

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

July 19, 2013 Vol. 40 No. 28

www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

LaRouche: How Silly Could Robert Hicks Be?
British Mideast War Plans Run Into Trouble
Plentiful Food: The Principle of Development

**A True Glass-Steagall Means
Rebuilding the U.S. Economy**



Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.
Editorial Board: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.,
Antony Papert, Gerald Rose, Dennis Small,
Nancy Spannaus, Jeffrey Steinberg, William
Wertz

Editor: Nancy Spannaus
Managing Editors: Bonnie James, Susan Welsh
Technology Editor: Marsha Freeman
Book Editor: Katherine Notley
Graphics Editor: Alan Yue
Photo Editor: Stuart Lewis
Circulation Manager: Stanley Ezrol

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Counterintelligence: Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele
Steinberg
Economics: John Hoefle, Marcia Merry Baker,
Paul Gallagher
History: Anton Chaitkin
Ibero-America: Dennis Small
Law: Edward Spannaus
Russia and Eastern Europe: Rachel Douglas
United States: Debra Freeman

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Bogotá: Javier Almario
Berlin: Rainer Apel
Copenhagen: Tom Gillesberg
Houston: Harley Schlanger
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.: Leni Rubinstein
Washington, D.C.: William Jones
Wiesbaden: Göran Haglund

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirns@larouchepub.com
www.larouchepub.com
www.executiveintelligencecivereview.com
www.larouchepub.com/eiwr
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.
(703) 777-9451

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach
Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany
Tel: 49-611-73650
Homepage: <http://www.eirna.com>
e-mail: eirna@eirna.com
Director: Georg Neudecker

Montreal, Canada: 514-461-1557

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 , Calz de los Gallos 39 interior 2,
Col Plutarco E Calles,
Del. Miguel Hidalgo, CP 11350,
Mexico, DF. Tel 5318-2301, 6306-8363, 6306-8361

Copyright: ©2013 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.

EIR

From the Managing Editor

“Give us this day our daily bread.” At a conference in Chicago in December 1988 of the recently founded “Food for Peace” movement, Lyndon LaRouche posed the question, “Who will answer this prayer?” As Marcia Merry Baker and the three other speakers whose presentations to the June 29 Schiller Institute conference we publish in this issue (*Conference Report*) make clear, that prayer, despite the efforts of the worldwide LaRouche movement and many others, has gone unanswered. And, in fact, the global food situation has only hideously worsened since then. As all four speakers emphasized, only the full reinstatement of Glass-Steagall, and great, Earth-transforming projects like NAWAPA, have the power to reverse this murderous trend.

LaRouche took up this issue as well, in his July 12 webcast (*National*), declaring, “We do not have enough food being produced for human beings to avoid a major crisis.” The terminal condition of the world’s bankrupt monetary system requires the revival of Glass-Steagall—immediately! A flurry of activity in Congress—see “New Glass-Steagall Bill Stirs Debate”—indicates that we are on the edge of a breakthrough.

Other indications of a paradigm shift taking place around the world: The overthrow of the Muslim Brotherhood’s President Morsi in Egypt is confirmed to be a move against Anglo-Saudi machinations in Syria. See “British Permanent War Plans for Mideast Run Into Trouble” (*International*). Even the British Lords (and Commons) are in revolt against the Queen’s drive to spark a Hundred Years War in the Mideast: “U.K. Parliamentarians Challenge Queen’s Perpetual War Policy.” Helga Zepp-LaRouche takes on Germany’s Chancellor Merkel, who is all but defending the global spy net cast across the globe by the NSA. If anything, Zepp-LaRouche notes, this is worse than the East German Stasi. And Lawrence Freeman supplies an eyewitness account of his visit to Mali, where all the preconditions exist for an economic breakout: “Impoverished Mali Can Become a Breadbasket for the Sahel.”

A recent op-ed in the *New York Times* provided Lyndon LaRouche with the opportunity to contrast the “nightmare-world which is still resonating in the spirit of the Andrew Jackson myth in some parts of our nation, today,” with the nation-saving presidencies of Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt (*Feature*).



Cover This Week

Contour strip-cropping; alternating bands of corn and alfalfa, Iowa/Minnesota border.



USDA/Tim McCabe

4 Marcia Merry Baker: Plentiful Food: The Principle of Development

We continue our coverage of the June 29 Schiller Institute conference in San Francisco, with four presentations that address the crises in food production and water resources, beginning with *EIR* Food and Agriculture specialist Marcia Merry Baker.

12 Frank Endres: Keeping the Farmer on the Land

Endres, a California farmer, is a leader in the national farm movement. His presentation, using many images, is being shown to farmers throughout the U.S.

20 Robert Hux: Glass-Steagall, NAWAPA—The Fight in Canada

Hux, a member of the LaRouche-associated Committee for the Republic of Canada, spoke about the urgency of expanding water resources on the American continent through development of NAWAPA.

22 Omar Pensado Díaz: Mankind's Occupation of the Biosphere

Dr. Pensado, a biologist and former director of the Center for Advanced Studies at the Popular Autonomous University of Veracruz (Mexico), is an outspoken critic of the unscientific theories of anthropogenic global warming.

National

24 Lyndon LaRouche: A True Glass-Steagall Means Rebuilding the U.S. Economy

A dialogue, excerpted from LaRouche's July 12 webcast, on the fight for Glass-Steagall, and the crucial role to be played by the LaRouche Policy Committee.

29 New Glass-Steagall Bill Stirs Debate

A second Glass-Steagall bill, introduced into the Senate by Elizabeth Warren et al. (S. 1282) joins Tom Harkin's S. 985; and in the House, the Kaptur-Jones bill, H.R. 129, now has 70 sponsors.

International

30 British Permanent War Plans for Mideast Run into Trouble

Egyptian President Morsi's decision to sever relations with the Assad government in Syria, without first consulting with his Defense Minister and Supreme Commander, Gen. Abdul Fatah al-Sisi, tipped the balance in the Egyptian military's decision to oust Morsi from power.

32 U.K. Parliamentarians Challenge Queen's Perpetual War Policy

The British Parliament is in revolt against the government's plan to supply arms to the Syrian rebels.

35 Germany Must Become Sovereign; We Need a Civil Rights Movement!

Helga Zepp-LaRouche assesses the impact in Germany of NSA spying, exposed by whistleblower Edward Snowden, comparing the massive surveillance to that practiced by the Nazi Gestapo and the East German Stasi.

37 Impoverished Mali Can Become a Breadbasket for the Sahel

A first-hand report from *EIR* Africa editor Lawrence K. Freeman on his recent visit to Mali, on the eve of July 28 Presidential elections.

Feature

42 A Study Of Percussive Intercourse: How Silly Could Robert Hicks Be?

By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. In his commentary on a recent *New York Times* op-ed, LaRouche identifies the source of the author's confusion about the Civil War, in his failure to take into account "the actual history of the Aaron Burr legacy," and that of the traitor Burr's protégé Andrew Jackson.

Editorial

51 Lift Our Eyes to the Stars

MARCIA MERRY BAKER

Plentiful Food: The Principle of Development

We continue our coverage of the June 29 Schiller Institute conference in San Francisco, “Forum for a New Paradigm: The Second American Revolution,”¹ with the four speeches that follow, beginning with EIR Food and Agriculture expert Marcia Merry Baker. Immediately following are the presentations by California farm leader Frank Endres; Robert Hux of the Committee for a Republic of Canada; and Dr. Omar Pensado, a biologist from Veracruz, Mexico.



EIRNS/Daniel Platt

Let's begin with a snapshot of the world and national food crisis, by putting it all together on a per-person basis: the volume of grain output since the Second World War (**Figure 1**).

We were going upward in the volume of grain produced per-person in the world, from after the war, until about 1980-1985. We went from a miserable quarter-ton maybe, to up to maybe 720 pounds, which isn't much per person. It would fit in the back of a small

pickup truck. But it was on the rise. But then it went down. From the 1980s to now, total world grains per person has gone up and down, and in net, it is going down.

Apart from those in the 1930s who survived on cornmeal three times a day, you need grain too, for livestock, for meat animals—it's all going in reverse. The number of cattle in the United States is now where it was back in 1952; the same process is taking place elsewhere.

Let's look at the geography of the world food situation: You know that due to what was de-

scribed by Helga Zepp-LaRouche² as the criminal system in the world: Who eats and who doesn't is decided by cartels, a system which was called by Pope John Paul II, “the structures of sin.”


The darkest places on this map (**Figure 2**) from the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), are the

1. See *EIR*, July 12, 2013.

2. *Ibid.* Helga Zepp-LaRouche, “The American People Are Needed Again To Save the World from Fascism.”

FIGURE 1

World Grain Production per Person 1950-2012



Source: World Watch, USDA, Earth Policy Institute

places of worst hunger and worst deprivation. You see Africa, but parts of the Americas, Haiti, Central America, and in Asia.

In addition, you hear, if there's maybe an earthquake somewhere, we send some food. We should! But on a tonnage basis, internationally, the volume of food aid

right now—it's *nothing*. It's maybe a third what it was in the 1990s, which was inadequate. So we're not responding and we don't have it.

That's the snapshot. Now, set that aside, but keep it in mind.

LaRouche: Give Us This Day, Our Daily Bread

It was 25 years and two months ago that Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche founded the Schiller Institute Food for Peace effort. It took place in Chicago, in September 1988; several people in the room were there. It was occasioned by a terrible drought in the Midwest; the corn shriveled up. But that wasn't the point.

The effort of the Schiller Institute then, was to prevent what you've heard described now, the crisis we're in today. And that's what brought diplomats and farmers together. And

there was an emergency meeting, a second meeting in Chicago, in December 1988, at which Lyndon LaRouche came to speak, and it would end up being only a few weeks before he was wrongfully jailed. But he spoke then, and the title of his presentation was, "Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread."

He spoke about the biosphere. He spoke about nuclear power, and the collaboration we must have between East and West. And he said, you must put a higher order into the biosphere, as a matter of course in history. You can't turn back the clock, or it's doom.


The question he posed was, "Who will answer this prayer?" And that's what brings us here today.

Now, let me speak of how the enemy answers the world food crisis that we have, and by that, I mean, the enemy that created this crisis. We turn to the fact that we're parched out here in the West; or that there isn't enough

FIGURE 2

World Hunger

Prevalence of Undernourishment in Total Population (%)



FAO

food; and they say, “Too bad. It’s ‘peak population.’”

They say we’ve reached the end of the line with fertilizer, water, and land. There isn’t any more left. You hear it all the time, but the Group of Eight had a pre-meeting in London earlier this month, and a parliamentary commission said, here’s what you should do, given the world food crisis: “Eat less meat; it will share the scarcity.” They said, “Have more population birth control, it will improve the ratio.” Prime Minister Cameron was there. Bill Gates was there.

The nail in the coffin is the idea that we should take food and burn it, in the midst of this scarcity. Even if you thought you were Green: Are people going to die? That’s what’s happening: The nail in the coffin is to burn food for fuel! The scale of this, is we’re burning

over 10% of the world’s corn for fuel, because it’s 40% of the U.S. corn now going for fuel. Also, a big percentage of the cane in Brazil is going for ethanol. A big percentage of oilseeds and soy from Africa is going into diesel, which is flowing into Europe, for biodiesel. So this is a death sentence.

You can quantify it, of course: If you’re impoverishing the world, the World Health Organization figures that for every million people who are pushed into poverty, at least—this sounds low, but don’t get confused—6,000 are absolutely guaranteed to die of undernourishment, disease, and infection. And so, we’re killing about a quarter-million people a year directly, because of the impoverishment of suppressing agriculture and general economic activity, for this false, quack,

M.S. Swaminathan Recalls FDR’s ‘Four Freedoms’

This message from Prof. M.S. Swaminathan, of Chennai, India, was read to the Schiller Institute conference by Marcia Merry Baker. Dr. Swaminathan, founder of the Swaminathan Research Foundation, and founding chairman and chief mentor, UNESCO chair in ecotechnology, is a world-famous wheat geneticist, who collaborated with Dr. Norman Borlaug, the American crop scientist who worked in Mexico, and is considered the father of the Green Revolution. Fifty years ago, Dr. Borlaug worked with Dr. Swaminathan and many others in India; and by 1974, India had become self-sufficient in grains.

Dr. Swaminathan often notes that he grew to manhood under the British Raj, during with time, the terrible Bengal famine of 1942-43 occurred, in which

3 million people died. Since then, he has committed himself to agriculture. And it’s sometimes said in India that Mahatma Gandhi gave India its freedom, and Swaminathan gave India its food.



Prof. M.S. Swaminathan

2013 marks the 150th anniversary of the initiation of Land Grant Colleges in the U.S. by President Abraham Lincoln. These colleges, which led to the establishment of agricultural universities in India, have played a key role in helping to improve the productivity, profitability, and sustainability of major food crops.

In India, for example, 2013 marks the transition from what was described in the 1960s as ship-to-mouth existence, to right-to-food, with home-grown food. Such transition has become possible only because of synergy among technology, public policies relating to input-output pricing, and, above all, farmers’ enthusiasm. This is an appropriate year to review the Second American Revolution designed to convert President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s “Four Freedoms” into reality. I wish the conference great success.

pseudo-scientific reason that we're supposed to quit over-heating the Earth.
 Leave that aside, again.

The Principle of Development


Let's go to the principle of development, and I want to take an example that's less often used, but it's a good one; it's from Abraham Lincoln's economist, Henry Carey. Carey wrote reams against the British East India Company system. In 1847, he wrote a book called *The Past, the Present, and the Future*. And in particular, he stated the development principle that mankind's discovery allows him to solve the paradox, that natural resources are man-made. That's the way it is. And the particular man he refuted was a character, a stock-jobber, a day-trader named David Ricardo, who said, mankind always goes into the best land and best water, then uses it up, and then has to die off.

Not so, in principle, said Henry Carey, and not so in practice. And he describes, in *The Past, the Present, and the Future*, how, looking at the Eastern Seaboard settlements going westward: They run into the Ridge-and-Valley region—that's the Appalachians and the Blue Ridge Mountains in Virginia, and so forth. The high part of the Ridges, said Carey, is where the scrubbiest trees, the patchy brush is found. So you can take a saw and it's easy to cut it down, and that's where the first settlements occur.

Which is true. Those are the homesteads. And when people moved there, put in a crop, did okay, developed things, became human, then they would have the power to go down to the rich bottomland, where the heavy trees are, and where they needed to use the axe to fell the timber, and then they could drain the swamps and create new resources—land and water.

So carry that through: You had the saw, the axe, then the bulldozer; we could go to the fusion torch—*there is no end to development*. So, carry that through now, to where we get today. Fortunately, there were institutional expressions of this. Abraham Lincoln's creation of the Department of Agriculture and Land Grant system; then in 1902, relevant to where we are today, the 17 westernmost states, many of which are dry, not all, were focussed on by the Bureau of Reclamation, as the English usage called it then—

FIGURE 3
California Water Plan
 Regional Water Transfers 1990



California Department of Water Resources, 1994

“reclaiming land” meant irrigation, so, Bureau of Reclamation.

And they carried through up to the famous Franklin Delano Roosevelt period of big projects. I think you have an image of those.

But what we want to fast-forward to, is, after the 1950s, and after the Second World War, there was a fabulous potential upthrust of the productive platform of the United States, and the world.

Let's look at three areas: land and water, together; power, and science. And right here, in 1957, began the official launching of the California Water Plan (Figure 3). Here's a snapshot of it from the 1990s; don't worry about analyzing it, that's not the point. The concept was, take the whole state; and the dark arrow vectors you see

FIGURE 4
North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA)



Parsons Company (1960s)

FIGURE 5
Space Agriculture



NASA

are to move water from where it's plentiful in the north, to where it's needed in the dry south; so that's the disaggregated regions of California, and the relative amounts of water flow that go between them.

But, the 1950s head of hydrology in California knew that if you built this, in 30 to 50 years, it would not be sufficient, and this was a fabulous, comprehensive plan. So they instigated what became the North American Water and Power Alliance, which you see here in a 1960s map (**Figure 4**), from the Parsons Engineering firm in Anaheim. This was brought before Congress. President Kennedy and his brother Robert supported it.

And what went along with this, in a very quick, snapshot way, is: In 1957, the same year, the first commercial nuclear power plant opened in the United States, in Shippingsport, western Pennsylvania. And the presumption was, you would go out and improve the environment this way; up to 200 nuclear plant orders and sites were conceived of.

And thirdly, during the same 1950s time period was the terrific analysis of science to improve plant life, even the anticipation of improving photosynthesis. And you heard about the Green Revolution: Another inducement of this, was the vision of going to the Moon and into space (**Figure 5**). So space agriculture research was done to look at the way you could have confined agriculture with a lot of power, with water where you wanted; in fact, you would even have soil-less agriculture!

Then, [Indian Prime Minister] Indira Gandhi stood up, when the World Bank said you can't do it, and she said, no. She issued a postage stamp (in 1968, on the Wheat Revolution), she planted the new genetically improved wheat in her front yard (**Figure 6**).

But all of this was thwarted. In particular, the North American Water and Power Alliance was shelved. We only built 104 nuclear plants—only 15 or 16 are west of the Mississippi. But one of the worst things is, it was this time period, when there was the patenting of research itself, in terms of seeds and means to life. The 1970 Plant Variety Act, that took place. And then it gave rise, through court decisions, to allow an improved seed, through biotechnology and genetic engineering, to be pat-

FIGURE 6



M.S. Swaminathan

Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi releasing a “Wheat Revolution” postage stamp, at the Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, July 1968

ented, as if it were a better wheelbarrow or a better mousetrap. And this put a tight lid on everything.

The Well Is Dry, the Bins Are Empty

So, in fact, we’ve stayed in the same mode for 40 years. We haven’t had new developments; we’ve depleted the groundwater, because if you don’t have increased surface water, that’s what happens—which, in brief, is what this map shows (**Figure 7**).

The intention was, to go to the north-western-most part of the continent, where you have Alaska and the Yukon, divert merely 11% of the runoff there, collect it in reservoirs, divert it down through British Columbia. It’s going to come in around the Idaho-Montana area; then, through power to lift it up there, it can gravity-flow, and otherwise be pumped up into different key points, and bring additional water, sometimes up to twice as much surface water, down to the dry Southwestern areas.

And this plan, with some 369 projects, is the realistic plan. Without it—you can picture in your mind what happened—we are completely vulnerable whenever some episode of drought

FIGURE 7

Groundwater Depletion 1900-2008




Source: U.S. Geological Survey, Groundwater Depletion in the United States (1900-2008), by Leonard F. Konikow, 2013

occurs; and of course, drought can take place due to much larger solar or galactic cycles and reactions. But the wells are running dry, the surface water isn’t there, so what happens (**Figure 8**)?


FIGURE 8

North American Drought Monitor



Source: NOAA, USDA, CONAGUA, Environment Canada, et al.

FIGURE 9
High Plains: Ogallala Aquifer




Source: World Watch, USDA, Earth Policy Institute

Now, if you picture the 17 Western states—and we continue now to where we are: That’s a map of some of the 40 aquifers (Figure 7); look at the big red part in the great High Plains; as you go farther southward and it gets more red: That’s the tremendous depletion of the High Plains Ogallala Aquifer system, down into Texas, Oklahoma, and southeastern Colorado, where you have dust-bowl formations of huge dust storms, even on a mini-version, like you have now in Central Valley California.

And if we keep going to where we are now—that’s the drought, and we’re here, amidst it

FIGURE 10
Percent of National Food Output



EIRNS/Robert L. Baker, June, 2013; Bureau of Reclamation base map

(Figure 9). And we can continue farther along; that’s the Ogallala Aquifer on the right-hand side, blown up, because, instead of looking to the irrigation on the lower left, you see what you have on the right.

We’ll continue to the 17 states in the West. And here is the percentage of the national food output that was centralized here, thanks to the projects which are 50 years old (Figure 10). Look at Texas: 45% of the cattle of the nation are in the seven High Plains states; 65% of the wheat in the nation, not including California, comes from the High Plains states. And 50% of the hay, of course; it goes with the cattle and dairy.

Now, come back here to California: 45% of the nation’s milk comes from the 17 Reclamation states—20% here in California, and the

FIGURE 11
NAWAPA XXI



LaRouchePAC, March 2012

number of dairy cows is going down, everything is at stake, and everything is threatened.

The bins are empty, the well is dry, the lake is *low to nothing*. And so, this is the NAWAPA XXI program that we're circulating today (**Figure 11**); this is at one with reinstituting Glass-Steagall, *including building up nuclear*, not taking it down, like San Onofre and elsewhere.

And the final image (**Figures 12a and 12b** summarizes what I said: Norman Rockwell painted FDR's "Freedom from Want." And Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace was the 1950s: *This* is what Glass-Steagall embodies, is the gateway to.

And in fact, the emergency measures we need should be ringing in your mind: *Ban biofuels!* Put a floor price under those corn and soy growers, overnight, a parity price to keep their situation stable. That's our food supply! Do the same for every sector: Get the dairy sector out here in California, and everywhere here and abroad, a price that's stable. That is security.

We can do this! We can bust up the cartels. We can

FIGURE 12a
'Freedom from Want'



From FDR's "Four Freedoms," by Norman Rockwell (1943).

FIGURE 12b



Postage stamp commemorating President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" program, issued July, 1955.

end the Monsanto seed control of science, its controlling the means to life.

We can answer the prayer.

Keeping the Farmer on the Land

Frank Endres is a leader in the national farm movement to bring back a commitment to keeping the farmer on the land, and restoring our nation's true sovereignty in these policies. His family has been farming land in California for generations. He gave this speech to the San Francisco Schiller Institute conference on June 29.

The presentation that I'm going to make is one that we are showing to farmers all over the country. The purpose of the presentation is to debunk some of the ideas that have misled the farm people, the food producers of this nation, for a number of years. And we call that "Adventures in Facts." It is primarily designed to show at house meetings and general meetings like this, to explain to farmers that they don't need to be taking the low prices that they are getting today.

One of the things that we are going to be talking about—it's quite buzzword today all over the country—and that is, "food security." They're all talking about food security. And they're concerned about the nation now losing our farmland. We've lost almost 1 million acres of farmland a year in the United States since the 1960s, and there's a lot of concern about preserving farmland. And they're passing ordinances; we have the Williamson Act here in California, that gives farmers a break on their property taxes if they keep their land in production; and there are different ordinances around the country, that



EIRNS/Daniel Platt

are trying to encourage farmers to stay on the farms and keep the farmland in production, rather than selling it for development (**Figure 1**).

The loss of our farmland amounts to 5,400 acres every day, or 200 acres an hour—it's a tremendous loss. A lot of the farmland that is being lost is not just the prime farmland surrounding cities and that sort of thing. There's a lot of farmland that's being lost out in the country, where there's really not much development. A land speculator will come out and, let's say, will buy up a nice 320-acre parcel of


land. And the first thing he does to make a big profit on it, is divide it up into 20-acre parcels and sell it off.

The first thing that happens, is that the new owner will put a fence around his 20 acres. As soon as he does that, that land is no longer in production. It can't produce cattle, pasture, or food crops, because it's not practical to farm a little 20-acre parcel.

FIGURE 1



FIGURE 2



So, what we're saying is, that if you want to preserve farmland, the number one thing you've got to do, is save the farmer on the land first. It does no good to preserve the farmland if the farmer's going broke on the land. So that's what we're doing.

An Aging Farm Population

A big concern to the people is the aging of our farm population (**Figure 2**). About 5% of the population is under 35; on the other end are people over 65, which is 30% of the farm population. The farm population is aging, and the young people are not coming in to operate our farms. So, what we're saying is, the farmer has to be able to make a living off the land, and the farm prices need to be at a parity level with the rest of the economy, to encourage the young people to come in and take over the farms.


One of the things that you've probably heard a lot about this year, is the higher grain and cattle prices, and this sort of thing. And I clipped this article out of a farm paper, and it shows that the farm prices have risen 177% since 1991, but also, the costs have risen by 210% (**Figure 3**). Now, there's a little fallacy in this chart: Back in 1991, our farm prices were not at 100% of parity. They were approximately 50% of parity, and if they would have shown that in this chart, the spread would have been even greater.

Most businesses, as well as farming,

have a formula, and that formula is: Production times Price equals Income. So any decrease in production or in price will drastically affect your income.

Supply and demand: We're told that this is what governs our prices, and so what we would like to do, is show you how that's not working today. World population today is approximately 7 billion. The acres of farmland per capita is, for the general population of the world, approximately fifty-five hundredths of an acre—that's half an acre per capita that is being used today to feed the population. And when you put that in context of what the world population is going to be, it's quite astounding.

FIGURE 3



In the United States alone, the present population is around 315 million people, and the projection is that, by the year 2050, which is only 37 years from now, they expect that our population is going to increase by another 100 million people. Most of our economic theory has been supply and demand; this is what the farmers are told—that supply and demand is what governs your prices, and you dumb farmers, you over-produce every year, and so that's why you can't expect to get a decent price for your commodity or your animals, because you just produce too much.


That theory is taught in the colleges and the universities like it's the theory of gravity: You throw a rock up and it falls down. Well, the same thing with the law of supply and demand. When your production goes up, naturally your prices are going to go down.

Adam Smith's 'Invisible Hand'

That theory was originally formulated by a fellow by the name I'm sure all of you heard of, Adam Smith, back in the 1700s. He was what is known as a court economist. And we have court economists today, who preach the same thing.

Adam Smith was a favorite of the British Crown at that time, because in all their colonies, all over the world, you had to have some way of explaining why they would literally steal the commodities, and take them back to England, and manufacture them, and then attempt to sell them back to their colonies. And so they had to have some way of explaining that away to the colonists at that time, and so Adam Smith's theory fit quite well!

And then when he couldn't explain it, he said, well, there's an "invisible hand" in the marketplace that's controlling it. It almost makes it sound like it's something divine is coming down from the Heavens. So, that's one theory of how farm prices



Adam Smith let slip that his theories only work when both parties to the transactions are dealing from a position of equal strength. The East India Company apparently didn't get the message.

are made, and the same thing is pulling the wool over the farmers' eyes today.

And to back up just a minute: Adam Smith let slip, in one of his theories, that his theories only work when both parties to the transaction are dealing from a position of equal strength. And when you look at the British East India Company, which did all the trading with the colonies for the British Crown at that time—that, most certainly, wasn't equal strength. If any other country would attempt to go in and trade with some of their colonies on some of the major commodities, the British Empire would send their forces, their Navy and their Army, in there, and would stop them from doing trade with those colonies.

Carl Wilken and the 'Golden Era'

But there's another man who's very significant, because his efforts produced what is called the "Golden Era" for agriculture; that was the period from 1941 until



Carl Wilken (1895-1968), standing, is credited with bringing a "Golden Age" to agriculture.

TABLE 1

Parity Ratio for Farmers: Prices Received to Prices Paid, 1929-1969

	Prices Received by Farmers			Prices Paid by Farmers			Parity Ratio (1)	
	All Farm Products	Crops	Livestock and Products	All Items, Interest, Taxes, and Wage Rates (Parity Index)	Family Living Items	Production Items	Actual Percent	Adjusted Percent (2)
1929.....	61	61	62	55	54	56	92	(3)
1930.....	52	52	52	52	50	52	83	(3)
1931.....	36	34	38	44	43	43	67	(3)
1932.....	27	26	28	38	37	38	58	(3)
1933.....	29	32	27	37	38	38	64	66
1934.....	37	44	32	41	43	44	75	80
1935.....	45	46	44	42	43	46	88	95
1936.....	47	49	46	42	43	46	92	95
1937.....	51	53	49	45	45	50	93	97
1938.....	40	36	43	42	43	47	78	83
1939.....	39	37	41	42	42	46	77	85
1940.....	42	41	42	42	42	47	81	88
1941.....	51	48	53	45	45	50	93	98
1942.....	66	65	66	52	52	57	105	109
1943.....	4 80	84	4 77	58	58	63	113	116
1944.....	4 82	89	4 76	62	61	66	108	110
1945.....	4 86	91	4 82	65	64	67	109	111
1946.....	4 98	102	4 94	71	71	73	113	115
1947.....	114	118	111	82	83	85	115	116
1948.....	119	114	122	89	88	95	110	111
1949.....	103	100	106	86	85	91	100	100
1950.....	107	104	108	87	86	94	101	102
1951.....	125	119	130	96	94	104	107	108
1952.....	119	120	119	98	95	104	100	101
1953.....	105	108	104	95	94	97	92	93
1954.....	102	108	97	95	94	97	89	89
1955.....	96	104	90	94	95	96	84	85
1956.....	95	105	88	95	96	95	83	84
1957.....	97	101	94	98	99	98	82	85
1958.....	104	100	106	100	100	100	85	88
1959.....	99	99	100	102	101	102	81	82
1960.....	99	100	98	102	102	101	80	81
1961.....	99	102	98	103	102	101	79	83
1962.....	101	104	99	105	103	103	80	83
1963.....	100	107	95	107	104	104	78	81
1964.....	98	107	91	107	105	103	76	80
1965.....	103	104	101	110	107	105	77	82
1966.....	110	106	113	114	110	108	80	86
1967.....	105	101	107	116	113	109	74	79
1968.....	108	103	112	121	117	111	74	79
1969.....	114	100	125	127	123	116	74	80

(1) Percentage ratio of index of prices received to index of prices paid, including interest, taxes and wage rates on 1910-1914 base.

(2) The adjusted parity ratio reflects Government payments made directly to farmers.

(3) Not available.

(4) Includes wartime subsidies paid on beef cattle, sheep, lambs, milk, and butterfat between October, 1943 and June, 1946.

The official indices are published on a 1910-1914 base as required by law. The indices have been converted to 1957-58=100 for the above table to facilitate comparison with other indices.

TABLE 2
Prices Received Index

Commodity & Unit	Prices Received	100% Parity	Parity Received	In cents lb
Cotton, ber lb.	0.727	2.12	34	0.72
Wheat, per bu.	8.10	18.70	43	13.5
Corn, per bu.	6.98	12.80	55	01.2
Barley, per bu.	5.58	13.10	47	01.6
Grain Sorghum, per cwt.	12.10	22.30	54	12.10
Soybeans, per bu.	14.10	30.30	47	23.5
Oats, per bu.	3.93	7.79	50	12.2
Dry edible beans, per cwt.	35.10	88.50	40	35.1
Milk [all], per cwt.	20.00	51.50	39	20.0
Beef Cattle [all], per cwt	128.00	294.00	44	128.0
Calves, per cwt.	169.00	403.00	42	169.0
Hogs, per cwt.	62.90	161.00	39	62.9

FIGURE 4



1952. Carl Wilken was a farmer in Iowa, and he had training from the University of Iowa; and he really liked getting into economics, and found that agriculture has a multiplier, as do all segments of our economy. But agriculture had the highest multiplier, and he found that for every dollar that's generated on the farms, that the national economy ended up with \$7 of new wealth. And when he found this, he became a one-man evangelist, so to speak, and spent countless hours all over the country, giving seminars on how this operated.

In 1941, when Pearl Harbor was bombed, within a couple of days, they had passed the National Defense Act, there was such fever to go to war at that time. He got 13 state secretaries of agriculture together in Washington, and he gave a one-day seminar, and showed them why we need to have parity prices for agriculture: because, number one, we've got to feed the nation, as well as the military; we've got to produce the food for the war effort. But more importantly, we have got to produce the income to pay for this tremendous war effort.

And so, as a result of that, he got Senator [Henry] Steagall—here it's a coincidence again—Senator Steagall, to tack onto the National Defense Act, what is called the Steagall Amendment, that simply stated that all farm commodities would be priced at 100% of parity. And because of that, they were able to stabilize agriculture, encourage food production, and also to pay for the war effort at that time. And this act went from 1941 to 1952.

But there were no farmers involved in getting that act passed at that time, to keep it in force, and so it was repealed, and they substituted a sliding-scale parity. And when that happened, the farm prices just began to skid downhill.

And during that time period, from '41 to 1952, that policy caused a depression in one segment of our econ-

omy. Can anybody guess what that is? It was the banking industry. The bankers could only loan out 16% of their money. Why? Farming was the biggest industry in the country; farmers didn't have to borrow from one year to the next to plant their crops or do anything else. It was paid for by the income from their farms.

And so, the farmers and people in rural areas were depositing money in the bank, and taking interest from the banker. And then, in 1952, when the law was rescinded, in one year, the loan-to-deposit ratio in banks, jumped to 32%.

It's very hard to see this, but basically what that is, if you have real sharp eyesight—I took out of the government statistics book, put out by the Department of Agriculture (**Table 1**): These are the parity prices; and it just shows what that was, during that time period. And that established a foundation for all the farms in this country that were established in that generation, and set the stage for all the farmers at that time to establish themselves.

Swords into Plowshares

Something very interesting happened during that period: The troops that returned from the war, many of them wanted to establish farms and become farmers. They could go out and buy a farm, and if they were good farmers, they could pay for that farm from the crops that they would raise and sell. So this helped establish the farm population at that time; they could go out and making a living in rural America.

The Prices Received Index (**Table 2**) is just a gauge of what

FIGURE 5
Beef Consumption
(million pounds)




FIGURE 6
Beef Consumption Exceeds Production
(million pounds)




TABLE 3

U.S. Wheat and Coarse Grains

(million metric tons)

Year	Beginning Stocks	Production	Total Use	Imports	Ending Stocks	Use As % Of Production
60/61	105.6	178.8	166.7	0.6	118.3	93%
61/62	118.3	161.0	175.5	0.5	104.3	109%
62/63	104.3	159.3	170.8	0.3	93.2	107%
63/64	93.2	171.5	175.0	0.4	90.1	102%
64/65	90.1	157.5	172.9	0.4	76.5	109%
65/66	76.5	179.1	197.8	0.3	58.2	110%
66/67	58.2	180.7	189.7	0.3	49.5	104%
67/68	49.5	203.9	191.0	0.3	62.7	93%
68/69	62.7	197.6	188.9	0.3	71.8	95%
69/70	71.8	201.0	200.4	0.4	72.8	99%
70/71	72.8	182.9	201.6	0.4	54.6	110%
71/72	54.6	233.6	215.1	0.4	73.4	92%
72/73	73.4	224.1	250.0	0.5	48.0	111%
73/74	48.0	233.3	250.5	0.3	31.1	107%
74/75	31.1	199.4	203.7	0.6	27.3	102%
75/76	27.3	243.3	235.7	0.5	35.5	96%
76/77	35.5	252.8	228.4	0.4	60.3	90%
77/78	60.3	261.4	248.6	0.4	73.5	95%
78/79	73.5	270.5	272.7	0.3	71.6	100%
79/80	71.6	296.5	291.2	0.4	77.2	98%
80/81	77.2	263.1	279.1	0.3	61.6	100%
81/82	61.6	322.4	284.6	0.4	99.8	106%
82/83	99.8	326.0	287.7	0.6	138.7	88%
83/84	138.7	203.0	272.7	0.8	69.8	134%
84/85	69.8	307.6	294.8	0.9	83.5	95%
85/86	96.8	340.8	259.9	1.2	178.8	76%
86/87	178.8	309.0	288.0	1.3	202.2	93%
87/88	202.2	274.4	309.6	1.4	168.4	113%
88/89	168.4	199.0	283.9	1.8	85.3	142%
29 Years		6,733.5	6,786.5	16.7		102.4%

Year	Beginning Stocks	Production	Total Use	Imports	Ending Stocks	Use As % Of Production
89/90	61.4	312.1	303.8	2.8	72.5	97.34%
90/91	72.5	279.7	307.9	3.8	48.2	110.08%
91/92	48.2	352.7	325.2	3.6	79.3	92.20%
92/93	79.3	258.8	301.4	7.3	44.0	116.46%
93/94	44.0	357.0	346.7	6.2	60.6	97.11%
94/95	60.6	276.7	316.4	5.0	25.8	114.35%
95/96	25.8	335.5	326.9	5.9	40.3	97.44%
96/97	40.3	336.3	323.4	5.9	59.1	96.16%
97/98	59.1	349.2	336.5	6.4	78.1	96.36%
98/99	78.1	334.8	342.8	5.8	76.0	102.39%
99/00	76.0	342.4	346.2	5.7	77.8	101.11%
00/01	77.8	324.5	340.5	6.1	68.0	104.93%
01/02	68.0	297.0	324.8	5.3	45.2	109.36%
02/03	45.2	348.0	353.6	4.8	44.4	101.61%
03/04	44.4	385.4	358.7	4.6	74.7	93.07%
04/05	74.7	362.9	371.8	5.2	71.7	102.45%
05/06	71.7	335.3	364.7	6.7	49.8	108.77%
06/07	49.8	411.8	412.9	7.2	54.3	100.27%
07/08	54.3	400.3	395.9	6.9	65.9	98.90%
08/09	65.9	416.4	421.1	6.2	67.3	101.13%
09/10	67.3	418.9	432.9	5.4	58.6	103.34%
21 Years		7235.7	7354.1	116.8		102.14%

NOTES: Aggregate data on corn, sorghum, barley, oats, wheat, rye and rice.

SOURCE: United States Department of Agriculture 2001-2010

they were receiving on the parity scale. Parity: Everybody uses parity in our economy, *everybody*, but they just call it by a different name; for farmers it's "parity." For university teachers, for firemen, policemen, and so on, it's "cost of living wage." And so, the cost of living wage for the farmer is called parity. And if you're receiving 100% parity for your crops and your cattle, then that is a full, fair wage, comparing the selling price of your commodities compared to what your input costs are to raise it. That's simply what parity is.

Lately, it's dropped down, on the average, to about 50% of parity, and that does not encourage the young people to go into agriculture, and it does not encourage the farmers to keep their land, if they can sell it for development or whatever.

Some people say, well, gosh, basically what you're asking here is, that we're going to have to double the price of our commodities, to bring it to 100% parity, and what you're saying is, "My God, we can barely afford our food right now, how're you going to double the price?"

Look at four major commodities from **Figure 4**, just to show you how small an increase that is: Bread, a one-pound loaf of

bread that retails for \$2.99—the farmer gets 18 cents out of that, for the basic raw material that’s in it. One gallon of milk is \$3.88—the farmer gets \$1.71 out of that—and he needs that. Dairy men desperately need to double that price; that needs to be *doubled*. But you’re only talking about the basic raw material that’s going to change, not the entire cost. This is where people have been misled on the consuming side, on what these prices will mean. You’ve got a sirloin steak there, retailed at \$7.99—the farmer only got \$2.01 out of that.

And the more processed the food commodity, such as cereal, for example, the greater the disparity is. Retail on cereal is \$5.49; the farmer only got 12 cents out of that. The 12 cents is the only part that we’re talking about, that needs to be increased, not the entire thing.

Of the top processors in the period from 1995 to 2010, 43% of the dairy processing sales were by co-ops. By 2010, no top four were cooperatives any more. These are all large corporations that are doing the processing now.

Of the top processors in 1995, there 10% of sales were from foreign owned companies; in 2010, two foreign companies in the top four.

Decline in Beef Consumption

This is really shocking (**Figure 5**): This is the consumption of beef in this country. We have an assessment that’s made against all of us beef producers. We pay a \$1 a head to the promotional board to get people to eat more beef; the consumption of beef, as you can see on this chart, had steadily been increasing. It dropped off a little bit in 2000, and in 2010 or so, but that’s mainly because of the recession.

The bottom line there (**Figure 6**) is the production of beef in this country; and at no time, at no time do those lines touch; in other words, *we’re consuming more beef than we’re producing in this country*. If supply and demand had anything to do with it, as Adam Smith said—that supply and demand governs your price—the cattlemen should be doing very well for themselves—and they’re not! We’re losing cattlemen and cattle ranches all over the United States, because of the low price of beef, compared to what their production costs are.

FIGURE 7



The wheat and feed grains—we’re not just talking one grain; we’re taking all seven of the major grains (**Table 3**). We total it up, and average the consumption of grains in this country; and it shows that, for a 50-year period, we are consuming an average of 102% of our total production.

Now, you’re saying, “W-w-well, wait a minute, how can that be? How can you consume 102% of your total production?” What we do is, we adjust the imports and the exports to make up for that; so that’s what that comes from. That’s more of the same thing.

The grain inventory: At the end of each year, we have what they call a carryover of grain into the next year. And the latest that we have the figures for is 2011; it’s kind of like the rainfall records. You have to go around into the next year, before you can come up with a total figure (**Figure 7**). And the carryover in terms of consumption represents 37.68 days’ supply—that’s all we have. That’s all we have left over at the end of the year.

Now, you’ll note, that that was in 2011! This is not taking in 2012 yet. Now 2012, that hasn’t come around yet, the full crop year—that represents the drought year in the Midwest! So that figure, I think, will probably be cut *in half*. Heaven forbid if we have another drought in the Midwest! We’re dangerously close in this country, and food security is a real concern.

I think that covers most of what I would like to present. It goes on here for quite a while, and I know you people want to get out and get something to eat now!

Glass-Steagall, NAWAPA: The Fight in Canada

Robert Hux, Ph.D., is a member of Committee for the Republic of Canada (<http://committeerepubliccanada.ca/>), the LaRouche association in Canada. Here is an expanded version of his video address to the Schiller Institute conference on June 29.

I would like to thank Helga and Lyndon LaRouche for inviting me to say a few words, and I'd like to greet the attendees at the Schiller Institute's fifth conference on the battle to establish a New Paradigm for Mankind, there in San Francisco.

I'd like to begin, first, by mentioning the intervention of the Committee for the Republic of Canada, going back several months, into our nation's capital in Ottawa, where we've been meeting Canadians on the streets of Ottawa, and also in face-to-face meetings with both Members of Parliament and in some cases with Senators. And what we're discussing is what you're discussing there at the conference, in terms of Glass-Steagall, and more importantly, what will follow after Glass-Steagall, in particular the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA).

Now, I have to say that what we found, is that in the case of several of these Members of Parliament and their aides, once they got the picture that perhaps Glass-Steagall is something that needs to happen, we saw that they went through a process of shakeup in some of their axioms. For example, one aide to a Member of Parliament asked, "Well, does this mean that you actually want to develop the Arctic? You're going to be totally changing the environment!" But this is exactly what we have to do.

People, I'm sure, are aware that right now in the Prairie Provinces of Canada and extending also into the Dakotas, you have very unusual flooding, in Calgary and elsewhere. Now, this is an area that often, in the case of

the Saskatchewan River, has not enough water. We're told that there's not enough water, so you can't have allocations of water for agriculture, for industry; we're also told that, in cases like we have now, when you have too much water, there's nothing you can do about it.

This is the sentiment behind a bill that has just been passed into law in Ottawa, called Bill C. 383, the so-called "Trans-Boundary Water Protection Act," which prohibits the construction of projects which would in-


crease the flow of water into the United States via international rivers. Taken together with existing legislation prohibiting bulk water transfers out of the Great Lakes Basin and inter-basin transfers, the intention is not only to prevent large-scale water transfers to the United States and Mexico, as envisioned in NAWAPA, but to declare the vast majority of Canada's abundant water resources which flow northwards into the Arctic Ocean and Hudson Bay, or westward into the Pacific Ocean, inaccessible even to most Canadians who live within a few hundred miles of the international border.

Although we may not have all the details yet, it is clear that this genocidal policy is being orchestrated by the same British Crown networks which we and, even more so, our Australian counterparts in the Citizen Electoral Council, have exposed for their destruction of the Canadian and Australian Wheat Boards, and the destruction of Australia's most productive agricultural region, the Murray Darling Basin.

So while there is no denying that we have a fight on our hands, I think that the present conditions of weather extremes that we are witnessing in the prairies, is making the point to even some people in our nation's capital that we are not in trouble because of too much human activity, but too little.

U.S.-Canadian Cooperation on Great Projects

I would like to also address people at the conference, particularly people that are from the Northwest of the United States, or California, to make them aware that there has been a history of collaboration between the United States and Canada, on subjects bearing on NAWAPA. For example, the development in the United States of the Lower Columbia River for hydroelectric generation; flood control and irrigation which began in the 1930s under Franklin Roosevelt, immediately gen-



Schiller Institute

erated a lot of interest in Canada in doing the same thing on the Upper Columbia River, which has its origin in the Rocky Mountain Trench of British Columbia. While there is no time here for the full story,¹ the Columbia River Treaty was finally signed in January 1961 by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister John Diefenbaker.

This U.S.A.-Canada treaty was a victory for the idea of developing the hydroelectric storage dams on the Upper Columbia River in a way which would mutually benefit both nations, and a defeat of the proposal of Anglophile Gen. Andrew McNaughton, the Canadian chairman of the International Joint Commission (1950-62), who proposed to divert the Columbia and Kootenay Rivers into the Fraser River, with the sole view of producing hydroelectric power for British Columbia, and providing water to irrigate the Canadian Prairies.

But this was not the end of the story, because the 1961 version of the Columbia River Treaty (CRT) said that British Columbia's entitlement to one half of the increased power generation downstream, due to the construction of the CRT dams, could not be sold in the U.S. on a long-term contract, but must be sent back into the province.

This created a problem for the Premier of British Columbia, W.A.C. Bennett, who was committed to the economic development of B.C.'s sparsely populated interior regions, powered by, not only, the hydroelectric potential of the Columbia River, but at the same time, that of the Peace River. Bennett's battle for the conditions required for his "Two Rivers Policy," which would go on for another three years before the final ratification of the Columbia River Treaty by the British Columbia legislature, led him, in November 1961, to risk a diplomatic incident, by flying down to Seattle, and seeking the support of President John F. Kennedy in a private closed-door meeting.

Although Bennett never, to my knowledge, publicly embraced the idea of large-scale water exports, the Columbia River and Peace River dams, which he was responsible for building, are linchpins in the proposed development of NAWAPA; the Peace River being the place from which you would divert water that normally would flow northward into the Arctic, in the Mackenzie River Basin; you would divert water eastward into the Saskatchewan River Basin, into the areas that, unlike now, are often very arid and require extra water. And some of this water could also be made available into the Dakotas, into the Missouri River System, into the Mississippi River. The Columbia River Treaty dams are part of the design which could deliver water southwards into the United States via the Rocky Mountain Trench.

So, you have this history of collaboration.

Also, if you look at the mid-1960s, right after the North American Water and Power Alliance had been put forward, you see a study conducted by the three Canadian prairie provinces and the Canadian government, under the Saskatchewan-Nelson River Basin Board, that asked the question: How much water would become available in this basin (this is the basin that is flooding right now), if we were to build up to 55 new dams, and consider up to 23 river diversions (including inter-basin diversions)?

So if you look at the plans that they were looking at, this is actually going through elements of NAWAPA.

This openness to collaborate with the United States on these areas, that could have allowed us to begin to solve the problems that you now have in this area, was there.

So, with that, I look forward to collaborating with people there, on what we have to do to make this happen.

Thank you.

NAWAPA 1964



PUEBLO, COLORADO
AUGUST 14, 1963

Released on Thanksgiving 2011, the LPAC-TV documentary "NAWAPA 1964" is the true story of the fight for the North American Water and Power Alliance. Spanning the 1960s and early '70s, it is told through the words of Utah Senator Frank Moss. The 56-minute video, using extensive original film footage and documents, presents the astonishing mobilization for NAWAPA, which came near to being realized, until the assassination of President Kennedy, the Vietnam War, and the 1968 Jacobin reaction, killed it

... until now.

<http://larouchepac.com/nawapa1964>

Mankind's Occupation Of the Biosphere

Omar Pensado is a biologist, the former director of the Center for Advanced Studies at the Popular Autonomous University of Veracruz (Mexico), and Doctor Honoris Causa of that institution. He is an outspoken critic of the unscientific theories of anthropogenic global warming, and, earlier this year, wrote an open letter to the U.S. Congress, as part of the international campaign to urge the restoration of the Glass-Steagall law. His speech, translated from Spanish, and delivered by video to the conference, was titled, "Man and the Biosphere; Occupying It as Human Civilization Advances."



Before beginning this presentation, I would like to express my deep appreciation to the organizers of this conference for allowing me the opportunity to be able to address you from the state of Veracruz in Mexico, and to share a few words with you. Many thanks to the Schiller Institute.

I have always maintained that mankind represents nature's greatest achievement; we are its triumph and expression. We are the only species on the planet that is conscious of being conscious, which can discern its own actions, and even redirect the path which nature itself has taken. This is possible because man is also a part of nature which creates its own environment. This is a result of the action of nature itself, because, since man is also an expression of nature, it is doubtless the case that nature wishes this destiny for itself, that is, occupying and utilizing the biosphere to expand itself and use energy for a greater end, creating a network of intelligence on the surface of the Earth, which leads to the expansion of life beyond Earth through its most valuable tool, human beings.

What I mean to say by the above, is that mankind is

reaching a moment in which it requires great amounts of energy to sustain itself at a high level of civilization, which, by means of the self-organization which occurs naturally, advances to the next level. This is the battle against entropy which life itself wages at an individual and group level as a society, because life is a thermodynamic disequilibrium, and this process repeats itself in communities, whether large or small, and it is what maintains us at the various levels of civilization.

In a word, species need to use energy from their environment to subsist, as do societies and civilization which repeat that pattern, where the amount of energy used determines the degree of progress.

For this reason, mankind's occupying the biosphere must begin to be seen from a different standpoint, a standpoint which contributes to serving the advance of mankind and its current civilization, which is the highest expression of nature, and not to its collapse, as some groups seek. Man must become the manager of nature, since he has dominion over it, as a being who is conscious of being conscious. The energy matrix of our current civilization must be increased, and not diminished, as some would do, because the only thing that this would accomplish is the destruction of our current model of civilization, and sink thousands of people into poverty and technological backwardness....

Climate Change: A False Paradigm

I am part of a current of scientists and intellectuals who are opposed to the policy of de-carbonizing the planet, a de-carbonization which is imposed by supra-national institutions such as the IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change] of the UN. [This policy is] based on a paradigm of a false planetary environmental emergency, which asserts that anthropogenic carbon dioxide is the cause and main reason for global warming, and therefore, of the misnamed climate change, which has become a public policy in many countries, especially in those of the Third World—which need a lot of energy to overcome their pitiful condition—and in the industrialized countries, in order to return them to energy sources which are

inferior to the current ones, destroying many economies and sources of employment.

And it is our battle in Veracruz, because we are concerned about how these ideas of de-carbonization to save the planet have begun to penetrate, ideas which come from London, and whose base of operations in Mexico, the British Embassy, has penetrated Veracruz with programs to reduce the sources of energy, deceiving the population and the government about its benefits. Veracruz was the first Mexican state, and the first in the Americas, to approve, in its state congress, a “Law for Mitigation of and Adaptation to the Effects of Climate Change.” We sought its repeal, since that law in Veracruz violates human rights by saying that carbon dioxide is a contaminating gas, which makes man a contaminator, since that is what we exhale.

Did the noble British forget basic physiology, or was it done with amusing premeditation? Yes, we are 7 billion human beings, who, according to these monarchies, exhale CO₂, and are therefore guilty of global warming—although our information indicates, by the way, that we are heading towards a cooling period of more than 40 years.

I will say it loud and clear: The British Crown has no business in Veracruz, since the Americas are for Americans.

It should be emphasized that the Optimum Population Trust, founded in 1991, promotes eliminating between 3 and 5 billion people by 2050. The question is: Should a free and democratic people make agreements with monarchies with genocidal tendencies, who consider themselves monarchs by divine right.

We will say it loud and clear: the cause of the warming of the Earth is not human beings; it is the Sun, as a result of variations of the solar constant, associated with cycles in the functioning of the magnetic field of the Sun, which is expressed with the appearance of Sun spots, which determine the changes in the climate of the Earth and the Solar System.

For that reason, I say this on behalf of all scientists who have been mistreated because they have stated that the policies on climate change are mistaken, and that they would take mankind towards a disaster called poverty, energy shortages, and hunger, as well as social degeneration. Because with the policy of de-carbonization, we will diminish our energy sources, and increase social entropy. That is what a Green economy will bring us, based on an unproven hypothesis, creating a speculative bubble which will enrich a handful of people.

Thus the importance of the Glass-Steagall law, which must be approved, not only in the United States, but in all of the legislatures of this planet, and in that way put an end to the Green economy and the speculation which comes from it. . . .

A Vernadskian Pedagogy of the Biosphere

For that reason, alternative energy sources are not sufficient to sustain our civilization, and we must not fall prey to those projects. For the world to eliminate economic and energy poverty, and to leap to the next level of civilization, it is necessary to make use of nuclear energy, make it more efficient and improve it. The next natural step is to bet on nuclear fusion, if we do not want to devolve and return to ruralism. . . .

The monarchies do not see human beings: they see subjects, and we free men should not make agreements with them nor allow their ideas to penetrate the minds of our youth nor of our institutions. . . .

We need a pedagogy of the biosphere based on postulates and axioms which transform our vision of what surrounds us, and which allows us to take control of the resources of our country, under a paradigm, not of scarcity, but of abundance—because what controls us today is the idea of resources being finite. This is false. The Earth’s natural resources are inexhaustible; we do not need three planets Earth to sustain the population’s next generation; all we need is to manage them, and to have a vision which allows us to raise up the rest of humanity which is living in a low-energy state. That suffering humanity is also part of nature, it is also part of the environment.

May these words serve as homage to a free mind, the distinguished scientist Vladimir Vernadsky, an inspiration to free scientists. Thank you very much.

SCHILLER INSTITUTE CONFERENCE

Forum for a New Paradigm: A Second American Revolution

San Francisco, June 29, 2013

Keynote Speeches **Helga Zepp-LaRouche**

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

<http://newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com/>

LYNDON LAROUCHE

A True Glass-Steagall Means Rebuilding the U.S. Economy

July 13—*With momentum building behind the necessity of reimposing Franklin Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall law, the LaRouche Political Action Committee announced that it is bringing the LaRouchePAC Policy Committee team into Washington, D.C. during the week of July 15, to spearhead a decisive breakthrough in the life-or-death policy fight for a thorough Glass-Steagall policy, based on the Hamiltonian principle of credit for economic progress.*

During his July 12 webcast, Lyndon LaRouche laid out the perspective for the immediate fight in Congress, which his Policy Committee will lead, concluding:

"If the Congress moves together, to get the Glass-Steagall through, and to recognize that Glass-Steagall is the core, but only the core, of the reforms which have to be made—we can save the nation! The purpose is to save the nation! To rebuild it! To get out of the dirt, and back into the pride it used to represent. . . . That is what has to be done! I think it's possible to do that in this coming week. It's possible. The question is, make it happen.

We publish LaRouche answers to the questions on the Glass-Steagall fight below. The webcast video can be viewed at www.larouchepac.com.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, with the introduction yesterday of an additional Glass-Steagall bill into the U.S. Senate, there are now two Senate bills, and one bill in the House of Representatives with 70 co-sponsors. All of these ac-

tions have been taken on a bipartisan basis. No matter how you view the individual members from both houses, the fact is that influential personalities have come out in support of the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall. Where, in your judgment, does the fight for Glass-Steagall stand, and what is required for an effective policy to be actually implemented? Thank you."

LaRouche: We have to understand that unless certain things are done, that what will happen in the course of the election process will not be something to remember, it will be something very dangerous. And we're going to have to induce a kind of cooperation that has not been considered for some time in the history of the United States Senate and House of Representatives. Because you've got a food crisis in the United States. People are going to starve, while farmers are going bankrupt, being pushed out of marketing. The water crisis is immense. There is nothing you can say as a, shall we say, conservative, to reduce expenditures. It won't work; you'll kill the American people.

So the point is, if we have a coming together of people who are candidates in this process, we can, actually, with cooperation, do a number of things that can save the United States, and help other parts of the world as well.

But the first thing we have to do is to realize that we have an impossible situation, apparently, in the United States itself, as well as in other countries. Europe, for example: Europe is on the verge of disintegrating!



LPAC-TV

Lyndon LaRouche at his July 12 webcast: "Glass-Steagall is the core, but only the core, of the reforms which have to be made. . . . The purpose is to save the nation!"

Western and central Europe. That's part of it, and that is not going to do any good for the United States to have Europe disintegrate.

We have crises in other places. We have a crisis coming up in China. China is about to plunge into a depression if Europe continues in the direction it's going in, and if the United States goes in the direction it could go here. A large-scale collapse in the economy of China will be a destructive blow for the United States, and to a greater degree for Europe. This says nothing about what South America's situation is, and nothing about Africa, and so forth.

So, we need to have not just a boola-boola, a reorganization of the schemes of our government; we have to have a very serious cooperation. Not where the President leads everything; we have too much President right now in the United States, because he's not qualified to do all the things he's trying to do. And some of the things he's trying to do shouldn't work anyway; they're bad ideas. But if we really get the balance of our governmental system back into play, and get rid of some of this shady business that's going on from behind the scenes, we can put the United States back together again.

Congress Is the Instrument

We have to take into account the various points of crisis. We do not have enough food being produced for human beings to avoid a major crisis. The kind of crisis we're talking about is not just a food shortage; it's both starvation, and it's epidemic disease. So therefore, in the gathering together of the process of trying to put the Glass-Steagall bill together, we have that.

We have also the fact that the whole monetary system, international monetary system typified by Wall Street and by the situation in Europe today, is *hopeless*! While it may be fun to watch Wall Street go the Hell, which they are going to do anyway, but it's not good for the United States to have them do that on our doorstep.

So therefore, we've got to think about this kind of change, and obviously the Congress as a whole is the instrument which is most appropriate, because the Congressmen are functioning together as a whole body, or most people are functioning together as a body, Democrat and Republican, and so forth. We can make the decisions—and there are emergency decisions that have to be made—we can make those decisions which will enable us to actually solve some of these problems.

Look, Wall Street is finished! Wall Street as you have known it is finished. It cannot exist. It is hopelessly bankrupt! There's nothing in it but fake values to speak of. So, Wall Street is nothing; it's not an asset. It's a criminalized kind of place which is not a good place to be.

But we have to pull back the organization of the money system, the banking system, which Glass-Steagall is crucial for. But we also have to get some food growing back in the Western states, where they didn't have any water available to build up the agricultural product in this area. So what we need is a consensual approach on a limited number of issues. On certain crucial issues, the United States, through the cooperation in the Congress, must conduct what will amount to a major sweep of changes in the way the U.S. government is organized. And I believe that there are enough people in the Congress, who would be individually willing to put their shoulders to the wheel on this one.

And there are other problems which need to be dealt with, with more emphasis on the Congress. The American people right now have no confidence in the Presidential system. They have only the fear of the Presiden-

tial system, not cooperation. They don't anticipate cooperation.

So, we've got to realize that Wall Street is going to collapse. But the only way it would continue is if they put a Hitler-style dictatorship over the United States and Europe at the same time. Otherwise, you cannot hold together this system of Wall Street, or in Europe either. You can not. You're dealing with a killer system now. And the problem is coming largely from our "rivals," shall we say, the British monarchy.

The Queen's Mass-Murder Program

The British monarchy is now operating on a basis, very serious and they're exerting great influence on our own country.

What are they doing? The Queen of England is committed to going to a reduction of the human population of the planet from 7 billion people to less than 1. And this is already in process. And much of what we're getting, especially from the Wall Street crowd, reflects this anticipation.

So therefore, we have to stop that, because unless you do that, you're going to turn this planet into a hell-hole. And you're going to kill a lot of Americans real fast, because they're not going to have enough food to eat. The American people, as a whole, do not have enough food to keep them alive under the present trend. That has to be changed. We don't have the farms functioning that we had. We don't have the cattle we used to have. California, which was the greatest food production area in the United States, has virtually collapsed. The cows are being killed; the foods are being cut, these kinds of problems.

And therefore, we need a very strong kind of consensual factor, which would be assembled around a core in the Senate and House of Representatives, to shift control of the situation away from the Presidency, which is over-controlling. It's controlling too much, far too much, for anybody's good.

And therefore, we've got to get the people of the



White House/Pete Souza

"We have too much President" now in the United States, Lyndon LaRouche said in his July 12 webcast. Now Congress must take the initiative. Shown: Barack Obama in the White House, March 2011.

Congress together as much as possible, to deal on a bipartisan basis, with these measures which must be taken. So, if we anticipate that we're going to do that in the Congress and otherwise, then it can succeed. And what we need is assurance now that more and more members of the Congress are prepared to shoulder this role of leadership of the United States. We need leadership of the United States in terms of the structure of the Congress. We've had too much Presidency, especially since George W. Bush became President. The United States has essentially, relative to what was there before, gone to Hell since that time.

And the changes away from Glass-Steagall have resulted in a cumulative destruction of the

ability of the United States to function as a democratic nation any more. A fascist nation you can get; a democratic one under the present trend, you can't have. And the British Queen does not desire to have any more Americans; she wants to reduce it down to less than 1 billion out of the 7 billion people living on this planet. And we've got to stop that.

And therefore, if we can get an agreement among leading members in the Congress, to do this kind of job, to get together and to avoid nonsense differences, we can save the nation. And I think that's the mission right now. So, it's not a matter of dealing with the obvious thing the question deals with, but it's necessary to have a more coherent, positive, assertive leadership from the natural leadership, shall we call it, of the Congress itself.

Do We Need Wall Street?

Q: On numerous occasions, you've said that after we put Glass-Steagall through, there's going to be a significantly decreased amount of money in the system. The question comes up very often, especially on the issue of Glass-Steagall, where many people who are ostensibly for it, are for Glass-Steagall but not ready to give up Wall Street. They say, "Can't we just keep Wall Street?" And you get this a lot.



creative commons/Robert W.B.

Queen Elizabeth and her ghoulish consort Prince Philip are at the center of the British Empire, and its objective of reducing the world's population from 7 billion to approximately 1, LaRouche stressed.

Now, if it's the case that there is not going to be enough money in the private sector to conduct the kinds of lending that people have come to expect—even if they don't get it, they come to expect it from Wall Street. Where then will the money come from?

For example, you have numerous conferences—recently a high-speed rail conference—and the people who want to make these projects happen, want to know, “Where are we going to find our investors? Who's going to buy our stock? Who's going to buy bonds so that we can get this high-speed rail line from X to Y.” So, I'd like you to address the question that often comes up: Do we need Wall Street? And what do we do with people who want to hold on to Wall Street for just a little bit longer?

LaRouche: Well, first of all, there's no possible way that you can save Wall Street in its present form. No possibility. Most of the people who are already investing now in Wall Street and counting on it, are going to find that, on one day very soon, there is no more Wall Street.

See, the problem here is, people don't think enough, carefully enough, about what's going on in the world today. What is the state of the world today? And they don't notice what's happening. They don't listen to what the British monarchy is doing.

Now, the British monarchy is not just the British monarchy. The British monarchy is an empire. If you look at the number of nations that are overtly part of the British Empire, then you begin to see the truth. The empire's destiny is to eliminate people; to reduce the population from 7 billion people approximately now, and falling rapidly, to less than 1. And that is the British policy; that is the Anglo-Dutch policy. That is the policy of the current euro system, and some other places as well. Add to that the collapse of China, the Chinese economy—because the market for Chinese goods, including automobiles, was shifted from the United States and so forth, into where? It's gone!

So, the system is impossible. And the only thing that's holding it together is the tendency of people,

out of fear, to believe in what's not true. There is no hope for a person surviving in the United States on the basis of Wall Street-backed investments. It's not possible. If you've got a Wall Street investment, you should start crying now, while you still have tears.

But then the problem is, what are we going to do about the people who are not going to be working for Wall Street, hopefully? They're going to be *working* instead of working for Wall Street. There's a difference. And that means we've got to change the whole direction of the budgetary policies of the United States as an overall institution.

We're going to have create jobs, yes! We're going to have to put these people who are Wall Street migrants or whatever, to work. We've got to do that; we've got to give them other jobs. We've got to get industry going again. So, instead of doing what this current President is doing, under the direction of his master, the Queen of England, we've got to get rid of that.

That's why the Congress must do it. You can't let this President do it. You've got to keep him under the restraints of the legitimate authority of the Congress to shape the legislation which is going to govern us. Otherwise, you're going to have chaos and mass death.

The problems we have are a shortage of a lot of things, but we *can*, if we have the will, and if the Con-

gress does the job it can do, we can fix this. We can take the people who are now living on Wall Street incomes—they'll do something else. Also, obviously, the United States is going to have to change its policy in increasing the amount of credit available through the system.

Now putting Glass-Steagall through means that you're going to actually foreclose on a lot of garbage. Because all the garbage, including the Wall Street garbage, will then, if Glass-Steagall is actually put through, much of that garbage will disappear from the accounts.

Now, this means that we're going to have to change the system, essentially, and most people, I think even in the Congress, do not really understand how to organize the system under these conditions.

We'll put Glass-Steagall into effect. Now, with Glass-Steagall, if we put that into reorganization, we're going to cancel a lot of the banking operations now, because they're bankrupt because they're Wall Street-connected. So therefore, we're going to have to actually take the good part of the system, boost it up, get the organization of the system working, and then we're going to have to create credit, because there will not be enough credit in the system to sustain the economy.

So therefore, what we're going to have to do is create a credit system account, which we run through the new banking system after the reorganization, and we're going to have to put up Federal guarantees for the existence of credit disbursed, to create an increase of productivity of jobs per capita and quality of jobs in general.

An Echo of FDR

So, we're going to have to go through a process which in many respects is an echo of what Franklin Delano Roosevelt did when he put most of the criminals on Wall Street in jail. And that's the way we have to do it. We've got to take the responsibility. These are human beings—these people out there, our people—they're human beings! And the way they're being treated now by the present Administration, and the previous Administration, the previous Bush Administration of two terms—has done a wrecking job on the U.S. economy which is beyond belief, if you think about it.

So therefore, *we*, through the U.S. government, in



Rebuilding the agricultural capacity of the U.S. is one of the first tasks for rebuilding the nation, along with the restoration of Glass-Steagall. Here, a dairy farm in California, a state where dairy farmers are being forced out of business at an alarming rate.

the way that Franklin Roosevelt approached this problem in his own time, we've got to take the responsibility to get the job increase to grow, to make more food produced, all these kinds of things. And I think the optimism which we have the potential to create among our own people in the United States, if they are convinced that the disaster they are living through, can be relieved in at least as rapid a way as Franklin Roosevelt dealt with the crisis back in 1933: that we can say, "We can do it." It's going to take a lot of devotion, a lot of intelligence, and so forth.

And if we can get the members of the Congress, or a great majority of the members of the Congress, in both parties, and all divisions, to recognize this: We have the power, as citizens of the United States, especially those who are in office, to do the kinds of things, which are needed to restore this nation to recovery; and to lead also in creating new conditions of life for people in Europe, who are now going through Hell. Get them out of Hell. That's what we have to do, and we *can* do it.

It's not going to be pretty, because we've gone so far down deep in this thing, that there are not great opportunities in terms of incomes available. But, as Franklin Roosevelt showed in the 1930s, if we start the process, we can stop the bloodletting, and we can begin to build our way back to a full recovery. And that kind of recovery-orientation, not only for us in the United States, but in our concern for Europe and other parts of the world, has to be expressed that way.

New Glass-Steagall Bill Stirs Debate

by Jeffrey Steinberg

July 13—The filing of a second Senate Glass-Steagall bill (S. 1282) on July 11, by Senators Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.), John McCain (R-Ariz.), Angus King (I-Me.), and Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.), has generated a good deal of media attention, along with the anticipated freakout from Wall Street and the Obama White House. It has also revived an open factional split within the City of London/Wall Street nexus, that was reflected today in the *Financial Times*, which ran a news analysis on Wall Street's reaction, and another editorial endorsement of Glass-Steagall bank separation.

The "21st-Century Glass-Steagall Act" joins the "Return to Prudent Banking Act" introduced in the Senate (S. 985), by Tom Harkin (D-Iowa), and in the House (H.R. 129), by Reps. Marcy Kaptur (D-Ohio) and Walter Jones (R-N.C.). It differs from them primarily in its specific reference to the fact that it would outlaw derivatives, swaps, etc., and in its timeframe for compliance (five years, rather than one or two). H.R. 129 currently has 70 sponsors; S. 985, one.

The legislation to restore Glass-Steagall has in-depth support around the nation, as reflected in the fact that memorials for its reinstatement have now been introduced in 23 states, the latest being Oregon, on July 3.

JPMorgan Chase Counters

The same JPMorgan Chase Bank that led the lobbying campaign to stop the pro-Glass-Steagall resolution from coming to a vote in the Delaware State Senate last month, immediately came out swinging to defend its speculative activities. Huffington Post July 13 headlined "JPMorgan Chase Fires Back at Warren-McCain Plan To Reinstatate Glass-Steagall" on an interview with Morgan's chief financial officer Marianne Lake.

Lake delivered the tired old lies that "Glass-Steagall didn't have anything to do with the crisis, and our business model allows us to be a port in the storm." To nobody's surprise, former Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.), the man who blocked the convening of a genuine Pecora Commission after the September 2008 debacle, came

out publicly endorsing the JPMorgan position against Glass-Steagall.

Senator Warren countered the Morgan lies in an interview with Fox Business News July 12, pointing out that it was precisely the too-big-to-fail banks—including JPMorgan Chase, Citibank, and Bank of America—that received the massive taxpayer bailouts after the collapse of Lehman Brothers in September 2008. She noted that the four biggest Wall Street banks are today 30% bigger than they were at the time of the 2008 blow-out.

Support from Britain

The *Financial Times*, which took a strong stand in favor of reinstating Glass-Steagall on July 4, 2012, today ran a news account of the growing U.S. battle around Glass-Steagall under the headline "Bill To Restore Glass-Steagall Unnerves Wall Street," noting that the introduction of the 21st-Century Glass-Steagall Act of 2013 "adds to a drumbeat of oddly bipartisan maneuvers in Congress to break up the banks that has been gaining steam."

The *Financial Times* also ran an editorial headlined, "Split the Banks: A New Glass-Steagall Act Is Needed—Not Just in the U.S.," echoing its editorial call for full bank separation a year ago. It cited Warren and McCain as the lead sponsors of the new bill, and concluded "the instinct of the two legislators that retail banking ought to be separated from riskier activities is sound and should be heeded. As the financial crisis made abundantly clear, the main beneficiaries of the universal banking model have been the banks themselves. They have been able to fund themselves cheaply, since investors know governments will come to the rescue to save depositors. This implicit subsidy encourages the type of reckless behavior taxpayers around the world are still counting the costs of."

The editorial continued, "Full-scale separation could be easier to enforce" than the Volcker Rule or the Vickers Commission scheme for ring-fencing. "The original Glass-Steagall Act was a mere 37 pages long. It would also eradicate the testosterone-charged culture of investment banking from retail activities, which require patient stewardship. As the Libor scandal has shown, when the two cultures conflate it is the traders who typically have the upper hand."

The editorial ended with a warning: "When popular discontent with the banks is so high, this powerful argument cannot be ignored."

British Permanent War Plans For Mideast Run Into Trouble

by Nancy Spannaus

July 16—The evidence is conclusive: It was Muslim Brotherhood President Mohamed Morsi's decision to sever relations with Syria, without first consulting with his Defense Minister and Supreme Commander, Gen. Abdul Fatah al-Sisi, that tipped the balance in the Egyptian military's decision to oust Morsi from power. With that action, the Egyptian military put a block in front of the British Empire's plans for bringing Egypt in on its permanent war plans for Syria and beyond, plans that will, if unchecked, lead directly to a thermonuclear confrontation between the Empire forces, and Russia and China.

The source is Mohamed Hassanein Heikal, the grand old man of Egyptian journalism, born Sept 23, 1923. His first reporting assignment was covering the Second Battle of El Alamein in 1942. He was a close friend and confidante of President Gamal Abdel Nasser; editor of the main Cairo newspaper *al-Ahram*, 1957-74; and the author of a dozen widely read books.

"On the day of that Syrian conference [June 15], Morsi phoned al-Sisi to inform him that he had taken a decision to sever ties with Syria," Heikal said in a televised [interview](#).

Heikal said that he had been in regular contact with al-Sisi in the run-up to Morsi's ouster.

"Al-Sisi told him that such a decision would not make any difference in the complicated situation there [in Syria], stressing the importance of maintaining relations. But Morsi told him he had already

made up his mind, and that he only wanted to inform Al-Sisi."

EIR's own high-level Washington sources have confirmed this story, and have stressed that the top Egyptian commanders kept their American military counterparts fully informed about their plans. The U.S. military leadership, led by U.S. Chief of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey, has itself been working non-stop to try to prevent an escalation of conflict in the greater Middle East region, including objecting to a no-fly zone.

So far, that blocking action has worked. Opposition to arming the Syrian rebels—a policy announced by Obama a few weeks ago—is growing more strident on both sides of the Atlantic (see following article). At the same time, the Russians are making it clear, through their own unprecedented military preparations, and their revelations about the Syrian opposition, just how dramatic are the stakes of military escalation in the region.

Morsi's Threat

As the millions of Egyptians who took to the streets to demand his removal attested, Mohamed Morsi was never, in his view, the President of all Egyptians, but rather, a representative of the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) sect, which is bent on winning power for its form of radical Islam. From the moment he took power, he moved to place members of the MB into crucial posi-

tions in all institutions, and to whip up jihadi sentiment, including by providing a platform for the message of Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi, the Qatar-based spiritual leader of MB and Salafi terrorists who issued the fatwa in 2011 for Libyan rebels to kill Muammar Qaddafi.

Qaradawi, an Egyptian by birth, has issued a call for “Sunni jihad in Syria,” reported London’s *Daily Telegraph* June 3. He was the head of the International Union of Muslim Scholars, and the host of an Al-Jazeera TV program that goes out in 40 countries. Although not officially in the Brotherhood, he is a long-time Anglo-Saudi agent for holy war, who has used London and Qatar as bases. Qaradawi’s organization, the International Union, provided the major speakers for the June 10-15 “Syria Solidarity Week” in Cairo where Morsi made his announcement of cutting relations.

According to the top Lebanese newspaper *Al-Akhbar* on July 9, unnamed Egyptian military sources report that Morsi had also planned to carry out a coup. He had ordered the military to arrest leading opposition and media figures—but Republican Guard chief Gen. Mohamed Zaki had declined to execute the order. Morsi had also begun to plan to fire al-Sisi and other senior commanders, but was thwarted by precisely executed precautions taken by the Zaki, up to the moment al-Sisi made his announcement that Morsi could be removed peacefully.

Permanent War

The decision by the MB President was in line with the overall British imperial plan for the Southwest Asia region—permanent sectarian war among Islamic factions, and every other religion, which will destroy lives, states, and prevent world peace for decades to come. That has been the overall policy of war and depopulation that has dominated the world increasingly since the assassination of John F. Kennedy, and again, with the British-Saudi act of terror on Sept. 11, 2001.

The Saudis remain key actors in feeding this mayhem, which has been destroying the nation of Syria and its neighbors. While the Assad government has remained intact, and is taking back territory, the Saudi-backed rebel forces are acting out the Empire’s bestial script of war against Christians, Alawites, and those they accuse of being “secularist” Muslims.

On July 12, militants linked to al-Qaeda in Syria killed a member of the Free Syrian Army’s Supreme

Military Council, and announced that they consider the FSA to be heretics who should be wiped out. “The Islamic State [what al-Qaeda forces call themselves—ed.] phoned me, saying they killed Abu Bassel and that they will kill all of the Supreme Military Council,” the FSA spokesman told Reuters.

Clearly, such threats, coming from forces that film themselves beheading, eviscerating, and even cannibalizing their enemies, have to be taken seriously.

The Russians Act

The British and French governments, and the Obama Administration, continue to declare their support for the Syrian opposition, whose backbone is comprised of these cannibals. The proposal worked out between U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry and Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov for an international peace conference has been allowed to languish, largely due to the fact that the Western countries won’t demand that the opposition come to the table, and continue to insist on the removal of President Assad.

On July 9, the Russian government took a new action to try to isolate the jihadis. UN Ambassador Vitaly Churkin delivered an 80-page report to UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, on the conclusion of Russian experts that the Syrian rebels were responsible for the March 19, 2013 sarin gas attack in an Aleppo suburb, that killed 26 people and injured 86 others. Churkin said that the samples taken from the impact site were examined in a Russian laboratory certified by the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, and that Russian experts personally collected the samples, rather than having them handed to them by third parties, as was the case for the samples analyzed by the U.S., Britain, and France.

A video released by the Arab news agency Ah-lulBayt on July 15 showed packs of chemical materials labeled “Made in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia,” in a warehouse raided by the Syrian Army.

Yet, as Churkin stressed, the Western nations continue to throw out a confetti of “the maximum number of allegations with minimum credibility” about the Syrian government using chemical weapons, thus blocking a serious UN investigation.

The Russians Are Prepared

Faced with the seeming intransigence of the Western nations in pursuit of their regime-change policy—especially that of President Obama—the Russian gov-

ernment has drawn the logical conclusion: It has to be prepared militarily to defend itself. From the time, in August 2011, of the overthrow of Muammar Qaddafi, against all international law, the Russians have known, and said repeatedly, that ultimately, they will be the target of the Empire's policy of destroying national sovereignty, in the pursuit of its policy of world domination and depopulation.

The Chinese will not be far behind on the target list.

From the Fall of 2011 on, the Russian leadership has moved to up its military preparedness, with the reorganization of its military-industrial sector and leadership. President Vladimir Putin has also called a number of extraordinary military exercises, of which the world would do well to take notice.

The snap military exercises in Russia's Eastern Military District, ordered Putin on July 12, are the largest since the Soviet period, reported *Russia Today*, and may even be the largest anywhere since the end of the Cold War. According to various Russian press reports and statements from the Defense Ministry, 160,000 troops from all service branches are involved. TU-95 Bear strategic bombers based in the Amur region are involved, having been ordered to full combat readiness on Jan. 14. "The main goal of the drills is to check the readiness of units to carry out their missions, and to assess the quality of their training and technical preparedness," the Defense Ministry said in a July 13 statement, reported by RIA Novosti.

This exercise is the third or fourth in a series of snap drills which have been called since November 2012. It will run until July 20.

The Russian enterprise comes on the heels of the largest joint naval drill ever conducted by China and Russia, held in the Peter the Great Gulf near the city of Vladivostok. The exercise, which involved 4,000 servicemen, concluded on July 10.

The Russians and Chinese are determined to increase their military cooperation in the face of Western—largely U.S.—insistence upon a policy of encirclement, and transparent efforts to incapacitate the ability of both nations to defend themselves against a first strike. At the same time, however, they are seeking to find Americans, in particular, who will cooperate in long-term projects of cooperation—so far, only to see them sabotaged by British agent Barack Obama and company.

Tony Papert contributed substantially to this article.

U.K. Parliamentarians Challenge Queen's Perpetual War Policy

by Carl Osgood

July 15—A significant faction of the British political establishment is not at all comfortable with the notion of a Hundred Years War in the Middle East, particularly when such a conflict presents the threat of drawing the U.S. and Russia into a global, thermonuclear confrontation. This was borne out by the debate that took place in the House of Commons on July 11, on a motion calling on the government of Prime Minister David Cameron to abstain from making a decision to provide arms to the Syrian opposition, without first putting the question to a full debate and a vote in the Parliament.

The motion, which carried by a vote of 114 to 1, was supported by members from all three parties; and the debate took on, not only Cameron's policy, but also that of the Queen's favorite, former Prime Minister Tony Blair. While the vote was considered non-binding, the *Daily Telegraph* reported today that Cameron has dropped plans to arm the Syrian rebels, in part, because of counsel from senior figures in the Conservative Party, including the Tory whips, who told him there is little prospect of winning a vote in the Commons on arming the rebels.

Just a few days before the debate, on July 8, Blair appeared on BBC Radio 4's *Today* program to call for military intervention in the Syrian conflict. "Personally I think we should at least consider, and consider actively, a no-fly zone in Syria," he said. "A refusal to engage, as you see from what's happening in Syria at the moment, where, after all, as a proportion of the population there's now been more people that have died in Syria in a civil war that shows absolutely no sign of ending than in the entirety of Iraq since 2003. So, you know, inaction is also a policy and a decision with consequence."

Blair has, in fact, been calling for Western military intervention in Syria for quite some time. On Feb. 28, as the 10th anniversary of the Iraq war was approaching, he told the BBC that, not only had he been right to destroy Iraq, but the world must agree with him to do

the same to Syria and Iran, immediately. And on June 20, during a conference in Jerusalem, he declared that “time is not our friend,” adding that, “the cost of staying out” of wars against Syria and Iran will be higher than going to war.

This is the same kind of lying propaganda that he used to start the 2003 Iraq War.

Queen’s Prerogative Under Attack

Blair was very much on the minds of those Members of Parliament who took part in the July 11 debate, but two of them went explicitly after the Queen’s prerogative to take the country to war without Parliament participating in the decision.

The issue of the royal prerogative was first raised by Labour MP Paul Flynn, who noted that, “The assumption is being made that Governments decide whether we go to war, but even that is not true.” That decision, he said, “rests with the monarch under the royal prerogative.” Therefore, “The reason we need Parliament to be supreme, and not the Government acting under royal prerogative, is the bitter experience we have had. In 2003, this House was bribed, bullied, and bamboozled into voting for the war in Iraq.” Nearly 50 Labour Members of Parliament who had already made statements against the Iraq War “were pressurised into changing their minds and abstaining or voting for the war,” and it was all on the basis of a lie, “or misunderstanding,” that Saddam Hussein allegedly had weapons of mass destruction, Flynn said. The same process was repeated for the deployment of British troops into Helmand province in Afghanistan in 2006; and the pressure is being applied again “for war in Iran to protect ourselves from non-existent long-range Iranian missiles carrying non-existent Iranian nuclear bombs.”

Those decisions, Flynn concluded, should be made in Parliament, “and there certainly should not be any Government [i.e., royal—ed.] pressure that settles those decisions. We should do it in future in free debate.”

Flynn’s point about the royal prerogative was en-



NATO

The Queen’s favorite Tony Blair is working overtime to escalate the conflict in Syria, using the same kind of lies he did in pushing the Iraq War.

dorsed by Labour MP Jeremy Corbyn. “This really goes to the heart of the power of Parliament because anyone outside this place, and indeed anyone outside this country, would find it extraordinary that in the 21st century we still do not have a war powers act, and that the Prime Minister can still use the powers of the royal prerogative to take us to war, supply arms, sign treaties, or anything else,” Corbyn said. “Surely a democratic Parliament and democratic accountability of the Executive require a vote in the House of Commons before any major decision can be taken that would have enormous implications for our foreign policy.”

Cross-Party Opposition to Cameron

The motion itself was the product of opposition across all three parties to Cameron’s policy of arming the Syrian rebels, and the debate reflected that fact. Tory MP John Baron, the sponsor of the motion, warned against the dangers of pumping more arms into a situation where there is already a huge amount of weapons.

“If humanitarian concerns are uppermost in people’s minds,” he said, “it beggars belief that anyone could suggest that pouring more arms into the conflict would not add to the violence and suffering.” He also warned that “the civil war in Syria is, in many respects, a proxy war being fought out at different levels,” those levels being Sunni versus Shi’a, Iran versus Saudi Arabia, and even the West versus Russia and China. “The risk of pouring more weapons into this conflict and of pouring more fuel onto that fire is that we not only increase the violence within Syria, but extend the conflict beyond Syria’s borders in very large measure.”

Peter Hain, a former Labour minister, argued that Britain is, in fact, culpable to a large degree for the violence in Syria. “We should have promoted a negotiated solution from the very beginning,” he said. “Instead, we began by demanding [Syrian President] Assad’s unconditional surrender and departure. However, calling for regime change meant chasing an unattainable goal at

the cost of yet more bloodshed and destruction, and so did supporting a rebel military victory.”

Menzies Campbell, a former leader of the Liberal Democrats, told the House that supplying arms to the Syrian opposition “constitutes a major change in the foreign policy of this government, with unknown political, military, and perhaps even Constitutional significance. Therefore, “the House is entitled to pass judgement on this policy before it is implemented.” Campbell went even further, however, to say, “Were the government to implement a policy of this kind without allowing the House an opportunity to pass judgement, it would be an abuse of the process, and would most certainly be regarded as such outside this House.”

On July 10, Foreign Secretary William Hague appeared before the House of Commons to make a statement on the Cameron government’s foreign policy, and in the process of answering questions, assured the House that the government would bring the question up for a vote should it decide to send arms to the Syrian rebels. While a number of partisans of the government used this point to try to argue that the motion under debate was “academic” or unnecessary, Baron noted that “there is a deficit of trust on these issues.”

In fact, more than 80 Tory MPs have signed a letter to Cameron asking that prior to any decisions being made about Syria policy, that they be put before the Parliament for a full debate and a vote. The trust problem was no doubt aggravated by Cameron’s statement a few days earlier that the U.K. had to retain the “ability to take action very swiftly.”

The Lords Weigh In

Discontent with the idea of arming the Syrian rebels has also been expressed in the House of Lords, notably by Lord Paddy Ashdown, leader of the Liberal Democrats from 1989 to 1999, and UN High Commissioner for Bosnia from 2002 to 2006. Ashdown has a history of supporting military interventions in other countries, but he nonetheless argued, in a speech before the Lords on July 1, that military intervention in Syria is “not sensible,” despite the fact that he otherwise agrees that Assad must step down.

Ashdown gave a number of reasons why Britain should not supply arms to the Syrian rebels, but the most important reason had to do with the potential for a wider war. “Syria is not the conflict,” he said. “[I]t is the front line in a wider conflict that is no longer about the great Satan of the West, but is now about the great heretic in Tehran. What we are seeing being built up now is a determined attempt, funded by the Saudis and the Qataris, to create a powerful, radicalised, jihadist Sunni element that can capture the community of the Sunni as a preparation for a wider war against the Shi’a.”

What is happening in Syria, Ashdown continued, is connected to what is happening in Lebanon, Tunisia, Egypt, and Mali. Therefore, “it is important that we understand the position of Russia. We believe that Russia is in favour of Assad because he is Russia’s last man in the Middle East. However, there is a deeper reason that we should understand. The Russian Islamic republics of Dagestan, Chechnya, and so on, are being infected by exactly the same movement. They know that the jihadisation of the Sunni umma [community] is affecting their stability.” Therefore, Russia is in great danger, he explained.

“So we have this terrifying situation of the West being instrumentalised on one side in favour of the Sunnis, and the Russians being instrumentalised on the other side in favour of the Shi’a in what runs a grave risk, although not a certainty, of widening into a much broader religious conflict that will engulf the Middle East.”

REVIVE GLASS-STEAGALL Now!



“The point is, we need Glass-Steagall immediately. We need it because that’s our only insurance to save the nation.... Get Glass-Steagall in, and we can work our way to solve the other things that need to be cleaned up. If we don’t get Glass-Steagall in first, we’re in a mess!”

—Lyndon LaRouche,
Feb. 11, 2013

WATCH the LaRouchePAC video:

‘Glass-Steagall: Signing a Revolution’

SUBSCRIBE to EIR Online

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

toll-free: **1-800-278-3135**

e-mail: fulfullment@larouchepub.com

Germany Must Become Sovereign; We Need a Civil Rights Movement!

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

July 12—The colossal, global eavesdropping assault on American citizens, as well as on the citizens of other countries and their governments, institutions, and corporations, is unprecedented in history, and represents a flagrant violation of human rights of all those who are being spied upon. It has, in fact, undermined international law.

The National Security Agency (NSA) monitoring programs “PRISM” and “Tempora” obtained telephone calls, faxes, e-mails, letters, chat, video and audio transmissions, etc.; communications can be accessed directly from the servers of Microsoft, Google, Yahoo, Facebook, etc. This means that even members of Congress and the German Bundestag, scientists, engineers, entrepreneurs, judges, lawyers, their clients, doctors, priests, etc., are bugged. Perhaps you will believe that this information is only kept in archives—if you are Sleeping Beauty.

Unfortunately, in Germany we have a two-fold experience with surveillance states. The Nazi Gestapo had 31,000 employees and also a perfidious system of informers established at the end of the Third Reich, which helped to train the population to the “German view.”¹ The Stasi system also violated people’s privacy, after East German Minister of State Security Erich Mielke’s motto: “Comrades, we have to know everything.” Despite the ruthlessness with which the opponents of the DDR system were persecuted, anyone who has ever visited the Stasi Museum, will agree that the Stasi’s cameras hidden in bird feeders were downright amateurish, compared to the global information vacuum cleaners of the NSA.

Therefore, NSA whistleblower Edward Snowden

1. The “German view” was a term for a timid, suspicious “keeping your eyes peeled,” even if no one is listening and no one is near. You could never know, in those Nazi years, whether any remark, any word of criticism, would be picked up by the Gestapo—with devastating consequences for those affected.

has done mankind a very, very great service. Snowden, in his June 4 interview with the *Guardian*, described the motive for his revelations: “We were actually involved in misleading the public and misleading all the publics, not just the American public, in order to create a certain mindset in the global consciousness, and I was actually a victim of that. . . .” He had hoped these excesses could be brought under control, but “as I’ve watched, I’ve seen that’s not occurring, and in fact, we’re compounding the excesses of prior governments and making it worse and more invasive. And no one is really standing to stop it. . . . The NSA lied about the existence of this tool to Congress. . . .”

Thus, Snowden has put his finger on the sore spot: From the time of the Bush Sr. administration at the latest, but, above all, during the two Bush Jr. administrations, and even more massively under Obama, the U.S. has been transformed from a republic into an empire, which is trying to control the world on the basis of the Anglo-American special relationship. Or, in the words of Daniel Ellsberg, who leaked the Pentagon Papers 42 years ago, which led to the resignation of Richard Nixon: “The country I stayed in [to face justice—Ellsberg] was a different America, a long time ago,” but now, Snowden has given Americans the chance to save themselves from the “United Stasi of America.”

Germany Faces Choices

This is exactly why the question is not whether “America is, and has been, our most faithful ally” as Chancellor Merkel has said, but this: Do we accept a status as vassals under an empire, or we stand by our republican constitution?

We can be wholeheartedly grateful to Snowden, because his revelations help to put a whole series of taboo topics on the agenda, namely:

1. That Germany, from 1945 to the present day, has

been an occupied country, as unequivocally documented by a book spotlighted by Snowden, *Monitored Germany*, by the historian Joseph Foscaphoth. This is a status that *all* governments have accepted without resistance since 1945, and nothing changed with the reunification in 1990. It is very good that this situation is now out in the open, because now everyone must face the question of whether he wants to stay a subject, or become a free citizen in a sovereign republic.

2. Given the breathtaking wealth of information over the past weeks on the extent of the NSA's operations on German soil, the exchange of information with German intelligence, and, above all, the reports of espionage on the EU itself, and against embassies, Merkel's statement that she had learned about the whole thing only from the media ought to raise some eyebrows.

If she really had no idea, then she has neither exercised her supervisory duties as Chancellor over the services, nor has she honored her oath of office to avert damage to the German people. If she has occupied herself so little with the matter, why is she so quick to play down the total surveillance of citizens, by rejecting the comparison with the Stasi? Given the excesses of American politics since the advent of the Bush-Obama era, ranging from wars of aggression, built on lies, against Iraq and Libya; Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo, drone war, Benghazi, arming al-Qaeda against the Syrian government; use of the IRS against political opponents, etc., she might have given a little thought to what sort of picture actually emerges from all that.

There is some evidence here that the American concept of "plausible deniability" comes into play, i.e., that the chain of command is so arranged that the political responsibility may be evaded, if in doubt. That Merkel so lightly dismissed the spying by the NSA, unfortunately brings to mind the fact that, although she now insists that the Stasi was incomparably worse than the NSA, as a young person in East Germany, she was able to thoroughly conform to the system.

Merkel's justification of the NSA's total-surveillance in Germany unfortunately confirms the thesis of Gertrud Höhler, who writes in her book, *The Godmother*, that Merkel is working for the dissolution of democracy in Germany; she allows the infiltration of "illegal activities into the legal system." And then

there's the outrageous statement which she uttered on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the CDU: "*For truly, we do not have a legal right to democracy and the social market economy for all eternity.*"

But what we indisputably do have is the claim guaranteed in the rights certified by the Basic Law, and in particular, Article 10 (1)—the privacy of correspondence, posts, and telecommunications shall be inviolable—as well as the inalienable rights that every human being is given by natural law.

The Fight for Civil Rights

Luckily, there are patriots in America like Rep. Rush Holt (D-N.J.), who are preparing laws that will abolish the Patriot Act and the FISA Amendments Act (2008), which made the present surveillance state possible.

The total spying by the NSA fundamentally violates the U.S. Constitution, and even in the U.S., has no legitimacy, but it may yet have legality. In Germany, it has neither the one nor the other. It is one of the great achievements of constitutional history that governments derive legitimacy only through the consent of the governed, which is wonderfully expressed in Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, with the formula, "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

Obviously, Madame Chancellor, your socialization has not allowed you to get to know this basic idea of republican virtue, and probably, you would take the side of Gessler's party in Schiller's drama "Wilhelm Tell." In China, there is the concept that the government has the mandate of Heaven, only if it represents the common good, and only this mandate gives it the right to demand the obedience and loyalty of the citizenry. The mandate of Heaven can be withdrawn in case of bad rule. I think your statement on the NSA was such a notice of termination.

What we need now in Germany, is a civil rights movement, which ensures that all rights enshrined in the Basic Law are recaptured and that Germany finally gains its full sovereignty, for which it struggled most recently with the peaceful Revolution of 1989—and indeed, the full sovereignty over the domestic, foreign, economic, and monetary policy.

We need a second peaceful revolution, because we have been cheated out of the fruits of the first!

Translated from German by Daniel Platt.

Impoverished Mali Can Become A Breadbasket for the Sahel

by Lawrence K. Freeman

July 12—There is a genuine desire by the Malian people to have their Presidential election on July 28, their first since the March 2012 coup d'état destabilized their country, and since the war against the jihadist invasion in the north. If this month's vote is successfully completed, the underlying issues that led to the crisis in Mali will still have to be addressed. A long-term strategic vision for the country, and for the entire Sahel, is desperately needed, to lift up this impoverished region, which is suffering from an extreme lack of development in basic infrastructure, especially in the critical areas of energy and transportation.

For Mali to become a stable, unified, and peaceful nation, conditions of existence in the northern region—Timbuktu, Gao, and Kidal—which extends into the Sahara Desert, must be radically upgraded. These three provinces encompass 800,000 square kilometers, about two-thirds of Mali's land area of 1,240,000 km². With just over a million people living there, the combined population represents less than 10% of Mali's 16 million people. Kidal, still not fully pacified (the Tuareg ethnic group, organized in the National Movement for the Liberation of Azawad/MNLA, has joined the jihadist invaders), has less than 100,000 inhabitants, and may have as little as 35,000 registered voters out of the 6-7 million Malians registered to vote in the upcoming election. Serious thinkers in Mali (and I would hope outside the country as well) realize that grand projects of economic and social development for the north are essential, as an included feature of Mali's plans following the election of a new President.

In a week-long visit to Mali (June 14-20), this author discovered what could be described as the country's "hidden" treasure: the Niger Inland Delta, which stretches 400 kilometers from the city of Djénné, north to the famous city of Timbuktu. West of the Delta one finds the Faguibine Lake system of five lake basins, another immense

untapped resource of water. From satellite photographs, the Delta appears as a gleaming giant emerald lying in the midst of the vast brown deserts of North Africa.

With the increased utilization of the great potential of the Delta and Faguibine, as an integral part of regional development approach, pivoted on massive expansion of infrastructure in water, energy, and transportation, the desert can be transformed into a lush garden, capable of creating the conditions for food self-sufficiency in Mali, as well as producing significant amounts of food to aid in eliminating hunger and the loss of life for millions of Africans suffering from a lack of nutrition.

FIGURE 1





EIRNS

During his recent trip to Mali, EIR Africa editor Lawrence Freeman (shown here) discovered the Inland Delta, managed by the Office of Niger. The billboard displays the canals and eight water systems of the Niger Delta. To the right of the map is a summary history of the Office of Niger, created in 1932.

According to recent United Nations reports on the humanitarian crisis in the Sahel region, 11.3 million Sahelians are short of food this year, and 1.5 million children under five years old are acutely malnourished. Thus, Mali, by becoming a major food exporter, can give the nation a meaningful mission beyond its own borders: to become a bread-basket for the Sahel.

Mali Knows How To Produce Food

Mali is one of the 25 poorest countries in the world, on the most underdeveloped continent on the planet, yet its agricultural potential has been recognized since it was a French colony (until 1960). Today, agriculture represents close to 40% of Mali's GDP, and employs 80% of the country's official labor force.

Mali's National Director of Agriculture provided the following overview.

Rainfall differs sharply between the north, which stretches up from the Sahel to the Sahara, and only receives 300-400 millimeters annually, while the south has an average of 1,200mm. In addition to many lakes and smaller rivers, the most important rivers are the Senegal and the Niger. Out of country's total land area

of 124,019,200 hectares (ha), 45 million are used for agriculture and breeding livestock, but only 572,911 ha are irrigated today, of which the 330,000 ha managed by the government grow the bulk of the country's food.

Mali's major crops are rice, maize, millet, sorghum, beans, peanuts, cotton, fruits, and vegetables; however, due to lack of storage, significant amounts of crops are lost to spoilage. In 2012, Mali produced 1,900,000 tons of rice and 6,674,000 tons of cereals, with the goal of 15 million tons of cereals by 2020. Already Mali is growing 2 million tons more than needed for domestic consumption, and almost twice as much rice

as it consumes. Mali is an exporter of rice, along with millet and cotton, to neighboring countries; yet today, many of its citizens are suffering from malnutrition and food insecurity, exacerbated by the country's political crisis.

Agriculture is allocated 13% of the government's budget, which provides seeds and a 55% subsidy for fertilizer. The government has programs to intensify cultivation of rice, maize, and cotton, using improved methods of farming to expand yields per ha, as part of its broader program that encompasses increased food production, improved storage, manufacturing finished food commodities, and marketing.

A New Breadbasket

The Niger River, originating in Guinea, snakes its way, first northeast, then southeast through Mali, Niger, Benin, and Nigeria, finally emptying out into the Bight of Benin in the Atlantic Ocean, after spreading out into Nigeria's vast Niger Delta wetland. Although the Niger River, at 4,150 km long, is the third-longest in Africa, behind the Nile and the Congo rivers, its volume is significantly less, so that it produces fewer than 200 mega-

watts of hydroelectric power for Mali, and only has a potential of 1,500 MW.

The real contribution of the Niger River is the Inland Delta, the oldest irrigated area in West Africa, which bridges northern and southern Mali, and lies in a depression that was once the bed of a large pre-historic lake. The smaller Bani River also feeds into the Delta.

The Office of Niger, a government-managed, irrigated area, created in 1932, located in the city of Ségou, 275 km north of the capital Bamako, manages only one portion of the Delta,¹ but it is the most fruitful section for irrigated food production. The Office manages 2,500 km of primary and secondary canals (not counting tertiary and quaternary canals), and uses 2.7km³ of water each year, about 10% of the total flow of the Niger River, the largest irrigation scheme in West Africa.

The author toured the Markala Dam, 816 meters long, first put into service in 1947 to provide a steady flow of water into the Delta for irrigation and navigation (no hydroelectric power). The dam has 488 gates that can operate in four different positions, and are used to raise the water level to 5.5 meters, thus diverting water into the Canal Adducteur, the primary 9-km-long diversion canal on the left bank. The Canal then divides into three diversionary canals; the Macina, Sahel, and Costes-Ongoiba.² Utilizing the natural canals and slopes of the Delta, the Markala Dam, with its man-made directed water flows, was conceived to dominate the eight water systems of this portion of the Delta, which the Office of Niger estimates covers 1,907,000 ha of irrigable land, that could be brought under their managed-irrigated scheme.³

Presently, with only about 100,000 ha of irrigated managed land in use, the Delta is reported to account for as much as 40% of the country's total rice production, with yields of 685,000 tons of rice in the last growing season. There are expectations of 737,645 tons in 2013-14. The Delta is also expected to yield 5,453 tons of maize, 337,307 tons of vegetables, and 24,500 tons of potatoes in this year's farming season.

In 1932, the Office of Niger envisioned that in 50 years, there would be 960,000 ha of managed-irrigation land, of which 510,000 would produce cotton; 450,000 would produce rice, with an estimated yield of

2,500,000 tons. That was to be accomplished by 1982. Three decades later, this potential has not yet been brought to fruition. While the motivations of those who developed this idea initially were purely colonial, in the worst sense of that word, the great potential of this area has been proven. If this vision for the future of the Delta is realized, Mali would become, in the words of the Office of Niger, "the granary of West Africa."

To accomplish this demands a reasonably centralized, integrated development of this area. In recent years, land-grabbing by various powers or financial interests, and agro-business ventures, have taken hold of whole parcels in the Office of Niger. Crop choices are not being determined by the needs of the Malian people and those of other Sahel countries, but by big profit considerations.

Among the largest projects is Malibya, a joint venture between Qaddafi's Libya and Mali, which was set up on 100,000 ha for rice production. Rice is highly water-consuming, as is cotton, the second source of revenue for Mali. The South Africans and the Chinese are producing sugarcane for biofuels on 20,000 ha of this very fertile land. A U.S. project to promote small farming extends over 14,000 ha.

For the full utilization of Mali's water systems, the dredging of the Niger River also is required, post haste.

Needed: A Strategic Vision for Africa

The lack of basic infrastructure in Mali is an indictment of the appalling failure of the City of London-dominated Western financial system, which is itself suffering the death agony of its own perverse monetarist ideology. How is it possible that in the second decade of the 21st Century, people in Mali (and elsewhere in Africa) are forced to burn down trees to make charcoal for cooking, because adequate electrical power does not exist? Basic roads to travel between cities have not been built. Transportation to northern Mali is effectively limited to air travel.

The United States abandoned any meaningful ideas for developing Africa following the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. After the collapse of the Bretton Wood System in August 1971, Henry Kissinger released his 1974 genocidal report, "National Security Study Memorandum 200 (NSSM 200),"⁴ which stipu-

1. The other two portions of the Delta are managed from Mopti and Timbuktu.

2. The Markala Dam also creates a canal for fish to pass through, and a canal for navigation.

3. From Office of Niger publications and personal briefings.

4. The full name of the Kissinger report, which remained classified until the late 1980s, is: "National Security Study Memorandum 200: Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and

lated that the strategic interest of the West was to maintain an uninterrupted supply of natural resources from the developing sector. At the same time, the West opposed the industrial development of those same countries, for fear they themselves would use up those resources; since then, there has been no meaningful commitment to build infrastructure in Africa.

Even before President Obama and NATO implemented Tony Blair's "responsibility to protect/R2P"-regime-change policy in Libya, which has resulted in a catastrophe for West Africa, 30 years of structural adjustments

imposed by the IMF on the whole of Africa had already caused the deplorable conditions which are pervasive throughout the continent. What better recruiting ground for insurgents and terrorists than large, desolate, underdeveloped areas, sparsely populated by desperately poor and alienated people, who, seeing no future, easily turn to criminal activity and violence?

President Obama's cynically misnamed "Power Africa" represents nothing more than a private sector commitment for 8,000-10,000 megawatts of electricity, which any honest observer of Africa knows does not even scratch the surface of what is needed. The African continent requires hundreds of billions of dollars of credits for the generation of thousands of gigawatts of electrical power, if we are to raise the level of existence of hundreds of millions of suffering Africans to a modern (human) standard of living.

Beginning today, we must abandon the prevailing narrow-minded, short-term, myopic, quick-buck approach to Africa, which has contaminated our thinking, and eaten away our morality, as we approach the 50th anniversary of the death of President Kennedy, our last elected national leader committed to scientific and



EIRNS/Lawrence Freeman

The 816-meter-long Markala Dam on the Niger River, shown here, was completed in 1947, to create a managed water system for irrigated agriculture, which potentially could service 1,907,000 ha of land. Full utilization of this naturally irrigated land would allow Mali to become a food exporter of rice to other countries of the Sahel region. The individual in the center is the director of the dam

technological progress. Kennedy was also the last U.S. President who acted to create a better future for Africa.

Given the porous borders and similarity of terrain of the countries neighboring northern Mali, it cannot be emphasized strongly enough, that without a strategic economic development policy for the entire region, the underlying conditions that have plagued Mali for decades will not be addressed. Nothing less will do. Without real economic progress, there will be no peace, and no security, but only failed and fragile states, strewn across Africa; the people will be easy prey for insurgency and destabilization.

This makes it all the more urgent that the United States implement Glass-Steagall legislation immediately to prevent further destruction of the global economy, and that we shift to a credit-based economic-financial system.

Pushing Back the Desert

Mali's Inland Delta is an oasis in the desert. But if its fruits are to be fully realized, there needs to be an integrated perspective that includes creating the financial means for the realization of these projects.

On June 30, 1962, the first President of independent Mali, Modibo Keita (1960-68) announced to an aston-

ished international community his intention to create a national currency, stating that, since the beginning of time, sovereignty was synonymous with the capacity of a state to issue its own currency. A monetary reform of that type, including public credit emission for large infrastructure projects, must be envisaged today, in the context of an overall international struggle to change the present monetarist system. This will be the only way to move Mali and the region rapidly into the 21st Century.

The perspective must be that all these nations develop a capital-dense infrastructure platform, including, in the medium term, use of nuclear power, and high-speed modes of rail transportation to span the girth of the continent, connecting to rail networks from the African Mediterranean coast down to Southern Africa. At the same time, education efforts must be significantly increased, with the intention to develop a populace able to master the higher technologies, and the culture of creativity, needed for the task.

Complementing what we might name the new Mali Delta Breadbasket, we should develop the long-known (but never realized) potential breadbasket of East Africa, of which 58 million acres of arable land are now located in South Sudan. This area is fertile enough to feed almost the entire continent. In our assault on the advancing desert, it is crucial that we move forward with the great water project of Central Africa, known as Transaqua, a plan designed 30 years ago to transfer water from the water-rich Congo River basin, to the arid Chad basin, and to refurbish the disappearing Lake Chad.⁵

Although we do not know the precise effects such projects will have, we do know that by significantly expanding the land area used for food production in the Delta, and reversing the contraction of Lake Chad, weather patterns will be changed through increased evaporation and transpiration, resulting in increased rainfall.

We must change the way we think about Africa, not limiting ourselves to the simple here-and-now, but rather, embarking on a bold and visionary journey to

discover what Africa could and should become. Let us allow our creative imaginations to soar to new heights, flying above all the practical nay-sayers who tell us "It will never happen," and unite the African nations and their allies around a common mission to finally develop the African continent.

Let Mali's Inland Delta become the center, from which expanding concentric waves of economic progress will spread across the region, with an immediate focus on increasing the production of food. Let us finally end the insecurity of millions of Africans, who wake up each morning not knowing if they or their children will have enough food to survive that day. If we adopt this approach, we will not only create the conditions to feed a billion Africans today, but the next billion as well. If we do not, we will be complicit, by our sins of omission, in condemning hundreds of millions of our fellow human beings to dehumanizing conditions of life, and death.

(This article was written in collaboration with my colleagues from Paris—Jacques Cheminade and Christine Bierre.)

lkfreeman@prodigy.net

THE EURASIAN LAND-BRIDGE

**'The New Silk Road'—Locomotive
For Worldwide Economic Development**

An EIR Special Report



(1997) 260 pages **\$100**
(EIR 96-007)

Available from

EIR News Service

P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Phone: 1-800-278-3135 or www.larouchepub.com

5. In brief, Transaqua involves building a canal from 5% of water—100 billion cubic meters—captured from the Congo River, north to join the Oubangui River, then sending the increased water flow across the Central Africa Republic to the Chari River which supplies Lake Chad. As a result, we will not only save the Lake for 50 million Africans who depend on it for their livelihoods, but reverse the spread of the Sahel desert. See "The Transaqua Project: Making Africa Bloom," *EIR* May 1, 2009.

A STUDY OF PERCUSSIVE INTERCOURSE:

How Silly Could Robert Hicks Be?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

July 8, 2013

There Is a Principle Here

*The question is: "Have you actually considered how many sad citizens there are out there, in certain parts of our republic, still today? I mean citizens who were caught up, even still today, by a certain implied complicity of conscience, in the nightmare world of the loutish U.S. President Andrew Jackson." If you wonder about those things, and have the stomach for it, you need but glance toward the weird world of the **New York Times** Op-Ed page this past July 3rd:*

"Why?"

For any actually competent historians today, the brutish manner of Jackson as in his actions against the Indians generally, and in his specific frauds against the U.S. Constitution, had represented nothing as much as what was never other than the evils of some lurking, nightmare world. It was a nightmare-world which is still resonating in the spirit of the Andrew Jackson myth in some parts of our nation, today.

Actually Andrew Jackson had been, and remains, in fact, that same spirit of evil, a spirit who had been actually closely linked to our nation's principal enemy, exactly the same Anglo-Dutch empire and banking system which had played the leading role in the treasonous creation of the Confederacy and its war, a war which was, in fact, mustered for the British empire's explicitly expressed intention of destroying our United States. In the end, President Lincoln's greenbacks had been the weapon which was decisive in beating back the British Empire's still-oncoming flood of intended crimes against our republic.

Therefore, you must ask yourself: who was Andrew Jackson, really? The answer, in fact, is, that he was a traitor by intention, and a criminal and a thug by his actions otherwise. Yet, a corrected view, shared by President

Author Robert Hicks seems never to have known the actual history of the Aaron Burr legacy, judging by his New York Times op-ed.



Herman Estevez

Lincoln, a view of the broader implications of those citizens who had joined the Confederacy, was that it was the leaders of the Confederacy, and, generally speaking, those leaders alone, who, like Aaron Burr's tribe, were the criminals: they had been evil, and had already known the fact of their own embedded spirit of evil, that from the start.

So, returning to the particular case of Robert Hicks in respect to all this and connected matters presently, Hicks' argument reminds us of the folly of the fictional "Miniver Cheevy" (who was, symbolically, of comparable intent and timber, as during the much later time of "Teddy" Roosevelt). They, too, had their reasons. Such fools as those, are a poor choice of bait for a cruel punishment of a simple man's offenses. President Abraham Lincoln clearly understood such distinctions, and acted so, promptly, in the appropriate moment. Lincoln's action on this account had given new birth to our injured nation of that time.

Therefore, how should we deal, once more, as might be needed, with dividing the sheep from the goats, especially in the matters set before us today? Bloody mass punishment is the self-inflicted doom wrought upon the children and grandchildren of those nations and individuals who would seek "satisfaction" in the killing or torture of fools, all that under the pretexts taken in the mere name of alleged justice.



Andrew Jackson, on the other hand, had been actually a fellow who had served the cause of British imperialism's project for the attempt to destroy our republic, an attempt by him which had been inspired by the morally worst impulses. Jackson had turned out, in fact, as a fellow who had been, at bottom, a mere flunky in the game in which he had played his part. For those who were not fooled, he was, even on the surface, also actually a bullying foe of our republic's vital interests. In fact, he was, actually, only one more soulless tyrant playing sundry vicious roles among a densely packed

mass of other swindling British agents: all of whom had been operating in the personal service of the U.S.A.'s worst traitor, that British super-spy, and also the British Empire's most notable professional assassin of that time, Aaron Burr.

But, for this occasion, when that much has been said, let us turn our attention here, to those, then, as also now, who had played the part of Burr's confused dupes in both what has been named "The Confederacy" of the past, and also the mere fantasists, such as the distant dreamer of this report, the **New York Times'** Robert Hicks of the record of Wednesday, July 3rd.

Lincoln's Justice


Despite the wretched part played by the so-called Confederacy, our President Abraham Lincoln had proceeded with what he had expressed, as the correct judgment, that, for the most part, the participants in the "Confederacy's" action were more often pompously reckless dupes and fools, than they were, otherwise, merely culprits, who were, at bottom, misguided fools lured into playing the part of an enemy of our republic, but, at bottom, the mere dupes of the evil force which is actually, still, the evil Anglo-Dutch British empire of

the present day.

Now, to what I have indicated as being *The New York Times'* confused Robert Hicks, who seems never to have known the actual history of the Aaron Burr legacy, even if Hicks does not show that he knows the actual effect of his contribution published in the *New York Times'* pages from earlier this past week. The fact remains, that Hicks' current role is neither particularly nice, nor an honest one, nor, at bottom, a competent one in any true sense. His role in history, is, in fact, only what he,

and his like, had merely wished to believe, with scant benefit of reason or actual cause. He appears to be essentially confused, and more than a little bit silly.

As President Abraham Lincoln made very clear, in his concluding judgment on the matter of the generality of the Confederacy, we must not crush those whom we should have intended to redeem: even were their error disgusting, it were better treated as mere error, rather than serious crime.



The British Empire's lackeys: the loutish Andrew Jackson (right), and his master, the murderer of Alexander Hamilton, Aaron Burr.

I.

The Presidency as Our System

In the course of the history of our Presidency, even today, when that history is considered in the light since its inception as an institution, our republic has been the repeated target for a set of those bitterly malicious British agents assembled under their monarchy's imperial control of such victims' minds. Their corruption has been a presently continuing practice, one which had been deployed, and that most notably, up into the present time, that done for the intended mass destruction of our United States and people, done also against other targetted nations, which the presently sheer evil of the Anglo-Dutch empire has decreed for mass-executions in such modes as mass-murder practiced on the pretext of population reduction, as presently.

This pattern of criminal practices of that monarchy,

had occurred, repeatedly, in the course of which, the dupes had been often aided in the purpose of that assigned mission of that monarchy, and others, as for the purposes of ruining, and, often, whatever the actual motive, bringing on the ultimate destruction of our United States through mass-murder done in the name of "environmentalism," in particular, as at this present time. Such had been the mentality of crime encountered in familiar specific cases such as that of the loutish Andrew Jackson, and also of his absolute master, the professional mass-murderer, Aaron Burr.

Fortunately, such "critters" as that Andrew Jackson, were never as successful on their own account as they might have often wished to have seemed to believe. Nonetheless, their witting, or either their often more or less witless, but habituated devotion, was to undermine our United States in one way, or another. All that had been done, essentially, on behalf of those intrinsically thieving British banking interests, such as those centered now long-since, around New York City's lower Manhattan, or the London-tied financiers in service earlier to the mere myth of what would come to be, later, today's Wall Street, a Wall Street now still operating with aims in the presently continued spirit of Wall Street's London-centered, now long actually deceased Confederacy.

Ironically, the British empire might have succeeded with greater success, early on, but for the fact that those

scoundrels who had been sent to destroy us on their behalf, like their agent Andrew Jackson himself, had often wasted their time, more because, like the gangsters they tend to mimic, they are already tempted to stop to cheat and steal for a while, instead of “sticking to business.”

The overt British agents working in the effort to destroy our United States, like Tony Blair, had been launched by the highest ranks of the (primitively Dutch) British intelligence services of the late Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, and beyond, all under the direction of the habitually murderous classes composed of a medley of British (i.e. Dutch-British) agents, and with auxiliary American traitors acting in the tradition of such as the relatively most outstanding traitor on the record for the U.S.A. of modern times, who had been for his time, the British empire’s agent Aaron Burr, who remained a leading New York banker in his own time, and, also a leading international murderer and thief for longer than he had lived.

Once that much were said, the British empire were better identified for practical purposes of historical accuracy, as the Anglo-Dutch empire (predominantly Dutch in origin) still to the exactly present date. That has been, and remains, predominantly, a part of what is popularly referenced as the nominally British world empire, that to the date of past and present alike. Those who believe the contrary, are the typical fools in current world affairs, notably including, most commonly, the silly fools among our own nation’s Wall Street.

Thus, to summarize the immediate point, the result of the lesser, but none-the-less brutish Andrew Jackson’s role of incumbency, was, in plain fact, a parade of some members struck in the likeness of a Caribbean “pirates’ crew,” a collection which, all at the same time, was an accumulation of fully witting, essentially British-directed skunks, against Wall Street lumps, each and all, stacked against our United States. Such traitors of those past and present times, and also our own, were Americans working as a quality of British agents best typified then as those under the direction of Aaron Burr for as long as he had lived. The principle to be considered, still now, is that that pack of murderous “political whores” who have been assigned, for some time, to serve the long-ranging aims associated with the Jackson school of treason, had been typified, otherwise, in their role of supplying continuing batches of political tool and fools, as since the bloody British (Anglo-

Dutch) imperialism since the late Seventeenth Century, as that habit had been continued, in fact, through to the present time.

However, from the beginning of both the original Plymouth settlement, and that of the Massachusetts Bay Colony and, later, the subsequent, Eighteenth-century struggle for establishing a sovereign U.S. republic, it had happened that the same forces have been the principal enemy of what was to be the United States, as their motive has been the same as the actually intended motive for the imperialist Anglo-Dutch rulers’ crushing of the Massachusetts Bay system, earlier.

It is to be said, that since those earlier times of the Seventeenth Century, through the Eighteenth Century, and to the present day: this set of issues had been our unavoidable struggle against the originally Dutch-created system of modern imperial warfare, that of William of Orange, et al. That which, in turn, had been launched as the active intention of what became the so-called British empire during the course of the Seventeenth Century, and had been renewed by the aid of provocations such as the brutal invasions of Britain and Ireland conducted by the Dutch oligarchy, in turn produced that which is now, still, the integrated Anglo-Dutch imperial system which now still operates under the prominently stipulated, and murderously “green” reign of Britain’s present Queen Elizabeth II.

Compare the Case of Hicks

Frankly, once we had considered those points of leading historical fact, Robert Hicks’ current literary product appears to be, essentially, speaking historically, a “flat-out” hoax. Whether Hicks is as dumb as he seems to be, or not, whatever you might wish to conclude otherwise, the fact is, that for me here, in what he has preached to whatever choir, the “bottom line” has not been the mere picaresque quality of Hicks’ ostensible foolishness, nor options of some intended wicked guile; it is, rather, the ends to which the hoaxes are aimed, such as those which Hicks’ folly has expressed in both his current and his past, as amply presented this past July 3rd as merely typical.

He is not to be described as having “merely made mistakes,” as much as he might be seen rather most clearly, as having defined himself in that July 3 piece. I think that, perhaps, I would judge the case he himself had presented, if so pitifully, as historically an intellectual mistake. His efforts to make history safely silly, indicate means which might be used to corrupt him, or,

perhaps, stupefy him, and therefore as duped into assisting, with some degree of complicity in the continued ruining of our citizenry, ever more widely. In any case, he is not to be considered as otherwise important, as other than simply misfortunate, probably silly, in his preferences.

II.

The Case of “The Bush League”

Before I might turn to some of the most profound implications of the issues posed for our attention as the systemic criminalities of the Anglo-Dutch tyrannies, reference the lesser, but also simpler subject of that system of participating roles in subversion and other corruption of the United States. Even within the bounds of the merely participating roles which have been recently typified from inside the United States itself, as by such cases as that of our temporary subject merely for reference here: Robert Hicks’ incompetence is not necessarily also criminal; foolish, or stupid, might be better suited to describe it.

The most convenient example for examining this matter of distinctions with which I had just been wrestling here, as since the beginning of the Twentieth Century, has been, presently, focussing our attention on the case of the presently well known Bush family’s traditional politics. Take the “Bush League” in its actual expression as exemplified by the sometime Adolf Hitler backer, Prescott Bush, et al. Or, take, for an example, his role as a prominent, modern example of the roots of “Wall Street,” which had inserted *de facto* treason against the U.S.A., in effect, as Prescott Bush, his cronies, and his ties to Hitler have done, as during the course of the Twentieth Century, in particular.

The Bush family’s part as a relatively leading factor in Twentieth-century international affairs, on its surface, might appear to be of less “solid substance,” than its convenient literary array of names as such, as being a kind of script which the members of the cult are assigned to read. Yes, they are a bad crew on the known record, like those financiers who were sent to prison, as during the term of the Franklin Roosevelt administration’s attention to the crimes of the relevant leading bankers of his time.

Otherwise, the Bush family’s roster of, unfortunately, leading influentials in the nation’s politics, has been, largely, a reflection of the failed attempt, as, for



White House/Joyce N. Boghosian

The two “Bush league” presidencies represented a continuation of the pro-Nazi founders of the family dynasty. Here, George W. and George H.W., at the White House, September 2008.

example, by the precedent of some prison-worthy veterans of the Hoover administration, at bringing a powerfully vicious, even specifically fascist form of government, into power within our United States.

A similar trend followed as the continuation of Wall Street erupted with the time of the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, all through an attempted set of take-overs, in replacing the legacy of the Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt, by a replacement, in every sense of the word, as under that nasty President Harry S Truman. Truman had been a particular insertion which was intended to be a characteristic feature of a post-“World War II,” “World Depression-trend” under Truman, in quality of impact on the trans-Atlantic world. That impulse has been the source of the setting-off of the broad trend which has continued in our nation’s history, since the effects of the assassinations of President John F.

Kennedy, and his brother Robert, up to the present time.¹

That conclusion which I had, thus, just stated, leaves no reason for doubt of that conclusion, when the customary lack of principles of physical-economic changes since the assassinations of the Kennedy brothers had been taken properly into account. That which was true already during the last years of the 1960s, has been accelerated into a long-term trend of ever deeper decadence of the trans-Atlantic region (in particular), from the close of the 1960s to the present day.

In those circles of those adversaries of President Franklin Roosevelt, which had come back into power with the deaths of President John F. Kennedy and his brother Robert, Wall Street had been the visible effect of the British agents' working against our nation's interests within the United States' leadership, as typified by the effect of that policy-shaping under the Bush family which had come to the surface since the 1970s, a crew which had been associated with an increasingly brutish power, dedicated much more, over recent decades, to being the parts of an attempted "Bush league," a kind of tyranny which seems to have been clearly of far greater importance to them, than the loss of the security of what had once been intended by some among us, as being our truly sovereign nation in every meaningful sense of the matter.

Now, the FDR Legacy

President Franklin Roosevelt, during the four terms of office to which he had been elected, had thus turned a then outgoing history into a directly contrary, far nobler direction, which was to have been intended for as long as he had lived. However, the greater portion of the interval between the earlier, "convenient assassination" of President William McKinley, which had been quickly followed by the election of the Confederacy-inspired President Theodore Roosevelt, to most of the period then following, and also, the continuing pro-Confederacy strain into Theodore Roosevelt's term in office, had set into motion a parade of "political skunks"

continued throughout the greatest part of the 1901 to 1933 interval, as contrasted with the election of FDR. So, with the death of FDR, the political corruption took over again with the accession of Harry S Truman. My personal choice during that and succeeding times, was expressed briefly in the proposal which I made in my concisely brief letter to Dwight D. Eisenhower, at a time when he had been based at Columbia University. There was also no error by me in discerning some actually most relevant "political skunks," in such terms of reference, as I had done from that time, up to the present date, and also the current time.²

However, the original fascist scheme affecting some among our own selections of Presidents, had already been built up earlier, as during the period of those acting as successors to the conveniently murdered President William McKinley, through the World War I interval, as continued through most of the interval between the assassination of President William McKinley [assassinated on September 1, 1901, and died on September 14], and the election of President Franklin Roosevelt, in 1932. Its reversal was the effect of what had been the Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt, for longer than he had lived.

However, for as long as while Franklin Roosevelt remained what he had been in death as in the best of his life, the succession of the evil embodied in the Truman Presidency, abruptly changed the absolute direction of our United States under the post-FDR, Truman Administration. That change was a sudden turn-about, a turn back toward an intended trend toward pro-fascist tendencies, as shown in the Truman administration's connections to the consummately evil Bertrand Russell, embodied in his proposing the launching of a "preventive nuclear war" against the Soviet state, a Winston Churchill-Bertrand Russell scheme which lasted, then, for about as long as the plotters had yet to discover that the Soviet Union already possessed a nuclear weapons system roughly comparable in efficiency to that of the United States

1. That was never consistently the case for all Presidents since President Lyndon Johnson's reluctant adoption of launching of the U.S. war in Indo-China; but, it was the trend set by those who had, for example, promoted the deaths of both Kennedy brothers. I had followed, personally, the manner in which the influence of the Bush tribe had overridden the influence of even Presidents of the post-John F. Kennedy intervals, and had then added the Bush tribe's borrowed "spare parts" sequel, British stooge Barack Obama.

2. Since relatively early during my modest, war-time service, I have always considered myself personally accountable, for stating and assuming personal accountability in holding myself as accountable for the benefit, or failure of my continuing personal insights into an updated insight into the selection of our U.S. Presidents. Any respectable citizen should have done the same. "If you put that bum into office, you should hold yourself accountable for either what you support, or your failure to assume reasonable responsibility for his performance in office. Otherwise, your choice of candidate, is not worth very much, and your negligence is probably even less worthy." Call it: "put up, or shut up."

and United Kingdom. Such were things as they went under the British monarchy and its consenting flunky, the Truman administration.

Fortunately, even then, the residue of what had been the patriotic core of the USA's World War II leaders, was still a significant factor, and that, for a moment in history, was continued as the contribution of a powerful thrust, only typified by the relationship between the Presidency of John F. Kennedy for as long as he had lived, and what General Douglas MacArthur and Dwight D. Eisenhower had briefly inserted into the process of world history even under conditions of their retirement, for as long as they lived. Hope continued up to the point that the rising fascist residue accumulated by a desperate "Wall Street" combined with London, was enabled to enjoy their pleasure in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and, later, of his prospective successor, Robert Kennedy.

It is urgent, for an effective understanding of the political process on which I have touched somewhat significantly, here, to look back a step or two in history, to recognize the "inside" enemies of the U.S.A. from an earlier century, which had included such specimens as Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren, and also such profoundly critical, contrary cases as the specific resonance, over decades to come, caused by the assassination of U.S. President William McKinley.

The McKinley assassination had been the means which had opened the gates of treason for the triumph of a student of a murderous U.S. traitor, Theodore Roosevelt's most treasonous Confederate uncle. It was that change which opened the gates of Hell, which were opened for the entry of such wretches as Ku Klux Klan fanatic Woodrow Wilson, and for the 1920s followers of a coming wave of fascism set into motion by such wretches of their times as Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover.

Why was that series of assassinations of great Presidents tolerated as much as it was? Guess!



Library of Congress

The assassination of President William McKinley, and the election of the Confederacy-inspired Theodore Roosevelt, set into motion a parade of "political skunks," from 1901 to 1933, as contrasted with the election of FDR. Shown: The assassination of McKinley, Sept. 6, 1901.

What Happened Then?

The death of Franklin Roosevelt meant a looming cessation of a U.S. patriotic revival against the after-effects of the Harry S Truman role in efforts combined with Britain's Winston Churchill and Bertrand Russell, in their effort to turn the course back, once again, toward what would threaten to become a movement toward both nuclear warfare and fascism. Fortunately, the later role of President Eisenhower as candidate for President, and also actually President, succeeded in checking, significantly, the fascist-and-even-worse (thermonuclear) trends such as impulses which had been already inherent, earlier, in the London-steered Truman administration's impulses toward the "preventive nuclear warfare" demanded by Britain's Bertrand Russell. These latter impulses had been checked, first, in significant part, but only a part, by the Presidency of Dwight Eisenhower, and during the earlier part of the next decade, by the Presidency of John F. Kennedy, the latter in such a degree of effectiveness, that the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and, later, his brother Robert, were virtually the only means by which the Kennedy leadership could have been stopped.

Thus, the threatened inevitable outcome of the

wildly fascist rage expressed in both the assassinations of the Kennedys, and in the wicked intentions of the Richard Nixon administration.

The end of the Ronald Reagan administration, and the disgusting qualities of brutish incompetence of President George H.W. Bush and his tribe, had seemed to have allowed the intermittent role of President Bill Clinton, after whom, since, all Hell has been spiralling downward toward our nation's self-destruction, under what have been, practically, the successive dictatorships of George W. Bush, Jr., the worse Barack Obama, and such as the present self-adjudged ruler of the Anglo-Dutch world, the imperial Queen Elizabeth II.

III.

The Spoor of the Anglo-Dutch Tyranny

For this moment, there is no reason of urgency which should oblige me to merely repeat here and now, the skein of evidence which has been the truth about the Bush family Presidencies' pollution of the United States' government over the course since the keystone role contributed by the Adolf Hitler-sponsor Prescott Bush.³ The influence of the Bush and Obama regimes, has been as it had been followed through, and beyond the relevance of the sundry leading political positions of his son George H.W. and, in turn, of "George W.", all those in roles such as sometime CIA "czar," sometime wretched Vice-President, and both combined in the effects of the reigns of the inherently failed President George H.W. Bush, and his brutishly foolish son, George W. Bush, in turn: all in the sickening exhibitions of both endless Bush-league Vice-Presidents and Presidents, as if this might have become a permanent pestilence in perpetuity. President Barack Obama is the outcome, this far, of that ruinous Bush succession.

Against that background, Robert Hicks' expressed view on the subject of the principles of American history, has no relationship to anything which might be decently considered to be actually a competently defined world-historical process. As I have seen the brief evidence presented, it might suggest that Hicks' mind appears to be occupied on this occasion, but not with any resemblance to actually real-life history. Instead,

Hicks is gripped by a hopeless fantasy, an eternally perpetual, and monstrously silly, pin-ball-game likeness, leading a poor fool to continue the legend of the "Civil War Forever." All meaning an outright case of a lunatic denial of reality spanning, in his delusion, about a century and a half later! So, the history of tragedy has sometimes turned into farce.

Therefore, consider that Hicks' expressed view, as in the case presented in the **New York Times'** editorial pages of July 3rd, has more similarity, as I have said earlier, to playing successive games on a pin-ball machine, than anything resembling the reality of a notion of history as an actual process of the human species' unfolding self-development.

Unfortunately, there had been much graver such folly in the British imperial service, that such as that of Prescott Bush and his relevant progeny to date. Both sets of cases, Bush League or Confederacy, have merely included the follies of those present-day scribblers who seek sympathy for their persuasion, the persuasion that the Civil War which had been actually created and backed by the clear and massive intention of British Empire, was instead to be regarded as merely a polite exchange of differences, if sometimes bloodied differences, among respectable gentlemen, in service of the silly dream of the "Confederacy forever."

All those particular, and related other facts notwithstanding, the fact of the Civil War in the United States, was that it had been an action by actual enemies of the United States, an action which had been organized and directed not by foolish "Southerners," but by the British empire, along with the presently intended, now presently proposed "Wall Street" destruction, through the sheer lunacy of "Bail Out," of the institutions of our United States, as also in Europe. All that had been done on the behalf of that Anglo-Dutch empire whose intent has been perpetually, to destroy our United States at some now very near time. The "peaceful remedy" would have been, formerly, to ship the relevant sponsors of "Black slavery," themselves, into efficient speed, as cargo, backwards, across the Atlantic waters, that done on the account of that British Empire where their actual loyalties to the practice of slavery had long resided. Now, much more mass-murderous schemes than those particular instances, are those present measures of intended genocide now in the frankly naked commitment to an avowed, current world agenda of genocide stipulated by the Queen of England.

Grant that author Robert Hicks has spent some ef-

3. See "The Bush Family's British Fascism," Anton Chaitkin, [EIR](#), July 12, 2013 or [LaRouchePAC](#).

forts on behalf of a hollow myth concocted to treat the Civil War as if it had been a mere misunderstanding concerning locations of fence-posts among neighbors. The passions expressed among a large ration of the admirers of the folly of the legacy of that Confederacy, remain embodied in much of the “virtual genes” of the Confederacy’s slave-system’s descendants to the present day. However, sadly, the sordid cult of “race relations” remains embossed upon the electorates of our United States, more emphatically in the “Southern states,” than the “North,” but also only somewhat less in the northern states. By the way, civilized Christians would have never have tolerated the practice of “Black slavery.” Robert Hicks’ expressed reaction to such facts of history, as in this current piece, is reduced to a model of an exhausted state of moral mediocrity.

IV.

The Truth of the Matter

I am now on the thin cutting edge of ninety-one years of age. Now, the beginning of what some wished to see become, in their hope, a new “ Civil War,” had begun, effectively, with the inauguration of President

Andrew Jackson, which was established by a truly disgusting sort of law since 1828. All of the lies under the superior authority of what we might choose to measure as the reigning sponsorship of the U.S. traitor, and chronic murderer, Aaron Burr, had threatened to drag us under that then-already long-standing British imperial agent and professional assassin, as that fact was also fixed, indelibly, in the monstrously shameless, and implicitly virtually treasonous folly of fools in the 1828 election of Andrew Jackson.

The full-scale drive for turning the so-called “Southern States” against the United States, had to have been seen as begun in Andrew Jackson’s mass-murderous actions, earlier, against the Cherokee Nation, a Cherokee people more literate and civilized than the associates of that Andrew Jackson with his lawless betrayal of honor and of the looted territory of the Cherokee nation. The debt of American honor had reposed in the guarantees by U.S. President George Washington. Jackson was already, clearly, a political whore, teathed in murder, as in his practice against the Cherokee nation at that time: that from much earlier than 1828, and beyond today’s 2013, all at my present age of 91 years.

Jackson’s claim to honor was all lies, conveniently covered over, in contrast to my own biological inheritance in North America, which had begun with the landing of the Mayflower. These matters, including the pattern of human progress which so many among us have honored, however limited that devotion had been, are not some relic from an obscure part of our nation’s history; they are the milestones of a profound dedication to a continuing process of permanent change, a change by means of which human existence were properly to be measured as a constantly living, and always developing, and, hence, always evolving process currently ongoing within our Solar system.

Our republic, in particular, is presently being confronted by attention to matters of evidence bearing on a long failure from among the Earthly mess. A new, higher meaning of mankind’s role within the region identified as Earth and Mars, awaits the future soon, if we were to become wise enough, as might become possible within the presently young century.⁴

4. Cf. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.: “Nicholas of Cusa, Kepler & Shakespeare,” [EIR](#), June 21, 2013, or [LaRouche PAC](#), and also [The Great Ontological Paradox](#), July 12, 2013, or [LaRouche PAC](#).

The Civil War And the American System


*America’s
Battle with Britain,
1860-1876*

By W. Allen Salisbury

Utilizing a rich selection of primary-source documents, Salisbury reintroduces the forgotten men of the Civil War-era battle for the American System. Together with Abraham Lincoln, they demanded industrial-technological progress, against the British “free trade” economists and the British-dominated Confederacy.

Downloadable PDF \$15.00

1-800-278-3135



Lift Our Eyes to the Stars

On July 20, 1969 mankind truly became citizens of the Solar System, when the Apollo 11 spacecraft touched down on the Moon. That historic moment, followed by the unforgettable “giant leap for mankind,” survives as a testament to the spirit of the real identity of the United States, when it was committed, under our great Presidents, to expanding the knowledge and welfare of all mankind.

What has happened to that identity? How could we as a nation, have become so degraded as to throw away that beautiful vision of man’s achievement, and submit to “leaders” such as Barack Obama, whose policies are systematically killing the space program, among his other victims? Can we, in fact, muster the quality of mind to fight to take up the mission which President Kennedy laid before the nation, and put ourselves back on the road to progress again?

The answer to those questions lies in facing some fundamental truths about the nature of mankind. As Lyndon LaRouche has stressed in recent years, human beings are not creatures of the senses, controlled by what they can hear, see, smell, taste, and touch. Human beings are *noëtic* beings, defined by having minds which can (and must) envision the future, and can take willful action to create what that future will be. Through their minds, which develop the ideas, and then the tools, to intervene into nature, human beings exercise the power to control their environment, to the benefit of the planet as a whole.

How very opposite this reality is, to the today’s common conception that we are creatures determined by our biology and the resources given to us from the past. We have literally been “dumbed down,” concerning ourselves almost totally with our immediate experience, and giving the non-

sense excuse of “not enough money,” when confronted with the demands from those committed to the space program, that we resume our mission to the Moon—as just one example—as the necessary jumping-off point for the full-scale exploration of the Solar System required for the defense of Earth for generations to come.

For space exploration, including eventual manned missions, is not a frill; it’s a necessity for mankind’s progress and survival. It is the Solar System, and the galaxy beyond, which actually determine our conditions of life and future as a species. To deny this reality is suicidal.

President Kennedy’s decision to commit the United States to land a man on the Moon during the 1960s, represented not just a “practical” response to Soviet leadership in space at the time, but an affirmation of man’s nature as a noëtic creature who can discover the principles which govern the universe, and master them. As such, it necessarily did have “practical” effects in vastly increasing man’s productive powers of labor, as a by-product of that higher commitment.

The other side of the issue is that a determination to *kill* space exploration, including manned space flight, reflects the anti-human intention to destroy human progress, and human beings as such. One sees this clearly in the case of Obama, who readily adopts the programs of Wall Street and the British Queen which are killing millions in the name of saving money and the environment. Such programs *save* nothing—not even their bankrupt system of Empire.

Man’s mind as the pinnacle of Creation—that’s the principle that must be restored. It’s the foundation of every program we require to save humanity now. Focus on it, and we can succeed.

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review
April 5, 2013 Vol. 40 No. 14
www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

The Cyprus Template: Your Money And Your Life
LaRouche: The New Governance of Inner Solar Space
EIR Attends Iran Conference on Persian Gulf Cooperation

The Great Cyprus Heist:
Glass-Steagall, or Death



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

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



I would like to subscribe to **EIR Online**

(e-mail address must be provided.)

- ☐ **\$360** for one year
☐ **\$180** for six months
☐ **\$120** for four months
☐ **\$90** for three months
☐ **\$60** for two months
- ☐ Send information on receiving **EIR** by mail.

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail _____

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

e-mail: **fulfillment@larouchepub.com**

Call **1-800-278-3135** (toll-free)

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 _____