

Thousands of Youth With a Passion for Truth Will Determine 2004 Presidency

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Mr. LaRouche gave this speech to a cadre school of the LaRouche Youth Movement in Pennsylvania on Nov. 1.

There are going to be some very significant changes in some of the ways we do politics. Our changes will be less, in some respects, than the changes we're going to impose upon the fools who are on the other side.

Now, the key thing here, as I said last night, is the question of emotion: that people view what they call "logic," which is generally meant by them, deductive or deductive/inductive argument, as logic and as rational. It may be, but it's often insane. The problem lies in an area called emotion, or passion. For example, did anyone ever say to you, something in which you knew they were lying; you knew that what they were saying was a complete lie? And saying it very assertively, very aggressively.

And you say, "Well, that's a lie. Where do you get that misinformation from?"

"I get it from the press! Don't you believe in the news media?! I got it from a man who is very authoritative, very well informed. And I know he's sincere—therefore, *I have to believe him*." Even if you claim you know it's false.

Did you ever have such experiences? Does that tell you something about our society and our culture? It tells you, look for where the real problem lies.

Now, take the case of the so-called Euclidean geometry. (I don't think they have the "New Math" now, which is not worth much, and probably some of you were exposed to that. Forget it—you didn't learn anything; *I hope* you didn't learn anything, because it's damaging to your mind, if you did. In the former time, before the end of the 1950s, when this "New Math" was brought in—when they thought you weren't sufficiently stupid—they took away geometry and they gave you the New Math; and they succeeded in making a lot of people stupid; they say, "*I hate mathematics*." Well, good! You didn't like it, right? Good! So forget that.) But, the problem was, in the old days, when the Euclidean geometry, or a version of it, was taught as an integral part of a mathematics education in secondary school, or what you call today, middle school; at that time, you were told that there were certain self-evident definitions, axioms, and postulates; and that everything in mathematics, or which involves the application of mathematics, can be, and must be explained in terms of deduc-

tive, or so-called inductive arguments, which never deviate from this set of arbitrary, so-called "self-evident," definitions, axioms, and postulates.

The Question of Axioms and Emotion

You get the impression, then, if you look at a mathematician, you think, "Well, you're a mathematician. Gee, how'd that happen? When did you die?" Because you get from formal mathematicians, when they're talking mathematically, or arguing mathematically about science or anything else, you have the impression that you're talking to something who's dead! Particularly in these days, when you have computers; and you say, "My computer is more sexy—it responds, but much more affectionately, than this creep does!"

So, the problem lies in this question of emotion. And you have to understand the connection between definitions, axioms, and postulates, and emotion. Now, for example: "Look, the news media run the country. We have to go by the news media. If you can not influence the news media, nobody's going to accept you!" What is that saying about our country? If, for example, you accept the news media as the standard, what does that say? You are *told* that there was a real increase in the economy. How many of you people, did you feel that? Did you experience that? Did you look at the figures? Did you see how they're faked? Anyone knows they're faked. The European press is talking about how it was faked. The figures are faked! Even the leading press says, "Well, the economy is growing! (Although the jobs are decreasing.)"

I'll give you another case of this: the case of Wal-Mart. Now, Wal-Mart is not a company, it's an epidemic disease. Wal-Mart is one of the biggest factors in causing unemployment in the United States. What Wal-Mart does: When Wal-Mart sets up an operation in an area, they go to all the prospective vendors, whose goods are manufactured, processed, and delivered to Wal-Mart to be put on the shelves—where you have this, you know, 300 lb. person standing there with a blank stare, and you ask them, "Where is this? Where is that?" "I dunno." Right? This is called part of our employment picture: You get all the people who didn't know which way to the store, and they now employ them at Wal-Mart!—But, the order was: You can not sell to Wal-Mart, unless you eliminate *all U.S. vendors*, except vendors which bring in goods which



Lyndon LaRouche addresses the cadre school in Philadelphia on Nov. 1. *"The key thing here is emotion. Emotion should not be treated as some irrational thing, contrary to reason, as reason is misdefined. But rather, we must look at emotion critically, to define what are sane, and insane, forms of emotion, and then judge the rest of the policy from that standpoint."*

are produced in countries which engage in cheap labor, such as China, or other countries. So therefore, when Wal-Mart gets a bigger impact in an area today, employment in that state and region *collapses*, because firms are shut down, because Wal-Mart won't buy from them. Why? Because they're producing with U.S. labor. It's one of the big factors in unemployment.

If you look at the general pattern of unemployment in the United States, what happened to the factories and farms? The goods still come in, at least to some degree; where are they produced? What is a General Motors car? Well, don't ask General Motors—they don't know! Because General Motors assembles its cars from components from all over the world. They not only buy parts from various parts of the world; they buy *assemblies*, like a rear-end assembly or some other kind of assembly. The company that sells the assembly does not inform General Motors, or Chrysler, or so forth, what the parts are! Or who made them! So, when you have a car to be fixed, in the old days, you would go and look for the part. You would go to a parts store; and you had a part of this manufacturer, or his subcontractor. The part was listed. You would get a copy on order, within a fairly short period of time. And you would replace the part in the car, according to prescription. But, the manufacturer doesn't know what the part is any more! Because the manufacturer bid, on the basis of getting the assembly! And the specifications are designed to be attuned to the assembly, not the component parts of which the assembly is made.

You look at everything: You look at power, generation

and distribution; water management; you look at the amount of time that people spend travelling on highways, between jobs and non-jobs. How many jobs do people have, who have households? How much commuting do they do, in the course of the day, particularly when they travel in high-traffic hours? And in areas where employment exists, the density of traffic is higher than ever before. So, people are out, for an hour, hour and a half, two hours, commuting to and from work. If they have two jobs in that day, they're probably commuting, again, another commuting cycle. What chance is there to have family life under those conditions?

So, the society is being destroyed. Skilled employment is being wiped out. We are now like ancient Rome under the emperors, under the Caesars. We are a "bread and circuses" society—get your entertainment from your neighbor; find out which sex he has this week, or she, whatever. Or the third sex, the fifth sex.

So, what we are, we're like the ancient Romans: where Rome conquered the world, or much of it, particularly from the end of the Second Punic War, before the Caesars came to power; and Rome, which used to be a productive society, based largely on agriculture and similar kinds of things, began to rely upon slavery. And the farmers were displaced. Returning veterans of the old Roman legions were thrown on the streets, with no place to go—no pensions, no nothing. So, you had a mass of Romans, who were called citizens, as in the United States, who were essentially wandering around, and living on what were called "bread and circuses," getting a dole, a handout, to live on. And now, we have handouts—not so many handouts, but you have jobs, which are handouts. Worthless jobs, which pay almost nothing, which are handouts. They keep you quiet.

Then, they tell you to have pleasure, as in ancient Rome: entertainment, bread and circuses. Well, television is supposed to be that. Hollywood is supposed to be that. A rave dance is that—the same thing. Gladiator contests. Large sports events. There's no difference between the decadence of ancient Rome, and the decadence which has crept up on the United States in the past 40 years. *We are a decadent, dying culture. A decadent, dying economy.*

Globalized Looting

How do we live? Well, in 1971-72, we collapsed the Bretton Woods monetary system, the system in which we had reorganized and rebuilt the world somewhat in the post-war period. Then, we used that power, increasingly over the 1970s, to dictate to other countries what the value of their currency would be. It was done very simply: The London



Wal-Mart is one of the biggest factors in causing unemployment in the United States, by squeezing out competitors with cut-rate prices, banning unions, eliminating U.S. vendors, and relying on imports produced by virtual slave labor abroad. Left to right: retailer Montgomery Ward closes in Michigan; the wreckage of a factory in Buffalo, New York; and Wal-Mart—“not a company, but an epidemic disease.”

financial market, which was specialized in this kind of thing, would organize a run, like a George Soros-type game, against some country—the way George Soros went at, particularly, Malaysia. They drive down the value on the international market—the trading value—in an orchestrated money market, like a rigged casino; they drive the value of the currency down on the international money-exchange market. Then, authorities go to the country and say, “Well, bring in the IMF! Bring in the World Bank, to advise you on how to deal with this problem.” The IMF would come in, and give the “advice” (or the World Bank): “Devalue your currency! Twenty, 30, 40, 50%!” Say, “Okay, we’ll do that, if that’ll work.”

“Oh, but don’t think that you’re going to pay off your debts in your currency! We don’t let you pay off your debts in your currency any more! Now, you pay off in dollars. And since your currency is *less*, in value, than it was, you’re going to have to pay *more* of your currency, in order to match the dollar requirements.”

Now, therefore, you have to have an *additional* debt, which *you did not incur*, which is imposed upon you, through the orders of the IMF and World Bank. And the IMF and World Bank are doing this, under direction of the Anglo-American interests that dominate the world.

Therefore, we converted these countries into markets of cheap labor. We ordered them, through the IMF and World Bank, to *shut down* their industries, to shut down their infrastructure! We turned them into virtual slaves. We turned them into cheap labor. Now, we come in with a program—they would come in with “tourism”: Give your body to a foreigner—that works when it has to—and similar kinds of things.

And then, take the case of Mexico: Mexico used to have infrastructure; it used to control its own petroleum industry,

which it doesn’t any more—so forth and so on. It lost its railroads, lost its transportation system, generally. And what happened? Well, the United States lives largely on Mexicans. We steal from them’ we call it employment; we call it *maquiladoras*; we call it NAFTA, which was pushed through in the Clinton Administration, pushed through by Al Gore. Good guy, huh? We are exploiting people to the extent, that in one state in Mexico, the majority of the income of the state is remittances from Mexicans who are working *inside* the United States—particularly in the South and Southwest in the United States—and, what they’re sending home to their families, as part of the cheap wages they’re getting as income, in California, Texas, and so forth, is the majority of the income of the entire state, within Mexico. If the U.S. were to collapse further, Mexico would be a disaster area. It’s almost nothing. That was done in Mexico in 1982, before the raid on the Mexico peso had occurred, which I was involved in fighting against.

Living on China

But, this is what we’re doing throughout Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Colombia, Central America, Bolivia, and so forth. This is what we’re doing!

We are also living on the Chinese: Now, the Chinese have a large population. And the Chinese take the view, that they can use up part of that population—use it up!—as cheap labor to produce things for the United States. It’s not good, in China. I have a friend of ours, who is a European entrepreneur, who created a high-tech firm in China, which is producing things in China of significant value, applying what are called “nanotechnology” methods. He has a firm. He has an immediate group of Chinese partners, who run that firm. They have another group, under them, who are the key men and women of



Judge our "bread and circuses" society by how we treat the elderly and the sick: "There's no difference between the decadence of ancient Rome, and the decadence which has crept up on the United States in the past 40 years."

this firm. And the people who are the partners, treat the key people fine. But, the key people, the immediate executives and sub-executives of the place, treat the rest of the Chinese employees like shit. So, China is not really a country of great freedom: It's a country whose culture has not overcome a long history of the destruction of the poor of China, who are used up as human cattle for the benefit of those who are more privileged, who have a better standard of life.

So, China, like Europe before the Renaissance, has a great culture, a great cultural tradition at the top; but you have to look at the bottom: There are many poor. So, the Chinese are using up part of their labor force, like burning wood in a stove, in order to earn money from the United States; justifying this, on the fact that the sacrifice being made by these Chinese, who are being thrown like cord-wood into a stove, is building a future China. In a sense, that's true. But, if you think of the relationship of the United States to China, *that is* the relationship of the United States to China. China is a dumping ground for the United States, and China is a vast source of cheap labor, *for people like Wal-Mart*.

This is the ugly reality of the situation.

The Legacy of Truman

Now we're in a destroyed society, and it's worse: Look, since the end of the World War II, since that son-of-a-bitch Truman dropped two nuclear weapons—for no military, justified reason—on the civilian populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the world has lived under *nuclear terror*. Now, the nuclear terror was invented by a guy who was called, by many idiots, a "pacifist": Bertrand Russell. Bertrand Russell is the single person, most directly responsible for the creation of nuclear warfare. He did so, stating that his purpose, and that of his sidekick—"animal man" H.G. Wells—their statement, of their policy, was to use forms of warfare which are so

terrifying, that people would submit to world government—dictated by them—in order to avoid that kind of warfare. Bertrand Russell and Co. developed nuclear warfare, to create a weapon so terrible, that the world would submit to world government, by their design, in order to avoid that kind of warfare.

The United States policy under Truman, from about the time of the death of Roosevelt until the present day, but especially up until the beginning of the 1950s—the policy was, to launch *preventive nuclear warfare against the Soviet Union*, as a way of bringing the entire world under world government, as specified by Bertrand Russell. That was the policy of the Truman Administration. That is a policy *embedded* in the United States from that period. That is a policy which existed, which turned many of my friends, probably 90% of them in military service, into worms, morally. They were so afraid of the right-wing turn inaugurated by Truman, with what was done with the so-called "strategic bombing" against populations, and capped by nuclear weapons bombing, against Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That was the policy of the United States: That was considered *patriotism*! "If yer not for it, buddy, you ain't a patriot—and maybe, yer a Commie bastard!" That was the policy.

Then, we got rid of Truman. Why did we get rid of Truman? Well, because traditionalists didn't like Truman—including me! I despised that fellow from before he was President. And, when Roosevelt died, people asked me what was going to happen; I said, "Our fate is horrible, under this little man. This little creature, not fully human. This haberdasher!" I was right.

But then, the Soviet Union developed a thermonuclear weapon—first. At that point, the United States: "Uh-uh! This preventive nuclear warfare ain't no good. They got a *thermonuclear weapon*!" So, we dumped Truman, and we brought in Eisenhower. And, Eisenhower was opposed to this kind of funny stuff, this fun and games. And we had about eight years of relative peace, under Eisenhower. It was not true peace, because the evil was still there. But, the evil was on the under-side, and Eisenhower was on top.

Kennedy came in. Kennedy did *not* understand the story. And you see the Kennedy family *does* have problems, as you see in California, with this Schwarzenegger. And then, we have Schwarzenegger in California—a Hitlernegger in California—and we have "Katzenjammer" in Philadelphia: the kinds of evil we have to get rid of.

So, we had that situation. Then, because Kennedy did *not* understand the issue—and because of complications in the Kennedy family and so forth, and in the administration—the Democratic Party *had* tended to become the party of nuclear warfare. The Republicans were *not* the war-party, at that point. There were right-wingers in the Republican Party, who were the war-party; but the hard core of the nuclear war-party in the United States was the Democratic Party. And it's still there. It's still there: They call themselves "liberal." They kill liberally—more people, that is.

So, don't have any illusions about the Democratic Party, as a party. The Democratic Party is an object we are going to *take over*, and transform. It is not a kingdom of virtue—or even good sentiment.

The Current Strategic Crisis

We are now, therefore, in the following situation: The fall of the Soviet system, was viewed by some people as the opportunity to establish an Anglo-American world government, and the fanatics in the United States, said it's going to be a U.S. empire. It's called "globalization": Globalization is imperialism. Globalization is the enemy of the United States, as you see in the case of Wal-Mart. Wal-Mart is your enemy! When you pass that store, you know, "That's my enemy." It's destroying our community, it represents globalization, it represents an institutionalization of the values which stink. Or, George Soros is your enemy. Other institutions of this type are your enemy. George Shultz, Bechtel, is your enemy. Halliburton is your enemy. Your personal enemy! Certain financial institutions and bankers are your enemy. They're destroying this country.

And, people say, "But they're powerful, therefore you have to respect them." Emotion, again. Passion, again. It's like the news media, "You gotta respect the news media." "You must respect these authorities! You must respect the Democratic Party. You must respect the Republican Party. You must respect the President." "No! You must respect the Vice President! You're going to attack the Vice President?! You're going to take our Vice away?" Anyway, so this is the kind of situation.

Now, what are we coming to? [In 1991-92], some of the wiser heads in the first Bush Administration, turned down Cheney's proposal to go to preventive nuclear warfare. And, the idea of the continuing the Iraqi war with an invasion at that time, was an attempt to go to *global, nuclear preventive warfare*. That was the intention.

Cheney has had that intention, since 1991-1992—no later. The neo-conservative faction which is controlling the Bush Administration is that. The neo-conservatives are also a major factor in the Democratic Party. Marc Rich is part of that, and Marc Rich is the guy who was pardoned by Clinton, and Clinton got a lot of money for it. It was dropped in the coffers. Gore is part of it; others are part of it; Lieberman is part of it; same thing.

All right, so, what's the situation? We're now at a point where we have thermonuclear arsenals on this planet. If thermonuclear arsenals are fully deployed, in a full-scale war, it can destroy human civilization—wipe it out. Therefore, the argument has been, since the end of the 1950s, that with thermonuclear weapons and advanced methods of delivery of those weapons, you can not have a full-scale thermonuclear war. This was called the doctrine of "Mutual and Assured Destruction." You can not go to Mutual and Assured Destruction. The policy was—while the Soviet Union was still the number-two power—the policy was, that we would manage

the superpower conflict. And therefore, the *threat* of Mutual and Assured Destruction would now be used to bring about a certain kind of one-world government, between chiefly two opposing powers: the United States and the Soviet Union. In other words, whatever they agreed to would become the fate of all the world.

So, you already had an empire, which is an empire of two opposing forces: the U.S. forces and the Soviet forces. This was brought together under Nikita Khrushchov, while he was General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party. And, that was negotiated by: Bertrand Russell, personally! Negotiated, in implementation by Bertrand Russell's fellow running-dogs.

All right, so now, we still have that situation: We live in a world, in which thermonuclear weapons, and related things, define an environment of Mutual and Assured Destruction, really. Now, what is Cheney talking about, therefore? What's the problem we're living under? What Cheney is talking about, and others are talking about—the neo-cons—is: Let's have a *sub*-Mutual and Assured Destruction regime. Let us conduct nuclear warfare, in such a way, that we never go to *full-scale* thermonuclear war, but that we use mini-nukes, and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, in order to find a level between what used to be called "conventional warfare"—pre-nuclear warfare—and thermonuclear warfare, generally. So therefore, to find a "middle area" to fight limited nuclear warfare, as *preventive* nuclear warfare: to establish a world empire; to eliminate all nation-states, and establish imperial control over the planet, by this method.

Now, what this means is—go back to another part of this story. Now, Truman was an idiot, and Truman was of the belief, and his administration was of the belief, that because the United States had a threat of a nuclear arsenal—we didn't have many nuclear weapons, then; but they were talking about having them, to use. That's why they didn't use them: They didn't have them, yet. We used up the last two nuclear weapons we had in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the production of further weapons of this type took some time. And, the development of delivery systems took some time. So, in this period, Truman believed that because of the United States' possession, or Anglo-American possession of nuclear weapons, that they could do whatever they damn pleased, with the Russians and Chinese, and other countries. And therefore, Truman, in the late 1940s, began to experiment with operations against China, and also against the Soviet Union; but specifically focused on China, but as a *threat* to the Soviet Union, and China. "We have nuclear weapons; you don't. You won't have them in the near future, we will. Therefore, you do as we tell you, or else."

So, the Truman Administration believed that the Soviets would be so terrified, and the Chinese so terrified, they would do nothing about it. They would be scared into submission. What happened is, is the Soviet Union and China made an agreement—and North Korea overran South Korea. And, the United States was pushed down into the Pusan perimeter,



"This is not a mismanagement problem: The United States is losing the war! And, it's losing that war, in the same degree that it lost the war in Indo-China." Here, U.S. soldiers surround and search Abu Ghurayb Market in Baghdad, after a rocket-propelled grenade attack, Nov. 2.

with no apparent chance of reconquering the territory. The South Korean army was wiped out—didn't exist. An American force, based in the Pusan perimeter, the tip of South Korea, was holding on, based by support from Japan.

MacArthur was brought into this thing; it was made a United Nations issue. MacArthur, typical of his being a traditionalist, flanked the situation with the so-called Inchon landing, and changed the character of the process. And, things have not changed, in terms of the geography of the area, since that time, since the immediate effect of the Inchon landing by MacArthur.

Now, the point was: The Truman Administration had miscalculated. They had assumed that the threat that they were making was so powerful, that *the world would submit, to the awesome power of the United States*. And, they found, and the world found, that China and the Soviet Union *would fight warfare*, in a way beyond the belief of these planners in the United States—then.

Asymmetric Warfare

Today, countries such as India, China, and Russia, are prepared—under the kind of threat coming from the Cheney crowd in the Bush Administration—are preparing to fight the kind of warfare, which fits the kind of threat, which Cheney and Co. represent. Therefore, we're looking in the near term—unless we get rid of Cheney, and get rid of what he represents; unless we get rid of Soros, also, and what he represents, which has taken over Bill Clinton and the Democratic Party—unless we get rid of that, *we will be, in the coming years ahead, at some point, in this kind of warfare!* It will be nuclear warfare; limited thermonuclear weapons; submarines of a type which have not existed previously; nuclear bombs stuck in the mud along the Chesapeake and up the Delaware

River and other places.

And, this will be the kind of warfare which you see in Iraq. They went into Iraq. What happened in Iraq? At a point that the U.S. killing operation—air power, use of super-weapons; destroy whole territories—became severe, the Iraqi military disappeared. It vanished! It didn't vanish to nowhere—it still existed. What you're now seeing—a decision was made, within part of the Iraqi population, among the military: Since they could not defeat the strategic arsenal being deployed against them by the United States, what they would do is, they would take a lesson from Korea and Vietnam. And they would say, "We can't beat their weapons, but when we're close up to them, next to them, walking the same streets, in the same neighborhoods, and they have to deal with us man-to-man; if we're willing to take the brunt of doing that, we can win that war." And, the Iraqi military is in the process, now, of winning the war, against a U.S. invading force! This is not a mismanagement problem: The United States is losing the war! And, it's losing that war, in the same degree that it lost the war in Indo-China.

You see, warfare finally comes down to people to people. Weapons to weapons don't mean much. What counts in warfare, is what comes out of warfare: Who wins? Now, winning is based on survivors, so mass killing is not winning warfare: It's extermination. It's madness. Winning in warfare, is winning it man to man, person to person. In the final analysis, when you get to this area, you think about fighting war between *total* thermonuclear destruction, and what used to be called "conventional warfare"—in this middle area, which these idiots are playing with, *that's what the logic is*. You *force* a situation, where countries which are capable, and understand military and related problems, and populations that are willing to fight for their sovereignty, to fight for their

independence—you're up against the factor of humanity, where people say, "I would rather die, than submit to this. If dying meant that we were going to defeat these guys."

And what you're seeing is the defeat of the United States—a *military defeat of the United States*, created by the *stupidity* of an American people and leadership, which failed to recognize the lesson of even the past period, since the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That is the logic of the situation.

So, what we're dealing with, again, is a question of passion. People are saying, "But, it's the United States. We have to defend the United States." *Against what?* How about defense of the soldiers who are not getting medical treatment, when they're injured? What about the trauma cases, the surviving trauma cases, piling up in hospitals, where they don't get care? What about the process of—they send these guys in as reservists and National Guardsmen, without body armor? They don't give them body armor! They offer to *sell* it to them! For \$800-900 a shot! So, some people get body armor, others get joke-body armor—not serious body armor, it's something that adds some weight; you get on the scale, you weigh more. Maybe that's important. But in its effectiveness against these conditions of combat, it is not serious body armor. A Hummer: It may make Arnie Schwarzenegger rich, but it's not much use in this kind of situation. What you call a "Hummer," is called a "target." And, if somebody has to say, "What target?"—"Well there's one!"

So, that's the situation we face.

A Passion for Truth

Now, overall, go back to the thing I started with, this question about passion: The problem of passion lies in these areas of so-called axiomatic assumptions: definitions, axioms, and postulates. Or, generally accepted truisms; or, generally accepted public opinion; or, believing that sincerity is truth. In other words, if a person lies, in terms of fact, but they're sincere, you can't call it a lie. "Well, he may be telling a lie, that it's not the truth, but he's sincere! Therefore, you can not call him a liar." Or, "He believes it, he heard it from somebody else, whom he sincerely believes is an authority."

"Look, he's a member of the Democratic Party. And his leadership of his party says it's true; therefore, if you're a member of the party, you have to accept that democratic decision, by that leadership of the party, and that has to be your opinion; and you have to act accordingly." "You have to believe in free trade. You have to believe in Adam Smith." You have to believe in these things—otherwise, there's something *wrong* with you.

Therefore, you find yourself living like a goldfish in a goldfish bowl, surrounded by all kinds of truisms. Some are like the truisms of definitions, and axioms, and postulates of mathematics. Others are these kinds of social shibboleths, that you have to believe. And your emotions are attached to that. So, if you are convinced—a bunch of you get together, and you discuss something. You go through it, you do an

investigation. You are convinced that a certain thing is true. You state your evidence and state why you believe it's true. And someone says, "That doesn't make any difference. Because that's not the way things are going to happen. Things will happen the way the news media believes; the way the party machine believes; the way my uncle believes—that's *how things are going to be!* I don't care what your evidence is, that's what it is!"

Therefore, *you* are now faced with a situation, where you are about to face social rejection—or lying. Because you *know* it's a lie! But you say, "Look, I've gotta go along. I've *got* to go along. I've got to go along! I've got to get along! Look, that's popular opinion! That's popular culture! You *can't* go against popular culture!" "I mean, the Nazi Party's has its culture. You gotta go along!" "Schwarzenegger has a culture." (I don't think he has any testicles any more—but he has a culture! That's why he went into politics.)

In any case, that's what you're up against. So, the problem of society, is the problem of emotion. People say, "Let's be objective. Let's *not be emotional*." The point is, you're being *controlled* by emotion. What they mean is, "Don't defy *my* emotions! If you disagree with me—."

For example, go to a professor of mathematics or mathematical physics, and raise the question of the Gauss Fundamental Theorem of Algebra, the question of the complex domain. You want to see an emotional display of fireworks? So therefore, you have met an axiom. You've met an assumption.

This guy *assumes*—he's a radical positivist; he assumes certain things, which are not true, which are false. But he and his buddies have all sworn an oath to this kind of freemasonic code: They believe in this thing. You are questioning the authority of Lagrange and Cauchy, in particular. What your evidence is, is to them, *irrelevant*. "We have already decided" that *this* is the way mathematics will be defined, that science will be defined. And, when you cross them, the dignified professor, you cross him effectively—you're presenting the actual evidence; and the so-called dignified professor, who has enough education to recognize that you've pinned him against the wall, that you've presented evidence that he shouldn't be able to overlook, he's got to consider it, and respond to it—he's not going to respond to it at that point, except one way: *Emotionally!* He has a freakout: "Get out of here! And, don't come back! You must be a Communist!" And, things like that. And you say, "Well, weren't you a Communist, once?" "Get out of here!!!"

The problem that you are up against, and that you face, is that.

Brainwashing of the Baby-Boomer Generation

Now, let's look at another dimension of this. What are you up against? You are up against a generation called the "Baby-Boomer Generation," which was so terrified by several things, that they never came back; they went away some place, and never came back. They're still walking around; they've got bodies moving around there, but something inside



A Baby-Boomer proclaims, "There is no future," in this New York City "pot parade" in 1981. The children of the Boomers are, increasingly, unwilling to accept the fate their parents' hedonism has handed to them.

them, which had been living before, went away; became part of the counterculture. The first thing, the most immediate thing that turned adolescents or late adolescents, in the 1960s, into Baby-Boomers, was the fear of—number one: the Missiles Crisis of 1962, and the effect it had on them and their parents (they were old enough to be scared; they were not old enough to judge the situation); the assassination of Kennedy; and the beginning of the Indo-China War—a hopeless war, which they had no confidence in, no belief in.

As a result of that, they fled into what's called a "counterculture." Various kinds of counterculture. Now, the people who fled first, were university students. And, the idea was, could your university enrollment protect you from being drafted to be sent into Indo-China? It was a big deal; and the whole ideology. That was where the expression was coined, "I don't go there." Typical Baby-Boomer expression: "I don't—Don't bring it up! I don't go there!" "Don't talk about the economy; I don't go there." "Don't tell me about Adam Smith; I don't go there." "Don't tell me about Cheney; I don't go there." "Don't tell me the Democratic Party leadership is corrupt; I don't go there!" "I do not deal with those issues! I'm living in my goldfish bowl, and that's outside my goldfish bowl. That's not in my water!"

So therefore, you get this kind of situation with them. Now, what happened is, the concentration was like this problem we discussed in Sweden, where they go at castrating the minds of the boys, and they leave the girls alone. If you can make the males impotent—that was the purpose of this Gunnar Myrdal kind of operation, huh?

So, they concentrated on the college and entry layers in society, to brainwash them first. What they brought in, among the other things, very quickly, was LSD. Now, is LSD an essential part of your education? Can you understand

the universe better with LSD? No? What was the slogan—the slogan of the London Tavistock Institute: "Drop in, and drop out." Drop in and drop out. You take LSD, with marijuana, cheap wine—and you're on a trip! So, the idea was to flee from society. The other thing was: "Technology is bad. Technology created the situation: We must get rid of technology. We must have new values. We must reject our parents' values."

So therefore, you had a fear-stricken generation, which had gone into a counterculture, a no-future society, and the older they got—when they got through their sexual enthusiasms; they couldn't do it quite as fast and often as before, so they had to think about things, then. Before, when they had sex, in their youth, they didn't have to think any more; LSD and sex would get them through the day, more or less. And when they had to start to think about earning a living and raising a family, and so forth, they had to find new kinds of entertainment, new ways of amusing themselves, of keeping themselves happy; new kinds of social habits, conventions, fads, costumes, and so forth. And so, they became a no-future generation, in and of themselves, called the Baby-Boomers. They became a "pleasure society," a "post-industrial" culture. They became a dead culture: Because, under the influence which was exerted partly through them, increasingly, the United States and Europe lost its ability to produce. The United States and Britain, first; Australia, and so forth, first; then other parts of the world were destroyed. Destroyed in the ability to see a future in the society.

Today's Youth Demand a Change

And then, you guys were born. You came out of a generation, or the effects of a generation, which went through that experience; you went through a generation, which had gone through the transformation, into something like Rome under the Caesars: the "bread and circuses" culture. It's called a "sex and entertainment" culture, in which 80% of the family-income bracket population of the United States is living in desperate conditions, increasingly desperate conditions. Some people say, "The economy is prosperous. The economy is doing well." What's that, but a state of insane denial? If 80% of our population is suffering, and the lower 25% of family-income brackets is in *desperate conditions*; if we're killing off older people, because we want them dead, by our health-care policy; if we're killing off people with serious diseases, because we don't want to care for them, we want them *dead*, as soon as possible: What kind of a culture is this? But that is the culture which the Baby-Boomer generation voted! Step by step, in a state of withdrawal.

You come along—and you're not prepared to die. You're not prepared to accept no future. So, you find, again, a barrier, an emotional barrier—with the very emotions involved in the fact that *they*, during the early to middle 1960s, made a *choice*, a kind of axiomatic choice of definitions and so forth—social definitions; and they have been living out those choices, of that and subsequent times, over these periods.

Reason and the Emotions

They have supported these kinds of changes. This has destroyed the United States' economy. It has destroyed much of the world; it has destroyed the basis for a decent expectation of life. But, they are *defending it*. For example, you've got Bill Clinton, who in 1996 and so forth, was running around the country, talking about the "Golden Generation"—his generation! That is the generation, which actually *delivered the disaster* which this nation is living through now; and he's still defending it. That's his problem. He's one of the brightest Presidents we've had, but he's still living out that delusion, the delusion of the so-called "Golden Generation." It was not gold, I'm telling you. It was something you generally flushed away.

But, this is what they're clinging to. So therefore, when you say, "I demand the right to a future. I demand that this society have a future. I demand that my life be meaningful, that I have access to being part of a society which has a future," you run up against the *emotion* of people, who made a choice—"We have *chosen to believe*": passion. So, don't look for what you call "objectivity." Don't accept the idea, that by arguing within the definitions, axioms, and postulates, of assumptions, without "getting emotional," that you're going to get anywhere. You're not going to change anything. Because, as long as you accept these axiomatic assumptions, *you are going to hell*, with the rest of society. You have no choice.

So therefore, you have to go directly against emotions.

Now, then we come back to the question: What about "rational" and "emotional"? Are these opposing categories? No. They are not. Irrational is a lack of sane emotion. A person who is emotionless is insane, it's a form of schizophrenia. So therefore, to be rational, is to be rational *in your emotions*, not to be unemotional.

What is the characteristic of our speech in society, today? What is the characteristic of speech, as you see it on television, as you see it in terms of news broadcasting, for example? In terms of ordinary speech in general? People-who-talk-like-ticker-tape. Who try to talk, as either one, as *unemotionally* as possible; or, realizing that that's awfully stupid, they try to color their speech by stylized methods of speaking. Sort of like rock music, it doesn't mean anything: You can just take and beat your head against the wall, and it achieves the same effect. But, you want to make it look it pretty, or something, so you develop a *style* of beating your head against the wall. Instead of saying, "I'm beating my head against the wall," you say, "I'm doing it with style!" We can have a little discussion about humor, these days, popular humor in your generation—you know, beating your head against the wall, or urinating on something, huh? This is called "high-quality humor"!

So, the issue here is: People don't even know how to speak. We have people who try to recite poetry, or sing music. It's horrible! They try to sing it, with a *style*, to impress people that they are masters of a style. But then, you sit back, and you say, "Wait a minute. What *idea* are you communicating?"

What idea are you communicating, and what is the passion which you are imparting, for that idea?"

Look at these actors. They can't act. Why? The function of an actor is to present, not himself, but an idea. An actor who is trying to sell himself on stage—get rid of him. He's useless. An actor who's conveying *an idea*, is useful. And therefore, when an actor is performing well, you don't see the performer; you see what he's doing, you see what he's representing. He's able to disguise himself, in a sense; to such a degree, that he becomes the *instrument* of conveying an idea. And then, you see him after the performance, and you have the impression to go up to him and say, "Thank you." Not because you liked his performance, as a physical performance, but you liked what he had done *to you*, in the conveying of an idea, by his performance. He was able to subordinate his ego, as such. He did not present his ego—he presented an idea. And the idea was important, and you were glad you got the idea. And then you say, "Hey! He did it!" Go up and thank him! Because he did it. Every great performance, is the same thing, conveying an idea.

So, the question we have before us, is, how do we bring passion, and what is called rationality, together? Because without passion, rationality is insanity. Therefore, the thing to look at, is what are the assumptions which are controlling the way we choose axioms.

Let's go back a bit—one last point on this. Go back in history: Mankind, until Europe's 15th Century, as far as we know, most humanity were kept as human cattle, not as people. They were kept as slaves and serfs and so forth, in forms of subjugation where they were used as cattle. The guild system is cattle: "Learn your trade! Do as your father, and grandfather, and great-grandfather did before you. Don't try to change anything." That is being an animal. You were not using that quality in you, which distinguishes you from a beast, an animal.

The difference is, in the 15th Century, the ideas which had accumulated about the nature of man, and in European civilization from the time of ancient Greece, the Pythagoreans, Thales, Solon, Plato, and so forth: These ideas were suddenly given an expression in the form of what became known as the nation-state, first in France under Louis XI, and in England under Henry VII. The law was the law of the general welfare, the concept of a constitution, the concept of natural law. It is a natural law of man which is based on the fact that man is different than any animal. Man is a creature of reason, not of sense-perception. Man is able to see through the paradoxes of sense-perception, as Gauss implies this with the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra, to discover principles, which actually run the universe; principles you can not directly "see" with your senses, but principles which you can know, through reason, and *prove* experimentally, to control the universe. Therefore, now you become a person, who has principles; you can change the universe, because these principles, once you discover them, you're able to change nature,

because you have principles that control nature; you're now able to control it.

Now, you have knowledge. Without these principles, you have no knowledge, you're only an animal. You're just acting like a baboon, on the basis of your heredity, on your hereditary sense-perceptual powers. You play games and tricks, but they're all limited to those sense-perceptual powers, like a cat or a dog, or a monkey or a baboon. And there's no difference between that and the typical liberal. There are no ideas there. The typical reductionist, the empiricist, is not human: They deny the existence of universal physical principles, and say, "What we call principles, is limited to things that we can *deduce*, deductively, or inductively, from sense-perception." That's empiricism. That's what it is; that's what's taught. That's the dominant culture.

The function of empiricism is to deny the existence of humanity. To deny the thing that makes you different from a beast, from a baboon: this ability of the human mind to see beyond sense-perception, and to prove those discoveries, which you make through looking at the paradoxes, the ironies, the metaphors buried in sense-perception. "Look, it doesn't make sense." Discover the solution. And, as Kepler did, discover a principle, like universal gravitation. And now, the universe makes sense, because now you know a principle which causes this aberrant behavior. And now, it's no longer an aberrant universe, an insane universe—it's a principle.

So, this is what makes us human.

The Issues of the General Welfare

Now, if people become human, are they going to accept being slaves; are they going to accept being serfs? Are they going to accept that kind of condition of being human cattle, who are moved out into the field, bred and culled, used up, and thrown away? Which is what is pretty much done, today, with our society. The lower 80% of our population, is essentially reduced to the category of human cattle. That's why the Democratic Party and others go out to get, and spend, big money on mass media as a way of campaigning, rather than going out in the streets and dealing with the people. Because the people, the rightful citizens of the United States, are chiefly in the lower category of the 80% of lower family-income brackets. Now, if you're organizing the lower 80% of family-income brackets as a force, what is going to be prominent today? The issues of the general welfare: health care; a decent life, these kinds of things; the development of children. So, you don't go there. You go into the mass manipulation business: bread and circuses.

So, in this kind of society, the problem we have, is the following: We have a modern nation-state, which was created, as a form of institution, based on what humanity had discovered about mankind over thousands of years before then. The modern nation-state, based on the principle of general welfare, and commitment to posterity; that the state, the nation, as an institution, must be responsible for protecting

and promoting the general welfare; that the state, the nation, as an institution, controlled by its people, must be accountable for the future condition of our posterity. The nation-state! And, the condition of posterity is based on man, as man. And man as man, is a creative creature, who discovers universal principles, who increases the species-power in the universe, who can fix things in the universe. We are a creative species: To be man, to be human, means that these creative powers must be developed. They must be encouraged. They must be utilized. That is the general welfare. Without that, there is no future, except as for baboons—who have a questionable future, as baboons.

So therefore, that's the issue. The first time such a society came into existence, was then, in the 15th Century, with the idea of a nation-state based on natural law; ideas which were expressed ecumenically by the Council of Florence, back then in the 15th Century, and were expressed in the outgrowth of that as Louis XI's France, and Henry VII's England.

Immediately, the forces which represented feudalism, represented the Middle Ages, fought back, and sought to destroy it. One of the products of this destruction was *to destroy the idea of man as a creative being*; of the individual as a creative being; one capable of creating discoveries of knowledge, beyond the veil of sense-perception, and using that knowledge as principles to improve the condition of man.

Now therefore, if you create such a citizenry, what happens? Well, you get the inspiration of the United States. So, you had people in the 18th Century, in particular, who looked at the colonization efforts in the Americas, and looked particularly at the option in English-speaking North America, especially from the middle of the 18th Century around Benjamin Franklin—from about the 1750s. And Franklin, at that point, was supported increasingly from the greatest minds of Europe, directly, to build around Franklin a set of ideas, which became the conception of this republic. And the purpose was of that effort, was not merely to create a republic, a utopia, in the United States: The purpose was to set an example, in the emergence of an American republic, which would then inspire Europe, which had given us these ideas—would inspire Europe, to do the same for itself.

So, against that, to prevent that, the British East India Company—headed by, at that point, actually, by Lord Shelburne—in 1763 moved with two stated objectives, of that period. He was the boss. He ran Barings Bank; he was the political boss of Barings Bank. He was the political boss of the British East India Company. He also was the paymaster for the British monarchy. The British King was paid—personally paid—by the British East India Company, through Shelburne. Most of the members of the British Parliament were *paid*, bought and sold, by the British East India Company.

So, the British East India Company, with a certain model, set out to prevent, first of all to attempt to prevent what became the United States from coming into existence; and to destroy France; because, among the intelligentsia in France—typified

by Bailly, for example, and Lafayette, who were young people (Bailly was somewhat older)—these were the people who formed a constitution for a French monarchy, which was presented in the Spring of 1789, to deal with the crisis in France. This intelligentsia around Paris, which had been the leading force in supporting the struggle to create the United States from Europe; this intelligentsia was determined to move in that direction, to take the American model, which was just being established under the draft Federal Constitution. And, to use that as a model, to spread into Europe, beginning with France, a system of republics—whether under monarchs or whatnot—which would represent this new conception of man, this new kind of society: to free man from the relics of feudalism, so to speak; and from the relics of what the British East India Company represented.

They were removed, immediately. It had been prepared by Shelburne. The French Revolution was run by Shelburne. It was run by the British East India Company. Philippe Égalité: British agent; Jacques Necker: British agent; Danton: British agent; Marat: British agent. The entire Jacobin Terror leadership: British agents. Napoleon: British agent.

Synarchism Against the Nation-State

So, what was set into motion, is what has been called in recent times, in the recent century: Synarchism. It was then called Martinism. This instrument, typified by the Jacobin Terror and Napoleon's tyranny, has been the curse of Europe from that time to the present day. Every time a financial crisis or a threat to this financial order occurs, these guys go into motion. And do, as they did in the 1920s: 1922, they created Mussolini; they created Adolf Hitler; they created the fascists of France; they created Franco of Spain; they created the Synarchist movement in Mexico, the Synarchist movements throughout the Americas. These are the people who are behind, in the United States, putting Hitler into power from here. These are the people who were prepared to run a coup—Morgan, DuPont, and Mellon, in 1933-34: *A military coup* against the President of the United States was planned by these guys, as reported by Smedley Butler, who had been approached to run this coup; he was a commanding Marine general, who had a few things to say about this.

These are the guys, who went against Hitler only because the British, and their American friends, decided they didn't want to be *run*, in a world run by Hitler! They didn't fight because they were opposed to what Hitler represented. They fought because he was a continental European. And the idea of a continental European power arising to dominate the English-speaking world, was something they wouldn't accept. They would put Hitler into power to destroy Europe! But, not to conquer them.

And, the *minute* that the war was virtually won, in June-July 1944, these swine moved *immediately* with a right turn, which included Russell's plan for preventive nuclear warfare. The conflict with the Soviet Union was created by these peo-

ple, by this British-American influence, the same crowd, which had tried to assassinate President Roosevelt; which had then backed Roosevelt against Hitler. And then, as soon as Hitler was defeated, moved to destroy Roosevelt's work, destroy the tradition.

So, what we're dealing with is a long history, which goes back into the medieval period; a long history of a struggle, out of the aftermath of the Roman Empire and feudalism, to develop a form of society which is committed to the welfare and promotion of the individual human being. The United States was the first such nation created on the basis of that principle, in a modern form, the Constitutional principle. We have been the victim of subversion, corruption, and so forth, typified by the present Administration; typified by the present leadership of the Democratic Party, who are paid by bankers who get their money out of stealing, or running drugs, like Soros; who control the Democratic Party; who control the Republican Party at the top.

If you try to deal with the existing institutions at the top, you'll get no place. Do what we do: *Go to the people*. Go to two groups of people: One, the people in the lower 80% of family-income brackets. They are the ones who are aware that their interest lies in a change. Go to people of conscience, among your parents' generation, who may not be, in a sense, of the lower brackets; go to them, and, as a matter of conscience, engage them in the idea that we've got to think about what kind of future we're leaving for our people, and for the world. Go, with a clear image, to these people, those who understand some of this, of *what we are looking at*: We are now looking, in the fairly medium to short term—at this kind of warfare, which lies between thermonuclear destruction and so-called conventional warfare, which is being pushed. If this happens, within several years, there *will be* no civilization!

And, we're the only ones who represent the opposition to that. Yes, there are many people, who are sympathetic to aspects of what we're trying to do; but they're not willing to do the job. You have to *eliminate* the influence of those institutions which are responsible for getting us in this mess, and keeping us in this mess.

And, the only way you do it: You've got to go to the people. The poor, especially. As we're trying to do in Philadelphia. What's happening in Philadelphia on the [Mayor John] Street case: We're trying to mobilize the people of Philadelphia, the poor—the poor, the so-called African-American, the late trade unionists, and others—or people of conscience. To mobilize them as a people to exercise their right to select their own government, to keep their own government accountable to certain principles, which are the general principles of our society.

There's no other force in society you can trust. None. Individuals, yes. But, there's no force in this society you can trust politically, except those who sympathize, and are part of, the cause of the lower 80% of our family-income brackets. And therefore, the reason that you are effective as a youth

movement—the key point—the potential you represent lies in that direction.

The key thing here is emotion. Emotion should not be treated as some irrational thing, contrary to reason, as reason is misdefined. But rather, we must look at emotion *critically*, to define what are sane, and insane, forms of emotion, and then judge the rest of the policy from that standpoint.

Dialogue With LaRouche

Here are excerpts from the discussion following LaRouche's speech. Questions came from the audience in Pennsylvania, and by telephone from a LaRouche Youth Movement meeting in Los Angeles.

What Is Romanticism?

Q: Mr. LaRouche, I was just hoping you could enlighten us on Romanticism.

LaRouche: Okay. Let's take Romanticism as it has existed in its modern form. Romanticism essentially takes two aspects: the dichotomy between passion and deduction. That's where it lies.

So, let's take the case of Franz Liszt, or Berlioz—we call him “belliose,” sometimes, or bellicose—or Wagner. (Now, Wagner, forget—he's something else; but Liszt is a clear case.) Now, Liszt was a young man who was brought to [Beethoven] by Carl Czerny, who was his teacher, the young man's teacher. And Czerny wished to exhibit, that this fellow was a keyboard master. So, Beethoven went through the exercise with Czerny. And, so, the people said, “What do you think of the young boy, Liszt, Franz Liszt? And he said, “He's a very talented young boy. But, under that bastard, Czerny, he will come to no good.” And that was sound, absolutely sound.

If you look at some of the notes that Czerny made on Beethoven concertos, and other things, you realize that this guy was a real piece of work, a butcher.

Now, what's the difference between Liszt and Classical composers? Say, through Mozart; take Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann, Mendelssohn, Brahms. What's the difference? Is there a difference. Yes. There is a fundamental difference. But there is also a deceptive similarity. Something that's called “passage work”—which is not diarrhea, but, it's the musical equivalent of diarrhea. You just use half-tone progressions, chromatic progressions, and you try to scintillate; make a scintillating performance. It's a parody. It's like a doll; or, it's like a dog dressed up as a person; or, a monkey dressed up as a person. It's like what happened in Britain, where they had a baboon escape from a church, and the baboon was discovered running around the neighborhood in a woman's dress. And he was being used in some kind of an obscure sexual ritual by the members of one of these cults, in Britain in the 18th Century. So, this is sort of—Liszt and Romanticism, is the baboon in a woman's dress trying to

pretend to be a person, or trying to avoid having to pretend to be a person (in the case of the baboon).

So, the way that it happened was the following. It happened through demoralization. You take the Classical humanist movement in Europe, in its modern form, developed in Germany around the influence of Abraham Kästner, who was famous as a teacher of mathematics. [Kästner] was born in 1719, which is three years after the death of Leibniz. He comes from the same city where Leibniz was born, Leipzig, and a city associated with much of the career of Johann Sebastian Bach, and the same city from which a young Efraim Lessing came, who was actually one of the most important pupils of Kästner.

This was the same Kästner who, in the 1750s, became aware of the importance of Benjamin Franklin in the United States, and—through this connection from Leipzig to Halle, to Göttingen, which became a very influential center, actually—made a direct intervention to bring some of the works of Leibniz into possession of Franklin—there were two efforts in that direction. And the concept of the American physical economy, the concept of the American Constitution, was largely a result of the influence of Leibniz, in several respects, but notably including his essays, the so-called *New Essays on Human Understanding*, which were transmitted to Franklin and circles from Germany from this circle of this Leipzig-Halle-Göttingen group. In the 1760s, Franklin was a guest in Göttingen of Kästner. Kästner had devoted his life—he was technically a teacher of mathematics—and had devoted his life, as he expressed it, to defending the ideas of Leibniz and of Johann Sebastian Bach against their opponents. So that this relationship between Leibniz and Bach was a characteristic feature of what became known as the Classical humanist revolution in Germany. With the influence of Kästner—

For example, Shakespeare, in England, had become a dirty word. That's the way it was done, on the stage. Just filth; foolish nonsense. This had started with Francis Bacon and company, who had done everything possible to crush and end the career of Shakespeare. And so, Shakespeare spent the last years of his life—the greatest dramatist in English history—in relative obscurity to which he was forced under King James I, under the influence of Sir Francis Bacon and his circle, and Hobbes and company. So, Shakespeare was performed as some of the great dramatists today in Germany or the United States: Great dramas are turned into garbage and put on the stage. And this was done to Shakespeare. Shakespeare was revived in the early 18th Century to some degree in England, but in a fragmentary form, in much the way that most great drama is destroyed in the United States on the stage today, eh?

So, as a result of Kästner's influence, and the association with Lessing, you had a rebirth of the concept of Classical drama and poetry in Germany. This revolution in Germany radiated throughout much of Europe and was associated with the rise of the pro-American circles throughout Europe from the period of about the middle of the 18th Century until 1789.

And, this was the Classical movement. It was a Classical movement in poetry, in drama, and so forth. We discussed it yesterday in Baltimore—this question of how drama works, Classical drama works. So this was the basis of the Classical humanist movement. It was a realization of what had been anticipated by the best of the Classical Greeks: the Pythagoreans, Socrates, Plato, and so forth. And it occurred there.

With the French Revolution—from 1789, July 14th on—and the Reign of Terror, and the reign of Napoleon, Romanticism emerged out of a reaction to *awe* at the *terror* of the Jacobin Revolution, the Jacobin Terror, and Napoleon Bonaparte's empire. You had the characteristic features: Hegel. Hegel was almost a sexual lover, intellectually, of Napoleon; a real degenerate. The theory of fascism actually was codified, for the first time, by Hegel, with his papers on history and philosophy, on the state of philosophy.

Kant is an example of Romanticism. Kant became extremely influential as an anti-Classical figure in the 1790s. And the birth of Romanticism, philosophical Romanticism in Germany, comes largely from Kant. Hegel is another one. In this process, even Goethe had a period of "affection" for Napoleon.

So, the Napoleonic image, the image of the great beast marching across Europe, subjugating all Europe, was the image. There was a slight change in 1812-1814, when the resistance, organized largely by Prussians who were representatives of the Classical humanist tradition, joined with Alexander I, the Tsar of Russia, to design a policy of strategic defense against Napoleon's invasion of Russia. Napoleon came out of Russia without any troops. He went in with a half-million. This created, very briefly, a period of great optimism in Europe, until the Congress of Vienna. And, with the travesty which was the Congress of Vienna, in which the Anglo-Dutch interests and the Hapsburg interests, divided power over the world, produced a great period of pessimism and a resurgence of Romanticism. So, Romanticism, in general, was to be understood historically, not as a category of a fixed definition. It's simply the idea that the acceptance of blind passion, as such, must rule. And the basis is the idea of the person of passion—. For example, we have this today in figures. You have stupid figures, incompetent figures, disgusting figures of art, who are faddish, like Hollywood stars, rock stars, and so forth—they are nothing! They are junk. They're garbage, but once they are established as having an image of something which is *emotionally appealing*, then they become figures to reckon with; against all reason—that is Romanticism.

So, Romanticism is of that form. It takes the form with Liszt, of someone who is clever, who is well trained, who knew how to fake it, and could fake Classical performance, Classical forms and composition. That is one form.

The other form is the more extreme form, of Nazism and similar kinds of things, or the rock-drug-sex counterculture. This is another form of Romanticism. Complete irrationalism,

controlled by wild emotions—"I feel, I feel, I feel, I feel." That's Romanticism. . . .


Passion and Compassion: The Case of Poe

Q: I appreciate all this discussion about the passion, number one, I've been asking you questions about this and, you know, been trying to develop ideas on this, the whole youth movement has been. But, a couple of weeks ago, I sort of dug into this. And I'm looking at something else which is very related with this passion, which is compassion. My idea of compassion is pretty much a certain understanding that one has towards an individual group of people, to sort of address the issue, because we've been looking at a lot of Poe; and it is very interesting to look at how Poe deals with the situation in "The Purloined Letter," where you have two people trying to solve a mystery, and on the one hand you have the prefect. And he is like you discussed with us—logical, deductive objectivity—who sort of imposes his view upon the situation, rather than looking at Dupin, which actually says, well, you have to understand the individual to understand how he would go about hiding the letter and so forth.

I looked at that and I said, "Well, how do we organize to that effect?" Do we organize in terms of proving people wrong, if we know a certain amount of knowledge? Or, I mean, it is a question of compassion, if you have an understanding of what this person is actually going through, like you discussed last night, when you said, these are our people. Have a sense of what these people—what we are actually doing; what it means to actually organize a population in the way that we are doing. Because, you said, a couple of conferences ago, that we're actually giving the lives back to our generation. So, this is something that you don't want to play with in terms of academia, or, you know, just sort of organizing to get a set effect. So, can you please touch on this question of compassion and touch on how we can access this better.

LaRouche: I would take the case of Poe, just because you used it in the context of Poe, and the answer can be best phrased in those terms. Poe was the grandson of the Quartermaster General of this region, for the American Revolution. And because of that, and because his parents had died, Poe was, in his youth, a member of the Society of the Cincinnati, which is a hereditary society of officers of the American Revolution. Poe, at the age of 19, rose to the rank of what we call sergeant major or master sergeant in the U.S. Army. He was then sent to West Point on recommendation of, I think it was, of Madison or Monroe, because of the Cincinnati Society. He left West Point in the first term because he had epilepsy, and therefore was not able to serve adequately as a military officer, those duties, because he was epileptic.

He then became a skilled intelligence officer, a counterintelligence officer, in U.S. affairs. At a certain point, he was sent to Paris under James Fenimore Cooper, who was also a famous intelligence officer of the United States, and a famous



Edgar Allan Poe's deep philosophical insight shows an indispensable quality of compassion, in examining the aberrant behavior of the characters in his stories.

writer. And, in Paris, he made the acquaintance of the actual living Dupin, who was a part of the French Ecole Polytechnique. And he used this figure of Dupin, the name of Dupin, to deal with certain philosophical questions. He was also famous because he, as a young reporter, working as a reporter in New York, he actually, from the facts of the case, solved a murder mystery, as a reporter; just a literary exercise. He solved it. They went and made the investigation; they found the proof. So, he was an expert intelligence officer with very special kinds of insight.

The usual idea of the reputation of Poe, forget it! It's not true. And most of this reputation was supplied by a British intelligence agent who moved in on him at the point of his death. [Poe] was probably murdered; the evidence is, he was beaten savagely, in some way, and died of his injuries in a Baltimore hospital.

So, on this Dupin case; what the issue has been in modern society is that you had a pig, a British pig, called Arthur Conan Doyle, sometimes called Sir Arthur Conan Doyle—first time a greased pig was ever called Sir, I guess. But, anyway, he wrote the first Sherlock Holmes story, in which it was stated, to eliminate the influence of Poe's Dupin. So, all bad investigations—the FBI was practically invented by Sherlock Holmes—all incompetent investigations come from this

thing. Poe's conception was a philosophical one; that is, he had a deep philosophical insight, and his stories reflect that. For example, "The Goldbug," all of these things, these show real philosophical insight. And so the significance is that.

Now, philosophical insight always involves compassion. Because, for example, when you are looking at aberrant behavior in a person, you should be looking at it the same way you look at the question of universal physical principles. You find a *paradox*, something that makes no sense. So, you have to find: What is the principle that causes this apparently irrational behavior? So, therefore, the first thing you have to do; You have to have a compassionate insight into the subject person, whose eccentric behavior you're studying. And, if you want to find out *why* he does what he does, and what he's likely to do, you have to have insight of the same type that Kepler showed in discovering gravitation. You look into the subject matter with insight; identify in a refined way what the paradox is, what the contradiction is; solve it, in the same manner you would solve a universal physical principle, discovery of universal physical principle; then, on the basis of that knowledge, proceed in two directions. First of all, number one, what is this person likely to do? Or, what's this planet likely to do? Or, this asteroid is likely to do? Secondly, how do you change that person's behavior? How do you use the knowledge of their behavior to induce them to change the way they behave. And Poe had that kind of mind. And what you're asking, I think, is essentially that.

You have to end this fragmentation of the relationship between physical science and human behavior. You have to say that they are different in the sense that physical science pertains to our insight as individual minds into the universe around us; that social matters, human relations, pertain to the way such minds, which are capable of discovering universal principles, are dealing with the way people interact in order to accomplish, or not accomplish common ends. So, therefore if you've got a principle, you want to implement it—physical principle—you've discovered it, now you want society to cooperate in applying that principle, for some benefit for society.

Therefore, the same powers of insight that you use for discovering the principle must now be applied to a different subject matter. It's how do you implement the principle as a form of social cooperation? So that it has to be, first of all, task-oriented, always task-oriented. Secondly, insightful, into the way the mind of the person you are addressing is working, or the minds, the interaction of minds. And then, two things: See where things are likely to go, as I do with the economic forecasting; and then see what the solution is, the alternative to a catastrophe.

How Russia Looks at the United States

Q: I've been reading in the paper about the Russian oil companies being indicted. I was wondering if you could tell us about that. . . .

LaRouche: Russia has—we discussed this somewhat indirectly, the same subject area, yesterday in Baltimore, as some of you may recall. There are two nations on this planet which have a global view of the planet. China does not have a global view of the planet; Russia does, the United States does. Other nations may have a global view of the planet, but they don't have an *efficient* global view of the planet. That is, European nations, continental European nations, do not have a global view of the planet, because they are living in the Anglo-Dutch liberal parliamentary model, or its influence today, and therefore they do not have a sense of sovereignty: Because their sovereignty is contaminated, not only by the fact that there are other powers which are relatively hegemonic in respect to them in recent history; but also because, if your government is subject to veto by a private interest called an independent central banking system, you don't have any sovereignty at all.

And that's why European governments go to dictatorships under conditions of financial crisis; because when the conflict comes between the general welfare in a modern state, and the interest of the bankers, then the government must choose. And governments which are controlled by the central bankers will choose against the people. And how does the government do that? Well, it simply imposes a dictatorship. First thing it does, it overthrows the parliament, the parliamentary government, creates a crisis, with a news scandal or some kind of scandal. Overthrow the government and put in a dictatorship, or put in a de facto dictatorship, by some ministerial government, which is a dictatorial form of government. So that European nations, your continental European nations, do not have a true sense of sovereignty. And if you don't have a true sense of sovereignty, you're imperfect in your ability to try to understand the planet as a whole.

Because, the planet as a whole is a matter of different states which should be sovereign. And therefore, you have to look at one sovereign nation, in terms of how do you relate to the planet as a whole which is a mosaic of nations which should be sovereign. Therefore, you have to look at what is the common interest, the common characteristics, what is the driving force that is determining current history? And if you are in a great power, which the United States is in various respects; if Russia, which used to be a great power, which is implicitly still a great power, they look differently at the world than do the continental Europeans generally, or China, or other nations.

Now, therefore, that's key to understanding the issue of the Yukos oil question, which is what's the Khodorkovsky case. Putin is working as an institutional person. Putin is a former member of the Foreign Service of the KGB, the Rus-



As a President from a ministerial—not political—background, Vladimir Putin views Russia's relationship with the United States as a primary concern. While seeking to cooperate with the United States, he also confronts the reality that the world is heading toward war, unless the policy of the neo-conservatives in Washington is changed.

sian intelligence service, a foreign service specialist, who spent a good deal of time in the Saxony region of Germany, where he was associated with the high-tech industry, which is especially electronics, based around Dresden. . . . You are dealing with a figure, not as a political background, but as a ministerial background. In other words, his background is not as a political party person, not a political campaign. His is a ministerial background. He is interacting with various institutions. The country has been destroyed, largely, and looted—chiefly by the United States, in the post-war period. It is still Russia. It still has Russian passions, which are specifically Eurasian, rather than European. Russia is not a European nation. It is a *Eurasian* nation, with dominant European characteristics, but as a special kind.

Now, Russia was once a superpower, and thinks of itself as having been a great power and superpower. Therefore, when it looks at the world and the mess the world's in, it has a double opinion, a divided opinion. On the one side, Russia, under Putin—remember, don't look at him as a political figure in the ordinary sense. This is a ministerial figure, who is now the President of Russia. In other words, he is a bureaucrat, who is now the President of the country, with a special ministerial background. His one side is to establish at all costs, if possible, cooperation with the United States; that's his primary concern. His second concern, his other, secondary, concerns: China; Russia already has a good relationship with India, of its special type; but China is a great concern to Russia, the relationship to China. But the relationship with the United States is in a sense primary from a Russian standpoint. Its relationship with Western Europe is tertiary, but important, extremely important.

So, therefore, you're sitting in a position: On the one side, he's trying to find cooperation for Russia, with the United States, with China, maintain the relationship with India, and develop a richer relationship with continental Europe at the same time. That's the peaceful version.

On the other side, he's faced with the reality, which he has expressed an understanding of publicly, that the world is headed for a war, a world war of a type lying between conventional warfare and thermonuclear destruction. Russia, on the other side, like China, and so forth, is preparing for world war of that type in the foreseeable future. As Putin is.

Now, up to a certain point, Russia took the view, which some people would call cynical, others opportunistic, others whatever, that they had to tolerate the continued looting of Russia by the United States, by financial interests—and Israeli interests—called the oligarchs, the thieves. They had to tolerate that as a political condition of a peaceful relationship with the United States. So, therefore, the looting of Russia—we're talking about hundreds of billions of dollars of looting directly by this method; talking about mass death of Russian people, the destruction of a large part of the nation and the people, by this Anglo-American looting, which leaves some very deep feelings there.

So, there are the two sides. His policy is a balance between these two things.

At this point, I come into the picture; not because of Russia, as such, but because, as you know, as I've said, I spend about half my time outside the United States, and apart from just being a candidate in the United States, I am an important candidate of the United States internationally; probably more significant than any of the other candidates of the United States, internationally, by far. . . .

I've had a certain impact on these questions, especially in the past two, three years. And therefore, the way in which countries such as Russia, certain countries in Western Europe, China, India, elsewhere, the Arab world generally, the Islamic world, to a large degree, think about the United States, they think in terms of the equation, that is including me as a factor in U.S. policy. And the question is: To what degree do I have an influence in shaping U.S. policy: That's a part of their calculation. It's not simply something that's discussed; it's an active part of their consideration of the way they look at the United States. And Russia looks at the United States, also, in terms of me and my candidacy. Therefore, Russia's concern is to maintain its relationship with the United States, if possible—for example, I'm a factor in that—on the other hand, to go to war generally, or be forced to war in the coming period, if that doesn't work out.

Now, what's my attitude about Yukos, and these swine? As President of the United States, I'd be perfectly sympathetic to putting the whole bunch in jail and clean the whole mess up. So, therefore, to the extent that either Putin's circles think that they can rely on my having a greater influence in the United States—or they don't give a damn, that the case is

otherwise hopeless—they're going to proceed, and change their government to eliminate or reduce significantly the power of the mafia. And that's what's happening. . . .

Take on the Health-Care System

Q: . . . I have a question from the guy that introduced me to the organization. He's wondering what we're going to do about our health. Because, in his words, he says, "Knowing what we know, and doing what we do isn't enough. We have to outlive the bastards." So, what are we going to do?

LaRouche: . . . Well, you know what I said the other day, on the 22nd,¹ and I meant it: There's no fixed recipe for health. We have a health *policy*. Now health policy has two aspects. First of all sanitation, that's the first issue with health. Because in the history of mankind, the great increase and improvement in life expectancy of the population, is largely a result, not of medical practice as such, but improved sanitation. If food is not rotten, if water is not polluted, if you control the insect life around you—disease-bearing insects and so forth, keep the mosquitoes down—if you use DDT where you should, then people are going to live longer—without even going to the doctor.

But, the other side, essentially, is having a policy of developing health care. The best model we had, was the experience we had from military medicine, which various nations developed. This goes back to the medieval period, to Ambroise Paré, and so forth—surgery in warfare.

So that we developed through experience—especially in warfare, and effects of warfare—we developed a conception of a medical health-care system, which was largely based on surgery and other things. And during the recent large wars of the 19th and 20th Centuries, we developed a military system of the type—for example, we had 16-17 million people in the U.S., in military service during the Second World War. We had a very large health-care system, as part of the military, and adjuncts to it. We used to have a Veterans Hospital system, which doesn't really function any more. So, we had to care for everything.

Now, most of the casualties in warfare, are not combat casualties. They are of a nature called "frictional": jeep drivers, airplane crashes, infections, diseases. I once faced, in Burma, where there was an epidemic of what was called "tsutsugamushi," Japanese bush typhus. And, people would get it in the bushes. The Japanese had picked it up in Southeast Asia, brought it into this area in northern Burma. They deposited it among the lice, and the lice, when they got ahold of a GI or somebody else, would bite him, and that person would get this tsutsugamushi—in seven days, they're dead. Now, we can control it; we couldn't control it then.

So, these were the kinds of problems. We had amoebic dysentery; we had a whole epidemic of amoebic dysentery in northern Burma. So, these kinds of problems are typical

1. Oct. 22 webcast speech in Washington—see *EIR*, Oct. 31, 2003.



Battlefield medicine during World War II provided broad experience that allowed the United States to create an effective health-care system for the civilian population in peace-time.

problems. . . .

In military medicine, just to illustrate the point, we had a broad experience of how to treat a population, not only from wartime casualties, which applies to—the same thing as accidents, so-called trauma cases; accidents on the street, emergency cases—same thing.

So, we had a system. At the end of the war, we had an act which was put through rather quickly, the Hill-Burton Act; which was a few pages, not some kind of Hillary Clinton nightmare, but a few sensible pages, that worked. And we rebuilt our health-care system around fixed-point institutions—hospitals, clinics, and so forth—on the basis of assigning a goal for health care to each county of the United States. Now, this goal would change every year, because the Federal act said, “We’ll have this.” So, we would have private hospitals, public hospitals, public institutions, would all get together; they would decide how many beds of what type and what kind of care they would provide for that entire community, for the coming year, or for the advance year; they would then find out how much money they would have, from various sources, and then go out and raise more, so-called “special fundraising.”

So, they would operate on that basis, so if somebody fell down in the street, whether they had any money or not; someone said, “Call a cop!” They’d take him to the nearest emergency ward. They’d get immediate trauma treatment; then assigned to some permanent care, if they need it, wherever it’s needed, wherever it’s available. And then, maybe a couple of days later, somebody comes through, and says, “You got

any resources to pay for all this?” or “Who’s going to pay for it?” And if they didn’t have any money, we’d pay for it anyway. Wouldn’t even bother paying for it; we didn’t call it pay. We didn’t have to have an individual payment system. People would pay what they could, and we would have a slop factor, of people who couldn’t pay, or couldn’t pay completely, and they would be cared for, as if they had all the money in the world. That was the system.

You combine that kind of system, with what’s called a teaching hospital, where doctors and nurses are trained, and given education. Teaching hospitals are generally located in the center of population areas—usually; and they’re places where, in the process of teaching, as well as practicing medicine in these hospitals, all kinds of capabilities and problems are raised. For example, D.C. General Hospital was a public hospital, full-service capability, research capabilities. You were *lucky* to get to D.C. General; if you had a problem, you’d be treated. They had the research capabilities, some of the most advanced capabilities in the world, in this poor, run-down institution.

So therefore, what we have is, two things: We have advanced research, advanced research in medical care, in health care, should be based on these kinds of institutions, including a Public Health Service, with research institutions; defining problems as they’re arising; discovering better ways to deal with these kinds of problems; pushing for cures, in relevant cases; and more advanced forms of treatment.

So, what we need is a *system*, which is a general welfare system. We are committed to the *general health* of the population; welfare and human care. *Human* care, not just care of a piece of flesh, but *human* care. And therefore, we have to keep working at it, as improving it.

So, the only way we’re going to deal with this, because of the nature of the problem, is to have a *health-care system*, under which all the facilities required are integrated, including research universities and so forth. Each get their relationship to this process. So, you have a national system, in which problems, as they arise, you can mobilize this *system*, to respond to a problem. And, you have to have reserve capability built in for catastrophes, at the same time.

That will define where we can go with health care.

For example, you have this stem-cell research business, which is becoming actively more discussed. It’s relevant. It should be done, the research should be done. Some of the crazy things, about making clones and things, forget that. But, the research about the relationship, what the stem cell nature is, what its relationship is to rehabilitation of damaged tissue, injured tissue, this is a relevant question. How to acquire the stem cells, from the person themselves; you want the person’s

own stem cells; you want to find them in them, someplace, and use them in the culture of those stem cells; and inject them back in them, and hope that this somehow will be successful. We need that research. So, that's the frontier.

The other aspect of this, is our attitude toward the person. Not just the health care of the *physical* person, but the attitude toward the person. In most of these cases, there are sociological-emotional problems, which come up, especially with severe health problems. And therefore, the care of the person as a person, regard for the person is sometimes as important as the actual physical treatment of the disease. So, we need a system that thinks that way, and functions that way. . . .

To Really Win Elections, Build a Movement

Q: I think that over the next eight months, in the course of the Democratic primaries, we're going to organize the majority of eligible voters to cast their votes for you. Now, in the past, where we've seen large numbers of people casting their votes for you in the course of the primaries, we've run into things like, evidence where maybe not all the votes were counted at the ballot box; and also, the instance, most particularly in Arkansas, where large numbers of Americans voted for you, and based on backing from the Supreme Court, the Democratic Party simply handed the votes to some other candidate—just refused to count them.

So, I would like to know what kind of measures do you think we should be prepared to take as a movement, to make sure that this kind of funny business is not allowed to go on?

LaRouche: I would say, first of all, if you want to get 50% of the vote, try to get 70. If you get 70, you probably will get 50. In other words, you have to go at this in a certain way: You have to mobilize, not voters; you have to mobilize a movement.

See, people often ask the question, "How can we get a certain percentile of the vote? What is the way to get a certain number of individual voters, in various categories, which will add up to a certain percentile?" It doesn't work that way. That's the way it's *said* it works; it doesn't work that way: Because the factor is, people walk into the polls, and most people, on the day they're going to vote, don't know who they're going to vote for. Because they change their minds! They will change their minds; after months of reflection, they'll change their minds, certainly on the day they go into the polls. And they'll tell you that. They do! "I was going in. I decided I was going to vote for so-and-so, but I got there; I'd made a promise and so forth, but I just couldn't do it."

So, what controls the vote? Yes, obviously, the result will be a number of votes cast. But what will determine the votes cast? Well, in anything but an irrational thing, it'll be a *movement* among people to bring about that effect. So, what you're out to do, is not to try to recruit individual voters, as such. Your object is to create a *movement* for that result, and the *movement* will recruit the voters.

The problem is, most recent campaigns have involved no

significant movement. For example, we have one in Philadelphia, right now. You have a case of a movement, which our intervention intersected. You had [Mayor John] Street, and Steve [Douglas] was talking about it earlier: The last time you had a mobilization of so-called African-American voters, politically, that meant anything in Philadelphia, was against Frank Rizzo, the police chief and mayor. This is the first time—as Steve reported today—this is the first time you've had a similar movement. But, not just this—it's more: because, it's labor, and it's other sections of the population, who are now in a revolt, against John Ashcroft and what he represents. And you have, suddenly, a *movement* in Philadelphia. If this Katzenjammer is defeated, it will be the movement that causes his defeat, *not* the number of voters that turn out—the movement.

So therefore, if you have a general movement within the population, where people are interacting and saying, "We, as a movement, have to bring about this effect," it generally can happen. It's when it's other than a movement, the vote is unreliable, and manipulable; and most votes recently have been manipulated votes. They are not really movements. They were anti-Bush movements, which got Clinton into office. And also, remember, it was Ross Perot, actually, who played a big part in electing Bill Clinton, and didn't get much gratitude from Clinton for that—it was a big mistake on Clinton's part, on NAFTA.

So, the way to control this process, is create a mass movement. As I said, if you've got a mass movement, based in the core of the lower 80% of the family-income brackets, we're addressing—. What I try to do, is I have these things which I present, which are necessary; but I always think about: How do we get those concepts into the minds of people who are influential within the ranks of the lower 80% of family-income brackets? That's why I did what I did on [Oct.] 22nd, on health care. Take a very simple, clear-cut case: The first hour I'm President, in the office, I will issue a Presidential order, setting into motion the immediate reestablishment of D.C. General Hospital, under the following conditions. At the same time, I will issue to Congress a Presidential directive, requesting the Congress to repeal HMO and restore the Hill-Burton law.

Now, this is something which, in terms of its implications, most people out there, in the lower 80%, who are influentials—that is, thinking citizens among the lower 80%—understand immediately. The big problem, for most people in this country, especially people who are poor, people who are senior citizens, or affected with sickness—and that's over 50; if you're over 50, you are subject to this problem. Disease can hit you, in various sudden ways—normal part of the process. And, if you don't have adequate health care, or a health-care system, you can be dead, or several crippled. Therefore, do we have a system, which is capable of delivering a response by society to those threats to our citizens? And people in the categories in the lower 80%, or people who have serious

health-care problems, people who are over 50, especially people over 60, or 70, these people become increasingly aware of this problem.

Therefore, if you want to talk to the majority of people, you mention health care in the proper way—not just, “Well, I got a plan for health care, you know; you can buy this cheaply, I can give you a good plan.” Garbage! Are you going to deliver? You are government: Are you going to do what is necessary, to make a sudden change in the situation? Yes! What is it? Put D.C. General back into place; slap these guys in the face; put Hill-Burton back into place; cancel HMO. And take other actions of a similar nature, immediately, in the first hours I’m in office: No big plans. Very simple, broad, and sudden.

And that’s what people want to hear. And that’s the only kind of action that will solve the problem.

You have the same thing on employment. People talk: “What’re we going to do about the jo-o-bs pro-o-blem?”

All right, look: We’ve got a lot people who are not qualified to work! Like the President of the United States, for example. So, what do we do with these bums? Well, if they’re young, we’ll put them in something like the CCCs. Or, we’ll open up the military service ranks, for real training, of an engineering-oriented training; rebuild the Corps of Engineers. We’re going to get the jobs immediately into works. For what? For things that are necessary! We’ve got water problems; we’ve got power problems; we’ve got all kinds of problems. We have to fix them, right now. If we can create enough jobs of this quality, fast enough, we can bring the national income, in the states, on the state level and on the national level, up to above breakeven, immediately: Depression is over! The effects of the depression linger on, but the depression, as a process, *is ended!*

So, jobs. What kind of jobs? How is the government going to provide jobs? Well, the government has to provide jobs. How about power and distribution systems? How about large-scale water systems? How about rebuilding the railroads? How about mass transit? You’ve got all these people spending their lifetimes, wasting them on the highways, in parking lots called “superhighways.” Why not put in some more mass transit? Use monorail, other kinds of things that are mass transit, to enable people to move from the places they work, to where they live and so forth, without having to sit in a traffic jam, and spend their life in a traffic jam breathing other people’s auto fumes! And getting angry and wanting to kill the driver in front of you. Bad passions, bad passions.

So that’s the way in which you can influence the voters, is by: Stop the crap; stop the nonsense about these elaborate, algebraic schemes, “I’m going to make a compromise with this guy, and this guy, and this guy. We’re going to make this compromise, and we’re going to come up with this bill.”

And I think the American people, generally, are sick and tired of these damned bills! They don’t mean anything. They’re simply ways of saying, “Look, I did this! I gave you



The LaRouche forces built a movement to save D.C. General Hospital (here, a rally on March 8, 2001). “The first hour I’m President, in the office, I will issue a Presidential order, setting into motion the immediate re-establishment of D.C. General Hospital. . . . At the same time, I will issue to Congress a Presidential directive, requesting the Congress to repeal HMO and restore the Hill-Burton law.”

this bill! I helped you! You owe me, I helped you. I voted for this bill.” And, what’d the bill do for you? Nothing. “But it was a good intention! I was warm-hearted! You gotta give me credit for that.” So, that’s the problem.

If we organize, as a movement, the other thing, the most important thing, which *you* can do—which you do with yourselves, which you do with others—is you have to make the person you’re talking to, a better person. If you can make them a better person, or help to make them a better person, they will be part of your movement. Because that’s what people want; that’s what makes them happy, is to think of becoming a better person. That’s what the Gauss issue means: It’s a step toward becoming a better person, not wandering around in a fog, wondering about how all these numbers work! But being a master! Understanding this thing; understanding how it works. Being able to clarify other people’s minds on this. Applying the same method to understand history. I mean,

most people don't know any history! They think history is something that came out of a newspaper. They discuss current events: "How shall we interpret current events?" "Let's discuss current events, today, children. Let's take this newspaper clipping. So-and-so politician says this. And, so-and-so jerk otherwise says that. Which of these two guys do you kids think is right?"

Nonsense, isn't it? Why not take, as a great Classical dramatist, why not take actual history, as I've described some of this to you today—why not take actual history, and have young people *live through* the experience of actual history? What was life like in Europe, during the 13th Century? Do you know? What changes occurred in the 14th Century, which were considered a catastrophe, which provoked changes that were made in the 15th Century? Do you know? Do you know where the first nation-state was born? Do you know what the ideas were, that were involved? Do you know what the religious wars of 1511 to 1648 were all about, and who did it? Do you know how those wars ended? Do you know what happened in the 18th Century, how the United States came into existence? Who was involved, what the ideas were, what were the issues? Do you know why it failed in Europe? Why politics failed in Europe, after Napoleon, to the present day? Do you know why we got into these wars? Do you know where fascism came from? Not some cheap explanation, where so-and-so had this bad idea, or something.

So, to have an understanding, as a human being, of a sense of immortality, to have a sense that there's a sweep of human history; that European history, in particular, modern European history in general, is perfectly comprehensible, in general terms. And if you understand it, and you understand what the experience is of whole generations, over successive periods, you have some understanding of what hit you. As I tell people, I remind them: I'm 200 years old! Because my culture, even in my family culture, at the family dinner table, goes back 200 years to a great-great-grandfather, who was born about the same time as Abraham Lincoln. And who was a rather notable figure, in his place and time. So, that's part of your culture.

Now, you go from that, from the family culture, the family/history culture; then you go to the broader environment. Like people in the United States, for example: People, I think some still today—more, say 20, 30 years ago—would trace their ancestry back, Americans of African origin, would trace their ancestry back, consciously, to an ancestor they either knew, or knew about, who had been a slave; and knew the place, where this slavery had occurred. They knew it! They knew what the transitions were. How was it fought? What was the movement like, before then? Isn't that something worth knowing? Because that's part of your identity, is to find out *what happened!* Because, you know, in your own family; things came down, in your own family, the family circles, from one generation to the other, which have an effect on you, today! Are you able to understand those things, which have an effect upon you, today, from that experience? Can you

understand other parts of society, in the same way? So, when you're looking at the face of somebody, do you realize that what you're doing face to face, you are representing a confluence of two completely different histories, which have certain points of overlap. And that's all inside you, as transmitted from great-grandfather, to grandfather, to grandmother, to father, to son and so forth. It's all transmitted. Cultures are not things that simply repeat, according to mechanical laws: Cultures are processes of development, which go through successive generations.

And looking at it, only from the internal side of European civilization—European civilization, which was actually a product of Egypt; Egyptian influence among the people called the Greeks, or the People of the Sea—goes back, in conscious historical European civilization, to about 800 B.C. Almost 3,000 years ago. That European history, as I know it, is a continuity, a cultural continuity, in which the experience of each generation, or each group of generations, throughout the whole history, has had an effect on the subsequent generations: *Each of us*, who have experienced European civilization, are experiencing the accumulation of those effects in us, today. The way we think, the way we react, is determined by this accumulation, most of which we're not conscious of.

If you understand history, then you begin to understand yourself; because, if you understand the history that we came from, then you're able to understand *why you react the way you do*. And why other people react the way they do. You see yourself, not as an individual like a blob on a page of history; but as an individual who embodies a cultural process. You embody history.

If you know that, you have a sense of power. You have a sense of being somebody. And you can act. And you can act for society. You can say: "Look, what we did, in our history, we struggled to bring something into being, something better. We struggled to overcome bad things. We struggled to make things better. That's us! We're not going to betray that! We're going to continue the process, of *struggling to make things better for future generations*, with a sensibility of what we went through to get here, so far! And all the struggles and setbacks we experienced."

When you convey that, to a population which is confused and frightened, befogged by circumstance; you create a movement, because, when people have a sense of that kind of immortality, that they're an expression of the immortality which is conveyed by this cultural transmission, they have a sense of power; they have a sense that what *they do*, is important for future generations. And they have a sense of pride, in looking back in memory at their ancestors. "Hey! You over there! Look at what I just did." And, it's that sense of pride, that gives people a sense of power. And you have to take poor people, who think they have nothing, and give them the sense that *they are something*.

And that's the way you create a movement. That's the way you win elections—really win them.