

## EIR Feature

# LaRouche Calls On Youth Movement To Make a Revolution

by Carlos Wesley

Scores of youth, many of them members of the international LaRouche Youth Movement, gathered in various capital cities of the Americas and of Europe at year's end, to conduct a dialogue with U.S. statesman Lyndon H. LaRouche, and with his wife, German political leader Helga Zepp-LaRouche. The essential message that LaRouche conveyed to meetings in Mexico City, Los Angeles, Seattle, Copenhagen, Budapest, Berlin, Wiesbaden, and Paris, was what he transmitted by telephone to 45 of these youth at a Dec. 27 seminar in Lima, Peru:

“Well, we live in interesting times, in a situation in which so-called ‘traditions’ will not work; so-called ‘generally accepted values’ will not work. We’re in a general breakdown of civilization as it has existed in recent decades. There are no local or national solutions for any problem. There has to be a solution, in terms of sovereign nation-states, but the solution will have to be a global solution.” He added that the world financial system has only weeks—at most, months—to survive.

“So therefore,” LaRouche told the Peruvians, “we are in the course of making a revolution, which is essentially a *cultural revolution*, globally. The cultural revolution is quite normal. It’s typified, as in all history, or most history as we know it, by youth revolutions. That is, when the existing adult generations become hopelessly decadent, then only the intervention of a young generation, which introduces a *cultural* change toward a culture which is viable, and away from the prevailing culture which is *not* viable, which is inherently doomed, can save civilization.”

He went on, “We’re trying to build a youth movement. This youth movement is not a youth movement as most people understand a youth movement. It is an educational movement, based on a Platonic conception of man, essentially, on the basis of fundamental physical discoveries,” unlike “the general bankruptcy of the universities and the so-called ‘intelligentsia’ of today.”

LaRouche’s Peruvian audience included students from San Marcos University, the National Engineering University, and 11 students from the National University of Huacho, some 200 kilometers northwest of Lima.



*Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., speaking by telephone to a meeting of young supporters in Lima, Peru on Dec. 27, 2002, declared that the intervention of youth has become indispensable in this time of international crisis, to introduce “a cultural change toward a culture which is viable, and away from the prevailing culture which is not viable, which is inherently doomed.”*

We “have an opportunity,” he said, “a very brief opportunity, historically—in which an intervention *to change* and replace defective cultures, defective educational systems, and so forth, can occur. Only if those changes occur, will society survive. Those changes do not occur as a result of spontaneous ‘popular’ reaction against bad ideas—because the bad ideas *are* in the population! They will come by a leadership which is capable of changing the population’s values. And you do that, essentially, by organizing young people, generally in the 18- to 25-year range, as a group.” You must educate them, LaRouche added, with methods like 18th-Century mathematician Carl Friedrich Gauss’s fundamental theorem of algebra, to develop the cultural and scientific perspective required. In the dialogue that followed, LaRouche elaborated on this question of method.

In her intervention, Helga Zepp-LaRouche approached the same subject from the perspective of Classical art, and the importance of the aesthetic education of man, as posed by the great German poet and playwright Friedrich Schiller. Zepp-LaRouche also went into detail about the Eurasian Land-Bridge, as the motor for world economic recovery: Learn the lesson of Germany’s Weimar Republic, she said, whose failure to adopt the 1931 Lautenbach Plan as a means of ending the Great Depression gave rise to Hitler’s seizure of power. The world must not repeat that error now, she insisted. (Her speech was excerpted in last week’s issue.)

Important roles in the Lima “cadre school” were also played by Luis Vásquez, who heads the LaRouche movement

in Peru, and by Sara Madueño, *EIR* bureau chief, and president of the Schiller Institute in that country. Engineer Alembert Pácora gave a class on constructive geometry as the language that makes intelligible to mankind the laws which govern the physical universe. Pácora guided those attending in reproducing for themselves the act of discovery of circular action, as the action from which geometry was born. Another leading Peruvian LaRouche activist, Manuel Hidalgo, extended that discussion with a class on Gauss’s fundamental theorem.

One of the most striking moments occurred when the Lima audience received a phone call from two U.S. representatives of the LaRouche Youth Movement in Los Angeles—Elizabeth Nash and Freddy Coronel—who carried on an interchange of ideas with their Peruvian colleagues, moderated by Yanina Quispe, Dino Gavancho, and Justo Vargas, on their respective experiences in organizing.

### **What Is Leadership?**

The LaRouches also spoke by telephone from Germany with some 30 youth who were meeting in Mexico City on Dec. 14-15. As in Peru, Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s presentation to the Mexican youth (who had travelled from all over, including Monterrey, Hidalgo, Querétaro, and the state of México), compared the disaster that resulted from Weimar Germany’s failure to adopt the Lautenbach Plan in the early 1930s, with the successful recovery launched in the United States by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The following day, Lyndon LaRouche spoke on the question of leadership, and specifi-



*Peruvian engineer Alembert Pácora, in his class on geometry, guided the audience in making constructions demonstrating the primacy of circular action, rather than arbitrary axioms.*

cally: What is the role that each one of us must assume at this historic moment?

“We now have a *real* youth movement in the United States,” LaRouche told the Mexican audience. “Not a *sans-culotte* youth movement, but a youth movement of people who are functioning like a university on wheels, who are studying some of the most profound concepts, the essential concepts of science and history, at the same time they’re doing the laboratory work, on the streets, in the university campuses, in the parliaments, in the legislatures, and other institutions. They’re exerting leadership. They are inspiring people of an older generation, who otherwise would be moral and intellectual corpses, to come out of their death-like state and to get out there and do something. And these people *are* being inspired. They’re say, ‘Hey, these young people are moving. It’s wonderful. We do have a future.’”

“So you guys have got to create that impression in places such as Mexico, that there is a future. And to mobilize young people to do their work, to provide that kind of leadership, to inspire older generations, who are still living, to believe again, that there is a future. To waken them out of their torpor, and get them in motion.”

LaRouche added, “I think we’re going to win.” (The text of his speech, and some of the discussion, is printed in this section.)

Rubén Cota Meza, member of the Executive Committee of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA), spoke on how to turn a dark age into a Renaissance, and Mariví Carrasco, president of the MSIA in Mexico, spoke about Miguel de Cervantes from the viewpoint of Friedrich Schiller and LaRouche. Ronald Moncayo, along with his nine-year-old daughter on the violin, demonstrated how Classical art transmits higher ideas. Rosa Sánchez Cota drew out a peda-

gogical discussion around the Cardan Paradox. Ismael Monge gave a presentation on the Golden Section, and several of the youth offered other contributions during the two days of animated discussion, which, as one participant put it, just “ran out of time.”

A highlight of the Mexican meeting was the youths’ performance (including an 11-year-old) of Cervantes’ short play, *Pageant of Marvels*.

### **The Tragic and the Sublime**

Several days later, on Dec. 19, the LaRouches met in person with a score of youth in Berlin. There, as in a three-hour meeting they had held Dec. 7 with some 60 people during a visit to Paris, and during telephone interventions they had conducted during an educational weekend in Copenhagen with nearly 20 youth from Scandinavia, the LaRouches elaborated on the scientific work of Gauss in overthrowing the mathematical axioms of his day, and on the concept of the role of the individual in history, which, they insisted, must be that of affirming the *sublime* over the tragic.

Lyndon LaRouche presented the contrast between the tragic figure of Denmark’s Prince Hamlet, and the sublime figure of the peasant girl Joan of Arc. The difference lies in the fact that, while Hamlet never broke with popular opinion, but rather surrendered to the culture of his era, Joan assumed responsibility for the fate of her country. To achieve her mission, she was fully prepared to give her life, but through her death she saved France, establishing the basis for the founding of the first modern and sovereign nation-state under Louis XI, and saved the Papacy.

It is in the dominion of the sublime, in committing oneself to that kind of immortality, that true leadership lies, LaRouche said.