

Thank You Very Much, Mr. LaRouche, for All that You Represent for All Mankind

by Dennis Small

The following is an edited transcript of the presentation by Dennis Small on the March 21 Fireside Chat. The audio of the presentation and the full discussion that followed is available [here](#). Mr. Small was introduced by Dennis Speed.

Dennis Speed: My name is Dennis Speed. On behalf of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, I want to welcome everybody to our March 21 Fireside Chat.

There's a saying that Mahatma Gandhi is credited with, with respect to his battle against British imperialism: "First, they ignore you; then they laugh at you; then they fight you; then you win." The situation concerning Lyndon LaRouche took a particular turn last week, and as of tomorrow, we going to see something very important occur in Italy when the President of China Xi Jinping arrives with a 500-person delegation in Italy. In one sense, it may be the beginning of a kind of second Council of Florence, an idea we can say more about in the course of our presentation. Last week

Helga Zepp-LaRouche was in Italy, participating in a conference together with Michele Geraci, Undersecretary of State at the Italian Ministry of Economic Development and the leader of what is called Taskforce China.

That process was a bombshell in Italian life. It was preceded by an interview in the news daily *Corriere della Sera* given by Giulio Tremonti, former Italian Finance Minister, and an associate of ours in the sense that he is a co-thinker with Lyndon LaRouche. In his interview, he said that the New Silk Road—

is a project that dates back to the mid-1990s by the American visionary Lyndon LaRouche, who saw it as the salvation of humanity. Since then, the Chinese plans have been articulated along various lines. Beijing, apart from its financial infrastructure, is developing along the Eurasian, Arctic, and southern routes. Italy is part of the last, which means Sicily, Trieste, and Genoa.

That was *Corriere della Sera*. Let me point out that Tremonti has been Finance Minister four times since 1994, once Deputy Prime Minister, and also wrote for *Corriere della Sera* for ten years between 1984 and 1994.

Yesterday, a guest editorial by President Xi Jinping was published in that same newspaper, called "East Meets West: A New Chapter of Sino-Italian Friendship." I'm only going to read a couple parts of what he said, and then go right to our guest. Xi said:

China and Italy are both stellar examples of Eastern and Western civilization, and both have written splendid chapters in the history of human progress. Being the birthplace of ancient Roman civilization and the cradle of the Renaissance, Italy is known to the Chinese people for its im-

Message of Condolence

I feel very saddened about the loss of Lyndon LaRouche. These things come in their time. Everyone's death diminishes us all and Mr. LaRouche will certainly find his place in history. He was treated unfairly in his life, for his vision and his work. His courage is especially notable in the face of pervasive and vicious propaganda. Time will correct this, in his memory. The truth will out.

Ramsey Clark
Attorney General of the United
States, 1967-1969
New York, United States

posing relic sites and masterpieces of great art and names in art and architecture and literature.

He goes on and says many other things:

China hopes to work with Italy to advance the Belt and Road cooperation. Our two countries may harness our historical and cultural bonds forged through the ancient Silk Road, as well as our geographical locations, to align connectivity, cooperation under the Belt and Road Initiative, with Italy's plan to develop its northern ports.

And he goes on and says some other things after that.

I think you get the context. So, the exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche is essential strategically for the United States to enter into that visionary conception that Lyndon LaRouche designed, according to the former Italian Finance Minister, which is now about to come into fruition in Italy over the next 24-48 hours.

To talk about the concept of the exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche, we have Dennis Small, who besides the fact that he is one of the seven people who went to jail with Lyndon LaRouche in January of 1989, has been for many years the director of our work in Ibero-America, and has taken a particular initiative in this campaign. So, Dennis, we're going to go to you right now.

The Strategic Necessity

Dennis Small: Posed in this Xi Jinping meeting with Italy's Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte is, of course, the implicit question of, "OK, and what about the United States?" Trump is a friend of Conte and has worked hard to develop a good relationship with Xi Jinping; there have been ups and downs in that. On the table immediately is a wide-ranging economic discussion between the United States and China. There is the possibility of a trip to Mar-a-Lago by Xi; it's not clear if and when that will happen.

But what is absolutely clear is that for the Belt and Road Initiative to function internationally as a full replacement for the existing bankrupt system of the British Empire, the United States must be on board. The only way the United States is going to be on board is with the policies of Lyndon LaRouche and by exonerating LaRouche and his ideas. The concept here, and it

may just sound simple enough from the words, but I think that by the end of our discussion, you'll see that there's a little more complexity and depth to it. The exoneration of LaRouche means *justice for the man means justice for his ideas*.

What does that mean? Well, one thing it means is that the entire world is watching what happens in the United States and what the Trump administration is able to do in the face of a top-down British Empire attempted coup d'état against him. The entire world is looking at the United States to see which way this is going to move, and they're looking at it from the standpoint—the strategically sensible person is—the standpoint of "OK, to what degree are LaRouche's ideas actually being acted on?" the best way to actually understand what happens in the United States, therefore, is through the reflected perception or concept of what is happening strategically as a result of U.S. action. This is not a national U.S. question; this is an international strategic question. So, the complexity of the issue of LaRouche is what makes it both extraordinarily powerful and also possible and necessary at the same time.

What do I mean when I say, "justice for the man is justice for his ideas"? Well, let's start by quoting Gottfried Leibniz, because Leibniz actually defined justice in an article called, "Meditation on the Common Concept of Justice," which he wrote in 1702, during the latter part of his life. If I'm not mistaken, he died in 1716. What he wrote there was "Justice is goodness conformed to wisdom. And wisdom, in my sense, is nothing else than the science of felicity."

The science of felicity, as in the pursuit of happiness, as in the founding principles of the United States. In fact, the idea of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" comes from Leibniz. So, "Justice is goodness conformed to wisdom." This is an interesting idea. This is not the kind of happiness or felicity you hear about these days from the viewpoint of "Don't worry, be happy." It's quite the contrary. It's felicity which comes from acting to change the world in a way coherent with the principles of the created universe.

Now, what does this have to do with LaRouche and the current strategic situation? Well, I want to approach this from three standpoints. I want to present you Lyndon LaRouche from three standpoints. For those of you who know him and know of his work already, it's not an introduction. Some of you may not be very familiar with it, and it is a sort of introduction. But, it's

from three different standpoints, each of which alone is not sufficient. But as we go through each, I want you to think about the other two; look at each from the other two at the same time.

LaRouche Through the Eyes of His Friends and Admirers

The first is going to be through the eyes of LaRouche’s friends and admirers, much like those of you who were on this call last week, where there was a discussion of the condolence messages and the tributes to LaRouche that are pouring in from around the world from prominent people who wanted to say something after LaRouche’s death. Sergei Glazyev, Colonel Bao, many other people; which gives you a sense of Lyn’s tremendous impact internationally. Tonight, I will read from some comments on LaRouche while he was alive from people who knew him prior to his passing away. These comments are largely from foreigners, and there’s a reason for this, which we’ll get to at some point in the discussion.

First, then, through the eyes of LaRouche’s friends and admirers. Then, through the eyes of his enemies. I will talk a little about the LaRouche legal case. It was 30 years ago, and we could talk for weeks on end about this; there are many books and articles that we’ve written about this and the direct connection to the current coup d’état against President Trump. If we look at LaRouche only through the eyes of his friends and admirers, it’s not the full picture; it begins to give you an inkling.

We then will turn to look at LaRouche through the eyes of his enemies, to give another important dimension and depth to the picture.

And lastly, I’ll conclude by discussing Lyndon LaRouche through *your* eyes and through *your* action: What we are doing, and what you on this call will be doing or should be doing. I will pose a couple of things for you to do. One of them is going to be quite easy, the others might be a bit harder.

With that said, and keeping those three points of view—a kind of triangulation of sorts; not what is usually meant by triangulation, but looking at this from



EIRNS/Steve Meyer

Dr. Enéas Carneiro with Lyndon LaRouche in the São Paulo City Council chambers in June, 2002.

three standpoints simultaneously. Let’s first look at a couple of LaRouche’s friends and people who acted along with him over the years.

Dr. Enéas Carneiro

The first person is a Brazilian. His name was—because he passed away—Dr. Enéas Carneiro. Enéas, as he was widely known throughout Brazil, had about six PhDs; he was a mathematician, a physicist. He was a world-renowned professor in cardiology; he wrote a major international textbook on Electrocardiograms (EKGs). Over the course of his many decades of teaching, he had 30,000 students, which became the base of the political party he later organized.

To give you some idea of him, he spent his whole life working as a cardiologist; but he decided he hated the way Brazil was going, what was happening in the world, so, in 1989, he ran for President. As a minor candidate, he was granted all of 17 seconds of air time on national TV. In those 17 seconds, he shook the world completely and Brazil for sure. Ending with his famous trademark “My name is Enéas.” And everyone in the country remembered it. His message was that the situation had to change and change in a dramatic way.

Five years later, in 1994, he again ran for President. He won, by the way, millions of votes in that first round in 1989. In 1994, he ran again, and he was given one minute of national TV time. About that single minute, he remarked that it was “an eternity!” Enéas could

Speak very rapidly, by the way. What he chose to go through in that one minute of national TV time in Brazil, was Alexander Hamilton and the need for a credit system for Brazil and internationally. Enéas did not know us yet; he had not yet met Lyndon LaRouche. Because of that speech, our people in Brazil immediately contacted him, and that's when we got to know him, and he got to know us and LaRouche.

In 1998, he went on national TV again; this time he was promoting *Executive Intelligence Review* magazine. He called it "the only magazine in the world which still defends the existence of the sovereign nation-state." On an hour-long TV interview program, he described LaRouche as a brilliant economist, who had forecast the crisis and called for a New Bretton Woods. In another interview, he held up a copy of the August 29, 1997 [issue](#) of *EIR* with a feature article on George Soros and with Soros on the cover, deep in a marijuana field. So, he promoted *EIR*. That was quite something.

In June of 2002, Enéas decided to run not for President, but for Congress. He won from the city of São Paulo, which is the largest city in Brazil. It's either the second or third largest city in the world; some 20 million people there. He won with the greatest number of votes ever registered in the history of Brazilian Congressional elections. He ran his campaign spending a maximum of \$22,000. In that capacity as the candidate who had gotten the most votes for Congress in the history of all Brazil, Enéas and others from his party invited Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche to Brazil. Lyn was awarded honorary citizenship of the city of São Paulo by the City Council.

The [full ceremony](#) in which he was given the award was a huge political occasion. On that occasion, Enéas talked about LaRouche. I want you to look at LaRouche through the eyes of a person such as Enéas; that's why I've described him to you, because I want you to actually get a sense of what we're dealing with here.

Enéas began his speech, which he gave in the São Paulo city council chamber, asking: "Who Is Mr. LaRouche?" What he said was:

Until 1994, I knew of him only as a great political leader. I could also see the convergence of our thinking, but I had no idea at all of his immense and extraordinary culture in almost every field of human knowledge. . . .

I became increasingly astonished and deeply

curious to know more and more about that man. Who, really, is he?

Recently, reading an article appearing in the May 10, 2002 issue of *EIR*, I was struck by Mr. LaRouche's deep philosophical and technical analysis of the catenary, and I recalled my classes as a university physics student, 40 years ago, with my dear friend Dr. Osorio—who is here today—when we were being introduced to transcendental trigonometric functions, analytic geometry, and hyperbolic functions.

He went on to explain to the crowd of a couple hundred people:

The catenary is the curve describing the form taken by a uniform chain when it is suspended from its endpoints. Any freely hanging cable or rope assumes this shape. The catenary represents the constant search of nature for a state of order, with a minimum expenditure of energy. That is a universal principle, which, like many others, Mr. LaRouche explains magnificently in his writings.

Universal Principles of Least Action

But, let's stop for a moment and think: What Presidential candidate in Brazil, or in the United States, for that matter, has ever heard of a catenary?

None of them, in their absolute ignorance of the scientific principles governing nature, has the slightest idea of the importance of scientific knowledge to the statesman who would lead a nation.

Besides being a mathematical philosopher, Mr. LaRouche has a keen intelligence and exceptional fluency in matters of the physical world, speaking with intimacy and profundity about the ideas of Gauss, Ampère, Oersted, and Kepler, and many other mainstays of physics.

Regarding philosophy as such, Mr. LaRouche is really a scholar. From Plato to Leibniz, from St. Augustine to St. Thomas Aquinas, or Descartes, Spinoza, and many others, the depth of his reasoning and wise analysis is, for me, breathtaking.

He speaks about ancient history as if he were there, at the same table, on the same sofa, at Plato's Symposium. . . . He who reads Mr. LaRouche's articles receives a refreshing shower of science, fine arts, . . . and philosophy.

But, beyond such incontestable knowledge, what most impresses me about Mr. LaRouche is his concern for social questions, poverty, and the destiny of humanity. . . .

And then Enéas concluded, “Thank you very much, Mr. LaRouche, for your presence here in Brazil, and for all that you represent for all mankind.”

Norbert Brainin

Now, lest you think that this was just one single, extraordinary individual in Brazil, let me briefly turn to another person—Norbert Brainin. Norbert Brainin was the head of the legendary Amadeus Quartet. Norbert Brainin was one of the greatest violinists of the 20th Century, without any doubt whatsoever. He was a good personal friend of Lyndon LaRouche. Norbert Brainin, with his accompanist Gunther Ludwig, gave a concert in Washington, D.C. at Georgetown University on December 2, 1988, exactly fourteen days before Lyndon LaRouche and six others of us were sentenced in the Alexandria “rocket docket.” What Norbert Brainin did, before performing in the concert, “Dedicated to Mr. Brainin’s Good Friend Lyndon H. LaRouche,” was to say:

Ladies and gentlemen, dear friends,

I just want to say a few words. You see, we are here tonight, my friend Mr. Ludwig and I, to pay homage to a great man. We are here to bear witness to his stainless character, to his honesty. I know that all these things [he’s talking about the trial then ongoing] will resolve themselves, and his character will remain as stainless as it is now. But there is another reason why I am here. It is because I’m a friend of the United States of America. I love the United States of America. God Bless America!

He then proceeded to play a magnificent concert.

Seven years later, in September of 1995, that same Norbert Brainin held a master class at the Dolná Krupá castle in Slovakia. Some of you may have seen some footage of this in one of the classes that John Sigerson



EIRNS/Philip Ulanowsky

Norbert Brainin and Lyndon LaRouche share some joy after a “Solidarity Concert for LaRouche” in Boston’s famous Jordan Hall, on December 4, 1987.

gave last year. Among the remarks that Professor Brainin said there in the course of his master class to a group of 100-150 people was the following:

Actually, the reason why I am here, is to make *Motivführung* visible to you. This question has always been very close to my heart. For a long time I have been carrying it around inside me, and for a long time this idea found no echo with anyone else.

The one person who did grasp the importance of the *Motivführung* [motivic thorough-composition] of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, Dr. Brainin continued, was Lyndon LaRouche.

That is what unites us and brought us together. . . . Lyndon has understood the importance of *Motivführung* in Haydn; Mozart understood it—but when we look at the output of present-day Haydn and Mozart scholars, we must conclude that they haven’t the slightest understanding of the problem. Yes, they have written a lot about it, but they are not dealing with the question in an adequate way.

So, this is one of the most important and profound Classical artists of the 20th Century, commenting on Lyndon LaRouche.

Dr. Pobisk Kuznetsov

Let me give you the last example of comments about LaRouche while he was alive that I want to mention. This time from a Russian. His name was Pobisk Kuznetsov. Dr. Kuznetsov was a chemist, a philosopher, an engineer, and is considered the last great architect of the postwar economic recovery in the Soviet Union. Among other things, he headed the famous Scientific Council for the Study of Productive Forces. He was widely considered, because of his multi-faceted knowledge and talents, as the “Leonardo da Vinci of Russia.” In mid-1994, upon being invited to Moscow, LaRouche met with Kuznetsov and a group of other scientists. During that same Moscow trip, LaRouche also spoke to the Economics Committee of the State Duma (the Russian Parliament), on the invitation of Sergei Glazyev, who is now a Presidential advisor to Putin, and who sent the message of condolence on LaRouche’s death which you may have heard last week.

A couple of months after his meeting with LaRouche, in December 1994, Kuznetsov published an article in a Moscow journal, *Rossiya 2010*. Kuznetsov, one of the most prominent physical economists and scientists in Russia, decided that LaRouche’s work in physical economy was so profound that an actual unit of measurement of the physical economy had to be named after him. Of course, it should be called the LaRouche, and it should be designated by La for short; like amps for the French physicist and mathematician André-Marie Ampère’s measurement.

Here is Kuznetsov’s idea of what he means; he wasn’t just saying, let’s honor LaRouche by simply attaching his name to something. He said:

Let us introduce the physical magnitude of “a larouche,” designated by La, which gives the number of persons who can be fed from 1 square kilometer, or 100 hectares, during one year. We share LaRouche’s view that the magnitude of potential relative population density” [which is what he’s just described] can serve as an indicator of “intellectual culture,” but taking into ac-



EIRNS

Left to right: Dr. Revoli Suslov, Dr. Pobisk Kuznetsov, and Lyndon LaRouche share the speakers table at a seminar of 60 Russian scientists under the auspices of the “Prezident” program, to explore the application of life-support systems for spaceships to the survival of human life on Earth, at the Economics Academy in Moscow on April 28, 1994.

count the quite diverse values for farv [photochemically active radiation per vegetative period], we shall compare not simply 100 hectares, but 100 hectares for a given local farv value.

Then he goes on to say how he has done calculations based on this, comparing Belgium’s capability and how much land-area is needed to feed 300 million people, saying: “We figured out how to do that, and what it would require to feed 300 million people corresponds to 20,000 larouches, or 40 times greater than the known productivity of Belgium.”

The key phrase there, if you want to mull over what he says, is that he shares LaRouche’s view that the magnitude of potential relative population density can serve as an indicator of “intellectual culture.” In other words, he’s recognized LaRouche’s fundamental discovery of the relationship of culture and human creativity to increased capabilities, increased power of mankind through potential relative population density.

We could go on all year, and we should, and we must, recounting the way LaRouche was viewed through the eyes of prominent thinkers around the world; because it gives the beginning of an idea of what we’re actually addressing here on justice for the man being justice for his ideas.

The LaRouche Case

Now let me quickly turn to a glance at LaRouche through the eyes of his enemies. You've probably all heard the famous quote from Ramsey Clark—it's in the exoneration petition—who was an appeals attorney for LaRouche. You will recall Clark was also U.S. Attorney General under President Lyndon Johnson. Ramsey Clark described the LaRouche case as—

a broader range of deliberate and systematic misconduct and abuse of power over a longer period of time, in an effort to destroy a political movement and leader, than any other Federal prosecution in my time or to my knowledge.

I want to argue that that's an understatement; because keeping an eye on what we were just talking about of "Who is Mr. LaRouche?" consider what was actually going on prior to the legal case, and then what happened at the LaRouche trials. Prior to the LaRouche legal case, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, LaRouche was playing a crucial role providing input and ideas and policy discussions to the Ronald Reagan administration. I would say that it happened in three areas worth noting. First, on the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). This was LaRouche's idea, and on this President Reagan went with LaRouche's policy in a nationally televised address on March 23, 1983. This was a total success which completely drove the British Empire and their friends on Wall Street berserk. They did everything to stop it; they could not.

The second broad area consistent with the SDI, where LaRouche had enormous influence in and around the Reagan administration, was how to carry out a successful war on illicit drugs. Who's behind the drug trade? Major international banks. You have to address the banking side before you can actually do anything about illicit drugs. We were in discussion with people in the Reagan administration, and I would characterize



White House

President Ronald Reagan, addressing the nation on national security in his Strategic Defense Initiative speech from the Oval Office on March 23, 1983.

that as a partial success. We made some headway; we didn't actually win the Reagan administration over to the LaRouche policy totally as we did with the SDI.

The third area—and all of these are related—was the reorganization of the world financial system. LaRouche's Operation Juárez, which he had developed after his meetings with India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and Mexico's President José López Portillo. The meeting with Gandhi was as central to Operation Juárez as were his meetings with López Portillo.

On the idea of bankrupting the IMF and the whole Wall Street trans-Atlantic system, and putting that failed system through bankruptcy reorganization, we did *not* succeed. Instead Henry Kissinger, on behalf of the Wall Street interests, beat LaRouche out within the Reagan administration. The same Kissinger who Reagan had emphatically excluded—and vocally so—for the first years of his administration, brought Kissinger back in, in 1983 as Central American negotiator or something ridiculous like that; but he got an inside track, obviously due to massive pressure placed on Reagan. Reagan had both the LaRouche proposal and the Kissinger proposal on his desk on financial reorganization, and we did not succeed. So, you can imagine what was going on in the centers of financial power when this was going on with LaRouche.

1986

It was nothing, however, compared to what happened after 1986 when these ideas took on direct political strength in the form of our electoral victories in the state of Illinois. That's when they hit the panic button: "You know what? This is over! We are going to get LaRouche. We're going to destroy him, we're going to destroy the movement. This cannot be tolerated. Good ideas [for them bad ideas] are bad enough, but when that is hooked up with an independent political movement capable of implementing those ideas, there's nothing we'll be able to do to stop it."

So, they moved. Documents exist proving exactly what happened behind the scenes. All of it was completely illegal. The first thing they did was put several of our publishing companies into involuntary bankruptcy in a totally illegal process without the requisite legal proceedings. Then, they launched a case in Boston against LaRouche and a group of his associates. When that case was moving toward uncovering the fact that it was government illegal proceedings against us through the office of then U.S. Attorney of Boston, William Weld and his sidekick Robert Mueller—the same Robert Mueller of today—there were documents that were about to be exposed on the LaRouche case in the archives of then-Vice President Bush. At that point, a mistrial was declared, and the Boston case was stopped. Lo and behold, jurors interviewed in the local press said that they were about to acquit LaRouche!

So, through various connivances, they managed to pull a mistrial. Then they immediately moved a similar case to Alexandria, Virginia, known as the "rocket docket."

I'm going to focus on one thing about the Alexandria trial, and that is that prior to the trial itself, the government presented a motion *in limine* before the jury was even selected, asking the judge to rule that we, the defendants, would not be allowed to mention the bankruptcy proceeding as anything having to do with what we were charged with, which were phony charges that we had taken on loans without ever intending to pay them. Our defense approach was going to be straightforward: tell the truth. That was rather unique back then, and still is today, to tell the truth in a trial. The truth was: yes we borrowed money; and yes, at a certain point we did run into problems making payments on those loans. But the *reason*, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, that we had problems paying those loans, is that



FBI

Special Counsel Robert Mueller.

the government bankrupted the companies! It would have been illegal to pay anything from companies that the government had bankrupted.

But, the judge granted the motion *in limine*: we could talk about that we had taken loans; we could say that we ran into problems paying them; but we absolutely could not mention why. Any lawyer, any witness who said that the reason that there had been a problem was because the government put us into bankruptcy, that person, that lawyer would have been proclaimed in contempt of court. In other words, we were told straightforwardly, that we were not allowed to defend ourselves.

The jury pool was made up largely of government-dependent people, and in particular the foreman of the jury was a gentleman by the name of Buster Horton, who we subsequently learned was one of the top people in the Department of Agriculture who had what they called "cosmic clearance"; which is way above Top Secret, because he was part of a small group in each department of government in charge of "continuity of government" under conditions of extreme crisis. In other words, he was a complete, total agent of the British imperial apparatus inside the United States. So, not surprisingly, we were all found guilty.

We appealed the bankruptcy verdict in civil court, and we won, as the appellate court found that the bankruptcy proceedings against us had not only been wrong but had been done on the basis of a so-called "constructive fraud" imposed on the lower court by the govern-

ment. So, there we were, sitting in jail; we had been in jail for about six months at that point, and I figured—maybe I was naïve and others knew better—but I figured, “OK, the cause of the problem has just been declared to be the result of government illegal activity. Now, we’ll appeal, and our case will be thrown out on the criminal side.” We did appeal but—Oh no!—we were told that the civil ruling had no bearing whatsoever in a criminal case; one case is civil, the other is criminal. Sorry. We appealed all the way to the Supreme Court and lost.

That’s what happened under the Bush [41] administration. LaRouche got out after serving five years of a fifteen-year sentence during the Bill Clinton Presidency. You get the idea.

So, if you look at Lyndon LaRouche through the eyes of his friends and look at LaRouche through the eyes of his enemies, you start to get an idea of what’s going on here. And why his exoneration—that is, doing justice to his ideas—is so crucial.

LaRouche Through Your Eyes and Actions

The third and final matter to discuss, is to look at LaRouche through *your eyes* and *your actions*. We need to act; we need to get LaRouche exonerated, and we need to get that exoneration not simply because we want justice done in this particular case. Of course we do; and terrible things were done to Mr. LaRouche. However, the worst damage was to the United States itself, by denying Americans access to his ideas. The worst harm was done to those who tolerated this injustice and looked the other way. The worst damage was like that inflicted during the McCarthy period; not so much to the people who were witch-hunted, but to those who swallowed it—he *good* people who allowed this to be done to our country. The worst damage in the case of the early Christians being eaten by the lions—sure, it wasn’t really good for the early Christians—but the real damage, as St. Augustine discusses, was to the people who watched the spectacle and *thereby* lost their souls.

That’s what we’re dealing with here. The issue is *you*; you collectively, you individually, your republic. The issue is whether you will allow this kind of thing to happen in our country; because if you do, you don’t have a country. Both directly in terms of the policies, but also more substantially in terms of tolerating this kind of injustice.

What do we need? Well, we need money to make

this thing work. We intend to hold a memorial for LaRouche. We intend to publish a pamphlet with many of the condolences for LaRouche, with the obituary, with the exoneration petition. I don’t have any detailed specifics at this point, but I would say that something in the range of \$30,000 would get the ball rolling on this.

That’s above and beyond what we already require to function; which I know many of you are helping with. But I’m talking above and beyond here, so if there are 100-plus people on this conference call, we’re talking simply \$300 a person on top of what you do otherwise to help make our work possible. But of course, as you know, not everybody can or will make such a contribution. So, those of you who are prepared to actually act and see LaRouche through your own eyes, are probably going to have to carry more weight than just your own. You’re going to have to carry your buddy’s weight; you’ll probably have to do twice that amount, or something like that.

“That’s the hard part,” you might say. I’d say it’s the easy part, because what we also need everyone to do is to go out and get ten signatures on the exoneration petition for LaRouche. That’s not going to come simply by appealing to people on the basis of, “Oh, he was treated badly; why don’t you sign?” People are going to have to understand what’s actually at issue here. That means you’re going to have to educate people. It’s very important. If 100 of the people on this call do that, we’ll have 1,000 new signatures.

And I would also call on each and every one of you—many of you have already done this, but do it again; and if you haven’t done it, do it now: Write a letter to the editor of your local newspaper; we need a tidal wave in this country of people talking about LaRouche and talking about what this means in terms of the true justice that’s required, which is justice for his ideas.

If we get that kind of campaign off the ground in the United States, then the entire strategic situation changes. Because the United States will be viewed in a very different way by every other major power in the world, from Russia to China to Italy and so on. It will cease to be the United States of Henry Kissinger or Barack Obama, but instead will be the United States of Washington, of Lincoln, of John Quincy Adams, of Franklin Roosevelt; it will be the United States of Lyndon LaRouche.

And that can make all the difference.