

# EIR LaRouche Youth Movement

LAROUCHE MEETS WITH EUROPEAN LYM

## What Are Your Plans for The Rest of This Century?

*Lyndon LaRouche addressed several forums of the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) in Wiesbaden, Germany at the end of December 2009, which we excerpt here. The first is from his remarks on Dec. 27 to a meeting of the European LYM leadership.*

### The U.S. Health-Care Atrocity

...As you know, in this past Christmas period, a piece of legislation was rammed through the Senate of the United States. Now, the piece is a piece of filth, and it's a piece of filth which was organized in the way that the Lisbon Treaty was snuck in: That is, you would have, "Here, see paragraph such-and-such and such-and-such in another piece of legislation. . . ."—that kind of thing. So you had to become an expert to find out what the real legislation was. They buried it. The same thing happened here.

But, then, ostensibly, in the last part of the proceedings in the Senate, they put in a provision which says, first of all, the establishment of the independent IMAB board,<sup>1</sup> which will determine what medical policy will be, and that no agency can interfere with this board. Of course, the other feature is, this legislation can never be repudiated, changed by the U.S. Senate, by the House of Representatives, or the U.S. government, in perpetuity! And this makes Hitler look like a piker, when you think of the implications. It's the same thing! It's the same thing as Hitler's dec-

laration of permanent dictatorship. But on this issue.

But now, look at the whole issue: The whole issue, as we have it now, is that every part of this action conforms to what the British did in the European Union operation. In other words, the European states, in Western and Central Europe, are now colonies of the British Empire. They're like poor-grade members of the British Commonwealth society. And worse, under the provisions added to this, there are no national sovereignties of any kind; regional sovereignties can take precedent over national sovereignties. There is no such thing as a nation, a functioning nation existing in legal terms, under the European Union. This thing is being extended into the United States, in an attempt to break the United States, in the way that Western and Central Europe were broken.

Now, however, this particular thing I referred to, was somehow snuck through in the end: Most of the members of the Senate didn't know, obviously, what was in this. Or, if they got a pass at it, they didn't get, really, what the pass was, because of the complexity of the legislation. What this constitutes—and it has the pawprints of the British Empire on it—is a British-style operation, that an attempted overthrow of the U.S. Constitution is being orchestrated, through the President, who is acting as a puppet, a virtual puppet of the British Empire. And this has the quality of high treason. Because the origin of this thing, like the Liverpool<sup>2</sup> opera-

1. Independent Medicare Advisory Board.

2. The Liverpool Care Pathway, Nancy Spannaus and William Wertz, "The Truth Will Out: Britain's Euthanasia Scandal," *EIR*, Sept. 11, 2009.



EIRNS/Ali Sharaf

*Lyndon LaRouche addresses a cadre school of the LaRouche Youth Movement in Wiesbaden, Germany on Dec. 27, 2009. “Your purpose in life is the kind of world you’re going to leave behind you,” he said. “What would you like to have said? What did you do on the way to the grave? And was it worth the trip?”*

tion and so forth, and this whole policy, is British and was initiated under Blair; but the institutions are older. The monarchy itself has adopted this policy! The Queen, herself, has adopted this policy. And her son and so forth, and others have done it.

So, this is actually an attempted subversion of the United States, and it involves the question of treason on the part of people in the United States, including the President of the United States himself. So, what we’ll be uttering on Monday [Jan. 4], will be a statement to that effect: This is tantamount to treason, because it has all the pawmarks of the British Empire.

### **Defeat the British Empire!**

When we look at the comparison of what was done in Europe, and particularly in the case of the Lisbon Treaty and its consequences, and the particular point of objection by the German court, that said this can not be in perpetuity, shows the pawmarks of the British monarchy. When all the facts are taken together, all the pawprints come out forthrightly, since the 27th of November, and forthrightly, put the monarchy as responsible for this thing, and using the Commonwealth as a vehicle.

They were *defeated* on the Commonwealth question, because some members of the Commonwealth did not consent to the arrangement; they resisted it, and other countries resisted it, so it was defeated. The British monarchy said it was determined to strike back. And the strike came in this form: Suddenly, something was smuggled into the legislation, adopted by the Senate, probably at the last moment. It’s not even decent language; it’s sloppy. It’s as if it were a British order, being delivered through the mouth of Rahm Emanuel—who’s a real, I must say, the kindest term you can use for him is “shithead.” A screaming shithead, if you can imagine what a screaming shithead is, that’s Rahm Emanuel. His brother is a mass murderer, Ezekiel. And their father was a bomber, the guy who blew up the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, and left some poor col-

onel, naked in a bathtub—the hotel had collapsed, except the bathtub was up there, hanging, and there was the naked colonel in the bathtub. And it’s the father of Rahm and Ezekiel Emanuel who did it. So there’s a certain family tendency for violent, noisy actions, in the family tradition!

But in any case, the key to this, the importance of doing it, is that the American people will fight on one thing: a foreign attack on the United States, either physically, or in terms of the violation of the Constitution. And the problem is, to give the citizen out there, who hates this crap and hates what the Congress is doing—we’ve got to give them a means by which they can understand, by which they can express what *is* their opposition to anything of this nature. And there’s going to be a riotous situation in the United States, and we’re going to help stir it up.

And that’s also the thing in Europe: If the United States attacks the British monarchy, on the question of sovereignty, other nations are going to tend to bolt, and resist the British. We’ve already got the case in the Commonwealth, with what happened with India, for example—India and China taking a very strong posi-

tion against this [at the Copenhagen Climate Change summit]. So now, you've got an international revolt, you've got a confrontation, you've got a fight. And you've got to get the fight on the terms in which you can win. And the way to do it, is you've got to get the culprit out there, you've got to identify him as a culprit; you've got to get it so that people recognize that he is the culprit, that you've have to deal with him, you have to bring him down, you have to correct the errors that he's imposed upon society. And the way we bring it down, is by going with the obvious thing: the Four-Power initiative. . . .

And you have to have a certain amount of sardonic humor about this sort of thing, to get it across. You can't be a nice guy. But you've got to get people to see things clearly! Because the sophistries will abound! They will say, "Well, you can explain it this way. . . ." "Or, couldn't you say this instead? Couldn't you really say that what they're saying is really this? Couldn't you say that what they're doing is really this?" And that's the way they get people to confuse themselves and not understand the clarity of the issue.

### **The Verge of Global Disintegration**

Here we are, on the verge of what? A collapse of civilization. And it *is* that. If the United States, for example, goes down, with a blowout of the U.S. economy, the entire world blows out. Contrary to all other statements: a chain-reaction collapse of the entire world—flat! The United States is going through another ratchet of a plunge down, in the economy. There's practically no economy left! There's practically no industry, small, odd shops, and so forth. And certain sections of the population are in miserable condition. Some are historically—the black population is in miserable condition in the United States, the condition of joblessness, of illiteracy, of conditions of life, are unbelievable! And you have similar kinds of patterns of conditions throughout the United States, as a result of what's been going on, particularly since the other Bush was elected, George H.W. Bush. The Bush of Thatcher's girlfriend [laughter] and François Mitterrand.

So therefore, we've got a global situation. We're under threat of complete disintegration of civilization. Existing institutions generally, in Europe, will not function. The institutions of the United States, presently, are not really functioning, although they could be brought to functioning. Forget South and Central America, they're not going to do anything.

Brazil has a significant [population], but you know, Brazil is not a reliable country. Why? Because it's an oligarchical country. You have a class struggle in Brazil which is beyond belief: Two sections of the population are at war with each other, and it's a shooting war! With peace treaties, and interim peace treaties at various points. In São Paulo, for example, you have a large part of the population who lives in Tin Can Alley—parts of tin cans and gasoline cans and so forth are piled together, and that's where they live! It's an outlaw section of society. It's an armed society, with its own self-policing element!

Then you have the main city of São Paulo, which is the wealthier people, and they're afraid. Businessmen do not go to work by driving: They take helicopters from the top of a building to the top of a building, because they don't trust going on the streets! The way that São Paulo is organized, in many of these sections of São Paulo, you have the outer layers of houses and complex of houses, like a bird's nest with eggs in it. . . . You honk your horn, the sallyport opens up and lets you through security. You go in, and they close the sallyport, and the house you live in, is *inside* the row of houses which is the outside set of houses in the thing. Why? Because it's a state of permanent class war, between two sections of the population. Now, that is not really a good situation.

Brazil happens to have a certain amount of power economically, and other power, relative to other nations. But its own internal situation, is *very* potentially unstable. You don't want to be on the main streets of the main cities. You have to be within the protected areas. You go outside the protected areas, you're dead meat. It's that kind of situation.

### **Orient Toward the Pacific**

So, we've got a Pacific orientation, which is defined by Russia, China, India, and other countries, like Korea, probably Japan, and so forth, who will jump in. Oh, Australia: It is not really happy with the British right now, because the British interests now do not correspond to Australian economic interests. Because Australia is a very thinly populated area, and they kept it that way; they didn't do much about the water problem, so they've got a lot of desert. They had water programs, but they shut them down, as part of an anti-development process, years ago. But what they have is very large resources, relatively speaking, large stores of thorium and uranium, for example, and other things. And therefore, it's obvious that their future depends upon

3812 BURTON	CHARLES WILEY JPMORGAN CHASE BANK MICHIGAN EDUC CREDIT UNION C/O MICHELLE MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL CREDIT UNION SHIRLEY WILEY	44014030438301 3811 HICKORY	VON CIELE DUKES VONCIELE DUKES	FIRST FRANKLIN FINANCIAL CORP FIRST FRANKLIN	FILE MANK	VON CIELE DUKES VONCIELE DUKES	FIRST FRANKLIN FINANCIAL CORP FIRST FRANKLIN
44013040359000 2991 CARLYSLE	WILEY, CHARLES-SHIRLEY MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SY SPECIALTY MORTGAGE CORP	44014030443000 3909 HICKORY	DORIS STOKES VONCIELE DUKES STOKES, DORIS	605 FAIRWOOD S MORTGAGE E MORTGAGE	LASALLE H	44017010149000 605 FAIRWOOD S MORTGAGE E MORTGAGE	44017010149000

# Detroit Free Press

44014010048000 3742 ALLEN	THEODORA OKAFOR FIRST COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE CO UNIVERSAL MORTGAGE CORP MIDFIRST BANK MASON, LORETTA A LORETTA MASON FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK CITY OF INKSTER LORETTA NOLAN LORETTA A MASON	44014990001000 VACANT ANNAPOLIS	PARKER, WALTER JOSEPH PARKER WALTER PARKER, JR	44017010251002 563 ARLINGTON S
44014010082000 3756 MOORE	EUGENE E HENDERSON HENDERSON, EUGENE MARY MARY R HENDERSON	44015010005000 28829 YORK	SAMIR HAMMOUD DAVIS, LEWIS LEWIS DAVIS	44017030315000 280 BRENTWOOD
44014010083000 3812 MOORE	AMERI	44015010017000 29131 YORK ST	AMERQUEST MORTGAGE SECURITIES INC LAWON OSBORNE LAWON D OSBORNE	44017030412000 128 AMHERST ST

## 2010 NOTICE OF FORFEITED PROPERTY SUBJECT TO FORECLOSURE Wayne County Treasurer Raymond J. Wojtowicz

Paid Supplement to the Detroit Free Press  
November 29, December 6, and December 13, 2009

WAYNE COUNTY  
TREASURER  
JUDICIAL TAX  
FORECLOSURE

Your rights may be affected even if you: 1) purchased the property, 2) received an assignment or other transfer of an interest in the property or 3) if the person named on this list is deceased and you are an heir to the estate.

20, 21, 22 and 25, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. each day at 400 Monroe, 8th Floor, Detroit, Michigan 48226. Please use the following schedule, which is organized by property location, to determine which day to attend. Note that for property located within the City of Detroit, the schedule for Show Cause Hearing

400 Monroe St., Suite 600 Detroit, Michigan 48226. Written objections must be filed and received by Corporation Counsel on or before February 11, 2010. If no objection is filed, the Court may enter a Judgment of Foreclosure as to the property. A person with an interest in a property listed below may lose

### SUBSTANTIAL FINANCIAL HARDSHIP APPLICATIONS

If you are the owner of a property on this list, which you occupy as your principal residence, you may qualify for a Substantial Financial Hardship Extension. If you qualify for the Hardship Extension, you can receive an extension to pay the taxes. Consideration for the Hardship Extension requires that:

1. The property is your principal residence.
2. The property is deeded in your name.

BALLARD, JOHNNIE BANK NATIONAL TRUST CO	200 JOHN DALY CONSECO FINANCE SERVICING CORP GREEN TREE FINANCIAL SERVICING WELLS FARGO FINANCIAL BANK TRIPLETT/BUTLER, CALVIN/ROBIN
WYTANA D ARORA KIMBERLY CHRISTIAN WMC MORTGAGE CORP	44017010167000 670 ARLINGTON ST
WALTER L PARKER WALTER PARKER, JR WALTER PARKER	44017010192000 935 ARLINGTON ST



### SOME THINGS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE SUNDAY SUPPLEMENT AND THE OFFICE OF THE WAYNE COUNTY TREASURER

The supplement to today's Sunday Free Press contains a staggering list of more than 23,000 Wayne County vacant lots, abandoned structures and occupied commercial and residential properties in danger of tax foreclosure. As intimidating as the supplement appears, on March 1st of each of the last three years, my office has received, on average, more than 210,000 parcels for collection of delinquent property taxes from the 43 municipalities in Wayne County. And, before the supplement went to print, my office collected more than 86% of the related property taxes.

available after Dec  
e visit the Way  
the Wayne Cou

# DELINQUENT PROPERTY TAXES Pay Online Save Time

[WWW.TREASURER.WAYNECOUNTY.COM](http://WWW.TREASURER.WAYNECOUNTY.COM)

*"The United States is going through another ratchet of a plunge down, in the economy. There's practically no economy left!" This special supplement to the Detroit Free Press on Nov. 29, 2009 presents a chilling picture of what has happened to the city that was once the symbol of American industrial power. The county publishes the listings of 23,000 properties in danger of tax foreclosure, begging owners to pay their property taxes*

not merely exporting these products, which are needed very much in Asia, but also developing these things, not merely exporting ore, as they do from Africa, but actually developing industries which use these ores, and export the product of the development of these ores in a finished form of some kind.

Australia's economic survival depends upon doing that. So there are strains.

Canada is not quite the same, but Canada also has a problem. First of all, Canada's close to the United States physically, and therefore is influenced by the United States, although there's a British element in Canada which is just like Britain, or worse. But the economic

interests and social interests of Canada, with its proximity to the United States, and its proximity to the Arctic belt—remember, the greatest concentration of planetary mass, of continental mass, is located in the Northern Hemisphere around the Arctic. And in the South, the Antarctic area, you've got vast seas—except for places like Argentina and Chile, you have vast oceans there. So that, mineral resources, which are also available under Arctic conditions, are concentrated there.

You've got African resources, but they're not used as African resources. They're used by grabbing them out of the soil and exporting the stuff immediately, without letting anybody else touch it! Which is not ex-

actly a very good idea.

So, we're in this situation where there are vital interests. All this business about this control of raw materials, and carbon counting and all that sort of thing—it was a threat! And it was being peddled in Copenhagen as a bonus: It's a threat! It's a deadly threat. And, the Indians said, "Well, let's go per capita, here." And the British didn't like that, at all!

So you have these kinds of splits. So you have a world which is going into, not just a deep depression, but a breakdown crisis: the entire world system. Some things may seem weaker, some things may seem stronger, but they're all part of the same system. And if a significant part of the world system goes, then, the whole world goes! Because globalization has created the greatest degree of interdependency among regions of the world, in all history!

Take food supplies: Virtually no country produces its own food supply. They grow food, but they sell it to another country, through a middleman who's part of the imperial system.

So, the world is interdependent, which is one of the objectives of the British operation: to create an interdependent world, so that no nation would have any independence, would have any power to *resist* economic sanctions. And the threat of economic sanctions is the greatest weapon which the British Empire uses.

So now, the world is in that condition. And the world is producing, but something like a billion people aren't being fed. And it's going to get worse. So therefore, *development is urgent*. National development is urgent. National sovereignty and development is urgent, otherwise the thing does not work economically. The British know how to make a mess of an economy; they don't know how to make a healthy one. They never did; it's the nature of the monarchy.

On the one hand, you have pure evil, in the form of the British Queen—and he and she are both Queens; they share the Queenage. (There aren't Kingships any more, they're Queenages. That way they don't have to worry about determining the sex of a newborn child. So, it's a future Queen.)

So, you have that threat, and you have the threat of the conditions which exist, and the trends and policies which exist, which mean that the civilization is doomed, and you see it going on—two things: There is no way civilization can survive under present policy. The system is finished. It's a breakdown crisis; it's not a depression. It's a breakdown crisis. And the only way you

can save it, is the way we're approaching this thing: with large-scale infrastructure projects of a certain type. You are better off in Asia, than you are in Europe or the United States. Why? Because we have destroyed, systematically—industrial power, agro-industrial power is being chopped down internally, while the employment that survives is being shipped to cheap-labor markets of the world.

## The Monetary System Is Dead

Therefore, you've got a situation, where the total amount of production globally is insufficient to maintain the present world population. On the part of the British, that's intentional. So therefore, the world requires, not merely stopping this nonsense, but a rebuilding program. The only way to do that, is take the monetary system, and take it out—bang, bang, bang! You're dead, monetary system! We just eliminated you! We'll get somebody to bury you tomorrow.

And you have to go to a fixed-exchange-rate system of credit, long-term credit, credit created synthetically by the state, as state debt, used as credit; or credit as the form of state debt. We'll be using credit as state debt, for large-scale infrastructure projects, which doesn't mean it's all infrastructure. It means that you're developing the infrastructure needed for the development of agriculture and industry.

So therefore, you need sovereign nations; you need a fixed-exchange-rate system, because you don't want to have interest rates fluctuating all over the place and charges all over the place because of differential fluctuations in currency values, hmm? And you've got to have a development program, which is high energy-flux density: lots of nuclear power.

They like windmills in Germany! You know, it costs more to operate a windmill, than what you get out of it, both in financial terms and power terms? It takes more power to create, operate, and shut down a windmill, than you get out of the whole windmill! Maybe there are a couple of places where the wind blows constantly and harder, but that's about it. You see all these clusters and you say, "Don Quixote, where are you now?" These things clustering all over Germany—it's disgusting! It's obscene! It's sexually disgusting! They ought to list it under child abuse, or something.

So, we have a situation where you must change the mentality of nations and the world, and you have to do both, simultaneously, on the question of a new world order: based on restoring the nation-state; based on des-

ignating a bloc of states which are powerful enough to push through the policy, a policy of crushing, one way or the other, all this crap that's destroying the world; and developing some long-term perspectives for humanity. That's why the Mars program is so significant: You have to have a long-term thing.

### A Mars Program for This Century

We're talking about a Mars project, we're talking about within the bounds of this century. We're talking about 90 years ahead. Because, you can not possibly move human beings to Mars, or Mars orbit, or consider a Mars landing—we can put things on Mars, inanimate objects, robots and things like that, but to put human beings on Mars is a little bit more difficult.

First of all, the gravity of the situation, is not too favorable. People will tend to lose bone marrow, or instead of being discoverers, they become blobs—and that's not a good idea. But we can deal with that, because we can deal with this question of gravity. But to have human beings travel to Mars, by inertial flight, you're talking about 300 days or more, each way. Not a very good idea, for moving human beings around in space! You're going to get a blob on both ends of the trip. Therefore, you have to have a constant acceleration, to get human beings back and forth. You have to have completed your Moon development project, or you're not going to have the equipment you're going to use to make the trip! It means you have to develop a whole industrial base on the Moon, which will be largely automated, or controlled as like an automated system. Fun, huh?

Now, what does that mean, as I've laid it out? How many generations are you talking about in 90 years? You're talking about less than four. You're talking about doing something within this century, anything: Your Mars landing, human landing, is your goal. That measures what you're going to do, because people are going to be born; they will not be very productive while they're adolescents. They'll have to grow up from babyhood to adolescence. They have to be developed, which is going to take another decade or so. Now you're going into 30 years. Now, they're going to be productive for another 30 years, in general—that's 60 years. Now you're thinking about the projects you're going to develop, and what steps they're going to involve: You're talking about a couple of more generations, before you actually get to an operating Mars system.

Non-manned systems we can put into effect very



NASA

*"We're now on the verge of becoming Man in the Universe, not man just on Earth. And therefore, we are now at a point, where experimental reality compels us to enlarge our view of ourselves and what's going on in the universe." Shown here is an artist's rendering of the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter, which was launched in 2005.*

quickly, but not in great quantities. And we will put non-manned systems in there, because of observatories, because of various other conveniences. We will also be concerned about developing the kinds of resources on Mars which are necessary to sustain any development which is going to be on Mars, even automatic stations. So therefore, you're talking about taking a child, born tomorrow morning, and what's their destiny? What's the destiny of humanity? After getting that fixed in your imagination, what your goals are, what your policy goals are, now you go back to the immediate present: Okay, we're going to get *there*, that's our destination. Our destination within the century. . . .

So, that's our situation! So, you get an image of that, and my view of politics is, you've got to give people a century, give cultures a century perspective. Because, first of all, just to get out of the mess we're in now, is going to take a generation. Maybe in ten years, civiliza-

tion can come back, a bit, and begin to resemble what it should be. But it's going to take a generation before it really is successful. It took longer than a generation for us to get into this Hell! You go straight back to 1968, which is the time the world entered Hell. Let's count the years! Now you're going to reverse all that, reverse all that damage, and then move ahead as well. And also deal with the unsolved problems which were left over from the previous years.

So therefore, you have to have a perspective for mankind, and for the cultures of mankind, over a period of 80-odd years, which brings us up to the brink of the next century. You know, some people are stubborn, like I'm 87—we tend to live a long time! And therefore, we're talking about our *life perspective*. We ain't talkin' about 20 years or 30 years! We're talking about 90 years or 100 years! What's going to happen to you for the next hundred years, if you're born tomorrow?

And you have to get that kind of thinking: Because if people don't see a future, if they're looking at what they're experiencing today, and what they experienced just yesterday, they're not seeing a future; they're not seeing a future for mankind. And if they can't see a future for mankind, how can they see a future for themselves? You're talking about a future! You're talking about your future. Where's your future? Where *is* your future? Where is it located? Who's there? What're the conditions of life? How are you going to spend the next 50 years? That's your future. What's your perspective for the next 50 years? What kind of life, what's the meaning of your life? You're not an animal, you're a human being: What's the meaning of your life?

So, if you don't have a long-term perspective, you really don't have morality. You have expediency, like all these damned Brits! Like Obama, for example. C'mon! Human beings are supposed to develop and become more productive as they become older. It may not mean quantity, but it's certainly in quality: The human mind is supposed to develop. It's supposed to *never stop* developing, until the end of life! And you have to think of developing a person to be able to do that. You've got to think of a society in which people are not operating just on muscles, but operating on brains, and culture.

Therefore, if you don't think about your grandchildren, and your great-grandchildren, you really don't have a motive for living. You may have a desire to have a motive for living, like a person will go out looking for a job, a desire for a motive for living. But do you have a sense of your own internal *worth*, over the coming three

generations? And the reality of that worth, that's something you're devoted to, something you're determined to get to, in the course of your lifetime; it's the achievement you're supposed to register for having lived. That's what really human motives are. A sense of quasi-immortality. And to span a century. And if you can give people that, and they understand it, and can come to understand it, they won't put up with this crap!

What happened with the 68ers is the whole generation, with the help of the Congress for Cultural Freedom (as they called it)—for Cultural Degeneracy—they took away from Europeans and others, they took away the very idea of a meaningful life, a human life. You have boring life before you: Now, you're out there to find some kind of perverted entertainment which amuses you, and change your choice of perversion from day to day, so you never get bored. And you keep going, like a person on a merry-go-round: Just keep going round and round from one thing to the other, and you keep changing, because otherwise you'll bore yourself to death. And you're going to bore the people around you to death, too. That's the kind of society we're living in.

So, that's what the implication is. That's where we are. We're at a point that civilization's on the verge of collapsing. Europe is now a colony of the British Empire—don't kid yourself, it is. You know it more and more, day by day. Most of the world is in deadly danger: We're a population of about 6.7 billion people now. They're determined to reduce it very rapidly, to less than 2.

What does that mean? Change it. So we have to have these kinds of senses of mission. You have to think about the end of life as the arrival of destination: You have to choose a destination which is worth surviving *for*, and something you can be proud *of*, and something you will transmit to coming generations. If you have that, then you have the motive, and the outlook, which is needed. And if you want to become a leader, you've got to represent a *mission*. And I think about human history as far as I know it, and you would say, "What would be the *mission* you would want for mankind, which would govern mankind, along those ways?"

That's where we stand: We stand at the doors of Hell, right now. And we're conniving in various ways to fight guerrilla warfare against these bastards. I think we're going to have some fun on Monday, because we're going to bring this question up.

But it's not just this question. The question is, why should we do it? And the reason you should do it, is be-

cause you have a purpose in life. And the purpose in life extends for three-plus generations. Your purpose in life is the kind of world you're going to leave behind you: What would you like to have said? What did you do on the way to the grave? And was it worth the trip?

---

## Dialogue with LaRouche

---

### Africa and the Four-Power Agreement

... **Q:** Being in Zimbabwe recently: The presence of the Chinese there is huge. The Russians are there; the Indians have, in a certain sense, always been there. But it has its problematic areas, in that the Russians are kind of doing their projects in the mining industry; the Chinese are doing a bit of farming here, a bit of building roads there, and infrastructure and mining, as well; but—I got the sense that if you don't have United States in the Four-Powers agreement—. When you go to Africa and you see what's happening, the three alone, or just maybe Russia and China alone—that's not really functioning. For example, the Chinese don't believe in the minimum wage. They bring their own labor in, but even if they use African labor—

**LaRouche:** Prison labor.

**Q:** Right. It's true! And then the African labor, they don't believe in paying the minimum wage, or paying anything much at all. And they don't believe in holidays. You work on weekends, holidays, whatever.

**LaRouche:** You need the structure of organized society. Bits and pieces may be necessary, but it's not good. We knew that. But you have to have a global agreement on objectives, because some things you really have to add up.

What are the objectives? We're talking about food, feeding people: Well, we got a miserable situation! Water management: big problem. Transportation, in places like the African countries. A nation which now is going to control its own policy, and then it would take systems from other countries, on the basis of "which niche do you want to do?" And then the government itself has to coordinate the niches. Like the transportation system, because the rail system is essential. And—power, power, power! I mean, in a country with high temperatures, you can not function without the power to control the conditions of the environment! Tree growing is extremely important. Water management is extremely important. So therefore, you have integrated



[www.worldlabour.org](http://www.worldlabour.org)

*China's presence in Africa is large, a questioner pointed out, but without a U.S. role in putting together a new global credit system, there are serious problems. LaRouche stressed that a Four-Power alliance must have an integrated, top-down economic policy.*

missions, which is the only way to function.

See, two things about this Four-Power agreement and what it will entail. It represents the greatest power on the planet, and therefore, can actually shape a policy. These countries, including Russia, China, and India, are really developing countries in many respects. Developing in respect to the large amount of extreme poverty in the population; the large shortage of infrastructure development; the lack of developed raw materials of the type needed; the lack of development of raw materials where they're found, rather than just dumping them on foreign shores.

So you need an integrated policy, which is a top-down economic policy, which is based on government control of infrastructure. If you control the infrastructure, everything fits into infrastructure, in one way or the other, as an integral part of it, or something which is dependent on it, or something which makes a contribution to it. If you're going to build a railway, you want to organize your freight process, you want to have the industries that you want to supply freight to and from, on that railway system. Water systems are the same kind of thing. So you have to have government centralized planning, on basic, mainstream, economic infrastructure: transportation, power, water management, and so



forth; health care, education—these all are national things which are not specific to some particular need. But they're part of the environment.

It's like plowing a field. When you plant a crop, you plow the field, you provide the ingredients; then you decide what you're going to grow on it. But you have to have this organized. You have to have a machine that functions. And you have to have an education system, you have to have a health-care system! All these things are required, because otherwise you have the breakdown of population performance, for lack of education, lack of health care, lack of child care, lack of defense against diseases, which will screw everything up for you.

So you have to have government, and you have to have big powers in the world which will agree that that's what the world needs, and have enough power to make it stick.

Break the back of the British Empire. We'll give them other occupations. And we'll even let them eat a little bit! . . .

*The following is excerpted from a discussion at a cadre school for LYM members from throughout Europe, on Dec. 28, 2009.*

### **Reality vs. Sense Perception**

**Q:** I have a question about space-time. I didn't read Einstein's relativistic theory, but since there's no time, but only space-time, biological processes, the speed of them, so to speak, seem to be fixed by the velocity at which you move. Could you elaborate on this. . . ?

**LaRouche:** Yeah, it's a different kind of question. People ask the question, and they don't know what the question is. And therefore, you have to think out, "What is the question here?"

There was a great revolution, which occurred from the 15th Century on, in Europe. It occurred around the great Renaissance in that period. And the principle involved in this, which is what I'm very deeply involved in, is the fact that our senses do not show us reality. Our senses show us a shadow of reality. Think of a sense organ as a shadow world. Now you put an object in a shadow world, and you see the shadow, not the object.

Now, what do we do? We sense with our sense-perceptions. Well, these are nothing but instruments, like scientific instruments; scientific instruments don't show you reality. They show you the *effect* of a reality!

Now, the way you discover things, is you have to take two, or more, scientific instruments, of a different

quality, of a different kind of operation. Now, you have to reconcile idiosyncrasies in effects which occur—for example: Kepler's discovery of the general principle of gravitation of the system, was based on comparing *sight*, that is, the telescopic view of the planets, on the one side; the other side is the harmonics, defined by the orbits of the planets, and among the planets. And it's the contrast between the two of them, which produced for him the concept of universal gravitation, and also the first formulation for a universal gravitation, where it originally was done. What was done in the name of Newton was a copy of his work.

So therefore, you have to realize that sense-certainty is falsehood. When you treat the senses as you would treat a scientific instrument. For example, you have a scientific instrument where you can't see certain things which are sub-microscopic. There's no way to see them—a microscope won't work for them; you're in a different domain. So therefore, you have to find different kinds of instruments, so you can say you "measure" an effect, which you can not explore by a microscope. In other words, you have to sort of triangulate on the domain, by taking two faculties of perception, like the senses, or instruments which perform a function like the senses. And the paradoxes in that will give you certain crucial points which are unique. You're always looking for a unique intersection of two contrasting effects, or maybe three things, hmm?

So therefore, the difficulty in getting people to understand science, is to get them out of mathematics as such. Because the question of science is not what you calculate, as such, but *why* do you calculate it? And what is the reality which you're trying to deal with in the calculation? So now you have to reduce calculation to a contrast, a crucial contrast between two different senses, or more, of the same event. And you're looking for a point at which there's a coincidence of this kind of event, and the coincidence then becomes the definition of the existence of a principle.

Now, then, you take what we know from physical science on this matter, and think back about the way you use your own senses in everyday life. Now you've got a sense that time is not an independent factor. Space is not an independent factor. Matter is not an independent factor. It's the interaction of these three kinds of sensations, three kinds of images, which tells you what the truth is.

For example, how much time does it take to get to someplace, by a method that's a measure of time? That's



EIRNS/Ali Sharaf

*LaRouche emphasized that input from one sense modality—or scientific instrument—is not sufficient. As Johannes Kepler understood, his early model of the Platonic solids as the basis for the planetary orbits was not precise; only when he added the dimension of harmonics was he able to determine the true orbits. Shown: LaRouche Youth Movement members work with the geometry of the Platonic solids at the cadre school in Wiesbaden, December 2009.*

a measure of *relative* time, *relative to events*. Now what does this mean about the universe? It gets wonderful, it gets beautiful at that point. But the main thing is to get away from this idea of sense-certainty, and to realize that when you have sense-data, that's where the problem begins. And you've got to wrestle with the problem. The only way to understand this, is by going through the experience of discovering these kinds of anomalies, solving some of these problems.

In Einstein's case, there's a *tremendous* accumulation of discovery, that goes into that: The most important is that of Bernhard Riemann, and Riemannian physics as first introduced in his habilitation dissertation of 1854, is the reference-point which you get Einstein from. Without Riemann, there's no Einstein. Without Riemann, there is no Vernadsky. Without Riemann there's no Planck.

So the point is, it's a certain method of approach. And what happened, of course, is that Riemann is famous for saying that Euclidean geometry is crap. And there is no such thing as space by itself, or time by itself; these are notions that come as sense-certainty notions, and you have to discover what they really mean. In other words, it's like the woman who's really an Aristotelean—she married a shadow.

That's the point. This is science! This question that you're asking *is* science; that's the question that demands

science. And this requires a special kind of experimental method for each type of case, and requires a certain sense of your own identity in looking at this kind of material. Then you find a *proof* of principle. And the question of science, is the question of how you discover proof of principle, given a certain kind of problem. What is the proof of principle for this question?

So you treat evidence as a question mark; find out what the nature of the question is, first; then, find out what the approach is, that might lead you to discovery of what the reality is that answers the question. Then, when you find out that you can make it work on the basis of that—and that alone—now you believe in it. And you should believe in it, until you come

along with a better solution.

And that's what it means. We assume, often, that space is empty. We assume that the space between the planets is largely empty, predominantly, characteristically empty space: But we know it's not. So therefore, I'm going to take helium-3, and put it in a rocket built on the Moon, and we're going to send people to Mars, and I'm going to try to use helium-3 to drive the rate of acceleration at the rate of the speed of light, and I'll take the speed-of-light driver, and I'll go out a certain distance from Earth, and then I'll do the same thing with the driver to slow down my flight, to get down to, shall we say, space!

Now, we're traveling through space, therefore, at relativistic speeds: That's the thought-experiment which was done by Einstein: You're going through space, at the speed of acceleration of the speed of light, which get you between Earth and Mars in three days. Inertial flight will take 300 days. So now the question is, what's the effect of this, on *you*, as an object, moving through the Solar System space, at speeds that no known object has ever gone? Because your maximum rate of acceleration is a gravitational effect, *on space-time*!

That's not empty space out there between Earth and Mars! That's physical space-time! You're not going through empty space, you're going through physical space-time! And what the Hell are you going to be doing

there, doing that? How is the universe going to greet your doing this? Because space is not empty! That's where this problem comes up.

It comes up in microspace, also, which is why Planck raised the question which all the other guys, Heisenberg and so forth, tried to destroy. You're going to microspace, you're talking about "objects" in microspace. "Whoa! Hey buddy, there ain't no space down there!" It *appears* to be space, but it's not! It's a fault of your instruments. The instruments are not faulty in the sense that they're useless; they're useful instruments, but you gave a wrong interpretation of the instrument in its function.

And that's where this idea comes up. Because physical space is *not* empty. You're acting *on* physical space; physical space-time *will react, on you*, if you act on it. And we've come into a period, where we're dealing with a kind of physical science practice, where we're actually dealing on a large scale with that.

I mean, for example, you're constantly dealing with the universe which is changing. The universe is not fixed—it's changing. We're getting new kinds of phenomena in the universe at all times. The universe is evolving! It's not fixed; you're talking as if it's fixed—Euclidean geometry, "space is fixed." It's not fixed! It's developing! You're going through kinds of phase-spaces in space, that nobody has been able to explain yet—and new ones keep coming up. You get a supernova, for example: That's a delight, like the Crab Nebula effect. And therefore, when you deal with these phenomena, and you find phenomena—for example, that the Crab Nebula's rate of expansion and changes, exceeded the speed of light! The Crab Nebula is a relativistic phenomenon, because the rate of changes, which seem to be coordinated change, those changes are more rapid than could have been transmitted by the speed of light.

And so, how much are these supernovae and other kinds of phenomena like that, actually of this magnitude, of things which are purely relativistic phenomena? How many objects which appear to be still not unmoving, are *also* relativistic phenomena, in microspace? When you're getting into the area of physical chemistry, the physical chemistry of thermonuclear explosions and things like that, this is what you're getting into. When you take great power, on a thermonuclear level of power, starting from the baseline of a helium-3 reaction as a thermonuclear reaction, you're entering an area which is completely different from what anybody thought existed before! Or, they only imagined it in a

certain way, but didn't know it as an experimental phenomenon. When we started making thermonuclear explosions, we began to create the kind of phenomena which needed a lot more explanation than we've supplied so far.

So, the answer to your question, is, we know this is true. We can not explain this by some magic formula, but we know we're dealing with a different dimension of reality. And we know that part of the problem is, that we come in with a prejudice that what our sense organs show is true. That's where the problem comes in. We should think of the sense organs as instruments, rather than providing a direct knowledge of something.

And that's why I've done so much writing on this question, because that *is* the great problem. We're in a thermonuclear age, where we can think about man traveling between Mars and Earth. We no longer are Earthlings: We're now on the verge of becoming Man in the Universe, not man just on Earth. And therefore, we are now at a point, where experimental reality compels us to enlarge our view of ourselves and what's going on in the universe. And this has been especially the case, when we got into the area of thermonuclear explosions. Now we're suddenly in an area where nothing works the way people used to think it works.

I've written a lot on this, particularly in the past year, so it's not easy to just answer in a few words. But it's getting into that kind of thinking which provides the answer. Because you're thinking about a concept which did not exist in your mind beforehand, which requires a special coach, to get at the "matter" of the concept. You can't just start with your terms of reference and expect an answer; you have to find out what puzzles you, what provokes you, because you don't have an answer. And that's the best answer: Get into this thing, because that's what you have to do. . . .

### Organizing the 'Yes, But' Culture

**Q:** With all these great ideas of science, the history, the possibility of going to Mars, we're always confronted with the "yes, but" culture, the thinking small, practical. Because we meet a lot of people who say, "for great ideas, you guys were right . . . yes, but . . . I know I should join—but. . ." Could you say something to help people to overcome this "yes, but" culture, but also help people to overcome that, in themselves?

**LaRouche:** Yes, but, they don't want to do it. They just don't want to do it. They don't want to consider it. They're probably thinking about a new girlfriend, or



EIRNS/Ali Sharaf

The Civil Rights Solidarity Movement (BüSo), the LaRouche movement's political party in Germany, organizes in Dresden against the global warming fraud. The sign on the left reads: "Climate fraud leads to genocide."

something like that. . . .

The problem with people in society is, you're in a society where people fake it. They're faking their way through life. They want to know, particularly in modern society, today, as opposed to say 40 years ago, or 50 years, people today have no sense of mission. Only exceptional people have a sense of mission. We used to have it built in: Someone's looking for a better life, for example, in the old days. Even in the post-war period, looking for a better way of life. And people were looking for a better kind of job, for example. They were trying to qualify themselves for a better kind of job, for a better kind of life! Or, to be less bored!

Therefore, there was a great interest among people, in bettering yourself, in trying to find ways of bettering yourself, which meant more meaningful work—and if you're on a monotonous job, you know what meaningful work is! Monotonous work is really a bore, isn't it? So therefore, you want meaningful work, you want work which has a challenge in it. Work in which you can take pride! Which gives you a sense of identity, "I can do something useful. I'm *earning* what I'm getting,

I'm providing for my family, I'm earning it, by doing something good!"

"I came up with an idea"—you know, in the old days, in factories, even back in the immediate post-war period, you used to have a thing called the "Suggestion Box," that every well-informed corporation would have: Suggestion Boxes all over the place. People would stick all kinds of things in the Suggestion Box. *But!* In many cases, the way they would be successful, was when a couple of guys, or a couple of people, or maybe a group of people, would get excited about something, saying, "We think we can solve this. We think we can make this change." And what they would put into the Suggestion Box, was pretty close to scientifically accurate in many cases.

So you would have the guy who became the machine-tool designer, who generally was an ordinary factory worker, who was working his way up, and got fascinated with this kind of science, had an opportunity to do it, and spent a life with the *pride* of being able to do that!

What's happening today, for example: The machine-tool design operation is being killed. In Germany, the machine-tool design function was the most important part of the German economy. And you had it in agriculture: Farmers were doing that in their own way. And you have the machine-tool designer, who's one step up above the product, or two steps above the product. And to be a machine-tool designer was considered a matter of great pride, and great satisfaction. You want to take a job-satisfaction measure? A machine-tool designer is one of those categories of people who had a great deal of satisfaction and life satisfaction. Maybe they drank too much beer and stuff like that at certain times, but they couldn't do too much of that and do a good job.

It's the same thing I mentioned before about a future orientation: What the hell is coming out of your life?! In various ways, if you're concerned with what's coming out of your life, and you can find a way of expressing that, you're going to be much happier than otherwise. You may be frustrated because sometimes you're not doing it, but you're happier because at least you thought about it. And you're happy when you think about it. That's the key to this thing.

But the point is, socially, what you're really doing in society, is what we're doing, I presume, here. What you're really doing is, you're finding satisfaction in life, by doing something for the future which you know is important. Or searching for something you can do for

the future, that you think is important. And therefore, you find your identity in doing something for the future which is important, which means you become *future-oriented*. And when you become future-oriented, you really become human.

And you can accelerate that process by helping other people to see it the same. But sometimes you get the “yes, but” guy. He’s not thinking about going forward. He belongs to the kind of people who say, “yes, but.” He will say, “Well, prove it to me.” He raises his objections, saying, “Prove it to me.” Because he’s looking for the answer—he’s just rejecting the question, instead of looking for the answer. You have to create a culture around yourself which gets people to associate themselves with solving problems rather than just creating them.

**Q:** Is that what you call the “Type B” personality?

**LaRouche:** No, the “Type B” is—the mind recognizes that what you think you’re seeing or sensing, is *not* real; it’s a shadow of reality. Now, once you recognize that, your thought about yourself changes. You don’t proceed from sense-certainty. You say, “Wait, this is a tricky question! Now, I did experience this sensation—sight, or whatever—but you’re telling me it’s not real. You’re telling me it’s really a shadow of something, not the something. Well, then how do I know the something?” Then you say, “Wait a minute! I must have a mind!” Because, by “mind,” I mean that you have to find a proof, which you will not find from sense-certainty; that there’s a certain reality which has produced this shadow that you think you see.

Your mind is using what we otherwise call “creativity.” The mind is using creativity to *create* the discovery of a solution for the question you couldn’t answer. Now, you realize that your identity is not in your sense-perception, but your identity is in your ability to solve the errors of sense perception, by being able to prove *efficiently* that that’s true.

How? By creating an effect that couldn’t otherwise exist. You say, “Okay, it appears to be this.” You say, “Can you prove that perhaps it’s not true?” Once you’re able to prove that the conclusion you drew from sense-certainty is not true, then you discovered you have a mind! And the chief function of all decent education, is to educate people, at the level they can do it, to do exactly that: to give them a paradox, which teaches them that what they assume to be true is not. But also to discover what *is* true. And the discovery that what is true, which appeared to them falsely as true before, tells

them that they have a mind! Once a person knows they have a mind, and can understand in those terms—and prove it!—then they’re not too likely to go insane. . . .

## The Copenhagen Circus

**Q:** I was so lucky, or unlucky, as to participate in the climate circus up north a week ago. And what I sensed was that the G77 nations, the developing countries, don’t have a sense of what the fight is, really. They want to fight against the so-called “Western countries,” but they don’t really have a sense of what to actually defend and what to try to attack, or destroy. And so, I was thinking, do you trust that the Four-Power nations actually know what the fight is?

**LaRouche:** I think that you’ve got two problems you’re raising. One question is, what is the quality of the people from the developing countries you met, encountered, and the real leaders of the society they represent? Because it’s always a relative minority in a culture, which really has grasped the sense of humanity, and they’re creative personalities. They’re always a tiny proportion. And our major function, the function you perform in society generally, is to increase the ratio of the number of members of society who are actually creative. The measure of progress of society is not what it accomplishes in wealth, but in the ratio of the number of its citizens who are actually creative. Again, like the question before, that’s the beauty question.

Second, you find this: I think you find in the developing countries—because I’ve dealt with a lot of them, and you find that most of the politicians are fakers. There are exceptions, and you will grade a country, generally, by the number of leaders who are not fakers. That doesn’t mean those who are intentionally faking, it means that they’re faking their way through life. They’re not being too serious, they’re not being too principled. But they also have a certain regard for their fellow citizens, the suffering of their country. They may be bums back in their own country, the way they behave, but they do know that their people are being abused, and that they’re part of a people that is being abused. And under certain conditions, they will reflect, and react to that. The environment will take them over.

What you had, is you had major countries, like India and China, in the G77 environment, and they were standing up to these Brits, and the other idiots from Europe! They were standing up to them! These countries. So the smaller countries, the ones who were weaker, took heart, and suddenly, contrary to what they

would do on most occasions, they would become heroes of the moment. But they were looking for leadership, someplace, which gave them a sense of strength to express these ideas. They felt it was safe.

What the Indians and Chinese did, in particular, is they made the people in the Group of 77 feel it's safe to express these kinds of ideas. And since these kind of ideas also existed in their population—I mean, what Third World country doesn't know the desperation that exists in those countries? Take Africa, for example: What about the disease ratios? What about what goes on there? Is there anyone—I've known many fakers from Africa, as leading politicians, but they, too, under certain circumstances, acknowledge the fact that they should be doing something different. And with the sense that somebody's behind them, who gives power to express that idea, they may do it!

I mean, it's a sense of pride: Even the lowest slug sometimes will show a sense of pride. And I think in this circumstance, what happened, actually, is when, on the one hand, Russia and China cut the agreement that set forth a change in the politics of the planet; and when China went to India—neighboring countries—with this kind of “let's cooperate”; and when the question came up on submitting to this Copenhagen proposal, and when they stood up and said, “No! we won't do it!”—then the countries of the G77, who otherwise, would have gone along with it, suddenly decided they're not going to. And suddenly, because of a sense of protection from China, and Russia, and India, they reacted.

I've dealt with these countries, again, and again, and again, and that's what my problem with them is: On a sunny day, they smile! But on other days, they get dark, and worry about who's going to beat them up. But if they have a sense of the protection of something next to them which is powerful—. You see that in a crowd, any kind of situation, that usually it's some individual in the crowd that gives courage to the whole crowd; they set an example, or a couple of people set an example. A process occurs that has the same effect.

So, don't be ungrateful for the fact that these guys did something. It's good that they did it. It's even better that somebody inspired them to do it, because that was the causal factor. And our job, essentially, is to use that principle, to inspire people. And the best way I know to inspire people, is by giving them the future—their future. Give them *their* future—that's the best inspiration.

In education, that used to be the case: How would you educate a class? You get a class today, most classes,

you talk to a group of children—they're hellholes! The teachers don't teach, they're afraid. The students are a bunch of bums, they're a bunch of rats attacking people. They're really out there to kill the cheese. So the problem we have, is to change the environment, and the best thing we can do with any group of people is to inspire them: to inspire them to associate themselves with creating a future, of which they need not be ashamed.

Get them a sense of what their identity is, an identity which extends for 40, 50 years into the future, and think about that. And if they think that they're doing something in that direction, and that it might succeed or they might be able to organize something to cause it to succeed, that's where people find something in themselves which is good. The goodness lies in the future that you're creating, if you're creating a good one.

Look, I can name people—a scientist, for example—who spent so many years in great frustration, to make great contributions to mankind. They devoted their lives to that kind of process. The greatest inventors, for example, similarly; the greatest artists did the same thing. Like the case of Rembrandt: Rembrandt's a perfect example of this.

Look at his self-portraits and his paintings in general, and look at these in a series. And look at the dates on these different paintings. Then look at the history of his personal life, against that background, to get these three layers. Now, look at the coordination among them, and look at the way he drew eyes! Especially the eyes that weren't there! The eyes of Homer, which weren't there, looking an idiot, Aristotle, a gilded idiot! And you get a sense of what beauty is.

And that's what inspiration is: Even people who have no idea why, are inspired by Rembrandt paintings. They don't know why! They know they're well done, they know they're unique, they know they can't free themselves of the grip of these things. They're looking at this painting: “I don't know what it means, but it just grips me! It grips me! I like it!”

And that, somehow, we have to get people a sense of a future, a sense of beauty in life, and look a number of decades ahead: Where do we want to go? And where do we want to tell human beings to go with us? What's our destiny? What's our mission? What's our place? What is our life going to mean, when it ends? What will it have meant, when it ends? Hmm? That's the difference between a man and monkey. We have too many people who are trying to be monkeys—not all of them are in the Bundestag.