


EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

August 31, 2012 Vol. 39 No. 34 www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

SDI Today! Next, Beyond Mars
It's Obama Who Is Pushing for Thermonuclear War
EU Bank Bailouts Are Murdering Europe's People

**Teller Was Right at Erice:
The Threat Against Mankind**



Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: *Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.,
Antony Papert, Gerald Rose, Dennis Small,
Edward Spannaus, 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 Hoeffle, 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 Almaro*

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.executiveintelligencereview.com

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Webmaster: *John Sigerson*

Assistant Webmaster: *George Hollis*

Editor, Arabic-language edition: *Hussein Askary*

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly

(50 issues), by EIR News Service, Inc.,

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

(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, Ave Morelos #60-A, Col Barrio

de San Andres, Del. Azcapotzalco, CP 02240,

Mexico, DF. Tel: 5318-2301, 1163-9734, 1163-9735.

Copyright: ©2012 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

Now that man has extended his sensorium to reach the planet Mars, opening up heretofore unimaginable new frontiers to challenge our noëtic capabilities, Lyndon LaRouche begins to investigate the feasibility of organizing a defense of Earth against the threats posed by asteroids and other space debris. In this week's *Strategy* cover story, "Edward Teller Was Right at Erice: The Threat Against Mankind," LaRouche delves more deeply into the scientific breakthroughs needed, and which now become possible, with the magnificent success of Curiosity. "It gives us, among other benefits, the justified hope to believe, that the human species might find succor, whenever, and wherever it is within the reach that is needed, for the continuation of that great mission which we have yet to come to know fully."

As you will see, LaRouche, and his "ironical sometime critic," Dr. Edward Teller, were already imagining—and campaigning for—a defense of Earth, more than 30 years ago, when the work of both converged to create what President Reagan termed, the Strategic Defense Initiative, and to accomplish what Teller would call "the common aims of mankind." Two speeches given to a LaRouche movement conference, ten years after Reagan's historic call for the SDI, describe how that amazing collaboration worked.

World News begins with, "It's Obama Who Is Pushing Toward Thermonuclear War," which cites the President's threat to use U.S. military force to overthrow the Syrian government, in statements that recall Cheney's lies about "nuclear mushroom clouds" from Iraq. In response, more sane voices are being raised against the danger of a U.S.-Russian nuclear confrontation: See "Military Experts Provide Alternative to Obama's War." There is also coverage of the economic catastrophe overtaking Europe in "The EU's Bank Bailout Policies Are Murdering Europe's People"; and reports on budget sequestration: "Obama's Coup Against Congress Gathers Steam"; Rachel Brown's campaign for Congress in Massachusetts; and on "Obama's War Crimes: Drone War on Pakistan."

LaRouche wraps up the issue, in our *Feature* article, "SDI Today!: Next, Beyond Mars," in which he observes, provocatively, "We, the human species, are now defined, in functional terms, as also a 'Martian race' in effect, even though no human being known to us has yet set foot to take up regular duties there." You will have to read the rest to find out what he means.



Cover This Week

An artist's concept of a Space Laser Satellite Defense System.



U.S. Air Force

- 4 Edward Teller Was Right at Erice: The Threat Against Mankind**
By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. "At this present moment, there are two mutually contradictory options respecting the continued survival of the human species": the lurch toward global thermonuclear war, centered on the strategic policies of President Obama; or the alternative of LaRouche's three-point program. However, LaRouche writes, the successful landing on Mars of the Curiosity rover brings us to the threshold of a new age for mankind, in which we can secure the continued existence of our species, and its future out into the Solar System and beyond.
- 18 The Power of Ideas: LaRouche's SDI Changed the World**
Jeffrey Steinberg's 1993 speech to a conference on the 10th anniversary of the SDI.
- 22 Dr. Edward Teller: Science Can End the Age of Nuclear Terror**
- 23 Erice 1983: Reagan, Teller, Wood Intervene for Mankind**
- 25 How the SDI Was Created: LaRouche's Method and 'New Physical Principles'**
- 35 It's Obama Who Is Pushing Toward Thermonuclear War**
Lyndon LaRouche's 2009 warning that Barack Obama is a pathological narcissist in the image of Emperor Nero, has proved right in spades: His illegal regime-change war in Libya; the extra-judicial assassinations of American citizens; the drone killings, all point to the need to remove him from office now.
- 38 Military Experts Provide Alternative to Obama's War**
Harvard defense analyst Graham Allison sounds the alarm about the danger of a U.S.-Russian nuclear confrontation, in a *Financial Times* op-ed, entitled "Thucydides' trap has been sprung in the Pacific." He offers an alternative: "Mutual Assured Stability."
- 41 The EU's Bank Bailout Policies Are Murdering Europe's People**
The EU policy of bailing out the banks in hopes of "saving" the euro is destroying the only basis for eventual recovery: Europe's people. The most critical case now is Greece, but Spain, Portugal, Ireland, and Italy are close behind.
- 42 Economist Demands Schacht Solution for Euro**

Feature

45 Budget Sequestration: Obama's Coup Against Congress Gathers Steam

If Congress fails to pass a budget which includes over \$1 trillion in cuts, then the mechanism known as "sequestration" will swing through the entire discretionary budget like an axe—and it will be Americans whose blood will be shed.

47 Profiles in Courage: Rachel Brown Fights for Kennedy's Legacy

LaRouche Democrat Rachel Brown, who became nationally famous for dispatching Barney Frank during the 2010 Congressional campaign, in a video that went viral, is running again in the Massachusetts Democratic Primary where her opponent is Joe Kennedy III, grandson of Robert Kennedy.

51 Obama's War Crimes: Drone War on Pakistan

52 SDI Today!:

Next, Beyond Mars

By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The successful landing of Curiosity on Mars, presents us with a matter of grave urgency: "that what has been mistreated as 'empty space' is filled with what must now be considered as deadly, and some more or less immediately mortal threats to the continued existence of our human species, threats which we must prepare ourselves to evade or overcome otherwise."

Editorial

59 Who's Responsible?

EDWARD TELLER WAS RIGHT AT ERICE:

The Threat Against Mankind

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Thursday, August 16, 2012

The following is a report bearing upon the current prospects for the survival of mankind. I include within it, not only the consideration of presently crucial trends and developments, but add, and will conclude with some necessary, deeper references to the roots of these matters of forecasting, with emphasis on roots dating from the late 1950s through the 1970s and 1980s.

The first issue of principle to be kept in mind, in reading the report as a whole, is the pathological implications of reliance on the intrinsically incompetent, but still popular, statistical-mathematical modes of economic forecasting. However, let us come to that point in the history of this process in due course. First, let us consider the immediate crisis-situation itself.

At this present moment, there are two mutually contradictory options respecting the continued survival of the human species. One, is typified by the present lurch toward virtually global thermonuclear war, an option which is presently centered in the strategic policies of either U.S. President Barack Obama himself, or someone using Obama as if he were a mere puppet. The only realistic choice of alternative to that at the present point of the trans-Atlantic economic-breakdown crisis, would be the triple-point package which I have presented as what would be the only presently available

alternative to a currently onrushing economic breakdown crisis:

1. Immediate re-enactment of President Franklin Roosevelt's 1933 Glass-Steagall Act.
2. Replacing the presently hopelessly bankrupt, present U.S. monetarist system, by a banking system based on the principle of national credit.
3. The immediate launching of a modern replication (NAWAPA XXI) of the original NAWAPA program of management of North American water-resources, estimated to provide 4 million skilled places of employment, as supplemented by an additional 2 million other high-quality machine-tool-grade and closely related places of employment, including the re-establishment of a "full throttle" NASA program for defense of Earth in the range of Mars-orbit and beyond.

The Following Policies Must Be Established:

Were Obama to succeed in his prospective candidacy for a second term in office, two consequences were the likely ones: (a) thermonuclear warfare is more or less an immediate likelihood, and, (b) a near-extinction of the human species might be reasonably expected to occur either soon after President Obama's renomination, or not distant from the time of his actual re-election.

tion. Under those two conditions, human life on this planet could not be reasonably expected to escape the actual, or virtual near-doom of mankind which an actually needless thermonuclear war between the U.S.A. and Obama's presently continuing list of designated targets implies. That list has included: nations such as Libya (already done by lawbreaker Obama), Syria, and Iran (actively targeted now), and includes the thermonuclear powers Russia and China as intended targets for a thermonuclear war launched as the nominal intention of a President Obama.

I must add to that list of threats, the cowardice which I have recently witnessed from so many U.S. citizens on that account. That still surprises me, but only with its enormity, once all were considered in the light of all those relevant factors which I have seen since the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and his brother Robert. "How were it possible, that thinking adult citizens of the United States would even imagine that Obama's intention is not the inception of thermonuclear warfare against a group of targeted nations including Russia, China and others?" It would be a war launched with full-blast qualities of thermonuclear blows, on both sides. It would be a war, which would represent a commitment to virtual extinction of the present world population, either by the attacks themselves, or as the aftermath expressed as the fruit of the consequences facing every part of this planet after an opening of full-scale exchange of fire, by and against both Obama and his selected targets. How dumb (or, simply cowardly) could so many among our nation's putative leaders have become!?

Such a war as that which Barack Obama has implicitly demanded of the U.S.A., as since his unlawful Libya atrocity, would mean, in its effects, the virtually inevitable extinction of the human species on Earth. Who, then, could be so dumb or silly, then, as to wish



U.S. National Archives

Thermonuclear war would mean the near-extinction of the human species. These photos from Nagasaki (above, a rare ground-level photo during the bombing) and Hiroshima (afterwards) give a sense of the power of the fission bomb; the fusion bomb is many orders of magnitude more devastating.

his re-election? Above all else, Obama must go into a forced retirement tantamount to what should have been his impeachment long since, while there were still a living human species in our republic to defend. Admittedly, we of the United States have fallen a long way down on the scale of moral values since heroes of the likeness of our President Franklin D. Roosevelt, or Roosevelt's martyred follower, John F. Kennedy; but, despite our self-inflicted disgrace on that account, we still have an honorable right, as human beings, to continue to exist, an existence which the continued incumbency of President Barack Obama would, according to him, deny us.

Happily, this will not be the end of the crucial matters at hand. There are at least a few good reasons for hope, as follows.

On “Curiosity...”

With the successful arrival of “Curiosity” at its intended destination, an entirely new, hopeful state of strategic affairs has been delivered: the safe arrival of “Curiosity” at its intended destination. “Curiosity’s” successful landing, now brings mankind, as a whole, to the feasibility of proceeding to organize the defense of Earth against presently existing, deadly threats to Earth from the region of space including Earth, such as Mars, and the vicinity of Venus. It gives us, among other benefits, the justified hope to believe, that the human species might find succor, whenever, and wherever it is within the reach that is needed, for the continuation of that great mission which we have yet to come to know fully.

On the other hand, one “rather awesome rock,” for example, unless prevented, could mean a more or less vast destruction of some region on the surface of Earth, or even, in the extreme case, the extinction of the human species. This would include those silly victims who had insisted: “I didn’t read what you are saying in any newspaper which I read.” Wars fought “on the table,” should not be aimed to annihilate the table itself.

Ban Oligarchism

However, “motives for peace” aside, it should have been evident, long since, that the human species was not created with the intention of gratifying those homicidal impulses which have been exhibited by a Barack Obama, as those impulses have been shown toward a Libya, and now to Syria, Iran, and others, of anyone with a temperament like Obama’s own. To understand this situation, we must bring the nation’s overview of its obligations in decision-making in such matters, beyond the domain of even what has been long known as that of “the oligarchical principle,” and outside what have been the underlying phenomena of that specifically “oligarchical” type, already long-since typified by the case of the temperament of the original Roman Empire of creatures such as that Emperor Nero whom Obama has tended to mimic in his Hitler-like health-care policies thus far, and his habits of outright homicide thus far. The oligarchical principle must be efficiently excluded from the permitted strategic practice of nations.

As the greatest of our known poets and dramatists already knew, and historians and statesmen should have known, the oligarchical prototype is one which serves a chosen sort of a wicked master all its own. The

institution of humanity which sane human beings must recognize as their proper constituency, is typified by those who are prepared to discover evidence supporting the possible past residence of the human species, or its likeness, on Mars, or beyond, a species on whose behalf we must be determined to build whatever defense might be needed on behalf of any species with the characteristics of our own.

When we will have taken adequately into account what we have come to recognize now as if our own mission, we must then recognize an implicit mission assigned to the future development of our human species, or its future likeness. It is a development arising from our devoted search for a fuller understanding of what a distant destiny would have us become. That is key to the proper morality which must guide us henceforth.

That much said by, perhaps, some ancient poet within us, turn now to the science of what is to be fairly recognized as the more awesome among the presently immediate implications of certain developments of recent decades of history, up to the present date. The present threat to the continued existence of the human species should now be clear to those thinking clearly respecting the facts of the matter: the question is, how did this present horror come about, and how might we be rid of it?

I. The Recent History of Warfare

Let us now proceed accordingly, clear-headed and at a reasonable pace. Begin with a convenient definition of the need for an unbroken link of the wishful close of what was called “World War II,” otherwise to be recognized as the presently organized beginning of what was to begin the long march into a presently, immediately threatened thermonuclear World War III. The attempt to launch such a war, as by U.S. President Barack Obama, is to be recognized and banned, on the premises of its nature, as the gravest of all possible crimes against humanity, as to be judged as under natural law.

We must, therefore, now consider relevant precedents and related examples.

The presently continuing threat, as by President Barack Obama presently, of mutual, threatened war of implicit self-extinction of the human species, was first set into apparently actual motion, as a proposal for nu-

clear war which had been proposed publicly by British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Bertrand Russell, during the close of the Summer of 1946.

At that time, the British threat of such pre-emptive actions by those primary sources, was presumed, from and by London, to occur under the influence of the British empire's Winston Churchill and Churchill's puppet of that moment, U.S. President Harry S Truman. This was the case, when they had unleashed a far worse than merely useless, nuclear bombardment of an already hopelessly defeated Japan. General Douglas MacArthur's forces had won President Franklin Roosevelt's war in the Pacific; Churchill and Truman concluded it as a wicked farce—and new wars to come.

Then, behind this turn at that time, there was not only Churchill, but that cowardly and eternally insolent terrorist, the Bertrand Russell who declared, in September 1946, his personal commitment to the launching of a "preventive" nuclear warfare against what had been up about that time, a U.S. war-time ally, the Soviet Union.¹ At that time, Bertrand Russell et al. had proceeded under the misguided presumption that the Soviet Union did not have the ability to create and deploy even nuclear-fission weapons systems. The real targets of Churchill and of his lackey, Wall Street "maven" Harry S Truman, had implicitly presumed, that their immediate threat of nuclear warfare was to be continued for as long as Russell and others had remained confident that Russia lacked the capability to have produced a deployable nuclear arsenal.

The discovery that the Soviet Union was already in possession of nuclear combat capabilities, induced Russell et al. to postpone nuclear-fission warfare until such time that actually thermonuclear warfare would be recognized as a serious intention, on both sides of the so-called "Cold War." Then came the time a Soviet Union's adventurous Nikita Khrushchov had launched a giant nuclear package (if of questionable merit as an actual weapons system) as a threat of nuclear war: for all of which Bertrand Russell was much pleased with himself.

The real military targets of Wall Street's "trained monkey" Truman, and of Winston Churchill and Churchill's followers throughout the remaining years of Bertrand Russell's life-time, were the post-war Soviet Union, and ultimately also China. The included

purpose of that hoax backed by both Wall Street "maven" President Truman and Winston Churchill, was to preserve the British empire as an off-again, on-again, world empire, in effect—with hope for sufficient backing from the U.S.A.² That had been the monarchy's practiced intention up through the recent days of inherently wicked creatures such as Tony Blair.

However, those intentions for nuclear warfare were only a preliminary. The death of the Soviet Union's Josef Stalin and accession of the adventurous, but also confused and desperate Nikita Khrushchov as Soviet head of state, had overlapped the London/Wall Street intention to supersede nuclear warfare with an emerging mid- 1950s intent toward *thermonuclear* "extermination warfare."³ Implicitly, thus, thermonuclear warfare was "on the table" as a feasible general military policy of practice during the latter half of the 1950s.

With the fall of Khrushchov, and the assassination of the President of the U.S.A., President John F. Kennedy, there had still been a hope, among many American citizens, for the continuation of the creative nature of the economic and strategic intentions of President Kennedy. The assassinations of President Kennedy, and, later, of his brother, Robert Kennedy, had actually unleashed what has been, since that time, a persisting change for the worse, even now the worst, in U.S. policy, a policy which has been since continued, in various expressions, all to a common effect, up to the present time. This decades-long decline of the U.S. econ-

1. See Bertrand Russell, *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Nos. 5-6, Sept. 1, 1946.

2. The chief effect of the role of Harry S Truman, first, as Vice-President, and then President, was to wreck what had been the potency of a United States operating under the leadership of President Franklin Roosevelt. The final, post-Franklin Roosevelt interval of World War II, and the manner in which the post-Roosevelt take-down was conducted under President Truman, up to the moment of Dwight Eisenhower's election as President, was qualitative in its effects. Later, with the convenient assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the effects soon became virtually permanent. This becomes clear, once the understanding of the meaning of the physical principle of economy, "energy-flux density" in the rate of increase of per-capita productive powers of labor, is taken into account.

3. Khrushchov rose to power through a channel which the British intelligence services created and managed under the supervision of "the most evil man of his time," Bertrand Russell. Khrushchov was neither the first, nor the last Soviet leader to serve the British imperialist interest and direction on this account. Worshipful Soviet dupes of London were often left to weep at the feet of London: "How could you in London have betrayed us in this way?" That pattern continues today in certain quarters. It were, admittedly, difficult to see the future clearly, while peering between the cheeks of a London backside; I recall, very clearly, and accurately a number of cases of this *virtu*.

omy, has been continued as an accelerating trend through the terms of the Presidencies of George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton, and has been accelerated precipitously under the Presidencies of whining George H.W. Bush's son, "Goof-Ball" George W., Jr., and worst of them of all so far, the murderously accelerating economic-breakdown-process instituted under President Barack Obama.⁴

The Actual War-Threat

In approaching the subject of the nuclear and related sorts of strategic threat-potentials of the late 1950s and 1960s, we must take into account the fact that the increase of intensity of weaponry of the qualities of nuclear, thermonuclear and more advanced qualities of weapons systems, converges on a point at which the means of warfare mean virtually assured human extermination. This crucial point in calculations must not be limited to the direct delivery of destructive effects of the bombardment or related means, but must consider the overriding by-product-effects of having deployed such destructive force.

4. I have never accepted the notion that the then-recently installed Soviet dictator Yuri Andropov was "honestly duped" in the matter of his radically irrational rejection of President Ronald Reagan's intentions respecting the SDI. The evidence is to be recognized in the economic implications of Andropov's trend of policies in the direction which had been set into position by Andropov's ties to Bertrand Russell, et al. In effect, Andropov was acting as a British agent since somewhere along his peregrinations around the Hungarian crisis. The history of Andropov's political evolution since the Hungarian Revolt, tilts the pointer of history toward factors pertaining to the radical shift in Andropov's career since that time. At the time he had entered the highest office, he was documented as deeply engaged in British matters. However, Khrushchov had risen to power in the Soviet Union under similar direction and sponsorship of Bertrand Russell's arrangements. On that account, we must look deep into London's imperial reaction to the defeat of London's own puppet, the Confederacy created by the British circles which had put U.S. President Jackson into place as their chronically enraged puppet. President Abraham Lincoln's defeat of London's Confederacy puppet-system, had cleared the way for the rise of the new, Bismarck-orchestrated alliance of Russia and Germany. It was the London-orchestrated ouster of Bismarck which had set into motion several strategically crucial steps into "The First World War." It was the consequent assassination of the President of France Sadi Carnot, and, especially, the British Prince of Wales' orchestration of the Japan-Britain alliance against China and eventually Russia in the Far East, which brought matters around to the launching the Balkan War. Any competent strategist today should have realized that, first, "World War I" had actually begun with the British royal family's ouster of Bismarck in 1890, and that "World War II" was a reflex of "World War I." The state of threatened "global thermonuclear warfare" now, is to be recognized accordingly. The true science of war thus far, has been the science of the shaping of history.

For example, the present level of indicated thermonuclear exchanges among indicated forces has been already well-understood by relevant authorities, as meaning human extinction. There are only two general classes of conditions under which we would consider the presently asserted, threat-intent against Russia and China, in particular, as having crossed the threshold away from all possible sanity: the by-product effects of the indicated level of launch of attack reach the state of likelihood of a general extinction of the human species. The only hypothetical case under which any power would seek to do what President Barack Obama has postured as his intention, would be a program of unbridled acceleration from mass-murder, into human extinction. That, as a mission-intention, could only exist under the condition that the leader of the nation which would launch such warfare were clinically insane personally, or that he, or she would prefer to bring on human extinction, rather than submit to humanly rational behavior.

Since the only public presentation of a treatment of such implications, is that of President Barack Obama, the question posed is clearly that either (a.) Barack Obama is only bluffing; (b.) that he is clinically insane; or, (c.) that, given the role of our Federal Constitution respecting war, he is prepared to destroy the human species, unless his Emperor-Nero-like fantasies are the ruling consideration for him personally. Adolf Hitler, anyone?

That much said respecting Obama as such, a less commonplace version of the same paradoxical predicament in policy-shaping follows.

The SDI Outlook Considered

Thus, certain matters should have become clear, since the first, 1983, rejection of U.S. President Ronald Reagan's backing for a Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), a rejection which had become "hardened," with the approaching election of the administration under President George H.W. Bush. The trend in U.S. and related strategic policy-outlook since 1983, has been a commitment of both the witting and the witless to the pathway toward thermonuclear extermination, one which President Barack Obama now brings to the brink of systemic virtual human extermination now. One must never put "practical politicians" in charge of serious strategic decision-making again! You need not defeat them as readily as they will ruin themselves with their own "practical way of scheming;" but, you

must defeat them, in any case. Unfortunately, such “practical schemers” as those, may bring about the destruction of everyone with their “practical way of scheming,” as we witness precisely that sort of suicidal “cleverness” among our scheming “practical political authorities” of much of our present U.S. leadership of today, particularly those reckless and cowardly folk who will not resist the re-election of the current President.

Now, look back, again, to the resistance to President Ronald Reagan’s attempts at reaching an “SDI” agreement during his two successive terms in office. We should recall how stupid the cleverness of some “practical politicians,” such as Reagan’s leading opponents in this matter, can turn out to have been. Looking back to then, from here, in the meantime, as I had warned repeatedly since 1983, we had come to experience the fall and subsequent break-up of the Soviet Union which I projected (in 1983) to occur “within about five years,” as that should have been recognized even in 1983, as coming under then continuing trends which had been set into motion by, as I had forecast during 1983, “about 1988.”

The Fall of the Soviet Union

As I had foreseen, and had warned repeatedly since the “SDI” initiative in which I played a certain key-stone role leading into 1983, the fall of the Soviet Union was used immediately, with the fall of the East Germany “DDR,” the subsequent Polish crisis, and the sequel of 1991, as the occasion to launch the destruction of the sovereignty of the nations of *both* continental western and central Europe. This change was prompted by the threats uttered by France’s Socialist President François Mitterrand, against Germany at that time, and was implemented on the entirety of western and central continental Europe by the order of Britain’s Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and U.S. President George H.W. Bush (the son of the one-time supporter of the career of Adolf Hitler, Prescott Bush). It was that action by Mitterrand et al., in concert with Britain’s Margaret Thatcher, and wobbly U.S. President George H.W. Bush, who had created, then, the mess which is the hyperinflationary disintegration of western and central continental Europe presently—into a threatened new “Schachtian” model for an hyperinflationary hoax of pretended “economic resurrection.”

However, the preconditions for what Mitterrand

did to destroy Western Europe, as we see the remains of that today, had been aided through U.S. complicity, that specifically of U.S. President George H.W. Bush, then squatting in London, in supporting the London-France destruction of the sovereignties of what had been the sovereign states of Western Europe through threats of military action delivered via Mitterrand’s France. Thus, the destruction of the sovereignties of Eastern Europe has served as the lever for the destruction of Western Europe, and now, with President Barack Obama, the system of nation-states of the world at large.

This was a ruinous action in willful violation of the Westphalian Principle, effected with aid of the complicity of President George H.W. Bush,⁵ of the western and central European continent, which has been conducted under the pretext of establishing a “Euro system,” a system under which all the nations of western and central Europe would be undergoing a systemic kind of thorough-going, “post-Westphalian” extinction of the residue of their past sovereignties. In the meanwhile, more and more under the recent nearly a dozen years, as under the obscenity of the George W. Bush, Jr. and Obama administrations, during the global process of, especially, the trans-Atlantic region, the course of strategic history has converged at an accelerating rate, toward a London-directed, but U.S.-conducted intention for the extinction of not only the region of western Asia, but the threatened thermonuclear extinction of Russia, China, and others: all of this has been, so far, intended in favor of a one-world empire in the heritage of what had once been the Roman Empire, an intended world empire of not much more than, at most, about a billion persons, mostly stupefied echoes of the most brutal of ancient oligarchical cults

In summary on this subject of the European crisis at this present time, the selected means for imposing such an intention, was the precondition of the absolute supremacy for the conduct of thermonuclear exterminations. Therefore, the policy of neither peace nor war, for as long as possible, between the United States’ party, and that of Russia and its party. Actual warfare would mean the ultimate consequence of the virtual extinction of all relevant parties.

Would it be, as the poet spoke, that “with this

5. And, thus, implicitly his relevant violation of the U.S. Federal Constitution, while serving as U.S. President.



Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

President Reagan awards the National Medal of Science to Dr. Edward Teller in 1983. Teller's efforts on behalf of the SDI and his mission to protect mankind from the threat of asteroid impacts, LaRouche writes, represent the quality of humanity in science demanded of us today.

regard, their currents turn awry, and lose the name of action. . .”⁶

That much said; return to the case of scientist Edward Teller's participation in the August 20-23, 1983 proceedings at Erice, Italy.⁷ Turn to the still present, still strategically crucial issue of the SDI and my personal role in this continuing strategic process.

“The LaRouche Factor”

How did those SDI-centered events of the early 1980s come about? How had I come to emerge as a significant factor in the course of what was to be a leading factor in that moment of world history since the Autumn of 1977? How did I happen to become the pivotal figure in the process, leading from my U.S. Presidential election-campaign of 1976, into the time when the U.S. Presidency of President Ronald Reagan had held victory for mankind briefly in his hands in 1983? For President Reagan, this was no stunt, but a commitment to which he remained devoted through-

out his terms in office, and even his commitment to the belief that, even later than that, the proposed “SDI” must be realized at some foreseeable future time.

Between my commitments on the matter of economic policies, commitments which I had developed during processes going into the matter of the deep recession of the late 1950s, I have been a uniquely successful economic forecaster of that time, and was to be recognized, in fact, as a leading forecaster of the period of the 1971 crisis, and beyond; so, there had been a process in motion which led through the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) of the late 1970s and early 1980s.⁸

This was not a matter of an isolated event, or events. It was a “living process” which has continued to exist since those times,

through to the present date. Consider some obscured actual roots of my part in what became later expressed as obscured but essential elements of seeds of later flourishing history.

Back during the 1956-1957 interval, I had been a rising influence within my own territory of corporate operations, in my then rising role as an executive of a management consulting organization, up to that time. During the latter part of that time, in the meantime, I had received several approaches from the FBI of that “period,” approaches which had begun with an agent's projected actions which I regarded as in the nature of “silly filibustering,” and which I explained in some concise terms to the FBI agent who approached me with his proposal for cooperation.

The FBI then decided to “punish” me, by measures which included, in effect, the break-up of my marriage to a wife who believed the lies of her wrong friends, and, later, a period of extended unpleasantnesses extended into the Spring 1968 political eruption at

6. Wm. Shakespeare, **Hamlet**, Act III. Scene 1.

7. See http://www.larouche.org/public/1983/eirv10n34-19830906/eirv10n34-19830906_016-beam_weapons_strategy_relaunched.pdf

8. Ed. Note: Pivotal was LaRouche's debate with leading Keynesian economist, Abba Lerner, at Queens College, Dec. 2, 1971, where he so exposed Lerner's fascist policies, that the latter's colleagues determined they would never give LaRouche the chance for such a public debate again.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon LaRouche announces his independent Presidential campaign at a press conference on July 19, 1984, in San Francisco. His mobilization for the SDI was a focal point of that campaign, and of his bid earlier that year for the Democratic Presidential nomination.

Columbia University, and affairs beyond, even internationally. The change in the quality and scale of my influences here and abroad, came at the onset of the August 1971 collapse of the economic policies of the existing monetarist system under President Richard Nixon, which suddenly changed things for me on an increasingly grander scale, later reaching even trans-oceanic dimensions.⁹

It happened that I had been the only publicly known economist who had presented an actually competent forecast of the major financial crisis of the U.S. economy over the course of the 1968-1971 period. This development brought a significant change in my

status internationally. Within the U.S. itself, I had been the only relatively well-known economist at that time (especially in the New York City region and somewhat beyond) who had forecast the exact kind of economic crisis which had struck in August 1971. Those facts were widespread, and also irrefutable in fact.

Many seeds cast in history remain merely seeds. Others become history. The seed, in my personal case, was an exceptionally successful economic forecast of a major recession, one which would soon disrupt the U.S. economy severely with an economic crisis which struck suddenly in the automobile and related industries in the February-March 1957 “deep recession” of the late 1950s. My method of economic forecasting was suddenly confirmed, whereas the statistical methods still in vogue today, had failed, suddenly and persistently, for that past time, and more emphatically, now. The same issue was expressed on a far broader and deeper scale, in President Richard Nixon’s relative economic breakdown-crisis of early August 1971. Suddenly, in the late Summer of 1971, the unique quality of my successes as an economic forecaster since 1956, seemed to explode into virtually global directions over the remaining months leading into a globally

publicized, December 2, 1971 debate, in which I was the relevant principal in the matter of those international crises which had suddenly seized the imagination as a leading factor in the economic process of the preceding months. The effects of that have never diminished but for brief intervals, with new crises kindling the old fires into often still greater dimensions. History is fairly often like that, especially during intervals of widespread economic or related forms of crises.

As was said of the alleged kicking of a cow in Chicago, small beginnings sometimes have gigantic consequences, even if they were merely rumors.

The root of that development in my case is to be traced, in turn, back to my forecast within that firm which I had first presented formally in August 1956: the most serious recession of the period, which, I warned, must almost certainly tend to erupt by February-March

9. It is sometimes rightly said, that who you do is more significant than what you do. For me, personally and otherwise, that is not a quip; it is my personal history in today’s world at large. Sometimes, implications are the most significant of all practical facts.

1957.¹⁰ Other executives of the consulting firm bureaucracy in disagreement with me, emphatically, at that time, and later, based their stubborn rejection of my forecast as premised on admiration for “statistical forecasting methods,” which I warned would be entirely irrelevant for this case. The crisis broke out during the end of February 1957, and earliest March. What I had foreseen was now changing everything in the economy at that moment.

There had been nothing unusual in the opposition to my forecast. It happened that the methods of forecasting used by my rivals in that firm, were based chiefly on deductive statistical methods, which I knew were then, as now, always wrong, and also, usually, intrinsically incompetent, then, as now; but they also expressed prevalent popular opinion among economists of those, as also still present times. What had begun during the second half of the 1950s, did not end there; it came back to the surface beginning in early 1968. Meanwhile, there had been a crucial change, during a brief several years, toward an economic renaissance which had intervened during the course of what were to be merely several years of the U.S. Presidency under John F. Kennedy.

Why Economists Usually Fail

Then, as now, the prevailing incompetence exhibited by most of those considered as qualified economists, is a reflection of the accounting doctrine’s influence on forecasting the future in no other aspect but that of extrapolation enhanced by cheating the credulous. The failure which that method inherently represents, is illustrated by the case of every competent discovery of a previously undiscovered principle. The effect of that problem runs as follows.

Consider every class of living creature excepting mankind. Those creatures are characterized by the inability to discover a new physical principle. Thus, the great majority of all living creatures, excepting mankind, are condemned to ultimate extinction, unless mankind enables them to outflank such a tragic destiny. Mankind, who exhibits the relevant point in the most convenient modes, is the only known living creature which actually chooses to use fire as an essential basis

for its existence. This function of fire is locatable in the specifically noëtic characteristic of the human species, the characteristic which separates mankind as superior to every other known variety of living species.

It happens, that no true invention of a principle of nature can be derived from what can be specifically defined as deductive. In other words, Sherlock Homes relied upon drug addictions, otherwise, a creature of his specific nature could never imagined that he had deduced a principle of nature. The manner in which the accounting systems are obliged to function in respect to calculations, tends to ensure that, only in rare cases, are trained economists competent in the actualities of the scientific progress on which the sustaining and advancement of the physical economy of nations and their cultures absolutely depend. Thus, the typical “environmentalist” of today, is also functionally insane in precisely this particular sense of the matter.

In the actual history of economies, the most crucial distinction is to be found in an estimated ration of a human population, even at pre-school levels of education, who have become habituated in a significant degree to a form of noëtic development which foreshadows the creative Classical artistic and physical scientist of the adolescent and adult levels of development. It is, therefore, of great importance, to estimate the ration of the employable adolescent and adult populations which are properly identified as “creative,” or, to choose a more rigorous terminology, noëtic development. I mean, the discovery of new principles of nature, principles of a categorical type which include Classical modes of artistic composition and related expression.

It is the rate of incidence, development, and progress, in those specifically noëtic modes of scientific and Classical-artistic expression in the young, and in the ration of employment of persons of those types, which tends to pre-determine the ability of societies to generate a combination of Classical-artistic and physical-scientific development and expression which is indispensable for preventing a society from degenerating into a direction of its collapse for reason of stagnant trends in habits. Thus, just the typical monetarist accountant, such as the Wall Street types, may be vigorous in his active practice, but his adopted nature is to produce a net less-than-nothing of real value devoted to the purposes of promoting the welfare of mankind.

The cases of the two categories of banking supply illustration of this point. The banker who is engaged

10. A specific factor of timing predetermined by the influence of credit-system factors specific to those industries. A relevant, but later reform of the contract relations between the industries and the automobile dealerships, was of crucial significance for the industry’s credit practices.

with good conscience, must rely upon the progress, including significant noëtic progress, of both the banker's clients and also a supply of a quality of clientele which is engaged in physical-creative growth of scientifically progressive increase of the productive powers of labor.

The investment banker may sometimes take the same course of action, to which I would have no objection as long as he stays in his particular neck of the economic woods. With such honest investment bankers, the Obama administration's cronies of Obama's Geithner, would prefer to have nothing to do; their own company would, therefore, not be missed by actually respectable investment bankers. No honest and also intelligent banker would wish to be associated, or consign his children to the custody of a society ruled by a President Barack Obama. Indeed competent bankers, including those among investment bankers, will be moving in droves toward seeking the safe-harbor which Glass-Steagall uniquely affords.

Similarly, a so-called "green policy for economy" is inherently a recipe for mass death-rates within any society which accepts such a standard of practice. It is only the increase of the energy-flux density of physically productive increase of per-capita physical output, which stands between society and increased death-rates in societies. (Human life can not stand still.) This point is the same, in respect to such effects, as the defense of the continued existence of the human species on our planet and also beyond. The need of means for defending our own planet, requires us to adopt responsibility for our planet's own neighborhood.

Kennedy and Clinton

The interval of the John F. Kennedy administration had seen a reversal of the trend of which I had warned during 1966-71 and beyond. However, the burying of the truth of the Kennedy assassination, plunged the United States into a trend of economic decline which has been continued, in fact, during the entire span of U.S. national history since the moment the "cover up" of the Kennedy assassination had been put into play. That led into the fall of President Richard Nixon and the following interim of the late 1970s. With the still later defeat of the initiative for the SDI and the subsequent, disgusting performance of President George H.W. Bush, the U.S.A. slid into a perpetual economic decline, ever since, to the present date.

However, during the short life of the Kennedy Presidency, a curiously ironical fact had crossed my path. It was the name of a young fellow from Arkansas, "Bill" Clinton, who turned up as a name among a group of apparent admirers of President Kennedy. One must be careful in reporting history!

In the meantime, other things had happened. The election, and later years in office of President William Jefferson Clinton had been a factor of relative stabilization, up to the launching of the campaign for the attempt to impeach him. Nonetheless, during the Clinton years, there were important developments up through the point of the attempted impeachment; but, there was no reversal of what continued to be an actually accelerating decline toward collapse in the U.S. and European economies.

President Clinton had attempted to address the economic crisis, if in a limited, but constructive way, coming out of the Summer of 1998 into the political catastrophe dumped into his lap during the Autumn; but, otherwise, he had done nothing to reverse the continuing process of economic decline of the U.S. economy which had been set into motion, originally, by the effect of the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and John's brother and Presidential pre-candidate Robert Kennedy. Since President Clinton's retirement from office, the U.S. economy has been careening along a course of national economic disintegration. With this approaching Autumn, the apparent prospect for the U.S.A. is that of nothing as much as pure destruction, even something much worse, unless President Obama is soon placed "on the skids."

I shall now shift the course of the report to the subject of the principles which have shaped European and trans-Atlantic shaping of history, up to the verge of the present dates.

II. Against Oligarchical Principles

In the course of what has come to be identified as "European history," some among us who are the proud bearers of the tradition of the "European cultural vintage," have come to converge on the notion of an Homeric account of the fall of the criminally butchered city-state of Troy. Whatever the weak points of the available, historical accounts, the fact remains, that European civilization has been dominated, at least for

most of the rather reasonably known times, by the persistence of what is known as “The Oligarchical System.” We, whether Europeans, or with their nominal descendants in the Americas, for example, have continued to be dominated by the tradition of that Mediterranean-pivoted oligarchical system, which is now principally associated with the social-political imagery associated with the descent of the Roman empire.

The view contrary to my own, that of the so-called “Greenie” or “Environmentalist” traditions, is a product of the oligarchical principle as that has been traced, from the Homeric legacy, to the oligarchical system which is, with relatively rare exceptions, usually employed to a common definition of both ordinary and extraordinary human minds, alike. The former populations tend to be classed, in some instances, as a talking variety of what are seemingly like virtually mere cattle, or, better said, virtually the type of foolish slave who forges his own shackles, shackles which he often installs as a kind of habit, to serve him as the predator ravishing his own mind.

Those human beings who are stubbornly disinclined to bear a slave’s submission to an oligarchical rule, as typified by the case of the American Revolutionaries who fought against the oligarchical legacy of those persons who are like willing slaves, like those who, even habitually, wear the shackles of a New Venetian party of that William of Orange, et al., who was the typical adversary of the great cultural achievements of the Massachusetts Bay settlement of the Winthrops and Mathers, must be considered against the background of such elements of post-Troy history generally.

The temporary crushing of what was to become our later United States, must also be examined for its value as among lessons of history, lessons which include what are still threatened to be imposed upon them according to the rule of the same oligarchical tradition of evil which slaughtered the Christians on behalf of the principle of the Roman empire, or such as the Jews under Adolf Hitler’s following. Take the evil tyrannies, which are rooted in that oligarchical tradition which is presently named as the “Greenies,” for example, or the Roman mass-murders of Christians in the arena or otherwise. These episodes in history happen, and have always lurked in the shadows of even the greatest human endeavors, unless we are sufficiently armed and alert to prevent such insurgencies of evil.

“A greenie,” for example, who adopts his, or her code of practice, may be not only a slave in his or her own right, but a slave who tends to commit atrocities against those who do not inflict slavery upon themselves, as on others. So, the “Greenie’s” habits have become increasingly a menace to the continued existence of the human species in a general way.


The physical evidence which supplies the proof for my argument here, is efficiently locatable in a contrast of what are fairly called “normal members” of the human species, to the beasts generally. The essential distinction of the human species in its healthy, normal state, is defined as human in its typical behavior, as I have noted in the preceding chapter of this report, defined by a habit of a willful reliance upon a principle of increase of relative energy-flux density, as opposed to the bestiality common to all species other than mankind. The qualified, apparent exception to that propensity for slaughter, is to be found in the training of breeds of animal species, in those practices prompted, essentially, by human training of specimens of animal varieties, as under conditions of animal husbandry. There is, thus, an increasing tendency toward limiting the cultivation of animal species to those species and types whose induced behavior is not inconvenient for mankind.

The distinction of mankind from beasts, including emphasis in favor of specifically cultivated varieties, is precisely that. I recapitulate, in a fresh form, what I have written on this account earlier, as a needed preliminary note.

Now Consider “Fire”

The crucial test of that distinction of man from beast, is located in the uniqueness of the human personality with respect to that of all other, known forms of life. We might therefore speak, truthfully: of the creative intellect which is specific to the human species. It were better, to make the distinction of the human species from other species, by beginning with a practical choice of an alternate approach to describing a standard: *mankind’s progress in the mastery of fire—increase in energy-flux density across the boundaries which mark the birth of successive generations of the culture of a successful form of organized society.*¹¹ That means, as I have repeatedly treated the subject in earlier

11. Many forms of society have existed which were, or still are, inherently defective, the oligarchical models most notably.



NASA/JPL-Caltech

The successful landing of the rover Curiosity on Mars gives mankind hope of organizing an effective defense of Earth against asteroid impacts and other threats from space. Shown is a “self-portrait” of the deck of the rover from its navigation camera, showing the rim of Gale Crater, the lighter strip of land in the background.

locations, a distinction consistent with the notion of an order of rank among distinct species of both the qualities and the applications of fire. In fact, the notion of the principled order of the definitions of “fire” is coherent with the orderable notion of “value,” as “value” is to be located in the hierarchical-like ordering of relatively lower, to reach higher physical states of matter, as these changes are employed as policies of practice by human societies.

Herein lies an exact distinction of man from beast, or man’s organized, willful progress in development of practice, from relatively lower “energy-flux densities,” to higher.

This brings us back to what must follow from a related argument presented in the immediately preceding chapter of this present report.

The Creative Mentality Defined

For example, mankind’s science is currently progressing from ordinary combustion, through, successively, thermonuclear fusion and matter-antimatter reactions. This represents a state of human scientific progress associated, typically, at root, with the insepa-

rable categories of (1) physics, and (2) of the Classical musical qualifications of Max Planck and Albert Einstein, and the general principle of mind associated with the achievements of (3) Planck’s collaborator Wolfgang Köhler, creating thus a set of principles respecting the still scarcely known, deeper principles of the human mind. Each and all of these “factors” urgently need to be understood as matters of principle.

The most crucial issues, at this stage of the history of such processes, pertain to the errors associated with popular views respecting the principles of human comprehension. The worst aspect of the short-falls in even the practice of scientific principles today, are those associated

with the widely popular, but incompetent notions respecting “human sense-certainty.” This problem is one which I recently addressed in my “Next, Beyond Mars,”¹² in which I dealt with the critical issue of communications implicitly confronting us with the success of the presently new, crucially ironical phase of the developments presented to us implicitly by the results of “Curiosity’s” progress so far.

As I have emphasized in an earlier report, when we consider the specific advances in sophistication incorporated in the design and deployment of “Curiosity,” we should consider ourselves impelled to recognize a certain important bit of irony. This means, to deprecate the attempt to correlate the functions of the human mind with sense-perception as such, and to shift attention to the implications of the transmission of what is called “information” when the transmission is located as a process connecting points of “broadcast” of functional platforms on Mars to the speed of light exchanged between Earth and Mars. Factors come into play, thus,

12. See *Feature* in this issue, or LaRouchePAC (<http://larouchepac.com/node/23679>).

such that we can no longer tolerate the notion that the human intellect is an extension of the function of an array of sense-perceptions per se: when we must admit that it is the process of transmission itself, which enables us to define the process as a whole. Fourteen minutes difference has a crucially subsuming role, especially when we take into consideration the implications of the need to master control over the masses of asteroid-like aggregations which contain the threats to Earth and the like from the asteroids converging on destinies such as targeting of mankind's refuge known to us as "Earth."

Our objective must be to attempt to gain such forms of control of that apparent debris which could end up as mines in space for the complex of Earth and Moon which might be gathered to our future advantage there.

In that process, and related matters, the included objective is to free mankind from that superstition which is known as "sense perception." The important thing might be, indeed, "the effect;" but, more important is "that which generates the apparent effect." Our objective should be to discover how to gain increasing "leverage" in so-called "space" in control of the processes which include the rubble in the space-volumes from Mars-orbit to Jupiter-orbit.

Now, to clarify the point I had introduced above, return attention to the matter of mind-as-such, as presented by Köhler to Max Planck, and as adopted by Planck. I have met very little beyond bare-bones evidence which reaches to the crucial aspects of Köhler's core-argument. This may well be among the effects left behind by the sequence of so-called "World War I," and the lunatic characteristics of the influence of such as Bertrand Russell's role in the scientific debates and cultisms of the post-World War I 1920s. Whatever the case adduced from such latter sources, the general point which the Köhler-Planck discussion presents, is that all human knowledge is a category of the essentially indivisible, that to such effect that the mind is to be considered as conditionally partitioned, but not categorically. It is we, in effect, who partition knowledge between experiences, rather than accreting separable categories of experiences. We are, so to speak, responsible for assimilating a defensible conception into a continuity of a unified idea.

That suggests that we distinguish the nameable "tag" such as a name from the substance to which that

"tag" has been attached. The ontological actual essence of the idea as such, is distinguished from that which is the named shadow of the "tag." Thus, the substance of human thought, is thus distinguishable in degree from the name given to an adopted "objective" aspect of the process to be considered. This comes directly to the surface in the experience of the recovery of a previously familiar name-likeness of an actually relevant process of thought—as if in recall of an interrupted memory, which remains knowable, if its recovery is properly motivated with respect to the entirety of the domain.

This is a typical sort of ordinary problem, as in either recalling old names or recognizing that which is to be named.

The crucial significance of all considerations along these lines, can not be efficiently separated from the implications of the discovery of a new concept—one not known, or named before: a kind of synthesis of a new idea, rather than some sort of synonym: in new categories of discoveries corresponding to an independently original conception based on a previously unknown experience. This points in the direction of a true cognitive process. Significantly, the work of Planck and Einstein, especially in respect to the importance of Classical musical composition for both of them, as of Johann Sebastian Bach, or Wilhelm Furtwängler, brings the focus of our attention on "these implied connections."

Or, a more precisely defined notion to similar effect, is found in the pathological features of the reduction of ideas to the functional characteristics of the domain of fixed parts, as in playing the notes, rather than performing the actual music.

Edward Teller Remembered

Those among us who have shared some knowledge of the kinds of scientific mission-orientation underlying the launching of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) and kindred missions, who share it more or less immediately, as I do, or as do younger persons committed to this same legacy, can not overlook what I recall as Dr. Edward Teller's leading contributions to what became known by both of us as "The Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)." We must also focus a mission-orientation commitment to the defense of Dr. Teller's leading role in today's crucial goal of defending both the parts, and, ultimately, the whole of our planet Earth against

what might be considered, in the rough, as “space debris.”

At the same time, we recall with some touches of bitterness, that minds such as those of Max Planck and Albert Einstein point us toward leading thinkers from the generation of Max Planck and Albert Einstein who have represented something which tended to become lost in the course of what is recalled as “World War I” and post-“World War II” scientific and musical society. Much that had been beautiful as scientific achievement, became relatively mired in the cheap-shot qualities of practice which became all too familiar in the generation educated under post-World War II conditions. In effect, these, my own recollections, must also have often occurred to a qualified “Martian” such as my ironical sometime critic, Dr. Teller.

Dr. Teller is remembered with a particular emphasis on the subject of the SDI and today’s increasing concern for the need of means of defense against asteroids which have been, are, or may be deadly threats to large parts of the population of Earth, or, ultimately, worse. Those of my associates now, recognize that a very seri-

ous concern is needed against this general threat, especially in light of our stunning lack of knowledge respecting the awesomely great mass of potentially threatening asteroids whose identities we have yet to locate.

All of this which I have just presented as content within this present chapter of the report, now separates the practice of science prior to “Curiosity,” from the larger category which the success of “Curiosity” has prompted to be recognized as an entirely new and much greater pathway to be opened now, when the foothold of mankind on Mars has just gained an awesomely greater mission-objective in all conceivable respects. The particular mission to which Dr. Teller had devoted particular attention, the threat to man on Earth from asteroids, should be long remembered, together with his famous mustering of efforts on behalf of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) as the quality of humanity in science which the present threat of thermonuclear warfare demands of us all today.

With that, will come a further, very special concern of my own: the true meaning of the human mind.

New from **EIR**

The British Empire’s Global Showdown, And How To Overcome It


In the face of a potential thermonuclear World War III, a confrontation being engineered from London by a desperate British-centered financial oligarchy operating through the vast—yet often underestimated—powers of the British monarchy, EIR has produced a 104-page Special Report, documenting both the drive for war, and the war-avoidance efforts of patriotic military/intelligence circles in the U.S., and the Russian and Chinese leaderships. The British hand behind the warmongers, and the concrete economic and strategic programs which can defuse the threat, are elaborated in depth. These include the Russian proposal for collaboration on the Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE), based on Lyndon LaRouche’s original Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

The Global Showdown report is available in hard copy for \$250, and in pdf form for \$150, from the [EIR store](#).

Call 1-800-278-3135 for more information.

EIR
Special Report

The British Empire’s Global Showdown, and How To Overcome It



June 2012

The Power of Ideas: LaRouche's SDI Changed the World

by Jeffrey Steinberg

This speech was given at a conference of the Schiller Institute in Reston, Va., March 21, 1993, commemorating the tenth anniversary of the announcement on March 23, 1983, of the Strategic Defense Initiative, by President Ronald Reagan. This edited transcript is reprinted from The New Federalist, April 26, 1993.

Ten years ago this week, President Ronald Reagan changed the world by delivering the following brief message at the close of his nationwide televised address: “In recent months,” the President said, “my advisors . . . have underscored the necessity to break out of a future that relies solely on offensive retaliation for our security. Over the course of these discussions I have become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence. . . . Wouldn't it be better to save lives than to avenge them? Are we not capable of demonstrating our peaceful intentions by applying all our abilities and our ingenuity to achieving a truly lasting stability? I think we are—indeed we must!

“After careful consultation with my advisors, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strengths in technology that spawned our great industrial base. . . . What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reach our own soil or that of our allies? . . . Isn't it worth every investment necessary to free the world from the threat of nuclear war? We know it is!

“I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive policy and no one wants that.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon LaRouche addresses a conference on ballistic missile defense, April 13, 1983, just three weeks after President Reagan's historic declaration that he had adopted LaRouche's SDI.

But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace; to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete. . . . We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose—one all people share—is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war.

“My fellow Americans, tonight we are launching an effort that holds the promise of changing the course of human history. There will be risks, and results take time, but I believe we can do it. As we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support.”

LaRouche Responds

The following day, March 24, in a public statement issued from Wiesbaden, West Germany, Lyndon LaRouche offered his personal congratulations and support to the President with the following words: “No longer must Democrats go to bed each night fearing that they must live out their lives under the threat of thermonuclear ballistic terror. The coming several years will be probably the most difficult of the entire post-war period, but, for the first time since the end of the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, there is at last hope that the thermonuclear nightmare will be ended during the remainder of this decade.... Only high-level officials of government, or a private citizen as intimately knowledgeable of details of the international political and strategic situation as I am privileged to be, can even begin to foresee the Earth-shaking impact the President’s television address last night will have throughout the world.

“No one can foresee what the exact consequences of the President’s actions will be; we cannot foresee how ferocious and stubborn resistance to the President’s policy will be, both from Moscow and from the nuclear freeze advocates in Europe and the United States itself. Whatever those reactions and their influence, the words the President spoke last night can never be put back into the bottle. Most of the world will soon know, and will never forget that policy announcement. With those words, the President has changed the course of modern history.

“Today I am prouder to be an American than I have been since the first manned landing on the Moon. For the first time in 20 years, a President of the United States has contributed a public action of great leadership, to give a new basis for hope to humanity’s future to an agonized and demoralized world. True greatness in an American President touched President Ronald Reagan last night; it is a moment of greatness never to be forgotten.”

Lyndon LaRouche’s prophetic comments on President Reagan’s address were based on his own intimate involvement in the process leading up to the President’s adoption of what he labeled the Strategic Defense Initiative. From Moscow to London to Washington, among the small circle of the world’s most powerful political figures, friends, and enemies alike, there was absolutely

no doubt that President Reagan had adopted LaRouche’s strategic doctrine. Against all odds, the power of an idea, devised and promulgated by LaRouche, had “touched” the President of the United States and a small handful of his most loyal advisors, and history was made.

Questions in Moscow

For some leading figures in Moscow, one of the critical questions left unanswered by the TV address of March 23 was whether President Reagan’s adoption of the ballistic missile defense/Mutually Assured Survival doctrine also meant that he had consciously adopted Lyndon LaRouche’s *Operation Juárez* proposal for a new world economic order. But on the question of ballistic missile defense (BMD), there was no doubt.

Earlier in the afternoon of March 23, at a National Security Council background briefing for the White House press corps, details of the President’s 8 p.m. television address had been filled out. At that briefing, it was made clear that President Reagan would propose that the United States and the Soviet Union work together to make the doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival a reality. Shortly after the President’s speech, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger more formally conveyed the offer to Moscow for the two superpowers to work together to develop and deploy a strategic ballistic missile defense system.

Not only was Lyndon LaRouche the intellectual author of the policy concept behind Reagan’s SDI. Between December 1981 and the date of the President’s speech, LaRouche, acting on behalf of, and at the behest of, the Reagan White House and other U.S. government agencies, personally conducted back-channel negotiations with high-level representatives of the Soviet government. As the result of those negotiations, Moscow was fully informed well over a year in advance of the President’s March 23 speech of the details of the policy offer. And because of LaRouche’s personal role in those discussions, Moscow had no justifiable reason to doubt the sincerity of President Reagan’s offer.

Had Moscow decided to take up Reagan’s generous offer, rather than adopt the suicidal alternative, LaRouche would have undoubtedly been called upon to continue in his role as broker and guarantor of a new era of world peace and prosperity based on a thorough transformation of East-West and North-South relations. Tragically, LaRouche was right when he warned on March 24 about the reactions that would come spilling out of the crevices in Moscow, London, New York, and

Washington. But he was also right when he said that the actions taken by President Reagan could “never be put back in the bottle.”

A Fifteen-Year Fight

Reagan’s March 23 address came as the result of years of effort.

LaRouche and his associates had been talking about ballistic missile defense, employing new physical principles, since 1977.

During the perilous years of the Carter Presidency, LaRouche had served as an unofficial channel of communication between elements inside the official U.S. intelligence establishment and their Soviet intelligence counterparts. This was part of a “fail-safe system” built up by sane individuals on both sides of the East-West divide, to minimize the danger of a misunderstanding triggering a strategic confrontation. LaRouche was solicited for this effort, in part, in response to his Election Eve 1976 nationwide TV address, in which he warned of the dangers of thermonuclear war should Jimmy Carter and the Trilateral Commission come into office.

In early March 1981, a senior Soviet diplomat posted at the Permanent Mission to the United Nations, Mr. Kudashev, approached the Asian Affairs Editor of *EIR*, soliciting LaRouche’s views on the new Reagan Administration. On instructions from the same U.S. intelligence channels through which the earlier Soviet discussions had been conducted, word of that approach, and a detailed summary of the discussion, was forwarded to White House counselor Edwin Meese.

By the early Autumn of that year, LaRouche had spelled out his proposals for a joint or parallel U.S.-Soviet strategic ballistic missile defense program. During this same period, representatives of *EIR* held preliminary discussions with a senior diplomat at the Soviet embassy in Washington, D.C., Yevgeny Shershnev.

As the result of these developments, in December 1981, LaRouche was again approached by senior U.S. intelligence officials and formally asked to initiate back-channel discussions with appropriate Soviet representatives on the possible adoption of a modification of existing strategic doctrine—i.e., LaRouche’s own Mutually Assured Survival concept. LaRouche was informed that the back-channel discussions were classified as a compartmentalized secret operation known to a select number of senior officials under a code name.

By this time, Lyndon and Helga LaRouche had met personally with CIA Deputy Director Bobby Ray Inman

at the Agency’s facility adjacent to the Old Executive Office Building and the White House.

In support of his back-channel efforts on behalf of the ballistic missile defense policy, on Feb. 18-19, 1982, LaRouche participated in a two-day *EIR* seminar in Washington, D.C. Of the 600 or so attendees, a number were Soviet and Warsaw Pact diplomats. At an *EIR* reception for participants in the conference, LaRouche was introduced to Shershnev and they had the first of a number of discussions about strategic policy issues affecting the United States and the U.S.S.R.

At their first private discussion, which took place in a suite at the Hay Adams Hotel in Washington shortly after the February 1982 event, LaRouche informed Shershnev that he had been designated by the Reagan Administration to conduct exploratory discussions, and that he would distinguish clearly when he was conveying official messages from U.S. government agencies and when he was providing his own personal evaluations.

In the early Spring of 1982, Admiral Inman announced his resignation as Deputy Director of the CIA, to become effective several months later. The channels under whose auspices LaRouche had been carrying out the negotiations with Moscow representatives informed him at that point that the operation was, for the time being, aborted. Sensitive to the highly restricted “need to know” security surrounding the back-channel negotiations, LaRouche prepared a written memo to Meese seeking some guidance on how to proceed. That memo was hand-delivered by a representative of the National Security Council. With the appointment of Judge William Clark as Special Advisor to the President for National Security Affairs in January 1982, LaRouche representatives had established ongoing discussions with a number of NSC officers.

After Meese failed to provide any clear response to the LaRouche memo, Richard Morris, the executive assistant to NSC advisor Clark, informed LaRouche that the Council would take charge of the operation and that the sanctioned back-channel negotiations should continue uninterrupted.

By the Autumn of 1982, momentum had built up inside sections of the U.S. military and intelligence establishment in support of LaRouche’s BMD proposals. Gen. Volney Warner, a retired head of the U.S. Army’s FORCECOM, told LaRouche associates in October 1982 that the policy was winning strong support among some of the President’s key advisers. Also in October, Edward Teller, a close personal friend and science advi-



Ronald Reagan Library

President Reagan makes his surprise announcement on March 23, 1983: “Our only purpose—one all people share—is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war,” he stated.

sor to President Reagan, threw his support behind ballistic missile defense, citing recent breakthroughs at Lawrence Livermore Labs on some of the very “new physical principle” approaches advocated by LaRouche. Significantly, Teller also advocated sharing these scientific and technological breakthroughs with Moscow (see box).

LaRouche publicly alluded to his role in the back channel process in a Dec. 12, 1982 *EIR* Memorandum titled “The Cultural Determinants of an Anti-Missile Beam-Weapons Policy.”

“During the months since I first announced the proposed beam-weapons policy, since February of this past year, I have had a number of occasions to discuss this policy with Soviet and other East Bloc representatives, both in person and through relayed communications,” LaRouche wrote. “In such discussions, one must acknowledge that the Soviet representative in question is speaking as a representative of his government to me as a person whom that representative views as connected to policy-influencing agencies of the United States. Therefore, the kinds of discussions which occur have two functional aspects. In one aspect, each of us is speaking for the record. I am careful to indicate what I believe to be my government’s policy, as well as I know that policy, as for the record. My Soviet discussion partner in each case will do the same. Then, apart from such

statements of policy for the record, we are able to enter into a more or less frank discussion of possible other, additional policy options.”

LaRouche again addressed all of these issues in his Dec. 31, 1982 speech to the International Caucus of Labor Committees conference in New York City. Referencing his beam defense program, LaRouche observed: “If we succeed, if President Reagan does this thing, in the coming weeks, then we shall have administered to that ancient foe of our people and of the human race—the Harrimans, et al., the Malthusians—not a killer blow, but a very deadly

defeat: a sharp reduction of the Malthusian power internationally. We shall have cleared the decks, weakened the enemies of humanity, to the point that those who are not the enemies of humanity are given a greater latitude for making decisions without having to submit to the Harrimans and that crowd in the period ahead.

“It is in that sense, in that act, which, I believe—in this great tragedy through which we are now living—that choice, is the *punctum saliens* of our age. Either we can grab it, or I know not what we can do.”

Soviets Reject SDI

In the early weeks of February 1983, back in Washington, LaRouche again conferred with Shershnev—this time in a suite at the Sheraton Carlton Hotel. In that discussion, Shershnev delivered a three-part message to LaRouche and, through LaRouche, to the Reagan White House straight from Moscow.

1. The Soviet government would reject SDI.
2. Soviet studies of LaRouche’s BMD proposal had proven that they were sound and viable. However, under conditions of “crash development,” the Soviet economy would be incapable of keeping pace with a revived U.S. economy. Therefore, it was principally on economic grounds that Moscow would reject the package.
3. Through other channels of discussion with the highest levels of the Democratic Party, Moscow had

been informed that LaRouche's BMD proposal would never reach the desk of President Reagan, and that, therefore, there was no danger of the Reagan Administration ever actually adopting the plan. Under those circumstances, since Moscow found the back-channel talks with LaRouche useful, they would be continued.

March 23, 1983 hit Moscow like a ton of bricks. Closer to home, the combat had already begun in earnest.

In his autobiography (1990), Reagan gave a hint of

the battle that had taken place: "March 22—Another day that shouldn't happen. On my desk was a draft of the speech on defense to be delivered tomorrow night on TV. This was one hassled over by NSC, State and Defense. Finally I had a crack at it. . . .

"March 23—The big thing today was the 8 p.m. TV speech on all networks about national security. We've been working on the speech for about 72 hours and right down to the deadline. . . . I did the bulk of the speech on why our arms buildup was necessary and

DR. EDWARD TELLER Science Can End the Age of Nuclear Terror

Dr. Edward Teller (1908-2003), a nuclear physicist who played a leading role in the Manhattan Project and then went on to participate in the U.S. development of the hydrogen bomb, addressed the National Press Club Oct. 27, 1982. Here are excerpts from that speech.

One of the obvious things is a point that absolutely all of us, those present and those absent, every American, I believe, shares, is our determination not to have another war, another big war like the First and the Second World War, or worse. There is no difference of opinion on that point. There is a difference of opinion what is the best way to avoid another war. Our policies for years have been on the wrong track. For a quarter of a century, we have conceived of our situation as a balance of terror, and the dreadful point is that the terror is obvious; the balance is not. . . .

We have arrived at the point where the ingenuity of several of my young colleagues has produced, to say it very cautiously, proposals for defensive weapons. I, as befits a person advanced in his 70s, was incredulous, but also obviously and greatly interested. I want to be very clear about this point. I am not talking about one proposal. I am not talking about one magic solution. I am talking about a whole trend.



Dr. Edward Teller

Furthermore, we have good evidence that the Soviets are familiar with the ideas on which we are working. . . .

And many scientists, many excellent scientists, who looked briefly and in some places with some prejudice, at these new ideas, have rejected them—as I did, when I looked at them the first time. But the more I looked, the more convinced I became. That is why it is difficult. It is impossible, because these ideas—not the details, but the very ideas—are classified. We call it not only secrecy, but "security." It isn't, because the Soviet leaders know; the American people have a need to know. But they are not told. . . .

EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

In response to a question, Teller referred to "the common aims of mankind":

We can, by using technology create a situation where the reasons for war will diminish and keep diminishing. If our allies and we cooperate both in making a stronger defense, and bringing about the origin of real peace, the pursuit of the common aims of mankind, at least in the free part of the world, then in the end, even in the Soviet Union where tyranny was endemic . . . I think a change of thinking may occur. . . . I am not telling you that if we can avoid war now, and I think we can, then the golden age will be here. We will have many other problems, and perhaps even greater ones. But I want to have for my children and my grandchildren the chance to confront these new problems, to struggle with them, and to do it as individuals. . . .

then finished with a call to the science community to join me in research starting now to develop defensive weapons that would render nuclear missiles obsolete. I made no optimistic forecasts—said it might take 20 years or more but we had to do it. I felt good.”

Years after that historic date, this author received a firsthand account from one of the key figures at the National Security Council of what actually happened on March 23.

James Baker III, as the White House Chief of Staff, was officially the last person assigned to review the President’s speeches before the final version was passed on to Reagan for approval. The SDI portion of the speech had

been written under the auspices of Judge Clark by a White House speech writer, Aram Bakshian, who had been in contact with *EIR* for some time, initially courtesy of Richard Morris. When Baker saw the BMD section of the speech, he “went ballistic.” He removed the entire final section, eliminating any mention of the SDI.

Fortunately, Clark was alerted to Baker’s perfidy, and in an outright violation of protocol, bypassed Baker, and alerted the President that that portion of the speech had been deleted. Reagan reinserted the SDI announcement. Baker didn’t find out about this until about 8:20 that night, when the Reagan read those fateful words to the American people.

ERICE 1983 Reagan, Teller, Wood Intervene for Mankind

At a conference held in Erice, Italy, Aug. 20-23, 1983 titled, “Technological Bases for Peace” Dr. Edward Teller, Dr. Lowell Wood, and President Ronald Reagan forcefully brought the concept of the SDI program to the participants, including the Soviets. The majority of scientists attending the event were by no means advocates of the SDI. But everything changed when President Reagan sent a telegram to the conference, which gave Teller and Wood the context in which to intervene and transform the gathering.

President Reagan wrote, “As this annual meeting at Ettore Majorana commences, I extend my encouragement to the distinguished scientists from many nations who have come together to discuss problems connected with the dangers of nuclear conflict and the ways in which such conflict can be avoided.

“War is the scourge of nations, and nuclear war would be the scourge of mankind. The citizens of the world face no more urgent challenge than the prevention of war. As scientists and teachers, you hold a special responsibility to use your wisdom and influence to help develop and use the knowledge that will lead to an age of true security against the threat of nuclear war.

“For nearly four decades, the increasingly destructive capabilities of nuclear weapons have domi-

nated issues of national security. But in the past year we have seen the possibility that we may be able to change that increasingly unstable situation.

“First, we are engaged in very serious negotiations with the Soviet Union on the means of achieving substantial, equitable, and verifiable reductions in our nuclear arsenals and on measures to build the mutual confidence and understanding necessary to reduce the risk of nuclear war.

“Second, if we succeed in applying the fruits of scientific and technical advances to develop a new generation of defensive systems, we may be able, at long last, to make nuclear war impossible.

“Our hope for the future is not just to halt the growth and the spread of nuclear arsenals, but to reverse such trends. We owe that legacy to the children of the world, and I commend your continuing effort to find realistic ways to make it possible.”

The impact of Reagan’s message resulted in an unexpected breakthrough, given that Soviet President Yuri Andropov had already categorically rejected Reagan’s proposal. A commission of 100 U.S. and Soviet scientists was constituted to investigate the feasibility of beam-weapon defense, and to conduct a computer analysis of the effects of nuclear war. Italian newspapers described the Soviet agreement to participate in the commission as “a sudden change in the attitude of the Soviet delegation.” It was, indeed the first public agreement by any Soviet officials (the Soviet delegation was led by Academician E.P. Velikhov, the leading Soviet scientist in the field of particle beam technology) to discuss beam weapons with the United States.



EIRNS

Even after the Soviets rejected—fatally for them—the SDI proposal, the LaRouche movement continued to campaign for the program that would make nuclear weapons “impotent and obsolete.” Here, LaRouche’s supporters rally for beam weapons defense in Orange County, Calif., Nov. 5, 1983.

Ironically, from Wiesbaden, West Germany, LaRouche had such a pulse-beat sense of the fight surrounding his strategic defense policy that, even after being informed of the late afternoon White House background briefing in which the SDI announcement was prominently featured, he warned us back in New York to watch the 8 o’clock telecast to be sure that nothing had been done at the last moment to sabotage the President’s public announcement.

I can assure you that there are leading figures from the Reagan Administration, who stood with us in the SDI fight, who will probably never forgive James Baker for what he tried to do that day.

In one of those fortunate quirks of scheduling, *EIR* and the Fusion Energy Foundation had arranged a conference on the strategic defense plan for mid-April in Washington, D.C. The event had been scheduled prior to the President’s March 23 speech. It was a standing-room-only crowd of 500 or 600 people. Shershnev sat in the front row. Afterwards, in a meeting with *EIR*’s Washington bureau chief, Shershnev conceded that his and Moscow’s hardline attitude toward LaRouche’s strategic defense proposals had been a mistake. He added that with the President’s March 23 announcement, the situation was now too big for him to handle. He reported that he had recommended a face-to-face meeting between

LaRouche and Georgi Arbatov, the head of the U.S.-Canada Institute. This recommendation was at that very moment being reviewed at the highest levels back in Moscow.

Moscow Closes Back Channel

Two weeks later, the back channel was abruptly shut down on orders from Moscow. Shershnev was shortly thereafter summoned back home.

Even after the Soviet government’s rejection of the SDI policy, LaRouche never abandoned the idea that this was the last, best hope for mankind. On Sept. 2, 1983—the day after the KAL 007 downing—LaRouche wrote to Arbatov:

“There is no possible route to war-avoidance,” LaRouche said, “except the general strategic doctrine I have proposed.... Since we must either end up agreeing to what the President

has offered on March 23, 1983, or destroy one another, the only worthwhile discussion is a discussion of means to reach such war-avoidance agreement....

“I am not in the least insensitive to the deep implications of the leading point I propose to discuss. I know there are aspects of this matter which are most painful by their nature to the Russian world-outlook, the issue of the 1439 Council of Florence, the issue of Plato versus Aristotle. Yet, experience shows that, unless Soviet thinkers in responsible positions can fight through precisely these issues with me, avoidance of war may be impossible, since the philosophical basis for conducting such negotiations may be impossible. How much psychological discomfort of this sort would your associates be willing to endure for so unimportant a matter as perhaps saving the Soviet Union from thermonuclear holocaust?”

These blunt but hopeful words, so typical of the vision that Lyndon LaRouche brought into all of his dealings with Moscow, spoke of axiomatics that are as valid today as they were a decade ago.

Now more than ever, the world needs Lyndon LaRouche—in the flesh and blood, free to shake things up and pull together the kind of international combination of people of good will that passed the world—albeit imperfectly—through the *punctum saliens* of 1983.

How the SDI Was Created: LaRouche's Method and 'New Physical Principles'

by Jonathan Tennenbaum

This speech was given at a conference of the National Caucus of Labor Committees and the Schiller Institute in Reston, Va., March 21, 1993, on the tenth anniversary the announcement of the Strategic Defense Initiative. Tennenbaum was the head of the Germany-based Fusion Energie Forum.

There is no doubt that the process leading to and from the adoption by the United States government of Lyndon LaRouche's policy for strategic defense based on new physical principles—as announced by President Reagan on March 23, 1983—constitutes a turning point in world history. The laws which had *seemed* to govern the world up to that point, suddenly changed. March 23, 1983 signalled that the entire system of ideas and institutions, which had governed the world increasingly during the 20th Century, were being swept away. For a certain time, the policies of Lyn, our policies, had moved into the White House, and were governing the United States. Yes, we suffered a serious defeat—humanity suffered a defeat—in the subsequent period. But no one can turn the clock back to before March 23, 1983. I think it is not incorrect to say that the *punctum saliens*, the historical turning-point which began then, is still ongoing. We are still in the middle of it. The outcome will be determined by what we are able to accomplish over the coming weeks and months.

That poses the question: *How* do we change history? By being rich and famous? Like David Rockefeller, with his beetle collection? No, David Rockefeller hasn't changed anything; he is just a menial slave, a slave of the Whore of Babylon! Do we change history by occupying positions of great nominal power, like members of the Soviet Politburo, standing like a row of vodka bottles on top of Lenin's tomb? No, history swept them away. Lyn *gave* them a chance to change history, by accepting the offer to share the SDI, but they refused. They proved themselves impotent.

So, how do you change history? The lesson of March 23, 1983, which I want to elaborate for you now, is this:

You change history by making *fundamental scientific discoveries*—above all—and otherwise by applying and radiating the same Socratic method, which is the essence of fundamental scientific discovery. That's how Cusa did it. That's how Leibniz did it, and that's how Lyn did it.

Through examining the true story of the SDI, we can grasp and learn from Lyn's unique personal role in this ongoing period of history. That role is inseparably connected with the fact that Lyn accomplished, back in 1946-52, a fundamental scientific discovery. And everything he has done since then, his rise to predominance as a maker of world history, has been based on nothing but that original discovery, and on his own, constantly improving mastery of the *method* by which he was able to make that discovery.

To show this, I want to single out two specific contributions by Lyn—contributions that could only have been made by him—which were absolutely essential to the U.S. government's adoption of the SDI policy. They may not have been adequately expressed in the U.S. government's public formulation of that policy per se, but they were implicitly the basis for everything.

First was Lyn's rigorous demonstration—which he and the organization forcefully brought to the attention of all relevant individuals—that the defense and economic policies adopted by the so-called Liberal Establishment for the United States and the rest of the world, were leading inexorably toward World War III. The problem was not this or that detail of policy, not some specific issue per se, but was located in the underlying axiomatic assumptions of Anglo-American policymaking, such that each new reaction of the Anglo-American elite to the ongoing crises was bound—as long as they

clung to those assumptions—to merely accelerate the plunge into disaster.

The second crucial point, was the way Lyn designed a complete set of alternative strategic, military, and economic policies around the crucial principle of “rapid technological attrition” applied to “new physical principles.” What this means, in a nutshell, is not to think of a single, hypothetically perfect defense system—that could never exist—but instead to *drive* development of anti-missile technology as rapidly as possible through an evolutionary series of breakthroughs based on the most advanced scientific research, while at the same time ensuring a continual “spillover” of the new technologies so developed, into the entire civilian economy. Lyn, and only Lyn, was in a position to specify *how* to organize that process, in such a way that a crash-program development of defensive systems would not only not be a burden to the economy, but would be the locomotive for a broad economic recovery.

Exactly this feature—the prospect of an SDI-led economic boom which, in the event of shared development, could also solve the devastating problems of the Soviet economy—was key to Lyn’s design of the offer he made to the Soviet leadership on behalf of the U.S. government.

LaRouche vs. Wiener

Now, before I elaborate these points, I want to briefly identify Lyn’s original scientific discovery, or group of discoveries, made over the period from 1946 to 1952.

As Lyn reports, what provoked him to embark on the essential phase of his discovery was an encounter with the famous book by Norbert Wiener on cybernetics. One thing in Wiener’s book infuriated Lyn to the point of having an angry impulse to throw the book against the wall. Wiener had attempted to characterize what we call *living processes*, by methods borrowed from Ludwig Boltzmann’s statistical thermodynamics. And Wiener tried to do the same thing for human intelligence, developing the now-famous approach of “information theory.”

The basic assumption of Boltzmann, which Wiener took over, was that all processes of nature could be described mathematically as systems of particle-like entities interacting according to fixed laws. And Boltzmann demonstrated what already Newton had remarked, that such mathematical systems are afflicted with the inevitable tendency to “run down” toward states of increas-

ing chaos. Out of this came Boltzmann’s claimed proof of a purported law of *universal entropy*.

Wiener noted that living processes, and the effects of human intelligence, show exactly the *opposite* tendency. But rather than understanding this fact as a devastating refutation of Boltzmann’s statistical approach, which it implicitly is, Wiener chose to define the manifest *negentropy* of living processes in terms of a progress toward what statistics regards as more orderly arrangements of particles. Similarly, Wiener implied that human intelligence could be defined essentially as the ability to arrange objects in an orderly manner—one of the few definitions according to which beetle-collector David Rockefeller might be considered to be “intelligent”!

Lyn immediately saw the folly of this whole approach, recognizing in it the same devastating flaws of assumption that Leibniz had pointed out earlier in Newton’s work, in the Leibniz-Clarke correspondence Lyn had studied as a teenager.

In his 1988 autobiography, Lyn emphasizes: “My understanding of this error of Wiener’s is the key to my original discoveries in economic science, and is therefore the key to everything which has made me an influential international figure today.”

Contrary to the absurd assumption of Wiener, Boltzmann, and Newton, we have conclusive evidence—featured in Plato’s *Timaeus*, in the works of Leonardo da Vinci, Kepler, and others—that *living processes are governed as a whole by a universal geometrical principle*. This principle is manifested to us by the harmonic characteristics of the visible forms of living organisms, characteristics associated with what Leonardo da Vinci and Luca Pacioli called the Divine Proportion, otherwise known as the Golden Section. Thus, life has nothing to do with assumed pairwise interactions of particles, nothing to do with the statistician’s tabulations of arrangements of objects. Living processes are governed by a *principle of development* which drives them through ever more dense series of changes or singularities, while remaining everywhere similar to itself.

Carrying the refutation of Wiener further, how might we adequately define the nature of human intelligence, and particularly what we call creative mental activity?

Well, Lyn proposed, let us look at the physical effect of such activity, in terms of human existence, in terms of the growth of economies. For creative mental activ-



The harmonic characteristics of the visible forms of living organisms are characteristics associated with what Leonardo da Vinci and Luca Pacioli called the Divine Proportion, otherwise known as the Golden Section. Shown here are the logarithmic spirals of the nautilus shell and the arrangement of parts of the sunflower.



Yves Couder

ity of individuals is the unique cause of technological progress, and technological progress is the unique cause of sustained economic growth, properly defined. If we can demonstrate that healthy economic growth is governed by the same Golden Section geometrical principle as living processes generally, then the same must be true for creative mental activity, which is the cause of such growth!

A precondition for this proof, of course, is to clear away all the intellectual garbage surrounding the concept of “economic growth,” the insanity of monetary accounting procedures like the so-called Gross National Product, which count drugs and gambling profits as forms of wealth.

What Is Economic Value?

The only sane measure of growth of economies is in terms of the ability to sustain a growing human population at increasing levels of per-capita consumption and physical productivity. In other words, to provide for an increasing density of human individuals, each one of whom is able to contribute at a higher level to the further growth of the economy so defined. Once economic growth is defined in terms of this self-reflexive concept of *increase of relative potential population density*, as Lyn did, the identity of the law of economic growth with that of living organisms generally becomes readily apparent.

But that growth depends on the creative powers of the mind to continually generate and apply scientific and technological progress. Each level of technology

defines a relative upper limit on the population which could sustain itself in that way. If we freeze technology at some level, society will eventually exhaust the accessible base of resources in that mode, and collapse. Therefore, even the maintenance of a constant level of potential population density requires a certain minimum rate of technological progress.

This raises two crucial questions: First, what is the internal ordering of technological progress, as a process of development of conceptions in the human mind? Second, what is the precise functional relationship between technological progress and the resulting increases in the productive powers of labor, as measured by increases in population potential of human societies? This includes the question, crucial to Lyn’s design of the SDI policy, of how an economy must be organized in order to realize a maximum rate of technological progress.

Lyn saw that, as a *mental process*, technological progress is implicitly measurable. That is already implied by the indicated geometrical ordering of economic growth which is the effect of such progress. But we can characterize the internal geometry of that mental process also in the following way.

Technological progress is a function of the development of science. That development involves the generation, in increasing densities, of formally unbridgeable mathematical discontinuities or singularities. To identify the essential point of the matter as briefly as possible: Continued scientific progress occurs as a succession of what we could call scientific revolutions, in which the fundamental assumptions that underlie an entire period of scientific and technological development are challenged, disproved, and superseded by the invention of a crucial experiment and an accompanying new set of improved hypotheses. If we call the state of knowledge before such a revolution *A*, and after it *B*, we see that there is no *logical* way to get from *A* to *B*; they are formally inconsistent on account of the change of fundamental assumptions. That gap between *A* and *B* represents a singularity generated by the creative action

of (ultimately) a single human mind, inventing and proving a crucial experimental hypothesis.

The technological progress upon which healthy economic growth depends, generates an unending series of such singularities, from *A* to *B*, *B* to *C*, *C* to *D*, and so on. It therefore becomes measurable in terms of varying densities of these and related species of singularities, as soon as we realize that the series of revolutions, *A*, *B*, *C*, *D*, *E*... must be lawfully ordered in a manner consistent with the Divine Proportion. How does that express itself?

Very simply: The internal history of science demonstrates that important discoveries are not isolated, chance events. In crossing the apparently unbridgeable gap between two stages of formal knowledge *A* and *B*, the discoverer is always energized and guided by a certain kind of idea, or “thought-object,” to use Lyn’s recent term, an idea of a mode of forward motion of discovery, referred to classically as a *higher hypothesis*, which carries society forward from *A* to *B* to *C* to *D*, and so on.

But by its very nature—the fact that it, effectively, bridges the gaps between mutually incompatible sets of formal assumptions—a higher hypothesis can never be described or communicated formally. It belongs to a higher level of conception whose relationship to the states of formal knowledge *A*, *B*, *C*, *D* is that of Cusa’s circle to its inscribed polygons. And yet, the existence of economic growth over human history, proves that adequate higher hypotheses are actually generated and effectively communicated from generation to generation!

The Concept of Metaphor

And Lyn identified the crucial means by which that is done: the method of metaphor, the metaphorical communication of concepts. At this point, no later, Norbert Wiener’s “information theory” doctrine bites the dust!

Exactly this is what comes to the fore in any period of rapid technological progress. Lyn and his collaborators demonstrated this in studies of such examples as the Italian Renaissance, the Ecole Polytechnique of Monge and Carnot, the Göttingen School of Gauss and Riemann—and also in connection with more recent technological crash projects such as the Peenemünde rocket project, the Manhattan Project, and Apollo Program.

To analyze the functional relationship between rates of technological progress and economic growth, Lyn studied the way in which new technologies are “in-

jected” into the economy. Typically a crucial experiment, in the form of a laboratory apparatus invented by scientists, is transformed into a new type of machine tool, which then permits entire new classes of products to be produced, increases the productivity of labor generally. Lyn examined the propagation of successive waves of technology *A*, *B*, *C*... into the economy, through successive investment cycles, and in relation to shifts in the composition of the labor force, the market basket of goods, the shifting use of land, and particularly as a function of improvements in basic economic infrastructure—energy production and distribution, transport systems, water supply, communications, education and health services.

It was clear from the nature of the series *A*, *B*, *C*... that the functional relationship involved could not be described by a logical-deductive form of mathematics. Does that mean it cannot be rigorously described? Not at all! Lyn found the key to the solution, as he emphasizes, by looking back on the work of Bernhard Riemann, *On the Hypotheses that Underlie Geometry*, from the standpoint of having grasped the essential idea behind Georg Cantor’s development of transfinite orderings, particularly his discovery of the so-called *Aleph* series.

On this basis, Lyn identified—among other things—the fundamental constraints which must be satisfied for healthy economic growth. Among them the point of most immediate relevance to the SDI is the role of energy-density functions: increase in potential population density correlates with the increase in useful energy available per capita and per square kilometer, subject to the condition that the technological quality of organization of the energy application is improving. That quality can be very roughly measured by increase of the power density of a machine, for example, at its cutting edge or equivalent area of application of power, or in the age of directed-energy technology by the frequency and wavelength of applied radiation.

But a closer look at this matter obliges us to recognize that the notion of “energy” commonly employed by physics today requires a rather profound revision.

Let me emphasize that Lyn’s early work points directly to “new physical principles,” uniquely appropriate to processes that are undergoing a rapid series of what physicists chemists call “phase changes.” In fact, Lyn proposes to make the case of an economy undergoing successive technological phase changes associated with *A*, *B*, *C*..., viewed as a concrete physical process

occurring in space and time, as the paradigmatic case for developing a new form of truly relativistic physics. The form of lawfulness governing such processes is embodied in the variable higher hypotheses governing the succession of scientific revolutions in healthy economic growth. Such “laws” cannot be expressed by formal deductive methods preferred by present-day mathematical physicists, but require a different type of mathematics, whose basis Lyn found in the works of Bernhard Riemann and Georg Cantor.


This already implies that the common textbook definition of “energy” as a scalar, linear magnitude is intrinsically fallacious. The shift in characteristics of action implied by a transformation of the form $A > B$ is seen to in effect *create* energy, in contradiction to the Helmholtz-Kelvin doctrine of “The First Law of Thermodynamics.” In particular, a correct appreciation of this point already indicates the underlying reasons why it is possible to destroy a speeding missile with a nominally very small amount of electromagnetic radiation, provided that the latter is delivered in appropriately shaped pulses.

Ending the MAD ‘Rules of the Game’

Keeping this fundamental work of Lyn in mind, let’s now jump about three decades ahead, to the situation that confronted the world at the end of the Carter Administration.

Although most people didn’t know it, that world was headed toward World War III on a very short fuse. The essential cause, as Lyn identified publicly with ever-increasing clarity, was the nature of the axiomatic assumptions underlying the way the Anglo-American Establishment thought it was running the world. The mind-set, the cultural outlook of that Establishment was such, that—to a certain extent wittingly, but also unwittingly—they were maneuvering the world step-by-step into a situation in which the only choice would be between total thermonuclear war with the Soviet Union, or submission to a virtual dictatorship from Moscow. In the latter case, a disintegration of the world into some sort of global Thirty Years’ War was virtually guaranteed further down the line.

Central among these Anglo-American axioms was the idea that the world should be run through a “balance of power” between two empires—an Anglo-American empire (with England supplying the brains, the U.S.A. the muscle), and an Eastern empire centered in Moscow. These two empires would be adversaries, but there



The 1964 film “Dr. Strangelove” became a metaphor for the military doctrine known as Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). The SDI policy was intended to replace this with Soviet-American cooperation for Mutually Assured Survival.

would also be an understanding between them, concerning the “rules of the game,” about how the world would be ruled between them. This arrangement would crush any independent development of sovereign nation-states.

Underlying the whole thing was malthusianism: the goal of establishing a perpetual, zero-growth, feudal-like state of mankind, in which a strictly regulated population of slaves would serve a tiny minority of oligarchical families. A worldwide Confederacy!

This utopian scheme was associated with a military doctrine which came to be known as MAD—Mutually Assured Destruction. Already set forth by Leo Szilard and Bertrand Russell in the 1950s, this doctrine declared the hydrogen bomb to be an “ultimate weapon”—the supposed “last word” in strategic offensive armaments, against which no effective defense is possible. Each of the two superpower empires was to build up an

enormous arsenal, so large, that even in the event one side would launch a surprise attack, the other side would still have enough missiles and warheads surviving to virtually annihilate the attacker. Under this condition of Mutually Assured Destruction, all-out nuclear war, had become impossible—or at least, so thought McNamara, Kissinger, Schlesinger et al.

No technological development was to be permitted to undermine this supposedly perfect system of balance of nuclear terror.

The problem was, as Lyn's discoveries proved in the most rigorous way, that no such scheme could possibly be stabilized. On the contrary, the very malthusian axioms, practically eliminating scientific and technological progress, meant imposing upon the world a regime of ratchet-like downward collapse toward virtual extinction of the human race through the combined effects of wars, famine, and pandemic disease, as the final, inevitable outcome unless those policies were stopped soon enough. With the Carter Administration, the utopian, malthusian policy had taken nearly complete control over the U.S. government.

But there was also a very specific, urgent danger of

this policy, located in the diverging perception of the second “partner” of the “game.” The Soviet rulers looked at things like the destruction of the quality of education in the United States, the spread of the rock-drug-sex counterculture encouraged by government policies and agencies, the cancellation of the long-term NASA space programs and so forth, and the Soviet rulers said: “What fools they are! They are destroying themselves. Let us help them to do so!” Soviet strategists were increasingly convinced that the West was collapsing from within and was losing the will and capability to fight. At the same time, the Soviet military leadership never accepted the “rules” of the MAD game. Instead they focussed on building up a war-winning capability, with emphasis on massive civil defense measures and anti-missile technology. An operational plan was developed for *winning* an all-out war with the West, known from the 1980s on as the “Ogarkov Plan.”

Meanwhile the effective decision-time in case of a surprise attack from either side, given forward-basing of submarines and medium-range missiles in Europe, plus the implications of the so-called EMP [electromagnetic pulse] “pin-down” effect, was reduced to five minutes or less. This meant that the world was running into a strategic military crisis compounded by the destabilizing and other effects of a deepening depression, plus growing insanity among the Western elites who were responsible for the malthusian policies in the first place. To this was added a monstrous factor of miscalculation: the growing discrepancy between commitment to the utopian MAD doctrine by the West, and commitment to a thermonuclear war-winning doctrine in the East.

As desperate as the situation had become, the work of LaRouche and his associates had generated major opportunities to change things in the United States. Lyn had already warned the American people of the disastrous policies that would be pursued by Carter, in a nation-wide television broadcast on election eve, November 1976. Lyn's characterization of the Carter Administration was proven right in the subsequent period. Through the terrible years of the Carter Administration, LaRouche built up a major grass-roots political movement, as the only coherent, visible opposition to the Administration's “deconstruction” of the United States. The *EIR Quarterly Economic Forecasts*, based on the LaRouche-Riemann method, proved uniquely accurate in projecting the industrial decline caused by the Carter-Volcker policies, and demonstrated Lyn's

A Strategic Defense of Humanity



Were the United States to eject Obama, and reciprocate Russia's offer for an SDE (Strategic Defense of Earth), we would not only avert the danger of thermonuclear war in the short term, but we would eliminate the reason for humanity to ever go to war again. Peace, is not the negation of conflict; it's an active commitment among all peoples to “the common aims of mankind.”

An LPAC video presented by Natalie Lovegren (12 minutes).

<http://www.larouchepac.com/node/20616>

unique competence in economics against the manifest incompetence of leading private and governmental agencies, institutes, and think-tanks.

The Carter Administration was voted out in a landslide. People had had enough of Carter's green deconstructionism. Going into the Reagan Administration, there was a craving to get back to what America used to be, to get back to economic growth, to the atmosphere of scientific and technological progress associated with the memory of President John F. Kennedy's Moon landing program. The Europeans looked to the new Administration hoping there would be a return to sanity.

Devising a War-Avoidance Policy

As for the new Reagan Administration itself, it was a mixed bag, to put it mildly. But there was a certain openness. The better people inside the administration were open to suggestions. There was already a certain, perceptible leaning in the direction of LaRouche's policies.

The challenge was to design an improved policy, which would assure war avoidance in the short and medium term, and at the same time provide the world with a long-term pathway into the future.

At the time Lyn designed his strategic defense policy, the idea of laser- and particle-beam weapons to defend against nuclear missiles was not at all new. Shortly after the first successful demonstration of an optical laser, Soviet Marshal V.D. Sokolovsky announced in the 1962 edition of his book *Soviet Military Strategy*, that the Soviet Union had embarked on a long-term program to develop laser- and particle-beam weapons. He remarked that only beam-weapon technology "based on new physical principles" could overcome the inherent shortcomings of anti-missile missiles, which made the latter unsuitable for effective strategic defense—a point which was underlined, recently, by costly experience of the performance of Patriot missiles during the Gulf War.

Through the end of the 1970s, both superpowers had programs to develop beam weapons. There was, however, a characteristic difference: The Soviets were committed to developing an operational beam-weapon defense as soon as possible; they deployed many of their best scientists into the relevant areas and pushed the work forward in a hubristic manner from one breakthrough to the next. Whereas especially under Henry Kissinger's policies, the United States was not only not committed to developing beam-weapon defense, but

officially regarded such development as undesirable, as a destabilization of the MAD doctrine. As a result, the U.S. beam-weapon program was kept on the back burner; it was relegated to the task of making sure that the United States would not be taken totally off guard in the event of major Soviet progress.

LaRouche was already familiar with many of the essentials of directed-energy technology through the work of the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF), which he had played the major part in launching back in 1974. The focus of the FEF's work, of course, was to promote fundamental research, development, and application of controlled nuclear fusion as the major energy source for mankind in the future.

The crucial thing about fusion, clear at that time, is not that the supply of fuel is virtually unlimited (which is true), but rather the fact that fusion reactors can potentially deliver power in various forms, at an energy-flux density many orders of magnitude higher than conventional nuclear or fossil fuel plants. This implied that fusion technology is associated with intrinsically higher economic productivity as compared with other known forms of power production. For example, we can use energy-dense plasmas to process ores and other materials; we can process low-concentration ores, industrial waste, or even ordinary rocks and dirt, into high-quality materials and at a tiny fraction of the present cost per unit output.

Furthermore, the energy-dense plasmas required for fusion confront us with varieties of singularities, in the form of solitons of various sorts and rapid successions of phase changes, pointing to a vast domain of fundamental research for which the LaRouche-Cantor-Riemann form of physics is uniquely appropriate. And, incidentally: 99% of the universe is in a plasma state!

From the standpoint of his science of physical economy, LaRouche knew that fusion would have to be at the center of any policy for healthy, capital-intensive growth of the world economy from the late 1990s into the 21st Century. This evaluation brought LaRouche into a somewhat heated debate with Dr. Edward Teller and other leaders of the U.S. scientific community, who generally supported controlled fusion research but failed to recognize the need for a broad-based "crash program." They tended to see fusion mainly from the standpoint of long-term supplies of energy, not as the locomotive of an economy undergoing rapid technological progress.

Now, it is clear, that if we can master the means to

generate and control the kinds of energy densities associated with “hot” fusion, and if in connection with this we learn how to focus and “tune” such flows of energy, to propagate them efficiently through space and through various media, then we can come up with weapons vastly more powerful than anything known up to now.


In a certain sense, the internal features of H-bomb design themselves announced the onset of an era of directed energy which would make the bomb ultimately obsolete. This simple observation refuted the whole MAD doctrine, of course, and was accordingly made into a “top secret” by U.S. classification policies. Hence a tumultuous response in some government laboratories, when an article was published in the newspaper *New Solidarity* in October 1976 on the basic physical principles of the H-bomb. The simple fact is, that if we study how the fusion process is actually generated in such a device, we confront a whole set of energy-enhancing processes—nonlinear focussing of shock waves, laser-like transformation and “tuning” of radiation, isentropic compression, and so forth—which are in turn crucial to the functioning of beam weapons. If we turn an H-bomb “inside-out” in this sense, we already have a rudimentary precursor to directed-energy weapons.

LaRouche was not at all surprised when U.S. Air Force’s Gen. George Keegan publicized his warnings on the existence of a large Soviet program for beam weapons. Lyn was familiar with the quality of Soviet work in related areas of plasma physics. One of his collaborators discussed this with Keegan, and the FEF made an independent evaluation, published in 1978 in *New Solidarity*, and in a celebrated pamphlet entitled “Sputnik of the 70s—the Science Behind the Soviets’ Beam Weapon.”

By the middle to the late 1970s, scientific proof of principle had been established for a wide range of beam weapons suitable to destroy missiles and thermonuclear warheads in flight. But this mere scientific feasibility in principle did not by itself dictate an entirely new strategic doctrine. All kinds of doubts and objections could be raised, and were, even by those who did not support the MAD doctrine: Wouldn’t the costs of an effective system be astronomical? Can’t any defensive system be defeated by countermeasures? And so forth.

Economics and the SDI

The most essential thing Lyn contributed here, was his solution, based on the economic discoveries I re-



EIRNS

This 1978 pamphlet issued by the LaRouche movement was the first major salvo in what became LaRouche’s campaign for beam-weapon defense.

ferred to earlier, to the problem of how to organize the economy for an unprecedented rate of technological attrition in the relevant fields. This implicitly solves every problem connected with the design of a viable SDI.

First, it was clear that the idea of an ultimate, invincible beam-weapon defense system was as silly as that of an invincible offensive system. Every development might *eventually* be countered by countermeasures. But, Lyn pointed out, provided a high rate of technological development is maintained, beam weapons and related systems, as a family, embody an intrinsically greater firepower than the slow, nuclear-carrying missiles. In his original design, Lyn demanded a crash program leading to the construction and deployment of a first-generation defense system (Mark I) within a few years, to be followed rapidly by successive, improved generations, Mark II, Mark III, and so forth.

In doing so, Lyn emphasized the close relationship between increase in firepower in military terms, and the energy-flux density and related parameters used by eco-

conomic science for the measurement of technology. The conclusion was that under conditions of technological attrition, defensive systems based on the indicated “new physical principles” would rapidly gain the advantage, leading “asymptotically” to a situation in which the nuclear-tipped missiles would be virtually obsolete.

In particular, Lyn showed that the higher firepower embodied in beam-weapon technologies as a family meant that it would become far cheaper to destroy one missile with a defensive system, than to produce and launch the missile. Thus, the defense becomes the superior investment compared to the offense.

But the most crucial point is the *economic impact* of technological attrition. If we think not of a single technological level of defense *A*, but instead of a process of driving defensive technologies through a series of evolutionary stages *A, B, C, D...*, embodying breakthroughs in advanced science, and if we organize the economy in such a way as to rapidly integrate the technological spillovers into the civilian economy, then the increased rate of growth of productivity of the overall economy pays back the investment into the SDI many times over. This was already demonstrated, to a limited extent, by President Kennedy’s Apollo Program, which returned an estimated \$5-10 to the economy for every dollar spent to land men on the Moon. However, as Lyn pointed out, the unique characteristics of beam-weapon technologies as a family, in terms of the vast increases in controlled energy-flux-densities embodied in first and later generations of such weapons, point to a potentially far larger spillover effect. The growing use of high-power lasers for machining and treatment of materials, marks the beginning of a new industrial revolution in which, ultimately, a single industrial operative might achieve a greater productive power than the entire industrial labor force in former centuries.

Cultural Implications of LaRouche’s Policy

Lyn underlined this point with his proposal, initially placed before the public at a 1985 conference in Washington, for a 40-year project to establish a permanent manned colony on Mars. The first steps would involve creating new space transport systems, with emphasis on the goal of fusion propulsion, and setting up mining and manufacturing operations on the Moon as a base and “stepping-stone” to the planets. This Moon-Mars project constitutes, as Lyn demonstrated, a necessary com-

plement to the SDI itself. The technologies required to install and economically sustain a human population in the hostile environment of that distant planet, are so closely related to those needed for an effective SDI, that research and development in the one area is at the same time development of the other area.


But there is a deeper, *cultural* implication of a properly organized crash program for beam-weapon technology, which was key to Lyn’s design of the offer he made to the Soviet leadership on behalf of the United States. In effect, Lyn was offering to the Russians a profound transformation of their society—a transformation radically different, however, from the disastrous IMF “shock therapy” promoted by Jeffrey Sachs and others.

A shared “crash program” development of SDI technology, provided it were organized in accordance with Lyn’s principles of physical economy, would have effectively solved the most essential problems of the Soviet economy. There was however a price the Soviets would have to pay for this solution, a price linked inseparably to the solution itself. This price was to permit a shift in the prevailing matrix of cultural values *away* from that associated with the dream of Moscow as the “Third and Final Rome” of a world empire, and instead *toward* an ecumenical form of agreement with the principles of Western Judeo-Christian civilization, as embodied, for example, in the work of Nicholas of Cusa.

A brief example identifies, in microcosm, the point at which the relevant issues of culture and economics intersect.

The best traditions of investment practice in Western industrial societies are associated with what is sometimes called “technological depreciation.” Typically, an owner or manager of a small or medium-sized industry—Germany’s famous *Mittelstand* exemplifies this—will often replace a machine or related piece of production equipment long before the useful technical life of the machine has expired. Under conditions of rapid technological advance, it commonly happens that a new machine soon becomes available, which incorporates major improvements and promises a much higher productivity than the original piece of equipment. In the typical case, the *Mittelstand* entrepreneur decides to discard the old machine and install the new one in its place. The nominal loss of remaining service life on the old machine is more than compensated by the increased productivity of the new one.

The typical *Mittelstand* farmer or industrialist in



Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

The crucial thing about fusion is not that the supply of fuel is virtually unlimited, but that fusion reactors can potentially deliver power at an energy-flux density many orders of magnitude higher than conventional nuclear or fossil fuel plants. Shown is the Tandem Mirror Experiment at Lawrence Livermore Lab in 1979, which was being used to create and maintain a high-density plasma.

Western culture sees this practice not merely as a means to earn profits; rather, progress in this sense *is a way of life*. Rapid technological depreciation provides the chief context in which entrepreneurs and workers, engaged in daily process of production, exercise the creative mental potentials expressed in the Cusan concept of *imago viva Dei* [the living image of God]. In this and related ways, Western culture at its best has fostered the relatively highest rates of technological progress achieved in history to date.

Contrast this now to the proverbial, monstrous inertia displayed by the civilian sectors of the Soviet economy, an inertia associated with what Soviet commentators sometimes referred to as “the peasant problem.” The rampant backwardness, the fact that obsolete equipment was often kept running virtually indefinitely, reflected not only organizational defects in the so-called socialist system. Rather, it chiefly stemmed from a deep-seated cultural resistance, from the bureaucracy down to the individual worker, against introducing new technologies and new ways of doing things. Implicitly,

the underlying idea of “value” governing such resistance was the notion that wealth is located in objects—e.g., a machine, a deposit of raw materials, or some country or population which could be looted—and not in the individual human being’s creative role in *generating new wealth through technological progress*. This problem predates the Soviet period; it is an expression of the same deeply imbedded cultural axioms which fueled the centuries-old dream of Moscow as the “Third and Final Rome” of a world empire.

It was that underlying cultural problem which Lyn addressed with his design of the SDI and the 40-year

program to colonize Mars—a design which offered a real pathway of solution. The rapid proliferation of SDI-related technologies into the civilian sectors of the Soviet economy would have provided powerful proof, in everyday life, of the efficiency of the creative powers of the mind. Instead of the dangerous demoralization we have now, the population would have been inspired by the ability to change things for the better. The most favorable context would have been provided for a broad cultural transformation.

It is to that, more than anything else, that the Soviet nomenklatura answered “*Nyet!*” From that tragic refusal, Russia and the whole world have suffered disastrously.

So, instead of joyfully exploring the universe together, hopping from planet to planet out to the stars, we have a humanity descending into a holocaust of famine, disease, and genocidal wars. How tragic, how unnecessary! It’s time to change history again, as Lyn did in the period leading to March 23, 1983. If we master Lyn’s method, we shall surely be successful.

It's Obama Who Is Pushing Toward Thermonuclear War

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Aug. 28—In the three years since Lyndon LaRouche's April 11, 2009 public warning that Barack Obama is a pathological narcissist in the image of Emperor Nero, the President has done everything in his power to prove that LaRouche was absolutely right. From the illegal regime-change war in Libya, ending with the gangland-style slaying of head of state Muammar Qaddafi; to the extra-judicial assassination of at least three American citizens in Yemen; to the drone killings in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, and Somalia, President Obama has proven that his only credentials are those of a mass murderer, who will kill on an ever grander scale if he is allowed to remain in office any longer.

With his overt threat last week to launch yet another war involving U.S. air power, this time in Syria, the President is bringing the world to the very brink of thermonuclear conflict and potential extinction. It is transparently obvious to anyone who cares to think about it, that a U.S.-led replay of the Libya regime-change war in Syria, without even a fig leaf of UN Security Council support, will draw Russia and China directly into conflict with the United States, the United Kingdom, and anyone else, such as France, foolish enough to engage in this provocation.

The danger of thermonuclear World War III is staring us all in the face for one simple reason: President Obama is a mass killer, whose lust to murder makes him a perfect stooge for the faction of the British Empire that is committed, on the record, to the elimination of

80% of the human race. War avoidance means removing Obama from power.

Obama's Latest Escalation

President Obama on Aug. 20 issued the most direct threat yet to use U.S. military force to overthrow the Syrian government. In statements reminiscent of the lies told by then-Vice President Dick Cheney about "nuclear mushroom clouds" from Iraq, in the run-up to the March 2003 invasion of that country, President Obama declared that any evidence of Syrian chemical weapons being moved around the country would prompt him to fundamentally re-think U.S. policy towards Syria.

Obama's public comments followed a lengthy telephone discussion with British Prime Minister David Cameron, in which the two men agreed that the ouster of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad was a non-negotiable policy, regardless of the Russian and Chinese vetoes at the UN Security Council, and the fact that the rebels have been delivered significant defeats on the ground in Syria.

On Aug. 27, French President François Hollande, in an about-face, announced that he, too, would support the use of military force to oust Assad from power. Hollande's statements came just 24 hours after the former head of the French Air Force gave an interview to *Le Monde*, in which he adamantly opposed military action against Syria, warning that the Syrian Air Force was



twice as large and more combat-ready than that of France.

At the same time that Obama and Cameron threatened direct Western military action to create a no-fly zone and humanitarian corridor along the Turkey-Syria border, Israel's Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu escalated his threats to launch "preventive" military action (i.e., aggressive war) against Iran sometime in the coming weeks. Netanyahu's and Defense Minister Ehud Barak's continuing threats to launch unilateral military strikes against Iran continue to fuel a backlash among Israeli institutions that have been nearly unanimous in their opposition to the Prime Minister's reckless threats.

Late last week, Gen. Gabi Ashkenazi (ret.), until recently, the Chief of Staff of the Israeli Defense Forces, joined a growing legion of active and retired IDF, Mossad, Shin Bet, and Military Intelligence leaders who have come out publicly against Netanyahu's and Barak's threats to order a unilateral attack on Iran.

Obama Exposed

Increasingly, Israeli security specialists have taken note of the fact that, while Gen. Martin Dempsey (USA), Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has repeatedly warned Israel against unilateral military action against Iran, the one voice that would all-but-certainly force Netanyahu and Barak to back down—that of President Obama—has been silent.

The editor of the Israeli daily *Ha'aretz*, Aluf Benn, was quoted in an interview in the *National Interest* on Aug. 21, saying that Obama's silence is being widely viewed as a green light for Netanyahu and Barak to



White House Photo/Pete Souza

President Obama and British Prime Minister David Cameron (inset) agreed in a phone discussion last week that the ouster of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad was a non-negotiable demand. This signifies a march toward a thermonuclear World War III. Obama is shown here talking to Cameron last year, during the buildup to the war against Libya. With him are National Security Advisor Tom Donilon (left) and Chief of Staff Bill Daley (center).

launch their planned military strikes. "The conventional wisdom is that President Obama is opposed to an Israeli attack," Benn told journalist Leon Hadar. "But Obama has refrained from vetoing an Israeli action or threatening such a move with sanctions if Israel acts. . . . I believe that this is another example of Obama leading from behind, counting on Israel to do in Iran what the Brits and the French did in Libya."

As Benn implies, Obama's "leading from behind" was pure subterfuge, as the U.S. was the prime mover and actor in the Libya war.

On Aug. 27, *Ha'aretz* commentator Chemi Shalev took up the issue by way of countering the frequent wishful argument that Obama would not want to have a war against Israel in the pre-election period. To the contrary, Shalev insists, giving his own opinion and citing that of a host of pundits including top Republican Party consultant Karl Rove, who, he said, in a recent appearance on Fox News, opined that any flare-up with Iran would only serve Obama's interests. Americans, he said, would instinctively rally around their Commander in Chief, and that Obama's standing in the polls would immediately improve.

Shalev writes that "most people who know Obama

maintain that if his hand is forced, either by Iran or by Israel, the President would not hesitate to send the American bombers on their way, elections or no elections, not only if Iran attacks American targets directly but also to help Israel, if it turns out that it cannot fend for itself. At the height of an election campaign, such a crisis would doubtlessly entail the fringe benefit of forcing Republican candidates Mitt Romney and Paul Ryan to support the President and to put aside their criticism while guns are blazing and American lives are in danger. . . . In fact, the very foundations of a theory that a war before elections would hurt Obama's chances in the elections are so far-fetched that it is actually unreasonable to believe that a seasoned Americanologist such as Netanyahu would subscribe to it. . . ."

No Local Wars

What these Israeli commentators neglect to say is the crucial point: Any war against Iran or Syria, will lead toward a thermonuclear confrontation between the U.S., and Russia and China. This view has been forcefully spelled out by Lyndon LaRouche, who warned this week that President Obama is committed to provoking thermonuclear war with Russia and China, using the Syrian and Iranian situations as pretexts.

Indeed, spokesmen for the Russian and Syrian governments have already denounced Obama's statement about "chemical weapons" as just a pretext for U.S. military intervention. A source in the Russian Foreign Ministry told *Kommersant* daily on Aug. 21 that this scenario is considered highly probable. "Our Western partners and Israel have recently made such statements," the source said. "We believe they can follow up on these threats."

Syrian Deputy Prime Minister Qadri Jamil, in Moscow for talks on finding a peaceful way out of the impasse, told reporters: "The West is looking for an excuse for direct intervention. If this excuse does not work, it will look for another excuse." Jamil also spoke against Western military intervention, warning that it could ignite a regional conflict. "Those who are contemplating this, evidently want to see the crisis expand beyond Syria's borders," he said.

An article in the Aug. 23 edition of the Russian military paper *Red Star* warned of the high probability of a conflict in the Persian Gulf. It begins with the deployment of U.S. and British minesweepers and carrier groups in the Gulf. It also reports on the maneuvers planned for Sept. 26-27, involving 20 nations and con-

centrating on mine-sweeping, with the deployment of Special Forces reportedly also equipped to disarm mines.

The article takes special note, however, of efforts of General Dempsey to tamp down the irrational exuberance of the Israeli whackos by stating that an Israeli military strike would *not* end Iran's nuclear program. It also notes that, in addition to the inflamed rhetoric of Israeli Prime Minister Netan-Yahoo and Defense Minister Barak, there are significant voices of opposition within the Israeli Cabinet, including IDF chief Benny Gantz and the head of the Mossad, to a strike against Iran.

The Chinese government, as reflected in statements in its press outlets, is aware of hostile U.S. intentions. In an Aug. 25 *China Daily* article, the American strategic drive toward "missile defense" in Asia (allegedly against the North Korean threat) is described, its "not against China" pretenses discounted, and high-levels talks are requested. *China Daily* says that "military experts in both the United States and China questioned the U.S. intentions, saying the expensive system, which is well beyond Pyongyang's military capability, is actually 'looking at China.'"

Stop Him Now

EIR's Washington, D.C. sources stress that Obama, in league with Cameron and others, is in a flight-forward mode, determined to pursue his confrontation course. Some may hope Russia and China will back down; they won't.

Meanwhile, Obama is escalating primarily in Syria, with aid being provided to the "rebels," even as it is widely reported that they are dominated by ruthless killer jihadis. The British establishment's *Economist* weekly even admitted on Aug. 25 that the Syrian armed rebels have been delivered a series of devastating military defeats in Damascus and Aleppo, the country's two largest cities. The Sunni middle class, concentrated in those two cities, has rejected the rebels, as more and more Saudi-funded neo-Salafists carry out atrocities against civilians.

Despite the continuing flow of money and weapons to the Syrian armed opposition, it is becoming clearer by the day that the Assad regime will remain in power for a long time, unless there is a major foreign military invasion, starting with the imposition of a no-fly zone. And this is precisely what Obama and Cameron threatened last week.

Military Experts Provide Alternative to Obama's War

by Tony Papert

Aug. 25—At precisely the same time that LaRouchePAC was flooding Washington, D.C. with Lyndon LaRouche's warning that President Obama must not be renominated as the Democratic candidate, because he is taking the world to thermonuclear war, prominent Harvard University defense analyst Graham Allison was sounding the alarm about the danger of a U.S.-Russian nuclear confrontation. In an op-ed in London's *Financial Times* of Aug. 21, entitled "Thucydides' trap has been sprung in the Pacific," Allison calls for abandoning the path toward war, and embracing a policy outlined in an International Security Advisory Board (ISAB) report, entitled "Mutual Assured Stability: Essential Components and Near-Term Actions."

Allison, who is best known for his studies of the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, chaired an independent study group, which was commissioned by the State Department in the Spring of 2011, to produce such a report on the question of war avoidance. The group includes a number of other leading strategists and foreign policy experts, including Joseph Cirincione, president of the Plowshares Fund, and an expert on nuclear weapons policy; former Defense Secretary William Perry; Robert Gallucci, former Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs; and George H.W. Bush National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft. The thrust of the report's argument is how to avoid nuclear war with Russia.

Not surprisingly, Allison's argument coincides precisely with that which has been put forward consistently by Gen. Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. Dempsey—working in tandem with the efforts of LaRouche and his movement, and the Russian and Chinese leaderships—has been fighting aggressively against the Obama Administration's manifest intention to detonate new wars which will take the United States directly into a thermonuclear confrontation with the Russians and the Chinese. Like

Allison, Dempsey has frequently cited Thucydides, the historian of the Peloponnesian War which destroyed Athens, and insisted that the United States not fall into the same trap, of provoking a war that will destroy itself.

President Obama has clearly turned a deaf ear to these arguments, again and again, over the last years. The question is, will other American leaders do the same?

Allison's Warning

"Classical Athens was the centre of civilisation. Philosophy, history, drama, architecture, democracy—all beyond anything previously imagined," Allison wrote in his Aug. 21 op-ed. "This dramatic rise shocked Sparta, the established land power on the Peloponnese. Fear compelled its leaders to respond. Threat and counter-threat produced competition, then confrontation and finally conflict. At the end of 30 years of war, both states had been destroyed."

(Today, as LaRouche has pointed out, in the thermonuclear era, the destruction will take about five minutes.)

"Thucydides wrote of these events," Allison continued: "'It was the rise of Athens and the fear that this inspired in Sparta that made war inevitable.' Note the two crucial variables: rise and fear."

Turning to China, Allison wrote, "Never has a nation moved so far, so fast, up the international rankings on all dimensions of power. In a generation, a state whose gross domestic product was smaller than Spain's has become the second-largest economy in the world.

"If we were betting on the basis of history, the answer to the question about Thucydides' trap appears obvious. In 11 of 15 cases since 1500 where a rising power emerged to challenge a ruling power, war occurred. Think about Germany after unification as it overtook Britain as Europe's largest economy. In 1914



harvard.edu

Harvard University defense analyst Graham Allison chaired a State Department study group whose report on “Mutual Assured Stability” points to the threat of a thermonuclear confrontation between the United States and Russia, and proposes how to avoid it.



and in 1939, its aggression and the UK’s response produced world wars.”

(Some of Allison’s historiography is of the Brand-X, untrue variety, like his reference to 1914, but what he is fighting to achieve outweighs those errors.)

Allison ends his dramatic warning with a call to arms, so to speak: “To recognise powerful structural factors is not to argue that leaders are prisoners of the iron laws of history. It is rather to help us appreciate the magnitude of the challenge. If leaders in China and the US perform no better than their predecessors in classical Greece, or Europe at the beginning of the 20th century, historians of the 21st century will cite Thucydides in explaining the catastrophe that follows. The fact that war would be devastating for both nations is relevant but not decisive. Recall the first world war, in which all the combatants lost what they treasured most.”

The State Department Study Group

The report Allison’s study group produced on Aug. 14, posted on the State Department’s [website](#), does

not focus on China—rather, its objective is to avoid thermonuclear war with Russia, and establish a regime of long-term war avoidance, largely by actions aimed at what the late Edward Teller called “the common aims of mankind” (see this week’s *Strategy* section)—and then to expand that cooperation with Russia to include all other possible nations, most urgently China.

A basic recommendation of the report is that “Neither side bases decisions on nuclear force structure, posture, or doctrine on an assumption that the other is *an adversary or likely to engage in nuclear conflict*” (emphasis added).

The report recommends that “the United States and Russia join together around the values, norms and motives they share, commit to reducing the global nuclear threat, and agree to influence others to share their views.” That call to “join together around the values, norms and motives they share,” is repeated again and again throughout the report, referencing not only the United States and Russia, but all other nations, as those two powers encourage others to join with them in this collaboration.

“A critical aspect of greater strategic stability requires both the United States and Russia to recognize that the dire consequences of nuclear conflict between them would be disproportionate to the scale of any plausible bilateral disputes they may have with each other. It should be recognized that both U.S. conceptual thinking on mutual assured stability as well as the U.S. dialogue with Russia must create more clarity on these issues.”

They recommend that “the United States and Russia collaborate on a full range of public health issues of mutual interest: stopping drug trafficking (particularly from Afghanistan to Russia), infectious disease prevention, promotion of healthy lifestyles and decreased drug abuse, affordable health care delivery, and other areas as identified.”

For whatever reasons, the report never mentions any current issues such as Syria or Iran, or the insane war provocation constituted by the U.S. unilateral European ABM system being built around Russia’s borders. Instead, its authors try to flank that latter issue with some alternatives of their own, which necessarily base themselves on LaRouche’s Strategic Defense Initiative of 1977 and subsequent years.

First, to “Conduct a joint U.S.-Russia review of the requirements for national and multilateral missile de-



Gen. James Cartwright (USMC), former JCS vice chairman, has proposed a war avoidance strategy based on “entanglement” or “beneficial interdependence.” He and other flag officers and diplomats have formed “Global Zero,” which campaigns for total elimination of nuclear arsenals.

fense in the coming years as missile technology continues to spread, with the goal of achieving a shared understanding of each nation’s requirements for effective missile defense.”

Then, more ambitiously, to “Develop agreements on sharing early warning data with Russia and using satellites to jointly monitor ballistic missile launches.”

Echoing the Military’s War Avoidance

Among the concepts cited in the ISAB report is one proposed by Gen. James Cartwright, the former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, until his retirement in September 2011. It is called “entanglement,” and framed as an alternative to the concept of Mutual Assured Destruction.

One of the components of that strategy is called “beneficial interdependence.” “Interdependence in humanitarian and economic as well as national security realms contributes to the benefits of mutual assured stability,” the report says. It cites Cartwright as having suggested the concept of “entanglement” as having beneficial aspects. The reference to Cartwright is one of only two references in the report.

In a June 26, 2012 presentation in Washington, sponsored by Johns Hopkins University’s Applied Physics Laboratory, Cartwright reported that during the Cold War, “entanglement” was put forward as an alter-

native to Mutual Assured Destruction. “If our economies were hooked together, if our defenses were hooked together, that the likelihood of going to conflict would be reduced. . . .”

Looking at the world as it is today, Cartwright said that the question that has to be asked, is, what will give us the adaptability, the comprehensive look at what’s going on in the world, the leverage of friends and allies, in order to reduce conflict? “The question is, how do you start to do this?” And the answer doesn’t include nuclear weapons, as Cartwright made clear, and has been making clear by his involvement with other retired flag officers and diplomats in a group called Global Zero, which is campaigning to eliminate all nuclear arsenals.

The problem that Cartwright highlighted in his June 26 presentation is that decisions about modernizing the U.S. nuclear arsenal (which are 50-year decisions, he said) are being made without much discussion about strategy. The problem that the Russians have with the Obama Administration’s European missile defense plan is that they’re afraid that it would make possible a U.S. decapitation strike that would eliminate Russia’s counterforce capability, but, “that’s the sort of problem that can be solved with a treaty,” he said.

Cartwright had made the same point, earlier in May, during a presentation at the Joint Warfighting Conference in Virginia Beach, Va., not only with respect to Russia, but to China as well. He said the Pentagon’s Air Sea Battle concept is “demonizing China. That’s not in anybody’s best interests.” Then, in response to a question from *EIR* on Russia and missile defense, he described the same problem as in his June 26 presentation, and said, “We’re going to have to think our way out of this. We’re going to have to figure out how we’re going to do this.”

Indeed, the military has been attempting to avoid a U.S. confrontation with Russia and China—even as the Obama Administration pursues policies which are leading directly to such a thermonuclear conflict. The very existence of this nation, and the human race, depends upon whose strategy is ultimately victorious.

The EU's Bank Bailout Policies Are Murdering Europe's People

by Dean Andromidas

Aug. 24—The European Union's policy of bailing out the banks in hopes of "saving" the euro is destroying the only basis for eventual recovery: Europe's people. The most critical case now in the headlines is Greece, but Greece is not alone. Spain, Portugal, Ireland, and Italy are most rapidly falling into the same abyss.

An important inflection point will be the Sept. 12 decision of Germany's Constitutional Court in several cases challenging the constitutionality of the EU's permanent bailout fund. The proposed European Stability Mechanism would strip decision-making authority from national elected leaders and put it in the hands of a group of technocrats with permanent immunity from prosecution.

Now that the bailout policy has destroyed the Greek economy and driven much of the population into abject poverty, Greece's creditors want to throw it out of the Eurozone. On Aug. 24, while Greek Prime Minister Antonis Samaras was visiting Berlin to beg for a two-year extension for implementing the austerity terms, the *Financial Times* reported that a working group has been established to study the possible economic impact of a Greek exit from the Eurozone. so-called Troika of the European Commission, European Central Bank (ECB), and International Monetary Fund (IMF) is due to issue a report next month on Greece's progress or lack thereof, which will be taken up at a European Union meeting on Oct. 18-19.

The bankers' alternative to dismantling the Eurozone was

laid out by the City of London mouthpiece the *Economist* on Aug. 11, calling for a full political union. This would be nothing like the formation of the United States of America in 1789, joining 13 pre-revolutionary colonies into one republican nation-state; in today's Europe, "political union" would mean a fascist, financier-run superstate, in which all countries are responsible for one another's debt (known as "mutualization" of the debt), forcing Weimar-style hyperinflation by printing the money to pay the debts, and then deflationary collapse.

The only actually viable alternative is to bury the euro, implement a Glass-Steagall-type reform to separate speculative investment banking from commercial banking for productive purposes, institute a credit system as Lyndon LaRouche has defined it, and launch the LaRouche movement's "[Emergency Program](#) for an 'Economic Miracle in Southern Europe, the Mediterranean Region, and Africa.'"



Poverty in Greece has become so widespread that suicide is now becoming an everyday occurrence and sometimes an act of political protest. Here, a man in Thessaloniki scrounges for a few drops of olive oil.

Where Have the People Gone?

We all remember the Balkan wars of the 1990s, when an estimated 140,000 people lost their lives and millions were displaced by ethnic cleansing: genocide. While these crimes against humanity were done through mass violence, today the same effect is being carried out, not by bands of armed fanatics, but by bands of European bureaucrats with their “fiscal adjustment” policies and “economic reform” programs: the Troika.

Take the case of Greece. Since Greece signed the bailout agreement in 2010, according to published figures, the economy has collapsed by more than 20%, and unemployment rose from 8% to 23%, and is expected to reach 25% by the end of 2012. According to the Institute of Labor, which is linked to the main trade union federations, unemployment could reach 30% in 2013. The same source reports that hundreds of thousands of unemployed are no longer receiving unemployment or even welfare benefits, and that real available incomes of employees, after payment of increased taxes and direct wage cuts, have decreased by 50%.

Hundreds of thousands of Greeks, especially well-educated young people, are simply fleeing the economic carnage. There are no official figures of how

many have left, but there is little doubt that the figure could be close to a million. There are reports that as many as 30,000 young Greeks have flocked to the city of Berlin alone. Most flee to other countries of the European Union, where work permits are not required for people from member nations. Others flee to the U.S., Australia, Asia, and Africa.

For those who remain, life is grim. Suicides have increased dramatically with official figures reaching over 2,000 since 2010. In Greece, suicide is no longer a “personal” tragedy, done far away from the public eye. Earlier this year a pensioner shot himself in Athens’ Syntagma Square right in front of the Parliament, leaving a note declaring his suicide an act of resistance to a government that he compares to a wartime government that collaborated with the Nazi occupation. A young bank employee jumped to his death from the Acropolis, his body falling in front of a group of tourists. Another man, when presented with an eviction notice, jumped to his death from his balcony. Since the Orthodox Church refuses a Christian burial for those who commit suicide, popular beaches serve as a venue for “accidental” drownings.

Yannis Xousos, labor union head of the public

Economist Demands Schacht Solution for Euro

Aug. 16—Richard Werner, a German-born economist at the University of Southampton, England, called for a Schachtian plan to save the euro, in an interview with the Aug. 16 *Daily Telegraph*. Werner is credited for having invented the term “quantitative easing” in 1994, in proposing a money-expansion policy to Japan. Now he is exposing the fascist content of his program, by opening citing Hitler’s economic guru, Hjalmar Schacht, the author of the Nazi’s austerity policies, as model.

Reporting on Werner’s current proposal, James Hurley wrote in the *Telegraph*: “Hitler’s central banker, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, knew how to deal with a Great Depression, Prof. Werner tells us. He argues it’s about time we revived his sage economic ideas now.

“Firstly, the plan involves the European Central Bank buying the banking system’s bad assets at face value, which Prof. Werner says would not cost taxpayers or cause inflation.

“Next—and here’s Dr. Schacht’s 1930s magic—the Spanish government and others should stop selling pricey government bonds entirely.

“Instead, they should fund themselves through loan contracts from banks in their countries, which Prof. Werner says would result in cheaper sovereign borrowing.

“All very appealing—but shouldn’t we be wary of using ideas favored by the Nazis?

“‘If we don’t want to adopt economic policies on the basis that they were favored by Hitler’s government, which is an understandable viewpoint, then we should not have introduced the euro in the first place,’ Prof. Werner responds.

“‘The introduction of a single European currency, with the central bank located in Germany, was, after all, favored by Hitler and his technocrats.’”

rescue service EKAV in Attika, told the German daily *Süddeutsche Zeitung*: “Nearly all victims put an end to their lives because they are in a deep economic crisis. Often, it is small entrepreneurs who had to declare default, or fathers of a family who took a mortgage before the crisis, then lost their jobs and now cannot make the payments anymore.” In June alone, EKAV received 350 emergency calls on its hotline, and in 50 of these cases, the person was already dead by the time the rescue workers arrived.

Greek television presented citizens who are no longer able to draw unemployment or welfare benefits, explaining that they had infected themselves with HIV, because then the state will at least pay welfare.

Greece Is Not Alone

Ireland, Portugal, and Spain are also experiencing mass emigration.

In Ireland, each year, 70,000 people emigrate, out of a population of less than 4.5 million, or 1.6% of the population, which is increasing only by a net 0.6% per year. Unemployment has increased from an official 4.8% in 2008 to 14.8% in June of this year.

The grim reaper has also made his Irish harvest of 600 suicides annually, a dramatic increase from previous years, directly attributed to the economic collapse. Ireland’s National Suicide Research Foundation found, in a study released earlier this year, that of the 190 suicides in the county of Cork between September 2008 and March 2011, fully one third were among young men who had been previously employed in the construction industry, whose dramatic collapse began in 2008.

In Portugal, a country of close to 10.8 million people, official unemployment was 15.4% as of June this year. Some 100,000-120,000 people emigrated in 2011. Between 2008 and 2010, Portuguese consulates reported that 324,000 Portuguese migrants came in to register. While most flee to other EU countries, many with skills, including engineers, computer programmers, and academics, are fleeing to the old colonies of Mozambique and Angola, where economic growth rates are far higher than in Portugal. Suicides have also increased, especially among the elderly and unemployed.

Spain, whose economy and population of 47 million is larger than those of Greece, Ireland, and Portugal put together, is now in free fall, with official unemployment reaching 24.7% as of June, up from 8.5% in 2008, with

youth unemployment at an astonishing 53%. In 2011, 62,000 Spanish citizens emigrated, while in the first six months of this year, 40,625 emigrated, a 44% increase over last year. Moreover, 228,000 foreigners, many of whom were construction workers, have left.

While emigration was a common problem in these countries in the 1950s, ’60s and ’70s, it was a time of major labor shortage in the countries of northern Europe, as the German Economic Miracle lifted growth throughout northern Europe. But now all of Europe is suffering from negative growth, and an average unemployment rate of over 10%.

Who’s Not Keeping Their ‘Commitments’?

Greece is being constantly hounded about “living up to its commitments,” but it is the Euro Group, the euro fanatics in Brussels and the ECB in Frankfurt, who have not kept their commitments. Under its bailout package, Greece was supposed to receive EU31 billion in June, but the funds were not released, in order to blackmail the Greeks into voting into power the pro-bailout New Democracy Party in the June legislative elections. That party won by a thin margin, on the slogan that Greece must stay in “Europe” and the Eurozone. But the Euro Group has still refused to release the funds, claiming that the Greek government has not kept its “commitments,” and must cut the budget by yet another EU13.5 billion.

The government is continuing to pay off the debt, first, by not paying any vendors, halting all capital investment, and just paying salaries and pensions. The second way is by printing euros through the Bank of Greece, an action which ultimately adds to the country’s growing debt pile. Just this month the government raised EU6 billion by selling Treasury bills to Greek banks, which also receive liquidity from the Greek Central Bank. These funds were not used to run the government, but to pay off bonds that were being held by the ECB.

Greece’s debt continues to grow and had reached EU303.53 billion as of June.

Finance Minister Yannis Stournaras revealed that for the first seven months of this year, the government has only spent EU40 billion of the EU100 billion budgeted for this year, saying it has only been paying salaries and pensions. What does that mean to the Greek economy and everyday life of Greeks?

Among the vendors not being paid are pharmacies and hospitals. Greece has a national health system.

This is not “free” medical care; citizens make monthly payments into the system in order to avail themselves of its services. Patients receive prescriptions that entitle them to go to private pharmacies and receive medicines within the national insurance system, the National Organization for Health Care (EOPYY), which reimburses the pharmacies. But the government is EU252 million in arrears to the pharmacies for May and June, and of course they have not been paid yet for July and August. This has led pharmacies to go on strike and to demand advance payments from patients, which most cannot afford. For cancer patients, it is a death sentence.

The Greek press is filled with horror stories about the collapse of the hospital system. Doctors and medical personnel have not been paid in many cases for two or three months. A virtual hiring freeze has led to triage, decisions of who will or will not receive medical care. In many hospitals, non-essential surgery has been frozen.

Greece is a nation of islands; yet the government has suspended subsidies to ferry companies that service

“non-profitable” routes, driving the industry into bankruptcy. What is a “non-profitable route” but a trip to an island where Greeks have been living for centuries, but without catering to tourists.

The Real Alternative

As the crisis intensifies throughout Europe, it is becoming apparent to more and more people that the euro system is doomed. The Germany weekly *Der Spiegel* (Aug. 16) wrote that the so-called European “rescue” of Greece has totally “failed,” and the only thing “drastic austerity measures have done is to exacerbate the economic crisis and push Greece’s debts even higher.” The article concludes that Greece should be allowed to “go broke” and restart its economy.

Greeks themselves are looking towards an Argentina-style default and restructuring in order to save the nation. Dimitris Stratoulis, economic spokesman and parliamentarian for the opposition Syriza party, called on Greece to stop repaying its debt and demanded that it be restructured.

“Based on United Nations regulations, international experience and what has been proved in other countries based on international law, Greece can get out of this miserable, catastrophic situation,” he told Flash Radio on Aug. 17. “The country can be declared to be in a state of fiscal emergency so it can choose between its people’s survival or continuing to pay its huge debt, which under no circumstances can be deemed sustainable.”

Stratoulis reiterated Syriza’s position that although the party favors Greece remaining in the Eurozone, the well-being of Greeks must come first. “We have stated very clearly that the currency is not an obsession for us; for us the obsession is the survival of the Greek people and the country’s economic recovery,” he said. Last week, Syriza parliamentarian Panayiotis Lafazanis said that a sovereign default could be an option.

But none of these measures, in themselves, will solve the crisis. The solution is that which is being promoted by the LaRouche movement internationally: burying the euro before it buries Europe, putting the bankrupt European banking system through a Glass-Steagall style-reform, and establishing credit institutions for funding the “Program for an ‘Economic Miracle in Southern Europe, the Mediterranean Region and Africa.’” That program would integrate this region, including Greece, Spain, and Italy, into the Eurasian Land-Bridge and the development of Africa.

Finish Off the Speculators Now: Cap Food Prices!



The approaching food crisis demands that the U.S. government heed the warnings of Lyndon LaRouche and follow in the steps of Franklin Roosevelt. Shut out the speculators and fix food prices now.

<http://larouchepac.com/node/18381>

Obama's Coup Against Congress Gathers Steam

by Carl Osgood

Aug. 13—The Obama Administration is moving full-speed ahead to overthrow the U.S. Constitution, specifically, the authority of the Congress to declare war and to establish the national budget. Obama is carrying this out by manufacturing “crises” that require that Congress take “emergency” action, through measures that cause the Congress itself to surrender more and more of Constitutional prerogatives to an out-of-control Executive.

The first step in saving the nation from this coup is the long overdue Constitutional removal of Obama from office.

Obama's ongoing coup against the Constitution entered a new phase, a little over a year ago, when the false debt-ceiling crisis was used to stampede Congress into passing the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act (BCA, for short), which mandated that Congress cut \$1 trillion over ten years from Federal spending, beginning with the fiscal 2013 budget; it also required that Congress develop a plan for cutting at least another \$1.2 trillion through a joint committee of the Congress, which was tasked to come up with a plan by Nov. 23, 2011. If the joint committee failed, then the mechanism known in Washington parlance as “sequestration” would swing through the entire discretionary budget like an axe, taking an equal amount from every single department, agency, and program, in order to meet that deficit reduction target.

The Obama Administration submitted a budget last February, which it said met the first deficit reduction target of the BCA, including taking \$487 billion out of projected Pentagon spending over the next ten years. To no one's surprise, the joint committee failed. Since January 2012, therefore, the Administration has been building toward the next false crisis, when the budget axe is scheduled to begin swinging on Jan. 2, 2013.

The ‘Chicken-Game’

While sequestration, by definition, would hit all areas of the discretionary budget (that is, those parts of

Federal spending subject to annual appropriations bills passed by the Congress) equally, the largest part of discretionary spending is the Defense budget. As a result, the impact of sequestration on defense has been dominating the debate.

It is estimated that sequestration will take another approximately \$500-600 billion out of the Defense budget, on top of the \$487 billion that the Administration has already proposed be cut. Defense Department personnel, from Secretary Leon Panetta on down, warn that the cuts would be disastrous for national defense, but the Obama White House has so far not advanced an alternative proposal. Washington sources have indicated to *EIR* that Obama prefers to wait until after the November election. If reelected, Obama can dictate the terms of any budget settlement, thus further cementing his coup against the Constitution. If he loses the election—“not my problem.”

Would Obama's Republican opponent Mitt Romney have a different approach? Quite the contrary: Romney has already indicated that he fully supports the budget-slashing process, notably by his selection of House Budget Committee chairman Paul Ryan (R-Wisc.) as his running mate. Last May, the House passed legislation introduced by Ryan—an avid follower of the fascist theoretician Ayn Rand—which, while nominally aimed at preventing the sequester from hitting the Pentagon budget, would replace that mechanism with a package of cuts to mandatory programs, amounting to \$78 billion in 2013, in order to meet the deficit-cutting demands of the BCA. That \$78 billion would cause another \$242 billion in mandatory cuts over the remaining nine years. Republicans have said that the rest of the required deficit reduction would come from further cuts in discretionary spending.

Since Ryan has long targeted entitlements, namely, Medicare and Social Security, for elimination, it is likely that a Romney Administration would slash even more than Ryan's legislation proposes. Not surprisingly, the Democratic-controlled Senate has let Ryan's bill languish, in keeping with Obama's opposition to any legislation that would repeal the sequester.

In the meantime, Obama and Panetta are using the *threat* of sequestration to demand massive austerity in entitlements, which is where the money would have to come from in order to save the Pentagon from further substantial budget cuts. The hammer being used, specifically, is Obama's Defense Strategic Guidance, released in January, which is little more than a continua-



White House/Pete Souza

Defense Secretary Panetta (left) warns that sequestration will be catastrophic for defense, but Congress is leaving it up to Obama.

tion of the Cheney-Rumsfeld imperial war plan. The difference is that the manpower-intensive wars in Iraq and Afghanistan that characterized the Bush-Cheney years, are giving way to wars of regime change, as in Libya in 2011, and now, in what is being attempted in Syria. Such a path will likely lead to nuclear confrontation with Russia and China in the not-too-distant future.

The budget plan that the Administration submitted to Congress in February is designed around this strategy. Sequestration, the Congress is told, would make Obama's wars impossible to carry out. "If sequester goes into effect you can throw all of this out the window," Panetta told the House Armed Services Committee on Feb. 16. "Sequester doubles the numbers of cuts, does it through that crazy formula, and guarantees that we're going to hollow the force and devastate our national security."

1 Million Layoffs

Since the release of the FY13 budget, the Obama Administration and Congressional Republicans have gone back and forth on sequestration. Panetta and Jeffrey Zients, the head of the Office of Management and Budget, are telling the Congress to come up with a deficit reduction plan that will make sequestration unnecessary, and Congressional Republicans are shooting

back and demanding to know how the Administration would implement sequestration.

The defense industry, meanwhile, has been frantically trying to figure out what sequestration would mean for it. Defense industry leaders have held numerous meetings with Panetta to try to find out how it might be implemented, and have testified before the House Armed Services Committee. They, along with their labor unions, have been warning that sequestration could result in the loss of as many as a million jobs, but they don't really know for sure, because of the lack of information from the Administration. A large portion of these jobs are those of highly skilled workers, such as machinists, welders, electricians, and engineers—jobs that pay well and each one of which supports dozens of other jobs in the private sector.

Industry leaders have also said that, because of legal requirements, they have to send out notices to employees 60 days before layoffs take effect. This would mean that as many as 1 million layoff notices could go out just before Election Day Nov. 6. The political implications are obvious.

The Obama Department of Labor (DoL) responded to the industry warnings by issuing a new guidance July 30, saying that, number one, sequestration is not a foregone conclusion, as there are efforts underway to try to prevent it; and number two, should sequestration occur, layoffs resulting from contract terminations would be "sudden and dramatic," and therefore, subject to a loophole in the law, which allows suspension of the 60-day notice under certain conditions. House Armed Services Committee chairman Howard "Buck" McKeon (R-Calif.) called the DoL guidance "politically motivated," adding that "the only certainty we are dealing with is that dramatic cuts will force huge job losses." As a result of the guidance, "people will still get laid off because of the President's irresponsibility, but they won't have the notice to protect themselves and their families."

Both sides in this fight are treating the Budget Control Act as if it were set in stone, but, in fact, under the Constitution, the Congress writes the laws, and can rewrite and even repeal existing laws. While such actions are subject to Presidential veto, Congress can once again become the co-equal branch of government, as provided in the Constitution, rather than making "deals" with the President that reduce its authority. It is time that Congress act to save the nation, by constitutionally removing Obama from the Presidency.

Profiles in Courage: Rachel Brown Fights for Kennedy's Legacy

by Matthew Ogden

Aug. 29—John F. Kennedy, in the introduction to his book *Profiles in Courage*, clinically diagnoses the psychology of cowardice and compromise that dominates the institution of the U.S. Congress: “the terrible pressures,” he says, “which discourage acts of political courage, which drive a Senator to abandon or subdue his conscience.” The primary pressure, Kennedy states, is the desire to be liked, the desire for praise and popularity: “Realizing that the path of the conscientious insurgent must frequently be a lonely one, we are anxious to get along with our fellow legislators, our fellow members of the club, to abide by the clubhouse rules and patterns, not to pursue a unique and independent course which would embarrass or irritate the other members. . . . *The way to get along*, I was told when I entered Congress, *is to go along*” (emphasis added).

Nearly 50 years have passed now since the assassination of President Kennedy, and “go along to get along” has become a disease of pandemic proportions which has delivered our nation to the very point of disintegration and destruction. A fascist President, Barack Obama, has all but eliminated the rule of law as written into our republic’s Constitution, yet Democrats, including those in positions of leading responsibility, have thus far refused to challenge his incumbency, to force him to step down, and to hold him accountable for the crimes he has committed—all this, in the name of “party unity.” As Kennedy wrote: “What sins have been committed in that name!”

However, during the 2012 election season, courage *has* been exhibited—not on a mass scale, but by a committed few. The LaRouche National Candidates Slate, consisting of five candidates for U.S. Congress running on a single unified platform including the impeachment of Obama—have fought for the Kennedy legacy both in policy and in spirit, demonstrating what real political courage represents in a sea of pervasive political cow-

ardice. And as the victory of Kesha Rogers shows (who won her primary with 51% in the 22nd C.D. in Texas, becoming the nominee for a second time), or the success of Bill Roberts (whose 41% in Michigan’s 11th District mirrors similar numbers voting against Obama in statewide Presidential primaries)—commitment to truth and principle is the only pathway to serious leadership, especially in times of crisis.

Rachel Brown, now running her second campaign in the 4th District of Massachusetts in the Sept. 6 primary, a district that includes much of John Kennedy’s old district when he was a Member of Congress—has exemplified this commitment to truth and principle, since she first challenged Rep. Barney Frank in 2009 at a now-famous town hall meeting on the subject of Obama’s health-care bill, which Brown denounced as a Nazi policy, provoking Frank to respond by inanely comparing her to a “dining room table.” Using that confrontation as her launching pad, Brown declared her candidacy in 2010 as a LaRouche Democrat, running a campaign in which she focused on the necessity to stop the bailouts and restore Glass-Steagall, long before that policy attained its current popularity nationally.

In a live televised debate during the 2010 campaign between Brown and Frank, Brown established the basis for her candidacy: “We are in a fight right now for the survival of the nation, and people deserve to be told the truth, and they deserve to be given solutions. So now, we are in a dire crisis, where people are losing their homes, and their jobs, and meanwhile, we have been keeping a bailout policy of Wall Street. This is what Barney Frank has proposed, endorsed, and pushed through, every step of the way, and this is contributing to the continual crisis.

“The only way out right now, is the immediate implementation of a Glass-Steagall reform. We need the full restoration of Franklin Roosevelt’s Glass-Steag-



Rachel Brown, running for the Democratic nomination in the Massachusetts 4th C.D., established herself as the unique voice of intelligence and courage, in a series of debates with Joe Kennedy III; they are shown here during a debate in Easton, Aug. 14.

LPAC-TV

gall policy. Actually, the only way the Democrats will not get wiped out in November, is if they immediately act to restore this policy. President Obama is not in reality; he's acting in a similar psychological manner to Emperor Nero, which ended in the collapse of Rome. Obama is fiddling while the United States burns."

Brown Debates Joe Kennedy III

This year, with Barney Frank announcing his retirement—perhaps to avoid confronting the disgrace of his opposition to Glass-Steagall in the 2010 campaign—Rachel Brown is running again, this time in a race against Joe Kennedy III, the grandson of Robert Kennedy. Though name-recognition and official party support has gained the young Kennedy popularity and prominence, when it comes to policy and political courage, to date, Brown has proven herself the true heir and defender of the Kennedy legacy.

Beginning on Aug. 14, three televised debates occurred between the Democrats running for the 4th C.D. seat. The first of these was hosted by Stonehill College in Easton, in front of an audience of approximately 300 people. Brown was joined by Kennedy and a third candidate, Herb Robinson. From the very beginning, the accuracy of Brown's statements established her role among the three candidates, as the unique voice of intelligence and courage, and many of the follow-up questions were provoked directly by her bold leadership.

The first question to the candidates was, "What industry in the Fourth District of Massachusetts do you see as the most critical to the economic future of the country?" Brown answered by referencing the victory of Curiosity on Mars, and stated that the Route 128 corridor high-technology firms employed in the Apollo missions of the Kennedy-era represent the latent potential of Massachusetts, when seen in the perspective of the success of the Mars Science Laboratory and what it implies for the future of man in space. This optimistic vision characterized many of Brown's answers, and provoked the moderators to return to questions of how to launch such a recovery, how to finance it, etc. throughout the debate.

Brown used the opportunity of each question to educate the moderators, the audience, and her fellow candidates. She repeatedly elaborated in-depth the history of national banking, the principles of credit and true wealth creation, the history and design of the NAWAPA project, and the details of exactly how a national credit system would work today to fund such a project—but only after Glass-Steagall is used to sever our national obligations to the quadrillions of outstanding gambling debts, a point that she emphasized several times, stating that the Glass-Steagall revolution that we're seeing now is being driven by the crisis, and that it will be a foot in the door for the full recovery program.

The second question, on Obamacare, elicited empty and politically correct answers, from other two candi-

dates, while Brown responded that health care is a human right, not something which should be determined by “cost-effectiveness,” but rather in its connection to principles of science, economy, and the general welfare. She identified the Independent Payment Advisory Board of the Obama plan and its “Quality Adjusted Life Years” principle as the deadly carbon-copy image of Hitler’s pre-war Tiergarten-4 program. She stressed that Obama’s commitment to such a killer agenda at the outset of his Administration demonstrated clearly exactly where his loyalties lay: rather than acting on his mandate from the American people and enacting a Roosevelt program as FDR did in his First 100 Days, he immediately established a program of killing Americans for the sake of Wall Street and London bankers.

With several more questions focusing on how to effect an economic recovery (with one moderator asking in response to Rachel if it were possible to create a recovery *without* a fundamental change of the entire financial system), she continued by elaborating her full three-step program of Glass-Steagall, National Banking, and NAWAPA. On the other hand, Kennedy referenced his model for how to deal with the economic crisis by “balancing cutting and spending.”

The most moving part of this first debate came when Brown read a 1960s letter from Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, endorsing the original NAWAPA project, and stating that this is important for the entire nation, both West and East. Grandson Joe Kennedy listened with shocked but genuine interest as Brown unveiled this crucial but unknown part of his own family history. (After the debate, he asked for the hard copy of the quote, and was honestly appreciative when given a copy of the LaRouchePAC National Platform document containing the summary history of NAWAPA, saying that he will make sure to be more educated on the project by the time he and Brown meet again in the next debate.)

The final question addressed the dysfunctionality of the 112th Congress due to the “partisan gridlock” which has dominated it. Brown, who spoke last, answered by stressing that the current fight for Glass-Steagall has become genuinely bi-partisan, since it’s not an issue of politics but of survival, and that the only real opponent of this policy is Obama himself. She asserted that Obama must be removed before the convention, and replaced with a candidate who can defeat Romney—something that many of the citizens she meets in her

day-to-day campaigning agree with. She stressed that Congress should have stayed in session to resolve this emergency. She finished by stating that she is confident that if certain individuals find within themselves the courage to take the actions that are needed now, the United States can be saved, and Americans can be inspired once again around a unified and future-oriented program of space, industry, and NAWAPA.

After the debate, a Republican Congressional candidate approached Brown and said, “I’ve learned just how important Glass-Steagall is from listening to you during your campaign, and yesterday, during a Republican debate, in response to a question on the financial crisis, I responded by saying that I supported a return to Glass-Steagall, but that I wasn’t qualified to answer in detail and would rather refer those listening to Rachel Brown—that you and your campaign represented the real authority on this issue of critical importance.”

‘Vindicated in Every Aspect’

The second debate took place Aug. 16, aired live on New England Cable News, which reaches viewers across New England. Brown again dominated the debate, with her clear three-step program, calmly and concisely educating the host, the other candidates, and the viewers, and constantly kicking the discussion upwards into the higher level of principle and policy in her responses to the questions.

Exemplary of her confidence, and refusal to compromise on principle, was her answer when the host brought up the LaRouchePAC posters of Obama with a Hitler mustache, saying “How can anyone take that kind of candidate seriously in a race for the U.S. Congress?” Brown responded without missing a beat, saying “I’ve qualified the mustache, particularly with Obama’s health-care plan, which includes the IPAB board, which is modeled on the T4 program in Nazi Germany.” She added that she has been “vindicated in every aspect” of her campaign, not only in what she’s said about Obama, but also in her advocacy for Glass-Steagall, which has now received national and international prominence, with now everyone, even former Citibank chairman Sandy Weill, realizing that it’s necessary.

In the remainder of the debate, Brown identified the clear and present danger of Obama being allowed to remain in office, stating that ever since the illegal Libya War, the world has been moving in the direction of a

direct thermonuclear confrontation with Russia and China through needless attacks against Syria and Iran. “What we need is not world war,” she stated, “but world economic development.”

In her final statement, Brown called for leadership in the tradition of Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy, with the courage to stand up to Barack Obama, to replace him with a real Democratic Presidential nominee.

‘New Things Are Possible Now’

On Aug. 17, Brown and Robinson appeared together for a third debate (Kennedy declined the invitation) on a round table on NBC 10. Again, Brown exhibited clear-headed leadership and maintained a commitment to principle, evidently making a strong impression on the hosts, who asked her questions which showed that they had studied her platform, including one on what it would mean to bring back a National Bank.

When asked why Obama would want to go to war with Russia, Brown replied, “Because Russia and China pose a real threat to the system of empire.... Ever since the assassination of John Kennedy, we haven’t had a real American policy. In recent years, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—some people can say that this is the policy of imperialism, but I would say that that’s when we’ve been under the wrong leadership. We need to get back to the real American principles of FDR, Lincoln, and Kennedy—and that is the American System. Right now we’re under the British system.”

Brown was able to expose the real enemy when she detailed the British origins of both the imperial war and fascist health-care policies which Obama has been enforcing, as well as the significance of the shift within the British establishment itself for a survival of Glass-Steagall. When asked about the feasibility of accomplishing such a profound paradigm-shift, she replied:

“I do think we’re in a revolutionary situation. There was just a battle to keep Congress in session, which I led, along with the LaRouche movement, right before the Summer recess, to keep Congress there to pass Glass-Steagall and enact emergency measures for the economy. We were successful in that. Obama shut it down, saying no, get out of here, so that he could, possibly, start a new war with Syria. We also had, from the City of London itself, including the *Fi-*

nancial Times, and banks associated with the Rothschilds, those who said we need Glass-Steagall. Everyone knows that the Euro system is collapsing and this is a blowout of the planet. So, new things are possible right now.”

Later that day at a press conference attended by 12 reporters, Brown was able to answer questions for one hour. Despite intentionally provocative and confrontational questions, the candidate maintained a posture of total authority and unwillingness to compromise. Some, local media have given her prominent coverage. One example is an [article](#) headlined “Rachel Brown States Case for Space Research, Infrastructure.” See also, the candidate’s profile published by the [Herald News](#)

‘I Pledge Myself’

Since the three debates, and the extensive coverage that Brown’s campaign has received, the campaign has taken to the streets throughout the district, continuing to represent the courage to stand against Obama, and fight for principle as opposed to party. In a statement issued on Aug. 26, titled “Remove Obama To Prevent Thermonuclear War,” Brown declared:

“I, as a LaRouche Democratic candidate for Congress, have been campaigning for Obama’s removal, since 2010. This must now be done, before the Democratic nominating convention, so Obama can be replaced with a viable candidate who will enact the needed measures to reverse the collapse of the economy, as I’ve proposed. Romney, who couldn’t win against anybody but Obama, will be shown as the empty-suit fool he is, and a more respectable Republican candidate will have to be chosen.... I call for an immediate reconvening of Congress, to pass Rep. Walter Jones’ HCR 107, which would make it an impeachable offense—by applying the U.S. Constitution—were Obama to launch an offensive military action against Syria without approval by the U.S. Congress. Any patriot, citizen or elected official, who does not make sure that Obama does not become President, could be responsible for the loss of civilization.... We must act now, with the urgency of warfare, to remove Obama before the convention, and I pledge myself to lead that drive.”¹

1. For more from Rachel Brown, and to watch the videos of the three debates, visit www.rachelforcongress.com.

Obama's War Crimes: Drone War on Pakistan

Aug. 21—War crimes worthy of being tried at Nuremberg must be added to the impeachable crimes that Barack Obama has committed as President. Glenn Greenwald, writing in the London *Guardian*, documents this in a column dated Aug. 20, though the evidence has been building for some time. The specific crime, in this case, is that of following up drone strikes in Pakistan with secondary attacks that target the rescuers responding to the first attack, thereby increasing the deaths and terror even more.

Reports of the U.S. use of the tactic prompted the UN Special Rapporteur for Extrajudicial Killings, Summary and Arbitrary Executions, Christof Heyns, to note these accounts when he issued his report to the UN Human Rights Council on June 21. Speaking in Geneva at a meeting sponsored by the American Civil Liberties Union, he said that if these reports are true, “those further attacks are a war crime.” There has been ample confirmation of those allegations since that time, as Greenwald writes.

The Geneva Conventions state that protections must be afforded to people who “collect and care for the wounded, whether friend or foe.”

On Aug. 19, Ben Emmerson, the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and Counter-Terrorism, called on the United States to make itself open to a full UN investigation of its drone program. Emmerson said that by refusing to confirm or deny the existence of the program, while allowing selected officials to publicly claim that it is legal, the U.S. Administration “is holding its finger in the dam of public accountability. There are now a large number of lawsuits, in different parts of the world, including in the UK, Pakistan and in the U.S. itself, through which pressure for investigation and accountability is building.”

The London-based Bureau of Investigative Journalism (BIJ) has been tracking these attacks since at least [February 2012](#). The first such known attack took

place in North Waziristan on May 16, 2009, where, according to the BIJ, CIA drones slammed into a group of Taliban, killing about a dozen people. As rescuers were clambering through the rubble, a second wave of missiles hit. In all, at least 29 people were killed.

This tactic of follow-up attacks on those responding to the first attack, has been used again and again, although, prior to the Obama Administration, Greenwald notes, Washington condemned the tactic as terrorism. A 2004 FBI alert warned that terrorists may use secondary explosive devices set to go off after the first one, to target first responders. The Department of Homeland Security in 2007 called the tactic “double tap,” and claimed that this was a favorite tactic of Hamas.

Growing Evidence

Since February, there have been numerous other cases of CIA drones turning around and attacking rescuers after the initial strike against alleged militants (Greenwald notes that all military-age males in the target zone are branded “militants” by the U.S., even though much of the time, the targeters really don’t know who they are).

On June 4, U.S. drones attacked rescuers in Waziristan, killing 16 people, according to the BBC. Between May 2009 and June 2011, at least 15 attacks on rescuers were reported by what Greenwald calls “credible news media, including the *New York Times*, CNN, ABC News and Al Jazeera.” AFP wrote on Aug. 19 that at least one of the numerous strikes against Pakistan that day was aimed at rescuers.

As bad as these attacks are, equally evil is the silence in the West, even as attacks on funerals in Syria (allegedly by the government) and Yemen (allegedly by al-Qaeda) draw expressions of outrage.

“The reason for the silence about such matters,” says Greenwald, “and the reason commentary of this sort sparks such anger and hostility, is two-fold: first, the U.S. likes to think of terror as something only ‘others’ engage in, not itself, and more so; second, supporters of Barack Obama, the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize laureate, simply do not want to think about him as someone who orders attacks on those rescuing his victims or funeral attendees gathered to mourn them. That, however, is precisely what he is, as this mountain of evidence conclusively establishes.”

SDI TODAY!:

Next, Beyond Mars


by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Friday, August 17, 2012

Now, since the successful landing of “Curiosity” on Mars, there is no good reason for continued use of the term “empty space”—except to identify the usual run of slapdash opinions. The nature of that successful landing on Mars, presents us with a notion of “closure” of the region which includes that “inhabited” Solar space, which is, for us, up to just beyond the orbit of Mars, down to Venus: all this as a presently single domain of what might become inhabited “real estate” for mankind. It is now a matter of grave urgency, that we accustom our leading scientific and political authorities to change their ways more than a little bit, and then think again, and act accordingly.

Most notably, what has been mistreated as “empty space” is filled with what must now be considered as deadly, and some more or less immediately mortal threats to the continued existence of our human species, threats which we must prepare ourselves to evade or overcome otherwise. For a moment, consider how foolish, popular opinion on this subject has been, until now. It is virtually common knowledge that we must consider the known density of actual threats from “empty space” to much, or all of mankind, threats which might be expected to strike seriously upon us Earthlings within the span of even a generation, or so, of some part of the inhabited region of our planet, as within a normal life-span measured in today’s experience of North America or North Eurasia, during one or two successive life-spans. Consider the hits on Earth which have actually happened, and include cases which would have exterminated the human species if it had then been in existence. Or, worse, consider the massive scale of the threat of a “hit” on Earth by a deadly comet.

Or, better, ask: what would be required to prevent such catastrophes



NASA/JPL-Caltech

"The placing of a surrogate 'occupant' on Mars by 'Curiosity' now, is, in fact, the efficient placing of humanity's representatives as operating on Mars." Here, an artist's concept of Curiosity firing a laser at a rock on Mars.

key, rising role in pushing for the international adoption of what became known as a "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). Consider the fact, that that SDI, although supported repeatedly by then-President Ronald Reagan, was rejected, repeatedly and massively by our own foolish, leading political circles-in-power during the 1980s and beyond, as, similarly, throughout Europe at that time. Most of our adult citizens living then, failed practically, and also morally at that time. Can you suggest, in good conscience, that the present voting population of today would do any better, now, when the

from happening at all? Look at the density of such missiles and related "space threats." Should you say: "Why should I worry? I will be gone long before that could happen to me"?

How about those man-made major wars of virtual human extinction, here on Earth, which threaten to happen during the generation or so immediately ahead, even the weeks or months ahead. Think about today's varieties of "really big wars:" such as the fraudulently composed splash of thermonuclear war which President Barack Obama has been pushing, in his hysterical efforts to bring it on since his launching of the war which he carried out against Libya—which had also been intended to be continued in Syria and Iran now as a lead-in to a thermonuclear war against Russia and China. Without the blocking of such warfare by such as both our Joint Chiefs of Staff and the governments of Russia and China now, the United States might have already gone out of existence.

Or, if warfare just now scares you into (hopefully) coming to your senses, how about the relative mass-death from starvation and disease, now descending upon western and central Europe currently, under current "Euro" policies of practice, or the foolish neglect of requirements for food during the recent years inside the United States itself?

You reject my warnings on this account? Look back to the interval 1977-1983, during which I had played a

danger is already far worse?

Or, consider those occupied in space exploration who carefully disregard the presently intervening promise of thermonuclear warfare which the continued presence of U.S. President Barack Obama almost ensures presently—but for the relative handful of political circles which include me and my associates. Just as warfare can not exclude the factor of both political and physical science, science can not evade the realities of global, even solar-systemic warfare.

Ask yourselves: "Are you really ready to act as a person truly fitted out to live in the full meaning of such terms?"

1. On a Matter of Background

"It could never actually happen to me!"

Since almost anyone will die at some time during one or three generations of individual life, what is the meaning of our lives for those who will live after you are gone? Admittedly, I have done well personally on that account this far; but, my relative success on that account obliges me to think through the issues which that has implied all the more carefully, as I had been compelled to reckon with such matters earlier, or will perhaps a bit into the future, always with much greater care than those most numerous persons with poorer insight into such matters.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

LaRouche's 1970s-80s proposal for beam weapon defense, based on new physical principles, later, the SDI of President Reagan, was the seed-crystal for what Russia today is calling the SDE (Strategic Defense of Earth). Shown: LaRouche and Reagan at a Presidential candidates' debate in Concord, N.H., 1980.

Generally, I am more careful in viewing the fate of those who are among our younger folk, who have relatively fewer old friends to mourn than I do. Also, consider my role in pushing the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) since the late 1970s and 1980s, in contrast to what most of my relevant contemporaries had done. I remain far more responsive, even now, at my present age, on those relevant matters of our human species' now imperilled survival, than most others who claim to be "officially responsible." How little do even the suffering among us care for the future of the "others" of mankind, even beyond a year or so ahead? Mine is a double duty: what I have done on the relevant account of our own and other nations' future security, and of the authority which I bear for reason of the relevant aspects of my combined intentions and experience in notable matters. I think it most important, on the record, respecting such matters: that I have been fortunately right most of the time on such crucial matters of my concern as the professional which I am, both as a professional, and otherwise.

I do not deny the existence of the serious injuries and insults which I experience, but am not complaining as much about those matters, as about the massive and repeated frauds which have been perpetrated against me as revenge for my leadership in putting forward the inherently human-life-saving SDI, and certain other

missions of great importance, which I had been prevented from accomplishing. For me, those political blows I have received have been signals of honor gained in the course of time. I mean to include the suffering of those who bear the guilt for having "done did me wrong," but, also, those who must be judged as having had simply deserted the good cause. My passion is reserved on those accounts, in part for what should have been then, but, must, more urgently, be done now. The issue, is who is doing what is necessary for him, or her to do, in these present times.

For Example:

From my experience, our "World War II," as we were led under President Franklin Roosevelt, was the most recent case of a necessary warfare which might be classed among the major wars my U.S.A. has fought this far, even though the last months of that war were contaminated by the role of President Harry Truman, and mightily soiled, early and often, by Winston Churchill. (Eisenhower identified what I call "soiling," strictly euphemistically: as a "difficult alliance.") The U.S. war in Indo-China, was a tragedy conceived out of virtual treason by those who relished the assassination of President John F. Kennedy (and his brother, Robert Kennedy, too).¹ Not only the virtually treasonous launching of warfare over the body of the assassinated President Kennedy. All of the wars fought with the prompting of the likes of former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, such as the fraudulently composed long war

1. Who could have gloated over the death of President John F. Kennedy, as some prominent personalities did and why? For me there is no mystery. Their answer is, "We won! We got the war we wanted so much," (as a way of slapping down true patriots such as General Douglas MacArthur, and MacArthur's associate Kennedy, as if with a single stroke). The gloaters intended to ruin the United States' "ambitions" for the sake of "the triumph of the different god which they admired." Virtually all the wars which were launched since, were designed to weaken the United States in a similar manner, and have had a similar motive.

in Iraq, and that fraudulently composed in Libya, and that against Syria and aimed at Iran composed by the morally wretched, mass-murderous U.S. President Barack Obama.²

Such have been the wars and related things over the course of these times.

There is also the mass-murder by swindlers in the business of food, as such shortages are currently promoted on the great plains of the central United States, especially that under the recent three terms of the Presidents of the U.S.A. Amid all this, the most disgusting crimes-in-fact have been the work done in the service of a spirit of political compromises by our own Federal and state governments. There are few real heroes out there any more, but many needlessly wasted lives, and for the most part, the record accrued in proverbial “high places,” presents us with, speaking frankly, a sickening prospect of the depths to which only the habit of compromise could reach.³ Remember: I was there when the



Bundesarchiv

Man's “landing” on Mars, via Curiosity, shares many features with the courageous exploration of the unknown territory of Antarctica (1928-30) by Adm. Richard Byrd (inset), “in more ways than most observers from Earth today will have yet imagined,” LaRouche writes. Byrd's ship is shown here, ca. 1930.

majority of our incumbent leaders in government sank the SDI, the SDI which would have saved the planet from most of the evil of the wars which the planet, especially our ordinary citizenry, has endured since the defeat of the SDI proposal in 1983. The worst crime is that which those who should have known, did not wish to know.

I used to say, “Tell me.” Experience encourages us to say these days: “Don't bother to give your excuses. Just, please end your swarms of hypocrisies; tell the truth instead.”

2. The Lesson from Mars

The landing of “Curiosity” on Mars has, at the same time, also changed the functional identity of the human species' habitat, that in more ways than most observers have yet recognized. “Curiosity's” success now represents a qualitative change in the nature of defining man's function, with respect to Mars. We, the human species, are now defined, in functional terms, as also a “Martian race” in effect, even though no human being known to us has yet set foot to take up regular duties there. To illustrate my point, I remember the days of such as Antarctica's solitary winter sentinel, the Charlestown Navy Yard's U.S. Admiral Richard E.

2. The recent wars fought by the United States since the death of President John F. Kennedy, have been either “unnecessary wars,” or wars which were, themselves, crimes against humanity. The cases of the U.S. warfare in Indo-China, and Tony Blair's fraudulent (second) long war in Iraq, are only typical of the kinds of wars which should have been outlawed from the start. The cases to which I have thus alluded, have been typical copies of the colonial-imperialist wars fought by the British empire, as, in principle, virtually all the wars organized by the British empire, or fought, as against Nazi Germany to defeat an evil state which the British empire, or its likeness had, in fact, created. We have now entered an age, during which major warfare, is thermonuclear warfare—*extinction warfare!*, from which no party could triumph. Admittedly, there have been wars which our United States—for example, was properly obliged to fight; but, the time has come, when “major warfare” can no longer be fought (as distinct from “police actions”); efficient other means are now available.

3. Take the case of the long war against Iraq which was launched through the fraud perpetrated by the combination of British Prime Minister Tony Blair and his nasty little wretched accomplice, President George W. Bush, Jr.

Byrd. The “collective personality” of the virtual sentinel who has put “Curiosity” in place on Mars, is like that in more ways than most observers from Earth today will have yet imagined.

The principle of the point which I have thus just introduced to the readers, runs as follows.

The development of the aggregated operation which will “naturally” unfold around the mind of the principal Earth-bound astronauts “handling” the administration of the operations conducted to, from, and on Mars, will have the effect of a human mind, that of the relevant personnel, actually working on behalf of a Mars team. The natural effect of any competent such team’s efforts will be that the “collective mind” of that team will be, in its required effect, a human mind (e.g., “minds”) operating as if being directly on Mars (“through remote control”—despite the lapsed-time factor).

The following illustration leads more efficiently to the crucial point.

The mind which is acting as if on Mars, but from Earth to Mars and reverse, is apparently composed of the aggregation of “sensing apparatus” connecting the “information systems.” The configuration of apparatus and persons engaged in the operation has the effect of defining the human inhabitant as being implicitly as on Mars itself (lapsed time considered). This, implicitly, places the personality of the team assigned to be the virtual “man on Mars,” as located functionally, as a virtual immigrant to—a colonist on—Mars.

The included function of this working arrangement will be dominated to a large degree by a security function: the role of the Mars team in directing the defense of Earth against “large rocks” streaming in the direction of intersection with the Earth orbit, and therefore a likelihood for hitting Earth as such. Therefore, that consideration requires the immediate re-establishment of the Earth-based space-program. The Mars-based operations will be a crucial element in the development of the systems essential to the defense of Earth, systems modeled on the conceptions which went into the 1970s-1980s U.S.A. Strategic Defense Initiative.

For the purpose of enabling the ordinary citizen to understand what this means in practice, there are two presently leading, identified types of aspects to that notion of “a defense of Earth.” Objects within space which are of a type which might, potentially, target Earth with destructive effects, and the more problematic comets. The details of that as such, belong to a different report than this one.

My principal scientific concern here is of a different nature. I explain.

The Lesson from Mars

Heretofore, it has been customary, on Earth, to regard gravitation within adopted physical space-time. The implications of the Curiosity landing compel us to abandon that tradition. Bring the following set of considerations into view.

Among the greatest strategic threats to the continued existence of the human species, are those expressed, most obviously, as both deadly rocks striking planet Earth, and the ominous surges of murderous comets. What must not be overlooked in this regard, is that the placing of a surrogate “occupant” of Mars by “Curiosity” now, is, in fact, the efficient placing of humanity’s representatives as operating on Mars. Most observers today, even among relevant scientists, would commit the cardinal error of assuming that the placing of “Curiosity” on Mars now, affords man “a merely symbolic” quality of functional occupancy of that planet.

That problem to which I have just referred, is a crucially important strategic consideration, an error which is commonplace among even scientific professionals now. It is a problem which I have laid out for those among my relevant associates, with the intention of conveying what will be an initially very difficult conception for most observers. It is a problem which is now of crucial significance for defining mankind’s crucial need for pushing a “full steam” approach to mankind’s Mars mission at this time. The issue is the challenge of recognizing the true nature of the human mind, as distinct from that of all other known living species, and the distinction of the human mind from the relatively lowly human brain.

First, I shall present some helpful pieces of the evidence leading us to such a conclusion as that. I strongly recommend attention to the deeper meaning which must now be attached to the concept of the human mind, as this had been presented, successfully, by Wolfgang Köhler, to his associate, the great Max Planck.


The distinction which I now emphasize, is the distinction of the human mind from what we classify as human sense-perception. “Curiosity’s” mission-performance provides us now with a most appropriate upgrading of the Köhler-Planck conception of the human mind, as distinct from the “mere” human brain. In other words, this should be recognized, also, as sharing a special quality of coincidence in the outlook of Planck and

Albert Einstein.

Curiously enough for this specific occasion, the essential basis for the argument which I present in this present report, is among the most ancient elements of the scientific world-outlook, the concept known otherwise as “metaphor,” and, as by Johannes Kepler, among others, as the principle of “vicarious hypothesis.” It is also to be recognized as the target of the rabidly reductionist fraud of the personally silly Sir Isaac Newton as promoted by Newton’s “handlers,” and by their followers, which had been directed, first, against Kepler, and then, was shifted to serve as that fraudulent attack against physical science by the “Newtonians,” which was launched in its now prevalent, later expression, aimed against Gottfried Leibniz as soon as Newton et al. were assured that Leibniz was safely dead biologically, and thus prevented from responding.

The principle of physical science to be emphasized at this moment, is the presently urgent consideration of a needed return of attention to emphasis on the subject of **metaphor**. I mean metaphor as properly used to reference human experience of realities which lie outside the domain of sense-perception: Kepler’s “vicarious hypothesis.” That is, ontologically, the domain of the agreed conception shared by Max Planck with Wolfgang Köhler. The Twentieth Century view in categorical opposition to those scientists such as Nicholas of Cusa, his follower Kepler, and, in turn, Gottfried Leibniz, Bernhard Riemann, et al., is located as the “radically modernist” variety of philosophical reductionism.

The folly which stands in the way as an obstacle to scientific progress still today, is the so-called “reductionist” conceit, which presumes that the objects of human sense-perception as such, are to be recognized



LPAC-TV

Among the most urgent matters which Curiosity will help address, is the massive threat to the continued existence of human life on Earth, from asteroids and, from the even more monstrous threat from comets. This image shows the orbits of various comets (<http://larouchepac.com/>).

as what are the misconceived notions of sense-certainty.

“Curiosity” turns out to have been a brilliantly successful term for prompting a much-needed insight into the folly of empiricist reductionism, an insight which the success of that landing represents for the human species’ existence now. That term should be considered as a sound of the trumpets of reality.

Now that “Curiosity” has actually landed, the last major bastion of empiricism has been implicitly reduced to a term for mockery. I present that case as follows.

The Arrival of the Evidence

The prominent fact presented to the innocent observer of “Curiosity’s” Mars-landing, is the fact of the impressive array of instruments mustered for this arrival. Let us compare the array of those incorporated instruments and of the “sensing perceptions” which that array provides, with the role of sense-perception as

an adopted view of the quality of the human brain's role in sense-perception, as contrasted with the foundations of human knowledge embodied in the higher truth of metaphor.

Whose mind is functioning? That of the instruments? Or, is it not the human mind, which is the means through which the meaning of the work of the instruments is made real in the specific sense of a truthful metaphor? Now, with that much said as introduction here, we have prescribed a rigorous distinction of the human mind (in principle) from mere sense-perception.

That fact which I just summarized in that pair of immediately preceding paragraphs, has two aspects: one, as a matter of actuality in its expression as a matter of formal argument; secondly, as a profoundly practical challenge of a functional physical principle of scientific method. Where is the location of the ideas which depend upon the practical use of the "sensory-functions-as-such" represented by the organized concatenation of which the functions of "Curiosity" are composed? They lie not in the data-stream, but in the function of the human mind as such, in the domain of the human mind which is known as "metaphor."

In the case of our present experience with the fact of the functions assigned implicitly to "Curiosity," there is a variously significant "distance" between the lapsed time between Earth and Mars, as measured in speed-of-light terms, and, otherwise, in other measures of physical-space-time in the linking of events among Earth, Mars, and so on. The fact that the communications are implicitly within speed-of-light limits signifies that the human mind's actions of relevance in the relationships differ from the rate of transport from Earth to Mars, which becomes a crucial fact of increasing importance. The mind is the paramount human mind.


That is only a beginning of the matter before us.

Among the subject-matters which confront "Curiosity," is the massive threat to the continued existence of human life on Earth, now to be considered in terms of the panoply of asteroid relics menacing human life on Earth. The trajectories of those "rocks," and the tracking of those trajectories, as also of the awesomely monstrous threat from comets, are examples of the implications of the essential role of the human mind's actions on the basis of developments within Mars and Earth. Anyone in relevant official positions, who is blocking a full-scale return to the space program, is a criminal against humanity in effect.

That is a fact. The additional facts depend on the immediate expansion of collaboration among relevant powers, such as Russia, China, and others which are leading factors in any effort to support the implications of what "Curiosity" has already accomplished this far.

However, those points of emphasis, while absolutely essential subjects of scientific investigations and related actions, must be accompanied by the more profound issues posed by the need to free the living human minds on Earth from the reductionist mental-world-outlook associated with the superstitions inherent in the prevalence of belief in what is worshiped by many as "sense certainty."

The human mind is not to be assessed as located inherently in the living biology of the human brain per se. Rather the mind must be considered as that to which the function of the human brain is to be tuned. Now, through means typified by the implications of the broadcast between human minds connected in function at the "speed of light," we have brought the human mind to reign in Mars, whence we shall organize man's fate within accessible reaches within our Solar system. It is the interaction of those minds in that fashion which now becomes the focal point of human civilization and its defense.



Planetary Defense

Leading circles in Russia have made clear their intent to judo the current British-Obama insane drive towards war, by invoking the principle of Lyndon LaRouche's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Termed the Strategic Defense of Earth, the SDE would focus on cooperation between the U.S.A. and Russia for missile defense, as well as defense of the planet against the threat of asteroid or comet impacts.

The destiny of mankind now is to meet the challenge of our "extraterrestrial imperative"!

Available from [LaRouchePAC](#)

Who's Responsible?

Is a nation which has the great minds and capability to land the marvelous Curiosity rover on Mars, not able to choose a President who will carry out the principles laid forth in the Preamble of the U.S. Constitution, and get rid of one who won't? Not if you listen to your fellow citizens.

The vast majority of Americans have decided that they can do nothing to claim such a future; that they have to go along with the powers that be, and simply scramble for their own day-to-day survival, choosing one "lesser evil" after the other on the way to destruction. If they ousted the immediate threat, Barack Obama, they could make way for a real Democratic President, and take their country back.

Lyndon LaRouche put it on the line in a discussion Aug. 25:

"The point is, what's the power of Obama? The stupidity and corruption of the American people. If the American people were not stupid and corrupt, this could not happen! He's only a President. He can be thrown out of office, immediately, any time! It's the people who don't throw him out of office, who are the criminals! This guy's a lunatic, a homicidal lunatic; but, nonetheless, he's not responsible. The people who are responsible, are those who allow him to run loose!

"That's what the issue is.

"And the oppression of our people is, number 1, they haven't got the guts to resist Obama. They're cowardly. And they will die, as cowards, not as heroes, because they refuse to put themselves on the line to eliminate this danger to the American people. And every person who is *not* attacking Obama is guilty of murder, because they have in their hands, all the evidence needed to show that this guy's a mass murderer. He's said so! His health-care policies are mass murder. Every

policy he expresses is mass murder. He conducts mass murder, freely! He organizes mass murder, weekly!

"And nobody does anything about it.

"So, who the hell is responsible for this? Is it him? No, it's not him; he's a mental case. Who's responsible? Those who don't throw him out of office? Who are they? What's the problem?

"Well, people don't like to attack people like that."

"Even if it means the saving of the human species? What kind of consideration is that?

"The danger lies with the American people. The gutless American people, who have lost all morality, essentially; who have morality, a very shallow kind of thing they call morality. It comes in a package. Oh, if you lost the package, you lost your morality.

"No, the guilty party are the American people. That's the guilt. Because the American people, and especially leading circles, in the Congress and so forth, have the power to pull this guy down, to make him harmless. *They don't do it!*

"That's your enemy. The enemy is the Senator who won't do it. The enemy is anybody else who won't do it. Those who *could* are responsible, not the poor idiots who are not capable of controlling themselves. Unless you want to call most of the members of Congress idiots, which in a sense they are: *They don't have the guts*, they don't have the morality needed, to keep the human species alive.


"And when you start to say things in those terms, *then, you are real.*"

It's time to stop blaming "the other guy," and take responsibility for telling the truth, mastering the solutions to our existential crisis, and acting to change the miserable conditions we face. *You* are responsible.

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online



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

EIR Online

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.

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

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

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

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail address _____

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

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____