

## **EDITORIAL**

---

# The Ideas which Can Now Change The History of Man and the Universe

by William F. Wertz, Jr.

*William F. Wertz, Jr., spoke as follows, as he opened the discussion on LaRouche PAC's Thursday, [March 23, "Fireside Chat" Activists' Conference Call.](#)*

Good evening everyone. What I just wanted to start out with is the fact that 34 years ago today, March 23, 1983, Ronald Reagan spoke before the nation and announced his Strategic Defense Initiative; the crucial words that he expressed were as follows:

I call upon the scientific community, who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these weapons impotent and obsolete.

Now the reason I'm raising this is that Lyndon LaRouche was the actual author of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), and was involved in negotiations on behalf of the Reagan Administration with the then Soviet Union to get the Soviet agreement to jointly develop the Strategic Defense Initiative so that, in fact, the SDI was not only to benefit just one country—ourselves, the United States—to the detriment of the Soviet Union, which clearly would not eliminate the danger of thermonuclear war, but rather, it was to be a joint project involving advanced physical principles, at the frontiers of science, which would also have major ramifications for the development of the global economy.

The reason that's important is because we are now

at a crucial moment in world history where similar ideas developed by Lyndon LaRouche have the potential to actually be consolidated on a global level as a result of the initiatives taken by the Russians, the Chinese, the Indians; and by the fact that we now have a President of the United States who is moving away from British imperial policy, which has led us to one war after another, and he is moving towards what he himself has called the "American System" of economics. That school of American System was initiated by Alexander Hamilton. And it's been brought back into the public domain by the efforts of Lyndon LaRouche and his associates starting really from at least the 1970s.

I just want to very briefly outline where we stand in the fight for the American System, and to also emphasize that what we're seeing is the power of reason, the power of strategic ideas which are consonant with the nature of man as a creative species—the only one that we know of—and the power of those ideas to change the direction of humanity, and to ultimately change the direction of the Universe.

One of the ideas that Lyndon LaRouche and Helga LaRouche have advocated is the Eurasian Land-bridge, which then became the World Land-bridge, and that has been adopted by the Chinese in the form of the "One Belt, One Road" policy or the New Silk Road Initiative, and this concept is a concept which you can also trace back to the policy of Pope Paul VI, at the time he put forward an encyclical called, *Populorum Progressio*, where he said that "the new name of peace is develop-

ment.” This is the concept which Prime Minister Modi of India also recently put forward when he visited the United States and said we have to develop a “mass movement for development.”

Development is the basis for world peace, and this is a concept which Lyndon LaRouche has put forward with scientific rigor, for decades. And that policy not only has become increasingly hegemonic as the trans-Atlantic region has become increasingly bankrupt, but I would say that we’re on the verge of that policy not only becoming hegemonic, but actually consolidating itself on a global level, to the extent to which the United States is brought into that dynamic.

We have circulated a petition for some time, calling for the United States to join the BRICS. The BRICS nations are Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, which have been actually pushing this kind of policy. And under Obama, or had Hillary Clinton won the election, the United States joining that process would have been the furthest thing from reality, because their policy was the British policy of geopolitics, of war. I would say that we’re on the verge of this policy of economic development, of the “One Belt, One Road” policy, coming into a position of consolidation.

As you may have heard, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson was recently in China. When he was there, he actually endorsed the policy formulation of President Xi of China. He said that “we agree with the policy of nonconfrontation, mutual respect, and win-win” as opposed to a zero-sum game, which is what geopolitics is. In other words, somebody wins, somebody loses—or everybody loses, in fact. But in fact, the Chinese are putting forward this perspective, and Tillerson endorsed that perspective.

There is a conference that will take place in Beijing on May 14 and 15, on the “One Belt, One Road.” As many as 60 or more nations are expected to be there. President Trump has been invited to go there. That’s a definite possibility, although there is no confirmation of that at this point. It is possible that there will be a summit between President Trump and President Xi in early April in the United States, and if that were to occur, that would probably mean that Trump would move in the direction of endorsing the One Belt, One Road policy.

As you may know, another Asian leader, Shinzo Abe from Japan, also recently came to the United States. He is working very closely with the Russians on economic development, and he made offers of invest-

ment in the United States to help redevelop U.S. infrastructure, and there is potential that the Chinese would do the same as a result of the One Belt, One Road policy.

### **Bring Back Hamilton’s System**

Since March 15, President Trump has given three extraordinary speeches. One was in Michigan, where he talked about rebuilding the U.S. manufacturing base, building cities. He welcomed foreign investment in the United States. Then he went down to Louisville, Kentucky and gave another speech there, and I think the next day, he gave a speech in Washington, D.C. at the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee event. These speeches are not getting wide publicity in the mainstream media, but what he has called for is the American System of political economy. He has explicitly called for that. When he was in Kentucky, he referred to Abraham Lincoln, who was an advocate of the American System of economy. He referred to Henry Clay—he was basically going through a list of people who were born in Kentucky, including Lincoln who was born there, Henry Clay who was born there, among others. And the basic thing that he was saying was that we’re going to develop the U.S. economy. We’re going to develop manufacturing. We’re going to put coal workers back to work. We’re going to have auto plants back in Michigan and Kentucky. He rejected the idea of free trade, which is actually the British system policy of Adam Smith, as opposed to the American System of protectionism and what he called “fair trade” or “reciprocity.”

Then in the speech in Washington, D.C., he went even further. He said that he advocated the “American model” of economy, the American System, which he said was what our Founders wanted, and he referred explicitly to Washington, to Alexander Hamilton, and also to Lincoln, again. He really emphasized the role of Lincoln and Eisenhower in developing the infrastructure of this country, and said that Republicans should be builders in that tradition. One of the things he referred to was the fact that Lincoln in 1832, in his first run for Congress, when he was merely 23 years old, had advocated bringing railroads to Illinois even though he had never seen a steam-powered engine. It was that campaign in 1823 which foreshadowed his later promotion of the Transcontinental Railroad in the 1860s. Similarly, he pointed out that after World War I, Eisenhower had participated in the first military convoy that trav-

eled from Washington, D.C. to the Pacific on the Lincoln Highway, and that this experience on the part of Eisenhower led him to fight for and introduce the Interstate Highway system.

So, what you've got here is a President who does not have a fully rigorous, scientific understanding of the American System but who, as Lyndon LaRouche said, after having watched the Kentucky speech and the Washington, DC speech, is seriously committed to this perspective.

So what you have is a situation where the British system is collapsing. The hegemonic conception in the world right now is one of economic development, as expressed in the One Belt, One Road policy of the Chinese, which we, the LaRouche movement, have advocated for decades. And at the same time, you now have a President who is breaking from extreme environmentalism, who is breaking from British free-trade policies, who is breaking from a policy of regime change and geopolitics, and is willing to embrace the conception of "win-win" partnership, which also has a certain history in the United States and in Europe. This is the principle of the Treaty of Westphalia, which ended the 30 years of religious warfare in continental Europe back in the 1600s. The conception of that treaty was that you should have a foreign policy based on the advantage of the other—the concept of what in Greek, the Greek conception of love *agapē*. Of course, in the United States, John Quincy Adams put forward a conception of "community of principle among sovereign nations" as what our foreign policy should be, as opposed to the geopolitics of the British.

So we're in the situation where we have it within our hands to bring about a fundamental change in the nature of human society, and we really have a capability

at this point of going beyond merely making proposals or complaining about the *status quo*—and actually winning. We're on the actual verge of winning to the extent to which we realize it and take that perspective.

We, in the LaRouche movement, particularly the Schiller Institute, are planning a major conference in New York City, April 14-15, on the Silk Road, and also on a dialogue of philosophies or cultures. This conference is a very important element in this dynamic in assuring it succeeds on the deepest level of understanding of the mission of humanity.

I would also point out that tomorrow, March 24, is the hundredth anniversary of one of the greatest pioneers of space science, Krafft Ehricke, a German scientist who came to the United States and was instrumental in the U.S. space program. He passed away early, in 1984, at the age of 67. His ideas about an "extraterrestrial imperative" have a certain consonance with the actual nature of man, which is now again on the verge of fruition, as more and more countries are committing themselves to space exploration. The Chinese are committed to a lunar program, including mining helium-3 on the Moon, which is a crucial element in terms of fusion energy. President Trump himself just signed a space bill, the first one we've had in a number of years, after Obama successfully took down much of our space program during the last eight years.

So, as you can imagine, the British are very freaked out about this. They have gone berserk prior to Trump's election and increasingly since his election, and I think we can discuss that further if people want to, but what Lyndon LaRouche said just the other day is "you have to understand—this is the British. The entire attack on Trump is the British." And, as he said, "it will not work."