

The cultural basis of strategic policy for Ibero-America

An interview with Lyndon LaRouche

In an interview with Robyn Quijano of EIR's Spanish-language publication Resúmen Ejecutivo, conducted from prison on Oct. 3, 1993, Lyndon LaRouche gave a wide-ranging picture of the strategic and financial situation confronting Ibero-America, as well as the cultural and educational issues which are the key to solving the current crisis. The excerpts we publish here constitute about half of the full interview, which was published in Spanish in Resúmen of Nov. 1, Nov. 15, and Dec. 1, 1993.

Q: As the collapse of the financial system accelerates, Ibero-America is being brought into a new level of looting. Right now, they're setting up commodities markets, derivatives markets, and a new level of speculating on Latin America is going on. This is being sold to Ibero-America as a great boost to their economies. What do you think about that?

LaRouche: It's a new stage of looting, period. Exemplary is the crisis which has erupted—a mini-crisis of sorts—around the North American Free Trade Agreement, with the [Rep. Henry] Gonzalez inquiries into the Federal Reserve operation, with the New York banks, the big ten, but the seven in New York, in planning the financial side of what's called NAFTA. Since virtually everything else is already in the works, except the financial part, it's obvious that the signing of NAFTA means purely the financial part.

Now the thing is buried out of sight of official responsibility of the U.S. government in the negotiations occurring between interested parties in the South and the Federal Reserve System. That's the only information which is confirmed. But when you say "Federal Reserve System," and the New York system bankers are going to conduit financial arrangements, that can mean only one thing. . . . The other aspect is already in place, the runaway shops, the great sucking sound that Ross Perot talks about—that's been going on for some time. He doesn't mention the other sucking sound, though: the sucking of the Mexican blood, which



Mexico City's Zocalo, the central square, in September 1982, when President José López Portillo announced the nationalization of the banks. "We must have unity," says LaRouche. "We saw that in Mexico in 1982, when the Brazilian government and the Argentine junta capitulated. Mexico was destroyed and they were all put in the soup as a result of their failure to stand by Mexico."

has also been going on. So you've got a great Moloch in New York, who is sucking two things: jobs and businesses out of the United States and blood out of Mexico, along with a few other incidental commodities.

But the financial situation is a much more dangerous and higher level, which overshadows absolutely everything done so far. The fact of utter destruction of the sovereignty of every nation in the western hemisphere, including the United States itself, which means setting up what, under Bush, was called "globalism," but is properly otherwise known as "globaloney." (I guess it's baloney that glows!). . .

Q: A few days ago the *New York Times* had an ad, an interview with Paul Soros, the brother of George. He directly says: "In Latin America, whenever the army, as an institution, is part of the country's power structure, all investments are discounted, because that introduces an element of instability. As an investor, one likes stability."

Now the kind of stability he's talking about obviously is just stability to loot.

Why are these swindlers so worried about the Ibero-American military?

LaRouche: First of all, you have to think of George and Paul Soros as the late twentieth-century parody of the two most notorious characters of the first half of the fourteenth century, who had the nicknames of Biche and Mouche.

These characters, representing a group of banks of that period—the Venetian-Lombard banks—did precisely what

Biche and Mouche of today, George and Paul Soros, as frontmen for the New York banks and the British Rothschild-coordinated interests, are doing all over the world. They're looting countries en masse, in the way that the House of Bardi and Peruzzi in the early fourteenth century was looting all the countries of Europe, all the little principalities here and there, by pyramiding debts, *exactly* the way it's happened since 1982, but even before, since the petrodollar debt expired. Pyramiding debts until, in 1345 approximately, the king of England repudiated his debts, and the whole thing came down. And then Biche and Mouche disappeared, having stolen the national treasury of France and the papal treasury, and disappeared into obscurity with the proceeds and after having stolen the papal treasury which they got in trust.

And this is what we're talking about with Paul and George Soros. They are not people; probably they're persons, in some sense, but they are more a disease than persons. So when one talks about them, one should not talk about them as personalities, but as a disease, a repetition of this same kind of phenomena, of which the most notorious case in terms of recorded history is Biche and Mouche from the fourteenth century. They're just thieves. They're not Robin Hoods; they steal from the poor for the rich, until the rich go bankrupt. And they're running a bubble which most nearly represents not only the bubble of John Law, the South Sea Island and Mississippi Bubbles of the early eighteenth century, but they're running a bubble which also represents the debt bubble which collapsed in the mid-fourteenth century

In Venezuela, the military, while doing something which was patriotic, defending the Constitution against a runaway, unconstitutional presidency, did not really understand the principles of politics; they were running coups from a cabinet warfare standpoint, not a competent political-strategic overview.

and was the characteristic of the New Dark Age.

So if Satan required a couple of imps, he required no better service, perhaps, than Paul and George Soros, the satanic imps of international or globaloney finance during the late twentieth century. . . .

Q: They obviously think they have it sewn up, except for this slight element, that the Ibero-American military still exists, which they want to get out of the way. Can you discuss the question of what role the Ibero-American military should play in countering what is essentially an invasion of the country by this financial swindle?

LaRouche: The problem of the military is their training under Yankee and post-World War I and II influences. They were trained to be a police force in their own country, to protect the interests of the U.S. banks, which then seemed to have an industrial and related orientation, in the old days, in which Grace was the most evil name you could mention on the continent relative to the United States. "There but for grace, my country would be prosperous."

They would defend that. Some of them had aspirations to build up national industries, to develop the country; they were not unpatriotic. But they knew they were a military force which lived at the sufferance and satrapy status of their government and their state institutions.

Now they face a situation in which the foreign power, Washington, is determined to exterminate their country—not conquer it, not change its government, which they put up with in the past—but exterminate them. And they no longer have the backing of certain U.S. military-intelligence factions when they get into trouble and they can negotiate a deal through their friends in the United States. They no longer have, in terms of these institutions, any *efficient* friends in the United States. They may have friends, but they're not efficient.

The problem they face, as we saw in the military revolts against the unconstitutional activities and treasonous activities of Carlos Andrés Pérez in Venezuela, is that the military, while doing something which was patriotic, based on defense of the Constitution against a runaway, unconstitutional presidency, did not really understand at that time any of the principles of politics, so that they were actually running coups in a sense from a cabinet warfare standpoint, not a competent political-strategic overview.

Refer to the case of the Middle East. What befuddled many people, even people who believed, on both the Israeli and other sides, that there should be an economic development basis for peace which would give rights to the Palestinian Arabs—they didn't understand how this worked. They didn't see that economic development was the alternative to bloody war.

In the case of Central and South America, the problem is, they have to see that free trade and what is called democratization are the *enemies of humanity*; and these ideas and principles have to be opposed as treasonous; and therefore, their weakness is on the political-strategic side.

So they limit their politics to an extension of military posture in a political crisis. They do not see military actions of institutions as instruments of strategic policy, in the true sense. And that's because you have a number of officers who get together and say, "What they're doing to our country is terrible. We've got to stop it, the country is going to be destroyed. If somebody doesn't do something, I guess we're the institution that has the responsibility to step in when constitutionality breaks down, to restore constitutionality." And they will say, "We have to have a coalition among us. So we have to have the free traders, the pro-radical democracy types, and all the other people all together in one schmoozy united front, where we are all great brothers, we get drunk together, we have honor together," and so forth—without realizing that those are the issues which must be settled, because without settling those issues, you cannot govern.

Without a [Friedrich] Listian sense of national economy and cooperation among states based on shared notions of national economy, strategically, *you cannot win*. And therefore, they violate the Augustinian rule for military action: Your action must be justified; it must have the opportunity to succeed; it must have a plausible basis for success. A plausible basis for success means that you realize the political objectives not only of constitutionality, but of durable government, which is able to meet its responsibilities to the personalities and the families of the nation. If you cannot protect the individuals and the families of a nation from chaos, then you have not realized any credible or justifiable political objective; and therefore you mobilize when you have a chance to win, fight in a way which has a chance to win; and you fight only for a cause which is justifiable. And in this case, they're fighting against evil, but they're not

fighting *for* a cause which is justifiable; and that's where they failed.

We must have unity. We saw that in Mexico in 1982, when the Brazilian government and the Argentine junta capitulated. Mexico was destroyed, and they were all put in the soup as a result of their failure to stand by Mexico, in July through August to October 1982. When they failed to do that, *they betrayed their own countries*. They said, "We cannot risk our countries for Mexico." But they betrayed their own countries, because once Mexico, which is the second-largest nation of Ibero-America, went under, they had no chance of defending themselves, because they couldn't get together.

They couldn't get together, because they could not agree that free trade is evil. They could not agree and understand that the fight between Moscow and London and Washington, was largely real, but also fraudulent, in the sense that it was based on a condominium, a condominium in which the Soviets as well as the Anglo-Americans were betraying all the developing countries.

So the problem with the military, is they must sit back and say: We were deceived. Now we must *undeceive* ourselves. We were not betrayed by personalities; we were betrayed because we were being deceived as to what the reality was, and what methods had to be used to save the nations of that time.

They have to go through another leap of maturity, a leap upward. But they do not yet know, as institutions what to do. And they have to understand and make a very quick leap in understanding and comprehension of reality. . . .

Q: The New Age education is very, very far developed in Ibero-America at this time. We are actually investigating something *that has happened*; we were late on this one. And we're finding that it is very much what is going on in the United States. It's U.N.-sponsored, and one of the major parts of it, is to have education that's different for the countryside; in any area where there are Indian languages spoken, Spanish will not be taught. It specifically states that Spanish should *not* be taught, that Spanish can be used, but should not be taught and should not be a written or read within the curriculum.

LaRouche: How far extended is that?

Q: This is in Peru, this is in Bolivia, this is everywhere where there are large Indian—

LaRouche: Where they have the large Quechua operations.

Q: Your movement in the United States is making inroads against this education reform called outcome-based education (OBE), and I'd like to know what your advice would be for Ibero-American patriots trying to end this child molestation in Ibero-America.

LaRouche: It's worse than child molestation. You molest

the child, and when you molest the child, you can produce a satanic personality. Now how about producing satanic personalities on a mass scale?

Remember OBE is designed by people who are collaborators of the Satanist known as Julian Huxley. Julian and Aldous Huxley were Satanists. They were protégés not only of H.G. Wells, who was a Satanist, but of the more overtly Satanist Aleister Crowley, who was their immediate mentor. They were close collaborators of a person who was an incredible Satanist, Bertrand Russell, probably the most evil man of the twentieth century, the most racist, pro-genocidalist figure. More of a genocidalist than Adolf Hitler, because Adolf Hitler limited his ambitions to parts of Europe. Russell had global ambitions for mass murder.

So these people, including Robert Mueller, were protégés at Unesco of Julian Huxley. Julian Huxley is one of the most satanic, most evil figures of the twentieth century, who dominated much of the second half of the twentieth century.

The ideas that are used, are the ideas of people like Alice Bailey, a professed Satanist. Not only do these ideas come from Satanists such as Willis Harman of the Stanford Research Institute, a confessed Satanist; but they also represent an efficient way of turning young children *into* Satanists.

So it's not merely that these people happen to go to a Satanist church, or something, and otherwise, six days a week, are not Satanists in practice. You know, "The guy may be a Satanist, but he's a good accountant"; "He may be a Satanist, but he's a good schoolteacher." Believe me, that does not function. The Satanist is much more proficient than professed Christians in these matters. Satanists practice their religion 26 hours a day, 7 days a week. And they are never *not* practicing their religion. If you've got a Satanist in the neighborhood, you'd better just try to purge them, get your local priest to perform the operation to purge them of the demon. Give up all other methods.

What are they doing? They're doing it explicitly in the United States, and they're doing it everywhere else. South America, Central America, will be key. The basis for the entire educational process is that the church and Spanish are the enemies. They must be destroyed. That's the goal of the Satanists. And anyone who attacks the church from the standpoint of the Black Legend—not from the standpoint of the Liberation Theologists, who do funny things—but about the corruption of the church as an institution, in this, the Black Legend way, we know he is a Satanist. I don't care if they call themselves Protestants or whatnot; they are Satanists.

We are familiar with this in the United States. The effect will be to turn children first against their parents. This is going to lead to children, teenage children, murdering their parents. One day the parent will look in the face of the child. They thought they knew the child: "I know all about my child. My child is in X School, there's nothing with that school." One day they cross that child in a certain way, and

they see a satanic gleam in the eyes of that child, directed against them. Pure, satanic hatred against them, which is motivated and shaped by “school counsellors.” “I like my teachers, I don’t like you, you’re no good. You’re not my real family. My real family is my school.”

We are getting that out of the mouths and eyes of teenage and younger people, in defense of their teachers in OBE, at parent-teacher meetings throughout the United States.

I said, “This is evil.” And people didn’t think it was that serious. They thought we had to present alternatives to try to win people, “Well, this would be better than that.” I said, “No, this is satanic evil.”

Now, once we began to scratch the surface, we found, first of all, what the counsellors and so-called facilitators were. We began to get glimmerings from some teachers who had quit the system, who were complaining about it. That wasn’t the worst, but it’s bad.

Then we began to get a picture, in some encounters, of what these counsellors do. Then we saw the real face of Satanism. We saw what these counsellors had done to some of these children, where the children would get up at meetings, and would actually militantly defend Satanism, and defend their counsellors as the apostles who taught them this, and who had freed them from their family. And the child says, at a school meeting in Barrington, Illinois, “Now, they didn’t teach us *all* sex. They taught us anal sex.”

When you’re getting this, it means that this is the time to destroy your school. You have no choice. Don’t try to reform it; eliminate it and start a new school. That’s the only thing you can do. This is not an issue of reform. This is a pestilence! And you must get these people who are behind this, out of the community. You must look, constantly, to extraordinary methods to recover some of these children.

Q: What you’re saying, is very, very directed for Ibero-America. I have here something from the Peruvian government, which is a new code, supposedly for children’s rights: “The child is not a subject for tutelage, but a subject with rights.” Then it goes on to say that the family should not have any authoritarian behavior over the child: “Every child and adolescent has freedom of expression and thought, belief and religious worship, even if it is different from that of the parents. The child and adolescent has the right to be respected by his teachers and to question everyone’s values.”

So this is codified, and this is the case in every Ibero-American country, and this comes directly from both the U.N. and the Anti-Defamation League.

LaRouche: I would have to say, if you tolerate this, your country’s going to be destroyed in short order.

Q: In Colombia, President Gaviria’s wife is in charge of part of the educational reform, and there’s a provision on sexual education, in which they now say pleasure is an inalienable right of every child and adolescent.

LaRouche: This is literally satanic. That statement of pleasure—that is literally satanic. The pleasure principle.

There should be more effective attacks on Freud, because lurking in the background, is what Freud represents. The fact is that Freud was B’nai B’rith; Freud was satanic; a homosexual, satanic, in this respect. Freud and Nietzsche—there is very little difference between the two. In terms of philosophy, Freud, Nietzsche, Hitler, and the French existentialists are pretty much the same thing. They’re just different varieties, competing varieties, of the same thing, whose ideas tend to merge and cross and cross-fertilize. And this should be openly attacked. This is as bad as the International Monetary Fund; this means the destruction of the nation by destruction of its people. This is *menticide*. This is the murder of children. This is treason against the nation.

Let me step back and restate it. I’ve indicated the point, I think usefully, and maybe it can be better restated sometime, in “History as Science” [published in *Fidelio*, Fall 1993]. . . .

We have to deal with Platonic methods. Without Platonic methods, it’s impossible to deal with these kinds of problems.

What we have today, is a fight between entropy and negentropy, as it will be described by some people. Between those who are for deconstruction—entropy—deconstruction of economy, the elimination of commitments to scientific and technological progress, and so forth and so on, against the commitment to technological, scientific, and related progress.

For example, I’m most pleased with the modest but very significant progress we’ve made in music. We have made, in a sense, a revolution in music, in fighting to defend the Classical conception; we have not merely *affirmed* the Classical conception, but we have *made intelligible* a principle which was implicitly *there* with all the great Classical composers from Haydn to Brahms, and implicitly already in the work of Bach and so forth before them. It became conscious with Haydn; it developed with Beethoven and Brahms.

But now we have shown the principle, the transfinite, if you will, the principle which governs this principle of genius of Classical musical composition, which virtually no liberal-ly educated musician today could even understand, let alone perform.

The popular music today—and I’m talking about the so-called popular classical school of music—is that the essential, intrinsic musical illiteracy on *essential* principles—not formalities, but essential principles—of musical composition. The modern composers do not know the ABCs of composition. They couldn’t compose like a Classical composer, if they wished to. It’s not a matter of *Zeitgeist*. The *Zeitgeist* is a moron today.

So, we have made progress in this area.

The issue here, as in composition of music, is change.

Let me put it again in theological terms, because that’s the



A children's chorus performs in Colombia. "The child is a process of development, not a fixed thing with fixed opinions. . . . The education of this imago Dei quality in the child is the essence of being human."

best terms to put it in: the question of God and the Becoming.

Is God in Time? Is God *confined* in Time? Does God have a limited place in Time, as an existent? Of course not. Therefore, you have two views of the universe: God's view and man's, because man's view is always located in the Becoming, is finite in Time. Our influence may be *transfinite*. We can change the outcome of the past; we cannot change the past, but we can change its outcome, as Cusa changed the outcome of the work of Archimedes, by revolutionizing it. So Archimedes continued not really as Archimedes' own work, but Archimedes' own work from the past, was revolutionized to a higher level by Cusa.

We can do that. We can determine the future, or the foundations of the future. The individual can determine, in some degree, the shape of all human existence past and present. But nonetheless, that individual is located in Time. His or her existence has a beginning and an end, though its effect has no beginning and no end.

So the individual can participate in God, only by becoming *timeless*. To become timeless, you must participate efficiently in the past and the future, in a creative way, which makes the past and the future *better*—or less bad.

Thus we see, that if God is real—and we can prove that He is—then the idea of *permanence* attached to an object of the Becoming, is a false idea, or is a superficial idea. That reality lies in that aspect of the object, which is permanent, which is timeless—which is not the object as a simple, sensu-

al object. It is rather the *principle of development* which corresponds to the infinite, timeless good.

Therefore, human beings are significant as human beings, in the image of God; which means that the individual, through creative reason, can contribute by assimilating ideas and by transmitting them—and also by creating them—can contribute to change which belongs to the category ultimately of the timeless good. And thus the individual is not only *imago Dei*, by virtue of creative reason, but is *capax Dei*, because he participates in the timeless God, the timeless existence of God, the unbounded existence of God, by doing something which is timeless in nature, which is in the image of God.

The only thing that could correspond to that, is creativity—true creativity.

If we take that away, what do we have? We don't have man; we have *man bestialized*; because man has no soul. He's an Aristotelian who has no soul, as Pompanazzi argues. He belongs to a collective soul. But if he doesn't change, if he is like the Emperor Diocletian, who chained the society, which is what these guys are proposing, that's evil. That's the evil of paganism in the extreme, and of those cultural relativists who argue, on anthropological grounds, that "we've got to return these people to their natural aboriginal state." Their natural aboriginal state does not exist. It was only a downward change into degradation and deprivation and bestiality.

For example, we saw this outside of Mexico City, at the pyramids. I knew that there had been wheels in Central and South America, because the civilization could not have existed previously without wheels. We found the wheels—where? Not in the carts used by the people; but in the carts used as toys by the children. A perfect example of this.

So these are degenerate cultures. And to replicate them, is suicide. If you tell people, “You’re going *back* to your ancestors, rather than justifying your ancestors by becoming something good today,” then you put them on the track of self-destruction as a people. And the evil ones in London sit back and say, “We fooled them. We told them to go back to their ancestors and they all died. And we didn’t have to kill anyone, because they killed themselves. They wiped themselves out—except the two we have in a museum over here, in a theme park we keep for exhibition purposes.” That’s what they’re doing with the Australian so-called aborigines. The same kind of thing.

That’s what the issue is. The dignity of the individual is being challenged.

We have to make this clear in education. Education is *not* learning. Education is re-experiencing creative discoveries which are made by people before you. Education is turning the mind of a child, which has only potential but no *competent opinion-making ability*, and giving that child, step by step, through various kinds of tutelage, the ability to become an adult. The child is not responsible and capable of adult opinions about society until it becomes an adult, though the child, in the process of development, will increase this quality of insight and morality and tutelage all the way through.

The child is a process of development, not a fixed thing with fixed opinions.

The child learns how to build with blocks; the child replicates a discovery which was made a long time ago. Everything the child learns is a replication of the mental experience of some discoverer hundreds of thousands of years ago and even older, over the past 2.2 million years of existence of mankind on this planet.

We have to fight for that. Because it is that—the education of this *imago Dei* quality in the child, which is the essence of being human. Those who say no, are against humanity. They are turning humanity back into destruction—they call it deconstruction, which is destruction. They’re murderers. And they have to be dealt with. You can’t say, “Oh, they have some interesting ideas. . . .” I disagree. That’s some kind of nonsense! Worse than Hitler! These people make Adolf Hitler look like a benign old country gentleman living on the next block, serving cookies and tea.

Q: In Virginia, this has been going on for a number of years. The guidance counselors come in to the grammar schools with a box, and they say, “I have something in this box, and it is the most important thing in the world, the most wonderful

thing. This is the center of the universe.”

A friend of mine told me about this. Her child was seven years old, in second grade, when he did this. And the child said, “Oh, it must be God.” And the counsellor said, in a very embarrassed way, “God wouldn’t fit in this box.”

Then she goes around to every individual child and has them look in the box. And of course what’s in the box, is a mirror.

Talk about psychosis!

When I studied to teach young children in the 1970s, when everything started going crazy, the older texts always said that what you’re trying to teach a child, is that they’re *not* the center of the universe. When a child out of kindergarten, a first grader comes in, they think they are. So the process of education is to teach them that they’re not.

LaRouche: That’s exactly what this does. It turns children into beasts, little savages. Primitive savages. Precisely that. . . .

Q: The Mexican situation, which a short time ago seemed somewhat tied up in favor of President Salinas’s policy, in a certain way, has taken a very big change, as the agricultural producers organized themselves, many of them basing themselves on a program very similar to what you wrote in *Operation Juárez* in 1982. I’d like to know how you see this development and what kind of power this particular movement could have in turning things around.

LaRouche: You have to understand, first of all—which some North Americans forget—that the Mexicans are human beings. Certainly, a lot of the State Department and Wall Street planners forgot that. They say, “We’ve got these Mexicans in our pocket!” “We’ve got the President! We’ve got the Presidents in our pocket. We have the PRI in our pocket. We have the institutions in our pocket; and we’re destroying them at our leisure—crushing them like nuts, one at a time.” They forget the Mexicans are human beings.

The North American takeover of Mexico in 1982 was not a seduction; it was a rape. A very important consideration. Now, the rapist had armed guards, weapons, and the victim did not. And so the victim, being the nation of Mexico, said, “Look, we’re being raped, but we’d better become accustomed to it, because there’s nothing we do about it. So we better get the best possible conditions as a victim of rape.”. . .

Now, where is U.S. policy? The international financial system is in an explosive condition; the East European, Russian state is about to blow in a bloody business. There goes Francis Fukuyama’s *End of History*. History resumes in the bloodiest imaginable fashion. China blows up. They say, “Well, that’s good, we’ll get rid of the former communist opposition.” But then—boom!—the Anglo-American financial system blows up.

If people don’t fully understand this, they can *smell* this; and when the victims, particularly those who have been raped

My being in prison is a very relevant thing. No one is going to survive in this world based on salvation of one country. There's no Venezuelan formula, no Colombian formula. Somebody's got to put the world back in order; otherwise, nobody, in any part of the world, is going to survive.

and are now about to be murdered, smell that the master, the giant, the ogre, is in trouble, they may begin chopping at the beanstalk.

Q: We have a very interesting situation in Venezuela. The hated Carlos Andrés Pérez, or CAP, is finally gone (we think); and there is a moment of opportunity that is very short, and fraught with tremendous dangers, because there are not too many people around who really want to stand up and fight in the right way. What you just said about the ogre being ready to fall, probably would have a decent impact—**LaRouche:** That means that somebody's got to chop at the beanstalk, otherwise this is not going to work.

Q: Do you have any advice for the Venezuelan population and politicians who are right now trying to figure out what they're going to do in the post-CAP era?

LaRouche: You see, my being in prison is a very relevant thing for them.

The problem is, they don't think in world terms. They may think as commentators in some world terms, some of the time. But they don't think, in a practical way, in world terms.

No one is going to survive in this world based on salvation of one country. It doesn't exist. There's no Venezuela formula; there's no Colombian formula; there's no Brazilian formula—though I think Brazil may be tempted to think in that direction. There's no Mexican formula.

Somebody's got to put the world back in order; otherwise, nobody, in any part of the world, is going to survive. You cannot have two-thirds of the world going up in smoke, and the other third on the verge of doing so, and expect that you've got some little gardening program for your country politically, which is going to make the country quite happy and prosperous and you can ignore the outside world.

It's not enough to *contemplate* the outside world; there has to be something being *done* about it.

Where is the international movement to deal with the world at large—a precondition for the solution for Venezuela? You can have solutions for Venezuela *provided they're integral to that process*; without that process, *you can't guarantee success of anything*. Because you'd be crushed.

So you've got to control the larger world, not of 18-20 million people; you've got to control a world which has more

than 5 billion people in it, which has five continents, and so forth. You've got to control the process, change the process.

Well, who in the world has been talking about this crisis and this process in the recent quarter-century? Where in the world has anyone been talking about this, and analyzing the process, and proposing?

The Venezuelans, like others, are going to have to study the timeline of what we have experienced in the past 25 years, and compare this with what was discussed in Venezuela and other places [by LaRouche and his associates], to see who has understood. Because you're not going to jump off the diving board into an empty pool. You've got to have water in the pool before you jump off the diving board.

Do we have water in the pool? "In the past, these guys have been consistently right. They've made these consistent proposals, said the alternative to accepting these proposals will lead to the following result. That is what has happened."

They're not going to buy a formula. They're not going to buy a populist—you're not going to build anything worthwhile on that. You're going to build on *authority*, by defining the authority of that to which they have to turn for leadership, the conceptions to which they have to turn for leadership.

Otherwise, why should anybody jump off their diving board? Is there any water in the swimming pool? Water in the swimming pool is an accredited, established authority, which has a unique authority versus everybody else who had a different policy. I'd say, "Well, at this stage, since that's the only car in town that runs, we'd better use that one, rather than these scrapped-up wrecks hanging around the streets."

And in Venezuela in particular, through the press, particularly in the recent years, ever since CAP's reelection, Venezuelan politics, since 1985-86, has centered around my name. There has not been a Venezuelan crisis or issue at any time, in which my name has not come into the press as a factor. And that's what they're going to have to recognize.

If they don't reckon with that, these fellows in jail who don't want to reckon with my name—they're idiots! They don't understand the ABCs of military-political strategy. They say, "Well, we'll keep away from him, because they hate him." Well, if you can't deal with me, then you haven't got the guts to take these guys on. And that's the proof you haven't got the guts. If you're afraid—"Well, we can do everything, except we can't mention that name"—whoever says that, "Okay, we know you haven't got the guts. Maybe

we'll find a rear echelon position for you if we can trust you; because you have no guts for this, if you're afraid of even mentioning a name? You coward! You contemptible coward!"

That's what I would recommend. I find myself in a unique situation, as being the central figure of a policy exposition which, over the past 25 years in particular, is the only sound, proven policy perception anywhere on this planet, with both the local situation and the global situation. If they want to come to that, they come to it. If they don't, they are losers. They're cowards, they haven't got a chance in this life. . . .

Q: There is a great potential for the United States to have trade relations that would further the [infrastructure development] you have discussed. Could you talk about that a bit?

LaRouche: The United States has a real problem, because people don't realize that the wealth of the population of the United States over the past 25 years has increased in only one respect: in the amount of stupidity which we own.

This is partly the result of the rock-drug-sex counterculture. Look at our universities. They teach sociology and similar things; where's the science? We have in large part a scientifically illiterate population. We have a population which, among youth, are not qualified, in general.

Probably the most qualified technological area for employment—and not very technological or industrial—are the farmers. Because on the farms, which are being broken up, the young farmers, or the young prospective farmers who grew up on a farm, have a mechanical aptitude for fixing machinery, using machinery, things like that, which is probably greater than that of the average citizen.

So that gives you an image of most of the population.

Now then, on the management level: Pick the population under 46 years of age. We know these people, because we know them from the 1966-72 period. In 1972, on campus, we fought them. We opposed them. They were the majority of the graduates of universities in that period. We know them very well; they're degenerates, in terms of intellectual development. They have crazy ideas; they lack morality. They may have tinges of conscience and compassion, but they lack a consistent morality of any kind.

These people—the people we knew as our political adversaries on campuses in the 1966, '72, '73, '74 period—are now running universities, running university departments, in all categories. They are running the Modern Language Association and all education. If they're not chief executive officers of corporations, they're one step below—division managers and things of that sort. They are shaping policy in government. The Clinton administration is an example of what this yuppie phenomenon is.

So we have a scientifically illiterate population, as typified by Vice President Gore's constituency. Gore typifies a malicious quality of scientific illiteracy, in the book that was written for him. Look at what he stands for. You don't have

to know what he is; you have to know what he is publicly: his public image, his campaign image, his book. His close association with [former Virginia Attorney General] Mary Sue Terry tells you a great deal. Think of the people who are attracted to this.

A scientifically, maliciously scientifically illiterate, population. Most people who are running U.S. corporations today, in the age of, or 10-15 years after the age in which U.S. corporate life was taken over by the raiders, by the hostile takeovers, by the financial swindlers; who's running the corporations today? Financial swindlers, like the people who took over RJR Nabisco. Those are the people who are running the United States today.

The United States therefore *cannot produce*. My aim is to make the United States again a productive nation, not by businesslike methods, but probably by some superbusinesslike methods, like mass infrastructural programs, which generate, beginning in ten years, a population which is capable of doing what they were capable of doing in 1982, when I presented what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

At that time, we could do things we can't do today, partly because of the generational gap.

Look at the ranks of scientists. Look at the way things line up on solid state fusion. These people are incompetent. Look at Sherwood Rowland, the author of the ozone hoax, putatively; head of the American Association for the Advancement of Science—fakers of this type.

I emphasized in the "History as Science," that language as a cognitive process, from a cognitive standpoint, as opposed to from some other descriptive standpoint, has three elements. First, well-tempered tuning of vocalization. The asymptotic freedom in music converges upon the well-tempered, polyphonic system, and converges upon the principle of *Motivführung*, as Haydn has described it. That's how we get the idea of metrical qualities; that's what Kepler was saying, in effect. That's what Leonardo da Vinci was emphasizing; that's what Plato was emphasizing, implicitly, if you look at it from this standpoint, backwards, today. We now understand Plato better than he could have been understood in his own time, if we look at it from this standpoint.

The other aspect, which is crucial up to a point, is geometry.

Now geometry, if it is taught at all in school today, is taught as a way of constructing illustrations of algebraic functions; in some cases not. But the algebraic non-function is not well understood, even among people with doctoral degrees graduating from universities today.

In 1958-59, they began to introduce the New Math. The nub of that, was the beginning of the *real* New Age takeover of education, as opposed to the Deweyite type of corruption which had already occurred. They took Euclidean geometry out of the schools. Now, Euclidean geometry as taught is not the greatest thing; but remember, there are two aspects to

study. One is, what is being taught; and the other thing, is the effect on the student's mind. The student has certain potentials.

Geometry is *natural* to language, a natural part of language. In language, we're talking about plus, less than, greater than, and so forth; we're talking about altering of relations. That's all language is, in terms of the verb. Start with the verb. The language is the way of showing the ordering of relations, and then identifying certain singularities which cannot be shown in relationship within those terms.

So geometry is essential to understand function, causality—anything. Algebra, if properly taught, is taught by geometry as a description of geometric proofs—not geometry as a description of algebraic proofs—on the basis of a rigorous education in the Classical sense of geometry, as Cusa did (or as Archimedes got him to do). Take what is called Euclidean geometry and present it, not from the standpoint of the formalism, but present it as Archimedes did. Present a construction, and as Cusa did, with his limited excursions into this, look at it from that standpoint.

That is the basis for scientific competence. When we took geometry out of the schools, we produced scientific illiterates.


This is so essential, that if a child does not begin to get geometry at the age of 10, 11, 12, virtually irreparable damage is done—not necessarily in every individual case, but among students in general.

Students in general who do not begin to have geometry taught to them at the age of 10, 11, 12, will never become scientifically literate. That is, in general. They will not even be competent engineers. They can't be. We've had experience with that on the SDI, one notable case. Talked great, feeble in terms of grade averages, terminal doctoral degrees from the best universities—incompetent for precisely that reason. Because they were dependent upon the personal computer-type of approach, putting in algebraic formulations, functions, algorithms. They can do perfectly with algorithms. But in reality? No, they don't know what they're doing. They're nominalists. . . .

People say that Colombia could argue with the United States today, that by becoming a better market for U.S. capital goods exports, this would be beneficial for the United States, and the good trade unionists here, like populist idiots, should understand that; and therefore they should be for Colombia having the right to do this.

Well, that was fine for us to say in the 1960s, 1970s, even in the early 1980s, because you still had a constituency in the United States which believed that, and you still had U.S. industry. Today, you no longer have U.S. industry. Ten to 20 years later, you have a scientifically illiterate population; feminist irrationalism-dominated population; ideological fanatics, utopian fanatics of one sort or another.

The only way this can be approached, is not from a populist standpoint. Anyone who's trying to put formulas in words



A day-care center in Bolivia. "If a child does not begin to get geometry at the age of 10, 11, 12, virtually irreparable damage is done."

which can be sold to the "woikers" today—we know a couple of people who have that tendency—is nuts! The "woikers" are demoralized. They don't have morality any more; it was the "woikers" of our dear friends up there in Quad Cities, the workers of Davenport, Illinois, who voted for no levees. The "woikers" of today are stupid, because they're younger; they're not the old "woikers" of 20 years ago. This is the younger generation, of terrified people, who are afraid that their children are going to kill them—give them quick "death with dignity," to get the inheritance. Desperately clinging to little crumbs, of very short-term attention span, who sit in front of their television sets and do similar things. They're trying to expiate their existence with diversions, so-called pleasures of that pitiful type.

Only by a movement in the United States which says, we're going to change this, we're going to revolutionize the United States, we're going to get rid of this garbage, now we need to develop the United States—under those conditions, that's the way to get the interest. The people of the United States, whether they know it or not, have a vital interest, in survival for their children and grandchildren, in this happening in Colombia. Not the idea of an export market as such; yes, there are export relations, but the old idea of our advantage, the simple material advantage, no longer exists, because of the culture transformation.