
Interview: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.



Cultural questions define a strategic branching point

Mr. LaRouche was interviewed on March 10 by Nora Hamerman from the Alexandria Detention Center in Virginia, where he is preparing his appeal with six associates. The seven were unjustly convicted of conspiracy and jailed on Jan. 27. What follows are excerpts of the discussion:

EIR: Last weekend the party conference of the Patriots for Germany, was held in Mainz, West Germany. This party conference kicked off the campaign for the European Parliament elections next year. One of the statements which was played for the conference was from Renata Tebaldi, the famous soprano, in which she says that she is very happy to participate in this election as a candidate from Italy (running with the Patriots of Italy slate), "because of the battle for the scientific tuning of $A = 432$," which of course you initiated. She says "we have to avoid the catastrophic disaster of losing all voices. "Italy was the cradle of bel canto, which was born here; nobody should take away from us this privilege, because it is our history. We have to fight with all our forces to avoid such a catastrophe." And she goes on, "What makes me sad is that we are losing Italy's best tradition, its musical culture, the artistic culture, literature, painting, all these art forms are at stake."

And that is the reason that she is running: "The more we are thinking in this way, the more we will succeed. We must do something together to save what we, thank God, still have and should be proud of."

Now most people don't think of these cultural issues as being at the center of politics, so I would like you to comment on that.

LaRouche: The way people behave is not determined so much by what they believe in particular, because particular belief, as even rather superficial observation informs us, changes. The question is, what governs the way in which we *change* belief, or in other words, what guides people, under the impact of experience, from one choice of belief to the next one. Therefore, we have to look at the determinant of changes in particular belief, rather than at the beliefs per se, even though the beliefs per se may be significant in terms of action. In judging what governs the characteristics of a human being, it's the changes in belief which are ultimately

decisive, rather than the particular beliefs as such. Or, to put it another way, the way beliefs are changed will determine what beliefs are. We are not ignoring the particular aspect of belief in shifting from particular to the way in which things change; rather, we are looking at the way in which the choices of belief are generated. It is this process of generation which is also the process of choice of change of belief, which is fundamental.

In the case of culture in general, culture, if the term is properly understood, with respect to its referents, is the only true issue in social policy in politics. If a nation and a people have the right cultural direction, that is, as culture shapes, generates, determines changes in particular belief, then that culture will in general survive. It will respond to stress generally in the right way. Whereas a defective culture, no matter what its particular beliefs or particular accomplishments may be at any time, that civilization, may be very well doomed.

We face that right now. The question in the world today is formed thus: We have not reached the point yet, at which we are inevitably doomed, to a new Dark Age, probably the worst Dark Age we can imagine. But we still have the choice available to us of taking the kinds of actions which will solve most of the immediate problems at least progressively, and save us from the prospect of a new Dark Age. Now, whether we do that, which choice we make, whether we let ourselves slide into a new Dark Age or not, or into solutions to that, is a matter of culture. If we do not change our cultural characteristics as they are now, we are doomed. If we do change our cultural characteristics in the proper way, we shall probably survive quite happily in the long run.

So classical culture, which is based on the principle of truth and beauty, as well as love of mankind, love of God, and so forth, means that we respond rationally to everything—everything that's human, everything in nature. And therefore to the extent that we prize development, emphasize, share that aspect of classical culture which represents the principle of truth and beauty, we have a culture which is capable of making the right choices. Without that, with the contrary trend in culture, the modernist trend, we shall not survive. We should probably say that it is the romantic reaction against classical culture, and then the modernist aggra-

vation of the romantic degeneration of European civilization, which have brought us to the point of threatened disaster today.

So unless we go from romanticism and modernism back to the classical cultural standpoint, we shall not survive.

EIR: In the last couple of days the Soviet health minister, Chazov, acknowledged that AIDS is more dangerous than nuclear war. This, of course, is a formulation that is associated with you. I found in *EIR* of October 1986 a proposal which you released on the day the Reykjavik summit meeting between Reagan and Gorbachov opened, which is called "Parameters for U.S.-Soviet Talks on the AIDS Pandemic."

LaRouche: This was the released version of memos I communicated privately to the Reagan administration, advising it on what I thought were the useful parameters, as opposed to the non-useful ones, for negotiations with Moscow at that time. And what I did was, in that process, produce a "sanitized" version—in the sense that I did not play up the fact that this represented a transaction between myself and the Reagan administration circles—but just put that forth as an *EIR* journalistic release.

EIR: We can remind people that in the period of 1981-82, into early 1983, you were formulating the Strategic Defense Initiative. The 1986 proposal came to be known as a Biological Strategic Defense Initiative. It was an outline of the basis for seeking cooperation—the nature of the danger, how it should be organized, how this would overlap with other treaties, and so forth. More than two years later, I wonder how you would reflect on this proposal today.

LaRouche: Let me divide this into three parts, two immediately and then a third which must be taken into consideration to put this whole business into perspective.

First, I had been working earlier, in the direction of determining what is it that the United States should negotiate with the Soviet leadership, or propose to negotiate, as opposed to what we should not. And therefore I felt obliged, in insisting that there were certain things we should not negotiate with Moscow, to do that in the most positive, constructive manner, by indicating what we should undertake to negotiate.

This jelled for me in the fall of 1982, up to about September and October 1982, in our work with the National Security Council and others, in advising what became known as the SDI. That it was our desire that Dr. Edward Teller would come forward as a leading spokesman for the advanced physical principles application feature of the SDI. He was initially reluctant to do so, but obviously after the summer of that year, decided that he should, and in September and October came forth. In the context of saying that he was coming forth to push for this, he made another statement which is very important and which I agree with completely, in which he referred to the fact that these developments would permit

nations to begin to pay more attention to those things which were the common aims of mankind.

I thought it was a good idea to make that direct linkage with the SDI, which I had made in a different way, but I felt that Teller had expressed it better than I had earlier. So I adopted his point of view, and the following year, after the President had announced the SDI, I began producing a series of papers indicating what I thought was the proper definition of "common aims of mankind" which the U.S. government should be presenting as the proposed agenda to the Soviet government.

Initially I concentrated, apart from the war avoidance issue, on the space and development issues. That is, justice on this planet for all developing peoples as a great unresolved problem which needed to be addressed, and the advancement of technology of mankind on this earth, through aid of space-oriented missions.

By 1985, it became clear to me from the scientific task force that the HIV virus was potentially a species killer of mankind. Then it became obvious that this was a part of the agenda between the Soviet Union and the United States, provided any discussion of this sort could occur. And therefore I added to the list of common aims of mankind, the joint efforts of the Soviet government and the U.S. government and others to find means for defeating the HIV pandemic. That was the history of it, and as I got wind of the Reykjavik summit coming up, at the behest of some people around the administration, I inserted my views on that subject, hoping that somehow the President might get that on the agenda at Reykjavik.

EIR: Pretty ironical that this was occurring just at the point of the first big raid on your associates in Leesburg, Virginia.

LaRouche: It becomes clearer as I get to the second and third parts.

Now, what actually happened at Reykjavik, what was attempted at Reykjavik, as opposed to what I would have proposed, was the acceleration of a rapid movement toward global power-sharing with Moscow, which some people call a New Yalta. Henry Kissinger's approach is to surrender the West to submission to Moscow, not the whole salami all at once, but slice by slice.

Henry—who has always been owned by that faction in Britain, and its ancillaries in the United States, who are for this kind of world federalism—has been committed to a malthusian, or what they call a neo-malthusian, anti-scientific, anti-technology, world federalist power-sharing with Moscow. This came to a high point—this comes to the Chazov statement—with Gorbachov's U.N.O. address of December, during the period that both Reagan and Mr. Bush met with Gorbachov. This malthusian address of Gorbachov was immediately heralded by Margaret Thatcher, who appears to have capitulated to the British Royal Family and to Lord Victor Rothschild on this issue, Lord Victor being pro-

Soviet and very much a malthusian. So Margaret's on the wrong track, at least for the present.

Now, while Prince Charles, Prince Philip and others are trying to destroy the chemical industry in the world, are proposing this ozone nonsense, this greenhouse nonsense, take down technology, wipe out the farmer, get back as quickly as possible to primitive hunting and gathering societies—the explicit proposal of Prince Philip—in the midst of this, from the Soviet government, we have reactions which are directly contrary to this agreement between Moscow and the British Royal Family.

. . . What is Chazov actually saying? What are the anti-malthusians saying?

I don't know the final answer. But this brings me to the third point. This anti-malthusian expression . . . poses the question, whether Moscow is speaking “with forked tongue”—or two heads. That is, the same Soviet head with a forked tongue that is malthusian and anti-malthusian simultaneously, or does the Moscow body have two heads, each with a different line on the question?

Looking at it from a more practical standpoint, we have to pay closer attention to the Chazov statement, because throughout it he adopts the very specific language, not only of my 1986 release, but of a subsequent report which I applied both to U.S. sources and also to the Soviet government, more recently. And he adopts large chunks of my argument, which is unique in the sense that nobody else around has made that kind of argument. It is very interesting for a top Soviet official who has been opposed to me for so long, to come around and throw my choice of words, my choice of formulation, out through the government newspaper the Soviet Union, *Izvestia*.

So, what I think is this: This reflects the fact that they are studying my analysis of the situation. Their economy is collapsing. In a physical-economic breakdown, *perestroika* cannot work, *glasnost* is the worst thing they could have done, from their standpoint, at the present time. There is nothing they could do with their present policy to save the Soviet empire from internal collapse, a spiraling collapse.

Now the only thing that can save them, is a certain kind of cooperation with the West, which under certain terms they could get. For example, if I were President, they could get certain kinds of cooperation from me under certain conditions, cooperation they would need. . . .

EIR: The problem is that the Bush administration is very weak right now. Do you think that they're capable of—

LaRouche: The Bush administration in the way it is projected now, is incapable of surviving. The British press said this week that it was like the last days of Jimmy Carter. That is precisely what it looks like. That is what I projected to these fellows who were putting the Bush administration together back in 1987 and 1988. They might get elected and inaugurated, but I told them that within 60 days of his inau-

guration, on that construction of the administration, the administration would begin to disintegrate. I found that I was wrong on that: It began to disintegrate in 30 days.

So obviously, the George Bush administration, as we see it right now, will not continue to exist for very long. This implies that maybe this is a cocoon, a chrysalis, and the worm is gestating inside there, and we'll get a butterfly or a moth or something else coming out of it down the line.

. . . We can say that the Iran-Contra business is coming home to roost. The Tower problem is an exemplification of that. It is almost the cork that can pull that whole can of worms loose in the bottle. The name C. Boyden Gray, I notice, is coming up prominently internationally. The Israelis are absolutely furious with the section of Bush's circle which was tied into the Iran-Contra operation. There are charges that if friends of people known to Gray did not kill Amiram Nir for Bush, didn't kill others, that the only ones that appear to benefit from these killings were the Bush interests—that means the Bush people tied into the Special Situation Group, the Contra-Iran operation.

We are also on the verge of possibly a wave of worldwide assassinations, let out of the bottle by the Iran reaction to the Rushdie book.

EIR: I guess you heard that some supposed Muslim fanatics threatened Ravenna, because the poet Dante is buried there, and he put Mohammed in his *Inferno*.

LaRouche: The interesting thing about this is that this conforms with alarming verisimilitude to a scenario which I knew of some years ago. We had a scenario, as an option, called to our attention, in which something to do with Iran and Islamic fundamentalism would be the basis or the trigger for a wave of assassinations of heads of state and governments, including prominent figures in the United States. This kind of operation has been mooted since the National Security Council and others neutralized the initial Black September targeting of figures in the United States back at the beginning of the 1970s.

What has happened around the Rushdie book now, is that a pattern has emerged, which strongly suggests that something like that scenario is afoot. I rather smell the possibility that heads of government and state and other prominent figures are probably already being targeted in a systematic, not a random way, by assassins who are just waiting for an opportunity—with the Rushdie book being the detonator. And I think that what has happened also, at the same time, is that Lord Rothschild's faction in Britain and the Soviets did set the Rushdie book operation into operation. It was an Anglo-Soviet derivative operation, with multiple targets. I think that the Soviet-Rothschild “Sorcerer's Apprentice” has created a monster which they cannot control. . . .

I couldn't predict it, but the dangers are great. I would encourage all relevant security circles to take suitable precautions.