

of its duty, and certify who they consider to be the President-elect of the United States, as of January 20th of next year. And that, I think, is the only procedure which I think is Constitutional, and which would work.”

The full text of LaRouche’s webcast address is available on [www.larouchespeaks.com](http://www.larouchespeaks.com). For more information, call 888-347-3258.

## LaRouche to Webcast: Scalia Has No Regard For the Intent of Law

*The following is an FDR PAC press release, issued on Dec. 13.*

During the Dec. 12 Washington, D.C. seminar and Internet webcast, former Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche was asked to respond to a question submitted by a high-ranking official of the U.S. government’s Executive branch. The question was, “What is the most efficient way to limit the potential damage that the [recent] Scalia opinion implies?”

LaRouche, who had singled out the Scalia opinion as a mortal danger to the survival of Constitutional government in the United States, replied:

“Most people, unfortunately, have forgotten what law means. They have forgotten the relationship between the concept of *agapē*, as developed by Plato in his dialogue on Justice in Book II of *The Republic*, among the characters Socrates, Thrasymachus, and Glaucon. They have forgotten the same principle of *agapē*, in the same form, using the same term *agapē*, used by the Apostle Paul, in such exemplary locations as *I Corinthians 13*: that, law does not come from written law. Written laws are often wrong! Judgments are often wrong! You cannot deduce law from literal principles. That’s the fallacy of Glaucon.

“Or, in the case of Scalia, you can say that Scalia is a true student, as was [Nazi Germany’s] Carl Schmitt before him, of the Thrasymachus of Plato’s dialogue. . . .

“The intent of law means the effect of the act for mankind, in the sense that *I Corinthians 13* exemplifies that distinction between a literal law, which is like the Babylonian tradition, as opposed to the Christian conception of law, which is that of *agapē*; that of Paul. . . .

“What is the intent of law? The intent of law—in Judaism, Islam, and Christianity—flows from the conception of the individual person, as made in the image of the Creator of the universe. And, by image, we mean not a physical image, as such, but rather the *identity* of the person, which inhabits that

physical being. That is, the creative power, by which man, and man alone, is able to increase our species’ power in and over the universe, as reflected in the ability of the human species to increase its numbers, and its quality of existence. . . .

“So, *the law must love the human individual*, in that sense, and with those qualifications. If the law does that, it is then *just*, because it is serving *the intent* of all true law, as the Declaration of Independence, in its first three paragraphs, reflects this. Or, as the idea of the General Welfare clause—the very same thing—does in the Preamble to the Constitution; what is otherwise called ‘the common good’—*that* is the basis for law!

“Now, people lose sight of this, when they get scared. They become like the plea bargainer, going into a crooked court. They ask, ‘What do I have to say, to get out of this trouble? What lies do I have to tell? Whom do I have to betray, with what lies, to get some mercy from you, you evil fellow, you judge?’

“That is the way a typical person reacts to law these days. They are afraid of the Law! It’s not a friend; it’s a killer! The law under these judges, of judges like Antonin Scalia.

“What is needed, is that people have to realize, that we need the protection of law! The protection provided by a government and a legal system, which is committed to the principle of *agapē* as *I Corinthians 13*, for example, exemplifies that. We must act with love for mankind; love for the quality of man, as an individual, which makes the individual in the likeness of the Creator. We must act accordingly. And, whatever we do as government, we must do accordingly. And if it’s not done that way, it’s wrong.”

LaRouche pointed to the imposition of the death penalty—a penalty imposed by a grossly imperfect system of justice—as such a wrong.

He concluded, saying, “We have to have people, including, I would hope, people of the rank of the President of the United States, who would come out at this time; people like concerned attorneys, other statesmen, who understand what I’ve said. And who, in their way, will make clear to the American people and to the institutions, especially to the Supreme Court itself—to the Federal Court itself—*make clear* what this principle of ‘intent of law’ means. And, recognize that, perhaps Antonin Scalia is so deeply embedded in these fascistic beliefs . . . that he is incurable! And, perhaps there are other people on the Federal bench, who are so attached to these unlawful beliefs, that they should simply retire from office, to make way for people whose temperament is more in keeping, for example, with the spirit of *I Corinthians 13*.

“That’s the solution. And, if that were to happen, *and happen rapidly*, I think we could avoid a great catastrophe, in the selection of the next President of the United States.”

The full text of LaRouche’s remarks is available at [www.larouchespeaks.com](http://www.larouchespeaks.com) and [www.larouchepub.com](http://www.larouchepub.com).