

## LaRouche Challenges Russian Youth To Assert Leadership

U.S. Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche visited Moscow in mid-April, for a series of public addresses, many of them oriented toward college-age young people, whom he described as “the most powerful political force in Russia.” Last week, *EIR* published an overview report on the trip, and the text of LaRouche’s address to a conference at the Vernadsky State Geological Museum of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The April 14-16 conference, entitled “Science and Our Future: Ideas To Change the World,” was attended by about 70 scientists, students, and members of the press.

LaRouche’s speech, “Entering the Economy of the Noösphere,” set the theme for his visit as a whole, by emphasizing Russia’s mission to break out of the “fishbowl” of current bankrupt economic and scientific thinking, and instead carry forward the work of the great Ukrainian-Russian biogeochemist Vladimir I. Vernadsky (1863-1945). Vernadsky, who was the father of the Soviet Union’s nuclear energy program, analyzed the three domains of the “Earth’s crust” as the abiotic, the Biosphere, and the Noösphere—the last being the domain of human cognition, which he saw as the most powerful “geological” force of all. Using this conception, LaRouche said, Russia’s task is to undertake the high-technology development of Eurasia, especially the minerals-rich but sparsely populated regions of its own Siberian districts, and to assist neighboring Asian countries in taking advantage of their own potentials.

Speaking to student audiences at Moscow State University (April 14) and the Academy of Finance and Law (April 17), LaRouche developed this theme further, while underlining the vital role that the young generation has to play to make it possible: to create a future for themselves, and prevent the onset of a global dark age. We publish below LaRouche’s speech to Moscow State University (MGU), as well as remarks he made to the closing panel of the Vernadsky Museum conference on April 16, in which he expanded upon his educational program.

During the discussion period at MGU, LaRouche was asked to discuss possible frictions with China, the problems of Russia’s Far East, as well as the development of “nationalist tendencies.” In reply, he emphasized the *idea of universality*: the best contribution of European culture, within which each nation must locate its own unique role.

“Your problem is,” he said, “that in the decay and collapse of the Soviet Union, how do you take what *had been achieved*, under Soviet conditions—how do you save that? See, for example, you can not, as a Russian, negate the heroism of the many people who died in Leningrad. You can not debate the heroism of those in Moscow, who prevented the country from being destroyed, and conquered. You can not debate the death, of those who died in Stalingrad, those who died in great numbers in these battles.” By taking up the challenge



*Lyndon LaRouche addresses students at the Moscow Academy of Finance and Law on April 17. “If we act as underlings,” he told them, “and say we’re going to try to adapt to the existing world monetary system, I can guarantee you that something like fascism, or worse, will take over the planet.”*

of struggling to make scientific breakthroughs on matters of universal physical principles, and using those discoveries to develop the Eurasian continent, you “adopt the mission, as a nation, *so that you can actually die with a smile on your face, because you did good.*

“That’s the problem: *China needs Europe. China needs Russia.* But, if we do not play that role, what does it need us for? If you are useful to China, China will protect you. If you are useful to people and they know it, they are not going to throw you away.

“See, like the great Treaty of Westphalia: You had people who had been killing each other in religious wars in Europe, from 1511 to 1648. And they brought about peace in a great peace treaty, called the Treaty of Westphalia. What was the principle, which brought people who had been killing each other, almost as a profession, to suddenly make peace? It was not fear. It was, they adopted a policy called, ‘the advantage of the other.’ If you care for what you do for others, and they care for what they do for you—then, you will have peace. Otherwise, you define nationality as a point of conflict. If you define nationality as a mission, to adopt, as a people, a purpose in the planet, for doing something good, and if other nations will take the same view, that they have something good that they must do, then you have peace.”