Click here for Full Issue of EIR Volume 26, Number 2, January 8, 1999

Jacques Cheminade

'A citizen of all places, and a contemporary of all times'

Here is the speech of Jacques Cheminade to the panel on Lazare Carnot at the ICLC/Schiller Institute conference at Bad Schwalbach, Germany, on Nov. 21, 1998. Cheminade is the president of the Solidarity and Progress movement in France, and a longtime associate of Lyndon LaRouche.

There is no history but the history of ideas. To know the lives of great thinkers, is to relive those acts of discovery through which they have changed history. It is thus, says Lyndon LaRouche, that we come to know a great thinker whom we have never met, better than many members of our own family. When we hesitate before our responsibilities, or when we have to make a major decision, those great thinkers come to us as examples, not through fixed sets of instructions, but through their deeds, works, and acts of discovery.

Today, at this very moment, not only is the world financial system collapsing, but, because of its lust for usury and the political corruption of the population associated with it, that collapse is leading toward the self-destruction of world civilization as a whole. We are confronted by a system of beliefs and behaviors axiomatically opposed to the essence of human nature; hence, if we identify with what we see or feel around us, we necessarily become pessimists, and therefore accomplices of that collapse. The only possible way to intervene efficiently is from a higher level, breaking with the rules of the game, with a full commitment to change the very axioms, to correct and improve ideas respecting man's relationship to the universe and the relations among men themselves. We are confronted with one of these crucial moments where history demands leadership, the intervention of men who are up to the challenge, *"hommes de caractère",* men of character who catalyze social forces into action.

We are all here to become one of them, and that's why we have to see through the mind's eye of Carnot.

Lazare Carnot, the "Organizer of Victory" of the French Revolution armies against the coalition of monarchies invading France, and a great scientist—inspired by the method of Leibniz—stands beside us as a giant on whose shoulders we have to climb. He faced, like us, a terrible challenge and, climbing on the shoulders of his giant predecessors, changed the course of history.

The key point to understand first, is that his passion was to defend his nation and make of it a better republic, in a total war against oligarchism, a war of weapons, but, far beyond that, a war for the human mind. There was absolutely no contradiction between that republican passion for his nation, and the cause of civilization. For him, as it should be for all of us, the true interest of France as a republican nation-state, was to do good for the cause of civilization as a whole.

In doing so, one's identity is that of a patriot and a world citizen, a citizen and a philosopher, working for our time, but also for the cause of those yet to be born.

This is the first and more fundamental of Carnot's paradoxes: It is by becoming a father to generations to come that the cause of one's nation and the cause of civilization as a whole become one. And this is the principle of "universal solidarity"—*solidarité universelle*.

In his "Eloge de Vauban" (Praise for Vauban) written in 1784, when he was about 31 years old, Carnot says of the late Marshal of France: "How rare it is for a wise man to reap the fruit of his works! He is ahead of his century, and his words can only be understood by posterity; but that is enough support for him; his imagination breaks through the shades of error; he is the friend of men yet to be born, he converses with them in his deepest research; as a citizen, he looks to his nation, his hopes are for it, he applauds its successes; he takes part in its triumphs; as philosopher, he has already crossed the boundaries separating empires. He has no enemies, he is a citizen of all places and contemporary of all times; he stays with man from his frail origin until his final perfection."

We are poles apart both from the chauvinistic attachment to one's fatherland—the romantic Bonapartism of "me against all"—and from one-worldism, today's "globalization." Both take man as an instrument, from the outside, for immediate purposes of domination, while Carnot, as a true contemporary of Schiller, whose works he had translated into French, is inspired by the future, by an horizon expanded to the common interest of mankind.

Speaking to the Academy of Arras on May 25, 1787, on the subject of habit, Carnot—paradoxically, again—defends "habit" as the means to attain wisdom. "There is only one true practicable morality, it is the one that teaches us to draw our

© 1999 EIR News Service Inc. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission strictly prohibited.

A statue of Maréchal de France Sébastian de Vauban (1603-1707) outside the Louvre in Paris. Vauban was famous for developing the defense of cities. Carnot, in his "Praise for Vauban," referred to this patriot as a "citizen of all lands and contemporary of all times."

particular interest from the common interest of mankind. . . . By the habit of serving the common interest of mankind, through the constant practice of virtue, the citizen arrives at a type of pleasure that only its very practice can give. . . . It is the only pleasure that, rather than becoming time-worn, has the unique advantage of increasing itself through its fulfillment. When you do the good, you always want to do more, you always know that there is much more to do and you can never be satiated."

Remember what LaRouche and [Jonathan] Tennenbaum have been insisting, and what Gauss also said about a mind of a discoverer: It finds fulfillment, not by some external reward, or even by the solutions it discovers, but by the pleasure of seeking, of discovering, of becoming, for a moment, "a citizen of all places and a contemporary of all times."

To the man for whom doing the Good is a habit, Carnot contrasts the courtier and his vanity, the sense of honor degenerated into vanity. For the courtier, he stresses, the future cannot exist, because he is only concerned with his "self." That sort of "honor," says Carnot, is "the deceitful homage paid by a mob of slaves seeking their own interest," and constitutes "the main agent for destroying all moral law." There are a number of anecdotes about Carnot harshly mocking Napoleon on this issue: In June 1815, just after Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo, Carnot, then Interior Minister, told Napoleon: "You would have been better off if you had remained First Consul. By becoming Emperor and creating a nobility, you got in with very bad company, and deserved your present fate."

Carnot's life is therefore entirely guided by an active principle of *agapē:* He was a great admirer of Christianity's holy books and he had studied theology, but he always rejected exhibitionist devotions. At the end of his life, he writes: "The practice of religious devotion and prayers may be of useful help to correct one's bad inclinations—but without good works, they are nothing but insults to God." His definition of *agapē* is that, to do Good should become a "natural impulse of all instants," because "man is born to work, and *otium,* idleness, is the source of all human degradation." In his speech "On the Supreme Being," on May 16, 1794, he elaborates on the same subject that Pope John Paul II recently developed in his most recent encyclical, *On Faith and Reason*. Carnot says: "A bit of philosophy, a famous man once said, leads to atheism; a lot of philosophy leads one back to the existence of the Divinity. Because a little bit of philosophy creates that pride that does not accept anything to be above itself, and much philosophy allows man to discover within himself his weaknesses and external miracles that he is forced to admire."

'The hard workers'

Now, at this point, I am sure that what comes to your minds, is the image of a man doing his thinking at some comfortable estate, honored and protected. Quite the opposite: His principles were fully defined for action. Carnot's inner mandate was to serve the people in the midst of the most violent events. "It is not an easy task," he once commented. "It demands courageous operatives; but let us pity those who are unable to love the people, despite their flaws, and to serve them despite their ingratitude." He did not serve the people to be rewarded by their admiration; more than once he was slandered to such an extent that he said of himself: "I have met many men, who, after the picture painted of me by some newspapers, could not conceal their astonishment to see who I really was." Sounds familiar, doesn't it?

Let's watch Carnot at work, in the very volcano of the French Revolution: There he is, the brain, organizer, and commander-in-chief of the republican armies of the Revolution, winning the greatest wars against a coalition of all of Europe's kingdoms and nobility. It is under his unity of command, as [conference panelist] Andreas Ranke said, that, in the 17 months between August 1793 and January 1795, he obtained

victory. Mobilizing his mind, this relatively inexperienced artillery captain in his early 40s, defeated all of Europe, mobilizing generals who were themselves only in their 20s and 30s.

Scharnhorst, in his treatise "On the Successes of the French in Their Revolutionary Wars, and Notably in the 1794 Campaign," minces no words regarding Carnot's innovative unity of command as "that advantage of the whole which keeps all the mainsprings of the machine in a state of extreme tension."

Think for a moment: Carnot is one of the twelve—and then basically nine—members of the Committee of Public Safety, exerting full power to save the French nation-state republic. France has been invaded from all sides: Alsace and the northern front are broken through; Spain threatens in the south; the west and the south of the country are agitated by monarchist insurrections supported by the British; Bordeaux, Caen, and then, Lyons, are in insurrection. The very fabric of the nation is collapsing. And Carnot, with a few men, takes over and snatches victory from the jaws of defeat. In 17 months, from Aug. 14, 1793 to January 1795, from Hondschoote to Wattignies in the north, to the fall of Figueras, in Spain, the impossible was accomplished.

How? Through informed love for the people, and by addressing their minds. The secret of victory was to change the rules of the game: the administration, the army, the mobilization of men were as never before. There was no model to be sought in the past. Carnot knew that he was alone, exerting the sovereign power of a leader, alone with the wise men of the past and the interests of the people, present and future—alone at a turning point, with no example to copy, as we are today. Alone against the oligarchy of Europe, the "tyrants," the "rapacious England," as he wrote, "which owes its ephemeral power only to the disasters of the continent." Alone among most of his own friends who were fearful or corrupt.

Within the Committee of Public Safety, you had the three organizers of the nation, who would soon be called by everyone "the hard workers": Carnot, with full war and administrative powers; his ally Robert Lindet, in charge of supplies, transportation, and communications; and his friend Pierre Louis Prieur, in charge of all the rest, including setting up the Ecole Polytechnique.

But, otherwise, what an irrational bunch:

Georges Jacques Danton, a corrupt agent of British influence; Maximilien Robespierre, Georges Couthon, and Louis de Saint-Just, nicknamed "the heavy hands." The Romantic, Jacobin, Roman triumvirate, full of hatred and pretense; and there were also the three babblers, only good for making reports and raising cash from foreign powers: Biliaud-Varenne, Collot d'Herbois, and the arch-corrupt Barrère, probably the main British provocateur.

Then, you had the Hébertistes sans-culottes running amok in the streets of Paris, mobs roaming around the Convention (the assembly), the city rife with rumor, slander, and lies. The currency created by the Revolution, the assignat, had collapsed into hyperinflation. (Goya's painting of *Saturn Devoring His Children* makes a good metaphor for the French Revolution.)

The authority of Carnot was so great that he was never really challenged, except by Robespierre at the very end. Because he had understood that the war had to be won, in which you had first to fire all the old generals—at least all those who had not fled to the enemy's side. Between 1791 and 1793, he fired 593 generals, who were replaced by sergeants. Why were the new generals obeyed by those who were their comrades just the day before? Because there was a general trust and enthusiasm in the nation, a unity of impulse, concentration of power, and rapidity of action. A centralized revolutionary agency worked for the safety of the nation.

Imagine the life of those men on the Committee of Public Safety during those years: 500 to 600 major decisions to make each day. They woke at 8, examined some documents, and held their first meeting at around 11; then a quick lunch, work at home or attendance at the Convention deliberations; the evening meetings began at 7 and lasted until 2 or 4 in the morning, with 12 commissions reporting every day.

How could Carnot and Prieur maintain their mental equilibrium? The secret was that Carnot wrote poems and Prieur set them to music. They were nothing great—good, but not great. They had no claim to be great artists, but to work, to look inside their own minds, as enlightened amateurs. Carnot himself says that mastering and educating the imagination is necessary to foster the courage to generate hypotheses.

It is through that unbroken connection to great artists—Dante, Cervantes, Schiller—that Carnot could continue to advance, making those *percées,* breakthroughs, a term that he created, which changed both science and the organization of society.

Interestingly, Robespierre was extremely jealous of him, and could not figure out how Carnot worked: He often came silently to inspect Carnot's maps and notes, and would repeat, "I cannot understand how you go about it." Carnot, whose favorite division in the army was the Cartography Department, one day smiled and responded, "projective geometry, and beyond that, a profound vision, stirred by the love of humanity." Robespierre retorted, "But you are in charge of war, you command the 14 armies of the Republic." "Precisely," smiled Carnot. Robespierre went back to his friends and reported: "Either Carnot is deceitful, which I think not, or he is more insane than all of us."

The mission orientation

Carnot's method was to find people with the "capacity of command"—like Hoche, whom he called "my godsend"—to educate them by giving them responsibilities and elbow room to exercise it. "To impassion man is my task, he once said, only a great passion is the soul of a large whole." Mission directives for the republican armies were "not for controlling purposes, not with precise instructions which lose all rele-

Carnot's deadly enemies on the Committee of Public Safety, Georges-Jacques Danton (left) and Maximilien Robespierre. The former was a British agent of influence. The latter was an aristocrat who practiced his caste's emotionless good manners, even while inundating France in its own blood.

vance by the time they reach the field, but to convey the passion of the Revolutionary Assembly to the soldiers in the battlefield."

Levasseur, whom Carnot sent to put down a revolt in the northern army, asked, "Where are my instructions?" to which Carnot answered, "They are in your heart and in your mind, they cannot be put on a piece of paper. They will come to you naturally under the press of events. Go and remember your mission."

Remember Wattignies: General Jordan, who was in command, disagreed with Carnot. He wanted to stick to the old rules, supporting forces where he was losing, on the left flank, to reestablish equilibrium. No, said Carnot. Throw away the classroom instructions; there is no such thing, in science or in battle, as "equilibrium." The secret of victory is to foster the active principle—the dynamics defining an entirely new order. Attack *en masse* where you can win, on the right flank, because that is where you are least expected. The enemy general is, like you, "stuck to the old tactics." He would never even conceive of our boldness, our insanity, according to the old order. Jordan, who was afraid to lose—and to lose his head, as was the bad habit of those times—said: "If we adopt the advice of the People's Representative, I warn him: He should bear the responsibility for our fate." Carnot answered, "I am, to be sure, in charge of everything, including carrying out the orders."

The next day, Carnot and Duquesnoy marched at the head of the armies, carrying the hats of the People's Representatives on the points of their swords. The battle was won. "Tradition, in those days," Carnot reflects, "was our chief enemy; the most audacious decision was the wisest, if supported by unity of impulse and of consciousness."

The nation, and especially Paris, were reorganized to meet the needs of the war effort: Was saltpeter needed to produce gunpowder? A collection was organized throughout the nation: A special class was created to teach the unskilled how to produce powder; a song was composed to teach them how to extract it from their cellars; iron works and munitions workshops were built throughout Paris. Poor men were thus transformed into skilled workers, as all of Paris was put to work. "Don't let the people be handed over to disorder, organize them, employ them," urged Carnot.

'A genius as daring as deep'

But even this does not adequately explain his unprecedented success: His approach to science corresponded to his method to mobilize the people: change, shifts, and a new geometrical ordering as a principle. This means the *levée en masse,* or mass mobilization: In February 1793 there were 204,000 men at the front; in May, 397,000; in December, 554,000; and in September 1794, 732,000. In addition to the *levée en masse,* Carnot would combine one professional battalion with two made up of volunteers.

There was also a *percée,* a breakthrough, arrived at by combining the massed attack of bayonet charges with concentration of fire power and extreme mobility of the artillery.

For that, they needed a light cannon, known as the *"cannon de Gribeauval,"* drawn swiftly by horses without becoming bogged down in the mud.

How was it possible? Thanks to projective geometry, Car-

One of the many committees that the Revolution churned out—this one is the Committee of Year Two. Within the Committee of Public Safety, Carnot and his allies had to outflank Roman triumvirate of Danton, Robespierre, and Couthon, in order to save the nation.

not generalized a method of teaching that had been a military secret up to the middle of the eighteenth century: the projection onto a two-dimensional space of a three-dimensional space, of a volume onto a flat plane. And how is this related to the solution of the problem of producing light cannon? Because projective geometry allows more precise calculations, while the advances in ironworking allowed them to produce lighter parts. Moreover, those parts could be assembled in different locations, creating a higher form of cooperative labor.

Here is what LaRouche calls the Machine-Tool Principle, applied to war. A paradox in science is solved by a discovery of principle, and from that discovery of principle, through experimental testing, a set of new, connected technologies is generated—machines to produce machines.

What was the secret? Well, it was precisely what Carnot had told Robespierre. In his *Eloge de Vauban:* He raises the need for both a higher form of geometry to make discoveries beyond the physical boundaries of the known (i.e., metaphysical), and for a geometry to carry out measurement:

"There is an exact, simple, luminous science, profound and sublime; it advances slowly, methodically, cautiously; it ensures the farmer's harvest; guides the navigator through the ocean's obstacles; weighs the heavenly bodies; calculates their distances; breaks down light, knows its speed: It is the art of Euclid. But there is another, even more subtle geometry, whose principles lie, so to speak, within the sentiment. Daughter of imagination and not of hard study, for whom a refined judgment, a profound, deep look, a fortunate tact, act as numbers, rules, and compass; its operations are metaphysical; its results are obtained through rapid calculation that no outward signs can represent: it guides the ingenious artist who is often ignorant of the art of Euclid; it is the only light which remains to us when ordinary methods become too slow, the objects too many, and relations too complicated; it perceives intuitively; it demands a genius as daring as deep; more sharp than methodical, more vast than thought-through. Without this geometry, the other is but a useless instrument; it creates, while the other polishes; it is the mother of invention and the other is the mother of precision."

From that higher standpoint, projective geometry, the projection of a three-dimensional space into a two-dimensional space, is a special case of natural geometry. Carnot's approach is to free science from the burden of aprioristic, deductive forms of geometry. It establishes "change" as the subject of study, excluding all notions of extension, those naive notions of abstract space, time, and matter so popular with our reductionists.

This leads us directly into Riemann's habilitation dissertation of 1854—but for this I leave you to LaRouche's writ-

ings, including the recent "How France's Greatest Military Hero Became a Prussian Lieutenant-General" [*EIR,* Oct. 2, 1998]. Attention is shifted away from the object as such, toward changes in position and dimensions.

In economics, this means that the primary expression of value is not the abstract accumulation of money or the concrete accumulation of objects (tons, bushels, or other units), but the change in the economic process. For the men and women participating in that process, it means that in place of repetitive labor at the cheapest price, the priority is given to increasing the productive powers of labor through generating scientific progress. This is—and I am sorry to sum it up so imperfectly —the beautiful coherence of Carnot's thinking with LaRouche's.

In his *Eloge de Vauban,* we again see the quality of Carnot's leadership of the French armies:

"It is a natural geometry, a type of instinct very different from accepted geometry. Science does not provide genius, but natural geometry is genius itself applied to measuring magnitudes. The accepted geometry because of its very exactness, is forced to proceed with extreme slowness and is limited to very simple cases; the other proceeds promptly and is applicable to everything; it sees at a glance what disturbs the combinations, without seriously influencing the results, and it skillfully frees itself from an overly rigorous exactness to the advantage of speed: Through it mathematicians foresee the results of an hypothesis, even before analyzing them through exact calculation; it is also the geometry required by generals to instantly grasp the arrangement, the ordering, and the line of march of the troops."

Again, remember Carnot's answer to Robespierre.

Education at the Ecole Polytechnique

This was the very basis for the teaching at the Ecole Polytechnique. Classes on mathematics did not start with algebra or analysis, but with the study of the sketches and paintings of Leonardo—and through Francoeur, Cherubini, Vuillaume, and others—with the principles of Classical music composition. "Education of the heart," said Carnot, "should precede that of reason and teach us to love and know the laws of creation and our fellow men."

Remember, too: There is a coherence between their method of thinking and the social relations among thinkers—the principle of LaRouche is applied here, just as it was at the Polytechnique: "We are all friends." Carnot called this the principle of mutual education. At the Polytechnique, a master class would be given by Monge, Legendre, or others, on a principle associated with a crucial experiment to be rediscovered or relived by the students. The students were divided into brigades of 20, with the more advanced students leading the brigade. The leader's task was to convey his knowledge, his method, to the others—mutual education—and they would all return to present their findings to the professor. No one was left in ignorance.

What future for France, today?

I should go now into what LaRouche sees as the challenge for us Europeans—and in particular for us French—at a time when western Europe is collapsing, with France leading the pack. For better or worse, the French have a peculiar tendency to be in the vanguard. "Shame on France," says LaRouche, "not to honor its true great men and the noble efforts associated with them." Indeed, Carnot was rejected and had to go into exile in Magdeburg, in Germany. De Gaulle was ousted, in a referendum by a coalition of imbeciles. The great Jean Jaurès, the only person who, together with Rosa Luxemburg, fought to stop Europe's descent into the butchery of World War I, was murdered. Giants run up against little people, and are only accepted, when the situation is perceived as being of extreme danger to all.

I want to conclude by saying a few words about that.

The great thinker is never offended when he is betrayed by the elites or by the people, nor does such betrayal put his life and his work into question.

In Carnot's last poem, a few weeks before he died, after he had had to sell his beloved family estate of Presles, Carnot wrote:

"I give Thee thanks, Author of Nature

"For the serene days, given to me."

Obviously this type of serenity does not come through leisure or possessions; its highest form is won through motion, the result of a life lived in accordance with the true humanity of man.

For the leader, for we who are committed to take the challenge of leadership, the challenge is of a different nature than most think: It is how to perfect people, how to protect the people not only from the oligarchy, but from themselves. Their minds cannot be spoon-fed with given knowledge, but their hearts can be inspired, so that they can trust their minds. This is the task that Carnot started, in the middle of the turbulence of his times: inspiring. This is what Schiller tells us to do.

The challenge requires two things.

First, to take one's mind seriously, and to educate ourselves and our friends—a handful of people with passion for truth and justice and prepared to act. This means having *caractère,* as Carnot did. *Caractère* to face the challenge of the unknown, and to make the drive to know, to be at the frontiers of knowledge, the highest form of shared pleasure.

As as an organization, we are trying to accomplish this. Maybe with a shortcoming: The habit of loving mankind has not yet fully killed in us the habit of the courtier, or in today's terms, the bureaucrat. To have an idea of what I mean by that, I strongly advise you to read a very bad book: *Il libro del cortigiano,* by Baltasar Castiglione. It is the book of recipes for the world of Venetian court life. It was published in Italy in 1528, after being approved by the Venetian censors. It was translated into French in 1538, and spread into England after 1561. This manual for the courtiers of the *ancien régime* was a bestseller in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe. But

we can make use of this book to confront ourselves, and see what we have to eradicate in ourselves and in our culture. Castiglione defines man by his behavior and manners, his capacity to seduce women, and curry the favor of the prince. As the favorite book of kings and aristocrats, it presented the ideal of the man of leisure: gracefulness, charm, good taste, the "speech of the body." All is tamed: body, language, and emotions; here we see the flaws of refined French culture, as well as of European culture in general.

In France, you can identify three forces, fiercely opposed to each other, but sharing the same courtier or bureaucratic worldview:

- the legitimists, landowner courtiers, with their Orléans financier-merchant appendages;
- the bonapartists or would-be Caesars, the financial and military courtiers;
- and the Jacobin existentialists and leftists, courtiers of the guillotine. Robespierre, the paranoid killer, the nobleman, with his perfumed wig and good manners. Maximilien de Robespierre, who never exhibited any emotion, the emotionless killer, the perfect courtier of death.

What is left of it today, is the bureaucracy of the caste. This culture of moral defeatism and impotence is a culture of death, of pessimism. "The world is evil, you have to succeed by any means, to save your skin in a hostile environment, where crushing the other guy is the court rule."

To that, Carnot answers that the world we can build is good—and that "mutual education" should spread into every pore of culture: schools, theaters, concert halls, and, today, even to our TV sets. The culture of life, of hope—the true culture of the French nation-state and of the Renaissance—has to find fierce fighters among us. Carnot, LaRouche, Franklin—the modern man whom Carnot "most admired"—are exactly the opposite of the whining sycophant. They are men of principle, true republicans, never at rest, seeing no fear in the eyes of the others because they have taken full responsibility for them.

The second task is even more important than the first: It requires changing the relations of the elites to the people, by having the courage to enter into the mind of others and give them the means to change their way of thinking, in the way that Carnot was inspired by Leibniz. This demands compassion, passion for another, an opening to the infinite within the finite: Carnot speaks of the *"infini sensible"* and the *"infini absolu":* the infinite of the infinite, the Absolute infinite, and the knowable infinite, as opposed to the Aristotelian notion of an indetermined, indefinite infinite—outside the realm of our knowledge. The moment of discovery, for Carnot, is a moment of beauty, a joy forever—a moment when all men can be brothers. The sharing of those moments is the very foundation for education.

Only one thing need be added: This type of creative relation between two minds requires a purification of all delusions on the common history of the world and respective nations: There is no history but the history of ideas. We have to be honest with people on that. For example, any European who refuses to admit that World War I was an awful butchery organized under British imperial influence, is deceiving people, and cannot claim to be defending the cause of truth.

The unacknowledged legislators are the poets and the children; it is from them that we have to learn.

Let me tell an anecdote from Carnot's childhood. When he was 10, his mother took him to see a play about a besieged city: A general appeared on stage, whose artillery was exposed to the enemy. Young Carnot leaped out of his seat and shouted out: "Watch it! You are going to let your men be killed and your cannons destroyed. Move to the left. Hide behind that rock. Open a breach on the right and bring your infantry through there."

Young Carnot cared for others and had a sense of mission. Let us, today in France, today in Europe, be loyal to that legacy. Let us, just as he did as a child in that theater, break with the rules of the game when the lives of human beings are at stake.

Carnot's grave in Magdeburg had only one word written on it: "Carnot." I am committed that that name be rekindled fas a beacon of hope for all of Europe, once again rescuing our continent from its present self-degradation, just as Carnot wrought victory out of the depths of defeat.

For previews and information on LaRouche publications:

Visit EIR's Internet Website!

- Highlights of current issues of EIR
- Pieces by Lyndon LaRouche
- Every week: transcript and audio of the latest **EIR Talks** radio interview.

http://www.larouchepub.com

e-mail: **larouche@larouchepub.com**