

A Washington Dialogue With LaRouche on Statesmanship

Lyndon LaRouche addressed an international webcast on behalf of the LaRouche Political Action Committee (LPAC) on Feb. 23, 2006. His opening remarks were published in EIR last week, and we continue here with the transcript of the question and answers session. His spokeswoman, Debra Hania Freeman, chaired the event. The full webcast is archived at www.larouchepac.com.

Freeman: I always try to give precedence to questions that come in from the institutions here in Washington, and I'll continue that, today.

British Are Pushing Iran War

Lyn, the first question comes actually from a Democrat who serves on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. And he says:

"Mr. LaRouche, in early February, you indicated that a military confrontation with Iran, no matter how limited, would detonate a bomb, that would in fact, serve to blow out the entire financial and monetary system. My question to you is really a very simple one: Are Cheney and Co. ignorant of this? Or is this, in fact, the intention of the policy?"

LaRouche: Well, Cheney's intention is a very interesting question. It's like speaking of George Bush's intention—I don't know if he knows what the teleprompter means.

Cheney is a stooge. The administration we're dealing with is a creation, nominally, of George Shultz; who, with Condoleezza Rice and the whole pack of them, created this administration around a guy who's not mentally capable of any other kind of job, except President of the United States. And he doesn't have to do that job, because Cheney does it for him.

So, therefore, the question of *intention*, and reality, in terms of this administration, is a very tricky question. What was Cheney aiming at, for example? Hmm?

So, in the Iran case: The intention does not come from the


United States. It comes from the participation of some people *in* the United States, in the institutions, influential institutions, but not *from* the United States: It comes from London. The orchestration of this policy comes from the British foreign intelligence organization, centered in the British Arab Bureau. Now, the British Arab Bureau is an offshoot of the British East India Company office, back in the time when the Empire started. Before the King Georges got to know they were emperors, long before that, there was already a British Empire: It was the empire of the British East India Company, which was actually running the Empire. Lord Shelburne, in particular, who was running the Empire, back in the 1770s and 1780s; he was the kingmaker. And the British King was actually a flunky for these financier interests, who actually ran the place.

So, at that point, the British Intelligence Service started, formally, in this form in many ways, as a Freemasonic organization, essentially; for example, the French Revolution was run through what Shelburne created as the British Foreign Office, in 1782, and the key figure of the Foreign Office who ran the secret committee, was Jeremy Bentham. And Jeremy Bentham, in a sense "begat" Lord Shelburne—and they created the British Intelligence Service. Which was created out of the East India Company.

So, in the process, they took a guy called al-Afghani, for example—who was a crazy-man, but the British picked him and used him—to create the Muslim Brotherhood, which is a key orchestration factor in Middle East politics. And they build up things against that, too.

The key operation that defines this whole area, is the British agreement with the Russians, with Nicholas II, on the partition of the spheres of influence in Iran, where the British took the southern part, and the Russians took the northern part: 1907.

Now, in this process, since then, the British have orches-



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon LaRouche at the Feb. 23 webcast. "The problem with Americans, especially in high office, is they refuse to recognize history."

trated the operations in the whole area, and controlled them. They have a fellow in the United States [Bernard Lewis], who was formerly head of the administrative section of the British Arab Bureau, and he is the key advisor to Henry Kissinger and others. Now, it's his office, which has shaped this particular aspect of policy, which is running it.

So, this is a British game. And they're using all kinds of things. For example, the British are orchestrating this Iran crisis—not the United States, the British are orchestrating it. Jack Straw, the Foreign Minister of Great Britain, is a key orchestrator of this operation.

So, this is what we're dealing with. And the problem with Americans, especially in public office, is they refuse to recognize history: the history of the U.S.-British conflict. And the complication that is not taken into account, is the fact that you have a section in the United States which is more close to the British than they are to the Americans. You look at the entire history of U.S.-British relations, the conflict from the beginning, from after 1763 on, and it's always of this same character. Americans refuse to recognize, that the British are not intrinsically our allies. They're intrinsically our enemies.

But it's not simply shoot-em-up enemy relations. The British realized, after Lincoln's victory over the Confederacy, which was a British operation—the Confederacy—the British realized they could never take the United States by force after that. So therefore, they used indirect methods, including subversion and economic operations. And a sense, they're allies, in which the people who are married are the worst enemies of each other. And they refuse to recognize that they're enemies. They're each trying to kill each other, or get

each other killed, and they're pretending to be happily married in between time, when company comes. So, it's this kind of situation.

So, the problem among American politicians, is they refuse to face the fact, that the British oligarchy is generally the source of the enemy, the important enemy of the United States in every operation, including this Iran operation. Once you recognize that fact, then it becomes very easy to understand what's going on.

An Imperial Tactic

The British—. Look, Britain went into this thing in Iraq. They knew the thing was a cock-up, they set it up. But what did the British do? They took the southern part of Iraq, as their area of military operations. What they did was: This was a setup to get an Iraqi Shi'a versus Sunni operation going. Because, the British interest was to destroy this area of the world, by setting up this kind of fragmentation and chaos. It's a chaos operation.

This is also part of the operation, which Bernard Lewis, the same fellow, set into operation, which is called "the war against Islam." Now, when did the world last have a war against Islam? This was the war of the Crusades, which went on for about three and a half centuries—the Crusades. So, Bernard Lewis says, "Start a Crusade against Islam!" And Bernard Lewis agents, such as Henry Kissinger and Samuel P. Huntington, and also Zbigniew Brzezinski, all got involved with this setting up a permanent war against Islam! A new Crusade! A religious war—akin to the religious war, which the same circles set up, before the British existed, starting in

1492 with the Expulsion of the Jews from Spain, by Torquemada, which was the beginning of a period of religious war!

Spain, prior to 1480, had been a very peaceful area of the world, relatively speaking, in terms of social relations. It had Christians, Jews, and Muslims, living together, in the same country, and generally with peaceful relations. Yes, there were conflicts, feudal conflicts and so forth, but they would always orchestrate things so the country wasn't destroyed. And there was a lot of cooperation. This was destroyed in 1480, with the introduction of the conception by Torquemada of the Inquisition. And in 1492 the Expulsion of the Jews from Spain—the Moors were actually expelled later, about a century later—was the beginning of a period of religious war, which raged back and forth across Europe until 1648 with the Peace of Westphalia.

So, religious war is a tactic, is an *imperial tactic*, which is used by certain forces. It's used primarily by the British, who are really the last empire on this planet. It's not an empire of the British people, it's not an empire of the Kingdom of Britain. It's an empire of a certain interest, which is centered in London. It's an international financier interest, which comes into this country; it's people like Felix Rohatyn. Felix Rohatyn, he's a fascist. He's the guy that put Pinochet into power, in Chile. Not a nice guy, a real worm. An evil character. One of my personal enemies (which is one of his virtues).

So, they run this kind of thing as an international cabal of the old Venetian style. There's no morality, there's no national patriotism involved. There's a certain sense of an interest, a *financier interest*. And they try to orchestrate the world to fit that.

For example, what are they trying to do, today? What's globalization? Just to get a clear sense of this. And, what do our friends in the Senate think about globalization? They think globalization is a "wave that is coming"? What? A new wave of syphilis? A resistant strain? Or, is it an operation against civilization. Isn't it obvious what it is? Instead of saying, "Well, it's a trend, and some people think this, and we gotta go along with popular opinion"—real Sophistry; "we have to go along with popular opinion." "This is the inevitable." Well, your wife is sleeping with ten other men—"but that's inevitable, what can I do about it?" This is typical Sophistry.

So, globalization means, what? It means, simply, that you eliminate the nation-state. You eliminate culture of people. With a population of over 6 billion—you want to eliminate the population, you want to reduce it. Your intention is to reduce the population to less than 1 billion people, in a fairly short period of time. How do you do that? By natural methods: Starve them to death! Disease! Bring down the population level—it's been done before. How do you do that? Take away the nation-state. Take production out of the areas where it's occurring, and move into slave-trade areas, where people work under slave conditions. Take steel production out of the United States and Europe, and put it someplace else. Put it in a country where 70% of the popula-

tion is starving to death.

And by that process of destroying the infrastructure and the character of a modern economy, you will create mass death.

But some people say, "It's inevitable." It means, they've given up the fight to Satan, so to speak.

So, the problem here, again, is the same thing I responded to earlier: The problem here, on the Iran issue—to me, the Iran issue is a perfectly transparent problem, with complications I may not know, but the general character of the problem I know *very well*! I know *who is doing what to whom, and why!* All the main lineaments. Some of the details are missing, but I have the main lineaments. Apparently, the people in the Senate don't know this! I know it! I know it, because I'm experienced in this stuff. They should know it, but they don't want to know it! Because, they want to know it, without having to know certain other things they don't want to be caught knowing.

And that's where I come in—often, in these things. I came in on the impossible situation, because I have nothing to fear at my age. What're they going to do me? Kill me? Hah! What d'you think my life expectancy is? C'mon, don't kid me! I'm not going to *waste* my life, that's the difference. Some people would rather keep their life by wasting it. I would rather keep my life, by not wasting it.

Okay, so anyway—so, this thing with Iran, it's real. It's essentially an imperial operation, part of an imperial operation. It's complicated, because the instruments being used to orchestrate the situation create a mask of uncertainty and confusion around it. Essentially, the fact of the matter is: The question you deal with, in a case like Iran, is different than saying what's going to happen there. What you have to do is this: Say, we know that in Russia, and in many of the important forces in the continent of Europe, there's a determination to avoid a conflict with Iran. Because any conflict with Iran would be insane, because of the implications of what that would lead to. And the financial system is about to blow up, anyway. All you need is an Iran war, and the whole thing blows. So therefore, the Russians, the Germans, and others in Europe, are determined to have a diplomatic approach to the Iran situation, and believe that a rational solution for the time being, is possible, if you don't try to settle *everything*, but concentrate on what you have to settle *now*, and then wait until the situation has calmed down, and get to the other matters later.

I dealt with this, in discussions the other day, here, in Washington.

Defeat the Real Enemy

So, do that. That means that, the key thing you have to do is this: In the United States, and in the thinking of people in the Senate and other institutions, you have to think, that every day that George Bush stays in the Presidency, is a deadly threat to the existence of the United States. Every day that

Cheney stays in the Vice Presidency, is an even greater threat to the United States. The optimum is, get Cheney out now, and then the Bush problem will be manageable. Because Cheney is the instrument of George Shultz and his international financier group, which is running this whole operation.

My goal is: Get George Shultz's machine *broken! Break his power!* Cheney is something in the way. He's sick, a man with two stents behind his legs, this kind of thing, in his condition, with his alcohol history? And the dope he's on to stay alive, and the woman he's married to—his life expectancy is very poor. So, he is only a disease, he's only a menace. Get him out, with the least effort possible. You don't want to kill, you don't want to do anything else—just want to get him out of there. He's now halfway out—he's like a still-birth or something. He's hanging out there, but he's not really going anyplace. Get him out. Once you get him out, you break the power of the machine *in* there, the tool that's being used. And he's not the source of the problem, he's only a *tool* of the problem.

Then, suddenly George W. Bush will not find a translator, who speaks his language. George speaks English: He doesn't know any English, he speaks it. The teleprompter shows him how. So, then we have to deal with that.

But we have to deal, fundamentally, with what's *behind* this. Why did they put a man—look, George Bush is a mental case! He's a dry drunk. He's a mental case, you saw him on television: He can't think! He says words that he uses, because he thinks he understands the words. He has no correspondence to what he's talking about! The man is an idiot! He's a mental case! Why would somebody knowingly put a mental case like George Bush, into the Presidency? That's your problem! George Bush is not the problem.

Who put the cockroaches in your kitchen? Don't blame the cockroaches. Who put them there? Somebody did it for a purpose. The purpose was to destroy the institutions of our government. And that's the way you have to look at it. If you look at it from that standpoint—of who the enemy is, then, instead of saying, “Do we fight this battle, or do we fight this battle, or do we fight that battle?” You say, “We've got to *defeat the enemy!*”

So, therefore, you have to have an *offensive policy*, a strategy for *defeating the enemy*, not for simply figuring out how to take out this platoon, or that platoon of his forces. And that's where we get screwed up: We don't take out the enemy. Because, we don't want to *talk* about the enemy! Like, the Senate didn't want to talk about Adolf Hitler! Here you're putting a guy into the Supreme Court, presumably for life: *He's a follower of the Nazis!* Not merely a follower of the Nazis, he represents *the policy* of the Nazis! The unitary executive, as a policy, comes from the Nazi regime! Orchestrated by the author of the Federalist Society: Carl Schmitt.

And people in the United States Senate, said, “You can't say, ‘Nazi’ ”! Well, when do you fight the Nazis? *When* do you fight them? When they're about to take power—isn't that

a good time, to say “no more”? And putting this Nazi into the Supreme Court, isn't that something to stop, if you don't want Nazism in the United States?

Don't go around hunting for Nazis: You got a live one, right in front of you. Running for Supreme Court. Why don't you say so? If you tell the American people that this is a Nazi operation, a Nazi philosophy, and tell 'em plain, in a Senate inquiry, do you think he'd get confirmed? Not at all!

They wouldn't do it! No guts! No guts. Because someone said it's bad—why? Well, because some of the big bankers on Wall Street are Nazis, and they have a long history of it! And I know the names—not all of them, but I know a few, enough.

So, that's what the problem is. A lack of guts, so therefore, the inability to face the *real* question, which is frightening, means that the problem is reduced to secondary or tertiary questions, and how do we deal with this tertiary or secondary effect? When my thinking is, let's flank the main enemy. Don't make a charge like an idiot, against some hill. Flank the enemy.

The Israel-Palestine Conflict

Freeman: This next question is a kind of composite of several questions that have come from both the Senate, and also a couple of people connected to Washington, D.C. think-tanks. It relates also to the question of Iran and the situation in Israel.

The question is, more or less: “Mr. LaRouche, both immediately prior to, and several times since Ariel Sharon's stroke, Bibi Netanyahu has travelled to Washington, D.C. to confer with Dick Cheney. There may also have been meetings that have taken place elsewhere, but these are the ones that we're aware of. Informed sources both here, and in the Middle East, indicate that Cheney and company are working hard for Netanyahu's election, with the presumption that if the desired military adventure against Iran continues to meet with opposition in the United States, making the political penalty too high, that one fallback would be to launch war by surrogate, with the Israelis initiating some action, and the United States then compelled to participate. It certainly seems that the Cheney crowd, or at least the crowd that controls Cheney, is committed to launch this war by whatever means necessary.

“My question to you, is not so much their intention, but your assessment of the situation inside Israel. How good do you think Netanyahu's chances actually are? And if he were to regain power in Israel, is he likely to proceed with such a suicidal scenario?”

LaRouche: Again, what we're dealing with in the conflict situation in Israel, is a case of asymmetric warfare, in which the key factor is outside forces, not forces on the ground. The situation is played like a pawn on a chessboard, by international forces. Now, what we have to do is, don't limit the question to Israel, or Israel-Palestine. That's the first mistake. It is not an Israel-Palestine problem. That is, it is not contained

within the territory of Israel-Palestine. It is a situation with conflict potential, which has been exploited in various ways, by various international institutions, going back to the games that were played between the Soviet Union and the United States and Britain, on this question, back during the relevant 1950s. It's that clear.

What our policy is toward this thing, is not to try to solve this or that problem. Because you're dealing with a slippery situation, in which, if you think you're solving one problem, you're going to neglect another one. Yes, Netanyahu is a danger, but why is Netanyahu a danger? First of all, he's run by the crowd which is behind George Shultz. For example, George Shultz is behind that cartoon run in *Jyllands-Posten*, which was used as a trigger to set off these Islamic protests around the world. So, your problem is not in Israel, your problem is George Shultz, who lives on the West Coast—and who controls the policy toward the Israeli right today; who controls the pro-Netanyahu policy in Israel, today. Netanyahu is an agent of Anglo-American interests. That's all. He's an agent. He's a throwaway, right? A throwaway.

Imperial Geopolitics

Okay, how do you deal with that? We're dealing with what area, what subject? The subject is *Sykes-Picot*, 1907 to 1916: The negotiation between the British, with the French involved, and stupid Nicholas II of Russia, over the division of the spheres of influence in Asia. And this involved what is called Southwest Asia, directly, the region, the Middle East region; it involved the adjoining area of Iran, and other things. This was the key instrument in organizing World War I. Not a fight in Israel, World War I. Not confined to Israel. Not confined to the territory of Palestine.

Who organized it? Well, it was organized, first of all, by assassinating the President of France, Sadi Carnot, to change French policy. Then by the Dreyfus case, to create an anti-Semitic thing—there's terrible anti-Semitism in France. Anyone who knows France knows that it's a very anti-Semitic country. So therefore, the Dreyfus case then defined a right-wing operation.

Then you had 1898, with Kitchener. And the French became the sodomic victims of Lord Kitchener. Lord Kitchener was key as a part of this operation, which involved Sykes-Picot; which involved the partition of spheres of influence in Iran in 1907; which involved the 1916 Sykes-Picot treaty; which involved the organizing of the forces for World War I by Britain; which is what Allenby was part of there; what other people were part of in Southwest Asia. The partition of the Ottoman Empire was part of the story. The question of oil was part of the story, because petroleum from the Gulf, what became known as Kuwait, was a British private preserve, which was being used by the British Navy, to create an oil-fueled Navy for World War I. And the British wanted to control the petroleum at that point. This is now the area called Kuwait, which is the southern part of Iraq.

So, to look at this historically, you see what the reality is. There is not a conflict within this thing, where you have to intervene and separate the partners of the conflict and imagine you've solved something. You haven't done anything. You've got to go at the main problem. The main problem is imperial geopolitics, centered on the same combination which gave us World War I, gave us World War II, and other things. And often these things change their character in the process of their evolution.

But the mistake is always to try to respond to the way the press poses the question. The newspaper headlines pose the question: "This is the great threat! What are you going to do? Answer the question! What's your solution to this problem?" Well, the solution to this problem is to shoot you! Then I could get a discussion of the real problem! You're breaking up the discussion. You're not allowing us to discuss the real issue. What is the root of the problem? What does this express? Someone comes in with a disease. "Oh, you've got a disease. Where's the bug? We'll kill it for you." Not curing the disease. And that's the problem here.

Redefine the Geometry of the Situation

The United States has always had people, on this question, for a long time, on the water question for this region. The key issue here is, with the present water supplies in this region, you can not maintain a stable form of society. What you need for the whole area is nuclear power, to help us have enough water, and the prospect of a decent life. Then, you have to somehow manage the situation, on the basis that you're creating something positive in the area. And on the basis of doing that, you can win more and more people to your side.

For example, let's take the case of the recent election of Hamas in the Palestine government. You do not want to start a fighting line on this. Crazy "Mrs. Booty" Rice—the worst possible thing imaginable! You don't want to start, dictate, "We don't like you. We won't give any money if you are there"—no, that's only stupid politics! You say, "Okay, now you got the government. What do you want to do? What do you want to *do*?" You don't shut off the money, you increase it! You give something to the Israelis. You increase it.

In other words, you redefine the geometry of the situation, so that you create the condition where people don't shoot. Why? Because they've got something else they also want. And the average Palestinian was upset, and Hamas won, because some of the Palestinians were taking too much of the money for themselves *personally*. And this charge of corruption against them opened the gate for Hamas' victory. Hamas was brought in, because they didn't like the opponent. They were tired of the corruption. Because, the basic problem is that they're hungry! They're desperate! They're hungry. They haven't got anything. So, give them better conditions of life.

Money is cheap. The way George Bush throws it away on silly things? Money is cheap! If you have to buy a peace, if you have to buy a peaceful condition, you buy it. If you have

people getting something good, you can always go to Shimon Peres—you can buy him! He's not a bad guy—you can buy him though. So do it! Get peace! And once you have peace, and once you have people committed to something, they're getting something, that they actually want, you have a different situation.

So instead of looking, "How do we win this fight?" you say, "Why have the fight? How do we change the situation, so we've got something better than a fight going?" "Don't come to the boxing match. We've got a solution. You want money? You want cooperation? Hamas, you've got yourself elected? Oh, good for you! You got elected. Now we have to work with you." Any sane U.S. government, State Department would do that. "Oh, you got elected? Good! Oh—we're glad to meet you! Now we have to talk. What would you like to talk about?" First thing you do! "You need some help? Oh, I'm sure we can find some way to do something."

Now you establish a basis for a relationship, for talking.

If you go to the other side—Netanyahu is not that powerful. Netanyahu is a U.S. agent. He's also partly a British agent, but he's primarily a U.S. agent. Oh, you can pull strings here. You can expose him. You can scandalize his name. Do it!

So, what we're not doing is enough diplomacy, and too much business about how we're going to rig the fight. And I think that's the general answer on this kind of problem: Is, that we've got to stop accepting the way the problem is defined in false terms. Define the problem from an historical standpoint: What is the real problem of the region? Look at the dynamics of the regional situation, and locate the particular problem in the region within the dynamics of the region, not as an isolated him-versus-him kind of thing. And go back to traditional diplomacy. It was corrupt as hell, but it worked.

The Problem in France and Germany

Freeman: Lyn, still on the topic of Iran. This is from a Washington foreign policy analyst, who's actually here in the audience. He says: "Mr. LaRouche, what is the explanation for the German and French turn, on the question of Iran's nuclear program? The British posture is more understandable, given their role in the Iraq War, but can't the Germans and French see the consequences of this turn that they've made?"

LaRouche: Haha! Another case, redefine the question. The French problem, is that you've got two problems. You have a prospective fascist Sarkozy (I sometimes call him Narcozy), who is Minister of the Interior, and sort of the head of the Gestapo. And you have other forces in France. And France is a very opportunistic country, but in part, it has a very specific quality in France, which is important. The banking interests of France, the private banking interests of France, are an integral part of the Synarchist International. Now, the Synarchist International is the organization which invented fascism. Napoleon actually invented it, in a sense, but the Synarchists made it a code, in the middle of the 19th Century. And the Synarchists were essentially a group of French bank-

ers, private bankers, and they created what became known as anarcho-syndicalism, and the organization became known as Synarchism, or the Synarchist International, as it was later called.

Now, this is the organization which did all the dirties in France. It was the aftermath of Napoleon III, did all the dirties. And they are the ones who still control French politics today.

They started fascism. Remember, Italian fascism was designed in France and exported under British license to a Venetian banker, Volpi di Misurata, who introduced it to Italy in the name of Mussolini. But Volpi di Misurata ran Mussolini. But, behind it, were the Synarchists.

Now the Synarchists were unable to get a fascist government in France, until the Nazis gave it to them. What the Synarchists did, is ensured that when the Nazi attack came on France, that the French troops would not fight effectively. Therefore, the Nazis occupied France, and enlisted the French as auxiliaries in the war against the Soviet Union. And divided it in two parts: one called Laval, who was an outright Synarchist, a famous Socialist Synarchist; and the other's the Pétain regime. These forces are still dominant as the private banking interests of France, to the present day. They are German-haters. These were the opponents of de Gaulle, actually. They're German-haters. They commit assassinations. France is the most significant police-state in the world. I sometimes think they have more policemen than citizens, because they have a department of police for this, a department of police for everything. So the problem is there, in part.

Now, what happened, the German European politics today is based on what happened in 1989-1990: Is that when the prospect of the reunification of Germany occurred, after the fall of the Wall, the Thatcher government of Britain, joined by Mitterrand, went to the point that Mitterrand virtually threatened to organize war against Germany, a military attack on Germany, if there was reunification. The United States intervened, that is, the Bush Administration of the time, intervened to prevent that kind of extreme, but submitted to the conditions which were demanded by the French and British, that Germany would be deindustrialized: that there would be no industrial development of the former East Germany, to speak of; there would be no industrial development around Berlin; and Germany would be cut down to size by creating a European currency called the euro, to destroy the power of Germany.

Now, Germany responds to this situation by saying, "Well, we have to submit to the euro, or we have to submit to the European Central Bank, for the time being. But, we have an option. We are an exporting power. We export to China, to India, to other places. We have close economic relations with Russia. We have developed a post-Yeltsin relationship with Putin. And therefore, our German economy is based on its export potential, even though its domestic economy is being crushed, and destroyed even, by the French-British alliance." On the other side, you have a French-German pact,

because the French nation lives on what it sucks of the blood of the Germans. Without that, there is no French economy. France has nuclear power. Germany has almost none—and so forth and so on.

So, the thing is a mess. There is no simple German-French policy. What you have is a hegemonic policy, in which the British, who are really controlling much of the U.S. policy through Cheney's wife, who's nothing but an asset of the Blair crowd—. You have the French are being controlled largely by the British, as sort of hateful, friendly rivals, who agree on some things—on keeping the Germans down! The British and French agree on keeping the Germans down! But, they agree that they have to work with the Germans, because the Germans are supporting the French economy.

Because they're Europeans and they're powerless, relative to Europe, they have to depend upon using France's relations to Russia and France's echo of its relations to Russia, in order to give France a position of European power which it can negotiate with. Now, once having power and having allies, now he has allies to betray. And that's the nature of the politics.

There is another France, a real France, which is not controlled by these bankers—and this is banker's mentality, bankers' deals—and we're in the same period internationally in terms of finance. International finance today is clinically insane! It's no longer productive economy-oriented. There's no sense of reality, in most of international finance today—none.

So, there is no simple answer to the question, because what you have to do is understand the complex of circumstances, which are interacting in the situation. And, of course, I'm close enough to the situation in Europe, to know this fairly well. But I think that in the United States, the tendency is *not* to know what's going on in Europe, and to come to conclusions which accord more with gossip around Washington, more with press gossip and that sort of thing, than it does with reality.

My perception is completely different. There is a rotten government. This Chirac government has become rotten. He's looking for his destiny. Pressure's on him. He betrays people. He betrays his allies. He's controlled largely by the growing Synarchist influence in France, which is a growing Synarchist influence in the world—as here as well. They all know the system is coming down. Like, right now! I don't know what's happening later today, but right now, that thing in Iceland could be the thing that does a blowout of the entire system, comparable to what happened in August-September 1998.

The Privatization of U.S. Ports

Freeman: Lyn, so far, I would say that half of the stack of questions that have come in, are in one way or another, touching on this current port situation: the United Arab Emirates contract with these commercial ports. One of the more

interesting questions, however, on the whole port controversy, comes from someone who is a policy consultant in Washington, D.C. He's an expert on questions of U.S. infrastructure and is a former member of the Presidential Cabinet of a previous Democratic administration.

He says: "Mr. LaRouche, I'm sure you're aware of the current controversy surrounding this recent White House deal to hand the operation of six commercial and two military ports to a United Arab Emirates government-run company. Bush's mishandling of this has led to perhaps the deepest fracturing among Republicans that we've seen since Bush has come to Washington, with some of Bush's most faithful lackeys breaking ranks. But, at the same time, we witness the phenomena of Democrats tripping over each other, with the belief that they have finally found the way to take a position to the right of the Bush Administration.

"At the center of this debate seems to be everyone's heartfelt concern about security issues. However, there is another issue here, that causes me far more concern, which I find very disturbing. As far as I can tell, this issue has only been addressed so far by Senator Feinstein of California, and she has only addressed it peripherally: that is, the apparent privatization of our ports and harbors. It seems that, in fact, a dramatic shift in policy was effected by this administration, without any legislative initiative. I'm not sure what the legal basis for this was, and perhaps it was another case of unitary executive action.

"I'd be interested in your thoughts on this, and your thoughts on how, in fact, you think this should be addressed. Do you think that there is actually a security concern, because the contract will be held by the United Arab Emirates? Or do you think that the larger concern is that we may be in for another Enron-style catastrophe?"

LaRouche: All kinds of catastrophes are possible, but the issue here is somewhat different. Go to the real issue. The real issue is that there is globalization, and deindustrialization. The thing that's going to straighten out a lot of this, is when someone has the guts to raise, in the United States, the question of return to nuclear power. Because that's going to put the thing on the table. If you're going to have a U.S. economy, that's the issue—you're not going to continue under present policies—if you're going to have a U.S. economy, you're going to reverse most of the policy trends, established between 1971 and 1981. That is, from the destruction of the Bretton Woods System, through the exit of Brzezinski from office.

Kissinger, the Nixon Administration, destroyed the U.S. international position, by taking the power in the international financial-monetary system away from the United States, into an international cabal under globalization: that is, globalization in the form of the floating-exchange-rate system. That destroyed us in the Western Hemisphere. It destroyed the U.S. economy, from the outside. It destroyed the economy of Mexico. It destroyed the economies of the nations of South



Capt. Albert E. Theberge

Containerized shipping at Port Elizabeth, New Jersey. The real issue in the dispute over a Dubai-based company taking control of U.S. port contracts, LaRouche said, is “globalization and deindustrialization.” The solution is an end to the “post-industrial” shutdown of nuclear power, ushered in by Zbigniew Brzezinski.

America, in particular. The destruction of the nations, our neighbors to the South, in Mexico and in South America in particular, was a destruction of the strength of the United States strategically. It was a terrible mistake.

What happened in '77 through '81, under Brzezinski, who had essentially the same rotten policies, was Brzezinski destroyed the *internal* economy of the United States, by the Trilateral Commission's deregulation, and by the nuclear policies associated with Brzezinski. Brzezinski was for nuclear war, but not for nuclear power! And, I almost got killed by Brzezinski, or by Brzezinski's friends, because I exposed the fact that he planned to stage a nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union. I did that in 1976, and that lost him the ability to run that operation, because I exposed it. I exposed it with letters from his correspondence, from his own people: that he had that intention, of a nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union, once Carter had been elected. I exposed it publicly,

on Election Eve of that year, in 1976, and that resulted in somebody putting out a hit operation against me, from Brzezinski, who had created a special intelligence operation for this kind of thing. So, that's that part of the history.

Now, if you understand that, you have to recognize—which is what the difficulty is, in the members of the Senate, the members of the Democratic Party particularly, and many Republicans—is that the policies, the change in policies, which was established officially from 1971 through 1981—and things that happened afterward, but that change in policies, the change in U.S. policy fundamentally, is what has ruined our country and made us weak. If we are not prepared to *reverse* those policies, then anything we're going to do is going to be a failure—and you've given up the fight.

The Key Requirement Is Nuclear Energy

So therefore, the first way to do it, you've got to confront this question of nuclear energy. This has come up clearly on the question of power: Because without nuclear power, if you're not willing to have 800 MW high-temperature gas-cooled reactors, in the territory of the United States in a number of places, you can not deal with the so-called petroleum crisis, oil crisis in the United States. You have to be able to produce an economical, efficient alter-

native. That requires an 800 MW high-temperature gas-cooled reactor. In other words, you've got to reach the threshold of energy flux-density, so-called, in which you can do the chemical operation necessary to use a water-based development of a hydrogen-based fuel. In that case, then you can use hybrids and so forth types of cars, and you can solve the so-called energy problem in the United States. You can also produce the kind of fuels you can use for heating homes and all that sort of thing. If you're willing to do that, then you can do something.

Fair Trade, Not Free Trade

If you're not willing to reverse free-trade and go back to fair trade, you can't reorganize the U.S. economy. Another little thing. Were they willing to do it? Are they willing to argue for it? Is the Democratic Party willing to go back to a fair-trade policy against free trade? Is the Democratic Party

prepared to oppose globalization? Are Republican allies of the Democratic Party prepared to oppose globalization in terms of defending fair-trade policies: that is, a protectionist policy for the product of the American farmer and American industry? Are they prepared to do that?

Are they prepared, at the same time, to realize that over the past period, since 1971, we have used negligence as a weapon to destroy the basic economic infrastructure of the United States? By not replacing plants that are *wearing out*: In terms of water systems, power systems, and so forth, we have destroyed the economic potential of the United States. Are we willing to reverse that?

We need to have a mass of employment, which will shift employment from emphasis on low-paid service employment, to higher-paid productive employment. How do you do that? Large-scale investment in infrastructure, which will create industrial employment, and similar kinds of employment. That means you have to change the ratio of infrastructure to current production, back to what was comparable to the 1970s. Are you willing to do that? Are you willing to reverse the 68er formula? And go back to a high-technology economy which is able to sustain pensions, able to sustain health care and so forth, or not?

So therefore, if you try to take some particular issue, like the port issue, by itself, you're in a trap, because you have *no principled position* from which to fight! This means that you can't do wheeling-and-dealing politics in the Congress. This means, you've got to go out with young people, you've got to go out to the mass of the population, where they live, and you've got to start organizing the mass of the population for these kinds of policies, directly, toe-to-toe.

Then, if you've got the votes, you bring the votes back to Washington, and you get the politicians to change their policy. Are they going to continue to try to play for the big money, to pay for their campaigns, for the advertising, and thus be controlled by the big money? Or, are they willing to get the people back into the voting act again? Because most of the people in the lower 80% of the population either don't vote, because they're disgusted, or demoralized, or they don't know where they live themselves, to have an address from which to vote; and because they don't trust the parties which have turned away from them.

Where are the Democratic Party meetings? Where are the people represented? The Democratic Party used to be based, the power of the party, particularly in the Roosevelt period, was based on going to the people, political organizations of the people. The people own this country, not the politicians. The politicians are elected and rule with the consent of the people. You want to change the country? Go back and give the people a reason to vote for you, by giving them what they need. And not just giving them what they think they need, but making it clear to them what it is they really need, technically. They'll ask and they'll challenge, and you have to answer the questions. But, if you're right, you can win. You can win them

over, particularly in a time of crisis, where none of the answers they're getting, presently, are working.

And so therefore, on the port thing? Yes, we must control—we must say, and protect, “*defend our national public infrastructure*”. Port facilities, rail lines, similar kinds of things, power systems, are *infrastructure*. They're not something that belongs to some corporate investment: They're something that the whole territory needs, or the whole nation needs—that thing. Now, if the nation needs that whole thing, it's not up to some private interest to come along, and give it to us. If the nation needs infrastructure, it's up to the government to provide it, and tax to raise the money to support it. If it's a private venture, yes, it's qualified, it's competent, okay? Normal rules: Start the business. If it's a good business, help it. But if it's infrastructure, it belongs to the government, because it is the *responsibility* of government, because it is for *all the people*. Schools are for all the people, not for some people. Education is for all the people. Health care is for all the people. Therefore, whoever does it, the responsibility to make sure that it's done, is the responsibility of government.

And the way you get that done, is you go out to the people you're supposed to represent, the so-called general welfare, and you appeal to them on behalf of not only themselves, but their descendents, their children and grandchildren. “We need this. Here's why. “And make it clear to them. If they know you're on their side, and you're willing to fight, they'll support you.

The problem with the party, is they want to play games, as in salon games; play debating games in salons; debate it through talking idiots on Sunday morning television. And that's our problem here.

Yes, they're right, Feinstein is right. What she said is absolutely correct. It's weak. It doesn't go much to the point, but at least it says something. The other stuff is—it's kind of loony.

My view is, what is really going on, is not the port issue. And standing away, you can see this a mile away, or 10 miles away, or 50 miles away: The issue is, the shooting event in Texas has so undermined the authority of the Vice-President, that Republicans realize they've got to get out from under that *now!* And what they're going to look for, is some gimmick which gets them off the hook of the Cheney-Bush party. It has to be a gimmick which has appeal to *their* constituency. And the Republicans who are not clinically insane, will generally respond to—a sort of a chauvinistic kind of patriotism. “It's ours! We don't want some foreigners—‘ferriners’ coming in and taking it over from us!” Eh? And the Republicans will go for that, you know. They go for that. They like that. Being a little bit chauvinistic helps, you know. And they often confuse the difference between chauvinism and patriotism.

But anyway. It's a situation which is created by the growing discredit of the eminently discredited, stupid psychotic President and his Vice-President, who's in charge of vice,

who doesn't aim very well. So, therefore, that's the situation. It's a symptom of the fact that the Democrats failed at the beginning of the year. They failed to continue the initiative they had going for them in the Senate, during the year 2005. And came into the year 2006, and did a pratfall on their face. And didn't have their "thing together," as it's said.

So, therefore, over the Alito nomination, they lost their "thing," and they're still searching for it, wherever it went. Now, what this represents, is this event, the fact that you have a Democratic-Republican coalition on *something*, which makes sense, is defensible, use it, because you've got to do this to get this momentum back again. *You've got to get a majority momentum in the Congress, together, to start to move this government in a positive direction.* Without that, you're not going to go anywhere.

Now, every time this administration discredits itself, that's a plus. Some things it does to discredit itself will work, politically. Others will not. The things that will work, which are the right thing to do, do it! The more important thing, is to get people to talk to each other, in a collaborative way, especially across the aisle, to get beyond party politics, to get to patriotic politics. That is, politics for the benefit of the nation. And to get people back into organizing the people out there on the streets, and the communities, to get them in the act, and use their power, the power of their vote: We can determine the results of elections. The people can do that, if they are mobilized to that. To be mobilized to do that, they have to be motivated to do that. To be motivated to do that, you've got to *educate* them, because they have a lot of wrong ideas—they don't know what is going on. But they will listen to you, if they think you're on the right side, because they want an alternative.

Now they know, they say, "This thing is no good. Get this guy out of here! We don't want him any more! This is too much. This shooting, I don't care about it—he's no good, he's gotta go! Get rid of him!" And a *\$32,000 shotgun*—in the days of this amount of poverty, in this country, does not make a guy popular, as a politician!

'Cheney's Coup'

Freeman: This is a question from actually, a very well-known international journalist, who did not want his name mentioned—but he wants his question answered.

He says: "In the now-infamous post-marksanship interview that Cheney gave to Fox TV, a question came up regarding a statement made in Libby's defense papers. Libby detailed there, or at least his lawyers did, that he was authorized to disclose to members of the press classified sections of the pre-war National Intelligence Estimate on Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction. When the question was put to Cheney, Cheney calmly responded, that he has the power to declassify intelligence. Even Brit Hume looked surprised, and Cheney simply responded that there was an Executive Order to that effect.

"I've learned that on March 25, 2003, President Bush signed Executive Order 13292. This has, up to now, been a very little-discussed document. But in reading it, it grants the greatest expansion of the power of the Vice-President in American history. The order gives the Vice-President the same ability to classify intelligence, as the President. By controlling classification, the Vice-President can, in effect, as I understand it, control intelligence and, through that, control foreign policy.

"Bush clearly operates in the radical notion of the unitary executive. He says that the President has inherent and limitless power in his role as Commander-in-Chief, and that it's above the system of checks and balances. By his extraordinary Executive Order, he elevated Cheney to the same level, and he acknowledged that Cheney was already the *de facto* Executive of this government in national security. Never before has any President diminished and divided his power in this manner. Now, the outrageous notion of the unitary executive seems to inherently include the unitary Vice-President.

"This Executive Order, at least as far as I'm concerned, bears all of the earmarks of Cheney's vicar, David Addington. Addington has been by Cheney's side for more than three decades, and inside the Executive branch, it is clear that Addington mimicks his boss's bullying, sarcasm, and intimidation. Sources tell me that there are few documents of concern to the Vice-President, even Executive Orders, that ever reach the desk of the President without first passing through David Addington's hands. Look at the record. To advance their scenario for the Iraq War, Cheney and company first pressured, and then dismissed, the intelligence community when they provided a contrary analysis. Even Paul Pillar, who is a former CIA official, has stated publicly that the administration used intelligence not to inform decision-making, but to justify a decision already made.

"On domestic spying conducted without legal approval of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, it was Addington who moved to isolate and crush the justified internal dissent from James Comey, then the Deputy Attorney General. On the torture policy, as we are learning more and more in revelations this week, once again, it was Addington, who intervened when the General Counsel to the U.S. Navy called the policies of torture unlawful and dangerous. It was Addington, who told him that the policies would continue, and that flexibility had to be preserved.

"Ironically, when Dick Cheney was Secretary of Defense under the first President Bush, he reprimanded Vice-President Dan Quayle for asserting power he did not possess, when Quayle called a meeting of the National Security Council, when Old Man Bush was abroad. Cheney knew very well that the Vice-President had no authority in the chain of command. Now it seems he does.

"I'm calling this 'Cheney's Coup.' I'd be interested in knowing what your thoughts are on this, and whether you think there's any potential for either a Congressional or judi-

cial intervention in this, since it seems to be contrary to the intention of the Constitution.

LaRouche: Certainly it is contrary to the intention of the Constitution, because it creates a parliamentary kind of feature inside the Presidency; which is the intention of the Constitution, is to create an Executive, in which that's not possible. We don't want a prime minister, or other parts of the ministry, like the foreign minister, who can intervene and override the Chief Executive.

But, in this case, I think the point is not to get simple legalistic action. What's needed here is a mood shift, and I think we already have the mood shift. I used to like this thing from McCaulay on *The History of England*, from the accession of the Stuarts, in which he described the case of Lord Jeffreys, the Chief Justice, or that old man, who came out of a whores' court to become the Chief Justice of England, and conducted the Bloody Assizes, which were really a Nazi-like operation throughout the continent. And then, when the Revolution, the Glorious Revolution, occurred, Jeffreys was seen—according to McCaulay—fleeing the mob in his night-shirt. He eventually did live after that, but he lived in some degree of obscurity.

I think what we want here, is the effect of Cheney fleeing the mob in his nightshirt—whether Mrs. Cheney is with him, or not. And that's the point: The thing you have to do here, is you have to defeat this bastard (as they say). I use the term advisedly, because I'm not even certain he was born.

Get the Bum Out!

But in any case, instead of trying to play parliamentary politics with an issue like this, the question is, do you have sufficient groundswell in the U.S. population and in the institutions, to get the bum out! If there's sufficient groundswell to get the bum out, the bum will be out! It's that simple. But it has to be done forthwith.

I think the incident that happened in Texas, where he's no straight shooter, shall we say, came out of there probably drunk. I mean, the 14 hours' wait before the press got on the story, and so forth, all this indicates there was a cover-up of nothing other than Cheney's drinking habits. And look, the guy's going around, he's shooting from the front—with three guys like this, and he's shooting from the front, and he turns around—BOOM! And hit the guy who's less than, probably less than 30 yards behind him. Or less than 30 feet behind him, actually, or something like that—because the concentration of the pellet pattern on the victim was so close, that it couldn't have been the greater distance. He just turned around and shot a guy. Now, that would be easy if he's drunk, or half-drunk, or having those kinds of effects.

But first of all, he's breaking all the rules: He's got a shotgun, he's turning around, and shooting the guy behind him! That's the number-one "no-no"! You take his license away from him. Take his pecker away from him, too! He



U.S. Air Force/Master Sgt. Randy L. Michell

Dick Cheney in Baghdad. "Instead of trying to play parliamentary politics," said LaRouche, "the question is, do you have sufficient groundswell in the U.S. population and in the institutions, to get the bum out!"

might shoot that in the wrong direction. Who knows what that might lead to.

But the key thing here, is that we have a groundswell developing against Cheney. And what you're dealing with, your dealing with the *aroma* of the situation, has become decisive.

So therefore, rather than waiting, and trying to say, "When can we get—? What technical composition of things to get this guy out of there?" I want him out of there, tomorrow! And the first thing on the the groundswell which induces him to either quit, or induces someone to tell him he's fired, is what we want. We don't want to limit the options. We're not going to shoot the guy, because we want him around, so he suffers—don't end of suffering. But, we want to get the guy out, for the sake of the nation. And what you need, is a groundswell to do it.

If you have a groundswell to get rid of him, then the institutions will find a perfectly legal way, to get him out of there! Rather than trying to come up with some chemistry, some magic formula, some lawyer's formula—I think we're too used to American lawyers these days. We've got so many of them, I guess that's why they're so influential.

And we try to come up with these schemes. "We're going to do this operation, that operation." I have people coming to me all the time with schemes, schemes, *schemes!* I say, "Get all these schemes out of here!" Have you got a groundswell for it, or not? Have you got a basis for it, or not? Have you

got a justification for it, or not? Have you got a good reason to do it, or not? Maybe there's a better way to approach the whole problem. Maybe you should redefine the whole problem.

In this case, there's no question: We've got to get the guy out. What you need is a groundswell. You *have* a groundswell. That \$32,000 shotgun, misused, with an important figure hit—shot. And then, the obvious signs of a cover-up, including the Armstrong family and so forth, who were all orchestrating this thing to cover this thing up! What do you do? How do you overcome the cover-up? You get a groundswell, that won't let go. And my job is, to tell you: Get a groundswell going.

A Question About 'Political Muscle'

Freeman: The next question is from a Democratic Party consultant based here in Washington.

He says: "Lyn, during the last gathering of this type, you emphasized that stopping Alito was critical. In fact, you identified it as a point of no return, in protecting our system of government. In the immediate aftermath of what you said, it seemed that the Democratic leadership in Congress was preparing for precisely that kind of fight. Within 48 hours, the Democratic Caucus had closed ranks and preparations were under way for a filibuster. As more information was filtered out to members of the Caucus, several of the Democrats in the Group of 14, who had previously said that they would *block* filibusters, indicated that in this special circumstance, they would in fact support a filibuster.

"Then, inexplicably, the leadership flinched. And once the leadership flinched, things began to fall apart. Sen. John Kerry made a heroic 11th-hour attempt to block the nomination, and announced that he would, in fact, lead a filibuster. While some members questioned his motives, the bottom line as far as I'm concerned, was that he stepped in, when others stepped back. Unfortunately, in something of a replay of his Presidential campaign, it was too little, too late. The promise of a fight, in fact, a more auspicious fight, on the question of the domestic spying issue, not surprisingly, fell apart in the aftermath of the capitulation on Alito.

"Today, with the administration's approval ratings dropping to an unprecedented low level, the Democrats still seem to be in total disarray. We're a leaderless group, and there doesn't seem to be any emergent leadership in sight. Now, you've continued to speak with fully audible clarity. And although what you say is taken very, very seriously, it still seems to be the case, that more open collaboration with you carries the threat of the most severe kinds of penalty.

"So my question has two parts: Is there any cause for optimism here? Do we have among us the makings of a leadership, that can lead the party and the population through this dark time?

"Secondly, I'd be interested in knowing what your plans

are, for building the kind of political muscle that actually would hold at least the promise of protecting whatever brave soul might step forward, because they do indeed genuinely favor open collaboration with you. I'm not asking the question cynically. I'm asking it, because I think that, until you do that, this problem is going to persist."

Toward a Democratic Platform

LaRouche: Well, that's the reason I propose to do something in lieu of a party platform. As you may recall, we had the situation in July in Boston, of 2004, where the party had no programmatic perspective on winning an election. And even after Boston, after it was recognized that I was right on this issue, because of the platform, it was possible to activate around Kerry, the campaign which, if it had started a little earlier and gone a little faster, could probably have won the election. The fact of the inertial factors were, I think, the key thing in the loss, because a little stronger mobilization and a little less vacillation in trying to handle people—particularly what the Vice-Presidential candidate did, was typical of the kind of campaigning which was required in that circumstance. I think Kerry came onto the case a little bit too slow.

I think even as of Labor Day, he could still have won that election. But his campaign came on too slow, and didn't reflect what I knew had to be done: with particularly the Ohio case, where we were *in* the Ohio case, and saw the situation there, and acted. We saw the factors were there to ensure a victory, but the deployment was not made consistent with those factors, to bring about that victory. But after the event, then the factors we saw then, became more apparent.

So, the question, my view here is, I'm stepping in with this platform statement, which is not a usual kind of platform. I don't believe in the usual kind of platform. It's a fish-and-chips platform, British-style. You know, "What would you vote for?"—everybody gets their tidbit in the list, and that's not good.

What you need for the American people, or any people, in a crisis: You need a conception, a conception of what the issue is, not what the *issues are*. What the issue is. The issue, now, is simply, that we're about to lose our nation, and about to lose civilization with it. And if we allow the process of globalization, and the measures which have been in progress for the past 40 years to continue, especially the past 35 years, this country hasn't got a damned chance in the time ahead.

Now, if somebody wants to put out a list of suggestions, they should take them someplace else: I think we used to have outhouses, or some other place, where you put those suggestion boxes. What we need is a clear conception of what this nation is, which is what I've tried to provide, in the statement which is going to be coming out this weekend.

But: *What is the history of European civilization? Who are we, this nation? What do we represent? What do we represent, in the world today?*

Ah! Well, we have to start with ancient Greece, as I did today. If you don't start with ancient Greece, you don't know what European civilization is! If you don't trace the history of European civilization from ancient Greece, you don't know a damned thing about Europe or about the United States! All this other stuff is junk. The significant struggle has been, from the beginning, the Asian model, the typification of evil, the Babylonian model, as a small group of people with imperial power, treated the rest of the people as human cattle, or as cattle. And that is evil!

With Solon of Athens, and with other developments like that, the concept of a society based on the general welfare, or

A platform should be an assertion of citizenship. It should not be a partisan statement; it should be a statement by a party, but not a partisan statement. It should be an appeal to all citizens, to support a statement of a partisan, who is making a proposal, which is not an expression of partisan self-interest, or special interest, but the interest of the nation, and the interest of the future of humanity.

what is called in Greek "*agapē*," the responsibility of the individual and the immortality of the individual lies in what they do while they're living, for those that come afterward. It's the continuation of their existence, and what comes after their death, is what they do for humanity while they're alive. Do they fulfill a mission, while they're alive? Okay. Society based on a mission, a mission-orientation, where immortality is defined in terms of what you do for those who come after you. A soldier dies for his nation, for the sake of those who come after him. Build a nation, at great sacrifice, for the sake of what comes after you. That is the difference between you and a monkey, and some people have decided to become monkeys, or if they think they're important, Great Apes.

The Purpose of an Election Campaign

So, that's the problem! So therefore, you don't think in terms of what we're defending, you don't think about the next election as the next candy-sale or whatever, or cake bake-sale. You have to think of each election, as a process of trying to continue a process, of development of a system of self-government, which is best epitomized by the intention of our

Founders in creating the Constitution of this republic. What do we have to do, to preserve this republic, and to further the well-being of humanity as a whole, through our existence? That's the question of every election. What principles are we fighting for? What mistakes do we make? What has to be corrected? What policies, what laws have to be reversed, in order to accomplish that purpose?

The purpose of an election campaign is to cause the people to *arise* from their slumber, where they're sitting and thinking about petty thoughts, about petty issues, and petty this and petty that; and get them to think of themselves as big people: as *citizens*, which is not a term of contempt, it's the highest rank of all! You're a citizen of a republic, you are a person who embodies, or should embody, that republic in your person. You are taking responsibility for the republic, in case nobody else is there to do it! You can be called upon. You know, there's always the neighbor who is the one who can be called upon, when someone was in trouble in the neighborhood. That's a citizen. Or, someone at a higher rank in society, who can be called upon, when needed. That's a citizen. But especially one who is called upon, when the nation is in danger as a whole, who steps forward with the ideas which are needed to save the nation. That's a citizen.

And a platform should be a statement of citizenship, an assertion of citizenship. It should not be a partisan statement; it should be a statement by a party, but not a partisan statement. It should be an appeal to all citizens, to support a statement of a partisan, who is making a proposal, which is not an expression of partisan self-interest, or special interest, but the interest of the nation, and the interest of the future of humanity.

And this is where we fall short. We are horse-trading. We're trading off deals with people, like corrupt politicians. We're not appealing to the conscience of people. We are not as politicians even trying to *understand*, what it is to be a citizen! We don't know history. We take mythology. We see what the *Washington Post* has to say, or the *New York Times*, or whatever. We have no independent thinking. We don't think scientifically. We don't sense the humanity of thousands of years living inside us.

When you see the continuity from ancient Greece in European Civilization, and the struggle up to today, and see yourself as a continuation of that struggle, and are able to identify the process of development which brought us from there to where you are here, and to see where that's leading tomorrow, is the state of mind which defining a program requires.

And people say: "Keep it simple. Keep it simple. Keep it down-to-earth, keep it down-to-earth."

Keep it down to earth? That's where they bury you!

Economic 'Expertise'

Freeman: Okay, Lyn, we have a few variations of that question. I'm just going to put them to you, to handle them as you like.

He says: “Lyn, honest Democrats admit privately, that your personal intervention into the Boston Convention, specifically by offering a programmatic alternative to the sitting government, along with a similar intervention, at the time, by former President Bill Clinton to reorganize John Kerry’s failing campaign, actually provided a path which should have led to a Democratic electoral victory.” (I think, as you know, it didn’t).

“Once again, we are heading into a general election, without any programmatic framework to address the critical issues facing the population. Now, the Democratic Party did come up with a statement of intent that was a credible starting point, and, I know you are familiar with it.¹ Since then, though, we have made very little progress in coming up with a national platform. I am aware of the fact that you are writing such a platform, and I await it anxiously.

“I firmly believe that nothing less than a unified, clearly stated, national platform has any hope of delivering a Democratic victory. But here is my question. You always say, that the problem is that nobody but you has the economic expertise to guide this nation out of the current crisis. That may be true, but I have my doubts as to whether or not the problem is one of economic expertise. From where I sit, my view, increasingly, is that the deficiency is anatomical. And, I’d like you to comment on that.”

LaRouche: Maybe a deficiency of genitalia, or a surfeit of it!

No, it is economics. But, see, people don’t understand economics, that’s part of the problem. They think of economics in terms of accounting.

Now, an accountant is a person who knows nothing about economics; otherwise, he couldn’t be an accountant. An accountant is talking with figures and so forth, which correspond to something called money. And, money is not a measure of value. If you don’t believe it, you should see the prices today, and, see what you get with them. You should see what’s happening on the international financial markets today. Money is *fake*, today. And, you have people talking about “the economy is growing.” Yes, the amount of money is growing, but the economy is collapsing! And, as long as people try to explain political issues, and substantive issues, in terms of accounting, they don’t know what the hell they are talking about! And any suggestions they make are likely to be incompetent, or worse. Or actually damaging.

Economics is physical, but, it is physical in a special way. It’s physical in the sense, that man is not a monkey—though Bush tries. Man is a creative creature, *the only living, creative creature known*. Man has creative powers of mind, which no animal has. Every animal has a relatively fixed potential relative population-density, depending upon the conditions

in which they live. If man were an ape, there would not be more than 3 or 4 million apes of our type, cluttering the Earth. The reason that we have over 6 billion people today, is because the human mind is capable of making discoveries of universal physical principle, *of comprehending the universe in which we live*—not simply smelling up the rear end of the animal next to it, which accountants do.

So therefore, the issue is: the *creative powers of mankind*. Creative powers which are denied to exist by every single empiricist; denied by every positivist; despised by every exponent of Information Theory; denied by every exponent of synthetic intelligence—popular things these days. People who believe in Information Theory or synthetic intelligence, are incompetents. They’re dangerously incompetent, probably psychotic, as I suspect in the case of John von Neumann. That sort of thing.

The problem here, of economics: It is *not* paper! It is *not* accounting. It is physical. But it’s not just physical objects. Economics is the power of mankind to *increase his power*, the willpower of man *over* physical nature! And, it’s by production. It’s not by software, it’s not by Information Theory, it’s not by services economy. It’s by actually changing things. It’s creating an environment, which is suitable to man. It’s power systems; it’s water systems; large-scale agricultural development; it’s inventions. But, it’s, above all, scientific discovery and Classical artistic composition.

These are the qualities of man. That is economy. That is *physical* economy: the increase, and protection of man’s power in and over nature, to meet the requirements of man. *And*, as an instrument in nature, to make nature better.

The Composition of the Planet

For example, the great example of this is the question which I have raised often recently: this question of Noösphere and Biosphere. There are three categories, physical categories, of events in the Earth, today. One, we call the non-living matter, the abiotic domain. Then you find the same material of the abiotic domain, when it passes through living organisms, undergoes the changes in states, which never occur in the abiotic domain, of the same material. It then discharges this result back into the environment, which gives you the Biosphere.

So, you have, on this planet—you have, the planet has been changing its composition, over billions of years, especially since the oxidation phase, about 2 billion years ago. It has been changing the composition so that the crust of the Earth is increasing in weight, relative to the Earth as a whole. But, also, not only the crust, but the atmospheric crust, the atmosphere above the oceans and land, has been increasing as a percentile of the total planet. Now, the planet, otherwise, is abiotic, essentially non-living processes. Living processes have changed the Earth, by increasing the crust, as a manifestation of the power of life over non-living things. And life is a principle. Nothing is ever generated that’s living, from non-

1. See House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi’s (D-Calif.) speech at Harvard on Dec. 2, 2005, “A New Era of American Innovation and Competition,” reprinted in *EIR*, Dec. 16, 2005.

living processes. Life comes only, is generated *only* by a living process. Life is injected into the non-living process, but it never comes from *within* the non-living process, as such.

Then you have another one: human cognition. Now you find that the amount of the Earth's weight, which is attributable to the activities of man, and man's intellect, as opposed to the Biosphere, is increasing *relative* to the Biosphere, as well as relative to the planet as a whole. So, human thought, human cognitive, creative thought, is a more powerful force than life itself, and a more powerful force than any non-living process. *That is really what economics is.* And, it lies in the development of the individual mind of the individual person, as a social person, to the degree that that person is helping to *generate* discoveries, which, applied to nature, applied to the conditions of life, will improve man's power in the universe.

Our object is *not* to maintain the United States. Our object is to make it grow, is to make it wealthier, to make it healthier, to improve it. To create things that nobody ever dreamed could exist before. To explore the nearby planets, to find out what their geology and chemistry is. To discover how to deal with those planets, as we may have to go out and deal with them. That's economics. It's *physical* economy. It's the application of the quality of the mind, which we associate with creative discoveries in science, to the universe around us. It's the nature of the individual person, which distinguishes the individual person from an ape or a monkey—an accountant. What an accountant can do, any monkey can do. It's just that an accountant can do it better. And the monkey has a mind of its own—which is sometimes dangerous.

Anyway, so that's the point.

The issue here, is to get people to stop thinking in terms of *money* terms! Money is *drek*. Money is nothing. Money is merely a medium of exchange, which government, if it's smart, controls.

Real wealth is that which is created by the human mind, with its creative powers. Real wealth, and the creation of wealth, is what is a manifestation of man's immortality, relative to the mortality of *all the other living species*. And, once you have a grasp of *that*, then you have a real understanding of economy. And, *until* you have a grasp of that, you *don't* have a real understanding of economy.

What you have to do, is to get economy understood by the people: is you have to bring it home *to their lives*. You have to bring it home to the question of their immortality. What about them, separates them from the characteristics of an animal, who dies? What lives on, of a deceased person, after they died? What have they done, that has a permanent effect on the future of mankind, after they've died? What is the manifestation, and proof, of their immortality? In their creativity? And, it is by appealing to that, and getting people out of the sliminess, the lowness, the pettiness, of the existence which people accept for themselves today, to see themselves as a wonderful being, a human being. And see what in that

creativity that the human being is capable of, it's the beauty of being human. And, to realize that if you can be creative, while being human, *you can die with a smile on your face.*

Why Rohatyn Is a Fascist

Freeman: The next question was submitted by a prominent California Democrat, who submitted the question prior to the webcast.

He said: "Dear Lyn, I look forward to your webcast. With your aid and with the aid of many of your representatives here on the West Coast, many of us in California became clear about the fraudulent so-called Schwarzenegger. (I think he actually exists though.) Not that we could trust him to do anything for the people of our state, but your analysis helped.


"However, there are many Democrats who are now promoting the national plan put forward by Felix Rohatyn, as the counter to Schwarzenegger. I know you've addressed this before, but would you please, again, explain this, and explain why what Rohatyn is putting forward is really *not* a serious plan to rebuild the nation's infrastructure?"

LaRouche: Rohatyn is a fascist! It's so obvious! But, he is a fascist with a program. He is a member of the Synarchist International. Nazism, the organization of Nazism on the continent of Europe, was organized from France, around Lazard Frères, a bank. It's the center of Synarchist banking circles of France. And this is the center of fascism.

Now, the objective of these Nazis, is not that they are Nazis under any ordinary sense—though Rohatyn has done a few Nazi-like things in his life, like Big MAC, for example. And some people know about that. But, these are a special kind of bankers: They're called Venetian bankers. And, they have a memory of Babylon, actually—they're really Babylonians: They babble on, and babble on, and babble on. That's the trouble with them!

So, their conception is that they had their heyday in the time of ancient Babylon, and they are the epitome of evil in history. That was before the swastika was invented, actually.

So, then they go on, and then they become Venetians. Now, you have this situation in the period from about 1000 AD to the Black Death period in Europe, in which these fellows with the Norman chivalry, ran Europe in a reign of terror, called Crusades. And there were many more Crusades, than those that were actually called Crusades. The Crusades was a method. The Crusades are the origin, essentially, of fascism, in the sense that, even though the idea existed beforehand, the idea of masses of people going out and killing masses of people, not as human beings, but as beasts, which is what the Inquisition did. And this concept of the Inquisition, which was established as the Holy League under the Venetian rule during the 12th and 13th Century, that *this* is the source of Nazism. As was recognized by the founders of fascism, who created Napoleon, based on this model. Napoleon was developed as a personality, on the basis of the model of Torquemada, as The Executioner. So, you have this kind of process.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Felix Rohatyn (left) is a member of the Synarchist International—the fascists who put Hitler into power. Vladimir Jabotinsky (center) was also a flunky of the Synarchists; although Jewish, he was a fascist himself, and even appealed to Hitler for an alliance. George Shultz (right) is a specimen of higher-level Synarchist financier-oligarch.

So, in this situation, Rohatyn symbolizes people, as he says, and has said openly—and said to me, as a threat to me, he said: The nation-states, today, are less important than large financial complexes. The world should be run by large financial complexes. The day of the nation-state is over, except some nation-states will continue to exist. But the world is going to be run by a financier oligarchy.

That is exactly what was done, during the so-called medieval period, with the Crusades run by the Venetians, using the Norman chivalry, and religious warfare.

That's what the intention is.

Now the intention, therefore, is to destroy the nation-state, to concentrate wealth, as it is being concentrated now by all this rape of industry. Industry is being raped internationally, by hedge funds, that are taking over and looting corporations, so the corporations either don't exist, or they become simply creatures of the hedge-fund interests. The hedge funds are the major banks! The major banks are the hedge funds. The hedge funds are their creation. They are running around the world pirating, stealing everything—like Biche and Mouche from the House of Bardi in the early part of the 14th Century! The same thing.

Their idea is to set up a permanent system, like the Venetian system, with Norman chivalry, during the medieval period, in which the power of the state is virtually non-existent, except by consent of the bankers. And the bankers run the world. And, the bankers have an enforcing arm, such as the Norman chivalry, to do the killing.

That is Cheney's policy. That's the Bush Administration

policy. That's the policy of George Shultz. That is Felix Rohatyn's policy! What does he say? He says, "private interest, private interest, private interest!"

You want private money?

Yeah, I got a hedge fund, that is ready to come in and take over your firm, in a take-over operation, based on what Scalia calls shareholder value, move in next to a corporation with a big show of money; say, "Now we represent the stockholders." Take the firm, *loot* the firm—hmm?—by paying big dividends, or big portfolios to people; loot the place; run it down into bankruptcy, and throw the carcass away—and move on with the gathered wealth, and move on to the next place!

That's what's happening to the automobile industry right now! That's what's happening to the industry of Europe right now. *This is fascism!* Felix Rohatyn is a fascist! And the key thing, to learn the lesson from the fact that some people don't realize he's a fascist: You understand now how Hitler came to power in Germany! Because, nobody thought Hitler was a Nazi.

You had Vladimir Jabotinsky. Vladimir Jabotinsky wrote two letters to Adolf Hitler, after Hitler came into power, and appealed to Hitler for an alliance! Dumb Jabotinsky, apart from being nasty, was also somewhat stupid. Now Jabotinsky, who was a fascist himself, but a pro-Italian fascist, not what the Nazis proved to be, believed that Hitler really was not an anti-Semite; that Hitler had anti-Semites in his party, and that Jabotinsky could convince him to stop it, to break it up. So, Jabotinsky made two desperate appeals to Adolf Hitler, per-

sonally, for an alliance, and Hitler turned him down. (How terrible.)

Now, this is the example: People did not understand, did not *recognize* the danger. The danger was clear. The philosophy was there. They didn't fight! They said, "Keep your head low, don't get into trouble"—and, then they were marched off, and killed! And that can happen here. It can happen to anyone. And, the cowards are saying, "I'm not ready to fight Cheney."

But, Cheney's nothing. Cheney's like Rohatyn. More stupid than Rohatyn. He'd get killed too. He is not the movement. He's only a flunky. But, *behind* it, is George Shultz. And, behind George Shultz and what he represents in the United States, is a concert of these fascist bankers: The same type of bankers, the same species, the same motivation, of the Americans and British, who raised the funds to put Hitler into power in Germany, knowing what he was! And only gave up on him, when they discovered he was going to march westward first, instead of eastward. And, who went back, once Roosevelt was dead—the same damned Nazis who had financed Hitler!—came back and picked on Truman as their boy, to put us through Hell, here in the United States, and go as far as they dared at the time, in destroying us.

But, those of us who returned from war, were not going to put up with that stuff, here, then. But, the *children* of my generation, were prepared to embrace Hitler. Because my generation knew what the difference was—they didn't. They thought that pleasure-seeking, and what they "learned" from what the Congress of Cultural Perversion—or something—was taught was right. They didn't fight.

Sometimes you have to fight. I'm not much on fighting. Most times you can work around it. But, sometimes you have to fight. Sometimes, you put your life on the line—you have to, or you are not a man. And, this is one of those times.

Blacks and the Collapse of Auto

Freeman: This is a question that was submitted by a member of the House of Representatives.

It says: "Lyn, a recent by a Washington think-tank, has shown that blacks have suffered a disproportionate number of the loss of high-paying jobs, with the collapse of the auto industry. Normally the question of saving the auto industry is not treated as a 'black issue,' but it seems that that's exactly what it is. Now, I know in advance that you're going to say, that the problem of the auto collapse, and in fact the overall collapse of America's manufacturing base, is a much larger question than a black question per se, and I don't disagree with you. But, the fact remains that despite major gains made by blacks in the fight for civil rights and equality, the bottom line, is that most of the actual post-war advances in the standard of living of black Americans, came because they were

brought into the industrial workforce, in the wake of Roosevelt's effort to alleviate the Depression.

"Now, we seem to be the first ones to go, and we are increasingly reverting to the status of a hopeless, perpetual underclass. I'd really like you to comment on this."

LaRouche: Well, when people become demoralized, they tend to fall into things like racism. I've seen this, having lived a fairly long life, I've seen this, back and forth, time and time again. Ebb and flow, ebb and flow, ebb and flow.

And what happens, when people become demoralized? They become discouraged, they become enraged, they go to the lowest part of themselves. They become psychologically regressive.

For example, let's take one case as a comparison, because we're doing it, the Baltimore study.² Now, Baltimore was, because it was a borderline, border state, borderline case in the whole history of slavery: That, because of that, the success of Baltimore, out of the Roosevelt period, in the building up of the steel industry, other industries, made it, actually, one of the prime examples of success, of urban success, which included a large degree of upgrading of the standard of living, and social standards for persons of African descent in that area.

Now, what's happened recently is, the reverse has happened. As Baltimore has collapsed, this has collapsed. And what has happened at the same time is, a large part of our people of African descent, in the Baltimore area, are plunged into the condition where they've lost their jobs. Often the family's broken up. The wife and children and so forth are sorted among various locations where they live. The man who had been a wage-earner beforehand is dumped on the street. He gets involved with the drug scene, with the killing scene, the stealing scene, and so forth. And he becomes psychologically transformed to a lower state of mental life than he had been before.


Now, you had two types of people who were victimized by that. We've been studying this, and two types come up. One type—and it's not just persons of African descent, but it's all of those who get sucked into this thing. You have one group, an older generation, which were crushed in the early phase of the retrogression in Baltimore. They tend to be psychotic. They tend to be almost permanently psychotic.

Then, you have people who have been thrown into the dust bin in more recent times: family broken up—the whole thing, that's the scene. They become virtually criminalized. They tend to become highly psychologically regressive. However, it's found experimentally, that if they are given back something like their old life, their psychological outlook goes back to what it had been in the previous life. So they are easily recoverable.

2. "The Case of Baltimore: Deindustrialization Creates 'Death Zones,'" *EIR*, Jan. 6, 2006.

Baltimore 'Death Zones'—Areas (Circled) of High Disease, Poverty, and Death Rates, Inside the City Borders

(Base Map Shows Percentages of Households with Annual Incomes Under \$30,000, by Census Tract, 2000)



Sources: EIR; U.S. Bureau of the Census.

In the 24 darkest census tracts, 70% of the households had an annual income under \$30,000 as of 2000. These tracts are core sub-sections of communities characterized by economic collapse, high disease and mortality rates, even measurable statistically as "excess deaths" compared to the national standard for current, age-adjusted death rates.

The problem here, then look at this same phenomenon more generally. When you take a population which, in say, the auto area. The auto area is Michigan, to some degree western New York state, to some degree western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana—that's a hard core of the auto industry. Now, you had a great migration from the Southern states into the North—"up North," as they call it Down South, or whatever—into this area in employment in Ford and other industries, before the war period, during the wartime period, and following. So you had a big concentration in the UAW, and associated unions, with this phenomenon.

They tended to become upgraded. You know, they would get up and get a job, they would try to upgrade. You'd have second generation of the family working in the industry,

or something turned into it, upgraded, upgraded standard of civil life.

For example, Detroit had a high school, a musical high school, which had one of the higher standards for Classical musical vocal training in the United States. Some of the so-called popular singers came out of this high school, as well as some of the greatest Classical singers, came out of that program. So, you had a high level of culture in Detroit, at the high point, which was developing among people coming up from Down South, into that process.

Now, what happens is, now you've got a population which is being demoralized. Just look at the figures, count the dots as we count them: of the places where the income of the population has shifted from industrial employment, to low-paid employment, or no employment; low-paid services employment. You know what that means. This means two or three jobs, fly-by-night jobs, terrible jobs, terribly low pay, terrible conditions—the whole population, it's not selective.

But then, what happens is, now, what is the population? The population that came up into the Middle West states, with the development of the automobile industry, was from the South; and two things came up from the South. The hillbilly! Have you ever seen the backwoods area of Alabama, of Mississippi, or similar things like that? Have you ever walked in those areas? Don't do it by night! Don't drive certain roads by night. If they half think that you've

got a Negro cousin, they'll kill you, for sport. And the police will do it, or back it up.

I've looked in the eyes of some of these guys in recent years. I know them. I recognize them. Look, I was in military service. I met all these guys in military service, I know what they're like, I know their personalities. I know *exactly* what these guys are thinking when their eyes go a certain way. I've seen it. And I had to deal with it. It's there.

So, now you get into this area, with this kind of degraded condition, in the prosperous area, which used to be industrially prosperous—western New York, western Pennsylvania, there used to be steel industry there, used to be U.S. Steel. They shut it down. Then you had Ohio, big; Michigan; Indiana. A big concentration. What happened to this whole popu-

lation? They've all been victimized!

What happens? They're psychologically pushed back to the lowest part of themselves on both sides. So, now what do you get? You get the chemistry of racism comes up. Absolutely! "My grandfather was in the Klan! Ah jes' remembered that!" And it comes up. And it comes up with clique groups, because there's a certain cliquishness in the unions, and so forth—reacts. And our responsibility is, I think, to address this thing *in that way*.

The best thing to do to somebody who is doing that, is to expose what really is going on. "Your granddaddy was a Klanster down theah South?" That's where a lot of this comes from, this frictional, selective, man turns man against man. Dog against dog. And any difference that could be picked out, any shading of difference, is used. "I got *my* group, you got *your* group: I'm going to help *my* group, I'm not going to help *your* group. I'm going to hurt you, if I have to."

And they'll say, often, "if I have to." Why? "I need something. I gotta take it from you." And that's what we're doing to our people. And we're doing it in the Democratic Party, in a sense, *by not recognizing this problem, and not identifying it!* If you identify it—

And the way to do it, is not by saying "This guy's a bad guy." "Look at that poor fellow. Look at that poor, racist pig. Look what he's doing to himself! He could have had such a good life, and. . . Hey, look what he's doing to himself! He's making himself disgusting, everybody spits on him! People in future generations are going to make a joke about him. About the contemptible piece of crap he is."

That gets to him. He gets angry, but that's the way I treat it. I say, "Aw, this poor man. Look what he's doing to himself. Look at how degraded he's becoming! What are we going to do with this poor guy? He's going to end up in prison! And you know what they're going to do to him, there."

How Do We Deal With Evil Sophists?

Freeman: Okay, Lyn, this is the last question that we can take, and it's from a LYM member from the East Coast.

He says: "Lyn, I was at the AEI event"—that's the American Enterprise Institute—"event, attended by Justice Scalia. It was the worst event I had ever attended in my life. But not just because of Scalia's Sophistry, but because of the evil that was demonstrated by the audience, both during and after the event. After the event, I had talked to some of the older, more experienced members about my disgust, and I was reminded of the principle of *agapē*, expressed in the lives of Martin Luther King, Joan of Arc, and yourself.

"My question to you, is this: When I find myself confronted with this kind of Sophistry, or evil men, like that in general, whether at an intervention, or just while organizing the population, what approach should I take toward them? Because I understand that anger is not the answer, but to get directly to the point: What should I keep in mind, because I

want to become a sublime person, when dealing with Sophists?"

LaRouche: First of all, in dealing with these kinds of people, like AEI—I mean, AEI is the hard core of the American fascist movement! So, you're not dealing with somebody who's a slightly deviant character. You're dealing with a real nasty piece of work.

Now, the way I deal with it, very simply, is, if I'm on top, and they're down under, I can be generous. If they're on top, I'm ready to shoot!

Now, what you do in this case, is actually, you have to look at these guys clinically. Think of going into a jungle, and you're finding a bunch of baboons—or, not a jungle, say, South African baboons, and running along carrying a couple of nuts, baobab nuts under each arm, and one in his teeth, and so forth, and he's ready to drop the things and kill you, the next time he meets you.

You're dealing with that type. And what you do is, you look at them clinically, as you would look if you were engaged in studying higher apes. You would look at them clinically, wouldn't you? You wouldn't say, "Oh, you disgusting baboon!" You would say, "Well, this is a baboon. And now, there's only one thing I can get out of this thing. I can either shoot him, or I can do some clinical studies, as I would if I were studying monkeys, something like that. Okay, I consent here. I'm willing to study the behavior of this monkey. Or, this higher ape, this baboon. He's got a stinking rear end, so I'd rather look at the front end."


Anyway, so there, you get clinical.

Now, when you go into the AEI, or some premises like that, and you have a confrontation with them, you have to be sublime. Sublime in this case, means, in a sense, insightfully clinical. You have to do as I said in a webcast made recently: in such situations, your sense of humor, your higher sense of humor must come into play.

The higher sense of humor is typified by, as I said: Look across the river, as I did, across the Arno, down into Florence, and imagine that I'm sitting there, as Boccaccio was, when he wrote the *Decameron*. And look at the people dying in the streets, of the plague. This city, which had been a center of the banking which had ruined Europe. And the wealthy people of Florence, were dying, of the Black Death, which their policies had helped to bring into being.

And you have the *Decameron*. Boccaccio is sitting up on his ridge, above the river looking down, as they tell these stories, or he recounts these stories, which are showing you the depravity of the culture, which had preceded this Black Death.

Then you have a similar thing with my friend Rabelais, who again, was facing terrible conditions, and he applied a special sense of humor in order to give present and future generations *insight*, into the sickness which he was looking at—a clinical point of view.



Asked how to deal with evil Sophists like Antonin Scalia, from the vantage-point of the Sublime, LaRouche replied: “You must at all times, have your sense of humor walking beside you, ready to spring into action, with a good clinical sense of insight.” That’s what Miguel Cervantes did, in portraying Don Quixote as a fool. Here, Gustav Doré’s illustration of Don Quixote’s Romantic fantasies.

You have the same thing with Miguel Cervantes, who portrays—there are no heroes in *Don Quixote*. They’re all fools or worse. But he portrays them as fools, even though the real-life types he’s portraying as fools are evil. But he’s concentrating on—you’re not looking at the pure evil of them: But looking at the *foolishness* of them. Like this thing—Don Quixote sitting up all night with a prostitute, having a deeply theological social discussion. I mean—this has two implications to it. Anybody who thinks this is a great event is really corrupt. Anyone who has a sense of

humor, is going to say, “This is what destroyed the society.” This kind of thing.

And therefore, when you’re dealing with these kinds of situations today, you must at all times, have your sense of humor walking beside you, ready to spring into action, with a good clinical sense of insight: Because the function of the insight is, instead of looking at them as an object of hatred, look at them as you look at a bug, a species of bug. You want to know how this species behaves—this may be useful entomologically, if you have to deal with a bug infection in the future: How do these things behave?

So, therefore, you should know this. And if you can detach yourself from immediate, narrow, personal passion, to look at these things clinically, you can look at evil people. There are lots of evil people in society—I mean, a lot of them. They’re evil. What I do is, I look at them clinically. You see what I write. People say, “Why do you put so much humor in what you write, and what you say?” Because I have a clinical view of things. And evil, I look at as ridiculous. It’s humanly ridiculous. It’s evil, but it’s ridiculous. If you can see the ridiculous side, you see how it works. If you see how it works, you know how to deal with it. And therefore, by a good sense of humor, in this way, is the best way to be able to deal with the situation.

Because, you walk out of a meeting at the AEI, and you get a sense of—“Now I have seen what these animals are like! I’ve just been at the

feeding time at the zoo.”

Freeman: So, you see, for all our LYM members, when your parents ask you what the hell are you doing in the LaRouche movement, you can tell them that you’re pursuing advanced zoological studies.

That brings today’s event to a close. I’d like to thank all of you for participating. For those of you who did not get your questions answered, we will submit them to Mr. LaRouche, and he will answer them as time permits. Otherwise, please join me, in thanking Mr. LaRouche for this event today.