

says, even if he also wants to make money. He writes: “On the way to high self-esteem, straightening out the government, fixing the schools, making more money, and lifting the yoke of the Illuminati Ruling Class Conspiracy, there are two main lessons to be learned: (1) your wealth is worth far more than your money; and (2) spiritual empowerment is the only way to build wealth.”

Lyndon LaRouche recently wrote that the principal problem we face in organizing the American people to understand and fight the British oligarchy is the problem of “my money”—that Americans are willing to commit almost any evil act, including sanctioning the ongoing bombing campaigns in Iraq and Yugoslavia, to preserve the illusion that “my money” is safe. Tony Brown exemplifies this problem, though he is better than most of his fellow Americans, because he is also willing to tell the truth. He should just listen to LaRouche more carefully.

Interview: Tony Brown

Tony Brown is the founding dean and former professor of the School of Communications at Howard University. He was interviewed on May 26 by Marianna Wertz.

EIR: I was alerted to your book by a subscriber, who asked me to review the book. So, I’d like to ask a couple of questions about LaRouche to begin with. On page 51, you say that you were “susceptible to media lampooning of LaRouche as a kook,” but that you have found that he has “one of the best private intelligence-gathering operations in the world.”

Brown: Number one, I think generally the opinion that people have of Mr. LaRouche is that he’s a kook, because I don’t think anybody—I know I had never done any research, I had never compared what he said with actual events. On the face of it, it sounds preposterous. When one hears charges that very wealthy, rich and famous people can be involved in some of the activities that he alleges. So, on the face of it, that’s why I said what I did.

After I got into the investigation for the book, some of his claims did not seem that preposterous, and many of his claims—I’m not talking about his record, because I’m not an expert on his record—but those claims that I used in the book seem to have a lot of merit to them.

EIR: And that would be claims particularly with respect to the British oligarchic conspiracy.

Brown: Yes. I think the most recent charges, by Dodi Fayed’s father, Mohammed Al-Fayed, the ones that were in the London *Times* the Sunday before last [May 16]—you’re familiar with that because they quoted your magazine, as the Internet source, and so forth—I think with this, it seems to me that Mr. Fayed has found out something, through his own


private investigation. I don’t think he’s saying what he found out, at least that’s how I read it, but he’s, in effect, blaming the MI6 and that British Establishment for the death of his son and Princess Di. . . . I’m not an expert on any of this. I cannot empirically prove any of this. But I can stand by one unalterable fact, and it’s a stubborn fact. There are just too many coincidences for me not to suspect that there is some form or some type of conspiracy. I can only draw two conclusions: That there *is* a conspiracy, or everything that is happening is just coincidental.

EIR: You say in your book that “although Lyndon LaRouche and anyone who dares quote him has been ridiculed by the media for exposing the aristocratic English cancer on world history, its tradition of evil and occult Illuminism is a fact.” Have you been ridiculed by the media for quoting him or for your exposé?

Brown: Oh my God! I’m sure you know you didn’t need to ask that question!

EIR: Well, for our readers I do.

Brown: Number one, I have been ridiculed with the most potent weapon they have, and that’s the conspiracy of silence. They kill you behind your back. I knew, going into this book,



that this would happen to me. In one of the sections I even say, to some extent, I know what's going to happen. It happens to you in a way that you can never point a finger at anyone. You can never prove anything. But my book has been *completely* ignored.

If I may, all this stuff about the Chinese and Clinton getting the money: I've got a section in here on the Chinese and giving money and about the secrets that have been stolen. The [Cox Committee] report that came out yesterday, I have all of that in this book [pp. 59-60]. I wrote this book two and a half years ago.

EIR: But the Cox report specifically, and the others, are British-inspired intelligence operations aimed at stopping the U.S. relationship with China, which is crucial to the future of humanity. Also, the bombing of the Chinese Embassy was deliberate and it was done in order to break off the U.S.-Chinese relationship. If this occurs, then the future of humanity is that the British will run the United States, as they are doing through this Cox operation.

Brown: What do you mean "will run" the United States?

EIR: We have a fighting chance for survival still!

You say in your book—and I have to applaud you for your courage in saying this—that “no country's leadership, including that of Nazi Germany, has committed more evil in the world than England's.” Are you aware that similar charges are now being levied against the Blair government's war for “human rights” in Yugoslavia, and that LaRouche himself said that if Blair were honest and wanted to stop human rights violations, he would start by bombing Buckingham Palace?

Brown: I have no comment on that. That's beyond my purview. I have to stick with what I have researched, and I don't draw a lot of conjecture into current events. I don't know anything about British involvement in terms of the bombing of the Chinese Embassy.

But I will tell you this, and I've said it publicly: There's no way in the world you're going to convince me, or is there anyone who can convince me, that the CIA did not know where the Chinese Embassy was. Maybe they made a mistake and aimed at a building down the street, but you can't tell me they hit that building because they didn't know where it was. There's no way in the world that I'm going to believe that the people who run the CIA are that incompetent.

Nor do I believe that the Chinese got all of these secrets, and I believe they have these secrets, I don't think they got these secrets, because the people who guarded the secrets didn't know. Somebody just opened the door and walked out. I don't think these things are coincidental.

I don't believe they're incompetent at all. I think they're very good at what they do. The intelligence community has destroyed many black leaders who they felt were threats.

EIR: And killed.

Brown: That's a possibility too. So there's no way in the

world you can tell me they don't know how to do their job. I know they know how to do their job.

EIR: I'd like to take up economic policy, because there are some real divergences between our view and yours. Your critique of the Federal Reserve as the instrument which the City of London has used to take over the U.S. banking system is accurate. Yet, you oppose a national bank, which was the instrument that Alexander Hamilton used to build the American economy, in direct opposition to the British plan to destroy our country in its early years. Are you familiar with the history of the National Bank under Hamilton and particularly with what was called the “American System” of economics, which Lincoln used during the Civil War to rebuild the country?

Brown: I know Lincoln came up with something. I'm not an expert on it. I can give you the genesis for my statement, and that is, that I don't trust government, period. In that respect, I'm very libertarian. I don't trust government. I don't think that the Chinese government is any better than the British government, or it's any better than the American government. I don't think any of them are any good. They're all controlled: 356 people in the world control 45% of the wealth. That means 356 people in the world have more money than perhaps 3 billion people.

So I don't think that we can live in a world in which, before we cast one vote in the year 2000, we're down to two men—either Gore or George W. Bush.

EIR: Which is no choice.

Brown: Well, there is a choice. We've already had a money primary. We've already had a primary. You and I didn't vote in it. I know I didn't. Because I don't have that kind of money.

EIR: The Democratic Party changed the rules yesterday on the primary race, on who can qualify to run for President. They made one new rule, which is, that you have to have been eligible to vote in 1996 to run for President in 2000. And Lyndon LaRouche was on parole in 1996 (and had lost his right to vote). That's how the rules are made.

Brown: First of all, it's nearly impossible for the average person to even become a candidate in the Republican primary. That's the way that's done. There's no chance of the average person getting elected through the Republican primaries. The Democrats are simply moving toward their position.

EIR: Back to your book. You cite Ludwig von Mises for your readers to study as a competent economist. . . . But von Mises, with von Hayek, is a leader of the Swiss Mont Pelerin Society, which are the leading advocates of the free-trade doctrine, that is, the British doctrine, and opposed to the rights of the nation-state to defend itself against free-trade looting. Do you support that Mont Pelerin position?

Brown: The question might be a false syllogism, because it doesn't mean that everything that Britain does is evil. A good

lie is 90% true. It doesn't mean that because one supports free trade and Britain supports free trade, that free trade is bad. I think von Mises, if the world were close to perfect, which it would have to be for a free-trade system to work—you can't have free trade or even capitalism where you have violence, and hatred is a form of violence. So, whenever you have an institution such as slavery, which means you've introduced violence into a market system, then the market system is corrupted, because there is no such thing as supply and demand. It's been perverted.

The economic system in this world is a system run by 356 or more people, who control the country. Now, you people have been behind, what's the Prime Minister of Malaysia?

EIR: Mahathir bin Mohamad.

Brown: Now the IMF and the Western economists are eating crow, aren't they? . . . Because he's got a fast-growing economy. They said controls wouldn't work. But they did work, didn't they? . . . Any economy will work if you close your borders and share your money with the people in your group! You don't have to be a PhD in economics to know that. That's the only defense against people who come in and raid your country, destroy your currency, and then take over your businesses for a penny on a dollar.

EIR: Do you see your Seven-Step Plan as essentially doing the same thing as what Mahathir did in Malaysia?

Brown: I have my own money: the Freedoms. I have a money system.

EIR: But you're not a nation! You don't have an army!

Brown: No, I don't have to be a nation. But I want to be free. My formula for being free is that we have to organize as communities, in order to keep the government from controlling our lives. In other words, I want to benefit from the fruits of my labor. My money is my property. The government has no right to my property. Now, I'm going to pay my taxes, because if I don't pay my taxes, they'll put me in jail. It doesn't mean they're right, it simply means that they have the Army and the Navy and I don't.

EIR: This is a fundamental difference between this view and the view that *EIR* and LaRouche express. . . . *EIR* and LaRouche take the view that the sovereign nation-state is the instrumentality that was created in Western civilization to defend the rights of individuals, created in the image of God.

Brown: I wouldn't argue with that. I would, however, amend it by saying that that intent is a wonderful intent, and I say it all through my book. But that is not a part of modern-day reality. We have run God out of America, which is why we have young people killing each other. And what kind of young people are killing other young people? The very best that materialism can produce. The privileged whites. Why are

they doing that? Because they are not filled with any spirit of God. . . .

EIR: I'd like to go to another question. You say that a Wall Street collapse is inevitable, as LaRouche and others have said as well. LaRouche's forecast is based on how wealth is created, of physical economy, that if you fail to invest in the manufacturing and agricultural development of your economy, and you allow financial instruments to grow like a cancer, as they have done since 1971, when we went off the gold standard, that the explosion of these financial instruments is inevitable, because there is no real wealth backing them up.

But, you say that we have left the Industrial Age and are moving into an Information Age. How can you have an Information Age with no manufacturing base?

Brown: But that's not *all* I'm saying. All through my book I even call for a gold standard, and I say that what they call the American dollar is simply an IOU or an instrument of debt. I agree that our money should be tied to gold and silver. But the other area that you mention, in terms of creating wealth: Wealth is mostly now being created through the transfer and distribution and accumulation of information. That's how we're creating wealth. It doesn't mean we're not doing any manufacturing. Obviously somebody's got to build houses, somebody's got to build cars.

EIR: But the question is, whether that wealth is real wealth, or is it just paper?

Brown: No, no. The use of the human talent is the essence of wealth in any society. . . . Therefore, if we are using human talent to build cars, and houses, and even guns, then that is wealth. In today's New York papers, you see where 67% of New York City fourth graders cannot read. They can't read! Now, that means that you are not producing wealth in New York, because it's just a matter of time before that catches up with you.

EIR: That's for sure. Let me add one thing to your definition. It is true that the source of wealth is the use of the human mind, but—and this is the center of LaRouche's economic analysis: It must be for the purpose of the reproduction at a higher level of culture or living standard of the human species that that mind is used. That is the production of real wealth. Not just anything. In other words, if the mind is used to produce garbage, it's not real wealth.

Brown: I think we're into economic theory, at which Mr. LaRouche is obviously much better than I. My positions are not intended theologically. They are intended in terms of practicality. If I produce a gun, as destructive as it is, you can't say I haven't produced wealth, because somebody will buy it. It doesn't have value. So I have produced wealth.

But wealth comes in three forms. Money is one form of wealth. Social capital, the ability of people in a community or in the world or nation to work together for the common

good, to build institutions, is a form of wealth. That's social capital. The third and the highest form of wealth, of course, is human capital, and that is your formal education and your work experience, which gives you the ability to create and produce. So, in order to have wealth, it isn't being rich. Some people confuse being rich with wealth, or having money with wealth. That's one form, and there's no doubt that if a person has money, they can get other people to do other things. But that doesn't mean I'm wealthy, because if you take their money, they don't have any wealth at all.

EIR: Here's the loaded question for you—

Brown: You mean another one, right?

EIR: LaRouche has declared his candidacy for the Democratic Party nomination for President. Would you like to endorse his campaign?

Brown: No. And it's got nothing to do with Mr. LaRouche. I just don't see anything happening through that system. That's Mr. LaRouche's business and I don't meddle in that. I'm libertarian to a very great extent and I think we should have all points of view expressed. My defense of Mr. LaRouche is the same defense I use of Clarence Thomas among many blacks who don't feel he has a right to exist.

I, for example, coordinated the largest civil rights march

ever held in America, in Detroit, Michigan, with Martin Luther King. He was the attraction, I was the coordinator. I did not organize that march so Jesse Jackson could be liberal. I organized that march so that any black, no matter what he or she believes, had a right to express that point of view. This is my position on Mr. LaRouche. I don't take a position for or against him. I think he has as much right to his point of view as Bill Clinton has to his point of view, which includes his running for President in the Democratic Party.

First of all, I'm a Republican. . . . But I'm a libertarian Republican. And I am a moderate Republican. I am not into that right-wing crazy stuff. Republican principles will work, if given a chance, but most of the people who are calling themselves Republicans, the Buchanans and the rest of them, are simply people who have another agenda, who are using the Republican vehicle. So I don't take any position on who's going to run and who's not going to run.

I take a position, as my book said, in empowering the people, if the people have the power transferred to them, by transferring back to them their wealth, that the people will run America. And it doesn't matter what party's in power. It doesn't matter who the President is. If the central government is still siphoning off and stealing the money, which means they steal the freedom of the population, we're not going to have a democracy.

EIR Talks

Interviews with EIR Intelligence Directors and guests.



EIR's Jeffrey Steinberg (left) and Gail Billington interview Cambodian Ambassador Var Houth.

ON SATELLITE
Saturdays 5 p.m. ET
Galaxy 7 (G-7)
Transponder 14.
7.71 Audio.
91 Degrees West.

SHORTWAVE RADIO
Sundays, 5 p.m. ET
2100 UTC
WWCR 12.160 mHz

Cassettes Available to Radio Stations
Transcripts Available to Print Media

LISTEN ON THE INTERNET:
<http://www.larouchepub.com>

Local Times for "EIR Talks" Sunday Shortwave Broadcast on WWCR 12.160 mHz

Adis Ababa 0100*	Bombay 0330*	Honolulu 1200	Los Angeles 1400	Paris 2300	Singapore 0530*
Amsterdam 2300	Bucharest 2400	Hong Kong 0600*	Madrid 2300	Philadelphia 1700	Stockholm 2300
Anchorage 1300	Buenos Aires 1900	Houston 1600	Manila 0600*	Prague 2300	Teheran 0130*
Athens 2400	Cairo 2400	Istanbul 2400	Melbourne 0800*	Rio de Janeiro 1900	Tel Aviv 2400
Auckland 1000*	Caracas 1800	Jakarta 0500*	Mexico City 1600	Rome 2300	Tokyo 0700*
Baghdad 0100*	Chicago 1600	Jerusalem 2400	Milan 2300	St. Petersburg 0100*	Toronto 1700
Baltimore 1700	Copenhagen 2300	Johannesburg 2400	Minneapolis 1600	San Francisco 1400	Vancouver 1400
Bangkok 0500*	Denver 1500	Karachi 0300*	Montreal 1700	Sarajevo 2300	Warsaw 2300
Beijing 0600*	Detroit 1700	Kiev 2400	Moscow 0100*	Seattle 1400	Washington 1700
Berlin 2300	Dublin 2200	Khartoum 2400	New Delhi 0330*	Seoul 0700*	Wiesbaden 2300
Bogota 1700	Gdansk 2300	London 2200	New York 1700	Shanghai 0600*	

* Mondays