of LaRouche's *Children of Satan* pamphlet—in order: Cheney, Rumsfeld, Perle, and Wolfowitz—and to call them all liars.

What If Republicans Get Smart?

Four of us decided to make some trouble with the truth in a press conference with Dean and Roger Hickey, co-director of the conference. After statements, I got in the first question, asking Dean: "Since the world has changed since the primaries began, and the primary issues which are on the front of voters' minds have become, increasingly, the economy and the war, there has been discussion of—in the interest of revitalizing the party—opening up the Democratic convention to include not only yourself and Senator Edwards, but also more controversial candidates such as LaRouche. What do you think about that idea? Dean: I think it's a bad idea, we already have our nominee and I'm supporting him!

Another LaRouche Youth got to ask a follow-up. He elaborated on the questions of the war and the economy, and asked, since LaRouche has actively put out solutions to both of these, why not include him? Dean: "Because he's a convicted felon!"

These people need LaRouche. The attendees were all unified in being hyped up about "Beating Bush." But they snapped out of their fantasies quickly when we asked them: Hypothetically, what would happen if the Republicans got smart and dumped Bush to get a better nominee? Where would the unity of the Democrats go?