


EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

November 8, 2019 Vol. 46 No. 44 www.larouche.com \$10.00

Smash this Fraudulent Impeachment!



LIVE TUPELO, MS

TRUMP
PENCE
★★★★★

MASSIVE CROWD IN MS FOR PRESIDENT TRUMP

TEXT "TRUMP" TO 88022

Founder: *Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. (1922–2019)*
Editor-in-Chief: *Helga Zepp-LaRouche*
Co-Editors: *Marcia Merry Baker, Paul Gallagher,*
Robert Ingraham, Tony Papert
Managing Editor: *Stephanie Ezrol*
Editorial Staff: *David Cherry, Charles Notley*
Technology: *Marsha Freeman*
Transcriptions: *Katherine Notley*
Ebooks: *Richard Burden*
Graphics: *Alan Yue*
Photos: *Stuart Lewis*
Circulation Manager: *Stanley Ezrol*

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Asia: *Michael Billington*
Economics: *Marcia Merry Baker, Paul Gallagher*
History: *Anton Chaitkin*
Ibero-America: *Dennis Small*
United States: *Debra Freeman*

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Berlin: *Rainer Apel*
Copenhagen: *Tom Gillesberg*
Lima: *Sara Madueño*
Melbourne: *Robert Barwick*
Mexico City: *Gerardo Castilleja Chávez*
New Delhi: *Ramtanu Maitra*
Paris: *Christine Bierre*
Stockholm: *Ulf Sandmark*
United Nations, N.Y.C.: *Richard Black, Leni Rubinstein*
Washington, D.C.: *William Jones*
Wiesbaden: *Göran Haglund*

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirns@larouchepub.com
www.larouchepub.com
www.executiveintelligencecereview.com
www.larouchepub.com/eiw
Webmaster: *John Sigerson*
Assistant Webmaster: *George Hollis*
Editor, Arabic-language edition: *Hussein Askary*

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly
(50 issues), by *EIR News Service, Inc.*,
P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.
(571) 293-0935

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH,
Bahnstrasse 4, 65205, Wiesbaden, Germany
Tel: 49-611-73650
Homepage: <http://www.eir.de>
e-mail: info@eir.de
Director: Georg Neudecker

Montreal, Canada: 514-461-1557
eir@eircanada.ca

Denmark: EIR - Danmark, Sankt Knuds Vej 11,
basement left, DK-1903 Frederiksberg, Denmark.
Tel.: +45 35 43 60 40, Fax: +45 35 43 87 57. e-mail:
eirdk@hotmail.com.

Mexico City: EIR, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz 242-2
Col. Agricultura C.P. 11360
Delegación M. Hidalgo, México D.F.
Tel. (5525) 5318-2301
eirmexico@gmail.com

Copyright: ©2019 EIR News Service. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement
#40683579

Postmaster: Send all address changes to *EIR*, P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

Signed articles in *EIR* represent the views of the authors, and not necessarily those of the Editorial Board.

Smash this Fraudulent Impeachment!

The Tentacle of ‘*Perfidious Albion*’ Behind the Impeachment Drive

by Barbara Boyd

Mrs. Boyd is the author of numerous articles and pamphlets on the ongoing attempted coup against President Trump. We present here her edited notes for the presentation she gave October 31, 2019 on the weekly LaRouche PAC Thursday night Fireside Chat. The full video, including questions and answers, is available [here](#).



Gage Skidmore

Candidate Donald Trump and then Indiana Governor Mike Pence at an immigration policy speech at the Phoenix Convention Center on August 31, 2016.

Oct. 31—While embarking on a different project, I happened upon an article by the inimitable Lyndon LaRouche, published in *EIR* January 15, 1999, concerning the Clinton impeachment. It’s called “[To Defeat Impeachment, You Must Defeat the New Confederacy](#).” And it struck me, just how *apropos* that article still is today: The strategic situation bears some striking similarities; only the uniforms of the partisan players have changed. This should tell you that something is controlling the process over and above those in partisan uniforms, something that controls the partisans.

One of the things that is different is that this President is taking on those out to get him on something other than a steamy sexual setup. They already tried that with him, and it landed with a resounding thud, as cheap reruns tend to do. And President Trump has called them out by name, the military-industrial complex, serving imperial aims, the globalists, and declared war on them with substantial public support. That is really very, very different. But the enemy is *not* different. So, I’ll give you some of LaRouche’s insights on the impeachment, which he penned

on January 1, 1999, before beginning our discussion on the ongoing Ukraine gate.

The Constitution is Threatened

LaRouche begins his article by asking: “Will the United States survive this impeachment side show?” And his answer is to call you out. He says, the impeachment is “A British style parliamentary coup d’état,” while noting that the impeachment process was only one among several crucial

battlefields in a much wider war. He says, “Whoever thinks only of one issue at a time—one battlefield, or one mass-media week—has made a commitment to losing this war, at the start.”

He noted that the global financial system, run by the City of London and its British Commonwealth appendages, had begun its inevitable collapse, a rolling mudslide. That mudslide culminated in the 2007-2008 collapse from which we have not recovered. Now, a similar bubble has been built up, and there are signs all over the world that its collapse is imminent. Even though the great Belt and Road project exists, which marks a hugely significant shift in economic potential, the collapse that is about to hit will engulf most of the world and create very dangerous conditions in the U.S. and Europe, and devastating conditions in the developing sector.

LaRouche said that replacing Bill Clinton with Al Gore would ensure that the neo-liberal and neo-conservative hawks who then controlled Washington would

have their way and that it would have become almost inevitable that they would recklessly create a nuclear war. Is replacing Donald Trump with Mike Pence any less a fear-and-panic producing proposition?

He then said, most importantly, “For us, in the United States, the central feature of our war is a fight against treason in our nation’s political establishment, like that treason that led to the Civil War of 1861-1865.” Treason perpetrated by President Lincoln’s London-centered and Wall Street-centered enemies. He said the British aim has been to “tear up the Constitution and Declaration of Independence,” and then to integrate a shattered United States as a vassal state into the British Commonwealth under conditions of the economic collapse of the world’s economy. He emphasized that if the President were to be impeached and removed from office, this would create such horrific conditions, that it would be as if the United States lost the Civil War. Under these circumstances, LaRouche stated, the U.S. would either fight a war against that treason or it would be finished as a nation.

But he cautioned sternly, once again, this is a war against the British Empire, which functions throughout the world. People who fight one battle at a time are usually outflanked, and lose the battle and probably the war, too. He asserted that this is not an internal U.S. political affair; it is a global affair in which every leading government of the world is vitally interested and will be playing a hand of its own for its own vital strategic reasons. It is not a battle that can be won unless American citizens abandon their “little me” identities and fixation on local bread-and-butter issues.

He then related what he called Al Gore’s “four poisons,” all of which are predominant in the Democratic Party of today: elimination of the nation-state in favor of globalist regimes; hostility to scientific and technological progress, as now embodied in the Green New Deal and Extinction Rebellion; slave-labor policies in the outsourcing of our formerly industrial economy and low-wage policies worldwide; and radical population reduction, engineered through radical environmentalism.

American System Solution

LaRouche spoke of the bankrupt policies of the world’s central bankers at the time of Clinton’s impeachment, writing:

All of these and related conditions combine to create an explosive political-economic mixture in each and all of these and other nations. We have

come into the kind of a time in history, once again, in which wars, revolutions, and terrible dictatorship tend to erupt as if on the order of the day.

And we do see that across the globe today. He added:

Behind every war there is an issue of choice. Contrary to the self-styled geopolitical variety of loonies, such as Halford Mackinder, Karl Haushofer, or Zbigniew Brzezinski, terrain does not cause wars; it is conflicts over choices of response in the political and economic and cultural terrain, which prompt serious warfare. Geopolitics happens to be one of those delusions which tends to cause loonies to choose wars.

He then located the fundamental conflict as that between the American System’s view and the British Monarchy’s view of humankind, writing:

The American System views each man and woman as made in the image of the Creator, as each endowed at birth with a divine spark of a creative power of reason lacking in all lower forms of life. For us, that is the principle of natural law which must underlie all rightful government, axiomatically, as our Leibnizian Declaration of Independence and the Preamble of our Federal Constitution express this commitment to such principles of natural law. The British monarchy’s system, on the contrary, views the majority of the nation’s and world’s population not as citizens, but as mere subjects of an hereditary, willful, essentially parasitical authority, the which is embodied in institutions controlled by a ruling, imperial financier oligarchy, typified by the pagan tradition of the Venice-modelled Anglo-Dutch financier oligarchy.

Under conditions of crisis, the British oligarchs will produce movements and ideological formations geared toward one thing, preserving their form of “order.”

Right now, advocates of the American System, as revived and revolutionized by LaRouche—those who believe in the human creative ability of the individual citizen—would say, let’s cauterize the bubble before it pops with Glass-Steagall; let’s create a national banking system that can issue credit for real development and modern infrastructure; let’s make sure our capital intensive expenditures result in the high wages and



Ralph Alswang

President Bill Clinton and his Vice President, Al Gore, in 1993.



White House/Pete Souza

President Barack Obama and his Vice President, Joe Biden, in 2015.



VOA

President Barack Obama and his Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, in 2016.

living standards necessary to an advanced population; let's develop fusion as an energy source and take off to the next frontier, space, in search of scientific breakthroughs and understanding nature's laws.

It is collaboration on the last of these initiatives—fusion, space, discovery of the actual workings of our universe, which can form the basis of collaboration between nation-states and through which—as LaRouche made clear in his November 29, 2004 [study](#), *The Coming Eurasian World*, published in *EIR* Vol. 31 No. 49—mankind will experience a higher and more creative culture than any we have now.

We would also be saying, let's replace the present international system with new fixed exchange-rate credit mechanisms, developed by the four nation-states of China, India, Russia and the U.S., with the potential, jointly, to survive and prosper despite the coming City of London and Wall Street instigated collapse.

The fact that President Trump leans in these directions, is the reason why the same Anglo-American apparatus and its controlled lynch mob of the day is after him. A different variety of controlled lynch mob impeached but did not convict Bill Clinton, based on a sexual scandal that erupted right after Clinton said the world needed a new financial architecture. And the choices we have to make now in this war, LaRouche's solutions, are the only sure way to defeat them and outflank them worldwide.

Expose the Real Traitors

When Larry Johnson speaks [see p. 56, this issue] he will tell you that the intelligence community game for the 2016 election on the British and American side was set into motion way back in 2015. And it was ginned up

to defeat any candidate but Hillary Clinton. They needed her as the President, because they knew what was about to strike their system. She was (and still is) their “sure bet,” their servant.

Now, in that context, let's talk about Ukrainegate. My [article](#), “Ukrainegate, or the Coup Against President Donald Trump—Phase Three,” is available in the Nov. 1 issue of *EIR*, and it will also appear on LaRouche PAC's [website](#), in a three-part electronic pamphlet that will be continually updated. We are setting up an impeachment update page on the website that will also highlight this war, which must be approached as a world war. I wrote it as a kind of opposition research piece for supporters of the President and the substantial body of people who may or may not like Donald Trump, but who realize that the Constitution is being trashed, and our Republic endangered, by a wildly partisan and enraged establishment—what Trump and Eisenhower have rightly called the military-industrial complex, and what we know as the financial oligarchy.

Our report is a detailed take-down of the big lie being spread—that giving lethal military aid to Ukraine is a national security imperative, and that the President was absolutely wrong in saying that defending the notoriously corrupt political elements of Ukraine does not at all serve our national security.

This is the big lie of Ukrainegate, the one “bipartisans” don't want you to think about. Why in the hell are we selling arms for continuing sectarian warfare on Russia's borders, arms that can fall into the hands of neo-Nazis?

In the piece, I detail how Joe Biden was Obama's point man in running a coup in 2013-2014 in that country, using actual neo-Nazis as muscle and putting them

into the new government. This Biden/Obama/British gambit recklessly risked a nuclear conflict between the United States and Russia. A subplot of Biden's use of the Ukrainian population as fodder in a potential war with Russia was his fixation on cutting off Ukraine's role in the transit of Russian gas to Europe and replacing Russian gas infrastructure and exploration in Ukraine with American companies.

This, of course, was designed to choke a vital source of revenue to the Russian economy. Key to this dangerous plan was gaining control of a very corrupt but dominant Ukrainian gas company, Burisma. That is why Biden's cocaine-addled son served on the Burisma board, making millions for providing this very, very dirty and corrupt company a respectable face. I show how Biden's association with Ukraine's neo-Nazis continued through 2018, despite the fact that the neo-Nazi gangs he empowered, like the Azov Battalion, trained neo-Nazis who operated internationally, such as those deployed in the Charlottesville, VA shooting and the New Zealand mosque mass shooter.

We demonstrate and will continue to expose how everyone who has testified against the President to date in this sham impeachment proceeding is a member of the certifiably lunatic State Department/intelligence community establishment active in America's regime change operations and "forever" wars—those whose livelihoods and prestige this President attacks and threatens every day. The bogus whistleblower himself appears to be Eric Ciaramella, a CIA analyst deployed to Obama's White House, who worked with Susan Rice and Joe Biden on Ukraine, according to an article published by Paul Sperry on *Real Clear Investigations* yesterday. In the disorganization that characterized the early Trump Administration, Ciaramella became the Ukraine Chair at the National Security Council until, according to Sperry's sources, he got caught leaking and was responsible for the bogus narrative that Putin dictated Trump's firing of Comey.

In the final part of my piece I demonstrate how the same people who staffed the illegal coup against Trump—Britain's Christopher Steele/Sir Richard Dearlove/Jackson Society group, GCHQ, and MI6; in the United States, Fusion GPS; Nellie Ohr; the State Department's Victoria Nuland and John Kerry; the CIA; and the FBI; aided by key personnel in the Ukrainian diaspora who swear allegiance to the tradition of Stepan Bandera (Bandera was the Nazi collaborator who slaughtered thousands of Poles and Jews). These same people and entities worked the atrocity known as the Ukraine coup in 2013-2014, ahead of being deployed against Trump



Azov News

The Azov Battalion of the National Guard of Ukraine, marching under the banner of Hitler's SS, in Berdyansk on July 21, 2017.


beginning in 2015. This is not accidental. The people employed at the Eurasia desks at State, Defense, CIA, and the NSA have been working, with London, since at least 2012, in an ongoing effort to remove Putin in Russia and are now mobilized to create popular hysteria against China.

We lay out the story of how the DNC (Democratic National Committee) contractor Alexandra Chalupa ran the black ledger operation against Paul Manafort with Ukrainian intelligence, Michael Isikoff, and Fusion GPS in 2016, and also worked, with her sister Andrea, in running Digital Maidan, a key information warfare group supporting the coup. Not surprisingly, Chalupa has been involved with the so-called "whistleblower" identified as none other than Eric Ciaramella by Paul Sperry and others.

Finally, we talk about how all the information warfare groups we have identified, the people responsible for censoring and defaming journalists who have rejected the anti-Trump poison, as crazed conspiracy theorists. These info war psy-op groups, who run the wall-to-wall anti-Trump coverage every day, got their start in Ukraine with new military approaches to brainwashing an entire citizenry. Not surprisingly, the Ukraine operations and the operations against Trump involved hacker groups personally mentored by Dmitri Alperovitch, the guy at CrowdStrike who invented the myth that Russia hacked the DNC and turned its trove over to WikiLeaks. This concludes my remarks at this point, because I want you to read and study the piece; I want to provoke and entice you to do that, rather than providing you *Cliff's Notes*. I want to inspire you to think strategically, if we are to win this war.

Cover This Week

President Donald Trump addressing a large "Make America Great Again" rally in Tupelo, Mississippi on November 1, 2019.



Trump for President

SMASH THIS FRAUDULENT IMPEACHMENT!

2 EDITORIAL

The Tentacle of 'Perfidious Albion' Behind the Impeachment Drive

by Barbara Boyd

I. LaRouche's Solution to the Economic Blowout

7 LAROCHE WEBCAST

LaRouche Demonstrates How the 2007-09 Blowout Should Have Been Addressed

November 11, 2009

23 Selected Webcast Dialogue with LaRouche

35 ZEPP-LAROCHE WEBCAST

People are in Rebellion Globally Against Collapsing Neo-Liberal Economic System

The Jan. 27, 1989 Jailing of Lyndon LaRouche Defined an Era, Which Now Must End

[Watch The LaRouche Case](#) video

[Watch the LaRouche Memorial](#) video

[Sign the Petition to Exonerate LaRouche](#)
at lpac.co/exonerate

II. An Alliance of Sovereign Nations

42 LOOKING AT CHINA

The Secret of China's Success Model

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

47 INTERNATIONAL ASTRONAUTICAL CONGRESS

Will Space Cooperation be Sacrificed to Geopolitics?

by William Jones and Marsha Freeman

51 AFTER CULIACÁN CARTEL ATTACK

Will the U.S. and Mexico Seal the Border Against Weapons and Drugs?

by Gretchen Small

55 OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO

Four Measures to Defeat Dope, Inc.'s Takeover of Mexico

by the LaRouche Citizens' Movement of Mexico

56 GUEST COMMENTARY

The Sordid Truth Behind the Witch-Hunt Against President Trump

by Larry C. Johnson

60 GUEST COMMENTARY

Climategate Ten Years Later

Climate Alarmists are Still Promoting Junk Science, Fossil Fuel Bans and Wealth Redistribution

by Dr. Kelvin Kemm

I. LaRouche's Solution to the Economic Blowout

November 11, 2009

LAROUCHE WEBCAST

LaRouche Demonstrates How the 2007-09 Blowout Should Have Been Addressed

This article is the transcript of a national webcast delivered by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., on Nov. 11, 2009. It was originally published under the title, "The Great Change of 2009," in the Nov. 20, 2009 issue of EIR, Vol. 36, No. 45. We reprint it here because Mr. LaRouche's rigorous scientific approach to understanding the causes and cure of the 2007-09 banking and financial crisis is still of immediate relevance today, a decade later. We include selections from the questions and answers.

Lyndon LaRouche: Thank you.

Well, as you know, since July, the 25th-27th of July of 2007, I had warned that we were headed into a general breakdown crisis of the world financial-monetary system, and the economic system. Three days later, after that announcement, the beginning of the breakup of the world monetary-financial system occurred. It occurred in the form of the dropping out of the mortgage market in the United States, that is, the home mortgage market. And this spread quickly internationally. Now, another thing happened at the same time:

There was a fundamental shift in the world economy, because, as you know by now, having seen the Triple Curve, you know that the world economy is governed presently, by a global, Triple Curve function. Forget all the forecasts by the Wall Street crowd, the statisticians: They're all incompetent, and they're always wrong.

They have always been wrong, and will be wrong, because they use a wrong method. They use statistical forecasting based on accounting characteristics, and that does not determine the way economies function.

Economies—today, and in European civilization,



EIRNS/Christopher Jatz

There is no chance of any recovery of the U.S. economy, under the policies of this President, LaRouche stated. The only shot we've got, is an alliance to break the power of the British Empire, a partnership, with Russia, China, India, and other countries, to eliminate the present world monetary system, and go to a credit system. That's our only chance.

off and on, largely, for several thousand years—have been determined by a threefold principle of economy. On the top, you have international *monetary* systems. Even before the fall of the Persian Empire, you had monetary systems controlling Asia, especially East Asia and South Asia. And the fall of monetary systems

was usually the trick which tipped off the collapse of economies in those regions: physical collapses of those economies, as the result of the monetary processes, and the effects of monetary processes. With the collapse of the Persian Empire, and the Peloponnesian War, there was a change. And that change, which occurred with the Peloponnesian War or its aftermath, has determined the history of economy in European and broader civilization ever since that time.

The three characteristics are:

1. The monetary system; by that I mean a money system, which is privately controlled, or imperially controlled, over the price of *money*. Monetary systems. These are used to control trade and other things. All empires, all European empires, including the British Empire today, are not controlled by nation-state power, they're controlled by imperial monetary power. And nation-states as such which play an imperial role, are simply victims of monetary systems. That's number 1.

2. Within nations, you have financial systems, and in trade among nations, you have financial systems. These are systems in which money is used to buy and sell goods. This is a financial system, but it involves, at some points, the sale of services and/or goods.


3. You have a physical economy.

The physical economy measures both the extent and the rate of growth or decline of physical consumption, produced physical consumption, which includes the role of services in those functions.

So you have three curves that, in past history, for more than 3,000 years to date, from Europe and beyond, have controlled the world economy: Monetary systems at the top, and they're always imperialist. Secondly, financial systems of nations, and in trade between nations. This is the use of money for the purchase and sale of goods, where monetary systems are the sale of money for money, and by money. Thirdly, physical production and productivity per capita and per square kilometer of territory. These are the three factors of economy, and have been the three determining factors of economy, for over 3,000 years of European and extended European history. No change today.

Now we had in 1923, under very special conditions, in Weimar Germany, under the conditions imposed on Germany, reparations conditions—Germany as a whole was under reparations demands. The economy was

FIGURE 1




The world economy is now governed by a global Triple Curve function (Figure 1), which is leading to Weimar-style hyperinflation (photo shows a cart full of German marks, Aug. 15, 1923), as LaRouche warned in July 2007.

squeezed, to cover reparations paid principally to France and Britain. But then, in that year of 1923, the French moved into the Rhineland, which resulted in a collapse of production in Germany. But nonetheless, the demand for reparations increased.

So, what happened: The German government printed money—just simply monetary aggregate. At the same time, there was a collapse in the economy, a collapse in the financial economy and the real economy, a collapse in employment, a collapse in production. So over the period from March of 1923, through November, Germany went through a cycle, in which monetary values, output, increased and went through the roof; the value of the currency decreased accordingly. There was a collapse in production and sales, and in financial transactions related to production and sales, and there was a physical collapse in the economy.

In November of 1923, the German economy disintegrated. What we are experiencing now, *in the world*, especially in Western and Central Europe and in North America, what we are experiencing is a general break-

FIGURE 2




down crisis, on a global scale, which is a virtual copy, but on a global scale, of what occurred on a national scale in 1923 Germany.

Now, that means, there never *was*, and *there never will be* an economic recovery of the United States under the Obama Administration. The Obama Administration is doomed to an early, *general breakdown crisis of the U.S. economy*, and a similar condition exists in Western and Central Europe. The situation in Western and Central Europe for the moment is hopeless, because it's under a dictatorship; it's under a British dictatorship, and they have so far submitted to that British dictatorship.

So, don't ask yourself what the prospects for the U.S. economy are. Don't ask a Wall Street stockbroker; don't ask your wise man, here or there, or your weatherman. Don't ask him! He doesn't know. I do: This present world system, and immediately the U.S. economy, *is doomed to an inevitable, early, total collapse*, unless we change the policy now! There's no way that the U.S. economy will continue to exist much longer, under President Obama. President Obama is the name of *doom*. He's like a floating balloon with a face painted on it, and

FIGURE 3

The 'Dual Curve' Function



The stock market just reflects their manic-depressive disorders (Figure 2). In a healthy economy, the growth of physical production will outpace the financial aggregates (Figure 3).

draperies in the form of trousers and a coat. And to keep the balloon from floating away, he has shoes, which sit on the floor. But this guy is not of any use, in the economy. He's a puppet. He's a puppet of foreign interests. But the key thing here is, under the Obama Administration, there is no chance for the continued existence of the U.S. economy, or even the U.S. nation.

And we're talking about something already in motion, not something that "might" happen. It's something which is already happening. And it's increasing day by day: Under Obama and his present policy, there will never be a recovery, or even a survival of the United States. That's a *fact*. That's not a guess; that's not a crystal ball picture; that's not a statistical forecast. That is already a fact.

You have a zooming rate of bailout money. Bailout money is entirely monetary aggregate. Hyperinflationary bailout. Since the Summer of 2007, you have an escalating rate of collapse of the real economy in the United States, the goods and services, things which are bought and sold. And all our basic industry has been wiped out. The auto industry, all the kinds of industries related to that, are being wiped out. Food supply is being wiped out, by international food systems, food-

control systems, cartels. The United States has been in a process of disintegration over this time.

A Long Process of Disintegration

This actually goes back to 1964-66-68, that period. The assassination of John F. Kennedy, as President, resulted in a change in fundamental direction in U.S. policy. As usual, as today in Afghanistan, the way the United States is broken, is by getting involved in some needless, useless war. Kennedy, as President, opposed going into a war in Indo-China. He did this with very great care, in shaping his policy, under the advice of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, the former President. They agreed with him: *no more long land wars in Asia for the United States!*

Well, what happened of course, is, they got the war, by killing Kennedy. And having the Warren Commission cover it up. But it was not some poor idiot that did that—there were three other guys from France, by way of Mexico, who walked in, shot the President, and walked out, and the Warren Commission covered it up. But what they got that way, by killing Kennedy, and covering it up the way they

did, is they got the land war in Asia, from 1964 to 1975. And under these conditions, whereas Kennedy had represented a resurgence of economic growth, a post-Truman trend back toward Roosevelt's policy—we went the other way. In 1966-68, the United States lost its infrastructure: that is, the rate of change of infrastructure—we had a contraction of basic economic infrastructure in the U.S. economy, from 1964 to '66 on.

So, since that time, there has been no net resurgence of infrastructure in the United States economy. We did make a landing on the Moon in [six] cases. These were very successful, but we were already shutting down the economy of the space program before then! So we took what we had used to build up the Moon shots, and we shot



National Archives



The assassination of President Kennedy resulted in a change in fundamental direction in U.S. policy. As today, in Afghanistan, the United States was broken by getting involved in some needless, useless war. Shown: Kennedy holds a press conference in 1961, during the early stages of the war; U.S. infantrymen in a search-and-destroy mission in Vietnam; anti-Vietnam War protesters in Wichita, Kansas, 1967.



it to the Moon. But we were shutting down the very capability upon which the Moon shot depended, from 1967 on. And the economic reason was, the Moon shot, the space program, gave the U.S. economy an estimated 10 cents increase in the economy for every penny spent. So it was not economic pressures, as such, which shut down the space program. The space program gave us 10 cents in return in technology for every penny spent on the program. It was a deliberate destruction of the United States, undermining it, decaying it.

And since that time, with the 68ers, which rendered a cultural change in the United States, and the 68er generation—the Baby Boomers, so-called, like the spoiled children from Columbia University and similar places—they destroyed the economy. They introduced this “post-industrial society.” That was their tick.

And these factors came together, so we have been decaying as a nation, as an economy, since 1966-1968, in the effects of the shutdown following the assassination of Kennedy, and the launching of the war in Indo-China. And since that time, we’ve been involved in other wars, other unnecessary wars. No war fought by the United States during this entire period since the death of Kennedy, has been necessary. Every war has been, essentially, a fraudulent war, conducted by the United States, especially land wars in Asia, and similar kinds of operations. These things have dragged us down, and down, and down.

We never improved. You look at the number of people—look at our factories. We don’t have a basic industry left in the United States to speak of. We have small businesses, small shops. What happened to the auto industry? The auto industry was sort of the last bastion, that and the aerospace industry, the last bastions of our high-technology industry. It’s shut down! And kept alive—General Motors only exists for looting and stealing purposes, not for production purposes.

We’re ruined, we’re broken. We’re wasted, and people are talking about, “Well, maybe there’s going to be a recovery of the economy.” Can a dead man recover? That’s what we’ve got.

So, the question of forecasting: Forget it. Anyone who told you that there’s any sign of recovery in the U.S. economy, is either an idiot, or a liar. Any newspaper that says there’s been a recovery, is a lying newspaper, or just a plain idiot. There is no prospect of a recovery of the United States under President Obama. Under President Obama, the United States is doomed. Even if we remove that mustache from his upper lip.

Bring the President Under Control!

And, it’s a fact. I mean, this man has got a Hitler-like policy. His policy is identical with his IMAC¹ proposal, which is the integral part of his program, which he votes for, he supports, he’s fighting for. He’s blackmailing to try to get it through. The IMAC program is a Hitler program! That’s no exaggeration. It’s a program that was given to him by his protector, Tony Blair, who first introduced this Hitler-like program in England, when Blair was prime minister. And Blair’s program, of Hitler-like genocide against people, through manipulation of health care, is the policy of the Obama Administration. That’s what the health-care program is. There’s no other reason for it. It’s mass murder, and it’s Adolf Hitler.

That mustache stays on this President’s upper lip. It belongs there. He put it there, by adopting the Blair policy of genocide, which he specified. And people say, “No, he’s a good man, he’s a Democrat.” What are they, idiots?

This man’s a killer. And the only way—. You see we have a problem with this guy, because he happened to be elected, which shows you how bad public opinion has gotten lately. So therefore, we can’t just dump him peremptorily because we don’t like him. We’re not a British government, a European-style parliamentary government. We’re a constitutional government, a republic. And therefore we’re very serious about what we do with an elected President.

Well, we’ve got to do something about this President. We have to put him under control, or we have to throw him out. One of the two. If it’s between the nation and that President, guess what? What your choices are?

But, understand clearly: There is no chance of any recovery of the U.S. economy, under this President, as long as he remains in his present policies. His economic policies, his health-care policies, are not tolerable. Either those policies go, or he must go, because we don’t have a United States unless that change is made. There’s no choice.

Now, people are saying, “Yes, but ... yes, but ... yes, but ...” They’re fools. The record on my forecasting is clear: I’ve always been right, and the opposition has always been wrong. Because they depend upon statistical forecasting, based on market forecasting, financial market forecasting largely, and a few statistics which are largely faked, or “improved upon,” shall we

1. Independent Medicare Advisory Council.

say? There never will be a recovery. And any American who's supporting this President and his policy, the current policies, the environmentalist policies, and these health-care policies, these military policies, is simply supporting the destruction of the United States.

And some time, perhaps, I may have to tell you: "I told you so." And it won't be far distant. We're very close to the point, at which the breaking point occurs.

Now, one thing about breaking points: The conditions for a breaking point are objective. We have this plummeting U.S. economy. We have *soaring* monetary inflation, sometimes called "bailout." We have *soaring downward* financial transactions, financial activity in the U.S. economy. We have a collapse of the physical economy, particularly in terms of employment. We are bankrupt—hopelessly bankrupt. We're as bankrupt in form, as Germany was, Weimar Germany, in 1923, a very similar kind of process.

Anybody who tells you there's a recovery, is either an idiot or a liar. This system is collapsing. This nation is on the verge of disintegration. And some of us have the guts to fight that. Some don't. Some are hoping the Democratic Party will revive. Well, I've seen a dead man revive, I suppose, before.

But that's where we stand, today.

We also have other considerations. Now, despite the fact that the United States is under such mismanagement as this, Europe is worse. Because the continent of Europe, that is Western and Central Europe, are under the control of the British euro system. And therefore, they no longer have effective sovereignty. Particular governments in Europe, Western and Central Europe, can not create their own credit: They're subject to an international institution, controlled from London, under this new euro system, which has gotten tighter, and tighter, and tighter, all the way. So therefore, we're not going to get anything from there.

Developing a Solution

What I've been involved in, recently, has been the development of a solution. The solution, and it's the only shot you've got, is a Four-Power agreement, prospectively, among the United States (with a change in the current Administration's policy), Russia, China, India, and some smaller countries which would be willing to participate in this. This would represent governments of the world which account for about half or more of the population of the world. So that, if an initiative is made—this includes the United States, Russia,

China, India, and other countries—if an alliance of these four and other countries occurs, that is sufficient power to bring down the present world system, and at the same time, institute a new one.

The first step in that direction was implemented recently, in negotiations between Russia and China. They agreed that China, using its credit, which is largely the debt of the United States to China, to use that as a resource of credit, and capital, for cooperation with Russia in developing the essential systems, centered on transportation systems and power systems, in that part of the world, that part of Asia. There are now negotiations going on, supplementing what has already been agreed to by Russia and China, with India. There is a potentiality of the United States.

Because if, the United States, which is in a disastrous condition, which has a vast debt to China and other countries, because of the mismanagement of this place—if we cooperate with Russia, China, and India, which is a great part of the population of this planet, and include other nations of Asia, such as Korea, Japan, Mongolia, and others, which are eager to cooperate in such a venture; and if you take into account Pakistan, which is totally unstable, and rendered unstable by what's going on in Afghanistan and other parts of that region, and the fact that India's aware that the very existence of India depends upon the security of Pakistan, in dealing with this problem which the British are trying to build up in Afghanistan and elsewhere—you'll find that nations, out of desperation and awareness of their threats, and awareness of their interests, are beginning to move in a direction toward collaboration in changing this system—if the United States comes to its senses. And it's up to Americans here, to a large degree; Americans have got to stand up on their hind legs.

Don't pay any attention to what Democratic Party leaders tell you. Don't pay any attention to these other factors. Don't pay any attention to the press. As I've told you—and it's a fact—*this system is coming down*. It has been coming down since July-August of 2007. We're now at a breakdown phase; you can not predict the exact date of breakdown, but you know we're in a breakdown phase; we're at a point where there's no way up, and you're already sliding down! And one little mistake, by the Obama Administration or something like that, would be sufficient to blow the system out. It would have that little trigger event.

But we're not waiting for a trigger event, which

says, we either have a depression or we don't have a depression. We already have a depression. And whatever happens on whatever date, this system is doomed, under its present policies. There's nothing that can save the United States, under its present policies now. That is foregone. There's nothing awaiting the American people out there, except *doom*, right now!

We could *reverse* that! And how will we do that? Simple! Use our Constitution.

What do we do? We go back to Glass-Steagall. We say that all banks which are commercial banks, or which used to be commercial banks, will now be put through bankruptcy reorganization, of the type that Franklin Roosevelt specified back in 1933. That would mean, that we would look at all the accounts in these banks, and those that conform to a Glass-Steagall standard will be protected, under bankruptcy protection by the U.S. government. Those parts which do not conform to a Glass-Steagall standard are—*whissskk!* Gone! "Look, Ma! No more money. It's gone!" These banks are gone. This system is gone.

We now have a shrunken financial system. Many billions, even trillions, of dollars have been wiped off the books, in a great bankruptcy reorganization, which does have certain similarities to what happened in Weimar Germany, in November-December of 1923: Suddenly, all the worthless paper was—*whhhskk!* gone! Except, they didn't have a good system to handle it. We do. Our system. Under those conditions, we can then use our Federal system to create new credit to rebuild an economy. But it means wiping out most of the loose-money people, who have control of our financial system today. We're talking about tens of trillions of dollars being wiped off the books. That's the price that has to be paid, if we're going to get an economy that can survive. That's where we stand. That's what has to happen.

And only if people recognize, that we have to get to that point now, is there any chance for any future for this country. This is reality! Don't ask your forecaster; they don't know anything, they're always wrong. This is a fact. Look in every neighborhood, look at the conditions of life. Look at where industries used to exist. Look where the agricultural sector is collapsing. Look at the tent cities that are being shut down. Look at the condition of health care.

And then look at the financial situation. This system is finished. This nation, in this form, is finished.

However, if we have the guts to put the system

through bankruptcy reorganization, this nation can survive. It will survive on the condition that we make an alliance to break the power of the British Empire, and the British interests internationally. That means, making a partnership with Russia, China, India, and other countries, to eliminate the present world monetary system; eliminate the present monetary system, and go to a credit system, which is the system adopted by the United States, before our Constitution was actually formed, under Alexander Hamilton, in dealing with the war debt of the United States in the early 1780s; it then became an integral part of the foundation of our Federal Constitution, at a later point. So, if we go back to our Constitutional standard of a credit system, and join with Russia, China, India, and other countries, and also get a bloc of a credit system, we have the power then, with the support of other nations who are looking for a solution, to eliminate the imperial system, the monetarist system, which runs the planet today. That's our only chance.

If we don't have the guts to do that, we have nobody else but ourselves to blame for not doing it. And that's where we stand.

So that's what my function is, and my function is here.

Look at what we have to do, look at how this system works: We require large-scale infrastructure; we don't have industry any more. We have some of the elements, the rudiments of what used to be industry. But the auto industry is gone! The aircraft industry is going. The machine-tool capabilities of the United States population are disappearing. There are some places that are still providing work, but they're diminishing in number and less in character. Look at areas where there are store systems, we had whole sets of stores in cities, and so forth, that were functioning—they're closing down, they're vanishing. A similar process is occurring in Europe. We have a worldwide collapse of the system.

Defeat the British Empire!

And there is a factor behind this; this is willful. This was the struggle of the American Revolution. In 1763, you had the conclusion of a Seven Years' War. The Seven Years' War was organized by the British East India Company, which was a private company, and it got the nations of continental Europe—minus the Dutch, who were in on it, with the British—to organize seven years of warfare among the leading nations of Europe. A peace was reached in February of 1763, after

Europe had been essentially ruined. And out of this war, the British Empire emerged, not as an empire of a British *nation*, but as the empire of a British *company*, the British East India Company. Out of this, Canada was surrendered to the British. The naval power was surrendered to the British; India was surrendered to the British; and in the process, other parts were surrendered to the British. And this went on, until the East India Company was dissolved in bankruptcy, and Queen Victoria took over.

And so, we've had an empire on this planet, the British Empire, ever since. The only effective opposition to the British Empire—there have been nations which had effective resistance, but the only real opposition has been the United States. A key case is Germany, and it's important to look at Germany today, to understand the kind of situation we're in. That Bismarck, the leader in Germany, the Chancellor, was a bit of a genius. He had problems in terms of the German royal family and its British connection, but he was a smart fellow, a very capable person, who led Germany in the right way, even though his government sometimes went the wrong way. And he was the fellow who worked with the United States to introduce the U.S. system, the same U.S. system associated with our tradition and with the government of Abraham Lincoln. He used the model of our economic development, for Germany. And from 1877 on, until 1890, there were great reforms in Germany which were all based on the introduction of some of the social reforms and other models of the United States, and the initiative of Bismarck.



EIRNS/Steve Carr

In order to reverse the deadly destruction of the U.S. economy over the past 40 years, we can, under the U.S. Constitutional system, create new credit to rebuild what has been taken down (from top): an abandoned factory in Detroit; an abandoned farm in Indiana; abandoned homes in Baltimore, Md.; an occupied tent city in Ontario, California.



EIRNS/Steve Carr



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis



EIRNS/Michael Steger

The British, however, at that time, who were pained by the fact that we had defeated them, by our victory over the Confederacy, which was a British puppet, were again trying to get back their imperial power. And the way they intended to do that, was to get Germany in a war with Russia, and in some degree, Austria, but mainly with Russia.

The problem they had at that time—because in order to have a war with Russia and Germany, they had to have France in as a tool for the war against Germany. But they couldn't do that, as long as Bismarck was Chancellor. Because Bismarck as Chancellor sabotaged the efforts of the British monarchy to start a war, with Russia, a way of getting this war started. Because Bismarck, among other things, had made an agreement with the Tsar of Russia, that he would sabotage any attempt to get Germany into a war with Austria in the Balkans, which would trigger a war with Russia. So the British solved the problem, in part, by getting Bismarck dumped, by Wilhelm II, who was the nephew of the Prince of Wales, Edward Albert, the later King Edward VII, who was starting the war.

So, Bismarck said later: This is a new Seven Years' War.

Because the way in which the empire, the British Empire, like empires before, had controlled the world, was by getting other nations to make wars against each other. And by getting other nations to fight each other over issues, then the imperial force could come in and take over, on the ruined combines of a nation—the way we were ruined in Indo-China!

We were a powerful nation, still, under Kennedy. We were dragged into a long war, technically from 1964 on to 1975, which ruined us! This was the way we were ruined! And we're still suffering that effect. That's the way Johnson became President; that's the way that Carter became President, a Presidency which ruined us. We've been ruined ever since, by playing into land wars in Asia, and other kinds of conflicts derived from that, by which we destroyed ourselves.

Take the classic case, the so-called Middle East war. What's the Middle East war? The Middle East war was organized by the British! When was it organized? It was organized at the end of the 19th Century. It was organized on the anticipation of the collapse of Turkey, of the Ottoman Empire. So they organized a thing which they called the Young Turk movement, which was run out of London, and used various people from various kinds of operations; and the intention was, to take the

Ottoman Empire, dismember it, and turn the whole region, including Iran, and other parts there, as well as Palestine and so forth, the Arab world, and turn it into an area of permanent warfare. And this was called the Sykes-Picot agreement, which was instituted at the end of World War I. We are fighting wars, or watching wars, in Palestine and elsewhere, today—and everyone wants to try to find peace with the Israelis and Arabs, and they're never going to find it! Because the war is being run from London! Every time there's a threat of peace breaking out in the Middle East, London organizes new warfare between Arabs and Israelis. The war with Iraq was a case of this; the attempt to get a war with Iran is a case of this! What happens in parts of Africa is a case of this.

We are subjected by the British Empire to this kind of policy of warfare as a way of inducing us to destroy ourselves, and to destroy our power. And the same method is used, that was used against Bismarck.

What happened with that? Go back to 1890: Bismarck's fired. Next thing, the President of France, Sadi Carnot, is assassinated. After that, the Mikado and the British emperor—the Prince of Wales—agree to start a long war. The agreement was, that Japan would undertake a war against two enemies. First, against China, and Russia. Second, at a later point, in the beginning of the 1920s, the British and Japan agreed on a naval conflict against the United States, to reduce U.S. naval power. At this time, in the 1920s, the Mikado of Japan agreed to build up the Japanese Navy for an attack on Pearl Harbor, as part of this British-Japanese alliance against the United States. This war of Japan against China and other parts of that region, continued until 1945. The war in Indo-China, in the post-war period, was the same thing. Ho Chi Minh was an ally of the United States. I was in military service not far from there at the time, in northern Burma; and we were operating out of Myitkyina—it was the most advanced airport, or set of airports in northern Burma, which was not only supplying, jumping “across the Hump” into China, but also from there, we were also operating in Thailand and operating in Indo-China. And the OSS [Office of Strategic Services] was operating in Indo-China and Ho Chi Minh was an ally of the United States.

So, what happened? Franklin Roosevelt died on the 12th of April, and shortly after that, Truman, under the influence of Churchill, moved in, to have the Japanese reoccupy Indo-China, under British protection! And



PRnewsFoto/ACCIONA

this led, through a long series of things, to a permanent state of warfare in Southeast Asia, that area. And we got ourselves into a war in 1964 to 1975, in Indo-China, as a continuation of this process. *And we were bled, by that war!* Morally, spiritually, otherwise—we were bled. That’s how the game is played.

And we say, “Who’s our enemy? Who’s the guy we don’t like? Who’s the guy we gotta beat?” We’re idiots! We get ourselves into wars with people who are not really our enemies, but who can be made into enemies if you annoy them enough! And we fight those wars, and *long wars*, especially long wars in Asia. They do the same thing in South America and Central America. These wars are not caused really by conflicts, endemic conflicts among peoples in these countries! They’re organized! They’re provoked, they’re orchestrated. And it’s the British system that does it.

Mankind is a fire-bringer, the only living creature which uses fire as a method of existence. Solar and windmill energy provide only a tiny fraction of the power, measured by energy-flux density, that nuclear does. “We’re now at the scale, where we can not really maintain the civilization on this planet, without nuclear power.” Shown: ACCIONA’s Nevada Solar One power plant; the Civaux nuclear power plant in France; a windmill farm.



Areva

So, we’ve come to the point, that the British have decided to eliminate this problem. And the one problem that was in their way—because Europe was destroyed again and again by wars; Asia was destroyed again and again, by these wars, orchestrated wars, orchestrated in the interests of the British Empire; but we still remained, despite the damage done to us, and the bad influence.

And the decision finally came to destroy the United States. And that was done, beginning systematically, on the day that Franklin Roosevelt died. We have been played, as our ever-loving British monarchy, monarchical friends, since that time, to get us involved in ways in which they conquer us, by inducing us to destroy ourselves. By weakening and destroying ourselves.

And the decision finally came to destroy the United States. And that was done, beginning systematically, on the day that Franklin Roosevelt died. We have been played, as our ever-loving British monarchy, monarchical friends, since that time, to get us involved in ways in which they conquer us, by inducing us to destroy ourselves. By weakening and destroying ourselves.

The British ‘Green Policy’

Where do you think we got this idea of the “green policy,” of the environmentalist policy, where do you think it came from? It came from London. What has it done to the United States?



clipart.com

What has the environmentalist policy done—it's a fraud! There's no truth to it whatsoever. There *is* no phenomenon of global warming! It doesn't exist! But how many people believe in global warming? It *doesn't exist*—they're told to believe it. Who tells them? Prince Philip, the British interests, and their sympathizers in the United States. Who tells us we shouldn't have nuclear power, which is what we need?

We're in a situation, now—let me just go through this:

The way an economy works, is that we rely upon developing increased power. We start, as mankind, with things like burning wood. Now remember, mankind is different from all animals, in several respects (except some people, who qualify as animals, hmm?). Mankind is a fire-bringer. Mankind is the only living creature which uses fire as a method of existence. For example, you go to ancient sites in Asia and elsewhere, and you find, a million years ago, or so forth, and you find sites, where evidence of something that looks like man, in remnants, existed, and the interesting thing is, you find there are signs of human ancestors having lived there, and also the use of fireplaces, the use of *fire* by man. The only creature on this planet that uses fire as a means of existence, is mankind. And that has something to do with the human intellect.

Now, we depend, for a living, on what nature provides us to take. And thus, we go to higher and higher standards of combustion: We go from charcoal and things like that; we go up through coal, to coke, to natural gas, to petroleum, and so forth. But we've reached the point, that we can no longer rely upon these sources of power, because they're not sufficient. Because the way we live is, we use power; we use things like ore, wood, for example, but especially things like ores. And the ores we take are from the upper surface of the planet, and they are effectively the dead bodies of plants and animals that lived a long time ago. And the way it works is, we had different parts of the planet that were under water. And in these different parts of the planet, you had forms of life, that grew in these watery areas. Take the case of iron: You get iron ore from areas where there was once a lot of water! And in this water, these micro-organisms and other organisms grew, and they died. And when they died, things happened. Now in some of the most important areas, these little animals or plants, lived on iron, iron as a metal. Now iron is distributed throughout the surface of the planet. But how do we get iron? We get iron, because plants and animals use iron,

what they pick up from their watery environment, and when they die, they have collected iron, and created an area of deposit, where there's iron. And that's how we get iron.

So then, we come along, and we find where the iron is most heavily concentrated, as in the case of other ores, other mineral deposits. We mine that, by the use of power, to use that material as a rich—shall we say, a rich lode of some raw material. And our society depends upon the relatively richer kinds of raw materials of this type that we use.

Now, what happens if we draw down the richest stores of these kinds of ores, which are left there kindly by deceased plants and animals? What happens, if we want to have some of the same ore? We've used up the richest ores. You have to get more power; you have to go up-scale, to what is called higher energy-flux density. We're now at the scale, where we can not really maintain the civilization on this planet, without nuclear power. If you don't have nuclear power, you can't make up for the fact that you have to use relatively marginal resources. It's not that we're running out of iron. There's still as much iron in the world as ever before, unless we take spaceships out there from them. That's not the problem. The problem is, we've dispersed it, we've used it up in a certain way, and we have to recover it, or we have to find new sources of this ore. And therefore we have to have nuclear power.

We have come to the point—you can not have a planet, maintain a population of this type, of 6.7 billion people, *you can not do it* without nuclear power! And that's not enough! Because we're going to have to use thermonuclear fusion power, which is a higher energy-flux density, in order to be able to supply our needs, with at least the same quality of life that we've tried in the past with lesser means.

So therefore, for mankind to exist, mankind requires an increase in the energy-flux density of sources of power available. Which means going from burning of wood, or charcoal, or waste, up through other things, including petroleum and natural gas. And you find that you have to go to a qualitative level *beyond that*, for mankind to survive: And that is, nuclear fission is your first step. But you have to go three orders of magnitude or higher than that, which is thermonuclear fusion. And we have some possibility for thermonuclear fusion now, on the Moon, in the form of helium-3 deposits from the Sun, in that source. But, we're going, of necessity, into a thermonuclear fusion economy.

What do the British do? The British say, “You shouldn’t have nuclear power. Nuclear power’s dangerous. You should use solar power.” Now, solar power is idiocy. Take an example I was referring to again yesterday: Take the case of sunlight, solar power. Solar power will destroy mankind—why? And how?

Life on this planet—again, come back to it: chlorophyll. And chlorophyll is one of three general modes on which life on this planet generally depends. If we use sunlight, directly, as it impinges upon the surface of the land, we will destroy the world. The way we use sunlight intelligently, is by chlorophyll. There are two other modes of use, also, but let’s take the case of chlorophyll.

Chlorophyll is the major way in which mankind is able to make the planet habitable. Because the little chlorophyll molecule, which looks like a polliwog, and has a little head like a polliwog’s head, and has a tail—it collects the power from the Sun through a tail. And in the head, a marvelous little process occurs, in which the energy-flux density of the sunlight power, is now converted into a much higher form of power, relatively speaking. And this conversion to a higher form of power, not only enables us to develop the land, in terms of other plant life, and the effects of plant life—for example, the sunlight applied to chlorophyll will generally give us a 1% benefit in grasses, from all the sunlight radiation; and in trees up to 10%. So that the ability to inhabit this planet with plant life—and this is true of the oceans as well—depends upon these kinds of processes, which take sunlight, and convert it into a *higher form* of power, with chlorophyll. That, therefore, creates the conditions of life which humanity requires.

What do they tell us to do? Go to solar power! If you cover this planet with solar power, in terms of an area capable of sustaining some semblance of life, you are going to destroy the planet. Who tells us we have to do this? The British monarchy: Prince Philip’s World Wildlife Fund! These characters.

We are the target of an intentional destruction of our nation and of civilization, by a kind of culture which comes out of a kind of a relatively dark age of imperialism, back in ancient times. And they’re turning us back to ancient times! And we’re like fools—we say, “We believe in green”! We become greenies. We’re idiots! We’re destroying ourselves.

And that’s how the enemy operates. It’s sort of like the Satan principle. Satan is out there to induce us to

destroy ourselves, right? And who is Satan? It’s called Prince Philip. Or people like that. And that’s our folly here.

A Global Strategic Threat

So, what I did recently, in this connection: There are some gentlemen, Russians, who are known to me—scientists, they’re in their seventies and eighties, which for me, it’s good. Seventies and eighties are good; my best memories come from the seventies and eighties. I took steps to try to solve this threat to our existence. And I have dealt for some time with efforts to get Russia, particularly, and China, but Russia in particular, and India, and I’ve been doing that for some decades, to enter into forms of cooperation with the United States, where I knew that our people in the United States, when rightly advised, would want this kind of cooperation.

And this becomes particularly important, now, because countries which technically should be viable partners of the United States, such as Germany and France, are presently not, really, at this time. They used to be more so; they’re less so now. And unfortunately, they are presently under the control of the British, which means that they don’t have real freedom. They’re not independent powers any more. They would like to be powers again, and can become powers again, but the trick is, first of all, we’ve got to break the system. And my concentration is: Okay, the United States, Russia, China, and India, and other relevant countries, if they band together, can change this system. And I’ve been working at that for a long time. And I’ve gotten into troubles with various people because I did it. But I knew I was right.

Now we come to the point that there’s no chance of saving this planet, with the British system, or with a United States under British influence, which is what the Obama problem is. Obama is a puppet of London. He’s not an American! I don’t know where he was born, exactly; that’s been debated all over the place; I will presume that he was born in Honolulu, or some place like that. But I don’t know it; I’ve just heard it, and some people have told me it’s official. But that’s not the point. He’s a puppet of Tony Blair. That’s how he came into existence. He’s from the Chicago mob, through Tony Blair. He’s utterly incompetent; his policies are evil; his intentions, as expressed now, are evil. But if you have a powerful government, well organized, you can take even a slug like him, with his problem, his balloon head, and his draperies, and his shoes, and you can

make something out of him, by putting him in the White House and having him surrounded by the right influences. It's easier than shooting him, and it's much more humane. And it's much nicer to have him credited with having accomplished something which he hates—which his owners hate.

So, the point is, now, we have to get the United States free of the Obama problem. If we don't get the United States free of the Obama problem: "Look, Mom, no more United States. And no more Europe, either." So this issue of the United States, Russia, China, India, and some other countries, as a cooperative bloc to destroy, once and for all, the British

Empire, and what it represents, is the only chance for humanity now. Otherwise, you are headed, inevitably now, for a permanent dark age, for a long period of time, maybe two or three generations. We now have 6.7 billion people estimated; we will go down to 2 or less, in a fairly short, rapid rate, unless we do this. So this is a very strong incentive. And some countries have realized that they're in danger.

For example, as I mentioned before, you have the case of India: India has had a long, well-orchestrated conflict with Pakistan, which is organized by the British Empire, by the British monarchy itself. But now India recognizes that Pakistan is not its great enemy! That the breakup of Pakistan would mean that the entire region, the so-called Islamic region, would be destroyed. And if that were destroyed, then India would be destroyed. India is now smart enough to recognize that it needs to have a cooperative relationship with Pakistan, and some other countries, and influences in that region, to defend itself! And therefore, to do that, it must have cooperation with Russia, China, Mongolia, and so forth.

And therefore, in that part of the world, there is a very strong tendency for recognizing these problems and these possible solutions. It is also recognized, that this type of solution is *not* possible without the partici-



EIRNS/Will Mederski

Eighty percent of the American population, like these people attending a "Defend Trump" rally in Washington on Oct. 17, 2019, hate what had been happening to the United States! Our problem, said LaRouche, is to organize the American people to say to the politicians: "Shut up! We want you to listen!" And to fight for the policies that will save them, and save the country.

pation of the United States. And that's what I'm up to. And I've been dealing with Russian circles, and talking with Chinese circles and so forth, and Indian circles for some time, off and on, and recently, more seriously. And we're now at that point: Were I President, there would be no problem with this. The United States, Russia, China, and India, and other countries in the region, *will and can cooperate*, if allowed to do so. It's in their interest to do so! All we have to do, is have the right interest in the United States, and we can pull it off. We can save ourselves from this mess.

Mobilize the American People

If we don't, if we start to say, "Well, maybe Obama will work out," kiss your—something—goodbye. If you think that these policies can be tolerated, kiss it goodbye. If you think you can adopt Hitler's health-care policy through Obama, and survive, *die!* It'll be more merciful than the alternative.

And therefore, we have to recognize that we have to mobilize the people of the United States around the idea of bringing this Presidency under control, and bringing it under control through a partnership with the United States, Russia, China, India, and other relevant countries. If we do that, I can practically guarantee, that Ger-

many and France will tend to join. They have the strength to be able to join, under those conditions; they will kick the British out, then. They won't like it, but they'll do it.

So therefore, we can save the planet. But it's up to *us* in the United States, to deal with this Obama problem, to recognize the Hitler mustache on his upper lip. And if you can't recognize the mustache, the Hitler mustache on Obama's upper lip, you're not a patriot!

You may call yourself a Democrat, but Democrats are getting scarce as hen's teeth these days! Even people who are running as Democrats, are calling themselves Independents and running on both the Republican ticket *and* the Democratic ticket as Independents! It's getting *hard to find a Democrat anywhere!*—except maybe Mrs. Pelosi will grow a mustache or something like that, to cover up her defects.

But this is the situation. And look at the other situation, which I've seen: Do you know 80% of the American people hate this President? They don't particularly hate him as such. He's not really a hate object; he's more or less of a lump. But what they hate is the people that they believe betrayed them. Because the American people don't think of Obama as one of theirs. African-Americans used to try to think of Obama as one of theirs—it was a hopeful thing, but it wasn't there. They began to find out what was really there, and that's not working! But Americans do not really hate Obama: They despise him. That's a difference. They don't think that shooting him is what has to be done.

They think, Americans think, that *their representatives, in the Congress, whom they voted for, have betrayed them.* You saw that, in August, in the turnout, which was really a mass-strike movement. You've seen it again, popping up again, and again: The American people consider that the members of Congress are the people who betrayed them. They think that the leadership of the parties has also betrayed them, but they're picking out, especially, the members of Congress, who are considered *traitors to them!* And therefore, they're perfectly willing to call themselves Democrats, but they don't want to be called Damnoocrats, these types that they have contempt for.

And therefore, our problem, is to organize the American people to realize what they already feel: Eighty percent of the American population hates what's happening to the United States! That's a fact. I don't care what other statistics people get, I know these facts.

Eighty percent of the American population hates their representation. The Republicans are smarter—they're pretending to be almost Democrats, to try to pick up the votes, hoping that they can take the seats by appealing to the former Democratic voters to come over to the Republican Party in the next election. That's the game they're playing! They know the health-care policies of Obama are hated, because it's Hitler-style genocide. They know that. And they know people don't like that! They don't like to be killed! They don't like to see their grandmother snuffed. Or their kids snuffed—they don't like it! Strange, you know? They know that this health-care program is mass murder. It's only stupid politicians who refuse to recognize that it's mass murder—it *is* mass murder! It's Hitler-style mass murder! (Of course, I'll tell you a secret: The British invented it. They invented Hitler!)

So, why are you, American people, out there, putting up with something that the average citizen, 80% of the citizens, *really hate?* And they don't hate Obama; they hate the Democrats! The Democrats who vote for Obama's policy! Because their attitude is, and they're right: Okay, Obama's an idiot. More and more people are going to recognize that, as time passes on. But they don't hate him! Because, they say, this could not happen, if the Democrats in the Congress had not sold out. And it's those Democrats that they voted *in*, two years ago, or a year ago or so—those Democrats, the ones who they feel *betrayed* them *whom they hate.*

Obama, to them, is just a fool. Anybody who thinks seriously, who hears him talk and sees what he does, and so forth: The man's a damned fool. He's an empty head, with these three teleprompters to guide him in talking. (If you got a fourth teleprompter in there, you probably would really screw him up! You know, just one, with a Mickey Mouse something or other, he'd squeak in the meantime.)

So, our problem is, the American people don't recognize, that a people has to survive, by showing leadership, when a people as a people must show leadership. Not as anarchy. The problem is, we saw with the demonstrations publicly, in the month of August, and we've seen since: The average American person was saying, in August, visibly, and has said more recently: "*You!*" they said to the members of the Congress, coming out in front of constituents—they said: "*You!* Shut up! We want to tell you what's wrong with you! We want you to

listen. We don't want you to talk now. We don't want you to explain now. We want you to *listen!*" They're assuming that the politician—they still control him. They elected him! Or they thought they had elected him. They thought he was their representative. They see, he's just another Pelosi. And they're *angry*, because they think their friends betrayed them! They don't consider Obama their friend. They don't think Obama betrayed them—yes, African-Americans, many think they were betrayed, but that didn't last too long. They began to realize what the truth was.

But what the American is upset about, is the members of Congress, who betrayed them. Look at the recent votes, the two recent votes on health care. First of all, Obama's intention *is Hitler's!* If you vote for Obama's health-care policy, you're voting for Adolf Hitler's 1939 policy. That's exactly what you're voting for! If you support a candidate, or a person in public office, who's supporting Obama's policy, you are supporting a *Hitler policy!* Now, Hitler didn't invent it—the British did. But Hitler was a British puppet; he was created as a British puppet, who went awry as far as they were concerned, and they had to get rid of him. But it was Hitler's policy, which are the policies of the royal family's World Wildlife Fund, Prince Philip. Prince Philip has a genocide policy! You don't need Hitler! Prince Philip is much more vicious than Hitler was! His whole family is! Al Gore is practically a Hitler man, on the same kind of policy—he's a liar and fool, and complete agent of the British interests.

So, the American people react, as you know them and as I know them; they react to a sense of being betrayed by their friends. That's where their greatest anger is. You know, most killings occur in families for that reason. Hatred is the greatest against the person you're close to, who's betrayed you—you know, the child against the mother who they think has betrayed them; or the father; or the cousin; or the sibling in their class, or the teacher; or some local official. The person who hired them and fired them—these are the people who stir up the greatest emotion in the typical American, these kinds of cases. And that's what the people are saying. And now, the Congressmen, who are frightened cowards, are running to Obama for succor! Against whom? Against the people who voted for them!

And therefore, you Americans: Better wake up. You've got to understand *how* you think and what you think. And recognize, that you've got to get this man,

whom you elected President, you've got to *bring him under control!* We don't want any shooting around here. We want him brought *under control*. And some people in Washington know what I mean by that: He'll be in the White House. He'll be there! He'll sign the bills! And we will take care of his teleprompters for him—he won't have to worry about what goes on those; we'll take care of that for him. It may not come out too clearly, but it'll be there. And the American people will say, "We have a President, again." Why? "He's ours." What do you mean, he's "yours"? "We control him."

And that's the way the job has to be done.


And the way you control him, is by bringing under control those who need to be brought under control: first of all, your own elected representatives, who are supposed to be your bosses; then, you've got to get the institutions to function under control.

You've got to have an assessment, a practical assessment of what has to be done on this planet, to *stop what is now a presently onrushing, inevitable, general breakdown crisis, of the entire planet*. We can stop it. We made an important step in that direction, right after my trip to Rhodes. It was done by the Russians and the Chinese. And contrary to some doubts on the Russian side, the Chinese *did do* what I knew they would do. They made an agreement, of historic importance. There is discussion with India, and with other countries in that region on the same thing.

We need to bring the United States into line, on this policy: Put this President, in the White House, under parental supervision. Maybe his grandmother—but she's not available any more. Bring him under parental supervision: He'll sit there, he'll sign the laws, he will authorize the speeches, he will do all these things. He will be informed on everything. But, he will be in the White House, and under management. And we will kick the butts of the members of the Congress. And we will go to cut the deal with Russia, China, and India. We will bring other countries into that: Japan will come quickly; so will Korea; so will some other countries, come quickly into that.

No Solution Without the U.S.

And we have to save this economy, we have to put this entire economy through a Glass-Steagall type of reform—immediately! We must take all banks which had any characteristic of commercial banks in them;



EIRNS/Christopher Jatz

The first step toward an agreement among the world's four leading powers—China, India, the U.S., and Russia—took place in 2009, in talks between Russia and China. The big question is: What will it take to bring the U.S. into the picture?

put all these banks under government receivership, in bankruptcy. Put them into bankruptcy reorganization by a Glass-Steagall standard, the one that used to be on the books, that we know we have to return to. Keep the commercial banks functional. Those which are bankrupt presently, put them back into operation! Because people had their savings there, and we have to defend that.

Then utter, by cancelling all this worthless paper, maybe \$20 trillion worth in worthless paper, cancel it! It's *fake money*! It's not honest money, by Glass-Steagall standards. Then, create, by a Federal act, create something which Roosevelt would have done: Create a reorganization of the U.S. economy.

Now, we have destroyed most of our industries. We have almost lost the skills that were concentrated in the auto industry, for machine-tool design and similar kinds of skills. We've lost the ability for major infrastructure. We're about to lose the last remnant of the aircraft industry. We're losing our machine-tool capability. We do not have functioning industries, of the type we used to have ten years ago! We've lost it. We have communities that are disintegrating! What we're going to have to do, is have a mass program of basic economic infrastructure of the type that requires a maximum emphasis on agriculture and machine-tool design, in order to make

sure to get the highest levels of technology functioning again, immediately, in this country. We've got to get to a full-employment program, which is not a make-work employment program, but one which is of infrastructure, which is actually building the skills and productive powers of the nation.

We're going to have to cooperate among nations, to enhance this capability. We're going to have to have a 1.5-2% basic interest rate for these kinds of projects, which will be authorized by the Federal government. We're going to talk in terms of 50-year and less, shorter types of investments by the Federal government. We're going to build a mass transit system. We're going to build a nuclear power system, beyond anybody's imagination today. We can do it! All you have to do, is start doing it, and you can replicate the project, and train more people in it.

And that way, we're going to save the nation, we're going to save the planet. We will find that Europe, probably beginning with a phase in Germany and France, which are nations which have the greatest relative *potential* for getting back into business—except for the greenies in Germany. We're going to have to start to do that. We're going to have to continue and expand the general program of development for Africa. We're going to have to look at the countries of South America

from the same standpoint. And within ten years, or less, we will have built—rebuilt—for the United States, a semblance of what we once thought we had, in modern terms.

That's what we must do. And you, in the United States, *must do it!* You must organize those in the United States to do exactly this! Because, I can tell you, that Russia is prepared to do this! China is prepared to do this! There are 1.4 billion Chinese! That's important. There are over a billion Indians; they're important! Russia commands one of the greatest raw materials potentials on the planet, in the Arctic region! We have in North America, we have in Canada, in Alaska, we have a similar potential for development, in the Arctic regions and the sub-Arctic regions. We can make a revolution on this planet, *rapidly*, within ten years—easily! We can change things, to get us moving in a completely different direction.

But the problem lies, not with who we criticize, outside in other nations, though criticism must be made—we have to look at ourselves! *We* are the supposedly great power! We are the nation, which inspired modern society! We have to kick our people in the butt, and get *them* to organize *themselves*, for no less a purpose than *their own survival!* Because if we don't, if we don't organize our own people to clean up this mess, in the Congress and in the White House, and put it back into order, there isn't going to be a United States. And if there's not going to be a United States, there's not going to be much of a world, either, at least for a long time to come.

So this stuff we've been doing, and putting up with, this debating, this question of popular opinion, this question, "We-ell, I don't think ... well, I'm not sure ... but, somebody tells me ... but somebody says differently than you're saying..." You know? Idiocy! *Idiocy!!* Cowardice! Corruption! When people don't think things through, in a time of crisis, because they want to doubt, or they want to protest, or they want to raise some objection of that type—you're the kind of people who'll condemn themselves to Hell! And if they're looking for it, they will probably find it.

So, the point is: *It lies with us!* The crisis is now. The time is short. The weeks ahead can not be wasted. I will be working during these coming several months, to try to put into place some of the agreements which are needed, to get this world out of this mess. *But I need more showing from the American people, of all particular degrees.* Let's get up, off the ground, let's

mobilize, and let's take charge! The mass strike movement which we saw in August is good, but it was not good enough! Because then, the people who were enraged were saying justly, "You! You! You!" To their members of Congress, "You shut up! Listen to us!" They didn't say, "You! We're taking charge." And that's the difference.

Thank you.

Selected Dialogue with LaRouche

Moderator Debra Freeman: The first question that I want to ask you, comes from someone in Russia, whom you have been engaged in an ongoing dialogue with on these very questions. For people who have been following this on the website, this is the third in a series of questions from one of Russia's leading bloggers on economic issues, who has asked Lyn in the past to explain what he meant by various elements of the recent Russia-China economic agreements. And Lyn has answered those; those answers are public, and as I said, you can see them on the site. But as Lyn answers, he has more questions.

He says: "Lyn, you say, without an essential change from the present world British-run monetarist system to a credit system, all of the currencies of the world would become worthless very soon. This point is, at the very least, it seems to me, disputable.

"If we look at, for instance, the Russian economy, we will see that it does not have as huge an internal debt, and so many financial bubbles as we see in America. So, even if the dollar collapses, it does not necessarily mean that the same will happen with our ruble. All that we would need to prevent such a scenario is to leave the foreign exchange market, and start using the ruble in international trade. If someone needs energy supplies from Russia, he will have to offer something useful to us—technology supply and industrial modernization, for example. Please comment on this.

"Secondly, you say, the U.S. dollar's ties to China's economy mean that an increase in per-capital value and output of the Chinese economy engaged in the presently agreed China/Russia agreement, would mean a revival of the value of the presently collapsing U.S. dollar through the increased value of the U.S. debt to a rising Russia/China economy. I will put my question to

you in slightly different form. Do you agree that Russia and China are able to perform this project even if the dollar collapses?”



“You’re in a globalized system. What’s a globalized system? It’s an empire!” LaRouche declared. There are no independent nations on the planet, because no nation has sovereignty over its food supply. “If you’re not prepared to destroy Cargill, you don’t have independence.” Shown: picking cucumbers in Belarus.

You Need the U.S. To Defeat Globalization

LaRouche: On the latter question, no. Without the United States, Russia and China’s collaboration would not be successful.

This other question to consider here—the deeper one—is, there is no such thing as an autonomous economy on this planet today. There is no self-sufficiency; nor is there any pair-wise self-sufficiency. If two nations decide to try to cooperate, and tell the rest can go to Hell, they’ll go to Hell first. They’ll be delivered the next day, in fact, to that destiny.

Now, you don’t have a “rules” system; you don’t have national economic systems any more. You don’t understand globalization. The problem in Russia today is largely a result of the failure to recognize the menace of globalization. Because that was what was done to Russia, was globalization. Russia’s potential does not lie very much in its own existing industries, that is, on the scale of those industries. And trade within that country, or trade with other countries, or a few countries, is not going to solve anything. You’ve got to increase the productive powers of labor of each country and all countries, and you can only do it with cooperation, because of globalization.

For example, take the case of grain. Helga [Zepp-LaRouche] went through this in her presentation just a few weeks ago, on this question. *There is no such thing as any independent nation on this planet! If you’re not prepared to destroy Cargill, you don’t have independence.* If you don’t look at the firms that control your food supplies on this planet, and go in there, if necessary, with troops, and straighten them out, you’re not going to have a food supply. You need an authoritative international force, composed of sovereign nation-states, but an effective force which is powerful enough to go in and shut down Cargill. Otherwise, you don’t



have a chance!

You’re in a globalized system. What’s a globalized system? It’s an *empire!* You tolerated Cargill! You tolerated similar kinds of firms. You tolerated globalization, and you thought you were smart. You had legislators who did that in country after country. You talked about globalization; the Tower of Babel back again, with similar results promised, for now. That’s the issue!

What we need is a consent of the people, consent of nations. Now, we know that Europe presently, under the euro, has no sovereignty! Continental, western, and central Europe no longer have real sovereignty. *It doesn’t exist in any of those countries!* We have to take a bunch of nations which do have enough *power* to represent sovereignty, which is largely the United States, Russia, China, and India, and a few neighboring countries, which will share their emotions in this matter, and that will constitute a representative body of the human race. And that representative body of the human race is going to go out and *crush* the imperialists.

I’m declaring war! And, as Franklin Roosevelt said: *I hate war!*” But that’s why I got to declare it.

That’s the solution here.

We have to create an economy. No economy presently exists, no sovereign national economy presently exists anywhere on this planet. You want to talk about trade within and among nations? You don't have sovereign nations anymore. There's no nation on this planet that's sovereign; it's all under globalization. It's under the empire.

What's the empire? The empire is the British Empire; the enemy is the British Empire! And the British Empire does include Buckingham Palace (or, there's another name for the place, but I won't use it here). And there is Threadneedle Street—that exists. But the Empire is international; it's an international monetarist system. The system which is typified by the globalizers—the ones that control the food supply of the world, that control the mineral supply of the world, that control the industries of the world. These bastards have to be shut down, in order to get our national sovereignties back. And what we have is, we have a nasty pact of nations who say, we're going to take our national sovereignty back.

We're going to eliminate globalization. We're going to have equitable treaty agreements among cooperating nations. We're going to think in terms of 50-year projects—in some cases, 100-year projects. The development of northern Siberia is a 100-year project, which is extended across the Bering Strait, through a tunnel through the Bering Strait, into Alaska, into Canada, and down into the United States. We're going to take the Arctic region of the continents, and we're going to start to develop them, because they contain essential resources, and we do know how to deal with them, at least some of us do.

We're going to deal with Africa. We're going to build a modern type of railway system which unites the world. We can devise it, we've reported on this repeatedly. We can today, create the equivalent of a high-speed rail system, including a magnetic levitation system, with a high degree of automation in it. We can create an entirely new transportation system for the entire planet. We can connect all of Eurasia with Africa and with the Americas, with, effectively, a single stroke—one continuous set of railway systems, going down into Africa, and transforming Africa. And you can't do it without railway systems.

Look, for example, take Africa: Africa has a great amount, especially in the Southern Shield, of the mineral resources of Africa as a whole. Well, why aren't the Africans rich? Take a picture of this helicopter study,

which was done from helicopters, travelling over various parts of Africa, and looking down at these parts in daytime and at night. What's the condition of Africa? Africa is a British crime against all humanity. Africa has one of the greatest agricultural areas of the world. Why don't they have farms, for food? Why is there no light at night in most of Africa? Why is there no mass transportation system? Why is there no effective system of disease control? Why is there no development? Why is Africa only *raped* of its raw materials, and not developed? Why is the water system of Africa not developed? Why was the Nile River system never completely developed?

That's the problem. And therefore, we have to have ground rules for nation-states. Our basic point is *nation-states*, because nation-states involve the concept of culture.


Now, the power of creativity, which does not exist in monkeys, but should exist in people, even among some politicians. The power of creativity is unique to mankind. All processes on this planet and beyond, are creative. Inanimate nature is creative.

Look what happened: You had a Sun; the Sun is sitting out there, it's all by itself. It's spinning around rapidly, not knowing where to go, in this neck of our galaxy. You got that little Sun. And the Sun spun off some things. It created; it just spun out there, and it began creating the Periodic Table; the complete Periodic Table, which keeps growing and developing all the time, through isotopes, some of which are generated by the aid of life, living processes. And so, suddenly, the Sun suddenly became a whole solar system. And all these kinds of developments occurred.

So, the Sun itself is creative; the universe is creative, inherently. Animal life is creative. But none of them can think; none of them have the ability for voluntary transformation of the universe. Only human beings have the mentality for the voluntary creation of new states of organization in the universe. And we need more people who are creative. We need to get rid of this uncreative nonsense, which was introduced in the post-war period.

We have to develop populations; therefore, we have to realize that when you're dealing with a language culture, which is a very complex thing—it involves not just the language, but a whole lot of other things: If you're dealing with a language culture, you have a certain depth of a faculty called *irony*, which exists in every language culture. Which is generally expressed

FIGURE 1
Proposed World Land-Bridge



EIRNS

“We can connect all of Eurasia with Africa, and with the Americas, with, effectively, a single stroke—one continuous set of railway systems, going down into Africa, and transforming Africa.”

in the music and the poetry, the art and so forth of that culture. And therefore, when you touch that aspect which is deeply imbedded in national culture, you are getting close to where the creative powers of the individual lie.

So, what our objective must be in a nation-state, is based on the idea of nation-state culture. You must bring into play the creative potential of a people through its culture. Therefore, you want them to represent themselves in terms of the fulfillment and enrichment of their own culture. Therefore, we want the consent of humanity—we don’t want a consent of piggens, we want the consent of different cultures, because creativity lies within the culture. Therefore, we want an *assembly* of peoples which are respectively sovereign peoples, in order to mobilize their cultural potential, for becoming truly as human as they can become.

And it’s the consent of these sovereign cultures, which we must bring into play, in order to finally

achieve what Franklin Roosevelt intended, when he designed the idea of the United Nations: to eliminate all elements of oppression from this planet, and to create a system of sovereign nation-states, of developed sovereign nation-states, which will then take over the entire territory of the planet, leaving no room for empires, or similar kinds of phenomena. And bringing that together, that should be our purpose. So therefore, we have some nations which have, together, the power—sufficient power—to free the slaves among other nations. And our job is to free the slaves.

Europe is a bunch of slaves; South America is largely a bunch of slaves. *We must free them*, and those nations which have the ability, the power, and the determination to do that, must join, on behalf of *humanity as a whole*, because we’re going to create another thing. We’re going to go to Mars! Not this week, but we’ve got to get there. I won’t be there. I will be there in spirit, and you never know what I’ll be able to do as a spirit. I’ll do the best I can.

So, therefore, mankind has a destiny. All nature is creative. Inanimate nature is creative, as we see when we study the inanimate processes of physics, of physical science. Living processes, all living processes are creative. Look at the emergence of species, new species and varieties which have come out of the existence of life on the planet. Life itself is creative. The human mind is creative, and the human mind is the only *willfully* creative power on this planet. And that's what our purpose is.

Therefore, we, as mankind, must look to the future, and the future is not what might happen next week. The future is what we can *cause* to happen, which is a higher state of existence of mankind than has ever existed before. For that reason, we know we must go to Mars, and there are a lot of problems which some friends of mine and I are working on, on this question of how we're going to get to Mars. We're very serious about it; we're determined to get there. I may not see it in this incarnation, but—Nonetheless, it'll take us about four generations to do that, and we can solve, in that time, we can solve the problem.

So therefore, our objective here is to bring nations together, recognizing that no nation has sovereignty—not now. But we're going to have a system of sovereignty on this planet—of sovereign nations—because we *need* it, because human culture demands it. Therefore, we nations which are strong enough to do this, who represent enough power to pull this off, have the obligation to exert that power we have, when we're acting jointly to get rid of the British Empire. And when you think that way, you're thinking strategically. Get away from those lower forms of thought, which are petty ones. We're going to change this planet; to make it a respectable planet, that other planets don't have to be ashamed of.

Currency Has No Intrinsic Value

Freeman: We have, actually, almost identical questions coming from someone on the professional staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and then from someone at Brookings. What one of the questioners says is:

“Mr. LaRouche, I have found your discussion of this new China-Russia venture to be most interesting, and I agree with you that it can serve as a stepping-stone for very significant developments. Not that it's going to solve all of the problems in the world, but again, that it at least puts us in the right direction. What I do not un-

derstand, and which I wish you would explain a little bit more, is, in some of your recent comments that I've seen on your website, and that your spokesman has discussed with us, you have said that what the Chinese are doing is, essentially, by investing hundreds of billions of dollars into this project, i.e., their investment is essentially denominated in U.S. dollars, that they are in effect giving those dollars more value than they have under current circumstances. That they are taking what is U.S. debt, and turning it into an asset. This is what I do not understand, and I wish that you would explain it in a little bit more detail.”

LaRouche: People believe in fairy tales, and the fairy tale is that value lies in a currency. A currency has no intrinsic value; no currency has an intrinsic value. See, what's the value here? The question is typical, though. It's typical from Russia, it's typical of some people from China, it's typical all over the world. They don't understand money! They think they do, and that's the biggest mistake. And I would like to take money out in the backyard and shoot it, and then give it a new name—not money—and then people might understand it.

But, the essence of human existence, and of economy, is increase in the productive powers of labor. There is no intrinsic value in any substance or any currency, especially currency. It has *no intrinsic value!* A currency is simply a convention. It has no intrinsic value! The intrinsic value is physical, but it's physical in a general way, not in simply a way that's something tangible.

What is an investment, you presume? You invest certain assets, like physical assets. Don't talk about money, just talk about physical assets. A guy wants to start a business. He wants to start producing something, and he needs the following machinery, he needs these other physical assets, and these skills and so forth. He's going to put these together, and he's going to try to do, what? He's going to try to produce more, as a result of combining these resources, than he put into it. He's going to get more value, in terms of physical reality, out of production than he contributed to start funding the production. Sometimes it's called profit. Profit is a lousy, dirty word, but you can use it sometimes, with my permission, under my strict supervision, because people abuse it very much.

Therefore, the value of a currency, insofar as it represents purchasing of something useful, is expressed by



Transrapid

By investing a trillion dollars, or what it can buy, in terms of the development of the economies of Asia, in physical production, which involves a factor of growth of values, you increase the wealth of the world. Shown, the Transrapid maglev in Shanghai, China.

its profitability, its *physical* profitability, not necessarily its monetary value.

So therefore, if I take a trillion dollars of U.S. obligations to China, a trillion dollars worth of obligations which are denoted in Chinese assets, and they're just sitting there. No use, nothing's happening to them. And I come along, and I say, let me buy, or guarantee, or pledge myself to support a trillion dollars' worth of Chinese activity, pledging these funds, these trillion dollar debt funds, for this purpose. Now why am I going to do that? Because by investing that trillion dollars, or what it can buy, in terms of the development of the economy of Asia and other things, I'm going to produce more than a trillion dollars' worth of value, and therefore by investing that in *physical* production, which involves a factor of *growth* of values, I'm increasing the wealth of the world. The wealth of the world does not lie in those dollars, or those other currencies. The wealth of the world lies in the activation of the productive process.

You see, most people say their accountants make money. They make money, unfortunately, which is why we have to put them in prison at times! Right?

What we invest in, we invest in the power of labor, the power of human labor when equipped with certain means, to produce more value for human beings than that labor and those resources represented beforehand. So, if I take a trillion dollars that the United States owes to China, and instead of letting it sit there, as a debt, waiting to be collected by China—which never will happen—

we say we're going to take that debt, and we're going to tell the United States that we're going to invest that debt it has to us in this investment, then everybody benefits. Because we bring together the means for creating the wealth.

You get this *hakem-makem* crazy stuff that goes on, and people talking about money, money, money, money. Investing money, investing money. Stop it! Get it out of Russia. I mean, the Russians are poisoned by this stuff about investment in money. They're brainwashed into thinking, ever since Gorbachov—they're brainwashed into thinking that investing in money, that money is the secret of wealth. *It is not!*

As we should know, money has been destroying the real wealth of the world. Money can be slavery. No, the key thing here is this wealth is, to the degree that it's invested, or its equivalent, what is represented by it, is invested in a way which results in an increase of the amount of real wealth—not money wealth—*real wealth*, and therefore, if you have a sane system of economy, the money value of wealth should conform to and follow the actual physical wealth increase. In other words, if there's an increase in profit, without an actual increase in physical wealth, it's a fraud: typical of what goes on in the United States these days. You get less than what you pay for. By investing in things which result in a greater gain for humanity, in terms of efficient physical values that you're investing in, and if you're investing in improving your nation in physical terms, you're profitable. If you're investing in money, you're a parasite.

The Power To Smash the British Empire

Freeman: This next question is from a member of the Stanford group who is now assigned with leading a new section that's dealing with some international questions, and his question—he phrased it as relating to the question of gold, but I think it goes a little bit beyond that. He says:

“Lyn, if we've learned one thing, it would seem—and, as I'm sure you're aware, this was at the heart of President Clinton's drive for a new financial architecture—it is that we must abandon the system of floating

exchange rates and interest rates in favor of a fixed currency and fixed interest rate. And that unless we do that, we are not going to have any hope of ongoing economic cooperation. It's the only way that, it seems to me, we can proceed, where you don't end up with one currency as dominant, but with a common agreement among different currencies.

"The question that I have in all of this is the role of gold. Some of my colleagues here have argued that the 1944 Bretton Woods system was based on a gold standard. Now, I'm not at all sure that that is even true, but in any case, I see a problem with using gold as a standard of value, and without going into the details of why I say that, I think you could probably figure it out. My question is, couldn't we use production as a standard of value?"

"So, what I'm asking you is, number one, in terms of discussing a new financial architecture, how do you see the role of gold? And, number two, concretely, if you agree with me that we wish to use production as a standard of value, how would that work?"

LaRouche: Well, you've got several problems, including some historic ghosts in this question. Go from April 12 to April 13, 1945. You had, in the previous year, you had the Bretton Woods conference, and in this conference, Franklin Roosevelt had denounced the policies, the British policies, of a monetary system, the Keynesian system. This prevailed until the 12th of April, 1945, when Roosevelt died. The following day, Harry Truman was President, and Harry Truman went with Churchill to a Keynesian system, as opposed to a Roosevelt dollar, a fixed-exchange-rate dollar. And then we produced a monster, which was an attempt to return implicitly to the gold standard, rather than a fixed-exchange-rate system, based not on a monetary standard, but a credit standard.

So, if you think about the gold question as a credit system, not a monetary system, most of your confusion is eliminated. But the confusion comes, once you ignore the fact that there was a revolution against the United States, a virtual act of treason under Truman, on the 13th of April 1945. Where Roosevelt had denounced monetarism at Bretton Woods, had fought against it and suppressed it, defeated it, as soon as he was dead, Truman, the traitor, brought Keynes in, and the world



Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

When President Roosevelt died, his successor, Truman the traitor, went with Churchill and the British policy, of a monetary, or Keynesian system. FDR had denounced the British system, and confronted Churchill over the Empire's colonial policies. The two are shown here at Casablanca in January 1943.

system, since that time, was Keynesian, not U.S. That was the beginning of the return of the British Empire, was that event.

Now, there should be no gold standard, for the same reason that Roosevelt opposed Keynes: The use of gold is as a denominator of a credit system, saying that a uniform price of gold will be a reference point, but for a fixed-exchange-rate system; and therefore, the gold is simply a mechanism to facilitate a fixed-exchange-rate system, as a credit system, not as a monetary system.

The thing is to concentrate on the essential question. It comes up in this question of law. We're going to tell those idiots in the Congress to vote up a law, and the crooks in the back room are going to fix that law so that by the time what comes out is going to have no resemblance to the initial intention of the members of Congress. We call it the "dis-Members" of Congress, often for that reason.

The problem is, that we don't go by the idea of production values, and in a fixed-exchange-rate system, the motive is production values. And what happens is, we absent ourselves, by the way we allow crooked behavior in the Congress generally. We allow crooked behavior. We allow people in the Congress to go behind doors and devise laws, which are *cheating* on what the

public thought the intent of that law was. It's happening right now. What are legislators? Legislation is a form of lying! You don't know what you're getting. It's like getting a krait snake in your bedroom, you know? It's not what you intended. So, that's the problem here.

And therefore you have to go at the question of how the *system* will operate.

You know, the other aspect of this in respect of law, is our lawmaking is increasing law-*less*. The U.S. Constitution, which is the only decent constitution in the world, really—when it's respected—was based on certain principles. It was not a farrago of this and that, with a multitude of different kinds of nooks and crannies, not like a British parliamentary system. But we've been corrupted by adopting the habits of practice of a parliamentary system, not a constitutional system based on credit, and therefore we put up with this nonsense.

But there has to be a general overhaul of our system of law, and the behavior of the legislatures, because our legislative process, over the centuries, has become increasingly corrupt. For example, the Hill-Burton standard of health care. Why should anyone ever change it? The change was a piece of thievery and robbery. It's a fraud! So we talk about health-care reform! Why don't we just go back to Hill-Burton and end the HMO system, which was a fraud from the onset?!

What's being proposed by the President is a fraud! It's mass murder of our citizens! There's no excuse for it. We have legislative doubletalk all over the place. This is *mass murder!* What President Obama is proposing is nothing other than what Hitler enacted in 1939, in September-October '39. We called it genocide, later. And this creature, this Obama, wants to practice genocide against the American people, the same way Hitler did, and the same way that's being done in Britain by the sponsor of Obama, Tony Blair.

This is what's happened to our law. The constitutional intent has been betrayed. You see, our conception of law is based not on trading, not on parliamentary horse-trading. Our conception of law is based on a principle of respecting the nature of man. The rights of man. Our Constitution was the greatest constitutional instrument of any part of human history, and it's been made a shambles by these prostitutes called Congressmen, and others, who sell themselves for their own convenience. We don't have people like John Quincy Adams. We don't have men like Abraham Lincoln. We don't have these types of people. We have imitations, cheap imitations, and that's the problem.

So, the problem here is *not* in the question of gold. Roosevelt's intention was clear; it was clear in 1944 in Bretton Woods. He wasn't there, but he made the remarks. And the intention of Truman was different. Truman was not an American patriot. I would [come to] consider him a scumbag very soon. I was in Kanchrapara, I was on my way going from India, up into northern Burma, where I spent the concluding war years, and some soldiers at Kanchrapara, American soldiers, came up and said they wanted to talk to me at night. I said fine. So they came up, and they said, we wanted to ask you what's going to happen to us now that President Roosevelt is dead. And my answer, which was memorable to me because it was short (that helps sometimes, doesn't it?), I said, well, I haven't thought much about this until now, but I can say this: We were governed by a great man, Franklin Roosevelt, and now our President is a very little man, and therefore I'm afraid for our people. And I was right. And as soon as I got back to the United States, I really knew I was right. This guy was a menace, and he's typical of the political corruption.

The problem we're going to have to deal with in this, is to recognize that these problems exist. They lurk all around in the institutions of government, and we're going to have to clean the mess up. But we're going to have to do this by a radical move of this Four Power agreement. The assembly of four of the most powerful nations on this planet, nations which are of a diverse cultural character with respect to one another, but which therefore are more suitably representative of humanity than a group of nations which simply agree with each other in their cultural characteristics.

We're now representing humanity, rather than a bloc or a group, and we're taking the most powerful group, and assembling around them to have a powerful enough group to *smash the British Empire!* To destroy the British Empire, once and for all, in order to free mankind of Satan. Want to get rid of Satan? Close down the British Empire.

So therefore, this is the kind of situation we're in, and therefore, we *do* have to establish a law for mankind again, which is not essentially different than what the intention of our Constitution was. We're going to have to do it in terms which are understood, as Roosevelt would have agreed, among nations which have different cultural characteristics. We're going to bring nations with different cultural characteristics together for a common understanding of the aims of mankind, and that's what the thing is. And we're going to have to

realize that we're cleaning up a mess, we're cleaning up the outhouse, in the process of doing this kind of negotiation, in reforming the United States. And presumably, we'll have an angry group of Congressmen who will do something, who will no longer go along to get along, but will do the job which their conscience should require of them. That's where we are, and these problems will occur. Don't worry about them, as long as we're doing something to fix them.

Measuring the Increase in the Productive Powers of Labor

Freeman: We have another question here from the Stanford group: "Mr. LaRouche, as you know, we have labored over the distinction between a monetarist system and a credit system, both from the standpoint of historic function and from the standpoint of an urgently required restructuring. Utilizing your Triple Curve Function, it became apparent to us that what had been a decades-long process of economic disintegration, reached a new and more dramatic phase in approximately the middle of 2007, when the price of monetary aggregates, as opposed to regular financial aggregates, began to skyrocket.

"At the same time, net physical income for physical consumption began to spiral downward. The result was a collapse in the market for products, especially for products of production, and as that occurred, employment also began to move in a rapidly accelerating downward spiral. But, the volume of monetary aggregates soared, contrary to financial transactions related to the real economy. This process grew even more critical with the effort to prop up and sustain these monetary aggregates, at the expense of America's physical economy.

"The Obama Administration, contrary to its promises, has adopted policies that have not only continued this, but actually have accelerated the process. And it's our conclusion that this series of facts is absolutely indisputable scientifically, and we're prepared to defend it.

"Now, in terms of a transition to a credit system, when you discuss a return to a Glass-Steagall frame-



ICRC/VII/Ron Haviv

True economic value is not measured in money, but in how many people we have; what is their life expectancy? What is their health condition; their productivity, education, etc.? How creative are we? Shown: A doctor tends to patients in South Kivu, Democratic Republic of the Congo.

work, and putting the current system through bankruptcy reorganization, it seems very apparent to us that what you are discussing and what former Federal Reserve chairman Paul Volcker is discussing, are two very different things. Our question to you is, aren't you really talking about eliminating the monetary curve entirely? It would seem that then, the primary measure of economic value becomes the interaction between the financial curve and the curve which represents the physical economy, and that that is the basis of what you refer to as a credit system. Are we correct in concluding this? And if not, could you please shed more light on where we are making a mistake?"

LaRouche: Okay, got you. Well, no, there is a little discrepancy here. The discrepancy is simply this: I do not believe in monetary value. I believe in an assigned monetary assessment of value, but that is not mathematically interchangeable, as value is physical. Monetary value is not physical; it's a conventional value, not an actual value.

See, you've got to go back to the question of what is an economy. Money has nothing to do with a real economy, as such. That is, in terms of the essential value terms. Money has nothing to do with real value. Money is a convention; it's a piece of workable fakery, in terms of, like, promissory notes. And the promises are what they are, and the outcomes are not necessarily in accord

with the promises. I've referred to this before; let me put it to you in this way.

What's involved here is, first of all, the increase of the productive powers of labor, as measured in the level of population density and productive powers of labor of the population as a whole. That's value. This value is determined by a rate of growth, which is not necessarily a simple increase, but it's an increase in productive powers of labor. It's an increase in productivity. That the idea of profit itself, real profit, as opposed to nominal profit, is located in: Is there an increase in the physical productive powers of labor, as measured per capita and per square kilometer? That's your fundamental measure. That's your measure of value. And it's a measure of value of *development*, not of a fixed value.

There's no such thing as a fixed value of money. It does not have fixed value. If money sits there and is not invested, it deteriorates. If somehow the process becomes more productive, it suddenly appreciates. It has no intrinsic value. It's a convention we use in society in order to organize trade and investment; that's all. Nothing wrong with that; but we have to keep it in its place. Don't make it a god! The monetary ideas are the ideas which are the typical poison.

So therefore, what we're talking about is the increase in the productive powers of labor.

You've got two problems here. Let's take the planet, the Biosphere, which includes the Lithosphere. We're on this planet Earth. Now, are we increasing the potential population density for human beings on the planet Earth, or are we not? That's the number one estimate of value. Are we increasing the potential population density of this planet, of human beings? Are we, or are we not—value! What's that got to do with money? Nothing!

Are we increasing man's power to increase this gain? Aah! Now, we're touching upon money. It came up earlier, when we discussing this thing about China's investment, a trillion dollar investment. If I take a trillion dollars of Chinese claims against the U.S. dollar, and if it sits there, it has one value, which is pretty much that of dung. If I say, this same \$1 trillion of credit is going to be invested in a science-driver program to transform the productive powers of labor throughout much of Asia, well! And you get a lot of growth of value. Aah! Then, that trillion dollars is worth something, isn't it?

So, value is based on these kinds of considerations.

There is no such thing as an intrinsic monetary valuation, except among people who believe in the fairies, or something. So, that's the difference.

As we do with the Triple Curve, what we're looking at, is we're looking at a physical relationship to a monetary process. In one case, we're looking at it from the standpoint of the money system; in another case, we're looking at it from the standpoint of a credit system, a financial credit system. And we're looking at it, thirdly, from the standpoint of a physical system. So therefore, the success of the process means that the physical system is increasing, in terms of man's power to exist in the universe; that's the physical part. The monetary part is simply fictitious; it's imperialism. Then, you have in between, the credit system, which is the credit uttered for the purposes of promoting actual productive activity in sales and so forth of real goods, which are invested as consumption to support people, which is good, or as investment to increase the productive powers of labor as such.

So therefore, the real values are these relations, which are essentially physical, mental relations. They're physical in the sense that mankind is physical; they're mental in the sense that they deal with the creative powers of the human mind, and the development of the creative powers of the human mind. Those are the real values.

And the function of government, if it's sane government, is to regulate finance, economy, government, according to these understandings. Their objective is to increase the productive powers of labor, through developing the mental powers of mankind—and improving their health, of course, at the same time. And everything else is simply things we take into account in managing the productive process. But money is *not* the productive process. Money is a convention which we use, presumably under policies which govern the way we use money. And it's the policies that contain the value, and the expression of those policies, *not* the value as such.

So, if you just stick with the Triple Curve, and realize that by eliminating the monetary curve, which is the imperialist curve, and going to only a credit system, which is what is in the U.S. Constitution—the U.S. Constitution proscribes a monetary system, and prescribes a credit system; and that's explicit. It's explicit under Hamilton's initial efforts, and it's explicit in the Constitution. We have been corrupted by the intervention of the British system, which is a monetarist system,

an intrinsically imperialist system of at least 3,000 years in existence. So, that's the distinction.

What we would do, for example, if we cancelled this several trillion, \$20 trillion or so of monetarist debt. Sshwish! Gone! Get thee gone, devil! If we do that, what happens? We say, "Aah! Aah!" And then we say, "Ah! But we now can create a number of tens of trillions of dollars of credit," which is no longer this monetarist crap! We are now going to assign credit to rebuild our industries, for rebuilding our infrastructure, for developing our health-care system, and so forth. And this will produce *real physical value*.

And therefore, the end result is the real physical value, and the end result of physical value is determined by how many people we have; what is their life expectancy, how long is it? What's their health condition? What's their productivity? What's their education? What's the rate of improvement of life among a population in general? *These* are the real issues that we deal with. How creative are we? How smart, how creative are our people? How many inventions have they made? How many things have they done that are brilliant?

Those are the real values. And we have to simply take the process of government, and use the instruments of management of government, and self-management of government, to bring about these results. What we really are talking about is increasing the productive powers of labor, which is another way of talking about increasing man's power as man.

What we are talking about is immortality. We're talking about a process in which mankind is a creative species, the only willfully creative species on this planet Earth, or any other planet we know of. And we're defending the essential immortality of man, or what should be the immortality of man. Animals? We're born and we die. We have animal bodies; they're born and they die. We try to make that as comfortable as possible, and as happy, and as long as possible, but that's not what man is. Some people call it the soul.

But, you look at the factor of creativity in human existence and culture, you realize that when a person makes a creative contribution to society as a human individual, it doesn't end there, or begin there. What happens is, the process of humanity as a whole, is generating creative products of the mind. Culture is being developed, the powers of mankind are being increased. This has no beginning that we know of; this is humanity; this is culture. This has no end that we know of. As long as there's progress, it goes on indefinitely, and as

we may come and go, be born and die, we are a participant in a process which we can call creativity. And creativity was there before we were born, and will be there after we die. And we have, in a sense, immortality in time, by virtue of participating in this phenomenon called creativity.

And that's what the moral purpose is. And the moral purpose should dictate government. We want to produce people who are more powerful in terms of their development, who are maintaining the heritage of the people before them, the great ideas, so that when people die, what they have done does *not* die; it's embodied in what happens to society later. And what came before them did not die, either, because it is embodied in them. And you have a sense of a human interest as being the interest of mankind, who, on one side, is merely a mortal creature like an animal, who is born and dies. But the *role* of mankind in this process is not that of an animal. The role is a process of creativity from earlier generations to the future.

So, you live not as an animal; you live as a creative part of humanity. You live eternally in what you came out of. You live eternally in what comes out of you. You are really mankind, and you *are* mankind by being a creative process, by being a creative part of this process which is specific to mankind, as not to any form of beast. Be man, not beast, to be a participant in that great force of creativity which is unique to humanity, which began before you were born, and lives on as creativity after you die. And you have a permanent place in space time, in physical space time, in that creativity. And that's what you have to think about.

Looking Ahead 50 Years—to Mars!

Freeman: We have time for one more question, which comes from a friend of ours who generally thinks on a pretty high level, but who sometimes slips into pragmatism, and who I kind of beat up yesterday, so I thought that I'd ask his question.

He says: "You know, ultimately the United States is a large and powerful country. In fact, I would say that it is probably the most powerful financial entity in the world, and I think, given that, if we chose to, we could employ our work force in a useful way—if we chose to. The reason why I say this, is that I don't really believe that the major obstacles that we face are themselves economic. We do have major economic problems, but I believe that the economic crisis is solvable, if we wish to solve it. I think the more difficult question is really



NASA

“The Mars colonization program is something mankind has to do, practically. But, the fun is getting there! The morality is getting there, because this forces us to examine ourselves creatively, and to identify the obstacles to realizing that objective. And to facing the problems.” Shown: Curiosity rover low-angle self portrait from the Martian surface.

almost a moral question. It’s a question of what our overall objectives are, of where we want to be 30 years from now, 40 years from now, 50 years from now. And how we get there.

“Ultimately, while we do have to solve the immediate problem of unemployment, problems regarding our health care system, and other such issues, I think really, it’s only at the point that we can agree that it’s not a question of how we return to full employment in five years, but really how we solve the more fundamental problems that we face, in a way which gives us one to two generations of steady progress, and really, in that light, what I’d like to ask you, Lyn, because I think it would be useful for people who are trying to understand what it is you’re proposing and why you’re proposing it, is where you’d like to be 30, 40, or 50 years from now.”

LaRouche: *Me?* It may occur to some of you that I’m 87 years of age, and while I do have a certain vigorous view, a fairly long view of what humanity must be doing over the coming years, I don’t know how long I’m going to be in it. But I do enjoy the question very much.

Where should we be? First of all, we have to really—well, let me go back, put it the other way. Let’s take this question of the Mars colonization program. And as I

said earlier, the Mars colonization program is something mankind has to do, practically. But, the fun is getting there! The morality is getting there, because this forces us to examine ourselves creatively, and to identify the obstacles to realizing that objective. And to facing the problems.

I mean, can a human being ride in a craft which is being accelerated, as I’ve indicated, in a short trip—and maybe a short round-trip—between Earth orbit and Mars orbit, in a matter of days? Now, if I take that as a challenge, and say that we must mobilize the world economy to feature that mission as the principal objective around which we organize all the other things, then I think we’ll have met the moral challenge. Because we will have posed a problem and proposed getting a solution which would solve a great problem for mankind. What is the human race’s future in the universe?

That’s a pretty good goal. It’s a pretty general goal, and it subsumes a lot of other questions. But what’s most important is the state of mind it requires of you, is what’s most important. Because that impels you to adopt a state of mind, a creative state of mind, which exemplifies what a human being is. And it’s a concrete way of saying, “I’m a human being, 50 years from now, 100 years from now, I’m a human being. And even after I’m dead, I’ll be there, because I was part of this process.


People are in Rebellion Globally Against Collapsing Neo-Liberal Economic System

This is the edited transcript of the Schiller Institute's New Paradigm Webcast of November 3, 2019. A [video](#) is available.

Harley Schlanger: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger from the Schiller Institute. Welcome to our weekly webcast with our founder and chairman, Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Today is November 3, 2019.

We're in the midst of an insurgency that's moving to an—almost every day—to a higher level worldwide against the neo-liberal policies, the neo-conservative strategic policies, and shaking the roots of the British Empire and its satraps around the world. Helga, maybe we can start with some developments in the United States. You had a chance to watch some of the rally of President Trump in Tupelo, Mississippi. What's your impression of that?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: The British Empire allied forces are making a very high-risk game right now, because what they are doing can backfire bigtime. [Look](#) at this speech Trump gave in Tupelo, Mississippi. He was very feisty, very much in direct connection with the people. He blasted the whole conspiracy against him. He said the first phase was the so-called Russia-gate; out of that came absolutely nothing. Then came the Mueller investigation, which produced zero evidence of him having colluded with Russia. Now we are in the third phase, he said, the evidence-less effort to go for impeachment. This is a big scandal, and as my late husband Lyndon LaRouche had said when Trump had won the election in 2016,— he had correctly said at that time, this is not an internal development to the United States, but it has global implications and is part of this global, growing rebellion against the neo-liberal policies of the British Empire.



U.S. Attorney General William Barr.

C-SPAN

In a certain sense, what we see right now is the showdown between the forces of that British Empire that have pretty much captured the Democratic Party from the top, and the former intelligence apparatus of the Obama administration, in and out of office, is still at it. But, Attorney General Barr has declared this all to be a criminal investigation, creating a strong force in the opposite direction. The mood has shifted, and these people now have to watch—they may be caught being involved in something that will lead to them being charged with obstruction of justice or even caught in a conspiracy against the President of the United States.

So, this is hot. I can only urge you, our viewers, use your own intelligence; do not go by the media. Listen to what Trump is saying; form your own opinion. Because this battle in the United States right now is, in my best estimate, the unique, key factor that will determine in which direction this historical period will go. So, follow



Eric Ciaramella USA

Who is Eric Ciaramella? Alleged to be the Whistleblower; Bio, Wiki, Age, Education, Career, CIA, Political Affiliation

Eric Ciaramella - Alleged to be the Whistleblower

- 2 days ago

0 4 minutes read



Who is Eric Ciaramella? Alleged to be the Whistleblower; Bio, Wiki, Age, Education, Career, CIA, Political Affiliation

our revelations and read our materials. The best thing is to subscribe to our newsletters; get in touch with us. This is a battle that will determine the future of civilization.

The Fake Whistleblower

Schlanger: We have repeatedly emphasized that this is a coup, not an impeachment. The fact that the Democratic Party is almost universally supporting it doesn't make it less of a coup. The Democrats are now a regime-change party trying to change the regime in the United States. The vote in the House was 232 to 196, with all but 2 Democrats voting for the impeachment, in spite of the fact that there's nothing that has been brought forward on Ukraine.

Helga, we've seen some very interesting things coming out on the role of the so-called whistleblower, who is alleged to be Eric Ciaramella; you may have some things to say on that. And also, importantly, former CIA analyst Larry Johnson spoke about it in his presentation on October 31 in the LaRouche Fireside Chat [published in this issue of *EIR*]. This is looking just like an extension of the coup in 2014 in Ukraine, isn't it?

Zepp-LaRouche: Yes. There is a very interesting

article by an investigative journalist, Paul Sperry, in *Real Clear Investigations*. He has a very interesting article there, in which he says that, while officially the identity of this whistleblower who supposedly triggered the whole impeachment drive against Trump is not known, because the Democrats are frantically trying to somehow hide the identity of this person—everybody inside the Beltway knows who he is.

Sperry reports that because so much is at stake with the impeachment, he reveals this name, and it is a guy—Eric Ciaramella—who is 33 years old, who used to be a CIA analyst, and then was deployed for a short period of time into the White House, and now he is working for the CIA at Langley, CIA headquarters. The specific background of this person Ciaramella is that he used to work for Joe Biden and Susan Rice in the critical period of the coup against the Ukrainian government, the Maidan coup. His expertise is the Ukraine. He speaks I think Ukrainian and some other languages, but he was sort of working for Biden who was the point person of Obama for the Ukraine during this period of 2013, -14, -15, and -16. Therefore, what is really at stake here is the entire policy of the containment against Russia.

This was an elaborate operation that started in November 2013, when the EU tried to lure the Ukrainian government into the EU association agreement, but President Yanukovich in the very last moment jumped out of it. He realized that this was an untenable situation because it would have opened the Russian markets for EU goods and flooded the Russian economy with goods that they could not compete against. It would have opened the gateway for NATO access to the Black Sea.

Ukraine in 2013

So in any case, as people remember, in November 2013, Yanukovich opted out, and that immediately led to the demonstrations in the Maidan. And in a few days, these demonstrations were basically taken over by successors of the Bandera organization, meaning real Nazis. These Banderists were then heavily involved in the coup of February 2014. This was when the famous incident occurred, in which Victoria Nuland of the State Department was talking to Geoffrey Pyatt—U.S. ambassador to Ukraine at that time—about getting “Yats,” Arseniy Yatsenyuk in as Prime Minister of Ukraine. So, this was all the story as to why Joe Biden's son was put



C-SPAN2
Former U.S. Career Ambassador, Victoria Nuland.



Former Prime Minister of Ukraine, Arseniy Yatsenyuk.

on the board of the Burisma oil and gas company, and he got a very high salary for having really no specific expertise. The Burisma case, which Trump asked Ukrainian President Zelensky to look into, was about why the prosecutor general who looked into corruption in Burisma was fired.

Trump made this request in a phone discussion with President Zelensky in July. This was then construed by the Democrats as blackmail, that Trump had threatened to withhold military aid to the Ukraine; that this was a quid pro quo, and this is the reason why Trump should be impeached. There is absolutely nothing to it. There are some statements from the present U.S. ambassador in Kiev, who claims that Trump said something different than he did. But Trump, in an [interview](#) with the *Washington Examiner* on October 31, suggested that he would go on national TV and read the transcript of that phone discussion with President Zelensky. So, there are other witnesses who say that there was absolutely nothing illegal in the discussion between Trump and Zelensky. Zelensky himself absolutely denies that there was any quid pro quo.

The whole story is so unbelievably blown up, but there is no substance. Because as this transcript will prove, Trump was just carrying out foreign policy, what every President should do. Therefore, the blowback potential of this whole story is enormous.

The Irony is Powerful

Schlanger: I just want to highlight two points, and there are so many points. I would urge people to go to the [larouchepac.com](#) site to look at our new report from


Barbara Boyd called "[Ukraine-gate: The Coup Against President Donald Trump—Phase Three.](#)" But Ciaramella was assigned to the White House by the CIA Director, John Brennan, who of course is under enormous pressure from the Barr-Durham investigation. The other thing I think is important is that at the hearings called by Rep. Adam Schiff, the Republicans still have not had access to the documentation that's being churned out by Schiff and his people, including a lot of dishonest and lying transcripts. They haven't been able to cross-examine, but many of the people from the State

Department and intelligence who were testifying, who are making up these stories about Trump's call, were part of the Ukraine coup in 2014.

Some of this was brought out by Larry Johnson in a discussion with our supporters the other day. What did you find about Johnson's revelations that was most significant?

Zepp-LaRouche: Well, I really like the way he opened his discussion, because he said that he likes irony; and the irony is that we, meaning the LaRouche movement, have always been accused of being conspiracy theorists. But now we are in the middle of proving the biggest conspiracy in history ever. So, I think the most interesting point that he made otherwise is that there was a sudden reversal. The intelligence bureaucracy had tried to prevent the report of Horowitz—Horowitz is the Inspector General of the Department of Justice who had been preparing over a long period of time a report looking into the wrongdoings around the lies to the FISA (Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act) court. This is the court that can, in secrecy, order taping of people and so forth.

The intelligence community tried to prevent that report from coming out for about two months after it was ready because apparently, according to Johnson, this material will be very damaging for such people as former CIA Director Brennan, former FBI Director Comey, former FBI Deputy Director McCabe, and various other people. When it became clear that Attorney General Barr has declared a criminal investigation into all of these maneuvers, they completely switched their



CIA

Former CIA Director, John Brennan.

behavior, because they didn't want to be caught in something that would turn out to be an obstruction of justice or an actual conspiracy. He referred to the very interesting case of Sidney Powell, General Michael Flynn's lawyer, who had produced the evidence that there was direct interference by David Ignatius of the *Washington Post*, with his January 12, 2017 article that created the environment for General Flynn to be indicted.

When the Prosecutors are Criminal

Larry Johnson reports that Flynn pleaded guilty at a certain point; he was running up enormous legal costs, and the prosecutors were threatening to go after his son. He agreed to a plea bargain—the prosecutors in essence saying, “Well, he's already guilty, so there is nothing we can do, even if it was a Brady violation.” A Brady violation occurs when the government has exculpatory evidence that it does not reveal to the defendant, in this case, Flynn. This is really a big story. Remember that General Flynn was the one who had spilled the beans early on, on the whole U.S. intelligence support for the jihadis, al-Qaeda, ISIS, and so forth. So, this is all now unraveling. You don't have to like President Trump—and I know many people here in Germany absolutely don't; but it is really an amazing fact that this man has the courage to stand up against these people who are in an open revolt.

The Democrats have gone completely crazy. It is quite an amazing fact that Nancy Pelosi and people who should know better, they can never win the election in 2020 by going only for the impeachment against Trump. And if all of this comes out any time before 2020, and it

is more likely than not that it will, this will lead to an earthquake in the United States and worldwide as the world probably has never seen it.

Schlanger: There are two other developments I'd like you to comment on that show that the characterization of Trump as inept or bullying or incompetent are completely wrong. One is developments in Syria, where there is now a constitutional process underway from a meeting in Geneva. The other is the breakthrough on the U.S.-China trade talks. What can you tell us about that?

The U.S. and China

Zepp-LaRouche: To start with the latter, I think this is promising because both sides, the Chinese and Trump, said that the first phase of this deal looks very good, and that Xi Jinping agreed to come to the United States to sign that agreement. He may very well come to Iowa, because part of the deal is a very large export of agriculture goods from Iowa and other farm states. So, I think that could be a very important rekindling of the good relationship between Trump and Xi Jinping that they had at the beginning.

Indirectly related, is the fact that there is now significant progress in Syria, despite some things that need to be straightened out such as the oil question. In general, the Syrian process is moving forward in a good way. The Constitutional Council started to meet in Geneva with the aim to soon have a new constitution, a new election, and then have the Syrian people elect a new government. At the same time, there is in the background a rapprochement and cooperation on that matter between the United States and Russia, and implicitly also with China, which has agreed to help in the reconstruction of Syria. So I would really appeal to you, our viewers and listeners, that you rethink all of these questions.

What is the most important to maintain world peace? It is the collaboration between the United States, Russia, China, and the other countries that could be in collaboration with these larger nations. I think that this is an historic moment that is extremely dangerous—there is no question about it that it's totally dangerous; but on the other side, I think it has an enormous potential to lead to a completely new epoch in the history of civilization. So, all the more reason to be active with us and be optimistic.

Schlanger: Then, you've emphasized for a long

time, it's this attack on geopolitics, the doctrine that the British have used for these never-ending wars and never-ending austerity that we hear that Trump is breaking with, that is behind what is the attempt to get rid of him. We also have the other factor—the ongoing financial collapse. There is a lot to report on that is coming out. Why don't you just go through, as you have, Helga, because it's becoming more and more apparent that something is going to happen soon. And it better be steps to counteract this hyper-bailout policy.

Europe and the Bank of England

Zepp-LaRouche: Now Mario Draghi is out as the head of the European Central Bank; that may not be so good for the Italian people, because there is a big push to make him President of Italy, which may not function, but the push is there. But unfortunately, he is being replaced by Christine Lagarde, who is determined to continue his policy of quantitative easing, of asset buying through the ECB (European Central Bank). There is a big push also in some financial media, picking up on the proposal that was originally made by Blackhawk to the annual conference in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, where they proposed that there should just be “helicopter money” given to the consumers directly so that they would buy and then get the economy going.

That is an insane proposal, because while the negative interest rates and zero interest rates are already eating up the pensions and the savings of the people; because the inflation rate is higher than the



European Parliament

Mario Draghi



European Commission

Christine Lagarde



Economic Club of New York

Mark Carney

interest rate they don't get from their savings. But if you would have “helicopter money,” you would enter exactly what happened in 1923 in Germany—a hyperinflation that would completely destroy the income of the general population. This is an insane push, and now Lagarde attacked Germany and Holland that they are not doing enough.

But I think it is the experience of 1923 that sits in the bones of the German people.

Every family recounted that, and even if you didn't experience it yourself, you have heard stories; you have seen the money of 1923—the Reichsmark—being completely worthless in the end. Jens Weidmann, who is the President of the Bundesbank, at a recent conference of the Bundesbank at the end of October, said he agrees that part of the tasks of the central bank is to estimate the risk factors and included in that is the “risk” of climate change. That, he said, he opposes the idea that central banks should direct money into Green financing. He mentioned Bank of England head Mark Carney several times as the person who presented this idea of the regime change at the Jackson Hole conference, where Carney said that from now on the central banks should make the monetary policy, and not the governments.

I find it very important that Weidmann is opposing this, saying that the central banks do not have the democratic legitimacy to do that, but that it is the task of the politicians to make such decisions. That's not yet the great policy shift that is needed, but at least somebody is there making the argument that if the central banks take over—

and remember that Mark Carney also had the idea of replacing the dollar with a global synthetic cyber currency; that would be a world dictatorship of Green finance. Jens Weidmann is opposing that, which is important. As I said, it's a stop-gap; it's not the solution. At least there is somebody who has not gone completely crazy, and is defending the need for a stable monetary policy, or rather blocking the kind of hyperinflation that Lagarde is pushing.

The Revolt Breaks Out

Schlanger: We're also seeing this as part of the global upsurge against neo-liberalism. Farmers on the march in Germany. We just saw another vote in Thuringia in Germany where the leading political parties were smashed. What's your sense of the mood there? Is Weidmann reflecting something, or is he in front of something?

Zepp-LaRouche: I think there is a growing awareness that this thing is not functioning. I have here some figures that I want to read. There is a Forsa poll that says that 80% of the German population today think that there have been too many privatizations leading to negative consequences for pensions and the health sector. 87% of the people in Germany think the income gap is becoming a problem for the cohesion of society; meaning the rich are getting too rich, and more people are getting poor. 62% believe that the top rich echelons have their rights undeserved. 81% think that they may fall into poverty. 83% think there is a risk of social decline for them in the next several years. So, that is really I think a symptom.

You mentioned the German farmers, who are now organizing themselves outside of the German Farmers



Farmers come to town

More than 1,000 tractors descended on former capital Bonn, home of many ministries including the

Association, because they don't see any longer that they are represented by that institution; it's thoroughly discredited for many decades as a matter of fact. But they are now recruiting 1000 farmers a day; they organized 100,000 farmers in three weeks. And they are planning a major big demonstration towards the end of this month. I think there is for the first time some real serious social ferment breaking out in Germany of all places, which has been the least willing to wake up to what the situation is.

Another symptom is the vote in Thuringia. The Linkspartei (Left Party) won 3%; the AfD (Alternative for Germany) doubled its vote, while the parties of the grand coalition all collapsed. The SPD is down to 8%; that's almost a free-fall. The attempt by the CDU to block a CDU-Left combination, which is the only one that would work. No one wants to make a coalition with the AfD. We are very close to un-governability in Thuringia. That is probably just a fore-

boding of things to come. The situation in Germany is just one of many. You have a global mass strike process. In Chile, despite total police brutality, people are still out in the street *en masse*. President Piñera had to cancel both the APEC summit—which has not been rescheduled—and the COP25 summit, which is now supposed to take place in Madrid, leaving Greta Thunberg stranded without a boat



CC/G20 Argentina

Sebastián Piñera, President of Chile.

to travel there, at least so far.

Then you have mass demonstrations. Argentina is completely hot, with the new government of Alberto Fernández and Christina Kirchner that looks better. But it's a very hot situation because the Argentine economy, as a result of the IMF policies, is in a completely terrible condition. Demonstrations in other places—Bo-

livia, Haiti. Haiti is completely collapsing. Iraq, Pakistan, other countries are in a similar condition. So, I think what we see is a global disintegration of the system, and that is not even with the coming collapse of the financial system. So, the time to go for the reforms we have been proposing for many years, the ideas of Lyndon LaRouche that must be put on the table because there is simply no other solution that would guarantee the survival of civilization.

Defeating Empire

Schlanger: Helga, I did a radio show this last week on a station in Iowa, and the host was asking about our coverage of the coup, why we say the British Empire rather than simply the Deep State. I went through Lyn's economic solutions. At a certain point, she said, "Wow! I wish I would have known about LaRouche all these years. This makes so much sense." I think it would be good, as we've just been reviewing the collapse of this system, for you to restate both the policies of your husband, but also the prospects for these being implemented.

Zepp-LaRouche: My husband many years ago, said that the only combination of countries powerful enough to oppose this British Empire—and remember, when he said British Empire, he said he didn't mean the British subjects, the British people living under the monarchy; he meant the British Empire—this new central system of central banks, of investment banks, of reinsurance companies, of hedge funds. That system that has been favoring the high-risk speculation for the advantage of a few at the expense of the many. What he said at the time was, you need four large nation-states to be powerful enough to cause a change of the system.

We need collaboration between the United States, Russia, China, and India. Not to the exclusion of other countries, but simply these four countries—if they would work together—are representative enough also of the developing sector that they could really speak for the world community and act for the world community. What it would require is the immediate implementation of a global Glass-Steagall law; the separation of the banks, the protection of the commercial banks; leaving the investment banks on their own. If they are bankrupt they would close down; if not, then one can think what they can do in a different environment. But most of them are bankrupt and they should just close down.

There is a lack of liquidity, so we need to immediately go to a credit system as it was defined by Alexan-

der Hamilton. We need a national bank in every country, and these national banks have to cooperate in a new credit system; a New Bretton Woods system that would make sure you have cheap, long-term credit for investment in the real economy and infrastructure. The good thing is that this is no longer merely a programmatic idea. With the Belt and Road Initiative, 157 countries and many international organizations are already cooperating on principles going in this direction.

U.S., China, Russia and India

The missing link in all of this is the United States. That is why the relationship between Trump and Xi Jinping is so crucial. Unless the two largest economies work together, there is no way we can get out of this crisis. And for strategic reasons, Russia must be in this combination. The inclusion of India is really not very difficult, given the present policies of the Modi government and China and Russia.

So, I think this is very close. We can have that, and I think part of the raging fury against Trump and the insane escalation by the crazy Democrats, as Trump called them, is because they don't want a person in the White House who could, under circumstances of crisis, actually go in this direction and implement such a policy. That is the real background. If you don't understand that, you are missing the whole point of what this strategic battle is all about.

Rather than looking at this as a passive observer, or some pessimist saying, "Oh, you can't do anything anyway," get active with us. This is a moment in history in which your help is required. We have a lot of things we are doing. We are an international organization; we have many activities you can join in every country. You can contact us and help to spread the webcast; sign up for our newsletter. Get active; there are many activities we can do together to change the course of history in a better direction. It's a moment that Friedrich Schiller would call a "pregnant moment," and you should not miss it.

Schlanger: Well, you took the words right out of my mouth. I was going to encourage people to make sure they circulate this webcast; get people to go to larouchepac.com; and make sure we win this fight. Because we don't want to have another lost opportunity. We may not have another chance.

So Helga, thanks for joining us this week. And we'll see you next week.

Zepp-LaRouche: Yes, 'til next week.

II. An Alliance of Sovereign Nations

LOOKING AT CHINA

The Secret of China's Success Model

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

The following is the Introduction to the upcoming EIR pamphlet with the proposed title, "End the McCarthyite Witch Hunt Against China and President Trump."

Oct. 30—Rather than seeing the rise of China as a threat, we in the West should acknowledge the enormous benefits for mankind flowing from the unprecedented economic miracle that China has achieved in the past 40 years. Unfortunately, most people in the United States and Europe know very little about China and its 5,000-year-old culture, which makes it relatively easy for the geopolitically motivated mainstream media and exponents of the anti-China lobby to paint a completely distorted picture of the country.

In fact, China has opened a new, totally inspiring chapter of universal history, by setting an irrefutable example, for all other developing countries, of a way to overcome poverty in a relatively short period of time and achieve a good standard of living for a growing segment of its population. Over the past 40 years, China has implemented the most massive anti-poverty program in human history, lifting 850 million of its own citizens out of poverty,



EIRNS/Pat Holzer
Helga Zepp-LaRouche addresses the 2019 Euro-Asia Economic Forum Think-Tank Meeting in Xi'an, China on September 11, 2019.

and contributing 70% of the total global poverty alleviation efforts. Its average economic growth from 1978 to 2018 was an impressive 9.5% per year, and even the decline this year to only 6% growth, due to various factors, still represents a level that European nations and the United States can only dream of.

According to World Bank statistics, China has been the second largest economy in the world, in terms of GDP, since 2018, but number one in terms

of per capita purchasing power. Since 2015, China has had the largest middle class in the world, and President Xi Jinping has personally committed himself to freeing



Students are seen at a job fair for graduates at a university in Shenyang, Liaoning province, China, March 21, 2019.

VOA

the approximately 4 million people still living in extreme poverty in China from that plight by the end of 2020. Neither Europe, with some 90 million people living in poverty, nor the United States, where 40 million are considered poor, has a comparable program.

It is hard to imagine how poor and underdeveloped China once was before its tremendous transformation when, in today's China, you can travel on one of the lines of China's 30,000 km of high-speed railways, serviced by trains running punctually and quietly over the countryside at 350 kph; see the modern, well-organized stations with clean marble floors; or perhaps visit the Shenzhen-Guangzhou-Macao region, the economic engine of the Belt and Road Initiative. But before Deng Xiaoping introduced the reform and opening up policy, people were very poor, often without enough to eat, and technologically backward. The streets were filled with hundreds of bicycles. Even the roads linking many cities were essentially dirt tracks, automobiles were a scarcity, and farming was not mechanized.

The Chinese people had lived through more than a century of enormous hardships and privations, from the British Opium Wars and territorial occupations to civil war, from the enormous initial economic difficulties of the People's Republic of China (PRC) to the horrors of the domination by the Gang of Four during the Cultural Revolution.

Two Generations of Economic Miracles

Deng Xiaoping launched an economic miracle with his reforms following the Cultural Revolution, which allowed the entire population, including the two generations born since then, to experience a continuous upswing, with expanding sections of society experiencing higher living standards. A comparable upward trend took place in Germany during the post-war reconstruction, at the time of the German economic miracle in the 1950s and 1960s. But then it ended due to a series of factors, such as the emergence of the anti-technology Green movement. The opposite direction was taken, toward the deindustrialization that threatens Germany today. In China, on the contrary, the improved living standards, the social progress, and the

growing respect for the country, in particular among the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Ibero-America, have generated a fundamental cultural optimism, such as that which was characteristic of the United States of America from the time of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal to the assassination of John F. Kennedy, and then continuing until the demise of the Apollo program.

During this time, China faced a series of problems. Deng Xiaoping describes how, in the early stages of his reforms, the world was still dominated by the notion of colonial rulers who attempted to suppress the develop-



CC/MNXANL

A Fuxing high-speed train, Model CR400BF, arriving in Shanghai.

ment of China and other developing countries. Thus, China initially accepted foreign investment in areas of cheap production in the coastal special economic zones, which brought at least some capital into the country. China was in a certain sense the main target of the increasing deregulation and monetization of the transatlantic economic system, which outsourced the productive capacities formerly located in the U.S. and Western Europe to China and other developing countries. This was motivated by the greed for profit of the City of London, Wall Street, and companies like Walmart, Kmart, and Target. The price that China had to pay was in the form of enormous environmental problems, such as contaminated groundwater and polluted air, which the government has now invested great effort in trying to remedy.

At the same time, Deng sought to gain access to



NASA

Deng Xiaoping, then Vice Premier of China's State Council, and his wife, Zhuo Lin, getting a briefing on NASA's manned space program from Dr. Christopher C. Kraft, Director of the Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas in 1979.

international capital and advanced technologies from abroad, by ensuring that scientists were invited in and students were sent to study in other countries. But given the attitude in the West, which consistently denied really advanced technologies with the “dual use” argument, as well as the increasingly hostile attitude of the Soviet Union since the era of Khrushchev, Deng emphasized the necessity for China to rely primarily on its own forces. That is something that very few in the West understand: the Chinese population’s tremendous will to develop, and the virtues which used to characterize Germany—diligence, reliability, a sense of motivation, efficiency, and creativity—without which China would never have been able to accomplish this economic miracle, which is unprecedented in history because of its scope and vision.


Various think tanks, mainstream media, and politicians try to blacken China’s image, by claiming that its success is due to the theft of Western intellectual property alone. It cannot be ruled out, of course, that in a population now reaching 1.4 billion people, there has been in-

dustrial espionage, just as is the case for every industrial nation in the world. The American government itself often encouraged such piracy. In his 1791 “Report on Manufactures,” Alexander Hamilton called on the country to reward those who brought “improvements and secrets of extraordinary value” from elsewhere. Because he knew that the export of machines in most nations was prohibited subject to severe penalties, he obviously considered state-sponsored smuggling of technologies to be a legitimate means to build the American economy.

Chinese Innovation of Several Millennia

But how is it that China has become the world leader in certain areas—for example, that it has built the best and biggest high-speed railway system in the world, now reaching 30,000 km, or that it is the only country to have landed on the far side of the Moon? Who could they have copied that from?

Another angle of attack against China is the accusation that the Social Credit System is proof that China has become a total surveillance state, as if Edward Snowden had never existed. Representatives of the intelligence apparatus and the media who level this accusation are obviously projecting onto China their knowledge of the surveillance apparatus in the



CNSA

China's Yutu-2 Rover rolling onto the Moon's far side shortly after its touchdown on January 2, 2019.

West. While the use of artificial intelligence—including facial recognition and digitization of many areas of life—is more advanced there than in the United States and Europe, such claims overlook the fact that China has a very different social system, namely a meritocracy that developed over more than two millennia out of the imperial examination system since the Han Dynasty (206 BC-220 AD), based on the Confucian tradition.

One of the most essential differences between the culture of not only China but all of Asia, and that of the West, is the priority placed for thousands of years on the common good of society over the unrestrained rights of the individual. Behind this is the conviction that the individual and the family can only do well if the state as a whole is doing well. The outstanding importance of individuality, as it developed positively from the Renaissance and European humanism, but negatively from the ideology of extreme liberalism (“anything goes”), is much less important in China. This historical cultural difference, deeply rooted in the Asian tradition, is the primary reason why the idea that China would automatically adopt the system of Western democracy after joining the World Trade Organization (WTO) was an illusion from the outset.

By the same token, most Chinese people view the Social Credit System positively, because it is in line with their conviction that those who contribute to the common good should be rewarded, and those who create a drunken ruckus in the train should be refused a ticket the next time. This view is completely contrary to the liberal *zeitgeist* that reigns here in Europe and in the United States, in which the legalization of drugs, pornography, and sexual perversity is viewed as a matter of “human rights.” Those who regard the Chinese system as the great challenge to the Western “system of values” should rest assured: Thanks to the green ideology in some countries, and the decadent entertainment culture and declining life expectancy in others, the West has done a very good job undermining

itself and its own values all on its own!

The anti-China propaganda is in no way something new; it comes from the resentment consciously stoked by the European colonial powers. The pejorative expression, “the yellow peril,” appeared at the turn of the 20th Century in all sorts of books, short stories, sketches, and caricatures. It insidiously stoked fears about Asian peoples, because the geopoliticians of the British Empire feared that their power in the world could be broken by the development of Eastern Asia. The same type of thinking is displayed by Samuel Huntington in his *Clash of Civilizations*, a book soaked in ignorance, or more recently by the former Director of Policy Planning at the State Department, Kiron Skinner, who came out with the racist statement that the United States is confronted for the first time with a competing superpower which is not “Caucasian.”



Samuel P. Huntington

The True History of Modern China

Over recent years, more and more people in the United States and Europe have developed a healthy mistrust of the mainstream media and the “fake news” they spread. It would be advisable to exercise the same wariness regarding the coverage of China and to form one’s own opinion. In that respect, it is recommended to read Xi Jinping’s speeches that have been translated into many languages, and which have been published in two volumes titled *The Governance of China*. They give the reader an impression of the philosophical depth and breadth of the Chinese president’s political spectrum, and his knowledge of Chinese history and of foreign cultures. It also becomes clear that he is interested in the regeneration of China, not at the expense of other nations, but that he is seeking a truly new paradigm of coexistence, namely a “shared community of the common destiny of mankind.”

If one considers Xi Jinping from the standpoint of the morality of Benjamin Franklin, of the other founding fathers of the United States, or of European humanism, one finds his policy orientation commend-



UN/Loey Felipe

Xi Jinping, President of China, addressing the UN General Assembly in 2015.

able; but considered from the standpoint of Hobbes, Locke, or the Rolling Stones, one only sees the suppression of the individual right to do whatever one wants to do. In the West, it is not usual for political leaders to care about the moral and cultural education of the population. But this is exactly what Xi Jinping does, when for example he promotes a renaissance of Confucianism on all levels of society.

In a dialogue with professors of the Chinese Academy of Fine Arts, Xi stressed the extraordinary importance of aesthetic education for the youth of China, because it is the precondition for the development of a beautiful mind and the creation of new great works of art. He emphasizes the role of literature and the fine arts in sensitizing people to “the true, the beautiful, and the good,” and enabling them to reject what is “false, evil, and ugly.” Without this moral and aesthetic education, he said, even those who are otherwise strong could end up on the side of bad habits or vice.

That, of course, goes completely against the *zeitgeist* in the United States and Europe. Instead of presenting China as a great threat, which it is not, we should rather ask whether this Confucian orientation to the moral improvement of society has something to do

with the extraordinary success of the Chinese model. No one should argue that everything is perfect in China, or that the West should adopt this model, but in order to judge the quality of a society, one needs to look at the direction development has taken. And for the past four decades, it has been upwards in China. As a result, the majority of the population is optimistic about the future.

If one has been freed of prejudice and ignorance about China, and becomes curious to get to know China and to understand its culture, one is very likely to arrive at the same viewpoint as the great German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, who recognized the enormous potential of cooperation with this culture, so that if the most developed cultures of the time, Europe and China, joined hands, they could raise all the nations in between to a higher level.

The same applies emphatically today to the United States and China: If the two largest economies in the world work together to overcome poverty in the world, and to develop new advanced technologies such as nuclear fusion and cooperation in space, then all of mankind will benefit from it throughout the future.



China has a very different social system, a meritocracy developed over more than two millenia, based on the Confucian tradition. Shown, statue of Confucius at Confucian Temple in Shanghai, China.

INTERNATIONAL ASTRONAUTICAL CONGRESS

Will Space Cooperation be Sacrificed to Geopolitics?

by William Jones and Marsha Freeman

Oct. 27—The 2019 International Astronautical Congress (IAC) was held this year in Washington, D.C. from October 20 through October 25, the first time in 26 years that it has been held in the U.S. Capital. The Congress was originally organized by the International Astronautical Federation (IAF), an association founded in 1951 by a number of space scientists including Wernher von Braun, Eugen Sänger, and others, in order to establish a dialogue among scientists around the world and to lay the basis for international space cooperation, including between representatives from both East and West during the period of the Cold War, when other cooperation was non-existent. The co-organizers of the IAC today are the International Academy of Astronautics and the International Institute for Space Law.

Every year the IAC gathers members of the global space community to give them an opportunity to present their latest research and to keep each abreast of what is happening in other areas of space research. Each year the Congress is held in a different country. The return of the IAC to Washington coincided, not by chance, with the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Apollo Moon landing, as well as with the announcement that the United States will be returning to the Moon.

A great deal of excitement was generated among the 5,000 people attending this year's Congress.

NASA, which during the Obama Administration had only a small representation in the giant exhibit hall where countries and companies can show their wares, was front and center this year. NASA Admin-



EIRNS/Bill Jones

Vice President Mike Pence addressing the 2019 International Astronautical Congress in Washington, D.C.

istrator Jim Bridenstine, one of the most enthusiastic of the participants, was to be seen everywhere, holding press conferences and participating in panels.

Pence Strikes a Strident Note

And yet a distinct note of dissonance was introduced into the general enthusiasm of the gathering by the Vice President of the United States, Mike Pence, the head of the White House National Space Council. After giving a short run-down of the U.S. plans for space, Pence then adopted a more strident, ideological tone. He quoted President Trump, who had simply stated, "It is America's destiny ... to be the leader amongst nations on our adventure into the great unknown." Pence, however, added his own particular twist to the Presi-



NASA/Bill Ingalls

Vice President Mike Pence during the IAC opening ceremony.

dent's straightforward formulation:

But to be clear, our vision is to be the leader *amongst freedom-loving nations* on the adventure into the great unknown.... The United States of America will always be willing to work closely with like-minded freedom-loving nations, as we lead mankind into the final frontier.

As more nations gain the ability to explore space and develop places beyond Earth's atmosphere, we must also ensure—we must also ensure that we carry into space our shared commitment for freedom and the rule of law and private property.

But space law remains an area still to be developed, as nations begin to plant colonies on the Moon, which nobody owns.

Pence's definition of "freedom-loving nations" undoubtedly excludes China, although he didn't name China specifically. Perhaps other unnamed countries also don't meet his criterion of "freedom-loving."

China's Absence Raises Questions

Following Pence's remarks, the Congress held its Heads of Agencies panel in which the leaders of the major space agencies—the U.S., the European Space Agency, Russia, Japan, China, and India—present their plans for the future. And, lo and behold, there were no Chinese representatives present! Following Pence's speech, this raised questions from the audience, questions that were asked on a publicly viewed app displayed on a large screen directly behind the panel.

While the absence of China was carefully avoided in the panelists' presentations, it could hardly be avoided during the Q&A. The moderator said that the Chinese were absent due to a "scheduling conflict"—which few believed.

The general suspicion was that the State Department had either refused to issue visas or had delayed so long that it was impossible for them to get here in time. Chinese delegates to the 2002 IAC in Houston had been stopped at the Canadian border on their way to the conference.


Representatives of the International Astronautical Federation insisted that they had worked early and hard to get the Chinese to the conference. But while some of the Chinese delegation did finally arrive by the third day of the conference, the head of the delegation, Wu Jianhua, did not receive a visa. The Chinese Foreign Ministry issued a protest at the "weaponizing" of the visa process.

NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine was defensive when asked about the Pence statements and China's absence. When *EIR*'s Washington Bureau Chief, Bill Jones, asked him about the strident nature of Pence's comments at a press conference following the Heads of Agencies panel, and whether the Vice President was perhaps looking for tougher restrictions on U.S.-China space cooperation than those already placed on human space cooperation by the controversial Wolf Amendment, Bridenstine simply referenced the Wolf



EIRNS/Bill Jones

NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine discussing the challenges and opportunities in space explorations at the IAC.



NASA/Joel Kowsky

Apollo 11 astronaut Buzz Aldrin delivers remarks during the International Astronautical Federation World Space Award ceremony at the IAC.

Amendment as the only restriction on U.S. cooperation with China in space.

Bridenstine was buttonholed by a group of journalists after the press conference and asked by a reporter from China Radio International why the Chinese delegates were not at the Congress. Bridenstine said he was as surprised as everyone else by their absence. “I came to the Congress expecting to see them here,” he said. Bridenstine added that he would have gladly intervened at the State Department if he had thought there was a problem with their getting visas. But on whether there had been any hold-up for political or other reasons, he simply noted that it was “above my paygrade.”

EIR was told by a manager at Russia’s Energia Space and Rocket Corp. that the Russian space agency Roscosmos and Energia were told by the Russian government that they should not send their highest-level representation, after a female Russian Duma member had been stopped and interrogated at an airport for several hours by the FBI.

But both the American hosts and their Russian counterparts were intent on conducting a successful Congress. The IAC retrospective session on Apollo was an important antidote to the cited remarks of the Vice President. Buzz Aldrin was the only Apollo 11 astronaut at the conference, but Neil Armstrong’s son was present, representing his father, as was Michael Collins’ grandson. An IAC joint award was bestowed on Aldrin, Armstrong and Collins for the success of the Apollo mission.

In his own comments both before and at the end of the Congress, Aldrin refuted the chauvinist views of the Vice President, calling for a “grand alliance” of the space-faring nations—the United States, Russia, China,

Europe’s ESA, Japan, and India—to return to the Moon and go beyond. Aldrin clearly spoke for the outlook of President John Kennedy and the Apollo generation of astronauts, and received great acclaim from the audience.

Space and the Developing World

The inclusiveness of the IAF was evident in a panel of the Heads of Agencies of the Emerging Countries, including South Africa, Angola, Brazil, Thailand, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). The UAE is “going like gangbusters” on space with its own astronaut program, and will be the host of next year’s IAC—the first time a Congress is to be held in an Arab country. The UAE has also set up a space university.

The representative from Angola said that his country would be participating in an upcoming space summit in Portugal and is working to find less expensive ways of building small satellites, which are also used for distance education in that vast country.¹

Valanathan Munsami, the CEO of the South African National Space Agency (SANSA), reported that South Africa was looking fifty years ahead in developing its program. SANSA is also working hard to develop an African Space Agency, and is working with 24 other African countries, eight of which are already involved in space in some way. The objective now, Munsami said, is to get the other African countries involved as well.

Carlos Augusto Teixeira de Moura, president of the Brazilian Space Agency, said that while there is space cooperation on a multilateral level, for instance, in BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa), yet because of the difference in development between the five countries, and due to political difficulties, it is sometimes much easier to work on a bilateral basis. He reported that Brazil already has a cooperative program with Argentina to study the oceans.

Fostering the ‘Artemis Generation’

As noted, Administrator Bridenstine was highly active at the Congress, making public appearances on every possible occasion when he was not at meetings with other space officials. At an open press conference in the exhibition hall, Bridenstine fielded questions from younger members of the “Artemis generation.” One eight-year-old boy asked when children could start flying in space. An amused Bridenstine said that this

1. For a [discussion](#) of Angola’s CanSat program, see “LaRouche’s Ideas Presented to Conference in Ivory Coast and Angola,” *EIR* Vol. 46, No. 26, July 5, 2019, pages 14-16.

will eventually occur, and that even entire families will be able to go into space. A seven-year-old girl, perhaps with astronaut ambitions, wanted to know whether NASA had chosen the woman who would be going to the Moon. A smiling Administrator said that the decision was still to come.

Bridenstine was asked if he were not concerned about getting the required funding from Congress. He said that he would work with whatever means he is given to reach the goal of returning to the Moon. He was also asked if the Trump impeachment fervor in the Congress would affect the funding, to which he responded:

I don't know, but our task will span generations and is not a partisan issue. I saw 500,000 people on the Mall celebrating Apollo, and they were happy people! ... My job is singular. I want a program that will make Americans proud.

In reply to another question, he returned to this issue. "We are getting strong support from the American people and our international partners. We are going to the Moon. This is our job, and this is our time."

One reporter asked, perhaps with China in mind, "Will we cooperate with other nations landing on the Moon?" Bridenstine answered that the United States is committed to cooperation. "The goal is to have many countries living together on the Moon."

Despite the uncertainty of the level of funding that the Congress will appropriate in this year's budget for the return to the Moon, NASA is moving ahead with the Artemis program.

This month, the companies that were selected last May to conduct studies on designs for landing systems will submit their designs and/or prototypes of human lunar landers. These public/private partnerships are expected to save time and money in providing the capability for the most complex activity of the lunar mission.

And on October 25, coincidentally the final day of the IAC, NASA announced it will be sending a rover to the South Pole of the Moon—a region unexplored by the U.S., and the target for the 2024 landing. When President Obama cancelled the manned lunar return of the Constellation program, the robotic precursor science missions were also cancelled. Some of these must now be reinstated before sending crew.

The VIPER (Volatiles Investigation Polar Exploration Rover), which is planned to be delivered to the lunar surface in 2022, will create a detailed map of the water ice at the South Pole. During its 100-day mis-



EIRNS/Bill Jones

NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine updating IAC on the Artemis Moon-Mars program.

sion, it is expected to provide a picture of the highest concentrations of ice, and their depth.

On the final day of the conference, two panels returned to the essential theme of this Apollo 11 anniversary year: "Space: The Power of the Past, the Promise of the Future."

The week before the IAC, the Association of Space Explorers had met. Its only requirement for membership is to have flown in space. After the meeting, the more than 120 astronauts and Russian cosmonauts attending went to speak in schools in Houston. A few then came to Washington for the IAC.

On an IAC panel with American and European astronauts and a Russian cosmonaut, a proposal was put forward that the International Space Station be nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize.

At the end of the last day, there was a session titled, "The Apollo Program and the Rockets that Took Humanity to the Moon." Each presentation reviewed a different aspect of the Saturn V rocket program, an important subject, since without the Saturn V, there would have been no flights to the Moon.

A paper by Jody Singer of the Marshall Space Flight Center reported that in 1969, von Braun told reporters that "the exploration of the entire Solar System is a major goal of mankind which will continue to be pursued indefinitely."

AFTER CULIACÁN CARTEL ATTACK

Will the U.S. and Mexico Seal the Border Against Weapons and Drugs?

by Gretchen Small

Nov. 2—Drug cartel gunmen struck in Mexico on Oct. 17, taking Culiacán, a city of nearly one million people and the capital of the state of Sinaloa, effectively hostage, and threatening to extend their deadly assault to the entire northwest of the country. It was a strategic attack that continues to shake Mexico.

It would be a deadly mistake to view the cartel assault as a response to a poorly-prepared Mexican government move to arrest a major drug-trafficker. As American statesman Lyndon LaRouche continually stressed, the drug traffic is not the purpose of the enemy; rather, its cartels are an instrument of warfare by the enemy against the people. The guiding enemy, LaRouche warned, is the British Empire, which in today's world takes the form of international financial power. That imperial power, operating through what LaRouche famously named "Dope, Inc.," took this opportunity to display its power, but it was an attack waiting to happen, if not in Culiacán, then somewhere else.

Mexico cannot win the war against this international imperial power alone. The government of President Andrés Manuel López Obrador, however, has allies in the United States Presidency and elsewhere internationally. George Soros's Barack Obama, with his policies of drug legalization and weapons trafficking to the cartels, made infamous in Operation Fast and Furious, is no longer President of the United States.

In the face of this assault, which threatens both nations, President Donald Trump has demonstrated, once again, that he is no instrument of those British imperial interests. His administration has undertaken to support Mexico and the López Obrador government in word and deed.

Trump quickly conferred with López Obrador after the Culiacán assault, and under the personal direction

The screenshot shows the top of a Wall Street Journal article. The header includes the newspaper's name, 'English Edition', the date 'November 4, 2019', and options for 'Print Edition' and 'Video'. A navigation bar lists various sections: Home, World, U.S., Politics, Economy, Business, Tech, Markets, Opinion, Life & Arts, Real Estate, and WSJ Magazine. The article is categorized under 'WORLD | LATIN AMERICA'. The main headline is 'Video Details Brazen Attack by Mexican Drug Cartel on Government Forces'. Below the headline is a sub-headline: 'Botched arrest of El Chapo's son offers crime groups a blueprint for how to thwart future crackdowns by Mexico's military'. A video player is embedded in the article, showing a man in a white shirt being held by soldiers. A caption below the video reads: 'Video Shows Failed Operation to Arrest El Chapo's Son'. To the right of the video player is a small thumbnail for another article titled 'FROM MUSTA SEEDS'.

of both presidents, joint action has been decided upon against a key vulnerability of the cartels: the flow of illegal weapons from the United States into Mexico, which provides advanced armaments to the Mexican drug cartels. Government agencies of both countries concur that some 70% of the weapons used by the drug cartel killers in Mexico come from the U.S.—and the majority of them are military grade.

U.S. and Mexican security officials met at the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City on Oct. 21 to set into motion Operation Frozen, a joint security operation whose assigned mission is to shut down that cross-border weapons trafficking to the cartels. The United States and Mexico will together face the common threat that "neither of the countries can face alone," U.S. Ambassador to Mexico Christopher Landau assured Mexicans.

Media on both sides of the border have either blacked out the news of this agreement, or cynically



Secretario de la Defensa Nacional

General Luis Cresencio Sandoval González.

dismissed it as talk. The same media are likewise blacking out, by and large, the close coordination between Presidents Trump and López Obrador, which set the new agreement in motion, but it is precisely that coordination that gives it teeth.

It is in this context that the LaRouche Citizens' Movement of Mexico (MOCILA) issued an open letter to President López Obrador identifying the crucial additional elements needed for a successful common victory—including cooperation with China both on stopping fentanyl trafficking and fostering urgently needed economic development in the region—and sent a copy of the letter to President Trump. We publish in this issue that Open Letter, which is already receiving close attention in important policymaking circles on both sides of the border. Given the deliberate media blackout of these immediate developments, the following summary timeline is provided.

The Attack in Culiacán

On Oct. 17, Mexican military units moved into Culiacán to arrest Ovidio Guzmán, the son of convicted narco kingpin “El Chapo” Guzmán, who already sits in the U.S.’s most secure prison. In his Oct. 30 report to the nation on the Culiacán events, President López Obrador was joined by top officials at the President’s daily morning press conference. Secretary of Defense, Gen. Luis Cresencio Sandoval González, reported that

Ovidio is a leading trafficker of methamphetamines and fentanyl into the United States. Fentanyl is extremely lethal, Gen. Sandoval emphasized, and is “the drug that is currently causing the greatest damage to society around the world.”

Ovidio was indicted by a U.S. federal court in April, and in September, the U.S. government requested that Mexico issue a warrant for his arrest and extradition to the United States, under the 1978 U.S.-Mexican extradition treaty. It was the Mexican government security team assigned to track Ovidio down that moved on Oct. 17 to execute that warrant.

Hundreds of heavily armed Sinaloa cartel hitmen descended on the city from across the state within minutes. They concentrated their attack not merely on the military units deployed to capture Ovidio, but seized control over key nodal transport routes in the city, attacked military posts, including on the outskirts of the city, taking military men hostage, and moved into the housing complex where families of the soldiers and officers live.

Cartel gunmen not only took the city effectively hostage, but—Gen. Sandoval reported—threatened that, should the operation against Ovidio go ahead, the cartels would unleash violence in three states neighboring Sinaloa: Sonora, Chihuahua and Durango—a threat, in effect, to drown the entire northwest of the country in blood, much of it along the U.S. border.

Gen. Sandoval detailed the weaponry the cartel deployed in Culiacán, which included automatic, anti-aircraft and armor-piercing armaments: AK-41s, AR-15s, .50 caliber machine guns and rifles, and 40 mm grenade launchers. The cartel deployed armored vehicles and used analog and digital radios for encrypted communication.

Faced with the certainty of huge civilian casualties in a military effort to defeat the cartel paramilitaries at that time and place, the government issued an order to release Ovidio, and withdraw the military forces. The cartel released its hostages, withdrew its immediate forces from the city, and kept much of the weaponry their forces had seized. Ovidio’s arrest warrant has not been cancelled, however, President López Obrador and Gen. Sandoval have stated.

Initiating the Arms-Trafficking Flank

President Trump and Ambassador Landau had a long talk the following day, in which President Trump expressed his support for Mexico, saying that he is “very concerned about the stability of the country. We



Gobierno de Mexico

Andrés Manuel López Obrador, President of Mexico.

want a prosperous and stable Mexico, that's our interest," the Ambassador reported to a businessmen's conference a few days later.

The U.S. government went into action. Ambassador Landau tweeted a warning to the cartels and their backers after his call with the President: "I express my full solidarity with Mexico's security forces, and the support of my government in the fight against transnational organized crime. Good will always defeat evil. Mexico is not alone. Together we will win."

The two Presidents spoke the following morning, at Trump's initiative. Mexican Foreign Minister Marcelo Ebrard reported afterwards that in that discussion, López Obrador proposed that the U.S. and Mexico jointly deploy advanced technology to close the borders to the weapons trafficking through which the cartels are armed, after describing to Trump that the narcos had used .50 caliber, armor-piercing rifles in the Culiacán assault. The idea, Ebrard said, "is to install at all border crossings advanced lasers, X-rays, and metal detectors, capable of even detecting chemical products," thus interdicting both drugs going north across the border as well as arms going south.

That very concept has been a central element of La-

Rouche's war plan to defeat the British empire's Dope, Inc. going back to his 1985 "15-Point War Plan" and most recently detailed in *EIR*'s March 29, 2019 article, "The LaRouche Plan to 'Hermetically Seal' the Border Against Drug-Traffic," which had circulated widely in Mexico.

President Trump agreed with the idea of "freezing—not reducing, freezing the arms traffic into Mexico," and thought the idea of deploying technology was a good one, Ebrard reported. They agreed that U.S. and Mexican officials should meet quickly to discuss options.

"President Trump called President López Obrador this morning to stress our full support for the fight against organized crime. Let us dedicate our energy to defeating the criminals who threaten us all. Together we can," Landau tweeted after the call. In another tweet, he wrote that "the illegal flow of arms and money into Mexico—as we saw in Culiacán, are the root of organized crime's power"; and in another, "Mexico, know that you have a strong ally on this matter in this Embassy!"

The Mexican President, for his part, tweeted his "thanks" to President Trump for his "respect for our sovereignty and his will to maintain a good neighbor policy, based upon cooperation in development and the well-being of our peoples."

Two days later, "Operation Frozen"—reportedly given that name by U.S. Embassy officials—was set in motion. The participants at the meeting at the U.S. Embassy, which included representatives of the relevant agencies of both countries, agreed to hold executive

meetings every 15 days to assess progress, streamline inter-agency collaboration, "and seal the borders, each country from their own responsibilities and within a sovereign framework," according to the statement issued by Mexico's Secretary of Citizen Safety and Protection (SPCC) after the meeting.

"Today Operation Frozen was presented," the U.S. Embassy tweeted. "U.S. Amb. Landau stressed that the political will exists to confront the shared challenge," it reported, and provided a link to the SPCC statement.



Gobierno de Mexico

Marcelo Ebrard, Foreign Minister of Mexico.

Trump-López Obrador Cooperation Censored by the Media

The situation in Mexico is delicate. People's understandable fear of the power displayed by the narcos is being fed by a wave of wild speculations, rumors, half-truths, and posturing by frightened politicians flooding the media—independent, pro-government and opposition alike. George Soros's legalization lobby moved to use the environment of terror created by the cartels to try to ram through its long-standing policy of drug legalization, hoping to do so by Oct. 31. That immediate effort failed, although the government continues to leave the door open to the option. Long-standing Soros henchman Jorge Castañeda opened a new flank against the institutions of Mexico, issuing a call for a national debate on sidelining the Armed Forces from policy-making and operational decision-making.

The national, and international, neoliberal forces that opposed López Obrador's efforts to reassert Mexi-



DoS/Ron Przynsucha

Christopher Landau, U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, at his swearing-in ceremony in Washington, D.C. on September 13, 2019.

co's sovereignty and economic development, are focusing their fire on the President himself, including implying U.S. support for their attack on the Mexican President.

In his Oct. 24 press conference, López Obrador counterattacked, by playing a clip from President Trump's Sept. 24 speech before the United Nations General Assembly, in which he thanked López Obrador, by name, for "the great cooperation" the United States is receiving from Mexico in the fight against human and drug trafficking. It was an unprecedented action by a Mexican President, and one very zealous of his nation's sovereignty, which has gone unreported in the United States—and was hardly mentioned in Mexico.


Reporters were hammering the President about comments by a State Department official in the wake of Culiacán that Mexico was not adequately cooperating with the United States in developing an anti-drug strategy. López Obrador asked, in reply, that the video be shown, because the media had effectively blacked out Trump's comments. He called reporters' attention in particular to Trump's statement at the conclusion of the clip, that "Mexico is showing us great respect, and I respect them in return."

"Fortunately, we have a very good relationship with the government of the United States," López Obrador stated. "We determine our security policy, as they in a sovereign manner decide their policies. Within this framework, it is understood that there is cooperation on confronting problems that affect our two nations."

DOPE, INC.

Is Back In Print!

Dope, Inc., first commissioned by Lyndon LaRouche, and the underground bestseller since 1978, is back in print for the first time since 1992. The 320-page paperback, includes reprints from the third edition, and in-depth studies from *EIR*, analyzing the scope and size of the international illegal drug-trafficking empire known as Dope, Inc., including its latest incarnation in the drug wars being waged out of, and against Russia and Europe today.



*This edition, published by Progressive Independent Media, is currently available in limited numbers, so there is no time to waste in buying yours today. The cost is \$25 per book, with \$4 for shipping and handling. It is available through www.larouchepub.com, and *EIR*, at 1-800-278-3135.*

Four Measures to Defeat Dope, Inc.'s Takeover of Mexico

This is an edited translation of the open letter sent by the LaRouche Citizens' Movement of Mexico, MOCILA, to Mexican President Andrés Manuel López Obrador on October 25, 2019.

Nov. 1—It is often the case in history, that forces representing evil policies are blinded by their own hubris and think they can impose their will on entire nations by brute force and terror tactics. But their very arrogance exposes their own Achilles' heel, and can lead to their destruction at the hands of their intended victims, if the latter counterattack vigorously on the exposed weak flank.

Last week's show of force by Dope, Inc., the international drug cartel run out of the City of London and Wall Street banks, around the Ovidio Guzmán case, presents just such an opportunity.

In the same spirit in which we issued our "Open Letter to AMLO," back in September 2018 before you took office, the LaRouche movement today—based on the established authority of the late Lyndon LaRouche in these matters—urges you to adopt four concrete measures that will take Dope, Inc.'s *tactical* victory in the Ovidio Guzmán case, and transform it into Dope Inc.'s *strategic* defeat.

Immediately fire your government minister, Olga Sánchez Cordero, who is a leading proponent of Dope, Inc.'s policy of drug legalization, and a Trojan Horse inside your government.

Aggressively pursue the policy you have already initiated, of cooperation with the Trump administration to freeze or hermetically seal the U.S.-Mexico border to both arms flows south, and drug flows north, by using advanced technologies including laser detection, MRI, X-rays and more. This is a key component of LaRouche's long-stand-

ing anti-drug plan, which is presented in depth in the [article](#), "The LaRouche Plan to 'Hermetically Seal' the Border Against Drug-Traffic," in *EIR*, Vol. 46, No. 12, March 29, 2019.

Expand such international cooperation by negotiating an agreement with China to cooperate on fully stopping the flow of fentanyl into Mexico, especially into the state of Sinaloa, from where it is increasingly being cut to lower concentrations for trans-shipment to the United States. This will establish effective triangular cooperation among Mexico, China, and the United States. China and the United States have already reached a significant bilateral agreement to stop the fentanyl scourge.

Propose further triangular cooperation among Mexico, China, and United States, to bring major infrastructure and other development projects to Mexico and Central America, in the context of the Belt and Road

Initiative (BRI) that now includes 157 nations worldwide. Only by providing such opportunities for productive employment for the region's youth, can young people be freed from enslavement to the drug trade and its terrorist gangs—or the other horrible alternative, the desperate need to migrate to the United States to ensure simple survival for themselves and their families.

Such a global paradigm shift toward the BRI would also entail the bankruptcy re-organization of the entire trans-Atlantic financial system, which is the driving force of the international drug trade, and is, now, heading towards an inevitable blowout of its \$1.5 quadrillion speculative bubble that will make the 2008 crisis look like a picnic in comparison.

A copy of this open letter has been sent to U.S. President Donald Trump.



Gobierno de Mexico
Olga Sánchez Cordero, Secretary of the Interior of Mexico.

GUEST COMMENTARY

The Sordid Truth Behind the Witch-Hunt Against President Trump

by Larry C. Johnson

Larry Johnson is a former CIA analyst and is currently a member of the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS). This is an edited transcript of the presentation he gave on October 31, 2019 to the weekly LaRouche PAC Thursday night Fireside Chat. The full video, including questions and answers, is available [here](#).

Oct 31—I'm a big fan of irony. I can't help but enjoy the irony for the mainstream media and the conventional wisdom crowd; they've always denounced the LaRouche group as a bunch of conspiracy theorists. And yet, here you are, pointing out what's actually going on, and it is those very same critics of yours that are the conspiracy deniers, and the conspiracy enablers. While I'm sure you've not had fun being accused of being conspiracy nuts, you should at least take some enjoyment in the fact that you are literally like Jeremiah on the walls of Jerusalem warning of the impending invasion; and all they're doing is throwing sticks and rocks at you, but you're telling the truth.

The other point I would make about this Ukraine-gate; we are living out the parable of the king with no clothes. We are being told that there is this breach of presidential conduct; that he's guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors. Yet here we are, pointing out that "No, the king is absolutely naked in this case." They insist that there was a quid pro quo that President Trump pressured the Ukrainians to investigate Joe Biden or else they wouldn't get military aid. Yet, the transcript shows the exact opposite.

Moreover, what was uncovered in the subsequent days, after that had become the focus of the Democrats,



is important. We are seeing the activities of Alexandra Chalupa, the DNC operative, connections with this Army colonel [Lt. Col. Alexander Vindman] who's got ties to the Ukrainian lobbyists opposed to Trump; and Eric Ciaramella, a CIA analyst—who I hope is under investigation. The investigation will look at every phone record and every visitor. Those folks were getting into the National Security Council in the Old Executive Office Building; the Secret Service does keep meticulous records.

They've created, I think, for themselves a high risk of being indicted for a conspiracy charge, because this entire affair turned dramatically a week ago Wednesday, when it was announced from the Department of Justice that this is now a *criminal* investigation. In fact, it had probably been a criminal investigation for three or four weeks before that, but there was a reason that was leaked.

Before that information became public, the bureau-



James Comey, former FBI Director, in 2016.



FBI
Andrew McCabe, former FBI Deputy Director, in 2017.

cracy was engaged in trench warfare, trying to prevent the release of the Horowitz report. The Inspector General's report on the FISA abuses really should have been out about two months ago, but there's been a rear-guard action by the Deep State, by these bureaucrats, trying to block it. They realize how *damaging* it's going to be to the FBI and to people like Jim Comey, Andrew McCabe, and others at the Department of Justice. And it will potentially implicate President Obama.

Guilty Until Proven Innocent?

Then we had Sidney Powell, the attorney for Michael Flynn. She had prepared a new brief with 18 exhibits attached to it, showing that there were Brady violations against General Flynn. A Brady violation means that the government had exculpatory evidence—evidence that would have shown Michael Flynn was innocent; yet, they withheld that information. They kept it out. So, she levelled that charge. The government's response is very curious; it was basically like PeeWee Herman going “Unh-unh! Unh-unh!” When the government attorneys got into the depth of their argument, they said, “Well, Michael Flynn already pleaded guilty.” But they admitted, “He didn't lie, and the evidence didn't show that he lied, but we went ahead, and he admitted to that, so we convicted him.”

So, Sidney Powell had prepared a brief with 18 exhibits that were going to prove her point. The FBI was fighting that; they were trying to get it classified; they were trying to get major portions of it redacted. *They didn't want it out.* As soon as the announcement came out that this was now a criminal investigation, within 5-10 minutes, Horowitz's letter was up to the Hill, stipulating that his report would come out; that there would be no classified annex, and that it would be largely unredacted. That is telling.

Then, the FBI withdrew their objections to Sidney Powell's brief. It was published, and what she published was *dynamite!* It showed corruption by the FBI;

The Washington Times
Reliable Reporting. The Right Opinion. [Subscribe](#) [Sign In](#)

Flynn attorney requests 'Brady' material to prove feds withheld evidence

Michael Flynn, President Donald Trump's former national security adviser, leaves the federal court with his lawyer Sidney Powell, left, following a status conference with Judge Emmet Sullivan, in Washington, Tuesday, Sept. 10, 2019. (AP Photo/Manuel Balce Ceneta) [more >](#)

By Rowan Scarborough - The Washington Times - Sunday, September 15, 2019

Follow Us

Print

lying by the FBI; manipulation of the interviews with General Flynn in the write-ups—what are called “302s.” The agents are supposed to write those up within five days. But there was lots of what the bureaucrats call massaging, of the message, to make it say what Michael Flynn actually did not say.

Why the reversal? Once it was announced that this is now a criminal investigation, then obstruction of justice and conspiracy are on the table. Anybody who is involved with these Deep State bureaucrats, who is trying to obstruct or block this investigation, will now potentially find themselves facing down the barrel of obstruction of justice charges, if not conspiracy charges. So, that is a dramatic and important development in my opinion. It’s really been underreported, and not widely recognized or appreciated for what it is. We’re peeling an onion in this case, and this is like a Russian nesting doll on steroids. As we peel off one layer, or pull off one doll, we find something new and surprising beneath it.

A Clandestine Taskforce Uncovered

Just in the last week or so, I learned from a very reliable source with knowledge and access, that in fact John Brennan set up a taskforce at CIA, and it was called the “Trump Taskforce.” Case officers and analysts were specifically recruited—by invitation only. This was designed to carry out operations against Donald Trump.

Some of those operations I think we will find will include Guccifer 2.0. I believe that Guccifer 2.0 was a manufactured creation of this CIA taskforce. It was designed to try and feed the meme that the Russians had in fact hacked the DNC, when the Russians did not hack the DNC. Azra Turk, the honeypot who sat down and tried to entice George Papadopoulos late in the Summer of 2016—I suspect and believe that she was a case officer assigned to that taskforce and sent forward on that mission. There were FBI agents detailed to this taskforce. I don’t know what their names are, but I suspect one of them might be a fellow named Michael Gaeta, who was the handler for Christopher Steele.

We know, despite the FBI claims, that this investigation started at the end of July 2016. We know for a fact from the Mueller report, that an FBI informant that we’ve talked about before with your folks, was Felix Sater, who has been a fully signed-up confidential human source for the FBI since 1998. His first plea deal was put in place by none other than Andrew Weissmann, Robert Mueller’s compadre and deputy.

Another element in this that’s still really to be fully reviewed, is the role that Stefan Halper played. I’ve been given to understand that Halper’s activities started as well in the Summer of 2015 in working with the Brits.

But underlying all of this, is the seriousness that



Trump Twitter Account

Candidate Donald Trump meeting with his Foreign Policy advisors in Washington on March 31, 2016. Fourth to Trump’s right is George Papadopoulos.

John Durham, the prosecutor, and that [Attorney General] Bill Barr are attacking this. Some might say, well why doesn’t Barr, for example, intervene *now* and throw out the case against Michael Flynn? I think he has the grounds to do so, but Barr’s a smart bureaucratic infighter. He understands the games that are being played. He knows that if he moved unilaterally before the judicial process runs its course, he could be accused, and would stand accused, of unfair interference on behalf of Donald Trump to feed into the meme that he is Donald Trump’s attorney.

Instead, he’s leaving it in the hands of Judge Sullivan. Judge Emmett Sullivan has a very clear track record on being thoroughly disgusted when he’s presented with evidence showing misconduct by the FBI and by prosecutors. He has punished and sanctioned

them before, including Andrew Weissmann, for their conduct in the Enron case and for other cases that they've been involved in, certainly in the case of [former Alaska Senator] Ted Stevens.

We're really in a situation where we're asking the Justice Department now, under Bill Barr, and through the judiciary, to help save the republic. What you've highlighted is not a fantasy; it's not a conspiracy from folks wearing tin foil. It is the truth; it's the reality. Yet what we're witnessing is mass denial on the part of the media.

The Duplicity of the U.S. Media

I learned in my early days at the CIA that the media could play a very critical positive role in helping hold politicians accountable. Because it provided an outlet that, if there was a real issue—and there were some real things going on that manifested disagreement within the intelligence community—you could leak that information out, get it on the front pages, and it would become a discussion in Washington and would force the issue to the surface. If the press is doing its role as an honest broker, that is very critical to our democracy.

But instead, they have become *Pravda*. Again—speaking of irony—I know that Dennis Speed and Barbara Boyd and I are old enough to remember the good old days of the Cold War. And the good old days of *Pravda* and other Soviet disinformation channels, of which they were sort of the predecessor of Baghdad Bob in terms of denying reality and creating their own alternate universe. There was a time in the Soviet Union when anyone who would dare question the authorities was immediately designated as mentally ill or schizophrenic; because how could you protest and oppose the government position unless you were mentally ill?

You know what? We've now seen a complete reversal of roles. Russia is a far more open, free society, and we have gone the route of becoming a Soviet state in that regard. Where, instead of one *Pravda*, we have an institutionalized bureaucratized media that is beholden

to a very small number of corporations. So far, those corporations have not had to pay a price for feeding into this lie, and promoting this lie, and allowing the message of this lie—the lie that Trump has somehow disgraced this country, betrayed this country, and must go.

The real irony of Donald Trump is that he's the first President we've had in a long time who will probably *lose* money in the White House and will genuinely go out of the White House a little poorer than when he went in. Not that he's a poor man, but we've witnessed—whether it's George W. Bush, or George H.W. Bush, or Bill Clinton, or Barack Obama—that they've all made massive fortunes as a result of their position. As well, many of the people around them have been able to cash in.

Just one final point. It's peripheral to this, but perhaps useful for your listeners. My business partner, John Moynihan, and his old college roommate Larry Doyle, who is a finance guy on Wall Street, testified before Congressman Mark Meadows' House Oversight Committee in December 2018, before the Democrats took control. What came out of that testimony was the corruption that was inherent in the Clinton Foundation. They found genuine tax fraud and wanted to be tax whistleblowers. They found documents—a document that was forged

by Lois Lerner and used by the Clintons to illegally raise money. So, they filed this claim. It is now going into a tax court; the trial will start in January 2020.

Twenty different law firms initially approached my friend and partner, Mr. Moynihan. They wanted to get involved with the case. But *all twenty* had to recuse themselves because they were conflicted out, because all of them were corrupted in one manner or another because of the vast amount of money that's out there washing around the streets of Washington. So, we're dealing with a system that's so inherently corrupt and funded by so much dirty money, that it has become widely accepted. And Trump is seen as a genuine threat to that good old boys' network that has prospered for so long.



Stefan Halper

Climate Alarmists are Still Promoting Junk Science, Fossil Fuel Bans and Wealth Redistribution

by Dr. Kelvin Kemm

Dr. Kemm is a nuclear physicist and CEO of Nuclear Africa (Pty) Ltd, a project management company based in Pretoria, South Africa. He does consultancy work in strategic development.



Dr. Kevin Kemm

Nov. 1—This month marks the tenth anniversary of “[Climategate](#)”—the release of thousands of emails to and from climate scientists who had been (and still are) collaborating and colluding to create a manmade climate crisis, which exists in their minds and computer models but not in the real world. The Climategate scandal should have ended climate catastrophism. Instead, it was studiously buried by politicians, scientists, activists, and crony capitalists, who will rake in [trillions of dollars](#) from the exaggerations and fakery, while exempting themselves from the damage they are inflicting on everyday families.

Few people know the [Inconvenient Facts](#) about the supposed manmade climate and extreme weather “crisis.” For example, since 1998, average global temperatures have risen by a mere few hundredths of a degree. (For a time, they even declined slightly.) Yet all we hear is baseless rhetoric about manmade carbon dioxide causing global warming and climate changes, all posing an existential threat to humanity, wildlife, and the Earth. Based on this, we are told we must stop using fossil fuels to power economic growth and better living standards. This is bad news for Africa and the world.

We keep hearing that rising atmospheric carbon dioxide levels cause rising global temperatures. But satellite data show no such thing. In fact, computer model predictions for 2019 are almost a half degree Celsius (0.9 degrees F) *above actual satellite measurements*. Even worse, any time a scientist raises questions about the alleged crisis, he or she is denounced as a “climate change denier.”


A major source of data supporting the human CO₂-induced warming proposition came from the Climate Research Unit (CRU) of the University of East Anglia in the United Kingdom.

Then on the morning of November 17, 2009, a Pandora’s box of embarrassing CRU information exploded onto the world scene. A computer hacker penetrated the university’s computer system and took 61 Megs (MB) of material, which showed that the UK-based CRU had been manipulating scientific information to make global warming appear to be the fault of mankind and industrial CO₂. Among many other scandals, the shocking, leaked emails exposed the then CRU Director, Prof. Phil Jones, boasting of using statistical “tricks” to remove evidence of observed declines in global temperatures.

In another email, he advocated deleting data, rather than providing it to scientists who did not share his view and who might criticize his analyses. Non-alarmist scientists had to invoke British freedom of information laws to get the information. Jones was later suspended, and former British Chancellor Lord Lawson called for a government enquiry into the embarrassing exposé.

The affair became known as “Climategate,” and a group of American University students even posted a YouTube song, “[Hide the Decline](#),” mocking the CRU

GUEST COMMENTARY



and climate modeler Dr. Michael Mann, whose use of the phrase “hide the decline” in temperatures had been found in the hacked emails.

So, what is the truth? If one considers the composition of the atmosphere and equates it to the height of the Eiffel Tower in Paris, the extra plant-fertilizing CO₂ added to the atmosphere since California became the 31st state of the United States in 1850, is less than the thickness of tiles under the Tower.

Can this tiny increase really explain any observed global warming since the Little Ice Age ended, and the modern industrial era began? Since California became a state, the measured global rise in atmospheric temperature has been less than 1 degree Centigrade. But most of this increase occurred prior to 1940, and average planetary temperatures fell from around 1943 until about 1978, leading to a global *cooling* scare. Temperatures rose slightly until 1998, then mostly remained stable, even as carbon dioxide levels continued to rise. Rising CO₂ levels and temperature variations do not correlate very well at all.

Moreover, during the well-documented Medieval Warm Period (MWP) from about 950 to 1350 A.D., warmer global temperatures allowed Viking farmers to raise crops and tend cattle in Greenland. The equally well documented 500-year Little Ice Age (LIA) starved and froze the Vikings out of Greenland, before reaching its coldest point, the Maunder Minimum, 1645-1715. That’s



Dr. Michael Mann, inventor of the phony “hockey stick” global temperature graph.

when England’s River Thames regularly froze over, Norwegian farmers demanded compensation for lands buried by advancing glaciers, and priests performed exorcism rituals to keep alpine glaciers away from villages. Paintings from the era show crowds of people ice skating and driving horse-drawn carriages on the Thames.

Industry and automobile emissions obviously played no role in either the MWP or the LIA.

Lying with Statistics

These dramatic events should ring warning bells for any competent, honest scientist. If the Medieval Warm Period occurred

without industrial CO₂ driving it, why should industrial CO₂ be causing any observed warming today? Europe’s great plague wiped out nearly a quarter of its population during the Little Ice Age. The warm period brought prosperity and record crops, while cold years brought misery, famine and death.

Ten years before Climategate, Dr. Mann released a computer-generated graph purporting to show global temperatures over the previous 1,500 years. His graph mysteriously made the Medieval Warm Period, Little Ice Age, and Maunder extreme cold years *disappear*—and showed planetary temperatures spiking suddenly in the last couple of decades of the twentieth century. The graph, which had the shape of a hockey stick, was published worldwide and became a centerpiece for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

Many scientists were highly suspicious of the hockey stick claims. Two of them, Steven McIntyre and Ross McKittrick, completely discredited Mann’s computer program and revisionist history. Of course, that did not stop former U.S. Vice President Al Gore from using the discredited graph in his doom-and-gloom climate change movie, *An Inconvenient Truth*.

The hacked CRU emails also showed exchanges between Mann and Jones, in which they discussed how to intimidate editors who wanted to publish scientific views contrary to theirs, so as to suppress any contra-



The Frozen Thames, a painting by Abraham Hondius, 1677.

ditory studies. In one email, Jones expressed his desire to get rid of the “troublesome editor” of the *Climate Research* journal for daring to publish differing views. The editor got sacked.

When University of Colorado climate skeptic Professor Roger Pielke, Jr. asked the CRU for its original temperature readings, he was told the data had been (conveniently) lost. Lost!?! Do professionals lose something as valuable as original data? Many suspected that they just didn’t want anyone to expose their clever manipulations and fabrications.

The Cosmic Truth

But if industrial carbon dioxide did not cause recent global warming, what did? A Danish research group, led by Prof. Henrik Svensmark, has found a very credible match between levels of sunspot activity (giant magnetic storms) on our Sun and global temperatures over the last fifteen hundred years. This all-natural mechanism actually fits the evidence! How terribly inconvenient for alarmists.

Cosmic rays from deep space constantly impinge on the Earth’s upper atmosphere and produce clouds, much like high-flying jets leave white contrails behind their engines. More clouds can trap heat, but they also cause global cooling because not as much sunlight

strikes the Earth. More sunspots mean a stronger magnetic shield, therefore fewer cosmic rays reaching Earth, thus less cloud cover and more global warming. The Sun is currently in a near-record period of low sunspot activity.

All sorts of interest groups are suppressing this information. Maybe worse, when Climategate broke, “climate justice” campaigner for Friends of the Earth Emma Brindal said bluntly: “A climate change response must have at its heart a redistribution of wealth and resources.” Not protecting Earth from manmade CO₂

emissions or natural and manmade climate change—but redistributing wealth and resources, according to formulas that self-appointed ruling elites claim are “socially just.”

Climate campaigners also oppose “excessive” air travel for business or pleasure, 4x4 vehicles as “unnecessary luxuries,” and modern homes for Africans. Some even say Africans must continue living in mud huts and

avoid the use of electricity and modern farming technologies. Minor U.S. actor Ed Begley has said, “Africans should have solar power where they need it most: on their huts.” They, Al Gore, Phil Jones, and Mike Mann are exempted from these restrictions, of course.

Real social justice and human rights mean everyone having access to abundant, reliable, affordable energy, especially universally important electricity—not from expensive, intermittent, weather-dependent wind turbines and solar panels, but rather from

fossil fuel, nuclear and hydroelectric power plants.

We in the developing world will no longer let climate truth be suppressed. We will not allow loud, radical activists to put the brakes on African economic development, jobs, and improved health and living standards, in the name of advancing their anti-human, wealth redistribution agendas.



NASA

Wealthy doomsday prophets promote low-tech solar cookers for African families.

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review EIR Online



EIR Online gives subscribers one of the most valuable publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today. Through this publication and the sharp interventions of the LaRouche Movement, we are changing politics worldwide, day by day.

EIR Online includes the entire magazine in PDF form, plus up-to-the-minute world news.

EIR DAILY ALERT SERVICE

EIR's new Daily Alert Service provides critical news updates and analysis, based on EIR's 40-year unparalleled track record in covering global developments.



SUBSCRIBE (e-mail address must be provided.)

EIR Online

- \$ 360 for one year
- \$ 180 for six months
- \$ 120 for four months
- \$ 90 for three months
- \$ 60 for two months

EIR DAILY ALERT SERVICE

- \$ 100 one month (introductory)
- \$ 600 six months
- \$ 1,200 one year (includes EIR Online)

For mobile users, EIR and EIR Daily Alert Service are available in html

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail _____

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to
EIR News Service Inc.
P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Please charge my MasterCard Visa
 Discover Am Ex

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____

EIR can be reached at: www.larouche.com/eiw
e-mail: fulfillment@larouche.com Call 1-800-278-3135 (toll-free)