

‘We Need Young People Who Are Hungry for a Future of Civilization’

This is a substantial excerpt from LaRouche’s closing remarks to the public conference of the Civil Rights Movement Solidarity (BüSo), held in Frankfurt/Main, Germany, on Dec. 17.

... Let’s go to the larger issue: We are not a drinking and marching society. We are an organization internationally, which is dedicated to the purpose of trying to save civilization from a catastrophe which has taken over the world since the death of Franklin Roosevelt. At the time that Franklin Roosevelt died, he was committed to ending colonialism internationally. That had been his commitment to Churchill, *before the war ended*, before his own death. Had he lived, colonialism would have disappeared immediately.

And the objective of Roosevelt, with his design for the United Nations, was to create an organization of sovereign nation-states on this planet, which would then use that as a vehicle for cooperation among respectively sovereign nation-states, to end the injustice, associated with colonialism and similar practices, and to finally bring about a community of nation-states on this planet, committed to joint, mutual progress, consistent with the same principle as the Treaty of Westphalia.

Truman immediately moved to sabotage the essential features of Roosevelt’s program. Roosevelt’s program continued, in terms of the international monetary system, for a number of years. It continued in the form of the Bretton Woods system, which was employed in Germany, as well as other places. But by the middle of the 1960s, after the assassination of President Kennedy, at that point, we began to go to Hell.

Now, the whole purpose here, *from the beginning*, the whole reason for the problem which we’re in today, globally, is the fact that the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system had tried to bring Hitler into power, and did bring him into power; but the British then turned around and did join with Roosevelt in combatting Hitler. The purpose of Roosevelt was, at the end of the war, to get to the point, as I described the kind of system he proposed. The British didn’t want it. The British didn’t want it, because they did not want the United States to exist, in its present form. They did not want a system that prevented the London-based, Anglo-Dutch Liberal financial interests—the same interests that control Europe today, from the top, through the ECB [European Central Bank] and similar kinds

of institutions—that prevented those institutions that wished to establish a policy we call today, “globalization”: The weakening and elimination of the nation-state, the establishment of a Venetian-style empire, like the Middle Ages, in which the Anglo-Dutch Liberals, who are nothing but a continuation of the Venetian bankers, would eventually control the world—*exactly as you see today*, in the “Locusts” and similar kinds of phenomena.

This is the kind of world that’s intended.

Now, in the United States, we have the following situation: The world is on the edge of not merely a depression. It’s on the edge of a complete breakdown crisis, comparable to, but worse than, the Middle Ages, the so-called New Dark Age. This can be stopped. It can be prevented by a change in the monetary system, by reorganizing; reorganizing on the model, essentially, of the Bretton Woods system. We could reorganize, with cooperation among nations, and we could stop this. We could fix the dollar at a fixed exchange rate, as a community dollar, for the world. *This would stop the collapse.*

We would have to put banking systems into bankruptcy reorganization, but they would still function, as necessary, even in bankruptcy reorganization. We have to create large-scale credit, for investment credit in creating new industries and developing infrastructure. Without that, there is no recovery, there is no hope.

We are now a few hours, in history, away from doom.

The only place from which this rescue can be organized is the United States. China can’t do it. India can’t do it. Europe can’t do it. Germany can’t do it. Russia can’t do it. But if the United States *does it*, then other nations can cooperate with the United States in doing it, and we have something in that direction now.

What you saw, symptomized in Washington by the Baker-Hamilton Commission, which, if you look at it carefully—and some of you, I think, have—what you see is a potpourri, a collection of proposals, including the same thing that we proposed back in 2004 for Southwest Asia: That is, to have the nations such as Syria and Iran, and other nations, cooperate in the Middle East around a Palestinian-Israeli peace negotiation to stabilize the entire region, as a solution for the ongoing war. *That proposal is essentially in the Baker-Hamilton Commission report.*

Now, the Baker-Hamilton Commission was the product

of a process, not something that was the same at the time it came out as when it started. When Baker and Hamilton saw how crazy the President was, President Bush, they knew they had to come out with a comprehensive proposal, not simply a few suggestions. So what they did is, they said, "We have to go all the way. We have to specify the Israeli-Palestinian peace, because without that, without the Madrid Process, as it's called now, there's no hope for the Middle East." Don't talk about Southwest Asia—there's no hope for it without that. You can't stick these pieces together. Without recognizing Iran—with *normal* diplomatic relations, not on conditions; without recognizing Syria, without conditions; without bringing Turkey into the question; without bringing Egypt into the issue, as well as all the other nations of the region, there is no possible hope for avoiding a general degeneration of this present, so-called Middle East situation—which could lead, itself, to a global conflagration, as big as World War II or something of that sort.

So the Baker-Hamilton Commission recognized this problem, recognized it on the basis of many people contributing, *including me*—not directly to the commission, but I've been involved in this, and I've been pushing hard for exactly this agreement. They adopted it! They're trying to shove it down the throat of the Presidency. We *know* this means we've got to fire, and get rid of Cheney. We know that we've got to put Bush in a cage, or impeach him, one of the two. And the Bush family is saying, "Well, put him in a cage, but a nice one. Keep him under control." So, there are efforts.

Prevent a New Dark Age

Now, the key problem is this. We know what the state of the economy is: We know how close we are to a general breakdown crisis—not a depression!—but a complete breakdown of the type that could cause *mass death* in this planet! To reduce the world population from over 6 billion to less than 1 billion. *We are facing that kind of potential*, if we get economic chaos now, on the planet. Because there is no simple way, without global cooperation, that *you could stop this depression from going into a Dark Age*. And it's about to come on now. We're weeks and months away at the most, from that point; we have to make a decision.

Now, in this process, here stand us. And when you consider our situation, you obviously have to think that maybe "normal" ways of thinking about politics *don't work* for a case like this. You have a very short term. You must make a very sudden change in policies of everything. You must *crush* the power of banking power. You must *crush* the hedge funds



Lyndon LaRouche addresses the conference on Dec. 17. He told the BüSo that they are part of an organization dedicated to bringing about the revolutionary changes needed to save civilization from catastrophe. Such changes can only be made by a youth movement—with the help of "old geezers" like himself.

and the power they represent. You've got to put banks, of practically every country in the world [into receivership]—at least in Europe and the Americas, at least in the United States. You must put the Federal Reserve System into receivership by the Federal government! You must do the same thing in Europe! You must eliminate the ECB [European Central Bank].

You must go back to the nation-state. You must put national banking systems into reorganization, receivership. You must create large-scale credit, like the deutschemark system again. You must generate credit for investment in long-term, low-interest, infrastructure development, major capital-intensive infrastructure development, *as a driver for rebuilding industry!*

You've got to put 10% of the population of Germany that's now unemployed, back into employment. You can't solve the problem, unless you take those kinds of measures. You've got similar problems in Italy; you've got similar problems in France. Europe is becoming a post-industrial society! Take the case of Berlin: What you see in Berlin is a city being destroyed! It's agreed to kill itself! It's agreed to die! It is dying! One of the major industrial centers of Europe is dying! It's becoming a post-industrial center. It's a city that can not pay its taxes to keep its people alive! It's not allowed to, under the present treaty agreements, or the hidden clauses in the present treaty agreements. Without the reindustrialization of Berlin, there's not much chance for Germany.

What you're looking at is 50 years of long-term development, across Eurasia: high-technology development, tremendous investment in nuclear fission power, for water systems



EIRNS/Chris Lewis

“What you’re looking for are young people,” said LaRouche, “of the type who, if they’re bright and if they’re given a good education, getting into a university, will actually become the creative geniuses that we need. Not just the greatest name in something, but actually great, capable geniuses who can do original discovery, who are trained in it, who are experienced in this process.”

and other things, *now*. Get Don Quixote here, and get rid of these windmills. Build this kind of system: We can do it. But we have to make these changes.

Revolutionary Changes Required

How can such revolutionary changes be made? Well, it can be made by a revolutionary people. And where do you find revolutionary people? They are found, especially, where the American Revolution found its people. The American Revolution was made by people who were mostly between 19 and 25 years of age. They were the leaders of the American Revolution—with an old geezer like me, Benjamin Franklin, involved in it. Every great movement in history depends upon young people, generally adult youth—today, 18 to 35 (and 35 is kind of old) for leadership.

There’s another thing that’s required: You just can’t use youth, because you see, what Elodie [Viennot] was referring to—youth can do some very nasty things, too. They can turn into animals; they can become neotenists, they can go back to the age of 12; you can find them at the age of 2 mentally, and emotionally; or even the age of 6 months, emotionally and mentally—they can be very destructive when they get large. So, you have to have a developed youth.

Now, the problem of this culture is, essentially, that the culture does not believe in creativity. Universities no longer promote creativity. What they do, is they keep the word “cre-

ativity,” but they don’t put the content in. They call masturbation “creativity,” for example. It’s virtually that kind of thing.

What has happened is, you are permitted “to learn” to do something. You’re permitted like a monkey to learn to do tricks. The whole computer industry is people learning to do tricks with a toy, called a computer. But intellectually, there’s nothing involved in this from the standpoint of human behavior which does not resemble what a chimpanzee can do! If you know the procedures, you can be a genius and so forth. But computer technology, making a computer, building and designing a computer: That does involve some science. Using it does not really require creativity. It requires ingenuity, but not creativity. It doesn’t require human qualities.

Human qualities are those which [make] discoveries of universal physical principles, typified by Kepler’s unique and original discovery of gravitation. And most people who studied physics don’t know what Kepler discov-

ered! They don’t know what gravitation is, actually. They think they do. They know a *formula* called “gravitation.” They believe that Newton, who couldn’t find an apple, invented gravitation.

Gravitation was discovered by Kepler, by a process which exemplifies creativity. We use it in the education of the Youth Movement, not merely because it’s something they should do, but because Kepler did something that nobody else ever did. Kepler wrote books, and papers, which contain, detail by detail, his process of experiment and discovery, step by step, over decades. So young people today, starting with the *Mysterium Cosmographicum* and going through his later writings, can re-experience the discovery of the principle of gravitation, by Kepler, blow by blow, day by day. That’s what we have youth doing, in the basement out there in Windy Hill: actually going through the process of re-experiencing *exactly* what Kepler did, step by step, each of the experiments; each of the measurements; each of the problems that he faced; each of the problems he overcame: They’re doing it! We went through the first thing on the discovery of gravitation; now we’re going into the organization of the Solar System.

When they get through with that, they’re going to do what Gauss did, how Gauss actually used Kepler to find out about asteroids and some other things. We will then take them into advanced dynamics, which is Riemannian physical dynamics. And they will have a core education, which is more advanced,

with this program from our young people—a core program, more advanced, than they can get in a university! Because very few people who are university graduates know anything about Riemannian dynamics: And without knowing Riemannian dynamics, there's not much you can do useful in the world, in scientific programs. If you don't know what a thermonuclear fusion process is, and the equivalent, if you can't master that, you're not much use for the next 25 years to come.

And this is what we're going to be doing.

Creating Geniuses

So, therefore, what you're looking for are young people, of the type who, if they're bright and if they're given a good education, getting into a university, will actually become the creative geniuses that we need. Not just the greatest name in something, but actually great, capable geniuses who can do original discovery, who are trained in it, who are experienced in this process. We are generating that! With the youth program.

Another key thing is the question of music: If you do not know, if you have not gotten into the solution to what Furtwängler demonstrated often, with his excellence, what's called the Pythagorean comma, and the function of the Pythagorean comma in polyphony: If you don't have that experience, of actually discovering the agreement in counterpoint, the agreement which makes the whole thing make sense; if you don't have the emotional effect of discovering that, then you can't think creatively.

Therefore, the key thing has been, in a society which takes Classical composition, musical composition, and puts it in one category, and you put Classical drama in the same category; and then you put physical science in another category, and you keep the two separate: What happens is, the person may learn the formula, through an experiment and so forth, know how to do the experiment, know the formula—but *they don't believe in a principle*. They believe in a mathematical formula, not a principle. Whereas, if the same mind, which is working in physical science, is also part of choral work, where they are developing the ability to sing in choral work, in such a way that they come to this agreement, which is the comma agreement: *They now know*. They feel. They sense. Because art is a social process. It uses the same mentality that you require for discoveries in physical science. It's a social process, and therefore, what you need to be a scientist, is to not only know what the physical experiment is, but to have a *passionate knowledge* of that. And a *passion* is a *social expression*. Human passion is a social expression; that is, creative passion, like love.

Love is a creative emotion, which is social in character. You have to connect the act of loving, in the social sense, to the act of discovery of universal physical principles. And when you combine the two in the same person, you have a creative personality. You have a person who is even more than just a creative personality: He or she is a true human



EIRNS/Chris Lewis

Elke Fimmen and her husband, Klaus Fimmen, were elected the new vice-chairs of the BüSo. They are longtime leaders of the party's work in Bavaria; Elke Fimmen is also a frequent contributor to EIR.

being. And most people are human; they're born human. They have human capabilities, but those capabilities as humans are not really developed.

Especially since the 68ers were invented, back in 1945 to the early 1950s, they took creativity *out* of the curriculum, with the Congress for Cultural Freedom. They took creativity *out*, in the universities around the world; they took it out in the United States. They *destroyed* artistic creativity; they destroyed Classical art. Classical art performances today are a farce! They destroyed it! We have to put it back together again, in order to develop a *whole person*, who has artistic passion: At the same time they experience artistic passion and scientific passion of discovery of physical principles, as the same emotional experience. And we are achieving that with some of the youth. They *do* recognize—when they do the music as well as the science—they recognize that the passion associated with recognizing a universal physical principle and the passion of art, say, Bach, the *Jesu, meine Freude*, for example, which is a challenge in this direction. They recognize that as the same emotional experience.

Passion and Social Policy

Now, they have discovered passion. And something else comes up, then. The next question is: What does passion mean for social policy?

Well, what do you believe in? What is your self-interest? Now, I can tell you, at the age of 84, we all die, eventually.

Some of us are more slow about this, and some of us faster. But we all die. So therefore, what's the purpose of living, if you're going to die?

The purpose of living is that you are, in some way, assured immortality. Not necessarily what some preacher tells you, but a genuine immortality. What's your immortality? It's the fact that your life means something. Means something to what? Means something to the human race, means something to the future of humanity, that when you have died, you will have contributed *something*, embedding it in the culture of society, which will be transmitted to future generations for the benefit of humanity to come. You now know, that your dead body, which is no longer functioning, is not the end of you: Because, what you have contributed, if you have made a contribution, lives on in your culture. It doesn't have to be original. But you have replicated an earlier discovery of principle, and you have thus *made it available* to more people. Therefore, from the standpoint of the future, the future can look back at you, and say: "You were a necessary existence. You are immortal. You have *earned your immortality*."

People who make revolutions, as I do, and who get old at it, and who go through frustration after frustration, where things that should have been solved yesterday, or within a few years, or a decade, aren't solved. They continue. The problems even become worse, as has been the case generally for the past 25-30 years—but you're doing it! You're becoming older! You're not going to reap the harvest of a rich, strong, healthy old age, able to do everything, fly to the Moon, fly to Mars. No, you're not going to do that! You're going to be dead, before that happens!

So, what are you living for?

You're living for the *outcome* of your life, not merely what you experience as a mortal living being. It's the *outcome* of your life that's important, the outcome of your life *for humanity* that's important. And unless you have a future orientation that reaches beyond the bounds of your mortal existence, you aren't much. You are like a monkey. When you die, you're gone! You've contributed nothing . . . except maybe another monkey.

Whereas, if you're human, you've contributed, as all the greatest artists, all the greatest scientists, all the greatest statesmen have done—like Solon, who was defeated, but he wasn't defeated: Because what he represented was continued as an idea, as a principle, as a memory, as a commitment, all throughout *the entire history of European civilization to the present day*. Therefore, if you think not of what you're doing *to get pleasure of it, physically, in your life*; but if you're thinking of what you're doing *for humanity*, so if you die in the meantime, you can smile, because you know that what you've done is going to do good in the future.

Now, people who have that view, can be revolutionaries. And this time requires revolutionaries. To be a revolutionary, first of all, is to create more revolutionaries; that is, to create people who are creative. To develop people who are creative,

not people who do the same thing, not people who are skilled, not people who are respected, not people who are powerful, not people who are rich, but *people who are creative!* Because only creative people are important. All other people aren't very important. Rich people aren't important, athletes aren't important, and so forth—only creative people are important: Because you contribute something to humanity. Your existence is justified, theologically and otherwise.

The Anti-Entropic Solar System

If you're like that, you're a revolutionary. Because you *don't* think the world is running down. You don't believe in entropy. You don't believe that the universe is running down, you don't think it's fixed, as some of the religious nuts do. No, the universe is just like the Solar System: The Solar System was, originally, a *l-o-n-e-ly*, fast-spinning Sun, *all by itself*, out there in space. All by itself, just spinning, and spinning—fast, too fast! It got a headache from spinning!

It spun off some material, a plasma, from the Sun. And this plasma formed a plane, around the Sun, looking much like the rings of Saturn. And this was plasma: It was organized in a coherent way, polarized, in effect. And solar radiation, which by itself would not normally develop anything higher than iron, in terms of fusion, developed what we call the 92 elements of the Mendeleyev Table, until we began to do the transuranic work later on, with fusion processes.

So, it spun this material off. And this material, now containing the 92 elements, and so forth, with all the isotopes included, known at that time, spun off, as if distilled, into orbital pathways. And the material was distributed along the orbital pathways, until, as Gauss said, because of the elliptical character of the orbit, as determined by Kepler, this stuff would condense into a planet and moons—and it did!

So, now, the Sun has created a Solar System! And in the Solar System, there has been development. There has been fundamental physical development of new types of things. They say: "What's this? You mean, God's creative? You mean, the Creator is creative? You mean, the universe is not entropic? You mean, the universe is *anti-entropic*? It's creative?"

And what are we? We are in the likeness of that: Our destiny is to be creative. Our destiny is to create a higher state of organization. I think our destiny is to take over the universe. We're not going to do it tomorrow, but we may make a small step in the next couple of years, or the next couple of decades. We are going to change the universe. We are reaching out to manage the nearby part of the Solar System, with Mars. We will go farther. When we get into higher ranges of power, like the equivalent of matter reaction/anti-matter reaction systems, we will have systems where we can go out to the outer part of the Solar System on a trip.

We are going to transform the planets. We are going to begin to terra-fy Mars, in the sense of terraforming it. We're already engaged in that. We are doing science on Mars and

finding isotopes that exist there that don't exist on Earth. We'll find chemical reactions that exist on Mars, or that did exist on Mars that don't exist on Earth, to our knowledge. So, we are exploring the Solar System not merely as pioneers out there with wagons, trying to find a new continent; we're exploring the Solar System in order to understand the Solar System in a higher way, and be able to do things in it that we couldn't do before.

Now, therefore, people who think that way, who think in terms of the future of mankind, and think that it's a privilege to be alive, even for a short time—even at the age of 84, it's a privilege to be alive, because you have the opportunity to do something, which is of benefit for humanity. Whether you enjoy it or not, or get to enjoy it, is not important. The important thing is causing it to happen, is making that contribution.

Now, if you get young people—and some of our young people are like that! They're ragged. As you should know here, they don't get much money. They eat, once in a while, as they said. What do they do it for? They do it, because the impulse is, to change the society, to take this stinking mess and make something of it. And to feel that the life you're spending *means something*, maybe to your future experience, but certainly to times to come. You think about all the generations that were wiped out. You think in Europe, of all the generations that were wiped out; other parts of the world, wiped out. Think about conditions in Africa, where people are wiped out, by disease and other things! What did we do about it? Can we set into motion a system which assures that attention will be paid to those kinds of problems in the future? Are we going to improve the world, as a place to live in? And if we die in the effort, is that so bad, because we're going to die anyway? But let's die as heroes of humanity, not as drags, or people who are trying to get *pleasure* out of society.

Globules vs. Thinking People

What they did to us, to destroy us, which got us into this mess, was, the creation of the Baby-Boomer generation. Now, they didn't create themselves. They were created. They were created by a policy. The policy was: We're not going to have another United States. We're going to have the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system: Where people do not get so smart that they get freedom, they're not going to have governments that they control. Groups of bankers, like parasites, are going to control them: The Anglo-Dutch Liberal system, called "globalization"! Everybody's a globule.

They want that system. They want us to be stupid. They want our people to be stupid. They want us to know how to do things, as we like to have a cow know what to do, when you want it to do it—or a donkey, to do what you want it to do, when you want it to do it.

But not human, thinking people. Human, thinking people are citizens! They see themselves as equal to anyone else, in principle, in political, moral principle. But they see themselves, also, as responsible. Not simply as parasites, getting



EIRNS/Chris Lewis

The BüSo's candidate for the German parliament from Dresden in October 2005 was Katarzyna "Kasia" Kruczkowski. She emphasized the need to stop the speculative attacks of the financial "locusts" on the German economy, including their takeover of the previously state-owned municipal housing of Dresden.

pleasures and satisfaction, but responsible for making a contribution to the future of humanity.

So these are the revolutionaries: Young people who have nothing, who know they have nothing physically. They don't get paid; they're hardly supported; you've got 16 of them in a room, or something, in Berlin. They don't get much support. But what are they dedicated to? They're dedicated to doing something with their life which makes their life meaningful.

Now, what we have in the United States, therefore, is this: We have young people like this. We have a limited number of them. But you should see what a limited number of a couple hundred can do! What they've done, is they've changed U.S. politics! Yes, I dreamed up the thing—but they did it! They changed the election result!

You had a situation where the House *might* have had a one-person Democratic majority—if that. A situation in which you would still have had Republican control of the Senate. *They changed it!* They went out and organized in our method of organizing, *my method* of organizing! They developed it themselves, but it was the method we got them to do. We organized them as a force capable of doing this. And they did it!

They went in, as Helga described this, and they uncovered the dead body inside the universities. They organized the youth of the universities—and beyond—and some of the professors. We *freed* the professors and students from this fascist

control by Lynne Cheney, who was running the ACTA organization, which is a fascist organization! Goebbels would love it! Goebbels would probably be envious of what she did! She's more evil than Goebbels—and she moves around faster.

So this thing, we freed it. Then what happened is because we were organizing as I described to the LYM in Berlin on Nov. 3rd—that was the method of organizing we were using in the United States, which created a landslide Democratic Party victory in the House of Representatives!

So, what they did was that, and they went around and hit—just as I described it in Berlin, and it worked. It worked, in the sense that it catalyzed a mass movement. We increased the turnout of youth vote, in the age-interval between 18 and 35, by 10%. That 10% increment is what created the landslide victory. If we had been able to eliminate Howard Dean, who I called “Coward Dean”—and I'll get to this, it's an important point—if we had eliminated him, we'd have gotten ten more votes in the House of Representatives.

We went back, and we got *one* of those ten votes back, in this special election which just occurred in Bexar County, the San Antonio area, in Texas. And we did it, ourselves, in terms of winning the thing. We'd already won the election for them, by our margin of effort, by the time Bill Clinton came down; and Bill Clinton came down, because Clinton is an ally of mine—along with some other people, James Carville, the Democratic specialist. And we're in a fight against the Coward Dean faction inside the Democratic Party. And he came down, to support our effort in this county, and he got the whole area organized. And we got a real *landslide* victory, over a long-incumbent Republican opponent, in that special election.

The Revolutionary Margin

And we did that. How? *Our youth did that! Our ragged, unpaid youth!* Because they embody creativity. And because the way we organize the LYM in the United States, in a more matured way—the goal is the same thing here—is to create a nucleus of youth organizations in Europe, which are capable of doing this, of being genuine revolutionaries! Of going into a situation, where if you play the game by the existing rules, you've got a hopeless situation—entropy, defeat. Whereas, if you operate in this method, you create a *margin*, which is a *revolutionary margin*, around people who want fundamental changes, the fundamental changes that are needed, and you make the change.

Now, we're in that situation. If the United States doesn't do what it has to do, in the short term, there's not going to be much civilization on this planet for a long time to come. Germany can't do anything; Europe can't do anything. Russia might try to do something, but it's not capable of doing it. China won't do it. India won't do it. If we don't do it in the United States, and get Europe and others to cooperate with us, you don't have a chance for civilization.

It's almost like the same thing as Roosevelt did. We had



EIRNS/Chris Lewis

Karsten Werner was the BüSo candidate for mayor of Leipzig in February 2006. His campaign poster read: “Hope for the Hero City. 50,000 jobs through new industry. In Saxony, the economy must grow.”

a situation where the Nazis were running Europe. Now, the Nazis weren't merely Nazis, they were instruments of the Anglo-Dutch Liberals. If you look at the people that created the Nazi system, they were all Anglo-Dutch Liberals, or products of the same thing, and whatever riff-raff they could pick up to help them on the side. And the British were the ones who wanted Hitler in. They didn't want him to go *westward* first; they wanted him to go *eastward* first, and then the French and the British would get on the rear end of the Germans (that is what they like to do; that's why you wear thick pants, huh?).

But it didn't work that way; the Germans didn't want to do it, because the military said, “No, you're not going to get the German army, the Wehrmacht, dug into the depths of Russia, and have the British and French come in on your tail.” They said, “You're going to attack west, first!” Contrary to Hitler's inclination.

So, they did end up attacking west, first. And Hitler would have won the war, but for the United States. Because, without Roosevelt, the British would have conceded and would have signed the treaty of surrender to Hitler, the same way the French fascists did, the French fascist government. And the British oligarchy, that fought on the U.S. side in World War II, was just as fascist as the French government—and just fully as fascist as anybody in the German government of that time.

So what you had, when you start talking about “Nazi this” and this kind of thing, it’s a mistake! It’s nonsense. These things are *instruments of power!* The question is, instrument of whom? Whose instrument are they? They’re the instruments of the heirs of Venice. Of the Venetian oligarchy. The replication of the Crusades, the medieval organization, of the Norman Crusader and Venetian oligarch, which ran a system, which we would call today, “globalization.” Globalization is the core.

The issue here, of the United States, is the following: Several times, the British thought they had knocked out the Americans. The British were concerned to maintain an empire, that is, to keep Europe under control. When the Anglo-Dutch organized the wars with Louis XIV, that was to tear up the Continent, in order for the British, the Anglo-Dutch Liberals, to dominate the Continent.

Then afterward, you had the Seven Years’ War, in which Frederick the Great was involved, in which Frederick the Great was put in a situation, where he was actually deployed by the British, and even funded for a while by the British, in order to stir up a war on Europe! Everybody was against Prussia: Russia was against Prussia, Austria-Hungary was against Prussia, France was against Prussia—all this sort of thing. Frederick the Great did his job. He survived, the British withdrew further funding from him, and they set up what, through the Seven Years’ War? They set up the British Empire, the empire of the British East India Company.

The Geopolitics of Empire

And ever since then, the British East India Company’s relics—the British Liberals of today, the Anglo-Dutch Liberals, the financial crowd—have tried to control the world by what they came to call, later, “geopolitics”: the power of this Anglo-Dutch Liberal power, originally through its maritime power, and then looking to air power later on, as a way of controlling the whole planet. And the way they managed the planet, is by trying to get Eurasia, in particular, to destroy itself by internal wars. And that’s happened repeatedly. World War I was that. World War II was that. The so-called Cold War was that. To take a conflict to prevent the United States from prevailing.

Now we defeated them, really twice: Once with Lincoln. That was a surprise. And if you look at the number of corrupt Presidents we had after John Quincy Adams left—Jackson was a pig, and so forth. There were a couple of exceptions along the line, but all the way up to Lincoln from John Quincy Adams, were mostly pigs. But, suddenly, with Lincoln—boom! A victory! The British were defeated. Queen Victoria went dotty. Her son the Prince of Wales, the so-called Lord of the Isles, became involved in desperation.

Then, after 1876, you had the American influence abroad, because of the success of the United States after Lincoln’s victory: Germany, under Bismarck, adopted the American System, and especially adopted things that even had not yet

been adopted in the United States, from the works of Henry C. Carey. Carey came to Germany, personally, and was involved in organizing Bismarck’s reform. He was the advisor to the German government in Bismarck’s reform.

You had the same thing in Japan. You had the same thing in Alexander III’s Russia and in other places. Suddenly, the British see not only that the United States has survived, and they can’t attack it militarily, directly, any more, but they find that replications of the American model of economy—in opposition to the British Anglo-Dutch system!—are now springing up in Eurasia.

Result? World War I.

To get World War I, what did they do? They killed the President of the United States; they assassinated him, in order to bring in Teddy Roosevelt. From Teddy Roosevelt—with a couple of exceptions along the way, but in general, from Teddy Roosevelt—until Franklin Roosevelt, the United States, was on the British side, was a puppet of the British.

Then Roosevelt popped out again, as Lincoln had popped out earlier, and suddenly, the tradition of the American Revolution, which sprung from the institutions of the United States, from the people, suddenly defeats it! So, the first thing the British wanted to do, once Franklin Roosevelt was dead, was: “Don’t let another Roosevelt exist; and destroy the United States.”

They went through a series of processes, the same way they played the game before, the same thing as geopolitics, but a different form: the so-called Cold War. The Cold War was the antecedent for the beginning of what you saw in Germany. Germany had won the battle [for reunification]. You think Germany’s going to be rewarded? No! Germany’s destroyed. Destroyed systemically by Anglo-French interests. No industry, it’s not allowed. Berlin has to be destroyed in its industrial development. Globalization. The most developed nations of the world are being destroyed economically, by globalization. What is globalization? The elimination of the nation-state.

Now, what’s our problem in the United States, right now, in the revolution? Take the case of Coward Dean: Why did Coward Dean want to *lose* the election, this year? He tried. Why? His policy was, you should restrict the campaigns of the Democratic Party to funding and orchestrating only customary voters. That is, don’t try to bring anybody into the polls, who is not among the customary voters. Now then, engineer, together with the Republican apparatus, engineer the campaigns of the two parties, state by state. And decide that you’re going to, do what? You’re going to do what two bankers want to do, who control the Democratic Party: One is a Nazi, Felix Rohatyn. He’s a direct descendant of Lazard Frères. The other is George Soros—you know what kind of pig he is.

So these two moneybags are the key controllers of much of the Democratic Party effort. They say, stick to the customary voters. What does that mean? Don’t bring in people

from the lower 80% and don't let youth in. Because the danger is, that if you get youth into the political process, and you get more people from the lower 80% participating, actively, in the political process—consciously, as a conscious process—you're not going to be able to control them! And as Rohatyn himself has said, against me, personally, "The danger is, he's another Roosevelt." And that's exactly what I am. Not really another Roosevelt, but the same kind of thing from his standpoint: Because, if we bring in the "other voters," the youth, the people of the lower 80% of income brackets who are sentient, willing to fight for things, like the Hispanic groups for example, we are going to cause a Roosevelt effect.

No 'Business as Usual'

Now, what we have now, we have a process in which the agreement is, we're going to get rid of Cheney. We're either going to get rid of Bush, or put him in a cage. That's what the commitment is now. There is not going to be any "business as usual" in the United States, from this time on. You're in a revolutionary period of upheaval: Radical changes will occur, one way or the other. Either we win, or the enemy wins. There's not going to be any "business as usual." We're in the middle of it; the fight is defined, against Coward Dean and other people, who are trying to manage the politics for the bankers, of the type I mentioned, for the sake of limiting electoral politics to "usual voters." Don't bring in the voters who are not "usual voters." Don't bring in large numbers of youth, that you don't control. Don't bring in a lot of people from the lower 80% of family-income brackets, because you'll get a Roosevelt effect.

Because, when you bring in youth, and you bring in people in the lower 80%, what do they want? *They're concerned with issues of the General Welfare.* They're concerned with care for the people, with benefits for the people. They don't like "moneybags," who steal from them. Therefore, they vote against the moneybags, as they did with Roosevelt, and they vote *for*, and demand, politicians who will promote the General Welfare. And *that* is the American tradition.

We represent the best ideas of Europe, which were planted for safety in the United States, as far away from Europe as possible. Not from a Europe that we hated, but from the European oligarchy.

And you have systems in Europe, today, which are parliamentary systems. Now, a parliamentary system under the control of central banking systems, where politics is limited by a central banking system, is a colony. It is not a sovereign nation-state. And therefore, where people are trying to work within the framework, in Europe, of the existing notion of sovereign parliamentary government, they're in danger of three things: One, outright fascism. Two, absolute collapse of the economy, because there is no solution. And the third thing they have to face, is the fact the United States might succeed.



EIRNS/Chris Lewis

Daniel Buchmann campaigned for mayor of Berlin on the BüSo slate in September 2006. He and his supporters circulated a pamphlet titled "Youth Want a Future, Industry for Our Capital."

In which case, our job, from the United States and in Europe, in particular, is to make sure that we have an activation of a principle, a seed crystal, in each of the countries of Europe, which is ready to respond at the point that we are able to make a turn in the United States.

But the only chance for Europe, is the United States. If the United States does not change, the situation for Europe is hopeless. The situation for Eurasia is hopeless. The situation for the planet, is hopeless.

So this is not a game. This is not a sport. This is not speculation, this is not an investment. This is the salvation of humanity, at least for a long time to come. And we have to understand this, that we have to have revolutionaries. We have to think like revolutionaries, as I described that. We have to fix what's wrong with the world. We have to reach out, and create alliances and contacts with various parts of the world, bring ourselves into collaboration and discussion with them. We have to craft a system, which will save the planet. We have to advise these governments and peoples in other parts of the world, of what we're doing, tell them what our proposals are, so they have time to think about it, think of whether they're willing to adopt it or not. And therefore, in Europe—in Germany in particular—we need a Youth Movement of the type we have in the United States, functioning the way we are learning to function in the United States.

We need a factor of young people here, who are hungry in the best ways: hungry for a future for their identity; hungry for a future for the country which they inhabit; hungry for a future of civilization, hungry for a meaningful life.