

What Horowitz's Defeat Implies: In Crisis, Politics Must Be an Action on the Future

by Michael Kirsch, LaRouche Youth Movement

In the months leading up to the Nov. 7 midterm election, Lyndon LaRouche and the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) descended upon the election, from our continuing fight for the future of the nation against the enemies of the United States, including American Tory John Train, William F. Buckley, Dick Cheney, et al. We focussed on the higher level of that fight to save the nation, a responsibility which the Democratic Party refused to take; and as I demonstrate here, we made a discussion of *that* higher struggle, *subsume* and define the election.

The Democratic landslide, which was deemed impossible both by anyone who had followed the Party's performance throughout the Summer, and by all statistical accounts, demonstrated the effectiveness of LaRouche's method of political organizing. Then, on Nov. 21, with the unanimous voting down of David Horowitz's "Academic Freedom" bill in the Pennsylvania State Legislature, the leading test case for the entire ACTA-FIRE-Lynne Cheney/Train apparatus (see *EIR*, Oct. 13, 2006), LaRouche's method was vindicated again. Next, on Nov. 29, the Democrats of Pennsylvania took the House. As will be demonstrated below, the manifestations of these predicates reflect the mass effect created throughout the nation, by LaRouche and the LYM creating political ferment in exposing the Campus Gestapo. Therefore, as the continuing effects of LaRouche's and the LYM's organizing emit themselves, perhaps the most important aspect of the election is, that the Democratic Party must now ask, *What is the method of Lyndon LaRouche?*

Dynamics vs. Mechanics

In the great statesman Leibniz's refutation of Descartes' rules of motion, he demonstrates, following Kepler's refutation of Ptolemy, Copernicus, and Brahe, that motion can not be understood in any of the formal predicates of the motion and the body itself, but must be understood in the unseen principle determining the space which the motion expresses. As Leibniz says in his 1692 refutation of Descartes, "In order to say that something is moving, we will require not only that it change its position with respect to other things, but also that there be within itself a *cause of change, force, an action.*"*

* Michael Kirsch and Aaron Yule, "Experimental Metaphysics," *Dynamis*, October 2006, at www.seattlelym.com.

Again, the cause must be located outside of the body and motion, in the principle organizing the relationships defining the sense-perceived object. Similarly, which was the central principle of the calculus, Leibniz uniquely discovered that the sense-perceived catenary can not be measured by an *a priori* simple description measured against an empty Euclidean-Cartesian space of x and y coordinates, but rather, that the catenary defines space by the physical principle expressed in its shape, which, as Leibniz discovered, embodied the paradox of physical action, leading to a new measurement for all ostensibly algebraic magnitudes.

The expression of a higher principle in politics is the same. How does one explain the recent election results? With the landslide for the Democrats which had seemed impossible months prior to the election, what was the determining factor causing the change in the organization of youth, professors, and citizens alike that created a *discussion* of ideas throughout the population? The Democrats must now discover the unseen principle that demonstrated itself in this election, and was the cause of what popular opinion determined "impossible."

To investigate this, take the negative first. How do you measure the effective magnitude of such a *discussion*? Do you take a poll, get a statistic of how many people agree with you, and then count up the votes?

Or even worse, do you explain the seemingly "impossible" occurrence as created by one singular political speech, a massive session of phone banking, or some mechanical push that causes all the dominoes to fall? In fact, it was not the sum of all the "robo-calls" which added up to an election victory, or any of the techniques of Howard Dean's amorphous "grass roots."

Is this your method of politics? Rather than this impotent approach, were you to tell the truth, and thus act upon the unseen power of the communication of ideas throughout the population, then, you could understand and measure the magnitude of effect of a discussion. Only if you introduce the truth to the American population, rather than navigating accepted popular opinion as a sophist, does the necessary method of LaRouche's "mass effect" become a power which can be wielded to effect change. Hence, the measurement of the discussion throughout the population, is found in the *cause* of the discussion.

LaRouche spoke of this during his post-election Nov. 16 webcast:

“It came, also, from a surge, a great surge of the population between the age of 25 and 35. That is what won the election! This was a part of the population which the Democratic campaign had done *nothing* to win over. The leading policy had been doing *nothing* to win them over.

“That’s where we played a role. We pushed. And the youth pushed hard: *We won the election*. Because we sparked a reaction *in* the population by the methods we used, to create a mass effect. You have a few people with *ideas*, you produce a *mass effect*. . . . By mass effect: you spread *ideas*. You deploy in such a way as to spread *ideas* among the people! And the spreading of ideas among the people, when the ideas are attractive to them, causes them to have a better relationship to each other. And the people who develop this better relationship to each other in terms of ideas, *then* become influential in the entire community around them. And that’s what happened!”

So, what is the *cause* of such a discussion of ideas? Keeping this question in your mind, review the following in-depth overview of the LYM organizing before the election.

A Nationwide Discussion

In the weeks leading into the midterm election, 750,000 copies of the LPAC pamphlet, “Is Joseph Goebbels on Your Campus? John Train and the Bankers Secret Government,” had been circulated by the LYM at an estimated 75 major universities and community colleges in 16 states, including California, Washington State, Oregon, Texas, Georgia, Ohio, Michigan, Missouri, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Virginia, to name the main areas of concentration.

LYM organizers, taking the temperature reading of professors and youth, found the great illness of the “Campus Gestapo.” We addressed what everyone was thinking, but was not willing to openly discuss, whether for fear of persecution, or a lack of understanding the truth of what was generating the conditions on their campus. Some reported examples:

- In California, a political science director admitted to calls to her office regularly from parents who were being affected by the Campus Gestapo operations.

- In Ohio, one professor honestly thought the LYM organizer inquiring about the Gestapo’s operations on his campus, was bugged. Another admitted that professors are beginning to stick to the script when they teach. Another professor stated that the environment is worse than McCarthyism, and excitedly took a bundle of pamphlets to circulate to others.

- In Pennsylvania, a teacher who told us of the attacks on her coming from ACTA (Lynne Cheney’s American Council of Trustees and Alumni), was thrilled that we are doing something, and took a DVD.

Students were unsure of what was causing the apolitical

environment on campus. Many indicated seeing professors being recorded, and other professors being pressured to conform to the Bush Administration line, or be fired. Students couldn’t figure out why there hadn’t been political discussion on the campus; others said, a lot of youth weren’t voting. Most youth weren’t excited about the Democratic strategy and hadn’t even been thinking about the election.

- In Texas, many students admitted there should be more political activity, but couldn’t put their finger on the problem. When briefed on the Campus Gestapo, they became empowered, and they could get other youth on campus to start thinking. At a different university, one youth, explaining how her friends were acting politically by disrupting an event on campus with Straussian neo-con William Kristol, was asked if she had thought about why only right-wingers are doing all the speaking events on campuses. This student recognized the effects of the Campus Gestapo, and took extra pamphlets to distribute.

While students and professors noted some of the effects of the Campus Gestapo, there was not a general discussion, but rather, an environment of suppressed political consciousness. With its action, the LYM generated a discussion throughout the country. On nearly all the campuses, every professor got a pamphlet either through another professor or the LYM distributions. Nationwide, our organizing created a forum for *real* political discussion.

Professors and Youth Inspired To Act

The professors who had otherwise been silent, were excited by our flanking maneuver against the controllers of the Bush Administration, and felt empowered to intervene. Many excitedly took bundles to distribute to other faculty.

- In California, one professor invited us to distribute literature in his class. A teacher’s assistant took extra to deliver to the professors’ boxes.

A political science director invited us to hold a forum, saying, “You are going to hit them hard!”

- In Washington, D.C. a professor walked with us back to his department. After unlocking the department after hours, he helped us distribute pamphlets to his co-workers’ mailboxes. On a different campus, a professor encouraged us to distribute in his whole department.

- In Texas, secretaries, after getting briefed on the pamphlet, changed their minds about the rules regarding distribution, and allowed us to distribute through the whole department. A professor, upon seeing the LYM be denied access to distribution elsewhere, helped.

Non-linear effects occur when getting a discussion on campus through the initiation of powerful ideas. The interrelation of mass distributions of literature, students and professors taking extra pamphlets, organizing of students, speaking events on campus, articles published in campus newspapers, and meetings held with students and professors, generated a self-developing process subsuming any particular organizing

experience. The LYM didn't approach the nationwide organizing with a formula, but rather, fought with citizens of America for their future.

- On one California campus, after distributing 10,000 pamphlets on student desks, and students taking extra to distribute, one youth decided to invite the LYM to do a radio interview, radiating the potential of the discussion further. Another youth came up remarking, "What is this pamphlet? These things are everywhere, you guys are doing a great job; it's raining pamphlets! They are everywhere I go!"

- In Virginia, after we set up A-frames with pictures of "Big Sister" Lynne Cheney's face, youth gathered around the LYM's organizing table all day, which in turn caused everyone to be talking about them. One or two friends of one youth would come up to the table. Pretty soon there would be eight youth in discussion, organizing each other about the questions they would have. They would walk off together in discussion about the political situation; our organizing was a driver to stimulate discussion.

- In D.C., one youth told the LYM that she heard her classmates talking about the attacks on Lynne Cheney. Another student came up to the table, having already gotten the pamphlet from an early morning distribution on student desks: "I read it cover to cover." Another student reported being watched by Lynne Cheney by one of the many pictures of "Big Sister" Cheney that had been posted inside the bathroom stalls!

- In Ohio, a student reported to a LYM organizer that someone in his class announced, "If you are interested in politics, you should check out this group, Campus Watch." (William F. Buckley wouldn't be pleased.) In response to our organizing, campus newspapers covered our exposure of the Campus Gestapo's suppression of the vote.

- In Connecticut, some students had started up discussion and wrote articles about our pamphlet, simply from the effects of mass saturation of literature.

The cross-country organizing causes an intersection of real discussion. More important than being in any one place, is to be everywhere. One professor reported, "I've seen you guys all over the country, so what is this all about?" In Ohio, a student who was visiting from California met the LYM and reported that her roommates had all been talking about our pamphlet back home. One youth who'd read the pamphlet, came up to the LYM organizing table, only to discover that he had worked with the LYM to save the machine-tool sector earlier in the year!

People accustomed to "happy ending" movies and entertainment, may get a little queasy—but some citizens, confused about the Campus Gestapo, were enraged with our organizing. Others were shocked. Not everyone *agreed* with us. And that is *good*. We created a fight, a discussion. In today's "Nerf" society, where nobody gets hurt, conflict is not popular, but, for those interested in the truth of reality, it is *always* necessary.

Locating the Cause

Consequently, we now return to the relevant subject of this inquiry. To comprehend the election results requires an ability to effectively measure the magnitude of the discussion of ideas.

Effects are measured and defined by what bounds and generates them; hence, we return to the earlier question: What unseen principle was the *cause* of the discussion of ideas in the population?

Look to the principle that LaRouche introduced into this midterm election, embedded in the mass organizing around the pamphlet, "Is Joseph Goebbels on Your Campus?" The pamphlet exposed the "Get LaRouche" Task Force of American Tory John Train, launched one month after, and subsequently sabotaging, President Ronald Reagan's 1983 announcement to the world that LaRouche's economic development policy, which Reagan called the Strategic Defense Initiative, was the new U.S. foreign policy—a treasonous attack by a fascist banker apparatus against America's and the world's future generations.

Today, the Train apparatus is targeting the youth of Americas campuses, to create a bankers' dictatorship as the financial system disintegrates. The development toward the future for young people is being squelched by a Gestapo. These are a majority of youth who readily admit, "We have no future." LaRouche ignited this principal concern of young people with the truth. What appeared to Democrats as an impractical approach, was, to the LYM, and to citizens who admit the horrible reality crushing living conditions today, the honest truth.

In the real universe—a universe determined by the decisions of humans, not one of an *a priori* set of rules—the truth is relevant to politics. If the Democratic Party accepts no underlying statistical axioms as to how political fights are supposed to be won, and instead addresses the human population's minds, the truth resonating throughout the nation will override the mechanical rules determining the limitations of action.

The success of the Goebbels pamphlet demonstrates that these *a priori* rules, for which only a Baby Boomer would fall, are in fact a fantasy, and a fraud. LaRouche is and will continue to be vindicated; the method of politics is to reveal the truth of the reality affecting the future of youth. The method of politics is not about winning elections; it is about the truth.

"We've proven it by the turnout by young people as voters, in the 18 to 25 group, and the 25 to 35 group: *It proves, that reposing inside the young people of America, the young adults of America, there is a core of young adults which does have an orientation toward the future, which will respond to the idea of a future.* Where the Baby Boomers in general have given up on the future, and have tried to cling to what they can salvage from their own past. That's what the problem is."—Lyndon LaRouche, Nov. 16, 2006 webcast