

[return to home page](#)

From the LaRouche in 2004 Committee...

July 15, 2004 was the date of the LaRouche Webcast from Washington, DC, entitled "[**The New Threat of Fascism Today.**](#)" To watch, listen or read the archived presentation, visit the campaign website, www.larouchein2004.com.

Please call **1-800-929-7566** for more information.

This Week You Need To Know

The Threat of Fascism Today

by **Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.**

What follows is Lyndon LaRouche's keynote address of July 15, 2004, delivered to his campaign webcast of that date, and the question-and-answer dialogue that followed that keynote. The webcast, which originated in Washington, D.C., was moderated by campaign spokeswoman Debra Freeman, who described the impact of LaRouche's campaign to remove Vice President Dick Cheney from office—a campaign LaRouche announced during a webcast in Washington a little more than a year ago; and one whose impact could be measured, Freeman said, by a 1,600-word article on the front page of the New York Times of that day—July 15—speculating on, not whether Cheney will go, but how he will go.

Subheads have been added.

I shall begin with just a notice, and a comment, on an event earlier today in Wiesbaden, Germany: My wife, Helga, was leading in the memorial for a recently deceased friend of ours, and collaborator, Mark Burdman. Those proceedings will be on record, for people to read, to hear. But, there's something *in* Mark Burdman's death, and in his life, which is relevant to the subject which is already scheduled for today. And referring to that, helps to humanize, personalize, and make clearer, the subject which I originally intended to present.

Mark died of MS, or complications of MS, which so far is a disease which you do not outlive. He at the same time, over decades, with a diminishing physical capability, which he was fighting to resist, spent this period of time, about 20 years, in Germany, with his wife, functioning in Germany as a station on my behalf, apart from just his function there. What he did was this — some other people associated with me, do this — but, as many of you know, I am in touch with people of influence, in many parts of the world, more or less constantly. The contact is sometimes based on circumstances, whether I may issue a policy-statement or so forth, and you have certain people who represent me, who share what I am saying, on a policy matter, with these circles, in various parts of the world.

And Mark was one of those, doing this, who would exchange feedback to me, from these circles, which helped me have a pulse, on most of the important decision-making processes going on in the world today at the highest level. So, that's why I'm probably one of the best-informed persons in the United States, on the United States itself, and on the world at large. It's through people like Mark, who are capable of carrying the kind of ideas I represent, and sharing those ideas with people who often disagreed with them, but who were capable of understanding what I was saying. And that way, we maintained an international dialogue, throughout Europe, throughout parts of Asia, throughout the Americas, and into Africa, by these kinds of mediation, which Mark specialized in.

Now, he's dead. In the process of dying, as he was going from one hospital treatment to another, to stay functioning, he would come back from the treatment, recuperating, get back on the phones, talk to his contacts from various parts of the world, and the dialogue went on. It went on until the day before he died, when he took himself to a hospital, because he was having an attack which proved to be the terminal one, because of a conflict of the medication, with the treatment, with the disease.

Now, the point was, to make this reference to Mark, is, in a sense, his immortality. Now, many people who are religious fundamentalists, don't know about immortality. Because they think of immortality in terms of a place outside the universe, which you go to, and it's completely different premises than you're living in now.

Those of us who are wiser, who are competent in science, for example, or who studied the work of Plato, or the writings of Moses Mendelssohn, for example, know better. We know that, what we perceive, as sense-perception, which is what we associate with our mortality, is only a shadow of reality. Reality consists of those principles beyond the senses, which act upon, and shape, the events which appear to us as the results of our senses.

Now, these ideas actually have the character, for us, of universal ideas, of universal principles: When a person, like a great scientist—well, for example, Einstein, as an example of that—a great scientist, who deals not with sense-perception as such, but deals with the discovery and application of principles which have *universal power*, in shaping the condition of the universe and of mankind *in the universe*: These people never die! Because, what they *do*, lives on, and has their personality attached to it.

Now, Mark was a person who dealt with those kinds of ideas. There are people around the world, who are sympathetic to that approach, or who actually share it. We are the makers of history. The others experience history. We make it. We make it, because our intentions enable us to make it.

How History Is Really Made

For example, leading into what I'm going to say on today's subject: World War II started in 1918. And at that time, events were put into place which led to World War II, all the way through the death of Franklin Roosevelt in 1945. Now, think of that period, of about 27 years, in which fools are marching around the world, thinking they knew, on the basis of today's events, where the world was going. Here's what happened: A group of powerful financier interests, people who are more important than bankers—people who *own* banks, control them, create them, and destroy them—like Morgan — The Morgan interests have destroyed Morgan several times—put it into bankruptcy, then bought it up cheap again, and started all over again.

These kinds of people, who are in the Venetian model, constitute a network of international family-related, financier power. They are the most powerful influence in the world, especially in European history since 1763, when the British East India Company, through the Treaty of Paris, became a world empire. And all world events, since 1763, have been based on the impact of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system, which became an imperial power, with the Treaty of Paris in 1763.

So, here we're coming out of World War I, which is a farce—a bloody, cruel farce. But at this point, these bankers, these circles of bankers, including names like Harriman, du Pont, Morgan, and so forth—Mellon—in our own country, and in other countries, these groups decided they were going to play a game: They were going to destroy the impact of the United States, the impact of our country's republic, in establishing efforts in Europe and elsewhere to establish sovereign republics, in place of the world being run by empires, empires of financier-family interests, such as the British East India Company.

So what they decided, is to create an impossible situation, in 1918, at the Versailles meetings: There, they set up what was called the Versailles monetary system. Now the Versailles monetary system, was a plan to put the world into a financial-monetary crisis, and political crisis. And out of that crisis, to create a system of dictatorship, which we saw developing over 1922 through 1945, of fascist regimes, beginning with Mussolini's regime, which was put into power by a banker, Volpi di Misurata, from Italy. Fascist regimes, all the way until the end of World War II.

This was the original *intent*. The details were varied. The details were not fully planned. But, the intention was, to orchestrate a *failed system*, a system which was failed from the beginning, the Versailles system; to bring it to a crisis; to make a revolution in international banking and financial affairs; and to run the world by an empire, a world empire, based on a system of dictatorship, for what the Hitler regime and so forth, in Europe, represent in our memory today.

What they did, is, they set up the Versailles system. The architecture of the entire international system was based on the following ingredients. Number one: It was based on war reparations, paid by Germany, to France and Britain, two countries that were financially bankrupt, hopelessly bankrupt as a result of the costs of World War I. These French and British interests, being paid by Germans, with reparations fees, would then pay the New York bankers, to whom they were indebted. So you had an architecture, of German reparations; French and British bankers and interests in Europe; and American bankers at the top of the pyramid, with a world system called the Versailles system. Which was brought to an end in 1931, with the formation of the Bank for International Settlements, with the cessation of the British gold standard, and with the creation of a financier cartel, where the entire world was essentially controlled, financially, by this international financier cartel, which *intersected* the Basel, Switzerland Bank for International Settlements.

Roosevelt Spoiled the Fun

What happened, what spoiled the fun, was that in 1932-33, Franklin Roosevelt happened. Now, Franklin Roosevelt was a true patriot of the United States, which very few Presidents have been! His ancestor Isaac Roosevelt was a founder of the Bank of New York, was an ally with Alexander Hamilton *against* Aaron Burr, who was a British agent, a traitor, and a scum-bag; general, all-round bad guy. Roosevelt had that tradition in his family. He wrote a paper for his graduation at Harvard University, on that subject, of the American System of political economy. When he was struck with polio, and in the process of struggling to recover, or master the effects of poliomyelitis, he refreshed his understanding of his roots.

And going from Governor of New York, to become President, he was fully determined, to re-introduce the American System of political economy, to wipe out the heritage of Teddy Roosevelt, of that Ku Klux Klan fanatic Woodrow Wilson, that scum Coolidge, and that dummy, in a sense, political dummy, Herbert Hoover.

Now he was opposed, Roosevelt was opposed: Then, in his nomination, the head of the Democratic National Committee hated him, as much as McAuliffe hates me! And did as much as he could, as McAuliffe has tried to do to me, to keep me from getting the nomination! So, that's the parallel—me against McAuliffe. John Raskob, the banker-owned head of the Democratic National Committee, was Franklin Roosevelt's leading opponent in seeking the nomination and election — Raskob, who was also involved in a 1934 planned military *coup*, against the Roosevelt government! Raskob the Rascal.

What Roosevelt did, was, when he went into office, and sat down at the desk after being sworn in—with not a pencil or a paper on that desk!—acted by calling in two women, who were assigned to him as secretaries, and, in getting the ball

rolling, saved the United States *from Hell*. Including such measures as the bank holiday.

What Roosevelt did, was two things, which are most notable: First Of all, *he saved the United States*. Because if Hoover had been re-elected—Hoover was not a fascist; but Hoover was sort of the Brüning of the American System. If Hoover had been re-elected, we'd have been a fascist state by 1934, just like Nazi Germany. The American version. Roosevelt *saved us* from that.

Roosevelt also prevented something: He prevented the British from joining Hitler, in the events of summer 1940, which would have meant the British Navy and the British Empire would have gone over into the same camp with the Nazis, and with Japan. And the world today would be a fascist system, a Nazi system.

Roosevelt's margin, of leading the United States, saved the United States from dictatorship, and saved the world, from a fascist dictatorship.

That's the way history goes.

Roosevelt understood what I just described to you, in his own terms. And, he acted, with a long-term understanding—first, of what the United States had been created to become, what the enemy was, what the issues were, and what the special powers of the United States, by virtue of its Constitution, were, to be able to act, as a sovereign nation, under these circumstances, *to save this nation*. And to save the world, from what would have been a Nazi tyranny of the world, had Winston Churchill not struck the deal that he struck with Roosevelt, when the British Expeditionary Force was on the beaches at Dunkirk. *That saved the world*.

That's the way history works.

After Roosevelt Died

So, these fellows who put Hitler into power, intended to put something like him into power. But it didn't end there: The day after Roosevelt died, under Truman, the Nazis began crawling back into the woodwork of the Americas, and elsewhere. This was the right wing, under Truman. This was the policy of "preventive nuclear warfare," designed by Bertrand Russell, adopted by Truman, which created the Korean War, almost got us into a thermonuclear war with the Soviet Union. At that point, the Americans said, the intelligent ones, said to Truman, "*You don't run again. You git! Y'understan' that, Missouri boy! You git!*"

And they brought in Eisenhower, who was not a nut, who was a traditionalist. And Eisenhower got the nation sort of safely through the 1950s, not too badly damaged, except for that idiot Arthur Burns, he dragged in with him. But that wasn't his fault.

Then, what happened? Eisenhower left office; Kennedy came in. Kennedy was a smart guy, but he didn't understand what he needed to know. He began to find out the hard way fairly soon. And he went the hard way, because he didn't understand soon enough, what his enemy was.

What happened is, Allen Dulles, who was a certifiable Nazi, John J. McCloy, who had become a certifiable Nazi, and similar kinds of people, began to move, once Eisenhower was out, to seize the opportunity. Because Eisenhower, being not only a military man, but representing a strong tradition in the United States, was the one political figure who had the ability to hold the fascist element in our system, in check. When he was out of office, the fascists came out. They were called the "pigs," the Bay of Pigs, Allen Dulles's operation. The missile crisis was done by the international fascist force, the Nazi

force, left over—they orchestrated it, for their purposes. Kennedy did as well as he could.

But that was a period of crisis. Changes occurred. De Gaulle, they tried to assassinate him repeatedly, by a Nazi by the name of Soustelle—Jacques Soustelle, operating from fascist Spain. Then we had—Kennedy was killed. The murder was covered up—there was no investigation. There was an investigation, but nobody published anything.

Then we went into the Indo-China War, a *perpetual war*! A perpetual war, with nuclear implications, played with the threat of nuclear weapons, all over the place.

Brainwashing a Generation

And then we began to be destroyed: Because a new plan for introducing a world empire, based on Nazi-like principles, was in process. And the way it worked, was, they took young people, who had been brainwashed under Truman—that is, they'd been born under Truman, and they'd been brainwashed under Truman. The worst of them came from suburbia, where their families were the scared bunnies of the 1940s and '50s: "Don't do anything, your father may lose his job!" "Be careful who you talk to. Be overheard saying the right thing. Never tell the truth. Learn to go along to get along." Hmm? Prostitutes!

Or, what is said by the famous Curtius, the historian, in talking about the fall of Greece, the fall of Athens in the Peloponnesian War. What took over the United States, with the Baby Boomer generation's indoctrination, especially during the course of the 1950s, was *classical sophistry*. "There *is* no truth: Lie all the time. Learn what the approved lies are. Put 'spin' on it."

So these young fellows, who were the bright young fellows from the families who were more privileged, from suburbia, where they'd fled to to get away from the cities, where all these working people lived; these fellows, they were selected! They were the cream of the crop! After the missile crisis, they were going into the universities, especially the leading universities, which normally produce, as output, a selection of people who become the rulers of the nation, in the corporate life, and the political life of the nation.

And these young fellows went on campus. And what did they do? They took off their clothes, took LSD, spent all night with marijuana and cheap wine, trying to figure out how the world worked, hmm? We had a cultural paradigm shift, which is called the Baby Boomer generation. And the key factor in this, was, to take sophistry to its extreme: "There *is* no truth, there is only the current vogue; and blue-collar people are *bad*!" "Blue-collar people are bad. Trade unions are bad. We have to have a—paradise. We are the Golden Generation!" "We're going to create a worker-free society! We're going to get rid of industry! We're going to get rid of technology! We're going to take our clothes off!"

And they did!

That didn't work too well, but what they did, eventually, they became prejudiced against that. And you have a generation, between 50 and 64 years of age, today, in general, who are the upper 20% of family-income brackets, who dominate most of the economic life of the nation, and the political life of the nation. And they don't know what work is! They don't know what production is!

You have the other part of the population, the lower 80% of the family-income brackets, who perceive themselves as *underdogs*. They don't try to *run* the country: They try to *beg for favors*. It's called "single issues." Not just the one-child family, but single issues in a different sense. And they will go for single issues: "my community"; "my family"; "my special interest." "No, I'm not going to get involved in national politics—I don't *care* what happens there! I don't care what happens on the state level! I gotta think about my *local* community, and my *family* interests, and *the way I feel*!" Underdogs!

Whimpering underdogs!

They don't vote to shape the policies of the nation: They vote to get something out of the people who *will* shape the policies of the nation. They say, "Buy me! Bribe me! Give me something! I want money! I want special concessions. I want my religion to become national policy. I just invented it yesterday, and I want it to become national policy tomorrow."

The Greatest Financial Crisis

So what we did is, we created this monster, which results in effects of the following type, which I'll now begin to describe: We're on the road, toward the greatest financial crisis in modern history. It is now happening. Sometime soon—tomorrow, several weeks from now, months from now—but within the period between now and the beginning of the year, *this present world monetary-financial system* will not collapse: *It will disintegrate!* If it's continued in its present form.

What we're going back to, is a situation which is comparable to 1931, but worse. In 1931, when the post-World War I financial system, monetary system, was collapsing, could no longer be sustained, there was an agreement among leading financier interests, to form the Basel-based Bank for International Settlements, to reorganize the Versailles debt system. And, in addition to creating this bank as a controlling bank, of which Schacht was an official, they also set up this cartel, whereby German corporations and other corporations would buy into sections of the debt which had been assigned to municipalities in Germany. So, you had a cartel now, which actually *owned* nearly everything in Europe, financially. Which was tied into cartel extensions, into the banking system in New York City.

This cartel, with the Bank for International Settlements being established, *the British dropped the gold standard*, the British gold standard. So now the world was being run by a cartel. It was this cartel, which survived Hitler.

After the defeat of the Nazis at Stalingrad, and a few months later, the defeat of the Japanese fleet at Midway, the possibility of a Nazi world victory was excluded. The ultimate defeat of Nazi Germany was ensured. It was an ugly business, a long business, but it was ensured.

Some people planned for the postwar world. The same people who had formed this cartel, the same people, including Hermann Goering, who had been part of the Nazi system—and what they did, is they used their cartel influence, *inside the U.S., and British, and other institutions, to prevent an exposure, of what the real Nazi system had been: the cartel side.* And they, with the death of Roosevelt, and their armlock on Truman, began to come back to power, in various parts of the world.

Now they created, between 1964 and 1981, with the changes that had occurred in the aftermath of the Kennedy assassination, and the launching of the Vietnam War, they've now created a financial system *which does not work.* This international financial system, is bankrupt. There is no such thing as anybody on this planet, who is not bankrupt. There are two kinds of bankrupts: those who know it, and those who haven't found out yet. Because what they think are assets, aren't worth much. It's comparable to the situation in Germany and Europe in the 1920s. They are, again, moving to collapse the system, to go back to the methods of the cartel, and to establish a fascist world empire, called globalization and outsourcing, and so forth, which will replace the existing world system. And they intend to rule the world forever.

Now Cheney is only a carpet-chewer for these guys. His wife is much more dangerous: She's the one that has the leash on her husband the beast. And he's a puppet-master who controls the President of the United States. Some people say, "Don't get rid of him. We have to defeat Bush." Put that pig in a kennel—now! Don't leave it loose, it spreads diseases!

Anyway, so that's the situation. That's where we are. That's what the Convention in Boston this next week *means!* It's not

who's going to be nominated for President. That is not the issue. Who is going to *own* the person, who is nominated for President? That's the issue.

Look at John. I mean, John is not a stupid person. John is not a bad person: John Kerry. But, does he *own himself*?! He's rich; but does he own himself? He does not! Not politically. He's controlled. By Shrum-bag, and similar kinds of people.

So the point is: Who is going to control the next President of the United States? Is it going to be the people? Is it going to be the long-term interests of the United States? The two-generations-to-come interests of the people of the United States, and the world?

Or, is it going to be this bunch of Nazis—in fact? In fact, you can trace the genealogy, they *are* Nazis! You can prove it. We've got some in Northern Virginia, who are provably direct legates of the Nazis, running around there.

Who's going to control it? That's the point we face.

Working With the 'System'

Now, what they're saying is, in a sense—the way they try to dope you, is, they say, "Well, you've got to work 'with the system.' " But, what is "the system"? The system is the postwar system, since-Roosevelt-died-system—which has undergone various evolutions, or, shall we say, degenerations. Especially since the assassination of Kennedy.

It underwent accelerated degeneration, under two National Security Advisors: Henry A. Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski. Kissinger was typical of the group, including George Shultz and Paul Volcker and so forth, who destroyed the monetary system, the Bretton Woods monetary system, in 1971-72. After Kissinger was key in the London and international oil-marketing cartel, in running the famous crisis, the oil crisis of that period.

Brzezinski, introduced, again, preventive nuclear warfare as a policy: The Committee on the Present Danger was a revival of the Truman policy for preventive war, nuclear war. I happened to stop that, by exposing it in a national TV campaign, in October 1976.

So they didn't do that, but they did everything else. It was under Brzezinski that we *deregulated* the United States, and destroyed the economy, the internal economy: We destroyed agriculture; we destroyed the transportation industry; we destroyed the power industry; we destroyed our cities. This was done. And then, we had Paul Volcker, who destroyed the savings and loan associations, and other things. So, we have been destroyed as a national economy, step by step, over this period, starting with the Indo-China War; then going to the Nixon phase; the Carter phase, which was really the Brzezinski phase. Then, we had poor Jack Kemp, who is not the worst person on the planet, who had this Kemp-Roth—it was terrible. The Garn-St Germain bill was a piece of thievery. And we kept getting worse, and worse, and worse.

Then we went, in 1987—I had the privilege in June of 1987, of forecasting a probably inevitable collapse of the New York Stock Exchange, to occur in the first week, approximately, of October. Which did occur.

At that point, Volcker was leaving as Federal Reserve chairman, and Alan Greenspan (otherwise known as "Bubbles") was coming in. And Alan said, "Hold everything. Don't do anything. I'm going to do something!" And what did he do? He invented financial derivatives. What he did was, he said: "Gambling side-bets will now be counted as money. And you guys will create side-bets, called financial derivatives, or hedge funds."

Then, we had the "IT" revolution, which is actually IT revulsion—it didn't work, as you may have noticed; finally, in the

spring of 2000, it began to collapse.

We've reached the end of the rope. The system is now collapsing. And people say, "But, you gotta work within the system." "What reforms? What's your *platform*?" "What kinda sex are you for?"

I have no interest in your sex! Just don't do it in my presence, whatever it is!

No, they are ducking the real issue: The issue is, we have to go back to the American System, as Roosevelt understood, Franklin Roosevelt, in the 1930s. It was going back to the American System, that saved this nation from fascism at home. It was the impact of the American System, which enabled the United States to build up the power, to ensure the defeat of the Nazi attempt at empire. It was the American System, as embodied by Roosevelt's design in the Bretton Woods system, which enabled the United States to create an international monetary system, the old Bretton Woods system, under which we worked with Europe and other countries, to build up the world economy, up until the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

What we have to do, is say, "This was a mistake. These were mistakes. We should have cleaned out the Nazi system, when we had the chance, instead of bringing it into NATO security, and into the CIA, in the form of Allen Dulles and company, and James J. Angleton." We have to do, what we *should have* done then. We can't simply change history. But we can learn the lesson of history, and apply that lesson to our present situation.

The Social Transformation

Now, that comes to the point now. Let's take the first issue: *What has happened to create, in particular, the economic crisis, threatening the lives of the people of the United States today?* That should be number one, before the Democratic Party Convention in Boston: What was done that was wrong, which has destroyed the U.S. economy, and threatens the well-being, and even the lives of our people today? What is it? And how do we get rid of it?

All right, let's look at it. [At this point was shown an animated graphic of the Incredible Shrinking Economy—ed.] Number one: We were transformed—and we'll repeat this, after I've described it—we were, up until the middle of the 1960s and slightly beyond, the nation that launched the man on the Moon, in 1969. We were that nation. We did that with technologies we had then, *we don't have today!* We were, in the postwar period, we were the world's leading producer society, in terms of agriculture, in terms of manufacturing, in terms of technologies, in terms of the general welfare, the standard of living. *We were the world's leading producer society.*

What did we become? We became *this!* [points to the animated graphic]. When did it begin? Well, it effectively began under Arthur Burns, but it began as a policy, with the rise of the Baby Boomer generation, in universities, during the 1964-68 period; with the rise of the so-called "ecology movement," with the anti-blue-collar movement; with the "we don't like people who work" movement.

So, what we did, is, we were transformed, especially after '71-'72, as the Baby Boomers, coming out of the universities, began to have more and more influence on politics, and actually on shaping economic practice; we became less and less a producer society. In other words, a crucial turn was made, which was like the things that happened in the 1920s and '30s: 1971-72, you had these three swine—the three little pigs—Henry Kissinger, Paul Volcker, and George Shultz. Those are the Three Little Pigs. These are the ones, who according to what John Connally personally told us—remember, John at that point was, in 1971, the Treasury Secretary of the United States. What John told us, personally: We said to him, "John, why did you do it?"—this is the Aug. 15 decision. "Why'd you do it?" He said, "Well, frankly, it was done, Kissinger, Volcker, and Shultz planned it, and pressured me to do it, to advise the President to do it." We said, "It was a mistake." He said, "Yeah, it was a mistake."

Then, Shultz, in 1972, went to the Azores Conference, and peddled the policy of Nixon, to the International Monetary Fund, the nations of the International Monetary Fund: creating a floating-exchange-rate system. Where we had had a fixed-exchange-rate system, which had been the basis for postwar recovery of the United States, Europe, and other countries, we went to a *floating*-exchange-rate system. A floating kidney system, hmm?

Then we said, "Okay, we control the monetary-financial system in London, through the London market. What do we do? We Anglo-Americans" (or we Anglo-worms, or whatever you want to call it): "*We control the system. We will organize a run against the currencies of South and Central America, and other countries. We will drive the value of their currencies, on the open, free, unregulated market, down to a low price. They will scream—and we will be friendly. We will say: 'Why don't you call in the nice IMF and World Bank? They will advise you.'*"

And the nice IMF and World Bank officials will say, "What you've got to do is the following: *You've got to devalue your currency! Officially!*"

"Okay, boss. We'll do that."

"Oh, wait a minute! Wait a minute—but you're not going to get by with this, now, remember. You owe debts to people. And you're going to have to increase your indebtedness to correspond to the effect of dropping the value of your currency. You will *no longer* pay your foreign debts in your own currency. Debts you incurred in your currency, will no longer be paid in your currency. You will pay them in dollars, and pounds-sterling. And we will create an international debt, which you will now carry, at interest rates we will determine."

So now we turned the people of South and Central America, in particular, into slaves! We sank the value of the peso, we sank the value of the Argentine currency, all the currencies of South and Central America—and we turned these countries into slaves! We forced them to shut down their development, to shut down much of their infrastructure, to lower their standard of living, and to work as cheap labor, for us in the United States.

Then along came Al Gore, and so forth, at a later point, who convince Clinton to go along with NAFTA, and other forms of outsourcing and globalization.

What we have done, is by orchestrating a floating-exchange-rate system, we have looted the entire planet, by forcing them to work for us as slaves—replacing the workplaces in the United States. So, now the lower 80% of our family-income brackets have lost their farms, have lost their jobs in industry, at an accelerating rate, and that sort of effect: Because we outsource, by becoming like the Roman Empire, a society of bread and circuses. What you get, instead of wealth, is: "entertainment. An' Ah do mean, *entertainment*. Outta yer own bodies, an' that of yer neighbors," chiefly.

So, we have become corrupt. We played games. We gamble. *We don't produce.*

We gamble in side-bets. *We don't produce.*

We say, "We're rich. We're powerful. We are the model of success!" We are the parasite of the world.

But, what happens when you run out of victims? What happens when the cannibal runs out of victims? The cannibal's children go hungry.

Now, let's go back to this thing. Just one more look at this, the incredible shrinking economy. See, the "market" which everybody admires, has gone up. What do people talk about? "How's the market doing today?!" "What's the news on the

market?" What does television tell you? "The market! The market! The market!" The Three Little Pigs went to market: Kissinger, Volcker, and Shultz, the Three Little Pigs went to market.

What has happened, is, our economy has been systemically destroyed—not just systematically, but systemically destroyed, because principles of practice have been built into law, and into the practice of life generally; into our universities, into all of our institutions: that we, as a nation, as a reflex reaction to reality, react like jerks. Like suicidal jerks, economically.

And people say, "That's the system. Ya can't put the toothpaste back in the tube!"

I can! And I intend to do so.

So, that's the problem.

Health, Steel, Railroads

Now, let's get to this next [case], on the hospital situation. At the end of the war, we had a Hill-Burton legislation, which was based, in part, in reflection upon our experience with 16-17 million people in military service, during World War II, served by a military medical system. And the military medical system, which had the assignment of treating almost everyone, particularly as informed by the *horrors* of the so-called "triage" policy introduced in France, during the First World War. We tried to avoid triage in World War II, by developing a medical system, a delivery system, which would prevent us from triaging our own citizens, civilian and military alike. This was called Hill-Burton.

The legislation was essentially simple, and it was a very short piece of legislation—not like one of these long, 2,000-page pieces of junk that won't work anyway. Very simply, we say that the objective has to be, to define every county of the United States, with its population, as having a certain standard in terms of number of beds per capita, by type, and located such—the hospital is located such, that everybody will have efficient *physical* access to medical care, at a point of need. The point being, is that other parts of the medical system, including the private physician, are oriented to the hospital system, and related systems. Therefore, if you have the hospitals in place, with the right qualifications, the right equipment, the right beds, and so forth, then you have the optimal way of treating the needs of the American people, whether as soldiers, or as civilians.

You had all elements of this: You had the Veterans Hospital system, all these other kinds of systems. The idea is, put them all together, and look at them on a county-by-county basis, and say that "We must set a standard, in each county; it should be managed by the county, of bringing private, and other elements together, for annual planning and cooperation in developing the delivery of an adequate medical care system, on a sliding scale—based, as we go along, we will change the standard, as we learn more and more about the requirements, for preventive health care, as well as others."

Now, look what's happened, on a national scale first. States that were adequate—this is 1980. The states had achieved an adequate level, by Hill-Burton standards. Now, let's see what happened after that [the figure used here is not available]. The green ones are the ones which were adequate.

Now, look at the next one—on the Pennsylvania county situation [*Figure 1*]. Pennsylvania: county by county, 1980. Adequate. Now, '85; '87, see them dropping away? Dropping like flies. 1989. 1990. Hmm? '94—how d'you like that? Right?

Now, let's look at steel production [*Figure 2*]. These are the steel states, essentially. That's what's happening. Go to the next one.

We're losing it.

Now, let's look at another question: the railroads. What happened to our national railroad system—these the connections among all this production process? What happened to them? [*Figures 3 and 4.*]

Highway traffic jams, anyone?

So, that's what's been done to us, in our economy. We have transformed ourselves from the world's leading producer society, to a Roman Empire-like society of bread and circuses. We pass out bread to our poor, and less and less all the time, as health care typifies this. We have more circuses, mass entertainment. It gets bigger, more plentiful, and more degraded. You can almost be sent to prison for putting a plot in a screenplay these days. It's considered an offense against morality. What you want to do is show those lurid effects of sex and blood. That's what people consider entertainment. They're just too lazy to do it for themselves. They want to watch it instead.

But that's what we've become.

And this is what is going to *vote* in Boston for a Democratic National Convention? *This* is the basis on which candidates will be selected, on which platforms will be adopted, and candidates and political figures otherwise be enjoined to get out and make this thing work. "Don't criticize it, make it work! Get behind it, make it work! It's our system! It's the American System! Don't talk about yesterday, don't talk about production! We're against that! Don't talk about murder of the people of South and Central America. Don't talk about the genocide in sub-Saharan Africa. Don't talk about what we did in the Middle East and Southwest Asia. Don't talk about what we're trying to do in the Philippines. Don't talk about the war we'd like to have between Taiwan and Mainland China, with Japan in the middle, and the United States orchestrating it. Don't talk about these things. That's the system, boy! Go with the system, boy! Be one of the crowd. Don't be one of those *outsiders*, those guys out there protesting in the streets. Don't be with them. Be with the system. Any doubts? Call up Ridge at Homeland Security."

Thank you.

The Dialogue

FREEMAN: Lyn, the first question comes from a former senior Senate staffer, who says: "Mr. LaRouche, how do you assess Tom Ridge's statement that the 2004 Presidential elections could be suspended if a terrorist attack took place? Even during the Civil War, elections were in fact held in 1864. Does Mr. Ridge's bizarre threat to suspend the election process have the character of a direct attack against our Constitution? Do you think his statement reflects an underlying fascist sentiment among high officers of our Federal government? Does this possibility relate to some Synarchist plan or objective to impose fascism on us in the United States, one way or another?"

LAROCHE: If we were to accept the idea of calling off the Nov. 4 election, or postponing it—which would mean calling it off—we would no longer have a Republic. We would no longer have a nation. Remember what happened. Just like today, there are some foolish people who say, "Don't try to get Cheney out as Vice-President, because we want him as a liability for Bush come November." These people are idiots. They obviously know nothing about history. They've studied nothing about the past history, the history of fascism.

On Jan. 30, 1933, under pressure from Averell Harriman's office in New York City, as a partner of the head of the Bank of England, Montagu Norman, Adolf Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany by Hindenburg. People in Germany—the

typical fools that they were—said, "Good, now Hitler's going to expose himself, and once the German people have had a good taste of Hitler, they will never tolerate him again." In February, the next month, while this foolish babbling—like the "don't attack Cheney" babbling—was going on in Germany, Hermann Goering, who was then controlling the state of Brandenburg, orchestrated a fire, an incendiary terrorist event, a fire, at the Reichstag, the German Parliament.

On the basis of that, following the code of *law* of Carl Schmitt whose ideas influenced the minds—such as they were—of the late Leo Strauss of Chicago and John Ashcroft, our present Attorney General, a decree was made which made World War II inevitable. Hitler was made dictator, under the emergency law designed by Carl Schmitt on principle, just exactly what Tom Ridge is mooted about here. That in case of a terrorist attack which his friends—well, Tom may not know anything about it, but his bosses do, the ones who really run the scene behind it—a terrorist attack orchestrated by *them*, would be used to have the same effect on the U.S. elections, to make sure a Democrat doesn't get elected, that was done by Hermann Goering in setting fire to the Reichstag, and then the invocation of the emergency laws, the *Notstandsgesetze*, in Germany the morning after.

Now, is there a danger? Yes, there is a danger. Is there a danger of terrorism in the Washington, D.C. area or elsewhere? Yes. Do I know, concretely, of any such danger, terrorist danger? Yes.

Do any of you know the name of Fernando Quijano? Fernando Quijano is a former associate who was recruited by people such as Nestor Sanchez and by the Nazi organization based in Mexico. The Nazi organization based in Mexico was established there from about 1935 on, directly by Hitler from Berlin, from a special office in Berlin. This coordinated with Hitler's determination to ensure that a Nazi by the name of Francisco Franco, would succeed in establishing a fascist dictatorship in Spain, with the support of Hitler and Mussolini.

This group, this Nazi group in Mexico which are called the Synarchists, which became known under such names as the PAN, this group had—in cooperation with Nazi Germany and with Japan—plans up into 1941, up until Midway, until the U.S. fleet defeated the Japanese fleet at Midway in June of 1942. Until that point, this group in Mexico, this group run by the Nazis, using Nazis recruited to Nazism in Mexico, including priests, centered in Guadalajara, a state of Mexico, had plans for military operations of a terrorist nature, against the territory of the United States; trying to incite people of Hispanic backgrounds, especially of Mexican backgrounds in the United States, to become part of this Franquista version of Nazism.

That organization exists today. I warned about it. It exists in Argentina, it exists in Uruguay, it exists in Brazil, it exists in Venezuela, it exists now in Peru, in Bolivia, as well as Mexico, and elsewhere. It is organizing in this area, organizing fools and sympathizers for this kind of—and exactly the same kind of propaganda which the Nazis promoted in their operations in Mexico in the 1930s and early 1940s. Is there a possibility that this operation, this so-called Hispanic operation, would be used for a terrorist act or acts in the foreseeable future? Yes. Yes. But that doesn't make any difference about having the election in November, as scheduled. We have the election anyway.

What we do is, we move to deal with the terrorist threat.

Now the first step you do to deal with something like that, is you expose it. Now, I've named the name. I could also name another name, an associate of Fernando's, Nestor Sanchez, a resident of Leesburg, or was a resident of Leesburg, Virginia, close to this death squad operation which a so-called section of the CIA was running in Central America, with the approval and support of Fernando. So there is a danger, and the danger is known to us. It's close. It's a danger, the facts of which should be known to the U.S. government, and this kind of problem should be dealt with, by exposing it. If you expose it, you isolate it. You neutralize it. You will find this kind of operation depends upon fools. You recruit fools to put their lives on the line for the dirty work which a handful are leading.

And the direction of this is coming out of Spain, out of fascist Spain, because the fascist organization still exists there, under leadership of people, Fernando's close associate Blas Piñar, who was the head of Nazi-like organizations in Spain, in France and in Italy today. He's a key leader of it. Therefore, if we expose the stuff, and move to isolate the hard-core perpetrators, and cause their dupes to run away, that's the first step.

Then, let the dupes talk. Not by torturing them; you don't have to torture them. Just say, "Hey buddy, you've got a problem. Come talk to us about it." And they will be most voluble. The problem is, they'll talk to you about a lot of things that aren't true. Then you have to figure out what's true. Don't torture them, let 'em talk! We've got people who've got nothing better to do than listen to these guys talk. And then those of us who are smarter will go through the garbage heap and figure out what's true and what's useful.

But we have to uproot the endemic potential for terrorist acts in the United States, and we do that by traditional intelligence methods, which are not the creepy type. It's very simple. Do the job. It's like a normal law enforcement problem. You've got a local criminal, he's a local hood. He's terrorizing the neighborhood. Isolate the guy. Get the neighbors to break with him. He has no power then. And that's the way you deal with this kind of thing.

Yes, we should have a positive anti-terrorist operation, based on known factors of terrorism. And this Fernando thing is only typical of it. There are others. There *are* terrorist capabilities. There are things coming out of Europe as well which are potentially dangerous. There are things especially coming from *London* which are also dangerous. So if we do our job, and we have a competent government under a competent president, we won't have a problem.

The problem is sitting back and saying, "This is inevitable, this is inevitable." It is *not* inevitable. By exposing the creeps who do constitute the danger to civilization, by exposing their Nazi antecedents, we can actually effectively neutralize them, at least to a large degree. And if we do that job, we probably won't have a terrorist incident.

FREEMAN: We have a very large number of questions on this topic. One has been submitted by someone who serves on the staff of a senior member of the Congressional Black Caucus. He says, "Mr. LaRouche, as you know, in a recent press conference, Attorney General John Ashcroft delivered a largely fraudulent report on the way in which the Patriot Act has successfully protected the American people from al-Qaeda terrorists. My boss, John Conyers, accused the Department of Justice of releasing information selectively, and of refusing to address important civil liberties issues. At the same time that Representative Conyers was making his complaint, many members on the House side are concerned that Homeland Security is currently calling the shots in Boston. Again, in the interest of "protecting" us. Some of us are starting to feel like that's the equivalent of letting the fox into the henhouse. My question is not one which asks you to assess the terrorist threat. My question is, do you share my concern about letting Homeland Security call the shots at both the Democratic and Republican conventions?"

LAROCHE: It comes back to a similar question. Do you want to leave John Ashcroft in as Attorney General, so that you can horrify the voters into voting against Bush?

John Ashcroft is a nut, a dangerous nut. The Crisco Kid. This guy's philosophy is the philosophy of Carl Schmitt. This man has a Nazi-like philosophy of enforcement. Now, this thing permeates—you have a lot of these guys, in government, who are for this kind of so-called hardline enforcement. They are not honest cops, because—what's the problem?

As you see in the case of Iraq, the United States went into a war on the basis of the gutless Congress voting for what it knew was a fraud. First of all, as Senator Byrd made clear, the act under which the President presumably went to war, was a violation of the Constitution, and any Congressman who cared to have his research assistant look up the law, would have told him that, because the history of U.S. Constitutional law on the question of the War Powers Act, and the control of the War Powers Act by the Congress, is very clear, from the most fundamental issues discussed in the context of the Congress

setting up the Constitutional Convention.

That was illegal, and to anybody who cared to know, it was fraudulent. The assertions were fraudulent. The assertions were *known to be* the policies of the Vice-President at the time he had been Secretary of Defense under Bush 41: preventive nuclear war. Preventive nuclear war against Iraq had been on the agenda from the day that the Bush 43 administration walked in. So everyone knew this was a fraud.

Now you go into the Middle East. You commit war against the people of Iraq. You send Bremer in, who was George Shultz's stooge, and instead of, even after having a surrender in effect of Iraq, instead of accepting the surrender under the rule of law, as the United States has understood the rule of law for such circumstances, we disbanded the Iraq military, we disbanded the civil service of Iraq, and thus we created a situation which led to what is called terrorism.

What we created was a resistance movement. Where did the resistance movement come from? It came from those we fired, that Bremer fired. If the United States had done a normal occupation, and said, "Now, you guys in the Iraq military, you're working as a defeated nation, a surrendered nation. You run the nation!" That's what we did in World War II. When a U.S. military unit would go into a section of Germany, it would set up a military government of occupied territories. How would they do it? It would happen because the colonel or whoever was in charge of that unit, and had that particular town in his custody, would go find the mayor, go find the local judge, the local officials. Anyone who was not really a hardcore Nazi, that you could work with. Call them in here. They are going to get back to work, and we're going to cooperate with them in getting them back to work, to keep this community functioning.

In Iraq, we did *exactly* the opposite. Now they call these guys who are shooting back "terrorists." Why would this shooting occur? There could have been some shooting anyway, some resistance anyway, under the circumstances. But the reason for the phenomenon, of the irregular warfare phenomenon, the asymmetric warfare phenomenon we ran into in Iraq, was entirely a creation of the failures of U.S. policy. The mess we made of Afghanistan is a case of that. We didn't deal with al-Qaeda as such, we didn't deal with Osama bin Laden. We made a mess of a country, and Osama bin Laden is still running al-Qaeda, or his section of it. That's what we do. We make a mess of the world. We're making a *mess* of Mexico, we're making a *mess* of South America, we're making a *mess* of Argentina. Under those circumstances, you're going to have a highly insecure situation among people who believe that you're the local equivalent of Adolf Hitler, invading their country. That's what the problem is.

So therefore, the first thing to do is to have a President who represents a United States which is worth representing. And as long as you have this bunch of clowns, under a poor idiot—you want to talk about compulsive behavior, an idiot who's a victim of compulsive behavior, the President of the United States is a mental case! We know it. I saw it on television. I saw a mental case, a clinical mental case on television! It's called the President of the United States! I keep seeing him. He's a mental case who's controlled by Cheney, and Cheney's not human, he's a beast, on his wife's leash. This kind of situation.

We want to talk about security? The first step in security is to provide justice. What do you want when you want to clean up a territory? What do you want to do? You want to end the conflict. You want to create peace, you want an armistice. You call the people in. Let's stop shooting, let's stop killing. Be creative. Isolate the problem. Isolate the hardcore problem. Make peace, build peace. If you are regarded as just, then people will work with you, because most people think of themselves as underdogs in one degree or another. If they think you have power, and that you will treat them justly, they will try to work with you. They might not like you. They may hate you. But they will respond in a positive way. We don't need these blanket things, "We're fighting international terrorism."

Look, Dick Cheney is the world's worst terrorist right now. You want to clean up terrorism? Tell Cheney to resign. Yes, that's a fairly good representation [graphic of ape-man shown.]

So, that's the point. You have two aspects of this thing. First of all, we do have a problem. It is, in part, a law enforcement or equivalent type of problem. But we have to also recognize that what we're doing at the same time is making the problem worse, faster than we're cleaning anything up. The first thing is, that I said the importance of my being President, of being nominated by the Democratic Party, which would do more good for national security than anything else that Convention could do. Because the people of the world would know they have a friend in the United States, but just don't mess with him.

FREEMAN: Lyn, we have a question that was submitted by another person who was once a candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination, Sen. Eugene McCarthy. Senator McCarthy says, "Lyn, you and I have discussed my differences with the Kennedy family. You called Mrs. Roosevelt's and Adlai Stevenson's opposition to the election of John Kennedy a very complex matter. Recently, a book that was written to slander me by some arrogant British kid, misrepresented these differences as the end of American liberalism. Now, Edward Kennedy is once again creating a place-setting in the Kerry campaign, and extending the post-McGovern Democratic Party as the party of doing nothing. I would imagine that you would have a few things to say on this matter, and I was hoping you would share them with us today.

LAROCHE: The subject is Schwarzenegger, and Shrum, otherwise known as Shrum-bag. It was from the *inside* of the Democratic Party, that Schwarzenegger became the Governor of California, under the direction of the richest people in the world, people who are represented by George Shultz, Warren Buffett, and so forth. This operation was an extension of the looting operation run under the name of Enron. Actually, Schwarzenegger, through his financial interests, was involved, integral to Enron. He was part of creating the mess of which he complained, and he's making it worse now. So what happened is, the Democratic Party *threw*, threw away the recall election in California, and it was done largely by people associated with Kennedy. And Ted, among other things which astonished and shocked me no end, in Washington received this in-law of his, this unshriven Shriver, and I said, "What's wrong with Ted? What's he drinking lately?" I mean, he should stick to martinis.

So, what obviously, without trying to diagnose exactly what's wrong—I understand exactly what Senator McCarthy is saying—is that whether you agree with people or not entirely, what you trust is people who have integrity. That is, people who will act even at risk to their own advantage, on the basis of integrity, because even if those people are defeated in securing a position, by taking a position which is for integrity, they become established as trustworthy.

And what we need, I'll just expand on this, and Gene understands this quite well. You need, essentially, a government of trustworthy people. And what I mean is this—because it's concrete now. What I have done, to the extent it's been successful in dealing with the Cheney and other problems, is, to a significant degree, express my obligation to people in our service, in the Congress, as staffers or representatives, people who are in the government, Federal or Executive branch, or who were formerly associated with it. These people are people of conscience, who I do not necessarily agree with on everything that comes down the pike, but they are true patriotic children of the United States, devoted to the role of the Presidency of the United States, and the Congress of the United States, in the implementation of the intent of our Constitution.

These people have done a grand job, in the way they have done it, both in the United States and internationally, to bring us to the point that the ouster of Cheney is on the agenda. These are what I mean by trustworthy men and women, who have experience, they're professional, military, intelligence, diplomatic, other kinds of functions, key staff people in the Congress, certain Congressmen, and so forth, who are senior and who really know their way around. These are the people who know how the country must work.

If you're a President, as I certainly intend to be even now, for the sake of the country—because I don't need the job, I've got other things to do, but the country needs me—if I'm President, my ability to govern and govern effectively depends upon trustworthy men and women of this type. Who is going to run our military? The President? No. The President is the key Executive. Who is going to run our diplomacy? The President? To some degree, yes. He actually is the Chief Diplomatic

Officer, except for our presently undiplomatic incumbent there. Not me, not the President. What we rely upon are faithful experienced citizens, in service, either as having been in service officially, or being advisors actively concerned and assisting those who are in service, or who have been elected officials of seniority who know something about how things work.

How do you make a policy? The first thing you do is you discuss it with these people, the way Mark Burdman was discussing with contacts in various parts of the world on my policy. That's how I form foreign policy, my foreign policy. I'm in contact with people from various parts of the world, including people who don't agree with me in the least. But we have a discussion, and the issues are put on the table, and it clarifies the issue. And it's not some half-baked thing from me coming out; it's a qualified understanding of what must be done. And it's that kind of discussion process among a selection of people, inside or closely associated with government, in the Congress, in the Executive branch, whether in service or not in service, that is the circle through which any President of the United States, following the intent of the U.S. Constitution, can effectively govern.

Because, when he says, "Let's do it," and he says it to them, they do it. They know *how* to do it. They know how to do the job. And therefore, you have people who work together, who know how to do the job, you have a President who gives them the policy, that's the way to do it.

FREEMAN: I'd like to call Sen. Joe Neal from the great state of Nevada to the microphone, to ask his question.

NEAL: I guess I might have a question, but, first of all, let me just give a comment in reference to a question that was made as to whether or not the election could be called off in terms of a terrorist attack. As some of you probably know, we do not have elections by popular vote in this country. We elect a President based on electors who are represented in each state by the number of Representatives and Senators of that particular state. The determination of the meeting of those electors, or the selection, I might say, the appointment of those electors, is determined by the state, but the time in which they meet is chosen by Congress.

So you have a couple of issues involved here, as to whether or not Congress, or the person who is now head of the security of this country, could actually move towards terminating this election. He will have to have an act of Congress to do that, because what we have in the election of the President, we have Article 2 of the Constitution, and Section 1 which deals with the delegates, and you have Amendment number 20, which sets out the process by which the President is to be elected. And that day is set in the Constitution as of Jan. 20. However, if there is a tie among the delegates, then that date can be put off until such time that the President is elected, or selected by Congress, who would be sitting and voting on who would become President.

So, what you actually have here, is a situation whereby you would have to have Congress to be in complicity with the majority of the states that would have the electoral votes to actually put off this election. If you do have the person who's running the security department acting on his own, I think you're going to have hell to pay in this country, and it might bring about a revolution immediately, if that should happen to happen.

So, I just wanted to add my voice to this, and say that it would be most difficult, at best, to have the election called off, because, as the Constitution stated, and it functions under the principle, what they call in Latin terms, *expresio excluso esto auctoritas*—what is written cannot be changed, unless you have a Constitutional amendment to do so. So, we function under that now, and if anyone wishes to challenge that, I would think they would find it very difficult to get that on. So that's the comment I would like to add in reference to what my good friend Lyn has stated in reference to the other aspect of that. You know, you deal with the security aspect in terms of trying to correct this whole thing rather than say, looking at the Constitution, you deal with the matter at hand, which would be correcting the terrorist problems, and getting rid of those. Thank you.

FREEMAN: Thank you, Sen. Neal. The next question, Lyn, is from Rep. Esther Haywood, who is here with us. She says, "Mr. LaRouche, what method would you use to bring our men home from Iraq now?"

LAROCHE: Fortunately, I think we've had some positive influence on this procedure, not really what I've put out, but by the general approval of what I've proposed as a LaRouche Doctrine for Southwest Asia, has had some impact on the processes which have been carried out. Unfortunately, the matter of principle is not yet clear, and the question of Southwest Asia policy is not yet clear.

First of all, in my view, nothing is going to work in Southwest Asia unless you have a Southwest Asia policy. You cannot take the place piecemeal and say you're going to do this in Iraq, you're going to do this here. It's not going to work! Because you're in a highly unstable world situation, what you have to do is have nested agreements on security on various regions of the world.

Take the case of the Straits of China—Taiwan and Mainland China. You cannot play the game the United States is playing among Taiwan, the Mainland, Japan, and Korea. You cannot play that game, without causing all kinds of incalculable hell. So therefore, in that region, as in other regions of the world, you have to have a general agreement on what constitutes a secure principle of operation, or *modus operandi*, among neighbors.

Now, Southwest Asia is united by one issue presently—hatred of the United States—and oil. And the hatred of the United States is richly deserved. Actually, some of it has been incurred by the British, but they gave it to us as a loan, or as a gift. The British are actually running the policy in Southwest Asia, not the United States. It's being run by the London petroleum-marketing cartel and similar kinds of institutions, not the United States. This is an offshoot of the British East India Company's imperial power dating from 1763, before the United States stuck its nose in that part of the world. So that's the issue.

In the case of Iraq as such, what is required within that context, you should put the country back to its original constitution, the last constitution it had. Let the people of the country proceed accordingly, to manage their own affairs. Get international agreements which facilitate the country coming back to a stable situation of self-government. Allow nobody to meddle in trying to bust the country up into parts, because if you fragment the country, you are going to create micro-states. If you create micro-states, you're not going to have any security whatsoever.

So, I would say that what has been done so far, I would accommodate what's been done so far to the doctrine I've laid out. There must be a Southwest Asia doctrine. That means Turkey—particularly, consulting—it means Turkey, it means Armenia, it means Azerbaijan, it means Iran, it means Iraq, it means Egypt, it means Syria. You've got to have a pattern of states around that, who agree on a Southwest Asia security policy.

In that context, you now have the context for resolving the remaining problems in Iraq. The main thing is to have a United States which no longer *pretends* that it did the right thing in going into Iraq. That's where Kerry is wrong. Don't pretend that what we did was right, saying, "Well, maybe the reasons we did were wrong, but we should have done it anyway. I would have done it anyway, under a different pretext." That is cowardice, it's intellectual cowardice, corruption.

So the key is, my doctrine will work. I've talked with many people in that part of the world, experts who I respect, whose opinion is critical, and also people in Europe who are relevant, and people in the United States who are relevant. Senior people here who understand these things. They agree, it would work; therefore we should do it.

I would say that at present, we should take the mess which has been created by the United States by this June deadline, take this mess, and try to salvage—with the agreement of as many people in Iraq as possible—try to salvage the situation along

the lines of the doctrine I laid out, but emphasize, don't ignore, we need a Southwest Asia doctrine. And if you want to get one, the easiest way to do it—what about petroleum? What about petroleum supplies? What about the effect of lack of petroleum supplies on the world in general, including the United States? That a little leverage we could use to try to get people to get serious about this thing.

FREEMAN: Lyn, Representative Haywood has a follow-up question. She says, "I understand your doctrine, and have read it. But what I'm actually asking you is, can we bring our troops home?"

LAROUCHE: Yes, we can, but we have to do it in an orderly way. We have to change our military policy. You have to get rid of Rumsfeld!

The problem is, right now, you've got all kinds of complications as the result of this Bush League administration. The military institution, the Defense Department as an institution, is wrecked by this operation. You've got to clean the place out. We have the people who can do the job, who are professionals. A President of the United States can make the appointments, or cause the appointments to be made, which will take care of the problem. We have to reorganize the U.S. military.

My approach is, you start with a long-term objective on the military. My objective means, building up the Corps of Engineers as a military corps of engineers, using that as the baseline for reconstructing our professional military, because it's a military capability, but it's an engineering capability, and that's crucial. Therefore, we have to think about what the effect is of what we're going to do on our military. What kind of a military are we going to have, as a result of this process? We do have an obligation, as an advisory occupation, presumably done with nations who are part of the United Nations, to provide Iraq with whatever cooperation it needs in terms of technical advice and services, in order to put its own affairs into order by itself. Therefore, the military mission should be to that intent, unless there's a warfare issue that arises external to that consideration, then obviously the objective is to get them out, or to reduce them to a limited force.

Because of the hatred which has been engendered against U.S. military forces by the criminal actions of the Bush Administration in that region, it is very difficult to sustain U.S. troops in occupation there in any function, even a peace-keeping function, a peace-making function. Therefore, the point is to try to find people of other national designations, with the backing of the United States, to go in there and take that part of the job. Iraq must be rebuilt. If it's not rebuilt, it's going to be an ulcer in the whole region. We are responsible for that. We helped create the mess. We have to meet with people, through the UN auspices, to set up a force, with the agreement of whatever's the government of Iraq, to set up a force, for a long-term, initially a five-year term, of commitment to putting the country back into shape. Working out a plan between these forces and the government of Iraq to implement such a plan. That's what we have to do.

But, when people say, pull them out or not pull them out, I say that doesn't quite ask the right question. Yes, I want them out as of now, for their own security, among other reasons, other purposes, but we have an obligation. We've got to figure out what we're going to do, instead of leaving them in as a combat force. What are we going to do, what role is the U.S. military going to play? I would say, my orientation is, shift the U.S. now, away from everything that resembles Rumsfeld and Cheney. Do it immediately. Rebuild the U.S. military, where you no longer have private contractors taking over military functions. Reconstitute the military in the American military tradition. Rebuild it around the Corps of Engineers as a military Corps of Engineers. Integrate that, and overlap it, with a science-driver program which is, to a large degree, space-oriented.

FREEMAN: The next question is from former Congressman Clare Callan of Nebraska. He says, "Lyn, I've been telling Democratic candidates that all you tend to find in the middle of the road are yellow lines and dead roadkill. How do you get Kerry, Daschle, and the rest of the Democratic candidates out of the middle of the road, and get them to be the standard-bearers of a Democratic Party which will really lead the country? How do we stop them from accepting the unconstitutional

destination, or direction, of our economy, the separation of powers, and our good neighbor policy?

LAROUCHE: How do you treat a mental patient who you diagnose as being a Baby Boomer? That's Kerry's problem, essentially. He's a Baby Boomer and, more important, he comes from a layer which sees itself as in the upper 20% of Baby Boomers, and within the upper 20%, as part of the political establishment, right? So therefore, what he reflects—and you see this in the manner of his response on many things.

Now, many of his responses I recognize are not his. He is not really his own man, and I know that very well because I *am* my own man. I recognize that he's not of the same species as me on this question. But he's intelligent and so forth. So the point is, could a guy like this actually function as President? Well, under peacetime unchaotic conditions, probably so. But as I said before, the question is, it's like the old thing about the Packard—ask the man who owns one, who owns it, and obviously, at present, he does not own himself. I'm not saying owning in the same of simple financial ownership. I'm talking in terms of intellectual ownership. Somebody has got his mind under control. They're controlling him. He's not his own man.

Now, if he could become his own man, or become *my* man, we might be able to do something about it. Because what he's shown, essentially, is a lack of guts. The most recent was this interview this past weekend, the press interviews on the subject of he and Edwards—you know, the Batman and Robin show they've been running out there. They brought in the Energizer Bunny to substitute for Robin. He's said the most silly things imaginable about the Iraq issue—both about the vote, what he would do, and so forth, conciliatory. That is not the behavior of a man qualified to be President of the United States under these circumstances.

My view is that the main problem he has is, who is controlling him. And obviously, the worst aspect of the control is coming from the bankers; that is, the policy which he reflects, by what he doesn't say as much as what he does say, what the Democratic Party does say and what it doesn't say, is the policy in the Democratic Party today is economically fascist. That is, it's a Schachtian policy, it's the policy of Hjalmar Schacht, it's a policy of learning to live with austerity and love it. You know, it's like the famous thing about "how I learned to live with the bomb, and learned to love it."

What he's proposing is, he says he's going to do good things for the American people. But under his present policy, he's not going to do good things for the American people. He's not going to create more jobs, he's going to destroy them. He's not going to create better health care, he's going to destroy it. He talks about his plan, his plan, his plan. This is masturbation. This is not planning, and no fruitful result will come of it.

So, the problem here is of a different nature. Now, how do you change it and when do you change it?

The big problem we have, the most important manipulation of the American people in particular, is that a group of international circles have agreed to attempt to postpone the financial crash of the world system until after the November elections. In other words, the tricks that are being used to fool the people into believing that this inevitable is not going to happen, is the major brainwashing lever on the American people, and on the candidates. And the candidates are responding to what they think the people are going to go for at the polls. Are you going to go out and poll people, and ask them, "How do you feel about the onrushing financial collapse that's going to wipe out just about everything?"

"Oh, that's not going to happen, that's not going to happen!" Right? The underdog says, "They must not let it happen, they must not let it happen." But it's going to happen.

Now, what is the President of the United States supposed to do? Is he supposed to make policy on the basis of what foolish people, who think of themselves as underdogs, wishfully wish to believe—"It's not going to happen!"—or does the President of the United States, knowing an onrushing crisis is occurring, does he have to deal with and tell the people about

what *is* going to happen? And the magic word for that in the United States is Franklin Roosevelt. You say, we're going to react to a depression along the lines that Franklin Roosevelt reacted. That's what we're going to do.

And therefore, we're caught in a situation, where, it's to the degree two things happen that determine the way populations think. Populations like this one. Populations which are dominated by underdogs. Eighty percent of the American people think of themselves as underdogs. They will not fight to try to change the policy of the United States. They will fight to get what they think they can get out of a Wal-Mart, but they won't try to change the policy of the United States. They'll protest against their neighbor's garbage, but they won't fight to improve the United States. They're underdogs.

The only time they're not underdogs, as Roosevelt showed, is when leadership gives them optimism, true optimism, the optimism of providing an actual solution to a problem. Remember what Roosevelt said: "We have nothing as much to fear as fear itself." Because it is fear that turns our underdogs into cowards, our political masses into cowards. They're afraid. Their fear makes them little, makes them mean. They don't think clearly.

Now, you tell them, here's exactly what we're going to do. What do the people say to you? You know it—"Yeah, but buddy, you haven't got the power to do it!" That's what makes cowards of them.

Therefore, you have to approach them and say, "Okay, *I* will do it." They'll say, "But you haven't the power to do it." So say, "what's going to happen to you if I don't do it?" "Well, yeah, it's going to be bad ... yayaya." "Well then, why don't you give me the power to do it, because I *will* do it."

And that's the only way we can operate in this situation. You have to realize, if you look at the history of mankind, which we know generally European civilization, we know something for about 8,000 years, and we know implicitly a lot of things from scraps here and there from earlier times. That's the way human behavior is. You have to realize that we are not, we have no guarantee of survival as a nation. There's no guarantee built in, except the guarantee we make for ourselves. What Franklin said in leaving the Constitutional Convention; he said to the American people: "We have given you a Constitution. Let us hope you can keep it."

That's the problem. This nation could cease to exist, through disintegration, out of the processes which are already in motion. Do we, as a people, have the intellect and morals, to rise and save this nation, which can be saved, from self-destruction? Are we willing to do it? Are we going to hide behind our cowardice—"I want my little thing. I want my special sex. I want my special religion, which I just invented the day before yesterday. I want this." Or are they going to say, "I want to do something for humanity"? I want to use the legacy of this country, which in most recent memory, is typified for us from a time of crisis by Franklin Roosevelt? Let's use that legacy. It involves events that people remember.

You know, people are not dead. People that are alive are not dead. We remember our grandparents, we remember our great-grandparents. We know something about the communities in which we were raised. We know something about the country. We do know that something *good* happened, when the country was plunged into a depression by the activities of the 1920s. We do know that Roosevelt saved us from destruction, and saved the world from Nazism. We do know that. We do know the Bretton Woods System made us prosperous, made parts of the world prosperous. We do know that the changes from that system have brought us to the messy condition we are in today. We know those things.

So therefore, when I say, let's do it *again*, and they say, "but you haven't the power to do it," I say, "give me the power. "Well, I don't know if you're gonna get the power." "Well, if I don't get the power, then buddy, you're not going to survive. Face it."

So, I have to have the power, either to be President, or, by what I'm doing, to shape the way the incoming President thinks.

FREEMAN: We have a *lot* of questions, on the question of the Democratic Convention, Lyn. Let me see if I can combine a few of these:

"Considering that, once again, in this election, we don't seem to have an alternative choice to vote for, that is, unless it occurs, via a Democratic Convention that actually is open to discussion, and that allows us to change that, my question is: What exactly are we supposed to do? I don't want to continue with the Bush regime. But, I also don't want to vote for Kerry with his choice of Vice President, as Edwards. And I seem to find myself, once again, caught between a rock and a hard place. Please tell us, what you think we should do. Right now, I'm somewhat overwhelmed, by how many Americans seem to be dead from the neck up, as we approach this election. What is the appropriate action for all of us, going into the Democratic Convention?"

LAROCHE: Well, the way to think about going into the Democratic Convention, is think about coming out of it alive.

Now, I'm going to be there.

Whatever happens at the Convention, I'm not going to disappear! [applause] And, I will do what I have to do. And what I have to do—

Let's go back to something which is a matter of principle, which I think people need to think about, in these matters. See, they have two conceptions of leadership. One is properly called a *misconception*. One is that a leader is a person, who represents what the people desire, feel, think, so forth.

In a time of crisis, that is not a leader: That is a fool. In a time of crisis, a leader is a person, as Schiller defined this distinction, who has a sense of the Sublime. And his treatment, and my treatment, of Jeanne d'Arc— and as I compared this in a recent occasion earlier this year, to the case of Martin Luther King. Martin Luther King was a true leader. In the manner of his dying, he was a true leader, for which we have found, in that part of the movement, *no replacement since*. Hmm? Because, he was a true leader! Others around him, who collaborated with him, were not leaders! They failed! They flew to the winds, to the foundation grants, and the money trees, and so forth. Away from the responsibility of the movement.

What did Martin Luther King do? Martin Luther King, was he a man of the nitty-gritty? No. He was not. He was a man who *cared* for the nitty-gritty.

Well, *what did he do*, as he gained more political power in this country? And why did J. Edgar Hoover's friends *kill him*?! Not because he was a nuisance, but because he was a danger to *them*. Why was he a danger to them? *Because he should have been President*. Why? Why should he have been President? And none of his rivals in the civil rights movement, were qualified to be President—but he was. Why? *Because he touched the Sublime*. Because he said—and he said it prophetically and truly, as the following day's events told us: If I'm going to be killed tomorrow, *I must do this, today*.

Now, this is the Sublime: a conception, of what *mankind* requires—the past of mankind, the future of mankind—what it requires. Even despite the contrary opinion of the people who are living today. And the function of the true leader, is to attempt to give the people living today, a *vision* of what they must become, in the future.

He was not just a civil rights leader. He was a civil rights leader, from the top, from on High. He was to say, "I'm going to make this nation, which is sick, *whole again*. I'm going to make the world, which is sick, whole again, to the degree the United States has the power to do that. I'm putting my life on the line, tonight, for that!"

And he was killed the following day!

That is the Sublime.

Now, that does not mean you have to get killed, to be Sublime. But, of course, you will die anyway, sooner or later, in the process of attrition, and it's not what you experience for yourself, in your lifetime, which is important. That's the mortal side, that's not the final side. What's important, is what you do for humanity. "Stranger, you pass by. You're gone. What did you do, while you were here?" What did Martin do, while he was there?

And, that's the requirement of true leadership. It's not to be popular. You must be influential, but you can not become a creature of popularity. You must stand above opinion. You must see the folly of the people you're leading. You must work to dissuade them from that folly. You must have a correct vision, of what *history*, the future of mankind, *demands for you*, and demands for your people. *You are spending your life*, as it's said in the New Testament, of the talent: You're given a talent. It is your life. How will you *spend* it? It's going to be spent, anyway. *How* will you spend the mortality you have? *What* will humanity have gained from you? What profit will humanity have gained from you? Both those whose hopes are put on your doorstep from the past; and those whose hopes are put on your doorstep from the future, waiting for *what you're going to do now*.

That's what you have to be as a leader. That's my job. My job is not to be popular. My job is first of all, to be *right*. My job is to understand what the people of the United States, in particular, need, and to fight to see to it, *they get it*, one way or the other. Whether it happens in my lifetime or afterward, is secondary. The essential thing, as for Jeanne d'Arc, *it must happen*. The same thing for Martin: *It must happen*.

And, those of us who admired, and had ever deeper appreciation of Martin, in the years that have passed since his death, say, "*His life shall not have been wasted. We shall not waste his life.*" And let us not, also, not waste ours. And I will not waste mine.

This world needs to be changed. Civilization, so-called, needs to grow up. I seem to have a clearer vision of this than almost anybody I know of on the planet. It's my job to get that vision across. And hope that we can inspire people to do that.

I will be there! Dead or alive, I'll be there! And, I'll be moving things.

FREEMAN: Lyn, the next question is from a Democratic political consultant, who says he's not being consulted.

He says, "Lyn, there's a lot of discussion coming from a lot of people, about the need to open up the Democratic Convention. But, the simple fact is, that at this point, the choice of the Vice President has been announced in advance." And he notes, "Most people probably don't realize, that that never used to be the case. And the question of who was going to be the Vice President, usually was the subject of a lot of wheeling and dealing and jockeying around at Democratic Conventions. But no more."

He said, "We've already got a decision on who the VP is going to be on the ticket." He said, "We also don't seem to have any opportunity for platform debate." He said, "It also is the case that the rules, as proposed, don't allow alternatives, as conventions in the past have allowed, if in fact, people were prepared to petition among the delegates.

"So that's the situation." He says, "For the sake of argument, let's just suppose efforts to inject meaning into this convention fail and that things proceed as they currently seem to be proceeding. For the sake of argument, let's just suppose, that Kerry

and Edwards are rubber-stamped, with no deliberation at the convention itself. My question is, what then? Is there still hope for that ticket to be a real Democratic alternative, in the best tradition of FDR? And, if you think so, how do you think that comes about?"

LAROCHE: Well, first of all, you know that John Kerry, and Edwards, in particular, have not shown much in the way of awesome thinking ability, recently. So, I think that their judgment, and the judgment of those who are handling them *is pretty stupid*, pretty incompetent.

For example, if you have a rubber-stamp Democratic Convention, what moral authority does it have? Look, the platform is a joke! It's a silly joke! Written by unknowns, with no discussion. It has no relevance to the issues of the time. None! So, if the Boston convention becomes a routine rubber-stamping, with no substance, it has no authority.

Then, what do we have? We have the prospect of a one-party system, which would be a Republican Party. Because, with no authority, and no enthusiasm for a Kerry-Edwards ticket, under those circumstances, the Democrats, faced with the Republican machine, would lose.

You would then have a one-party system, if that worked out that way, in which you wouldn't have much left of the United States very long.

Now, therefore, that means that—the Convention is not the last word, on how our Federal government will be run. We have another important institution, which is also going up for election: It's the Congress. And people who are running for Congress, are going to have less and less respect, for a national ticket, which is put together in a slipshod manner, such as being proposed now, for Boston. The people on the state level, who represent state interests—-that they *perceive*—are going to say, "Well, I'm on my own! I'm on my own; I'm running on my own." And they're going to look at their colleagues, in the same part—who are bums—as bums, and say, "We're not going to do anything for him! That bum! But, we're going to help our guy. We gotta guy coming up, he looks pretty good. He may fill in for that guy."

So, the election will suddenly be on the state level, the state elections level, because that's the only place you're going to get any music. Therefore, if it shifts that way, I will be there. I have plans in place, to do exactly that.

I'm concerned about the United States. I'm not "competing" for a job. The job is competing for me. So therefore, we'll move. We are not going to give up. We are going to use our imaginations, be alert, and do what is obvious to us. We're going to organize!

We're going to organize around getting the Congress under control. Look, you've got this abomination. The abomination, where you need an improved House of Representatives, without DeLay. And we might get it. We've got to get the Gingrich factor out of the Congress, as well. We've got to *do* these things. We've got Young Republicans coming up, who are a menace to the human race: They are not Republicans, they're cannibals! It's called the "Eat Your Neighbor" movement.

So, we have a real issues. Also, this is not a plateau. It's like a poor rendition of Belshazzar's Feast. What's going to come out of the convention? Ask Belshazzar, in that case.

So therefore, we don't assume anything. We have to have an ongoing, evolving, developing, strategic conception of what the situation is in the country, and the world. We have to respond to what we know are going to be onrushing crisis events: Events, as Tom Paine said, famously, "times that try men's souls." The system is coming down. The collapse is here. The crisis is here. The Bush Administration is despised. The only thing that's going faster to the bottom than the Bush Administration, is the Democratic President campaign. Which one is going to reach bottom first? It's a race.

So, I'm there, as I said before. We should be there. We should be like an army. Just think about the case—I'll use this again. You had the case of Frederick the Great. And Frederick the Great was smart in some ways, and dumb in others. He was fighting a war, which was organized on the continent of Europe by the British, who were determined to put the nations of Europe at each other's throats, to such a degree, that the British could create an empire. And that worked: It was called the Seven Years' War, it resulted, in 1763, in the establishment of the British Empire.

But, Frederick was a good commander. And everybody was out to kill Frederick the Great, except the British, who were funding him, to keep him alive, so he would get the other guys to kill each other, too! The French, and the Russians, and the Austrians, and so forth. So, he's down there, at this place called Leuthen. And he's got a small army, vastly outnumbered by the Charles de Lorraine, with the Austro-Hungarian army. And they are coming at him, with a classical Cannae, double envelopment attack. Very well planned.

But, he won! What did he do? He assessed the situation; he saw a double enveloping operation, which is classic, and everybody in military knew that at the time, from Roman history. Looked at it, and he beat 'em! Because, he got his troops to do something, that Charles de Lorraine never thought possible. He broke his ranks, had the troops scamper, and run like hell, to get to a position, where they regrouped efficiently, and outflanked the Austrians *that* time, and then outflanked a second time the same day.

Now, that I cite as a good example of how you think, not only in warfare, but in politics: What you have to do, is, you have to be prepared to think. And when you think that all the known solutions, and problems given to you are predetermined, just say, "Well, that's exactly what we gotta work on. If everyone thinks, this is the way it's going to work out—we can't think that way! We have to think about something they're not thinking about, and give them—surprise!" Double flanking the same day; the Austrian forces were routed. And Prussia went on to live, as a result of that battle, though that was not the end of the war.

So, we always have to think of a situation: We must be prepared, and organize—not around tactics—that's how you get killed. You organize around *principles*. What are the principles for which we are fighting?

What we're trying to do, is, recognizing that the United States is what it is, historically—a unique creation, by Europeans, of the United States. It's the only republic of its type, based on principle, in existence today. We have the only Constitution that has lasted since 1789. *The only one*, because it's the best! We have to use the role of the United States, and the American System of political economy—those principles, as Roosevelt used them—we have to use them, which are *our advantage*. Our superiority! Over every system in Europe—which are all these central banking systems. We have to use that advantage, and mobilize our people around a consciousness of *what we are*, as the United States. And *use* that advantage, of those features of our system of government, *which are superior*, and then, use our ingenuity, to outflank the bums. Whatever it is.

If we have that capability, if we have the imagination, the dedication, we, the American people can do it. And these crises—which are going to discredit *everybody*, who's in the way of the policy, I know we have to have—-we use that: That's our road to victory. This has to be looked at as a long war. The long war, the march to victory of humanity, is a very old one. The march against the time, that people were people were treated generically as human cattle—it's an ongoing fight. This is a continuation of the fight. We now have history behind us. We know more about this than ever before, if we study it. We have, in the United States, the instrument, which is capable of making the change. Contrary policies are being discredited, one by one. We have to march forward.

The reason I place the emphasis on the youth, I do, because it's the youth who are not corrupted, by the Baby-Boomer or Tweener sicknesses. They're the ones, who know they have no future under the present system. Therefore their minds are open, to finding *alternatives to doom*. Therefore, they think, where the adult generation tends to stop thinking, and thinks

only in terms of their tradition. Therefore, we have to think in these terms, and know that our youth, the adult youth, if they're treated properly, will provide the spark which will lead the rest of the population forward, in a time, around any correct policy.

Meanwhile, everything which is contrary to that, is going to be discredited, rapidly, over the coming period. The danger is, that if we do not keep the spark of the alternative before us, our people in the United States will become demoralized, as the people in Germany became demoralized, successively, over the 1920s and beyond, and became Nazis. Our people can become Nazis, too. We must not allow that demoralization to occur. We must keep the spark of freedom, the spark of what we represent, alive. We must keep it alive, in terms of development of our youth.

That's all we can do. To me, that's a strategy. I don't believe in just simple tactics: They kill you. You're committed to a tactic, the enemy finds out about it, you're doomed, you're dead.

Have a strategy; have a principled strategy. [applause]

FREEMAN: [Identifies the webcast] For those of you are familiar with Mr. LaRouche's drive for the Presidency, you know that this Presidential campaign, has been fueled and energized by young people. And it has normally been the tradition at these events, that, at a certain point, I turn the questions over to some of the leaders of that movement.

The situation today, however, is that we really do have an overwhelming number of questions from elected officials and from institutions. And therefore, what I'm going to do, is, I'm going to continue to take those questions. I will mix in questions that are being submitted by the youth, but it's a situation, where it's going to be difficult to turn things over to exclusively youth questions, so I hope people will bear with me.

Lyn, this is a question that was submitted by members of the LaRouche Youth Movement, and actually, we got this question from four different locations, and in each case, the question is almost identical.

What they ask, is they say, "Lyn, those of us in the LaRouche Youth Movement always discuss that we organize, not with any material objective, but out of love for humanity. And we tell other people to join us, and to also organize out of love for humanity. But, the problem is, that humanity today isn't really all that admirable. And, other young people look at us, sometimes, like we're crazy. What we want to know, if you can tell us, or rather, tell youth in general, why they should love mankind."

LAROUCHE: Ah! Well, I just said, at the beginning of the remarks, today, if you think about it. I talked about my friend Mark Burdman, whose obsequies we held in Europe today, earlier. I talked about immortality. Now, what I'm trying to do with the youth, as some of them have caught onto it, is, I'm trying to give them a sense, a rational sense, of immortality. That, our sense-perceptions are an expression of the reaction of part of our living bodies, organs of our living bodies, to action upon them. What we sense, as sense-perception, is not reality, but is the *shadow* of reality, which is cast by the impact of the real universe, upon our sense-perceptions.

Now, you find out, for example, in dealing with so-called sensory illusions: How do you test to know whether what you are seeing is true? Hamlet: Whether the ghost I have seen is true? You think you've seen something: Have you actually seen what you thought you saw? What do you do? Categorically you make tests, to determine, whether or not that is true; whether the principle you think is operating, is actually operating.

You carry that further in science. You find things which are beyond the senses, which are causing what you experience to change, just the way that, for example, Kepler discovered the principle of universal gravitation: by looking at anomalies,

which could not be explained, in terms of sense-perception, as some principle operating upon the universe, to cause the planet Mars not only to go in an elliptical-like orbit, but governed by a principle that equal areas/equal times. Which defined, there was principle operating *behind* sense-perception, not *seeable* by sense-perception, not *feelable* by sense-perception, which organized the universe. That what we *see*, in astronomy, is not the universe. We see the *shadow* of the universe.

The changes that we see in astronomy, are not the changes that are occurring; they are *reflections*, shadows of the changes. These shadows are determined by universal physical principles.

There are also other kinds of principles, which have this same universality: The principle of cooperation among people *around* principles. So, what I've tried to do, with the emphasis upon the Gauss attack on Euler and Lagrange, is to show youth a way, from a standpoint of the *simplest* approach, physical science, to discover what a universal physical principle is: Why Euler and Lagrange were liars and idiots. What Maxwell was an idiot. Why Kelvin was an idiot. Why Cauchy was an idiot. A liar.

Because, in doing that, they recognize that reality, *their* reality, is not that of an animal, but a being with a *mind*, a human mind. You do *not* discover universal principles with your senses. You discover universal physical principles, by applying *your mind* to anomalous experiences. And these things you discover, are the principles that actually run the universe! Universally!

And, when we improve our condition as mankind, we improve it, because we *use* these discovered principles, to *change man's relationship to the universe, efficiently*. And thus, instead of having a monkey-like species, with several million individuals living at one time, we now have over 6 billion people on this planet: Because of this principle! The human mind is something that separates the human being, from the animal. This is us. This is us.

Now, to have the power, to avoid becoming a Hamlet, you have to believe, that there's something about you, which *lives efficiently beyond your death*. Not as a thing, but as what Riemann calls *Geistesmasse*: That is, when you conceive of a scientific principle, you don't think of an algebraic formula. Only idiots think of algebraic formulas as principles. An algebraic formula, or mathematical formula, is the smoke-trail, of something that has passed. When you think about a principle, you're thinking about the name of a discoverer, such as Kepler. And you think about that personality. And the principle that is associated with him, that creates the smoke-trail, as an object—an object in the same sense, that you think you're able to distinguish objects with sense-perception. That is a principle! It's an object! It's a *being*, with existence. *You*, by absorbing that *being*, are now able to change the way the universe functions.

The principles you learned, were there already. But, by your learning them, and applying them, you change the universe, typified by technological and scientific progress. *You increase the power of man to exist in the universe*.

Therefore, by passing this knowledge, or this kind of knowledge, from one generation to the next, from the richer to the poorer, you transform the human condition, and future society. And you become, *efficiently*, immortal, because *you never die*. Because the principle, which is your objective existence, the principles which you discovered and incorporated, which are your *objective existence*, your *ability* to make these discoveries, or reenact them, is *you!* And to the degree you transmit what *you* are, to more people, and to coming generations, you are immortal.

When you have a sense of immortality, you have courage. When you *don't* have a sense of immortality, just like Shakespeare's Hamlet, you *don't* have courage. You have flight forward: You go to your death to get over the agony of worrying about immortality.

And therefore, the power—my conviction—the power to bring to youth, is to engage them, in recognizing *their own*

immortality, so they will have the courage to do what that bunch of *cowards*, their parents, never had.

The problem with the Baby-Boomer, is, he's a coward! He's a Hamlet. He's doing all kinds of silly things, to try to conceal from himself, the fact that *he knows* he's a coward. That's why people go into religious nut-stuff, like George Bush, President George Bush. Or Tom DeLay, who's still the slob he was, a lady-chaser. He's out there holding this girl reporter, around the shoulder. Feeling her up—like what he used to do, before he went to church! He used to say, of the Southern revivalists, you know, that the preacher would actually create more souls than save! That's the Baby-Boomer!

The point is, the key thing is: You have a people who are decadent. Why are they decadent? Because they're human beings—they don't know they're human. They don't have a sense of immortality, as human immortality. They don't have a sense of a historical immortal existence. They don't have a sense of the mission they're performing, between life and death. They're on a journey, between life and death, to perform a mission. Their objectivity is that mission! Discovering it, and realizing it!

And therefore, to have a powerful youth movement, you must deal with the spiritual question: The question of what is immortality. Not as taught by some preacher, who's out there trying to impregnate most of his congregation. But, as real immortality: The kind that the scientific mind is capable of comprehending, and to recognize that, it's not just physical science. It's physical science as an expression of man's increased power in the universe, as a species. But, it's also *the nature of the individual*.

And, it's like Martin saying, as he did on the day before he was murdered: He was willing to put his life on the line, for his immortality. And that's not some crazy thing—that's real. This is the same thing that was said by Moses Mendelssohn, in his famous *Phaedon*, which we had revived, and put into circulation again. Same conception. The same thing is said by Plato, in terms of the character of Socrates, which occupies that part of his collective dialogues.

The sense of immortality: I must somehow, get you young guys, to really have a deep, actual sense of immortality. Not as something which is taught to you as doctrine. Not as something which is spilled from the mouth of a preacher. But, a *real sense* of immortality. Then you have the power *never to be defeated*. [applause]

FREEMAN: It's sometimes amazing what Baby-Boomers who become religious fundamentalists will do, in their dedication to the Second Coming. [groans, laughter] Get your minds out of the gutter!

Lyn, this is, again, one of these questions that we've gotten from a number of people, including Johnnie Pugh who is here, who's the city director. The question is in regard to the situation, the torture at the Abu Ghraib prison. People are, and should be, outraged by these abuses, but the question is, how do we get the truth out, as to who in fact, was responsible? There are some questions, and a number of people who have submitted questions, Lyn, are not really sure, as to whether or not—they're saying—right now, we're proceeding on a track where the soldiers, who committed these abuses are going to be punished. Some people think they should not be punished. One questioner says, "I personally think they should be punished. What they did was wrong. But, I think that the greater punishment should be reserve for those who, in fact, were responsible. The question is, how do we actually discover the truth, about who really ordered these abuses? And what do you think should be done to those individuals?"

LAROCHE: Well, I think, that I can say, that I have discovered who the bums were. And there is no secret. The question is, how do you get people to have the guts, to recognize what many of them, in the Congress and elsewhere, already know. How do you get Kerry, for example, to have the guts to tell—he knows the truth! He knows the truth. He knows it came out of Cheney's office. He knows where it came from. He also knows, that *this is Nazism!* And what this comes from, as Cheney represents that, is the effect of the radiation of Nazism, into the system of the United States! Which was something that was brought in, by people, like the people who put Hitler into power, from New York! People with names like Morgan,

Mellon, du Pont, and Harriman. And Harriman, who steered Truman, as President, who was part of the process of Nazification, of the political system of the United States. The entire war-party in the United States in the post-war period—the nuclear war faction! Including Bertrand Russell, who was also another Nazi—or worse than a Nazi: He was the mother of Nazis.

We *know* this! There's no lack of evidence. We know where this comes from. Then people pretend they don't know. Why? "I don't want to attack that guy—he's powerful! I'll hang some poor, little guy, as a scapegoat. I don't want to go after the big guy, who's really responsible."

What happened to Schacht? Schacht got off. Schacht was the architect of the Nazi system, in Germany. Or the von Schroeder family, the Hamburg, British family of von Schroeder. They were the architects of this.

We know. We know. If they have the guts to say it: That's what's lacking.

FREEMAN: Lyn, the next question is actually from Jordan. It is from a journalist there by the name of Samira Katib [ph]; she's from *An Najib* [ph], which is a newspaper that is circulated not only in Jordan, but which also serves the Palestinian community.

She says: "Mr. LaRouche, it certainly appears that the two candidates for President, John Kerry and George Bush, have what seems to be the same international policy. To those of us in the Middle East, it appears to be a policy of blind, and total support for the right-wing government of Ariel Sharon.

"How do you differ from this policy? And what do you think the possibility is, of actually shifting the current policy toward this region of the world?"

LAROCHE: Southwest Asia? Well, look, this is a policy, you trace it back to its history. The history goes back to the formation of the British East India Company. And, the spinning off from the India Office of the British Foreign Office, of the Arab Bureau.

There's a book written on this question, which everyone should read. It's written by Rabbi Hertzberg. It's called *The Jew in America*, and it pertains to, not only what happened in the United States, during his lifetime, in the post-war experience, but what happened *afterward*, in Israel. That, between 1967 and 1971, there was a fundamental change—we all know it, who lived, in say, the East Coast area from Boston on down in the United States. Those of us who were sentient, all knew it: That you have, for example, prior to '67, you had the gut of the support for the civil rights movement in the United States, came from Jews, especially Eastern European Jews, who were part of the Yiddish Renaissance tradition. That, after this '68 process, after the assassination of Martin Luther King, and some other changes—and as I found out in the Middle East, so-called, at the time, in '75' and '76, in dealing with there: I as told by Arabs; I was told by Labor Zionists, and similar types of people, on the question of a peace proposal, "Move fast, because we're about to lose it all."

What happened was, with the emergence of the Baby-Boomer generation, in Europe and in the United States, and in Israel, you had a moral degeneration, which is *Baby-Boomerism*. And in the area of conflict there—and Rabbi Hertzberg details this, in this book, a great deal of it; because this involves his involvement, both in the United States, as a leader here of the Zionist movement, and also in Israel, in dealing with his friends and so forth, and others there: That there was a qualitative change. Which *I know*, I experienced it, here. He records it in fine detail, in his book, as what he experienced in Israel, and here, also. It's the same thing.

For example, the way my association was brought together, it was brought together around these kinds of

questions—around the civil rights question; similar kinds of questions. And the greatest support, at that time, up until the New York teachers strike of 1968, where the various people that the Ford Foundation pulled in, like McGeorge Bundy, to organize a racial conflict, between Jews and African-Americans, in that area: The unity of the civil rights movement, was largely around this impetus of the leadership of the Yiddish Renaissance—the children of the Yiddish Renaissance immigrants into the United States—and, leaders of the traditional civil rights struggle, in the United States. That's how the fight was staged, in which Martin Luther King emerged, with the kind of leadership he represented.

Then, *after that*, the *left-wing* in the United States, *destroyed it!* So, this is the problem.

Now, by understanding *that* problem, that way, I know that if the United States were to act in the appropriate manner, we could *reverse* this. But, the United States would have to have a determined position, a no-holds- barred position: This is going to come to an end.

And that's why I say, among other things, a Southwest Asia policy, security policy, is needed. You have to have an equitable policy, which stabilizes the region, which puts in a process of economic development, water development, power development, and so forth, in that region of the world, to create a spirit of optimism which can override the pessimism which drives people to kill each other in that region.

But, you must have a guarantor, and you must have, above all others, you must have a Presidency of the United States, which will take no nonsense on this thing. We are going to have this killing stop. We're going to have this injustice brought to an end.

But at the same time, we have to understand how this evil was developed. There's a much longer story than I indicated here. But that's just a sample of how the thing happened. I lived through it. I saw it. Many of us who were associated with me saw it, firsthand. We saw this change. And it was evil. But the change came largely as result of the pessimism, which hit the people of the United States, and other parts of the world, as a result of the Indo-China war, and the introduction of the

You know, what you have in the United States, is you had, in 1966 a meeting in Biloxi, Mississippi of a perspective new president of the United States, Richard Nixon, with the Ku Klux Klan leadership. That was called a Southern Strategy. And the arrival of the Nixon Administration, the demoralization of the Democratic Party, because of its stupid policy with the Indo-China war, and the arrival of the Nixon Administration, produced a phase shift in the United States, a shift to pessimism. This pessimism poisoned our society, and made scoundrels out of people who might have become good people instead. And this is simply a part of the process.

What we have to do is produce a factor of optimism, into U.S internal affairs, and international affairs. Without optimism, you cannot cure people of the evils of pessimism.

FREEMAN: We have far more questions than Mr. LaRouche is going to be able to answer. Let me say this. I still have a pile of questions from Democratic elected officials who are here. You all are going to have an opportunity to ask him those questions a little bit later, so I'm going to ask you to be patient.

We're going to take two more questions. The first one will be from Sohair Soukhary, who is a freelance journalist who's affiliated with al-Ahram of Egypt, and she'll tell you who she is. And the next question is a composite question that's been submitted by about 35 different members of the LaRouche Youth Movement.

SOHAIR SOUKKHARY: Hello, Mr. LaRouche.

You will always be our President, whether inside the Democratic Party, or outside the Democratic Party.

Mr. LaRouche, you were the first person when the attack on the Towers took place. Luckily, you were on the radio and you said, who in the Pentagon who are the rogue people there, who could have done that. Now the report of the committee is out. There are many questions that are still pressing for answers. And the more answers we get, the more you are proven to be correct. Somebody did this, from within.

The question now, that when it came out, we still have many questions, and it worries me a lot that we're getting more and more scary propaganda about another imminent attack. And being of Arab-Egyptian, American, but of Arab origin, I am even more scared. We are going to be blamed *again* for whatever they do, especially that I have here an article about this Zarqawi, now Mr. Bush every speech talks about Zarqawi, and the terrorists in Iraq. Mr. Zarqawi is *dead* since April 2003. And they are always fishing for dead people, for some odd reason.

The Saudi Foreign Minister, when he came immediately after the attack, he said, and this was published in *Al-Ahram* twice, that seven of the people whose names were on the list given by the Pentagon, were dead Saudis. They were not alive. Afterwards, nobody spoke about this.

And the only person who had training on these airplanes is Moussavi, who couldn't even make it on the plane. So, there are questions which we really want to ask this Administration, *before* they commit another atrocious attack. And then they will have an excuse to push the elections, whatever, if they can. How can we write these questions? Have them published, as citizens, we want answers, until now. And of course, under your leadership, maybe we can have some of these questions given to you, and all of us have it published in the *New York Times*, or whatever, that before a serious catastrophe happens again, we want to know who is responsible. How can we go about it?

My second point is, I have two articles that prove you again to be correct. One that was written 150 years ago, and another one was written by Churchill, and I downloaded them from the internet, if you would be interested in reading them.

LAROUCHE: Yes.

Well, first of all, in dealing with these kinds of questions, you have to sometimes reshape the questions in accord with history.

Now, take several things, which all fall into the same category that you mentioned. One, of course, is Sept. 11, 2001. Another one is the recent Butler Report, which, there's a report of that today which is widely misinterpreted. The Butler Report is not an exoneration of Tony Blair. The Butler Report, as described by a reporter in an article published in England today, is called a "chest of knives." That is, the report contains the evidence to convict Tony Blair, but refuses to draw the conclusion. But it publishes the evidence.

The same thing happened in the United States in a different way. Jay Rockefeller's commentary on the Select Committee report on the intelligence here, the Iraq intelligence matter. Again, it contains—if you don't read the newspapers on it! All the newspapers lie about it. Because they distract attention from the essential thing. The essential thing in the report is one statement. A lot of other questions not answered, but this question is answered. The information used to get the war was fake. And people knew it at the time. It was faked.

So, then you have the question of the 9/11 case. The evidence that we get is very useful from the report as a whole, and accurate, but it doesn't answer certain other questions. So, in these cases, what you have to do, is you have to take what you've got, look at it, now you have to have a method to understand what makes all this kind of thing go together.

The issue is, that people think of a Flatland society. They think that if a conspiracy occurs, it occurs by known people who operate in Flatland as a conspiracy by themselves. That's not the way history works. History works largely on the basis of ideas. People are controlled by ideas, of which most of them are not conscious. So, they try to explain things in terms of what they say, what I consider credible, they say. "That makes sense to me." But what makes sense to them is not real, because they don't face reality. They have an interpretation of things, which does not correspond to reality. And they try to explain everything in terms of what they believe, which is nonsense. It's like a guy trying to explain advanced physics from the standpoint of highschool arithmetic. It doesn't work. It will not work.

All right, now, what the problem? All of these conspiracies — now take what I mentioned with the case of the Fernando Quijano case. You have also the Huntington thesis on the Hispanic war with the United States, as the Arab. Now, the Hispanic one is different, but it has a character, and we have as much danger from this Hispanic problem as we do— even though Huntington's a liar about what he says the problem is, nonetheless there is a *real* problem, which is Nazism of a Spanish-speaking variety. Of the Nazism that was planted in the United States, by the Nazi Party, by Hitler's order, in Mexico, and other countries, and reintroduced to Mexico by William F. Buckley, senior and son, in the postwar period, as a CIA office agent in Mexico. That kind of stuff.

So, what creates these things? Who actually creates these things? If you take it by the street explanation, you'll never get the answer.

All right, did Cheney do 9/11? Obvious question. Because Cheney is the person who is closest to the kind of action that 9/11 represented, he and Ashcroft. Because certainly George Bush is stupid, he couldn't even... I don't think George knows which end of a plane to enter. So, don't blame poor George. I never accuse him of intelligence, or anything. Cheney's not too intelligent.

No, see, it isn't. I doubt that Cheney knew what was happening. The nature of the way this thing is done, the dead bodies, the dead Saudi bodies, scattered on the landscape— in other words, previously dead, also—it all tells you what's going on. The evidence you're getting is not evidence. It's not evidence of what caused the problem. It's evidence—it's to distract your attention from the reality. The way this could be done in the Senate, in the Committee on 9/11, the Kean Commission, essentially points to the fact that there was a complete — as I said in my broadcast at the time this was going on — there had to be a complete breakdown in what I knew, from my experience, when I was working on SDI and similar things, what the U.S. security provisions were. I happened to be rather heavily involved in those kinds of questions, back in the late 1970s, and early 1980s. And obviously what happened could not have happened if what was supposed to be the security systems of the United States had been operational at that time. They'd either been removed, or somebody had turned off the switch.

Okay, so therefore, that's number one.

Also, the way the thing was done, because it was a coordinated operation, it was not a coincidence of three planes, it was a coordinated operation. That is, the movements of the planes involved were tightly coordinated. Therefore, it was a centrally coordinated operation. It was not people going in and seizing planes and doing something. This meant there was an "above" factor.

Now, the top power in the world is not people in governments. The top power in the world is represented by international, financier oligarchical cartel interests, typified by the Synarchist International of the period 1918 through 1945, which was responsible for the entirety of the fascist phenomenon in Europe, and the wars of that period. Entirely, including Japan. Entirely.

These were financier interests who were protected by the Truman Administration at the end of the war. They are intact. They exist today. These are the guys, these banking circles, which run government from above, which have a separate ability, a separate capability, to use even facilities of government, to get access to everything, and to run such an operation. Who could run 9/11? These guys. They are the ones who can run such an operation.

Who ran the Nazi operation? We know a lot about the Nazi operation. It's been thoroughly studied by a lot of us. I've become a sort of expert on this, on exactly how this thing was done, how it worked. I know it way back in history, all the way back to ancient Greece, exactly step by step, how this thing developed. That's where it comes from.

The problem is, people are naive, they refuse to understand history. We don't teach history in the schools. Or what we teach is fraud. We don't teach the struggle of mankind. It comes from Egypt — you may know that. European civilization started there, in the roots of the great Pyramids of Giza, about 2700 B.C. and earlier. In the astronomical characteristics of those pyramids, we find the secret of what became the founding of European civilization by people like Thales, and Solon, and the Pythagoreans, and so forth.

So, we know a lot of this history. We know the characteristics. But we don't teach it. And therefore we have ignorant people, who've been taught to be ignorant, and they try to explain things in ways that don't correspond to reality, what I know is reality. That's why— that's one reason why we're so successful in intelligence work, is simply because we know things that I think everybody should know, but they profess they prefer not to.

And this is the answer. We have to, as I'm trying to do in all the writings I'm doing, is try to get people to understand what civilization is. How it works. You have, you know, you have a long struggle of mankind, which is the noblest creature in creation, has been practicing the enslavement of other people, as a characteristic form of society continuing down to the present time. And you have this idea of people who will treat other people as herded or hunted human cattle. And this form of system has resulted in an evolution of what became with the ancient cult of Delphi, which was actually an international monetary, financial cartel, which did all kinds of things, including destroying Lydia with crazy Pythia's forecast, with Croesus—this kind of thing has gone down through the Venetian oligarchy; to the Anglo-Dutch system of liberalism, which is a financier oligarchy, which pretty much runs the world today, including most of the United States.

We are still struggling to free the individual person from the status of being treated as human cattle, either herded or hunted. That's our problem. And what we're against is one problem, which is the same problem of the first of the Trilogy of the Prometheus trilogy of Aeschylus, is that Zeus, the fascist, the ultimate Nazi, says to Prometheus: you tried to give knowledge to human beings; therefore, you've going to be tortured for eternity.

And Prometheus smiled and said, "No, you're going to be toppled."

Zeus is still around. The Olympian crowd is still around. We have yet to get rid of them. My long-term purpose is, get rid of them. Because, as long as you have this Zeus-Olympian conception, of an elite centered around financial privilege, financial power and privilege, acting as a cartel, like a slime-mold, as I've described it often, controlling destinies, they from the top control governments. And what we often think, government must have done it, yes, government did it, but who used government as an instrument to do it. How was the command given?

My view is, that Cheney would not have been trusted to know the details of an operation like 9/11. It would have come from a much higher level above government.

FREEMAN: Okay, this is the last question, and it's a question that's been submitted by members of the LaRouche Youth Movement. It says, "Lyn, next week members of the LaRouche Youth Movement from Washington, D.C. to the state of California, are going to be heading to Boston to the Democratic Convention, whether they want us there, or not. We're

excited about it, and we're determined to be heard, and to make sure that you get heard too.

"Some of us have asked Debbie what we're going to do there, and all she'll tell us is to wear good shoes, because we're going to be kicking down some doors. But that aside from that, you'll tell us what to do when we get there. We're up for it, and we think that you're going to make history, and I think you also know that we trust your leadership, and we'll do whatever you say. But the suspense is killing some of us. Could you be a good guy, and give us a hint? If not, that's okay too, and we'll see you there."

LAROCHE: Often, the most accurate answer is the obvious one. I will disgorge.

Boston, Massachusetts pretends to be known as the Athens of America. It is clustered by a group of maniacs, who are gathered in institutions which are called universities. Much better than calling them insane asylums. It gives a better flavor of the situation. But it has pretensions. And it does have, in the environment, some actual processes which are supposed to be knowledge. At one time there was knowledge there. At the time of John Winthrop, Cotton Mather and the Mather family, and so forth, there was knowledge. Also in part of the 19th century, there was knowledge.

So, if you have a bunch of youth, who are largely in the 18 to 25 age bracket, who are not stupid, and who are intellectually energetic, gathered together around in any event, then they become, in and of themselves, an event. They become an occasion. They become a conference into and of themselves. They become a counterpoint of reference, simply by being in the same vicinity, to what is going on in the convention hall, and the proceedings.

So, now you have the counterthesis. The British Tories are meeting in Boston, and the revolutionary party is also meeting in Boston. The two do not actually have to intermingle. They might intermingle, but the proximity of the one to the other, creates an international standard of reference for current history. I would suggest that the question you should take up, is the question principally, which I introduced here today—It's not entirely a new question—the question of looking at politics from the standpoint of immortality, as understood by Plato, and to some degree, Gauss and Riemann. Because if you want to have an effective youth movement in the country, you *must* give people power: not the power *over* others, but the power over themselves. And the power over themselves, is a sense of the nature of their immortality, as taught, by Kepler, by Cusa, by Plato, by Gauss, by Riemann, which I'm trying to teach you guys.

Because once you get a sense that you actually do have a knowledgeable access to immortality, not as a doctrine taught to you, but as an idea which struck you like lightning, which you understand yourself. And once you have the sense of that, that you are working *together*, around that understanding of *who you are*, and what you represent, you are an infectious, unstoppable force, that this planet desperately needs. That's your mission.

FREEMAN: To carry out that mission, the LaRouche campaign needs money. I will invite those of you, who have not yet contributed the maximum to the LaRouche in 2004 campaign, to do so. The earlier you do it, the more your money will be worth—especially given the way the dollar's going recently. I want to encourage you to do that: those of you here, and those of you who are listening over the internet. I want to thank you, for your attention today. We have a lot of work to do, in the period immediately ahead. And, before I ask you to join me in thanking Mr. LaRouche, I just want to make sure, that all of you are ready for Boston.

Otherwise, I guess we'll see you there. And please do join me in thanking Lyn, for the time he has spent with us today.
[applause]

LAROCHE: As I always tell you, my advice to you on this occasion, as on all other occasions, previously and yet to come, is: Have fun, and understand what I mean by that!

Feature:

[The Policy for Physical-Economic Reporting](#)

[by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.](#)

The following, formal restatement of the internal economic policy of our association and its publications, was initially prompted by the need to promote a timely eradication of certain residual, slovenly, often politically opportunistic habits which have continued to creep into our international association's practice, even since the time, two decades ago, I, rather gently, but firmly expelled London School of Economics matriculant David P. Goldman from our economics staff.

Economics:

[Crazed Vultures To Argentina: Pay Now or Die!](#)

[by Cynthia R. Rush](#)

International financial predators have risen to new heights of desperation and vengeance in their attempts to annihilate the nation of Argentina. The Global Committee of Argentina Bondholders (GCAB), the front-group for the vulture funds that speculated on Argentine debt prior to the December 2001 default, and claims to represent the majority of those 'investors' holding the country's defaulted debt paper, announced on July 12 that it was launching an international offensive to force the government of President Néstor Kirchner to renounce its official proposal to restructure \$88 billion in defaulted debt, and accept the GCAB's 'counter-offer' instead.

[World Food Grains Output Potential Falls](#)

[by Marcia Merry Baker](#)

The wheat harvest drew to a close in July in Kansas—one of the world's leading wheat centers—and the estimate is the crop will be down by fully 35% from last year's decent level. On July 18, the Kansas Agricultural Statistics Service reported that this year's area harvested will be 8.7 million acres, 1.3 million fewer than last year; the average yield per acre will be 36 bushels, down 12 from last year's yield; so all told, the harvest will be 313.2 million bushels (8.5 million metric tons), down 35% from 2003. In addition, the milling quality of the harvestable wheat is poor.

[Interview: Wayne and Jean Robinson](#)

[LaRouche's CEC Challenges 'Free-Trade' Destruction of Australia's Agriculture](#)

The Robinsons are farmers from Kojonup, in the state of Western Australia. Jean has been the State Secretary for the Citizens Electoral Council, the LaRouche movement in Australia, for the past several years, and is now running for the Senate in the Federal election expected sometime between August and October. She is widely known for representing the CEC and Lyndon LaRouche in the state, and polled 7.4% of the vote in her last race in a highly contested state election.

International:

[The Philippines Is Pushed Over the Cliff](#)

[by Mike Billington](#)

When the Philippine Senate, dominated by the government party, announced on June 24 the official tally for the May 10 presidential election, declaring incumbent President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo the winner by 12.9 million votes to 11.8 million for opposition candidate Fernando Poe, Jr., opposition members from both the Senate and the House issued the following joint statement: 'In the wee hours this morning, the majority in Congress delivered to democracy in our country a fatal blow from which it may never recover. ...'

- **Revive the Marcos Nuclear Power Program**

by Ramtanu Maitra

The Philippines, a power-surplus nation in the 1960s, is now a power-short nation. Power outages in the capital city of Manila have become a routine discomfort. Are the authorities concerned about the power shortcomings? What one hears in the Philippines today is the promise to privatize the power sector to 'solve' the problems.

Neo-Cons Questioning Bush Faith in Pakistan

by Ramtanu Maitra

Since 9/11, the Bush Administration has maintained a two-track policy towards Pakistan. Both the White House and the State Department have consistently exuded confidence in Pakistan's efforts to counter terrorists, both in Afghanistan and in Pakistan, and to remain a steadfast ally of the United States in the war on terrorism. But signals from both the Pentagon and the neo-conservatives have been critical of Pakistan, constituting the other track.

Saxony Election: Ruling SPD To Be Minor Party?

by Rainer Apel

Two weeks after their disastrous showing in the June 13 elections for new European Parliament, the German Social Democrats (SPD) were struck by a new disaster: In the June 27 elections for municipal parliaments in the eastern state of Thuringia, the SPD vote was cut by more than one-third statewide, from 24.4% to 15.6%. In some of the municipalities, the SPD lost much more than that:...

Sharon's Wall Ruled Illegal

by Dean Andromidas

The fight for the creation of a Palestinian State, and regional peace, won a great moral victory on July 9, 2004. The International Court of Justice, in the Hague, ruled that Ariel Sharon's Berlin Wall on the West Bank is a violation of international law and must be dismantled as soon as possible. The ruling—'Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory'—was passed almost unanimously.

China Sends Warning On Taiwan Arms Sales

by William Jones

At a press conference at the Chinese Embassy in Washington on July 12, Chinese Press Counselor and spokesman Sun Weide issued some rather pointed warnings regarding U.S. attempts to exacerbate the Taiwan issue by increasing arms sales to the Taiwan government.

International Intelligence

by EIR Staff

National:

LaRouche Webcast: Restore FDR Legacy or U.S. Faces Fascism

by EIR Staff

Speaking to an international Internet broadcast from Washington, D.C. on July 15, Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche refocused his 20-month mobilization to force out Vice President Dick Cheney, on the Democratic Party: 'It's not who's going to be nominated for President. That's not the issue. Who is going to own the person, who is nominated for President. That's the issue. That's what the Convention in Boston this next week means!'

Enron's Lay Indicted: Who's Still At Large?

by Harley Schlanger

The indictment this week of ex-Enron CEO Ken Lay, while long overdue, does not even begin to cure the actual disease ravaging the U.S. economy, of which his bankrupt company became the most visible symptom.

Senate Intelligence Report: No Basis for Cheney's Iraq War

by Jeffrey Steinberg

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) on July 9 released its 551-page Part I report on the pre-Iraq war intelligence fiasco. Contrary to virtually all of the U.S. media coverage of the document, it represents a damning indictment, not of the CIA and the rest of the intelligence community, but of the Bush-Cheney White House, which manipulated the Congress and the American people into a war against Iraq, on the basis of lies.

Has the Chief Justice Lost the Supreme Court?

by Edward Spannaus

For many years, Chief Justice William Rehnquist was the dominating feature of the U.S. Supreme Court, along with that radical nominalist ('textualist'), Associate Justice Antonin Scalia. The hard-right trio of Scalia, Rehnquist, and (since 1991) Justice Clarence Thomas could generally pull a couple of others along, to constitute a guaranteed majority in most cases. That has now changed, even though the composition of the Court itself has not changed for a decade—since Justice Stephen Breyer was added in 1994, following the first Clinton appointee, Ruth Bader Ginsberg, in 1993. While the Court's makeup is the same, its alignment is not....

Congressional Closeup

by Carl Osgood

This Week in History

July 26-Aug. 1, 1750

Celebrating the Birthday of Henry Knox

A Most Extraordinary Revolutionary War General Who Became America's First Secretary of War

Henry Knox loved solving a problem, and when he found the solution, he would go out and implement it. Always optimistic in the service of the American cause, his unremitting efforts left a vital legacy for the Americans of today. His story began in Boston on July 25, 1750 when he was born the seventh son in a family eventually of ten sons. When Henry was 12, his shipmaster father died in the West Indies, and Henry became the sole support of his mother and younger brothers. He had to leave his studies, and was able to find work in a Boston bookstore. The store was a popular gathering place for officers of the British Army, and many became friendly with Knox, especially since he was interested in military affairs and read all the books he could find on the subject, in particular those dealing with artillery.

By the age of 21, Knox was able, perhaps with the aid of patriot friends, to go out on his own and open "The London Book-Store," which also carried musical instruments, telescopes, patent medicine, and tobacco. He built up contacts with other bookstores in the colonies, especially with James Rivington in New York, who often sent him large orders for books of plays. At that time, bookstores were often centers of intelligence operations, and Knox's bookstore became a gathering place for the American patriot leadership.

While he was still a bookstore apprentice, Knox enlisted in a Boston military company, and in 1772 he joined the crack Boston Grenadier Corps as second in command. As he continued his artillery and engineering studies, he became more and more involved in the patriot cause. At the scene of the "Boston Massacre" in 1770, he grabbed the coat of British Capt. Thomas Preston and told him, "for God's sake to take his men back again, for if they fired, his life must answer for the

consequences." Then, in December 1773, when Americans were protesting the tax on tea, Henry Knox was one of the committee of 25, chosen from the grenadier company of the Boston Regiment, who guarded the three East India Company ships to make sure their cargo could not be unloaded.

During the growing conflict with Britain, Knox wooed and won the hand of Lucy Flucker, the well-read daughter of the royal secretary of the province. Her parents strongly opposed the marriage, but Lucy persisted and she and Henry were married in June, 1774. Like everyone else in Boston after the East India Company had reacted to the Tea Party with repressive decrees, the Knoxes were prisoners in the city, forced to live under British military rule. Henry was under heavy pressure from his in-laws and his British officer friends to support the Crown, but once the Battles of Lexington and Concord had been fought, the Knoxes left almost everything behind and told the sentries they were going on a short picnic. They kept going, however, until they reached the Continental Army in Cambridge. The one thing Henry would not leave behind was his sword, which Lucy quilted into his cloak, and since he was six-foot-three and 280 pounds, the British did not detect it.

After the Battle of Bunker Hill, the British remained in Boston, waiting for supplies and the troop reinforcements which would enable them to attack the American Army in Cambridge. Washington and the Continental Army could not attack Boston, because of the perilous shortage of gunpowder and the fact that the Army possessed less than a handful of cannons. In this situation, Henry Knox went to the War Council in Cambridge and proposed that he go to the old French and Indian War Fort of Ticonderoga on Lake Champlain and bring back the French and British cannons that were mounted on the fort's walls. Most members of the War Council felt that it was an impossible task to drag heavy cannons through the wilderness in the middle of the winter, but George Washington told Knox to go ahead and try it.

Taking his 19-year-old brother Will with him, Knox rode to Albany, where an Army messenger had alerted Gen. Philip Schuyler that men would be needed to build boats and sleds. Once they reached Ticonderoga, Knox picked out the cannons that were still functional and hired carpenters to build heavy boats. Against strong headwinds and through dense fog, the cannons were floated down Lake Champlain to the portage to Lake George. There, they were loaded on sleds and dragged by teams of oxen. A snowfall made progress easier, but when it reached three feet deep, Knox had to leave the men and teams in a grove and push forward for miles to a town where he could obtain help.

When the long caravan reached the Mohawk River, the ice would not hold the heavier cannons, and the men had to drill holes in the ice to allow water to come up over the top of the ice and form a new, thicker layer. Even so, a man with an axe had to walk beside each cannon's sled, ready to cut the rope if the ice broke, in order to save the ox team. This did happen with Will Knox's cannon, but Henry had it raised out of the Mohawk and it survived to do service in Boston. After an incredibly arduous passage through the Berkshire Mountains, using block and tackle to raise and lower the cannons, the expedition at last reached actual roads, and the cannons were secreted in various locations while Henry Knox reported to Washington.

The existence of the cannons was kept secret, because of the Americans' fear that the British might burn Boston if they realized they would be forced to evacuate it. So a diversion was set up on the north shore facing the town, while Henry Knox directed the emplacement of all the cannon in one night on Dorchester Heights, which overlooked the city and the British fleet. Early the next morning the cannons boomed, but were not aimed at the ships, because Washington wanted only to warn the British, not force a tragedy wherein the occupying force, in revenge and terror, would fire the town. After an abortive attempt to attack Dorchester Heights, the British agreed to withdraw and not burn Boston, if they were allowed to retreat unmolested. They took with them about a thousand Tories, among which were Henry Knox's in-laws, the Fluckers.

Knox served for the rest of the war, setting up and commanding the American artillery and becoming the close friend and confidant of George Washington. He was entrusted with organizing the crossing of the Delaware to Trenton, and for his planning ability was commissioned a brigadier general. Through the "times that try men's souls" he was unfailingly

optimistic, and wrote that "We want great men who, when fortune frowns, will not be discouraged." In 1779, he proposed the establishment of a military academy at West Point to train officers and to provide technical proficiency in engineering. After Yorktown, during the difficult days when the Army received no pay and the Newburgh Letters suggested a military coup, Knox was instrumental in backing Washington's successful attempt to let cooler heads prevail.

When Washington resigned his commission, Knox became commander of the Army, and was soon appointed Secretary of War for the Confederation Government. When Washington was inaugurated as first President of the United States, and Congress set up the War Department, Knox continued as Secretary into Washington's second term. His attempt to bring some Federal standards into the state militias was blocked by Congress, and he had only temporary success in stopping the privatizing of Army supplies and food. But Knox, resolving that the terrible frontier defeats of Generals Harmar and St. Clair should not be repeated, did succeed in reorganizing the Army's structure into what was called a Legion, a composite organization of infantry, riflemen, dragoons, and artillery that would be more effective in wilderness fighting. Two years after Knox had left the Federal government, Gen. Anthony Wayne used that structure in his American Legion to finally drive the British out of the American frontier posts.

Finally, before he left office, Secretary Knox reported to Congress, that although military arms could be purchased more cheaply from Europe, the lower price was of little value "compared with the solid advantages which would result from extending and perfecting the means upon which our safety may ultimately depend." Congress responded by expanding the number of magazines for stockpiling weapons, and by establishing national armories for arms manufacture. The first was established at Springfield, Massachusetts in 1794, where Knox had created an arms depot during the Revolution, and later that same year the second armory was begun at Harper's Ferry, Virginia. As George Washington said of Henry Knox after the Battle of Yorktown, "The resources of his genius supplied the deficit of means."

All rights reserved © 2004 EIRNS

[top of page](#)

[home page](#)