

EDITORIAL

The Only Way You Can Win Is The Hard Way

May 5—In just a few words spoken over a few minutes on Tuesday evening, May 3, Lyndon LaRouche spelled out starkly what he himself has long known, and what every successful architect of victory has known,— but what others refuse to face. He showed that victory is only possible through doing the things that have never been done before,— indeed never even thought of before—based on a totally new original insight.

You can only win by doing what all the smart people knew was absolutely impossible. This is the story of the Inchon Landing of Sept. 15, 1950. MacArthur told the nay-sayers, namely the entirety of the U.S. high command, that “the very arguments you have made as to the impracticalities involved” confirmed his faith in the plan,— “for the enemy commander will reason that no one would be so brash as to make such an attempt.” MacArthur finished his statement (like LaRouche, he knew when to finish), by whispering, “I can almost hear the ticking of the second-hand of destiny. We must act now or we will die. . . .”

But LaRouche’s leadership has long been on a profounder level than even the genius MacArthur’s. Better to think back to MacArthur’s friend Gen.

Charles de Gaulle. In his memoirs, de Gaulle recalled the moment in 1940 when all the French officials turned their back on his struggle against the treasonous “French” government at Vichy. “I felt like someone approaching the ocean,” he wrote, “preparing to swim across.”

(Yet he did swim across!)

This is almost impossibly difficult, but it can be done. It must be done, even if you can never say in advance how to do it. It has been done. And Lyndon LaRouche in particular has done it repeatedly and successfully. He debated and soundly defeated the chosen representative of the British system in 1971. Impossible!

Then, later, through the Strategic Defense Initiative, he transformed the incoming U.S. Reagan Administration into the instrument of what would have been a new world system of peace and dramatic human progress. The British tried to assassinate Reagan, and went all-out to destroy LaRouche. They jailed him, but couldn’t destroy him,— although his influence was effectively contained for years.

Achieving the Impossible While Under Attack

Yet even under this attack, LaRouche and his wife Helga succeeded

“The question is, how will Russia and China survive this situation? . . . this depends upon maneuvers on the part of the leading parties; that’s the only chance. You cannot use deductive methods; they don’t work. They can’t work under these circumstances.”

in laying the basis for the Eurasian Landbridge/Silk Road policy and the BRICS, without which humanity would have no prospect for the future.

Beginning in October 2014, LaRouche set out again to accomplish the impossible. He outflanked the resistance and founded a new organization in Manhattan on a new basis, prominently including Classical choral work and competent Classical musical performance, both of which are linked to a weekly live dialogue with LaRouche. It seemed impossible; for years, every previous attempt had failed. But it is demonstrably succeeding and spinning off new organization on a new basis in Northern California, in Boston, and in a special way in Houston, Texas, where LaRouche leader Kesha Rogers has vigorously and effectively taken up the fight to revive the Space Program.

In the referenced Tuesday discussion, LaRouche also specified that, “Right now, the question is, how will Russia and China survive this situation? Because if they don’t survive this situation, there is not going to be a civilization; it just won’t happen. Now, this depends

upon maneuvers and things of that nature on the part of the leading parties; that’s the only chance. You cannot use deductive methods; they don’t work. They can’t work under these circumstances.

You actually are going to depend largely on a contributing factor in which Russia and China are going to play a controlling role. If they cannot successfully do that, then I think the case for humanity is poor; more than poor. In other words, it is not just this piece of equipment out there; it has to be the way in which this thing is orchestrated. And the orchestration has to come *chiefly*—chiefly, from Putin and from China, chiefly. And it will have to be an act of choice, chiefly; and it will be so clever, that it will take the enemy forces off their heels, before they can really come to an understanding of what they’re being threatened by.

“It can be done; this kind of thing can be done. But it *has* to be done; or it doesn’t work.”

These thoughts touch on the most profound issues we know: One hopes that this account is truthful as far as it goes; it is not complete.