

LAROCHE TELLS GERMAN ASSOCIATES

Prepare for Battles Ahead: 'I Know the Road to Victory'

The LaRouche movement in Germany, and its political arm, the Civil Rights Solidarity Movement (BüSo), met near Frankfurt on Dec. 16-17, to deliberate on how to bring to Europe the "New Politics" with which the LaRouche Youth Movement in the United States is shaping developments across the Atlantic. As we reported last week, the BüSo re-elected Helga Zepp-LaRouche as its national chairwoman. Daniel Buchmann of the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM), along with Elke Fimmen and Klaus Fimmen, are the new vice chairmen. The new party executive committee includes six members of the LYM: Daniel Buchmann, Petra Carlsson, Kai-Uwe Dücke, Katarzyna Kruczkowski, Alexander Pusch, and Stephan Tolksdorf.

The first day of discussion was a private meeting of the International Caucus of Labor Committees, including members from the rest of Europe, the United States, and Eurasia. We publish here substantial excerpts from Lyndon LaRouche's opening speech to that gathering. The BüSo open session, its annual party conference, was held on Dec. 17. We include in this package Helga Zepp-LaRouche's keynote speech there, and concluding observations by Lyndon LaRouche.

What we are talking about today, is largely the future. Now, we don't have any guarantees as to what the future will be, but we have an advantage: I have a map. And the question as to what future you get to, depends upon which route you take, according to the map. And what I shall present to you today is the essentials of the map.

Now, first of all, the reality in the U.S. today, the political situation, the general situation, is far contrary to anything that I've heard from Germany, or from other places in Europe. I've just heard from Germany, mostly. And everyone who

thinks they know about what's going to happen in the future and thinks they know what's going on in the United States, doesn't know what they're talking about.

We have made, ourselves, this movement has made a change in the course of history. We have not secured a road to victory, but we've discovered where it lies. And we discovered the means of transportation to get there.

It started directly about 1999, as some of you recall: that because I was not able to get to the United States to participate in the [Presidential election] campaign, I did two broadcasts from here in Germany, and one was on the subject of "Storm Over Asia," which I think some of you may recall; some of you saw, some of you participated in making. And if you look back at "Storm Over Asia," you see exactly where we've gone. This was the point, at which I was getting out from under restraint; that is, even though I'd been out of prison actually since January of 1994, I had not been allowed to direct this organization, or any part of it. Because I was not allowed to talk to key people, and therefore, I could not direct it.

So, suddenly, at the end of 1999, I began to be allowed to find out what had been going on in the organization in a period of ten years. A lot of changes had been made, many for the worse, mostly for the worse. Bad policies. So, we moved to do two things: First of all, to have a war-plan for dealing with the future, and this war-plan developed essentially over 1999, beginning with "Storm Over Asia," as the first formulation; we did another meeting with people by video hook-up from here, again during that period. But during that period into the end of 2000, when I was free to manage things and was finding out what had gone wrong, and who had done what to whom, while I was ten years out of control, we made new policies. We set a new direction.

One of the things I did, was to start a Youth Movement. This was done on the basis of contact with campus youth who were attracted to my Presidential campaign. And this resulted, particularly, on the West Coast, in the development of the beginning of a youth movement. It was a sorting-out process at first, more than anything else. But, we moved.

Then, we faced the results which were almost inevitable: that with the Gore-Lieberman ticket, you were going to have a disaster, one way or the other. Gore-Lieberman could have been possibly just as bad as Bush and Cheney have been. There really wasn't that much difference. But, we began to move.

Now, right after the election of the year 2000, we moved; we moved in a matter of days. And in January of 2001, several days before Bush was actually inaugurated, I set forth what the perspective would be for the coming, immediate period, since a new phase of depression had broken out, in the year 2000, the end of the so-called boom at that time, the Y2K boom. So at that point, I said: This has already happened. Bush is totally incompetent. His administration is incompetent. As a result of this, we're going to have an economic disaster, under Bush—which we have had, internationally as a matter of fact. Things are much worse in Germany, you may have noticed it, than they were at that time. And since they are incompetent, what we must expect, is something to happen, soon, like what Hermann Göring did in Germany, in February of 1933, in organizing setting fire to the Reichstag, in order to make Hitler a dictator.

In September of that year, Sept. 11, 2001, someone did what Hermann Göring did: They launched what became known as 9/11. Which was an act of terror organized by interests inside the Western system! Remember, Osama bin Laden had been a person who had been put under Jimmy Goldsmith and George H.W. Bush, during the period of the Afghanistan War. Osama bin Laden is a member of a famous Saudi oil family; it's very close to the Bush family. And Osama became a leader in the Afghansi operation. That was the beginning of al-Qaeda. Al-Qaeda translated as "The Map," which is the program for terrorism by al-Qaeda, under Anglo-American direction in the tradition of al-Afghani in that region.

So, this agency was used as a cover for a sophisticated operation, which became known as 9/11. And Bush came very close to becoming an absolute dictator, on the evening of that day. The effort was made to push through adopted policies, which didn't go all the way, the way it was planned, under which Bush would have become an absolute dictator—like Hitler. Just as Hitler was after the *Reichstagsbrand*.

So, it didn't quite go all the way. But as we know, it went pretty far. So, again, we were right.

Why I Am Considered a Danger

In the meantime, I'm building up the policies for doing something significant in the 2004 campaign. And we got more and more influence, and we made more and more enemies



EIRNS/Helene Möller

Lyndon LaRouche advised his German associates: "We don't have any guarantees as to what the future will be, but we have an advantage: I have a map. . . . And what I shall present to you today is the essentials of the map."

during that year, because the reason I went to jail in the first place is because I was considered a threat. Not because I had done anything wrong: I hadn't. But I was considered a threat, because I had orchestrated what became known as the SDI. And the fact that I had done that, over the objections of the Anglo-American interests involved, and had nearly succeeded—if the head of the Soviet Union had not been an idiot, we would have succeeded. And he was an idiot, who died that year of a heart attack, as a result of his own foolishness, of the stress he put himself under. Maybe somebody helped him to go, because they decided to get rid of him.

But anyway, at that point, I was considered a danger, particularly after Reagan made that address. So, within a few weeks, actually, after the President's address, the operation to get rid of me was put into motion. It was set into motion, signalled by John Train: John Train, the banker, who was one of the leaders of the organization that was run in Europe under *The Paris Review*, of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, a fascist cult which destroyed the culture of much of Europe.

So, I was a danger. I'm still a danger, as far as they're concerned. They wanted to kill me several times, and they said, "Don't kill him, you'll make a martyr of him, and that would be bad." They said, "He would be more dangerous as a martyr than he will be alive. So, let him be alive, and hope he does something foolish and discredits himself. Try to discredit him." It didn't work.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

LaRouche gives a speech on beam-weapon defense in Washington, D.C., April 13, 1983. The reason LaRouche was considered a threat to the Anglo-Dutch Liberal establishment, and was sent to jail, was that he orchestrated what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Now, we're back, not with all the trappings we had in the 1980s, but actually, in terms of historical position, we're in a much stronger position to shape the history of this planet, than we have ever been before; and we were very close to shaping the history of the planet back in the beginning of the 1980s, which is why they're trying to get rid of us.

Go for Mass Organizing!

The form now, is different. Remember, this is ten years: I was out of action, out of command, out of leadership for ten years, between prison and after prison. So, one of the first things I did, was to recognize that we had destroyed our outreach. . . . My concern was to get that back. . . .

So how do you do mass organizing? Well, mass organizing is always done with young people. The American Revolution was made by young people, the same age as our Youth Movement here! And even somewhat younger. The same age-interval as our Youth Movement here, made the American Revolution! Every revolution, every great change in history, has been made, on the field, by people of that generation. This is true in all history. You may have a few smart people at the top; but what makes it work, is you're going to the mass of people at the base, the young adult population. If you haven't got the young adult population working with you, you've got nothing. And what we started, in the year 2000, during the election campaign, that year, we started to build that process.

And it took some effort, because we didn't have much enthusiasm for this. Because people were ingrained, over ten years of acquired habits of not doing mass organizing, of being afraid of it! Of trying to rely on hiding behind a telephone someplace, being a voice from afar, but not getting out there with the people.

But young people who have more energy, and other quali-

ties, they're looking at the future, not at the past. Older people tend to look at the past, especially Baby Boomers, because it's the no-future generation. It was trained to be a no-future generation, by the people who created the Congress for Cultural Freedom. So, if you don't believe in the future, and you get older, what happens? You become mean-spirited, crabby. "Nyah! Nyah!" You know, you hate children, you hate young people—"Get 'em out! Get 'em away!" "Leave me in peace, don't bother me! You're stepping on my garden!" "Your dogs crap on my sidewalk." Things like that.

Whereas younger people don't have much of a past, and they hope they have a future. In former times, people, when they had families, and grew older, particularly as grandparents, would look forward to their grandchildren as being the future. Healthy people always are like that: They like young people. Not because young people don't have bad breath, or things like that, but because they represent the future. And young people, having nothing else to do, except the future, because the past is childishness, are now going into the real world, and are thinking about 50 or 60 years of life ahead of them: What kind of a world are they going to live in? Stupid people are concerned about what they get. Intelligent people are concerned about what other people get.

If you want a future—you're going to die, so therefore, what can you work for that is solid, that is safe? Other people's future! The future of the next generation, and generations to come. The future of the nation. Your identity is located in the future of the nation, the future of society, the future of civilization. And that's the point.

Education of the Youth Movement

Now, the question is, how do you do that? There's one aspect which has been particularly successful in what we've done, in that: And that is on the relationship between choral music and physical science. When I saw what had been accomplished with the Youth Movement on the West Coast, I was very happy about what had been accomplished, but I saw a weakness, a very crucial weakness: There was no effective music program. There was singing, but there was no effective music program. [As a baby cries in the audience] There is one now! The future is here.

So, what we've done, is, we started with the *Jesu, meine Freude*: I suggested this to John Sigerson as the appropriate choral work, around which to build a musical capability with the youth group. Now the objective was ultimately to get to my old friend, Furtwängler's goal, of "performing between the notes" as he called it, or things like that. Which is the same thing as the Pythagorean comma. The Pythagorean comma is not an arithmetic magnitude; it is not a number. It is an ontological quality, of between the notes. And you find out, if you watch, if you do some of the work that they've done with the *Jesu, meine Freude*, you find that, if you eliminate one voice, or put it back in, you have a different sense of the comma, a different sense of dissonance, or quasi-dissonance, than with

a different number of voices, voices sung—that is, species-voices. So: the comma.

Now, what happened is, we had just recently, an interesting youth hook-up with me from Leesburg, out to California, to the West Coast. And the question came up on the nature of science and musical programs; and what came up out of the West Coast was not right, and I said so. And the youth there, who had been in this particular part of the music program, spontaneously laughed. Because, how do you know what a physical principle is? A physical principle is not a mathematical magnitude, and most education today is incompetent, because it equates physical principles with mathematical magnitudes. This is only the case of people who have never studied Kepler, or at least, never understood him. Because, there are two aspects to knowing a universal principle. One thing, maybe you're able to demonstrate that it exists, as a phenomenon. But the other thing, is to *know* it. That is, to know it as an experienced, impassioned idea.

Now, when you're doing work in physical science, as this group in Leesburg had been working heavily on Kepler. They were working on Kepler from the beginning to its completion: Working through each of the books, step by step, re-experiencing everything Kepler experienced, because it's the best scientific training available anywhere: Take Kepler *as he wrote*; as he wrote his experience. Re-live each step of the experience, as he describes it, in progress. Now, instead of knowing about Kepler, you actually have re-experienced what he experienced in making these discoveries. And you go through the agonies, the doubts, and everything involved, as people did.

Now, if, at the same time, you're doing rehearsals, as they were doing with John, on the basis of the comma, in a cultivated performance of the *Jesu, meine Freude*, in particular, in this case, you get another type of refinement. And once the people who are singing, realize what they're doing, and realize that *it is right*, this sense of rightness, becomes *passion*. And it's association of the idea of physical reality, of physical principle, with *passion*. So that, only by unifying the Classical musical sense, from a Pythagorean standpoint, or like a Furtwängler standpoint, together with the act of discovery of a physical scientific principle—*then you know what you're talking about*.

If you haven't done that, you don't know what you're talking about. And most people, in science today, *don't know what they're talking about*. They're talking about something, but they don't know what it is. They haven't experienced it. They don't know it. They know *about* it; they know its reputation; they may respect its reputation. "It's true." "Oh! That's true!" But they don't believe it. They're not in love with it! There's a difference.

Okay. Now, so: That characteristic, as the Youth Movement gets that, and they get it more quickly, particularly with the concentration on the choral singing voice, and then going through the steps, as you have to go through, to perfect this,

to make the thing stand out clearly as voices, not as a series of notes, not as different voices, but as a process, a process of development with continuity. You get a better power to organize, because you have more self-confidence, because you know what you're talking about.

See, most people in society don't know what they're talking about. They will express *passion* in defense of what they assert to be true . . . but they *don't* know what they're talking about. They don't actually *know* it. They say, "I believe that." They don't know what they believe. What they're worried about, is what they're seen appearing to believe, not what they believe.

So, now, if you take young people, who are still optimistic and future-oriented, you develop in them, through their own work, a sense of their own mission, and put them out in a challenging environment, where they have to adapt, and they do adapt, they can adapt.

So what happened, essentially, was this development: We created a Youth Movement, in varying degrees, and varying qualities. We had a West Coast development which was leading at one point, but it was stagnating, for various reasons, environmental as well as others. But also the point was, the music work had not been developed sufficiently. Therefore, what we had started on the East Coast, I insisted that this *Jesu, meine Freude* pivot be used, in order to make the bridge, so that there was not this division between so-called art and science. As long as art and science are divided, are treated as two separate departments, you don't know either. It's only when you can bring the two together in the same mind, where the passion for truth of physical principle, and the passion of truth in musical performance, polyphony, are clear, then you are a united person. You have an identity, you have authority. . . .

The Boston development was particularly crucial, because when I formed the youth organization as a Boston region, I knew that Bill Ferguson up there could handle the region, and he did a good job. He has done a good job. He's an imaginative, creative person, and a qualified person. But the youth that were sent to Boston, were a selection of people who had the quality of functioning as the core of a professional chorus, or becoming a professional chorus. We needed a chorus, as a model for building the choruses around the organization as a whole. So the Boston region became special in a sense: It became the base in which we developed choral work at the highest level. We get John Sigerson, actually, who's indispensable in this; he has an excellent ear, an excellent knowledge of this stuff, and good judgment, and works hard at it. So therefore, he was key in organizing the voice-training sessions, which we would have as clinical sessions.

The 2006 Election: A Political Shift

With that kind of background, we went into this election campaign. Not just the year 2004-2005 campaigns, but into this year, and what was coming up with the midterm election,



EIRNS/Chris Lewis

Members of the BūSo singing at the Dec. 17 conference. As the Youth Movement gets a better understanding of choral singing as a process of development, LaRouche said, “you get a better power to organize, because you have more self-confidence, because you know what you’re talking about.”

Nov. 7. Now, if you read the transcript of what I said—and some of you heard it, in Berlin, on the 3rd of November, where I gave a description of a principle of “mass effect” in political organizing—what I described there, in that report to the youth in Berlin, is exactly what was going on in the United States, which resulted in a landslide victory for the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives. And but for Howard Dean, the chairman of the Democratic Party campaign committee, but for Dean, we’d have had ten more votes in the House of Representatives than we got. So, over that opposition, we won.

Now, what happened was, is that probably, the Republicans would have won the Senate completely, and they probably would have also maintained a majority in the House of Representatives. What we did was crucial in this process: We are the ones who created the landslide in the House of Representatives.

Now, all the facts, afterward, the polls and so forth, and studies afterward, show exactly how this occurred: As you may recall, we were dealing with this John Train problem. In the process of examining the John Train operations, at Boston University we ran into an attack on us, there. This attack was vicious and suggested various things. So, we checked on it. We found out what the organization was that was behind what happened at Boston University. A meeting of this organization, ACTA [American Council of Trustees and Alumni], was being held at the Harvard University campus. So our members up there, the youth, went in like college mice, sat in on the

sessions, listened, took notes, got copies of everything, and then we investigated all the material we collected. On that basis, we ran an operation on key campuses and similar locations throughout the United States, in targeted areas. We exposed this thing.

Now, what you had, was a virtual fascist dictatorship being run by—guess who? At the head of it? Cheney! Lynne Cheney! The Vice President’s wife—who is a worse bastard than he is! She keeps him chained up at night, you know, along with the dogs. But, she has been, since the 1980s, a key part of this neo-conservative fascist movement in the United States. And she was the head of this organization which targeted professors to be expelled from the university; that anyone who talked like them should also be expelled, and students on campus should not be allowed to discuss politics.

So, you had a strange aura on these campuses where the students were afraid. They would smile [gives a fixed grin], “Umm-mm. Umm-hmm,” but

they wouldn’t talk! Professors were terrified. When we broke the thing open, the professors began to say, “Ahhh! Now, we can talk!” Students, who it had been predicted would not turn out for the elections at all, the midterm elections—turned out. Because they had been oppressed, they were angry, they had a sense of being liberated by what our work was doing. So therefore, if you take the areas in which we were deployed, you see the surge. And they spread, through links, throughout the country.

So that, in the last few weeks, before the midterm election, there was a sudden surge by a 10% increase in the level of youth participation in total national campaign. It was that youth participation in the campaign, which *won the election*. That is, maybe the Democrats might have eked out a narrow victory in the House. They would not have won the Senate. The Republicans would have maintained the Senate.

Victory in Texas

Then, we had this more recent one, as an off-schedule election, because of a jam-up in the former district of DeLay, in Texas, outside of San Antonio, next to a German-speaking area, called Bexar County. It’s a place where Germans settled in the 19th Century, and they brought camels and other things down in there to try to use some of the desert area, and that didn’t work out too well, but they stayed there. I know the county fairly well.

So, we decided we were going to take on this election. Ciro Rodriguez was considered a sure loser, a Democratic

candidate, against [Republican] Henry Bonilla, who had been in the House about 14 years, and had won every election, and seemed indomitable. The Democratic Party leadership was actually defending Bonilla's winning. That was their policy. We went in, against the Democratic Party leadership under Dean; we went in against the whole operation. We went into, particularly one of these areas, Palo Alto College, which is a commuter college, a spillover of the Bandera County, German colonization, and you had a post-war German colonization move into that area to reinforce the German colonization that had occurred back in the middle of the 19th Century.

So here, we had a fine old time, despite the fact that Dean, the head of the Democratic Party, was doing everything to try to get us blocked out of there.

So, then what happened: We were ahead. We know that we were ahead already, because there was a period where people could vote early, cast their ballots and put them in a bag, so to speak, and they would stay there, and be counted on Election Day. So the early vote count, showed that already, Rodriguez was going to win! To the point that Bonilla conceded, even before the full vote was counted. A margin of 10% of the total vote cast was for Rodriguez, coming from behind.

Now, the initial part of that victory, the narrow margin of victory, was given by our operation. But then, Bill Clinton, who is no idiot, following what we did, read my report on the "New Politics" [EIR, Dec. 8, 2006], decided that I was right about the election, and therefore, went down to the same college where we were concentrating our campaign for Rodriguez, and he turned out a tremendous turnout—for him! And therefore, what happened is, what we had created as a marginal victory, now became a landslide victory, because of Clinton's intervention.

During this same period, you've had a period where Dean, who has tried to follow the old fascist, the old racist from South Carolina, Don Fowler, the former leader of the Democratic Party—an old enemy of ours—Dean, and similar people have been going at the Clintons, they've been going at Bob Rubin, and they've been after me, and James Carville, who is famous in the United States. So, we were the targets.

Now, what is at stake, therefore, in this particular election in Texas, was Dean's credibility: And Dean lost his credibility. So, now you have an upheaval inside the Democratic Party.

It's even more complicated than that: Don't assume that Cheney and Bush are in any respect in a solid position in the United States, at all. *Not*. They're not merely criticized; They're probably going to be dumped. I won't talk about something that I know, but the game, essentially, is, to get Cheney out, and neutralize the Bush problem. If he goes out, if he resigns before the completion of his term, to have it occur more quietly. But, to get Cheney out.

What you saw in the Baker-Hamilton commission, was a signal of that: that the mood in the United States is increasingly, "*Get the bums out!*"

Political Upheaval

So, the idea that there's a stagnant position in the United States, as is talked about in Germany—is absolutely untrue. There is no stagnant position. What there is, is the fact that for 14 years, the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives has been essentially isolated from any function, by a Republican majority, for 14 years. Now, suddenly they're coming back into position: The key committees, like the Ways and Means Committee and others, are going to go to work. But there's not a sense of confident authority, that you would have had, say, 14 years ago. So therefore, they're creaky, they're gradually getting their wheels into shape, they're moving. But the moving is determined. And the other thing to consider is the effect of the fact that we are now in *an inevitable, global crisis*, depression crisis. Nothing will stop it. This system is finished. And the effects of the death of the system, are going to accelerate the effects you've already seen.

The problem you get in the Democratic Party, the leadership, which is why you have to understand this to judge it—the problem you have, is that, they say, "Yes, yes, you're right. But, uh—look, the market's up." Do they believe the economy is improving? No, they don't believe the economy is improving. They don't believe it. But they believe that many suckers believe in the stock market. Therefore, they don't want to be caught saying bad things about the stock market, for fear that they'll be blamed for the collapse.

And when I talk with people in the Congress, members of Congress, that's exactly what you get. They say, "Yes, but. . . . Yes, but. . . . Yes, but. . . ." That is, they don't have the sense of certainty of the need to act in this way. So their willingness to mobilize for positive action is limited. Their willingness to mobilize for negative action, is there. That is, the idea of introducing a positive change in policy, and posing a positive change in policy, does not exist. It exists as an idea. It exists as something that people talk about; but the passion isn't there. The passion is, to remove things that are considered bad, not to add things that are considered good. Difference.

For example: To make legislation to help people who are losing their jobs—yes. To push legislation to rebuild the industry—no.

So, you're at a point where the population is indecisive. On the one hand, it has a sense of victory; it has a sense of that. But it has not yet got the sense of strength to be willing to say, "Now, we're going to make changes of the type that Franklin Roosevelt typifies, in the history of the United States, today." But that's our situation.

Europe Can't Survive Without Change in U.S.

Globally, the other side is: that unless this happens in the United States the way it should happen, you can forget Europe. There's nothing that Europe will do to save itself, unless the United States acts first. It's a complete illusion. Because, look: First of all, European systems are based on parliamen-

tary systems. Parliamentary systems are intrinsically not the systems appropriate for sovereign government. Because, if you're under a parliamentary system, especially parliamentary systems where central banking systems have authority over government, on matters of economic policy and related policy, in that case, the parliamentary system *has no authority to deal with a serious crisis*, except under the leadership of another government, as for example, when the United States functions, Europe can function. If the United States doesn't function, Europe is a useless thing. Especially Central and Western Europe.

Look what's happening in the Netherlands right now. Look what's happening in Belgium, right now. Look at the situation in Italy, right now. Look at the crisis in France, right now. Look at the crisis here in Germany, where the country is dying, and nobody in the government even dares to think about doing anything to stop the process of death! So that, unless the United States acts, to provide leadership in this kind of direction, there's *no chance that Europe will survive—none!* If the United States goes, you're finished! Europe's finished, and finished very soon. There's no chance.

So, we're in that situation. I say we have an excellent map. I have an excellent map. I know lots of things. Not everything, but lots of things. And I know the road to victory. I know the direction we should go in. *But:* I can't guarantee victory. I can only show you the map, and hope that we get enough people, and the right people, to decide, to follow the right signs on the map, and go in the right direction.

The other thing we've got to do here in Europe, in Berlin in particular: The only way you're going to get morale, and build anything in Europe, is on this conception I just presented to you. Because, Europeans who are not stupid, no matter what they say, if they're not stupid, they know I'm right. They may not know why I'm right, but they know that unless the United States turns, they know, in themselves, that they haven't got the *guts* to do what has to be done! They know that. Maybe the Russians have guts, but the Russians don't have the capability of doing this. Central and Western Europe don't have guts. Look at Eastern Europe, they have the right to speak—it's a good thing they have the right to speak, because they have a lot to complain about. There's no country in the former Comecon region, including part of east Germany—Saxony, for example—there's no part that is not worse off economically, today, than it was under the Comecon. All they have is the right to complain—if they don't complain too loudly. They're worse off—far worse off. You expect morale there? You get even fascist tendencies there, as a result of depression, despair.

Central Europe? Nothing! No chance. The British are out to eat the place. They're getting ready to, the British are ready to make a new King now. William has just gotten his maturity, he's now qualified—even *Bildzeitung* recognizes he's the coming King. (I don't know with whom, but he's coming.) So, the Queen is out there, merrily planning to have her grand-

son take over the throne, to replace her errant son, the other candidate, or something of that sort. And you have a fight going on in England, among the Scottish interests, among the English interests, and the Welsh interests—if you please—as to how the “Lord of the Isles” arrangement is going to be configured. A change in the monarchy is in place; there's a fight about it. There's a fight among these particular types of interests, and they're preparing to head up (they hope), a globalized world empire. Like a Venetian-style, not as soldiers or Red Coats running the world, that sort of thing. But simply, the City of London, with its Dutch banking associates, will essentially be the center of controlling finances in the world, in a totally globalized system.

So, you will get no guts here.

But if the European knows that something is in the United States, that is capable and might be disposed to save civilization, then the European says, “Okay, we can count on the Americans, can't we? Or, *can* we count on the Americans? What do we have to do, to get the Americans to do what we require of them, in order to make ourselves free?” Therefore, if you knock the U.S. in Europe, if you knock it existentially, you say, “It's hopeless, things are going to go on like that forever, it's hopeless,” you're committing suicide. You're saying, “Let's go die.” Only if you're optimistic about what *could* be the case in the United States, do you have any reason not to be in deep despair. . . .

And that's the problem you've got here. . . . The policy's not oriented to what this organization was based on: It was based on an understanding of history; it was based on understanding what the American Revolution represented in history. And that's been lost.

Bush and Cheney Discredited America

Of course, that's been helped greatly by the case of George Bush, as President. The Bush-Cheney appointment, was something stuck into the United States by the British, in order to discredit the United States. You want to destroy a country, give it that kind of image, Bush and Cheney. Make it hated.

What have they done? The Bush-Cheney Administration has destroyed the U.S. military. The Bush-Cheney Administration has conveniently, for the greater glory of the British, destroyed U.S. influence in the entire Southwest Asia. It is on the verge of going to war with Russia. It is on the verge of a war orientation toward China. It is destroying India, as much as it can. It's ruining everything. It's taking the entire Southwest Asia, in the process of destroying it.

For example, the Saudi Ambassador to the United States just resigned. “I'm getting out of here,” he said. He packed his bags, and left the United States, al-Turki. Why? Well, because Prince Bandar cut a deal with Cheney, behind the Ambassador's back, for Cheney to have a visit to discuss this policy of his in the Middle East—without informing the Saudi Ambassador to the United States! Now, what does that do?

The Saudis are not in the best of shape, shall we say—to put it charmingly, They're not in the best of shape. What are they being pushed into? They're being pushed into something even they don't want. They have a susceptibility: They're afraid that the Shi'a minority, or probably majority, in that territory, which is also in the oil territory, will somehow join a revolt against them. They're upset about the Sunni problem, in the whole region, as the result of this war. They're concerned about many things. All these nations, many of whose governments are not much, are frightened. They're easily intimidated. And Cheney is working around, on the assumption that the United States is going to support Israel against the Palestinians; on that assumption, they're all in despair. And even some of them are thinking about joining with the Israelis, against the Shi'a. That's not going to go far—because the Arab on the street won't go for it. But, that's the kind of thing that's going on.

Now, what does that do in terms of the United States? It discredits the United States. It discredits people even who want to be corrupt; they want to be corrupted by the United States. But they don't want this!

So, that's the kind of situation. And therefore, if you have a United States which is discredited, then you have no optimism in Europe. You have a dark mood, an existentialist mood in Europe, and no future.

If there is no hope in the United States, then that's a reality you have to face. However, if there *is* a chance in the United States, on the map, to make the turn to save civilization, then, you're optimistic. That's the situation. And that's what the problem is here: if there's any doubt, about what's possible in the United States.

'Mass Effect' of the Youth Movement

Now, the other side of the thing, is, the youth question. Yes, the guy wants to set up a business. So, what he does, he hires some employees to fill up an office, which is going to administer the business. The business produces pamphlets, other literature, television advertising, about how wonderful the business is. *But!* The problem is, the business is based on saving money. How'd they save money? By not employing anybody in the factory, and not producing any product.

In politics, the product is the activity of a mass movement, a mass movement orientation. And what I described as "the mass effect." Which I've written about; what I first described



EIRNS/James Rea

LaRouche Youth Movement organizers in Berlin, November 2006. The sign in the foreground urges passersby to contribute for a straitjacket for Bush, "Made in Germany." "Without a youth movement, you're dead," LaRouche warned the BüSo.

to the youth in Berlin on the 3rd of November, which was going to happen in the United States, and it did happen. It happened there; it's now happened again with this Texas election. But, without the Youth Movement, without the Youth Movement functioning in the way I have been pushing its functioning, this organization *could not continue to exist*. And without the Youth Movement, like the one we have in the United States, we don't have a chance for civilization: Because it is this factor, of the age-group between 18 and 35, especially the university-oriented, not necessarily in university, but university-oriented, intellectually oriented—that layer of the population is decisive in determining whether there will be anything in the United States. That is also crucial if there's going to be anything in Europe.

So, if you don't have a youth movement, growing in the way I have built it, in the U.S., and tried to build it here in Europe, since 1999, *you don't have a prayer of existing!* And you might as well shut up your organization, if you're not going to do it! Because the organization will not exist. And it is better to make a decent withdrawal, than to make a disgusting mess of yourself.

So, without a youth movement, you're dead. Any plans that don't include a youth movement development of the type we're trying to run in Berlin, for example, without that, you don't have an organization in Germany—you're just kidding yourself.

And you don't have any history. And you don't have a future. So what the hell are you doing?