

Now, they were accusing us, for lack of a parliamentary system that will bring about free and fair elections. Now, listen: We have been holding elections since 1980; this election here, was our fifth election. And all our elections since 1980 (every five years we hold elections), the international community were coming here as observers. And at the end of all four elections we held, they said the elections were free and fair. No violence. They were carried out freely and fairly. And the people of Zimbabwe expressed their views, and elected their own government.

This time, they came in predicting violence, predicting all sorts of things: To their surprise, except for what was instigated by their agents a few weeks before the elections, there was no violence. We realized that if you allowed violence, it would be deliberately hatched out, so that they could not support the election as free and fair, and therefore cause problems here. We realized that, and we pleaded with our people: Never mind what happens! If necessary, turn the other cheek; don't respond in violence. And I'm glad to say, our elections were free and fair, and they said it themselves—they pronounced it.

You are asking me what I think about America's elections. All I can say is, that I'm surprised to hear what I'm hearing about the American elections, of people who think they are holding the democratic pattern for the whole world, and that they know better, how to organize elections. And up to now, they have not clearly announced the results of their elections—how many days now?

EIR: 22 days.

Msika: That is very surprising. We realize that election democracy is a process. There was no democracy in Rhodesia. There was no free play in Rhodesia. There was no human rights in Rhodesia. There was no rule of law in Rhodesia. We have introduced all these things. And we realize that democracy is a process. We perfect it as we go forth. And we intend to go about it like that. We have never said we are perfect.

EIR: Is there anything else you want to say to the American public?

Msika: We are a young country, a developing country. We have set ourselves to correct the ills of the colonial era. We have established a democratic, young state; and we don't deserve the treatment we are getting from certain individuals in the Western world. We want to develop, as Zimbabwe, on a non-racial basis, where people of different ethnic groups, across the color line, can live together happily. We have established, since 1980, a peaceful country, with stability, and we would like to sustain this stability. Please, people from outside, don't come and give us your evil thoughts. We want to live together as a people of Zimbabwe, whether white or black. As long as you respect our laws here, you have a home, which will be the envy of our enemies, if we are allowed to pursue our own policies as we see them.

LaRouches in Budapest, Invited by Hungarian Freedom Fighters

by Birgit Vitt

At the beginning of December, American economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche and his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder of the international Schiller Institute, were invited to Budapest, the capital of Hungary, to commemorate the tenth anniversary of Schiller Institute activities in Hungary. LaRouche spoke at a seminar which was organized by Dr. Tibor Kovats, representative of the Schiller Institute in Hungary.

Dr. Kovats was a founding member of Pofosz, the organization of political prisoners, in Hungary. Pofosz represents those courageous people who participated in the famous 1956 uprising. In this function, Dr. Kovats was the first foreign guest from the former East bloc who visited Lyndon LaRouche in prison during his political incarceration. On Oct. 23, 1990, Zepp-LaRouche was invited by Pofosz to speak at the occasion of the first celebration of Hungary's national holiday, Oct. 23, after the demise of communism in Eastern Europe. Since that time, the relations between the Schiller Institute and Hungarian patriots have intensified. Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche, on this visit, had discussions with politicians, scientists, and representatives of church organizations. The Prime Minister of Hungary sent greetings welcoming the Budapest event at which LaRouche spoke.

Hungary, as one of the so-called transition countries, is a victim of International Monetary Fund austerity policy. The living standard of the majority of the population is very low. The inflation rate of 10%, and rising costs for telecommunications, electricity, and other services, are hard to bear. The domestic industries have either been bought up in large chunks by foreign investors or have ceased to exist. Stock markets are collapsing. As result of the war in former Yugoslavia, Hungary has been economically damaged. The government coalition of the liberal-conservative party FIDESZ-MPP, and the Small-Holder Party, FKGP, is straddling all chairs politically. In addition, the country is shaken by scandals. Because of its very close ties to the United States (Hungary is a NATO member), Hungarians reacted to the election crisis in the United States with *Schadenfreude* (gloating), but at the same time expressed their concern about the future.

So, the thoughts and policy proposals of Mr. LaRouche find an open ear in sections of the Hungarian political and economic elites. Guests at the seminar came from embassies, were representatives of political parties and economic institu-

tions, scientists, students, and other friends of the Schiller Institute. Dr. Kovats welcomed Mr. LaRouche as “a friend of Hungary,” and thanked him for coming to share “his wisdom and advice with us, the Hungarians, on questions of economics and politics.”

Mrs. LaRouche, in her short remarks at the seminar, reflected upon the fact that Mr. LaRouche and the Schiller Institute forewarned people in Eastern Europe of what is happening now. And that Pope John Paul II spoke about the “structures of sin” which exist both in East and West. She compared the collapse of the system today with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989-90. Today, however, as she emphasized, the situation is much worse, if you look at Africa and Ibero-America. Countries in Asia, suffering from the monetary crisis since 1997, are today joining together with the aim to build a regional bloc in which the policy of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, which was formulated by the Schiller Institute, is politically being realized. “We will face very hard times. The shock will come, but the solution is on the table,” she concluded.

LaRouche’s Presentation

In the concluding section of his presentation in Budapest, given on Dec. 5, Lyndon LaRouche discussed the way nations must deal with the ongoing collapse of the “globalized” financial and monetary system. Here is his conclusion:

Now you have the United States, the so-called leading power of the world, which is part of a new Roman Empire, called globalization, dominated by the English-speaking parts. This is a great tragedy for all humanity. Great tragedies occur on stage, and we are supposed to learn lessons from them. Tragedians wrote the tragedies to enable people to see what the mistakes were, so that tragedies would not be made in real life.

Let me define the tragedy for you and indicate what the alternative to a tragic conclusion could be. In a sane situation, we would take the same approach to the current world depression, that the United States took under Franklin Roosevelt to the last depression.

The main principles of Western civilization, especially in the past 600 years, are two things, essentially: 1) Classical Greek culture as it was used by Europe, and 2) the taking of Classical Greek culture’s legacy in the hands of Christianity. The essential unity, as far as policy was concerned, was, in one aspect of this union, between the Classical Greek legacy and Christianity. This aspect is summarized by a famous chapter from the first letter to the Corinthians, Chapter 13, of the Apostle Paul. One should either be familiar with that and recall it, or should study it. It involves what is called in the Classical Greek, the principle of *agapē*.

Some people try to get a simplified explanation of the Greek term *agapē* and call it *caritas*. In English, it is translated “charity.” But in the minds of most people, that means giving

donations to the poor. *Agapē*, as a principle, does not prevent giving things to the poor, helping the sick, carrying for one’s neighbor—all these things are included under *agapē*. But, if you read this chapter from Paul’s Corinthian letter, you realize that there is something much deeper, more profound, involved.

What Paul makes clear is: Obeying the letter of the law, is not morality. It is rather the *intent* of the law, as Paul defines it, which is what is crucial. In Plato’s second book in *The Republic*, this means “truthfulness” and “justice.” The special nature of man as made in the image of God, means that truthfulness and justice require that we always behave toward mankind in that way. And any act of law which violates that principle, is wrong.

In the 15th Century, with the great Renaissance, that principle of Christianity became law, in the form of the sovereign nation-state. This is articulated in a very clear and influential way by a man who later became Cardinal, Nicolaus of Cusa, who developed in his *Concordantia Catholica*, the idea of the community of principle among sovereign nation-states, dedicated in effect to the principle of *agapē*. In the course of time, this principle was incorporated both in the Declaration of Independence and the Preamble of the Constitution of the United States. All great Presidents of the United States have been governed by their conscience in respect to this principle.

Roosevelt’s Legacy

In the Great Depression of 1929-31/32, Roosevelt took the Presidency to save the United States from disintegration, under the pressures of the great economic depression. The institutions he built before his premature death, intended to provide the extension of that principle for the rebuilding of the war-torn depression in the world. Before President Roosevelt’s dead body was cold, his successors had begun to destroy that legacy. But nonetheless, a nub of Roosevelt’s legacy persisted in relations with Western Europe. Through the influence of Jean Monnet of France, and the influence of others, the United States and Western Europe cooperated in an effort to rebuild the economy of both parts of the world.

Racists and others in the United States, as in Britain, have worked to destroy that policy. But now, we have come to a great world depression, far worse than that experienced over 1929-31. Very soon, the full force of that ugly fact will be apparent to everyone. It could be prevented; if I were President, I could prevent it now. But I am not. And none of the leaders of governments of the world presently have the courage and insight combined, to even try to do it. Even President Clinton, who is a very intelligent man, whom I try to help—he would not do it either.

We are faced with the question, what do we do, when it happens? And we can not operate without a plan of action. It can not be a detailed plan, but it has to be a conception of what are we going to do, what policies will we use. We have two things on which to rely in making such a policy. First, we have the legacy of Classical Greece, and we have the legacy



Lyndon LaRouche addresses the seminar in Budapest, Hungary.

of the 15th-Century great Renaissance, which brought Europe out of a terrible Dark Age. We also have the precedent of the United States' action under F.D. Roosevelt. A precedent in principle, principle as to law, as to natural law, as to man's law. We have precedents and examples of a practical nature, such as the experience of 1933 to 1965 in the rebuilding of the United States and Europe, as economies, out of the desperate Great Depression.

That a true statesman with those examples in mind would say, "That work that was right, let's do it again." I have hoped, without success, that the President of the United States, and specifically President Clinton, would take that kind of initiative. That he would take the initiative of bringing together, at least some leading nations and groups of nations in the world, to agree on a new monetary conference, to do on a world scale, what Roosevelt attempted to do in 1943-44. Again, the authority of the individual sovereign states, and a concert of a community of principle among sovereign states, to declare a bankrupt system financially bankrupt; it's what you would do with an individual firm, in fact. Under certain conditions, you can shut down a bankrupt firm, but you can not close down an economy. You say, What are the assets of a bankrupt firm? They are people, productive people, their existing means of production, there are functioning institutions, including banks, which will enable us to organize production again. A bankruptcy of the financial system, particularly a rotten one, is not a catastrophe; it's a blessing in disguise.

Once you do that, and set up a new monetary system, and set up a process of bankruptcy of bankrupt institutions, what do you do next? Your purpose is to maintain stability, maintain social stability, maintain justice and growth. You make

a listing in the states, and you do the things that were right, and continue to do them. Then you adopt missions of cooperation within nations and among nations, to begin a process of real growth. This I worked on, on a world scale. What I have written on this subject, you can read in the publications which discuss the New Bretton Woods and other proposals.

A Perspective for Central and Southeast Europe

I want to focus, in conclusion, on one point. Naturally, in my discussions here, there has been frequent reference to an evil treaty called Trianon, which the area from the Danube Valley, the Carpathians south, called the Balkans, to Greece. This area has been torn, under Trianon, in a way in which the economy of the region has never been functioning as it could. The answer is obvious. What

we need as a part of a just, new world system, is an organization for the economic development of this region, as a cooperating unit. The very establishment of such an agreement, will tend to cause growth in and of itself. This means building up the infrastructure in the region—transportation, power, and so forth. It means protection for the growth of independent farmers and small entrepreneurs. It means the organization of credit to build up trade within the region itself. It means building up the education system. It means building regional blocs like the ASEAN-Plus-3, not as a division of the world into competing blocs, but as units of cooperation to participate in establishing a new form of cooperation on a broader scale.

I think that the area from the Carpathians and the Danube Valley, south to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean Sea, is an area for a zone of cooperation of this type, and can be one of the great building blocs of a new world monetary system of cooperation. And I would hope, that in this situation, the very fact of the great crisis warns us, that what we've been doing for 35 years is largely wrong—If we cease doing that, we must use the examples from the past, to give us models on which we can build a sounder system, to replace this bankrupt old system. And build with a sense of mission and justice for the entire world, and build that on the basis of cooperation among regions in the world and cooperation among the regions in the world. Building a world which is just. It may not be perfect, but at least it will be just. And enjoy and take satisfaction from the fact, that we of a generation which is now about to die, in a decade or so, that we can leave to our children and grandchildren a legacy of which they need not be ashamed. That is my purpose. Thank you.