
Interview: Lyndon LaRouche

If you came from another solar system, would you invest in Earth?

The following is excerpted from Lyndon LaRouche's weekly radio interview, "EIR Talks with LaRouche." He was interviewed on June 16 by Mel Klenetsky.

EIR: If you were President, or if you were in a position to advise President Clinton, what would you do to begin to reverse [the current world crisis]?

LaRouche: Well, maybe the President doesn't have to do it, but the President has to take actions which coordinate with it being done.

The American people have to face the truth about two world wars. For example, you've got a military in which most of the flag officers have imbedded in them the myth which covers up all the things which caused World Wars I and II. Our military has been imbedded with the idea that we were on the right side in World War I and World War II. Yes, we were against Hitler; we had to eliminate Hitler. But we should never have gotten involved in playing a role in the First World War, and we would not have, but for Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, who were both actually British agents, in effect. That's a complicated story, but to all intents and purposes, they were as much British agents as the leaders of the Confederacy—for whom both of them had great sympathy. They were haters of Abraham Lincoln, and sympathizers of the Confederacy.

We have to change that. We cannot accept that we are indebted to support an Anglo-French alliance of the type of the Entente Cordiale, of Versailles, and to preserve it around the world. We're not going to do that.

We have to lay down principles: that we are for the sovereignty of nation-states; that we are for the development of national economic security of those nation-states in the form of economic development; that we are for a commitment to technological and social progress, through scientific and technological improvements and discoveries; that we are for a system of rational cooperation among states to promote world trade and world security; that we are for nations controlling their own credit and their own currencies, and not leaving these to private organizations which rape nations, such as the Federal Reserve System, and the people behind it. . . .

We need politicians who have the guts to make this change, and who look at reality, not at the polls.

In England, you had Norman Lamont, after he was kicked out by John Major from his position as Chancellor of the Exchequer. He made a speech in the Parliament, and everything he said was absolutely true [see article, p. 50]. He should have said it a lot sooner. . . .

You can take three issues, two of which were discussed in England: 1) what Norman Lamont said in the Parliament; 2) what Michael Heseltine, a former prime minister candidate and a member of the government, said, and then compare that with the issue of derivatives, and 3) the issue of the Balkans. These three issues exemplify the crisis of the Major government, the Balladur-Mitterrand government in France, the Kohl government in Germany, the U.S. government, the Italian government, and so forth.

Essentially, Lamont said that Major, like typical U.S. Presidents—like George Bush, for example—was going from pillar to post based on the morning's polls, and sacrificing tomorrow's interest in an attempt to propitiate the polls of today, to butter up public opinion this morning, and forget about next week. And next week had caught up with us, essentially. And he said this kind of government has to change.

Heseltine said the same thing I'm saying, and Heseltine's a fairly bright fellow, in his own way, and he has some bright advisers. And other people in England who are not so public, are speaking out privately to my friends and saying the same thing, in different ways, on different subjects.

Don't look at England's government, don't look at the United States government, the French government, the Kohl government, or the Italian government; look at *all* of these governments. There is a miasma, says Heseltine—which the *Financial Times* admits, but then tries to steer away from—a miasma which is destroying *all* of these governments of the world.

And the miasma is the economic crisis. Take derivatives. Imagine if you were coming in from a very intelligent civilization, from some other solar system in this galaxy, and you were visiting this solar system and you came to Earth and you were asked, would you invest in Earth? You would look at Earth, and you would see, first of all, the derivatives insanity.

Now, here's derivatives; a gigantic financial bubble, a pure bubble, pure speculation, the kind of thing we used to outlaw, because we knew it was insane, especially since the

South Sea Island bubble and the Mississippi bubble of the early 18th century. *We knew this was insane*. But here we have a derivatives bubble, which has an inventory, that is, an average inventory of derivatives investment at any time, of between \$9 and \$10 trillion. Now that's almost getting close to twice the total GNP of the United States. And this is pure speculation.

In the course of a year, the number of transactions based on this inventory, is over \$300 trillion a year, according to best estimates. Most voices around the world, more and more, in leading positions—in Switzerland, in Sweden, and elsewhere—are saying that this thing is about to bust; and when it busts, the whole world financial system goes—including the U.S. dollar. That's another story in itself, what can happen there.

Would you invest in a planet whose inhabitants were so insane as not to outlaw this derivatives market, which is sucking the blood—the profit for derivatives comes out of industry, out of infrastructure, out of pension funds, and so forth? The tax revenue base, the income of the economies, are shrinking, while the derivatives and the demand for payment is increasing.

We are now reaching the breaking point where the balloon is about to burst. Nobody knows quite when; some people are saying earlier, some are saying later. But we know the balloon is going to burst; and the whole banking system, the financial system, the whole thing goes out the window when that happens.

Would you invest in a planet whose inhabitants are so insane, as to elect governments which allow this to go on?

Now look at the rest of it. Look at our school system. We have people coming out of colleges who are not qualified to sweep out corporate parking lots—and I'm speaking of the kind of education which is going on at Stanford University, which used to be a very prestigious university, but where you are no longer compelled to study the works of "dead white European males."

That's insane! The entire world civilization—about 50-60% of everything we know—depends crucially on the work of "dead white European males." And if you're not obliged to study that, you don't know anything. You can't run a corporation; you can't even run a parking lot; you could barely be qualified to sweep it out. Which is what happens to people who lack that education. They are qualified to be sweepers and slave labor.

They're doing that to our labor force.

Look at our managements of our corporations. You wouldn't hire these guys as parking-lot managers back 25 years ago, not people of the type who are running our major corporations and our universities.

You wouldn't invest in this lunatic planet. That is the essential message, and governments know that. But most governments don't have the guts to face it, and that's why we have these problems, and that's why they're all in a global miasma.

Then take the Bosnia situation.

Here we are, we bomb Somalians. We're not even sure we bombed the right person, but we're bombing Somali civilians when it is not even settled who is responsible for the shooting of the 22 Pakistani soldiers; but we will not do a thing for a clear case of outright genocide—worse genocide than that practiced by Hitler—in Europe itself, practiced by a bunch of Nazis who call themselves Serbians or Chetniks, who are mass-raping tens of thousands of women, who are mass-murdering unarmed civilians. We won't do a thing about that—for fear of offending our British and French allies. But we'll go in and bomb some poor black people, all over nothing, just to show we've got muscle.

This kind of mentality typifies the inability of governments to govern competently, and the reason why any sensible person from another solar system would not invest a penny in Earth at the present time.

EIR: We're seeing mass strikes or a strike process emerging in Ukraine. Is this coming about because of the inadequacies of the approach of the western European countries and the United States to the former Soviet Union, which includes Ukraine?

LaRouche: It's not the inadequacies. It's the lunacy. The same spirit of carpetbagging which prevailed after the Civil War, when the New York crowd sent carpetbaggers into the former Confederate States to loot them at the end of the Civil War (that is, not under Lincoln, but under Johnson, who was more pro-British), went into eastern Europe in 1989.

For example, George Soros, who is a derivatives speculator—that is, a thief, in a moral sense, it may be legal, but it's thievery—went in to loot Poland; went in to loot Russia, Hungary, and so forth. Soros brought down the pound with a swindle. He's trying to bring down the German mark with a swindle. He's stealing left and right by these swindles, which ought to be outlawed. And they are stealing, in every moral sense.

Now, the Anglo-Americans are demanding, through Soros's stooge Jeffrey Sachs, a young squirt of a professor from Harvard University, that shock therapy, which has dropped the total Polish production and standard of living down to 30% of what it was, at best, in 1989 . . . [be implemented] in Russia and Ukraine. And we say that Yeltsin is our man, whom we must support, because Yeltsin is tolerating these programs, except he's not doing it hard enough, he's got to put on more shock therapy.

What has happened is that the Russian *nomenklatura*—the same people who are in or out, depending on whether communism comes or goes, the same ruling families—that doesn't mean that they're all wealthy, it means they're powerful as a group—are looking at the West. They see the governments of London, Bonn, Paris, Madrid, Rome, Washington, and so forth, collapsing, and they say, "Wait a minute. We don't have to take this nonsense. We can take it all back. Maybe we'll be weakened, but we'll be top dog, because these guys are going to go in the bucket." . . .