

SPECIAL REPORT

The Question of Democracy

by **Lyndon H. LaRouche**

USLP Presidential Candidate

Incredible as it may still appear to be to some, only police-state measures and forces could prevent the U.S. Labor Party ticket from winning or at worst nearly winning a plurality of the electoral college vote in the November elections. The impending developments in the world and national economy will trigger the hundreds of factory and neighborhood Labor Party caucuses around the nation into a major political force, exposing my pathetic Republican and Democratic Party opponents as what most working people would rightly describe as Mickey Mouse politicians.

Excluding police-state measures or massive frauds to prevent honest campaigning and elections, from spring through summer the Labor Party support will spread through the nation like proverbial grass fire, extending the 30-plus per cent support we now have in some regions into majorities in a large number of key voting districts.

Most of those who vote Labor Party in November will be persons who have been firmly anti-socialist all or most of their adult lives, persons who will demand from me a clear statement of where I stand on the issue of democracy.

I could reply simply and honestly that the Labor Party can confidently put its democratic record against the anti-Constitutional tendencies in the Supreme Court and the U.S. Department of Justice, or the police-state performance of the Virginia and North Carolina state Democratic Party machines, or the vote-fraud machines of Boston's Mayor White and other such notables. The voters will accept such plain truths concerning so much of the Republican and Democratic Parties' internal dirty laundry, but they will also — rightly — still demand to see the inside of my head on this question.

A 1977 Labor Party White House

First, let us leave no doubt concerning the nature of the government I will quite probably head up after the 1977 presidential inauguration. It will not be a socialist government, but a capitalist government, enjoying the support of not only a majority of working people but also a probable majority of industrialist forces. For a key minority of the voters, I will be in the White House because I am one of the world's important socialist figures; for a majority of voters I will be in the White House despite the fact that I am a socialist.

I will be elected — if that probable event occurs — by a large number of people who reluctantly support me as the only candidate competent to put the nation and world

economy back together again under conditions of the worst depression since the early 17th century.

Workers and others will vote for Wayne Evans and me not only because they demand that the International Development Bank, the Emergency Employment Act, and related Labor Party legislation be put into effect; for the critical few years immediately before us, they wish the nation — and their urgent interests — to be served by the same kind of thinking and commitment which went into developing the IDB and EEA.

Industrialists and others will come around to accepting a socialist in the White House because they see that as the only credible hope for getting back to full production levels — and also because they are willing to meet Labor Party demands on employment, wages, working conditions and social services as part of the price of getting out of the current depression collapse.

For such serious work, the nation will not cheerfully tolerate a vacillating, limited personality such as President Ford, a cast-off from the late late show circuit, a Rockefeller, or the procession of Mickey Mouse eccentrics predominantly contending for the Democratic nomination.

In brief, my entry into the White House will end the role of the USA as an imperialist nation, but will vastly strengthen the nation as a capitalist industrial power.

Because this is already the spring of 1976, and because the U.S. Labor Party is merely mass-based but not to this point a mass-organized machine, a very large proportion of the support for a Labor Party White House in the Congress, state legislatures, and municipalities will take the form of fractions of Democratic Party machines. Some former Democratic Party figures will directly enter the Labor Party, others will act as political independents collaborating with the Labor Party; others will continue as Democratic Party units acting independently of the official national party ticket.

After a Labor Party victory in the elections, certain sections of the Republican Party and a larger portion of the Democratic Party will adapt to the role of "loyal opposition" to the White House. Meanwhile, the Labor Party machine will of course grow rapidly, keeping incumbent officials honest, and preparing for subsequent electoral campaigns.

That, given a fair semblance of a democratic process in the USA during the rest of 1976, will be the basis on which the nation functions to climb out of the current depression beginning 1977.

"What Will He Be Up To?"

It will be assumed that my residence in the White House will somehow lead the nation in the direction of a later socialist transformation. That is a reasonable assumption, unless one means to imply that I shall somehow "sneak" socialism into being behind the backs of the electorate. Have no such fear; it is a scientific impossibility to "sneak" socialism into being — if there were any doubts of that, absolutely everybody would be zealously watching everything the White House does.

Let this be clear, however. The election of a Labor Party ticket to the White House in November 1976 means that the issue of moving toward a socialist transformation will be the leading electoral campaign issue of the 1978 congressional and 1980 general elections.

What is indisputable is that a successful four-year Labor Party presidency will win a very large plurality, probably a majority, to a socialist outlook. Therefore, provided that we understand that a socialist USA is not the practical question of the 1976 elections, we can competently discuss the question of what a Labor government in the USA will probably lead to by 1979 or 1981. If a socialist USA emerges — say during 1981 — as a popular reaction to a 1977-1980 Labor Party government, will the USA then be a democracy of the type that most U.S. citizens today desire?

The very short answer is "Yes, absolutely." However, as we admitted above, the voter wants something better than a quick one- or two-word answer. For such reasons, the voter will understand my obligation to take up this question in a relatively profound way.

Two Ideas of Freedom

There are in fact two quite different main definitions of what ought to be meant by individual political freedom. The strict meaning of individual freedom, which is unfortunately too little known, is the concept for which I stand. The more commonplace notion of individual freedom, more or less similar to the views of John Locke, is fundamentally unsound from a scientific standpoint, but nonetheless corresponds in form to the only workable type of doctrine of political freedom which can be agreed upon in a capitalist society.

To make the problem a trifle more complicated, the strict conception of human freedom — to which I adhere — and the Locke-like conception embedded in the U.S. Constitution (and violated by the Burger Court) work out in practice to much the same result in capitalist society. So, for capitalist society, I support in practice the forms of individual political freedom which the strict Constitutionalist would describe as Lockean.

To understand how a socialist democracy in the USA would function, it is most useful to analyze the reasons why I, a socialist, must support ostensibly Lockean policies of individual political freedom for capitalist society.

The most effective approach to making the strictly scientific conception of individual freedom clear to the average U.S. voter is to locate that notion in respect to the religious conception of the human soul. Most people, excepting such unfortunates as logical positivists, know that they have a soul. Excepting certain pet-lovers who are unduly influenced by their enthusiasms, most people also know that this experience of themselves they designate as their soul absolutely distinguishes them from the lower animals.

The issue is not merely one of having or not having a soul. The idea of the soul and the idea of a moral responsibility for the consequences of acts of free will are two aspects of the same idea.

Whether or not one is religious — I used to be a devoutly evangelical member of the Society of Friends, but as not now religious — provided one is not an atheist, which I, like Karl Marx, am not, the religious conceptions of the interconnection between the human soul and free will are based on existing notions which are absolutely valid as strictly scientific conceptions. I explain, restating a point which I have developed at length in longer published writings.

As an animal species, that is, as a species whose range of behavior could be explained strictly by a biologically determined form of behavior as for lower animals, man has the ecological population-potential our ancestors of a million years ago possessed — about the same as that of intellectually gifted baboons or chimpanzees. Yet, man has developed his technology and culture — that is, qualitatively changed his range of behavior — to the point that our species is now approaching 4 billion persons, and has a currently known potential (given fusion power) for several tens of billions of individuals.

This accomplishment — whose future potential is effectively limitless — absolutely distinguishes man from all lower forms of animal life. The source of that distinction is man's special quality of **free will, the power of the individual to make scientific discoveries and otherwise create new ideas for effective use by his or her society**. It is that creative aspect of the human mind, the power to create and to assimilate and use new scientific discoveries and so forth, which is the hard kernel of man's free will and the empirical experience of one's self which best accounts for both the religious experience and the certainty of the existence of one's soul.

All efficient modern moral principles are historically directly connected to such ideas of the soul and free will. It is the soul of the other person which prevents us from raising him for meat or otherwise treating him or her as one would freely treat an ordinary lower form of animal life. This moral principle is no fetish. A single creative individual, by producing scientific discoveries or even lesser innovations, directly contributes to the power of survival and development of the entire human species. Every soul is thus potentially precious, and in the most practical terms, to every other human being. Even the individual who apparently creates no new ideas, but who apparently merely develops his or her mental powers to the point of being able to assimilate for practice new conceptions created by others, has the same kind of universal importance.

That intersection and agreement between religious beliefs and scientific judgement identifies the essential basis for the strict conception of human freedom.

The question follows: how does one then advance the cause of individual freedom? Obviously, a stone-age individual from perhaps some remote New Guinea highlands village could not contribute immediately to the advancement of humanity from within modern culture. The quality of freedom in the individual is something which must be developed in each individual. This demands some forms of teaching, of course. But teaching will not succeed unless the individual has a certain level of material culture in the home and so forth, unless the family and the individual have a cer-

tain quantity and quality of leisure. Today, it demands a society advanced beyond child labor; a society which devotes the first 20-odd years of the new individual's life-span to childhood and educational development cannot tolerate average life spans in the order of merely 40 or 50 years.

As scientific and other technological advances in the mode of production increases the amount of energy at man's per capita command for production and consumption, the material conditions of individual life, the quantity and quality of leisure, must be improved. Without such improvements, the development of individuals will not progress to the point of making further general advances in knowledge and practice possible.

In that respect, the quality of human freedom is its own end. Free will, as the expression of creative mental powers, effects scientific discoveries and fruitful technological innovations, which make possible improvements in the material-cultural conditions of individual life generally. Those material-culture improvements lift the creative potentials of the individuals to a higher basis for further advances in scientific knowledge and technology, thus increasing the power and extent of human freedom.

This cause of freedom is no fetish, no luxury. Without technological advance rooted in such advancing power of the creative will, the human species would die in ecological disaster. Each technology defines certain aspects of nature, as man has altered nature, as resources. The resources so defined are always relatively finite in extent. Therefore, the longer society persists in a stagnating technology, the more it exhausts the relatively finite resources as defined by that fixed technology. Without scientific and technological advances in the mode of production — and definition of resources — man would soon cease to exist. Freedom is no luxury, but the very practical essence of human existence.

It is not necessary to argue the fact that this necessary aspect of human freedom is generally overlooked. That is especially the case among our contemporary "zero-growth" fanatics, who are determined to doom the human race to extinction by emphasizing backward, labor-intensive production, and who, not so incidentally, support programs which mean the genocidal murder of literally more than a billion human beings through hunger and disease during the coming five to ten years. To these miserable "zero-growth" fanatics, other human beings — and they themselves — are no different in a moral sense than lower animals. It is not accidental therefore that such miserable creatures should be increasingly concerned to find a current animal-like satisfaction from life in drug addict's fantasies and new, more exotic forms of sodomic sexual practices.

Freedom of Expression

What is usually emphasized in connection with freedom is the matter of the relative political liberty to express a dissenting opinion, and to act, within limits, on the basis of a divergent perception of self-interested practice. Into such a broad definition of freedom all sorts of queer fish as well as creative innovations can be deposited. However, that is the best sort of descriptive definition of freedom that capitalist society can adopt. How does that conception differ from and yet coincide with the conception of freedom I have just summarized?

Society as a whole has two vital interests in protecting certain aspects of freedom of individual expression. Immediately, society must be concerned to discover which policies,

in large and in detail, coincide with the current and emerging general interest of society. At the same time, society must foster those material, cultural, and political conditions in which the new scientific discoveries and other innovations necessary for tomorrow can emerge.

In the conception of socialist society, the effective realization of such requirements can be approached in a straightforward way. In capitalist society, the problem is more complex. This complexity originates in one way because of the intrinsic conflict of perceived immediate self-interests among classes, sections of classes, and among regions within nations. This aspect of the difficulty is aggravated by a general condition which is strictly termed **heteronomy**, or in words of approximation, the implicitly anarchic conflicts of perceived immediate self-interest among the individuals and small and larger groupings within society.

To give one useful example, the political labor movement has been more or less indispensable to successful capitalist economic development. Although enlightened capitalists tend to learn from experience that improved material and cultural conditions of life in the general population are indispensable to the technological potentials of the productive labor force, that enlightened perception could not have been generally imposed upon capitalist society's practice without sometimes bloodily heroic struggles for the advancement of working conditions, wages, and living conditions of the working class.

Also in matters of capitalist economic development as such, since there is no rational procedure for deciding what new technologies will be employed and so forth, the capitalist economy depends upon relatively or marginally anarchic procedures — akin to a market principle of "survival of the fittest" — for determining the marginal changes in overall composition of production in general, patterns of consumption, and so forth. This anarchy in the "competitive" evolution of production intersects, in a somewhat interdependent way, the requirement of corresponding degrees of political freedom within the general population.

Looking at this and related questions from my socialist standpoint, the practical aspect of the society's need for political freedom can be better understood by defining the problem of freedom on three levels.

Any fixed technology of general production can be implicitly represented by what mathematicians properly describe as a single, higher-order manifold, or in the language of the average person, a certain fixed multi-dimensional geometry. Such a system is implicitly susceptible of a predeterminable overall policy, or perhaps a remarkably enlightened dictatorship. On this first level of analysis, the cogent argument for political freedom is the observation that suitable qualities of enlightened despots simply do not exist, and that therefore society requires a process of collective deliberation, a form of political freedom of expression, through which an approximately correct solution to the question of the right policies can be evolved politically.

The instant we pass beyond the notion of a society of fixed productive technology, the real problem of freedom appears in its own right. Society's progress — and even, ultimately, its very survival — depends upon an enriched process of intellectual ferment, through which new scientific discoveries and other forms of creative innovations and experiments can be developed. This involves two discernible phases, as follows.

The first phase, like the present global situation, is expressed by immediate necessity. Without an IDB-type political-economic innovation, the human race would simply not survive in a civilized form beyond somewhere between a possible 1977 general war and ecological collapse during the early 1980s. We should not get much beyond the 1980s without the specific revolution in technology satisfied by controlled thermonuclear reactions technology. These typify, admittedly to an extreme degree, the otherwise constantly recurring confrontation of modern society with some set of immediate problems demanding specific kinds of innovations.

The second phase emphasizes the development of the next generation to a quality in which it will be broadly qualified to develop creative solutions to whatever kinds of problems it, in turn, must solve.

Taking these two latter phases together, that is, the second and third levels of our glance at the problem in socialist terms, we are showing that it is not sufficient to allow sufficient political freedom merely to solve the immediate kinds of problems posed by existing practices; we must also provide further political freedom and so forth in anticipation of the needs of the next generation.

From this standpoint, we must agree that the ordinary notion of the subject of political freedom — individual difference of opinion — includes something which is potentially pathological. In matters of current policy and related practices, there exists an implicitly well defined correct short-term policy, **besides which all contrary opinion is essentially pathological.**

It is as we pose the question, “where does society go next?” that the vital issues of political freedom are posed in the same terms of reference as ideas concerning the free-will-endowed soul.

However — a very large “however” in practice — even with respect to current policy there exists sufficient lack of scientific precision such that two kinds of political freedom on that subject are required. First, obviously, the power of society to detect errors of policy for prompt adjustments. In a connected way, but for more lasting purpose, where errors in current policy arise it is essential to criticize such errors from the standpoint of ascertaining what kinds of methodological error may have caused such a flaw in judgement — thus increasing the quality of judgement employed for future policy deliberations.

The Role of Principles

In the recent and current popularized discussions of democratic principles, we hear much repetition of the nonsense-word “pluralism.” Such current babbling is essentially a direct result of such conniving by the mice at the RAND Corporation and similar pestholes of the Atlanticist establishment. For over a decade, RAND and similar agencies designing “covert operations” have emphasized a stated policy of indoctrinating the general population in late 17th and early 18th century philosophical outlooks. This atavistic enterprise has been justified in such mice-circles by the recommendation that if the U.S. and other populations can be driven back in the general direction of caveman-like ideology, the Atlanticist rulers can more easily control the population by various kinds of political manipulations.

The gist of the matter is this. The mice have gone back to nibbling at the writings of Locke, Hobbes, and Rousseau, with a quality of scholarship fit to shame an especially sloppy

college freshman. Out of that miserable bit of alleged political-philosophical research work, they have produced this current babbling around the theme-word of “pluralism.”

Happily, the 17th and 18th century English and French philosophers had nothing in common with RAND’s miserable stew of “pluralism.” From the accession of Tudor Henry VII to the throne of England, and out of the Italian Renaissance, the dominant idea permeating the emergence of modern capitalism was the **Idea of Progress**. To all the leading philosophical and other intellectual influential persons of the period from the Renaissance through the early 20th century, the by-word was technological progress, and the evolution of political institutions and expansion of individual political freedom in the interest of making the realization of technological progress possible.

In our own history as a nation, Franklin, Jefferson, and Hamilton, as well as Samuel Adams and Tom Paine, proceeded from that same underlying common principle — the Idea of Progress — which governed our nation’s economic and political development until World War I and the Great Depression. In our U.S. tradition, the Idea of Progress and what was known from the beginning of this century as our “frontier” principle of cultural and political development persisted to the point of exerting largescale appeal in the “New Frontier” slogan of the John F. Kennedy election campaign.

It is an ugly historical fact that after the assassination of President Kennedy and the accompanying increased hegemony of the Rockefeller-aligned “utopian” faction of Atlanticists, progress and the idea of new frontiers of general national achievement were degraded almost into dirty words by the rise of the rock-drug counterculture, Maoist idiocy, and “zero-growth” cults.

The notable implicit and inextricable basis for the current spread of pluralist ideology is an accompanying rejection and even frequently outright denunciation of the Idea of Progress.

The relevant point to be drawn out of such facts concerning the history of modern democracy is that the motor-force for the emergence and development of political democracy was a shared, if poorly defined, agreement on the principles of the Idea of Progress. This has two main aspects. First, democracy is based on the acceptance of the principle of progress, which means technological progress in production, improvement in the general material-cultural conditions of life, and the enlargement of political freedom to the end of making economic progress politically efficient. Second, democracy has never meant equal treatment for just any idea or practice. Ideas which did not have a credible connection to the principle of progress were properly considered worthless politically as well as in substance. The right to exercise political freedom in ideas and practices was always — properly — more or less explicitly associated with the latitude of freedom of expression necessary to the overall efficient pursuit of progress.

Freedom does not mean that the initial scientific discovery of the existence of dirt must be independently pioneered by each new individual, and such discoveries detailed *de novo* each day. In general, freedom is delimited by the working assumption that certain questions have already been conditionally settled, at least up to the point that someone develops a cogent reason for publicly reexamining such ideas. In general, freedom does not mean putting obvious absurdity upon an equal footing with scientific knowledge.

Just as capitalism's development permanently abolished certain feudal and mercantilist-feudal habits from accepted social practice, and rejected the Domesday Book in favor of the Idea of Progress, so socialism signifies the rejection of certain outlived and discredited features of capitalism. Just as capitalist society does not permit landlords to practice feudal serfdom, so socialist society does not permit the practice of capitalism.

How The Change Occurs

"Do you mean that under socialism I will have no 'freedom' to be a capitalist?"

The direct answer is "Precisely so." However, there is another, implied question involved: "Do you mean I will be forced to give up my pro-capitalist ideas?" To which the answer is "No; you will quite cheerfully give them up in due course."

Great transformations in the form of society occur with accompanying changes in the accepted values and world outlooks of entire classes of the population. This means that no approximation of socialist society could be instituted within the USA without a preceding and accompanying hegemony of socialist world outlooks with a body termed the **political working class**, made up of the working class and other strata who are committed politically to those principles of society which are otherwise most immediately an expression of the general interest of working people in maximizing the long-term rate of expanded reproduction.

"But, what about the Soviet Union?" "What about the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'?"

The Soviet Union, first of all, is no model for socialist society. From the beginning of its existence, the Soviet Republic has been a besieged garrison, repeatedly invaded and otherwise constantly threatened with military incursions, economic blockades, and so forth. These circumstances of its existence, including proportionately massive military burdens on the most advanced sectors of its industry, a struggle to emerge out of backwardness in the wake, first, of World War I and civil war, and then the ravages of World War II, have witnessed successful economic development at the price of major personal sacrifices not always so gladly contributed by all sectors of the population, and so forth. The Soviet Union is what it is, and nothing different. It is neither Paradise on Earth nor otherwise a model to be copied — unless one chooses to also copy all the hideous burdens and aversive conditions against which the Soviet nation variously has struggled and continues to struggle.

Otherwise, to round out that point, the Russians are not coming to the USA except as invited guests — unless by some hideous misfortune, the Atlanticists remain in power in this nation and bring us to the point of general war. Any other views on the "Russian question" are simply terrifying fantasies of the sort evil old men concoct for the malignant purpose of frightening gullible children.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a more serious proposition than the mythical issue of the "Soviet model." Yes, if you insist, I am for the "dictatorship of the proletariat" **in the way I mean those words**, which is, of course, not the way George Ball deliberately misinterprets them.

The term "dictatorship of the proletariat" was developed by Karl Marx to describe a **transitional form** of workers' economy as the exact parallel to capitalist political democracy.

Capitalist democracy can be usefully compared to a goldfish bowl. Within the bowl, the fish is **free** to swim as he may

choose. It is as we empty the fish into a bathtub of water that we discover something special about that **freedom**; for a time the fish continues to swim within circles like those to which he had become accustomed within the bowl. We observe that the goldfish, preoccupied with his freedom within the bowl, has lost perception of the "dictatorship of the bowl." It is the same with capitalist democracy. Capitalist law and related practice circumscribes behavior within the limits of those practices which are necessary to capitalist forms of ownership and control of the means of production and distribution. (Hence, I as a socialist President of our democracy shall be presiding officer of a capitalist dictatorship.)

tional form of economy bridging the development from capitalist to world socialist economy, the norm of political freedom of the individual is greater than in capitalist democracy. However, there is also a bowl for that political goldfish bowl as well. In this case, the bowl is the axiomatic framework of nationalized ownership of the basic means of production and distribution, for which the political working class is the, so to speak, property-holder of record as thus comparable to the titled position of the capitalist in capitalist democracy.

Otherwise, a socialist USA of the sort that might be initiated in 1981 — after my excellent preceding performance in the White House — would be what we decided to make it.

Labor Party Democracy

The center of the democratic policy of a Labor Party White House will be the dissolution of the existing intelligence establishment and the creation of a new **public information agency** which functions will be set up and will function in the Labor Committees' intelligence department functions now. This new institution will be set up and will function in the following manner.

I will introduce legislation authorizing the creation of the position of **Director of Political Intelligence** as a regular Cabinet post.

Under the immediate executive responsibility of the Director of Political Intelligence, we shall constitute a full spectrum of political, economic, scientific, and technological intelligence covering global developments — a vastly expanded agency modeled on the basic principles tested for practice by the Labor Committees' intelligence department.

This operation shall be integrated with the Cabinet as a whole. The supervising body for intelligence policy and operations should be the President, the Vice President, and the Cabinet. At the same time each Cabinet officer shall have a special Deputy who is assigned direct responsibility for attending to the Secretary's intelligence supervisory functions, and who directly coordinates the activities of his or her department with the Department of Intelligence.

The President, Vice President, the Cabinet and their deputies have responsibility for daily and also emergency decisions concerning intelligence matters, and for coordinating the activities of the respective Departments with respect to Cabinet decisions.

The immediate internal governmental function of the Department of Intelligence is to daily brief every ranking executive department official, every member of Congress, and executive and legislative officials of state and local government with both a synopsis of global political, economic, scientific, other technological developments, and a

more detailed updating of information of immediate relevance to their areas of responsibility and expressed special concern.

Under this procedural policy we shall end the present nonsensical arrangement under which members of Congress and other responsible officials are pressed to act on proposed legislation and so forth with either false or incompetent information from the Executive or, more broadly the present case, with no sources of competent information regularly available to them.

The primary Executive function of the Department of Intelligence is to provide the President and Cabinet members with the basic current and background information essential to executive decisions on breaking developments, and on other policy matters properly based on intensive research.

The further function of the Department of Intelligence is as a public information agency, functioning as a news service should function, making all essential newsworthy developments directly available to public news media and to individuals through state and local public information offices.

Incidentally, to ensure a competent basis for public confidence in the quality of reporting by the Department of Intelligence, I shall propose that selected members of both branches of the Congress shall have the power of audit and public reporting concerning the quality of the work of the Department.

The sources of information used shall include the following. Regular channels of the Executive Department, federal, state, and local executive and legislative agencies, and the federal, state, and local courts' transactions. In addition, information from public news media shall be cross-referenced and, as warranted, independently verified. Outside the territory of the USA itself, the Department shall function in cooperation with the State Department. Public information officers, selected from professional journalists, scientists, technologists, and other suitable backgrounds, shall be appointed as U.S. public information representatives, functioning **openly** as public information representatives in those countries in parallel to public news media. Public information officers designated for central office and field assignments within the USA shall function in the manner of journalists.

The direct relevance of such an agency to the advancement of political democracy is emphasized by the general commitment with which the Department of Intelligence — like the Labor Committees' own modest intelligence department of today — is to be charged. The continuous public duty of the agency is to take the general public out of the presently prevalent midnight and twilight concerning the vital information on which national policy is to be competently based.

This responsibility demands the kind of open government the policies and functions of the Department outline. It is not merely the supplying of such public information as factual information which accomplishes the desired result. First, as far as the information itself is concerned, the daily mass of knowledge must be digested in such a form of synoptic organization of the briefing that every citizen, as he or she becomes familiar with the procedure, develops daily or at least weekly competent overview of all the basic policy questions. Such a well designed briefing is, of course, supported by detailed reporting suitably indexed, so that the citizen may efficiently evaluate the judgements of the briefing in

any desired area for himself, by reference to the indexed larger bulk of supporting information.

The responsibilities of the Department go beyond such routine duties. The essential further duty of the Department — with the aid of other Executive Departments and suitable professionals — is to formulate the problems of policy decision and policy implementation in such a way that the average citizen quickly becomes competently informed of the kinds of national policy decisions he ought to contribute to formulating.

The object is to end the arrangement under which most citizens lack the means to do more than contemplate and perhaps protest against proposed national policies from — so to speak — the underside. The task of a democratic government is to foster in the general electorate the competence to **formulate policy**.

Never again, to the extent that I have the power to effect a change, shall the people of the United States and the world be trapped in a mess of misinformation and ignorance on vital issues such as that to which they are still being subjected through the lies and ignorance of both government agencies and major news media. Never again must the situation develop in which the human species is threatened with imminent catastrophes, but in which the average citizen and even federal elected officials of the USA are essentially ignorant of the nature of the danger as well as the alternatives available to avoid such menace.

Objectives of My Policy

This public information policy is aimed to serve the public interest on three principal levels.

First, the application of the experience of the Labor Committees to national intelligence practice ensures a degree of competence in the Executive and Legislature which is not only lacking but impossible to attain under the current and prior administrations.

Second, the outlined public information functions provide the practical basis for that quality of informed electorate which is inseparable from effective political democracy.

Third, and of the most profound importance, such a policy is essential to the objective of providing each citizen a competent basis for objectively conceptualizing his own personal importance to the rest of his species. Only a person who has a competent overview of the world as a whole, the current and impending problems facing humanity, can objectively locate the general importance of his or her creative innovations, his or her applied skills as professional or productive worker, his or her effort of self-development, and the importance of those efforts he or she makes in behalf of the enriched intellectual and moral development of the emerging new generations.

If you insist on identifying such matters in the religion-tinted terms of **soul** and **free will**, so be it. The proper fundamental object of the general self-government which a people adopts for itself is, if you prefer such terms, that enrichment of the **free-willed soul** which purpose is its own proper end. It is to the extent that a people is able to afford its individuals a proper sense of intellectual and moral self-development as individuals of recognized and self recognized importance to their species generally, that we realize to the fullest extent possible those moral qualities of the people from which indispensable scientific and technological progress ensue as a natural consequence.

The included object of such democracy, the included object of my White House tenure, is to reverse the hideous moral decay which has increasingly afflicted our society especially during the approximate past decade. Large sections of our youth live only for the gratifications and fantasy-oriented titillations of the immediate sensual moment — the horrible moral decay which has become the concomitant of the self-styled “**now** generation.” They reflect in this wretched moral condition the fact that they have to that extent lost a sense of moral purpose for their existence — indeed, according to the amorality prevailing among such afflicted persons, when they in turn are carried out of this life, who should mourn their passing, to what end of importance to the rest of the society has their pathetically existentialist, sensual self-seeking life been “all about?” This moral decay is the inevitable consequence of rearing youth in a society which has a declining sense of purpose, no frontiers of achievement to master on behalf of future generations, no commitment to

the Idea of Progress — and no sense, consequently, of that kind of fruitful struggle for self-development of creative and productive powers which makes an individual life important and worth living.

Democracy cannot persist in a society which has no shared commitment to the underlying goal of progress. Without commitment to progress, there can be no practical sense of the importance of those creative potentialities properly symptomized by fundamental scientific progress in particular. Without a sense of the importance of such creative powers of the individual, there can be no practical sense of the **soul** or creative **free will**. Without a sense of that which the religious person identifies as the soul and creative free will, there is no respect for the personality of the other individual, no basis for an efficient morality — and without such an efficient morality, society must degenerate into such a jungle that civilization itself could not long survive.