

process of being experienced, would be sufficiently strong to make such a radical change in policy-matrix possible at this time? Second, whether the needed new policies have become sufficiently widespread knowledge, and have sufficient support from among at least some influential circles and institutions, to make the required changes a clearly visible political alternative?

Certainly, on the first account, the shock in the process of being experienced, is more or less as strong and profound as any experienced in recent history. On the second, there are reasons for doubt. Although my own proposals are widely known, and do have increasing support from important circles around the world, as well as in the United States, there is still room for doubt that my initiatives could be successful. If not, then, the U.S.A. as we have known it heretofore, is assuredly doomed during the near term. Worse, unless some powerful combination of states can act in concert, in the directions I have indicated as necessary, the prospect for the world as a whole, is little better than that for my country itself.

I have given you a grim picture, but, the only accurate and honest one possible. We have our implied options, and we must proceed with the intent for success, whatever we must face in that effort to overcome the obstacles before us. True solutions will be found, only when realistic assessment of challenges before us, is accepted.

Discussion

What Is Behind the Idea Of the Nation-State

Following the morning presentations of Jan. 15, three people asked questions of Mr. LaRouche. The first questioner asked why it is that his ideas, which are very persuasive, are not generally accepted by Western politicians; and also, what the countries of the South can do to manage the global crisis, without external support. The second question was from Hamdy Abdel Rahman, professor of political science from Cairo University, who asked how we can rely on the role of the nation-state, when in Africa, nation-states do not exist, in many cases; and also, how we can count on the rationality of leadership, where in Africa, this is often lacking. The third question was from Sam Aluko, professor of economics from Nigeria, who asked for further explanation of the proper role of sovereignty of government; and also, for a discussion of the role of the United States. Here is Mr. LaRouche's reply to the three speakers.

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.: Since we only have a few minutes, I will respond to one key question which came up, which is the most important: the question of the sovereign nation-state.

The importance of European civilization, modern European civilization, was not really reflected, in its influence, until the 15th Century: It was in the 15th Century that Europe developed the modern nation-state. It was developed chiefly, in two works—key works, along with many others, by Nicholas of Cusa, the *Concordantia Catholica*, which is the idea of a community of nation-states, based on principle; and the second one, the *De Docta Ignorantia*, which is actually the work which founded modern science, modern experimental science.

Now, the reason for the success of European civilization, the power *in* European civilization, is entirely an outgrowth of a revolutionary discovery, for the first time in all known human existence, of an institution called the sovereign nation-state. And the sovereign nation-state is based on a moral principle. The moral principle is, first of all, that *man is made in the image of God*. If you don't accept that condition, you don't have a safe nation-state. You can't have one. Because the condition of the authority of the nation-state, is the notion of the general welfare, or common good. What is the general welfare or the common good? It is to take care of all of the people and their posterity, *as human*.

Every culture of every significance, before that, has made

NOW Are You Ready To Learn Economics?

Lyndon LaRouche's 1984 textbook, *So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics?*, forecast a global financial meltdown, if we didn't learn the difference between real economics and financial speculation. Unfortunately, most people refused to listen. Today, they are finding out that LaRouche was right.



This new book reprints three of LaRouche's most important articles on what must be done *after the crash*.

ORDER NOW FROM
Ben Franklin Booksellers
 P.O. Box 1707
 Leesburg, VA 20177

We accept MasterCard, VISA,
 Discover and American Express.

OR Order by phone, toll-free: 800-453-4108
 OR 703-777-3661 fax: 703-777-8287

\$10 plus shipping and handling
 Virginia residents add 4.5% sales tax.

Shipping and handling: \$4.00 for first book, \$.50
 each additional book.

contributions, in terms of great individuals, or efforts of great leaders of nations. Languages have been created, and so forth. All these things were done. But there was no modern nation-state. No nation-state *existed* before the 15th Century in Europe. Nowhere. States existed, but not sovereign nation-states. Because the state was a thing controlled by an oligarchy, and its armed and other lackeys. And most of the population were subjects of the state. They were *objects* of the state. They were not human beings.

So, you had no system of self-government. Self-government is not *democracy*. Self-government is based on truth, not individual opinion. A government based on truth means, that the government must be accountable for taking care of all of the people and their posterity. Now, if that constitutional feature is not in government, then you don't have government! You want to form a state, based on some charter?!

The problem that we have today, is that the oligarchical interests, which are typified by the British interests today, the *empiricists*, do not believe in man. They say there's "free trade," something mysterious going on under the floorboards, which will make everything work, if you just stick with free trade. It never does! But the mentality, which has been exported by British institutions, and by many European institutions, and by American institutions, which adopt that policy, is to deny the existence of the sacredness of the human individuality as in the image of God, an individuality which must participate in the *ideas* which distinguish man from the monkey. And if that principle of law is recognized—

A Revolutionary Change

And how do you get that kind of nation-state? One answer: You have to make a *revolution* to create it. How? There have been many efforts to do that. The impact of European civilization, in many parts of the world, was to say, let's do it! Let's do it, not as colonies; let's do it for ourselves. You had the "winds of change" in Africa, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, under Kwame Nkrumah and others. The great wave of change. You had the development of Nigeria, as a product of what was done by Nasser, in Egypt, in the attempt to create the so-called United Arab Republic, which was a unifying factor. The idea: Let us make a revolution, to create a nation-state. Let us mobilize the people, not as shock troops for somebody's ambition; let us mobilize the people to demand a government which is based on this constitutional principle, of man in the image of God.

The Dialogue of Cultures

Now, let me say one final thing on this subject. I've written another paper here, which is submitted—we didn't have a place to put it in, but it should be shared among the people, on this dialogue of cultures.¹ It deals specifically

1. Mr. LaRouche's paper, "Dialogue Among Cultures: The Road to Peace," was circulated at the conference, and appeared in *EIR*, Feb. 9, 2001.

with the problem here, and elsewhere, the Middle East war, all such things: this question of religious warfare and similar kinds of warfare. And the obvious thing, which has been propagated largely through the initiative of Khatami, the President of Iran, is extremely important. This man is a very cultivated man. Very unusual statesman, of very unusual quality, from what I've seen of his performance. He has articulated something which is very old, in terms of Iranian history, which is also very good. It goes back to Ibn Sina, and other things, in the history of Iran. What we need is a *dialogue of cultures*.

Now, what do we have? We have cultures which base themselves on the basis of the Mosaic conception of monotheism. Which is not simply a religious doctrine; it is something which has a physical foundation, physical proof. Because only a human being, can make a discovery of a universal principle, by which the power of man in the universe is increased. No individual member of any other species can increase the potential population density of that species in the universe. It can not be done! Only human beings. So human beings, therefore, have the ability to command the universe, in this way, through this power of discovery, which makes every individual child, potentially, in the image of God. Therefore, our job is to educate and develop every child in that direction. To develop people who understand themselves, as in the image of God.

Now, then we deal with cultures like Islam, Christianity, and the better part of Judaism, which agree on that. We have other cultures on this planet, that don't agree, at least on religious and related grounds, culturally. The Buddhists don't agree generally—though many Buddhists do. So, therefore, why don't we recognize that this principle, of winning the entire planet—in which you have China; you have India, where there's a lot of disagreement on this thing; Southeast Asia, where there's not unanimity. You have all the heathen in the United States, and the heathen in Europe, just to make things more complicated. The basic thing we have to do, since the nation-state depends upon a *concept*, which is what the nation-state was created on, the idea of man in the image of God, it requires that the state has no moral authority, except as God's instrument to protect *all* of the people and their posterity, and promote their welfare. That's the law. And that's the basis for the nation-state. Now, if we agree on that, then we run into a conflict with people who do not agree with that. For that, we require a dialogue of cultures, an ecumenical dialogue of cultures, for a political purpose, both to come to an agreement among those of us who *do* agree with the principle, and to win over those who *should* agree, by showing them the truth. As Khatami has proposed.

Therefore, I think that in dealing with these problems, you can not create a nation-state by a formula. You have to evoke, from inside the soul of the individual, a conception which makes them *want* the nation-state. And that's our job.