

## Revive the Principles Of the Renaissance

*This discussion took place following Helga Zepp-LaRouche's speech in Rome. In response to comments by Hon. Alfonso Giammi, Undersecretary of State for Economic Development, and Catia Polidori of the Young Entrepreneurs association, LaRouche replied:*

I would say in response to this, that there's one underlying issue here, which is most important—and the significance of the meaning of culture, the actual meaning of culture. The success of European civilization, in the times that it has been successful, is a development of culture. For example, you have essentially, a very long dark age, despite Dante's great work, until the beginning of the Renaissance, with 1439. There's a great gap in European history between the breakdown of culture about 200 B.C., until the Renaissance in 1439, and so forth. But it's possible to understand this cultural phenomenon, if we look back far enough, say about 3,000 years. Because European culture was formed by certain maritime agreements among certain powers in Europe about that time, about 3,000 years ago, about 7,000 B.C., with the Etruscans, the Egyptians, and the Ionians, which led to the emergence of what is a specifically European culture. There were earlier roots of this, but it took place about that time. It's the post-Homeric period, which comes out of a period of crisis before then.

So therefore, with the ebbs and flows of the success of European culture, its defeats, its retreats, European culture has been the source of all of the successes of Europe. Now this culture's gone along with another problem: the problem of the separation of the rulers from the ruled. And the great periods of European culture have always been periods in which the people themselves are uplifted into an integrated population. For example, Dante tried to start that, and made a legacy which is still alive today. The Council of Florence [1439] was a great watershed of all European culture, modern European culture.

So that we have, in European culture, we had the most magnificent development out of many periods of crisis. And we in the United States had a very special advantage. Most of the people who came to settle the United States were not running away from failure in Europe. The colonization was motivated by the desire to find a place *away* from Europe, in order to get away from the oligarchy! And the distinction of the United States from Europe, is that we don't have an oligarchical tradition in the United States. We don't have a Black

Nobility—we don't have any of these curses! When we want a curse, we import it from England! They follow us.

The key thing here, is the question of culture, and culture means the difference between man and an animal. It means that we try to organize the work and the life of people, in depth, in communities, so that the creative factor of the individual mind is the dominant expression of what they're doing. For example: In employing people, if you employ people with the idea that they're going to do their work and shut up, you're not a good leader. If you're a leader in a community or in a business, you're doing the most to promote the development of the employees. Animals are the same from one generation to the next. People are not animals. (Well, some politicians I know are, but that's a different matter.) But the function of society is to promote the development of the creative powers of the mind of the individual, and to promote as much creativity as possible in work, in addition to simply doing their job, to enrich the community with ideas.

And this is where the society succeeds or fails; in which you have the greatest amount of participation of the individual in development, their own development and that of others, is the primary source of success, because that's where profit really comes from.

And this is where the loss occurs, is this idea of cheap labor being good. Cheap labor is not good. What does cheap labor mean in terms of the community, the children of the community? What does it mean to be *bestialized* by routine? And the promotion of culture, and the use of a language-culture and its development as the way of promoting that, is the most crucial thing, *which we have been losing in Europe*, especially since World War II.

Just take Classical music as an example: Should we make noises like animals, or should we use the Classical culture? And do we promote these kinds of cultural activities among the people who are doing the work in the community? A respect for the mind of a human being, in terms of a culture which goes on to successive generations. The great-grandfather said, "I did this for my grandchildren." People coming into the United States would come in as laborers, and their grandchildren would be doctors and scientists. Success in the ordinary sense is not the standard: It's the improvement of the development of the individual mind, the culture development, which is precious. If that is the political standard of behavior, then I think everything would work. This is the only expression of love of humanity, is this form.

### Walking an Elephant Through a Mousetrap

*Here, LaRouche responds to several questions: one on the difference between President Franklin D. Roosevelt's policies and those of John Maynard Keynes with respect to Bretton Woods; Ukrainian-Russian scientist V.I. Vernadsky and nuclear power; and banking and monetary policy.*

First of all, there is no relationship between Roosevelt's de-



There was “a very long dark age, despite Dante’s great work, until the beginning of the Renaissance, in 1439” and the Council of Florence. This painting, “Dante and His Poem,” by Domenico di Michelino (1465), shows Dante holding his Divine Comedy, with the great dome on the Cathedral of Florence (completed more than a century after Dante’s death), where the Council took place, in the background.

sign and Keynes’ design. Keynes presented his design originally, in Germany, in Berlin, in an edition of his famous book, in which he said that he was publishing the book in Germany, because he thought that under Nazism, his ideas would have a more favorable hearing than in a democratic state. In principle, Keynes was correct in his estimation.

Now, on the question of the Bretton Woods system: The Bretton Woods system was not a Keynesian system. Keynes made a presentation in 1944 at the Bretton Woods conference, and the speech is on record—there’s no doubt of that. But those who were trying to equate Keynes’ with Roosevelt’s conception of Bretton Woods, are really trying to walk an elephant through a mousetrap.

There’s a point of history here, which is the most fundamental thing to understand about the entire period of history from the 1920s, from the end of World War I. The whole history as generally taught is completely nonsense. Mussolini and Hitler were both put into power by the British monarchy. And the biggest supporter of Mussolini from England was Winston Churchill, until the verge of the war. On the inside of Italy, for example, a known British agent, involved in the Young Turk operation of the British monarchy, Volpi di Misurata, was the key architect of the Mussolini leadership, and he was the actual guy on the inside, who ran it during much of the 1920s and 1930s!

Hitler was brought into power by the British monarchy. They changed their mind later, but they put him in power. He was personally put into power by the head of the Bank of England, whose agent was Hjalmar Schacht. What you call “fascism in economics” is Schachtianism. Mussolini got his fascism from Britain! It was a product of Versailles!

Now, what happened here was simply that Roosevelt and Churchill, Roosevelt and the British, had no agreement whatsoever. Roosevelt hated the British, as all patriotic Americans do, because we hated their damn colonial system, their imperial system. We knew there would never be peace in the world until we could bring justice to people who were victims of colonies.

See, Roosevelt’s policy from the beginning of the war, was to shut down the British Empire at the end of the war! My life has been—I’ve been on the Roosevelt side against the other side on this thing ever since then. The Roosevelt policy was, as he said to Churchill: When this war ends, there

are not going to be any more colonies! “You have to understand, Winston, when this war ends...”

So therefore, what happened is, Roosevelt died. Now, I happened to belong to the faction which was the pro-Roosevelt faction against the Truman faction. And actually Truman was backing the U.S. faction that was backing Hitler, up till Roosevelt made him stop! So now, 1944, Roosevelt had made the Bretton Woods design. The Bretton Woods design and the statement on the forming of the United Nations are the same thing. First, the United Nations was to create an alliance of states which would prevent the existence of colonialism. The intention of the United States was to use the great military power we had, military-industrial power, by converting military power back to technology power, which include a long, big project for Northern Africa. And for the entire world.

All right. The minute Roosevelt died, the policy went in the opposite direction. Therefore, under Truman and his followers, they interpreted Bretton Woods *against* Roosevelt, and for Keynes!

## Organizing the Planet with Nuclear Power

Now, on the question of nuclear power: People should study Vernadsky, the great Russian scientist Vernadsky, who defined the fact that the universe is composed of three known



World Bank

*"There is no relationship between Roosevelt's design and Keynes' design," LaRouche stated. John M. Keynes is shown addressing the Bretton Woods conference, July 4, 1944.*

different qualities of universe: The non-living, which comes from the Sun; it includes fusion and nuclear power. Our Solar System is a product of nuclear power. Everything in it depends on nuclear power. Now you have a second thing which is higher than nuclear power: living processes. And you can not get living processes from non-living processes. No one has ever derived a living process from a non-living one *and no one ever will!*—contrary to Microsoft.

Also, there's a third quality: Human beings are not animals. We have animal bodies, which we lose fairly easily. But the quality of humanity is immortal: It's the power of human reason, the creative power of human reason.

When you look at our planet, we have three components to this planet: We have the non-living components, things that are not derived from living processes. The planet was originally chiefly composed of things which had not been derived from living processes. Now we have a second thing that developed, called the Biosphere. The Biosphere is composed of both living processes, and things which come into existence *only* as products of living processes. If you study the isotope structure of the Periodic Table, you will see there's a clear distinction of this type. Certain isotopes themselves are specific to living processes. As a matter of fact, one of the most important developments of nuclear development, is the development of radioactive isotopes which are used to treat cancer and other problems.

Now, there's a third category, which was called the Noösphere. This discovery was made uniquely and entirely by Vernadsky.

So, you have three layers on the crust of the Earth, which is a thin part of the total. One, is you have a non-living material; chemically non-living. You have a second part, which is increasing, which is the Biosphere. Everything, including the atmosphere, the oceans, the seas, the lakes, belong to the Bio-

sphere. A third element which is growing rapidly, is the Noösphere, things that come into existence only as a result of peculiar characteristics of the human mind. And we depend, now, if we're going to continue to maintain a population in excess of 6 billion people on this planet, you're not going to do it without nuclear power. So tell me: Which people do you want to kill?

So, the question is: Are we going to organize an organization of nation-states on this planet, which will do this, and prevent crisis? Are we going to run like rabbits from danger, or are we going to take charge of the

planet? Our job is to get the nation-states together to create an order among nation-states on this planet which is fit for human beings to live in!

And finally, on this question of debt: We're going to have to have—one way or another, most of the monetary aggregate in existence today is doing to disappear, one way or another. Nobody can prevent this. Don't defend the banks in that way! Don't defend the financiers. What we have to do, is simply do what Roosevelt did, and had done before: We have to create a new monetary-financial system. And in the transition, we have to make sure that life goes on in an orderly fashion for people.

For example, I have three proposals now, on the table in the United States, for adoption. Number 1, the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act: no evictions; postpone all resolution of household debt; provide absolute protection to the homeowner by the government. Then secondly, protect the banks—the banks as instruments of credit. If you don't protect the banks, you're going to lose everything. You have to have a bank there, doing the job, in the community, of keeping the community alive.

Second, set up a two-tier credit system. Government-approved credit at no more than 1-2% interest rate, for all things which are in the public interest, the social welfare.

Thirdly, create a new world monetary system. The United States should immediately approach Russia, China, and India, to form a bloc of four countries, who will bring the other countries in to set up a new world monetary system. And create a system of credit, of long-term credit agreements, to transform the planet in the way required to sustain more than 7 billion people on this planet: Which means, put European civilization back to work! Do what it's supposed to do. Keep the nation-states—just make sure they cooperate. And don't shoot each other!