

LAROUCHE WEBCAST

The Post-Election Prospects: Your Options Now

Lyndon LaRouche gave this webcast presentation Nov. 9, as part of his ongoing series of Friday evening webcasts, and his first following the Nov. 6 Presidential election. The event was moderated by LaRouchePAC editor Matthew Ogden, and a dialogue with viewers and listeners follows the keynote address, in which LPAC's Leandra Bernstein and Jason Ross joined the discussion. The complete webcast is archived at <http://larouchepac.com/webcasts2012>.

We've come into a point where the Obama Administration, and the outgoing, or not successful, Republican candidate, and Obama, have had the same rotten, stupid policy—which, unless they change that, is what they will do. But I do not discount the possibility of their changing their line, under the current conditions.

What's going to happen is, that both parties, in going into the final period of the campaign, have committed themselves to a program of supporting business interests, or the equivalent of business interests, at the expense of the rest of the economy. Now when we consider the fact that actual productive work has collapsed to a minimum in the U.S. economy, that people may be employed but they're employed with make-work, not really productive work—and that's a key problem. And with a business oriented-only kind of thing, it means that a terrible thing will happen to the U.S. economy and its people, if either of these were to be elected.

Now, one has been chosen—Obama—to be the next

President of the United States, as well as the present one. And that would be a catastrophe, considering the fact that Europe already is in a process approaching breakdown, a general breakdown crisis of western and central Europe, as a result of hyperinflation, already in progress there. It hasn't reached the full hyperinflation, but it's bad.


For example, Spain is almost out of business. Portugal is in distress. Italy is in jeopardy. And Greece is being murdered. And these are only typical of what's happening in Europe right now.

Now, what will happen in the United States is typified by what happened in New York City, but also the adjoining regions of that section, where people are still dying of the errors made by, in particular, the Obama Administration. Because what's happening is that the losses of life, and losses of conditions of life, in the New York City and adjoining areas, as in New Jersey and so forth, that these conditions are genocidal conditions. And the Obama Administration, which has just been reconfirmed, is committed to an austerity program under which there will be no effective relief for the New York City, as it had existed before, or the nearby New Jersey area, under the present times.

So that's where we are. We're in a catastrophe.

Obama: Blair's Puppet

Now, what's important about this presentation today, and about the presentations that will be made in



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon LaRouche addresses the webcast on Nov. 9, 2012. Both Obama and Romney have “the same rotten, stupid policy,” he said. “But I do not discount the possibility of their changing their line, under the current condition.”

a different form, but the same thing in the coming weeks, on the same schedule, is, not that we’re going to qualify what *has* happened—I’ve already just said that. We’re going to qualify what is *about* to happen. And that’s one of my specialties, in determining what is about to happen in the economy, which is something that neither the President, nor his recent rival, have any competence in dealing with.

And that’s the issue.

So, what we’re dealing with is Obama, who is actually a puppet of Tony Blair, the British Tony Blair. It was Blair that ushered Obama into the Presidency, as his protégé. It’s Blair who has been continually advising Obama on his policies; and it’s Blair who is the chief architect of the worst things that are happening in the entire trans-Atlantic community.

For example: You may recall that there was a case that came up, where Blair was key in it, where he insisted that there were secret weapons in Iraq, which were going to be deployed. And therefore, that the United States, and other powers in Europe, had to start a second war in Iraq. I was involved in that, with British officials in certain capacities, in discussing this matter, and we determined that there was no justification, in terms of these superweapons, that Iraq was going to start such a war. And Iraq never *did* start such a war, in fact. And the war went on and on and on, and not only

did it destroy Iraq, into the time of the Obama Administration, not only did it do that, but it created the situation for the entire blowup of the Middle East itself, including what happened in North Africa.

So, this is the man. Now, this fellow is a very significant figure, representing the British Empire, and believe me, friends, the British Empire still exists. For example, did you ever hear of the Saudi-British empire, the Saudi-American-British empire, which gave you 9/11, the first 9/11? And gave you a second one, in part, in what you’ve just seen in North Africa, and it’s continuing now.

So, this same Blair, Tony Blair, is guilty of a fraudulent creation of war involving the United States, and other forces, in a war which

was totally illegal, and based on a fraud. And this war, this fraud, which was orchestrated by Tony Blair, is the actual provenance under which Obama came into office. And that has been his character all the way through.

Now, technically, Obama is supposedly committed to an austerity budget. There’s no doubt he will try to do that. What will happen down the line may be different.

Now, this is the issue. This is the issue that’s going to carry into the coming weeks, and the coming years: That you cannot predict what’s going to happen on the basis of the past. And we’re in a period which is typical of that: You cannot forecast what the future of the United States or Europe is going to be, based on the past record.

Now the problem is that most forecasters, in the United States and elsewhere, on economic forecasting, have been failures. None of them has been competent in forecasting, actual forecasting. Because what they do, is they look at statistics, and take the statistical patterns which they read from the past, and apply those statistical patterns to forecast what they predict will be the future. That does not work. That would work on animals; it does not work on human beings.

The human species is entirely different than any other species which we know of existing in this universe. There may be something out there somewhere

that we don't know about, but no living species on this planet can be compared directly to people. The human species is the only species that has a voluntary capability to reshape the future, by making discoveries and decisions concerning discoveries, which could never be predicted on the basis of the past. It's the introduction of new principles, willful new principles, by mankind, which are responsible for the entire progress of the human species.

And it's that kind of, what we call creativity, which is unique to the human species, which is the only competent way in which we can have foresight of what the probable developments will be down the line.

We now have the defeated Republican candidate. We have Obama still in office, and renewed in office, if nothing happens to his career, and most people out there, including the so-called specialists, have, as usual, in my entire experience in forecasting, which goes back to the 1950s, in every case, including that case, exactly the opposite happened to what every statistical forecaster projected. In fact, in that case, in January or February of that year (1957), the auto industry collapsed, exactly on the date that I said it would collapse. And everyone among my rivals, in business of that time, the consulting business, was wrong. And I was right.

MacArthur Got It Right

Now, I'll give you another case of a guy who was right. It's rather interesting, because it's important to our case: Douglas MacArthur. Now, Douglas MacArthur was a young genius; his father was some kind of a genius, if you know about the history of his father's role in the Civil War. And Douglas became what he was; and he went into World War I for the U.S. in France, against Germany, in that period. And he was a genius. He rose from colonel to a high-ranking general in terms of esteem, in the short period of his career in France, because he always was able to outflank the German forces, who were more numerous than the forces at his disposal.

This came up later, and came up famously, in a later part of his career, after the brilliant work he did in organizing the defense of the Pacific Ocean, against Japan. Also at Inchon, in Korea—take the case of what he did there. And this was a case where he stood alone, against all his military colleagues, on making the decision to go into the Inchon inlet, in order to outflank the entire North Korean overrunning of virtually the entirety of what we call South Korea today. He was the only one



Brigadier General Douglas MacArthur in France, Nov. 3, 1918. His role in France during World War I, LaRouche states, was that of a genius, because he was always able to outflank the German forces, who were more numerous than the forces at his disposal.

that did it, and did it over the opposition of every one of his officers, and every other advisor. And he won.

So, therefore, Truman, at the first shot, had him thrown out of office, for that reason.

Then, what came into office at that time, in the same period, in a later phase of the Korean War, is that a man who had been trained under MacArthur, Eisenhower, began to campaign for the Presidency of the United States on withdrawing the U.S. forces out of the Korea War. And this continued.

Now it continued in such a form that, when we came to the late 1950s, the same thing happened; is that the bright people, including Charles de Gaulle, as well as others, great commanders, and men of *foresight* and *insight*, who have insight into the future, which is a natural potential of the human being, but unfortunately, because of the way our culture is run, we do not condition people to become creative. We condition them to learn how to behave as instructed, and that means that all forecasting, generally, most all forecasting, general forecasting, done by nations and groups within nations, most groups within nations, are flat wrong.

Because what they do is, they use statistical projec-

tions, based on recent past and earlier experience, and presume that statistics will show them exactly what the result is. And it never does.

Don't Listen to Financial Advisors

Now, we've come to a point of another forecast, the recent storm, which hit New York, New Jersey, and so forth, Sandy. Now, this thing is still going on. The death rate from Sandy is still in progress in New York City, and New York City areas. And nothing has been done, or nothing ever will be done, as it stands now, under this Administration—nothing ever will be done to restore the City of New York and adjoining areas—nothing. Obama has made that very clear as his intention. There will be no funding.

Now the other side of this thing, again, forecasting: We had a case of forecasting in Louisiana, where they had built a buffer system necessary to defend that whole coastal area against a major flood. Rhode Island had faced a similar threat, and had acted to build a buffer as had been done in the bay in Louisiana.

But the other side of the thing is, earlier, George Bush II—the dynasty, right?—George II had blocked the development of the bulwark defenses for the Louisiana area, and the great system that now protects Louisiana's coast, was put in following the incompetence of the Bush Administration.

And so the problem has been constantly that when people forecast, everyone says, no, that is not a necessary thing to do, when scientific information has indicated it *is* a necessary thing, as a precaution.

What's happened now, in the case of Sandy, the destruction in New York City and adjoining areas, will never fully be restored, as long as Obama is President. That's a forecast, and that's the price that was paid because we didn't listen to the forecasters, we listened to the financial advisors, and that's what has happened, and that's what is happening now.

So therefore, if Obama falls into his track, as in his



USACE/Sarah McLaughlin

After Hurricane Katrina, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers built this surge barrier in Louisiana; it was first used in a storm on Aug. 28, 2012, to close the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal and Lake Borgne. Something similar should have been done for other regions, such as New York City, but there was no funding.

track record now, we are not going to have ever restored, New York City and adjoining areas to what they had been over years before. And this is a *decision* made, so far, by Obama, the current President of the United States, and apparently the future one.

Similar kinds of things. And oh, the great one is, the great *New York Times*, which I sometimes refer to as the "Slimes," if you know some of my experience with that little organ. They are now praising all the good things that are supposedly happening in the New York general area, when there's nothing really but net loss and death, guaranteed by President Obama, who has said that the funds for this will never be done.

Now, if the bulwark which was scheduled for New York City, which the mayor and others of New York City refuse to consider, had been used, the cost of that bulwark would be a fraction, a small fraction, of the cost which we're going to incur, without profit, without benefit, from New York City now. And people this day are still dying, because they are still in places, apartments, and so forth, where they have no access to anything, and the natural condition of the loss of food, and conditions of life in those places, especially for older people, they're dying. How many, I don't know. But it's going

on. The death has not stopped, and the *New York Times* is still spreading filth of denial in dealing with this.

So, the issue before us, the issue which you face, now, after the election, is, are you going to continue to cave in to authorities which have proven themselves to be of this character? Are you going to rely on people who make forecasts which are intrinsically incompetent from the outset? Not forecasts that are mistaken, but forecasts and guarantees which are intrinsically incompetent from the outset.

Forecasts, Not Hind-Casts

All right, so now what are we going to do? Well, first of all, we're going to have to have an insight into what the forecast is, for the future, not the usual forecast for the past. It's a little kind of funny thing there—the hind-cast—they call it a forecast, when it's actually, a hind-cast. They don't apparently know whether they are coming or going.

All right, so this is the issue. Now we all are facing conditions which, in terms of the press, in terms of many forecasters, or forecasting agencies—people don't know what they are talking about, or are neglecting it.

For example, both the Republican Party and the

Democratic Party, are, as of now, unless they change their opinion, as of now are going to cause a great disaster throughout the U.S. economy. The greatest disaster you can imagine. Now we already have millions of Americans, whose situation, who should be employed, who are hopeless. We have other Americans, who are employed, but they're employed in make-work jobs, not really productive jobs. Not ways that are going to improve the economy of the United States. And that's not bad, in a sense, because getting them jobs and paying them is better than starving them to death, of course. But they're not getting much better than that right now.

Now, health care: The cut in health care, which Obama demands, and which the Republicans do not oppose—that health-care policy will be a killer. It will be a mass killer. And when you take the depth which the vast cuts are going to take in these categories, you're going have a death rate in the United States produced by the forecasts made by Presidents and their candidates.

So therefore, you have to be concerned about the future. You have to find a way to understand what the future means, now in the coming several years even, and it's going to be a terrible future, unless you change it. And that's what our problem is now. And that's what we have to pay attention to.

So my job here, and in related functions, is to continue my function as a forecaster. And as many people know from the 1971 experience, for example, and certain other experiences, my forecasting has always worked. Now that doesn't mean I've forecasted everything that has happened. It means that, when I've committed myself to a forecast, it was right, on the terms I specified. And in a case like 1971, in Summer 1971, I was the only one who knew this,¹ and had forecast this as early as 1968. And we had argued this issue, about what was going to happen in 1968 on, and it happened in 1971, as I said it would happen, in the period I estimated it would happen.

So that is simply an example of the fact that competent forecasting is possible. And forecasting means, what do we have to do to solve the threats which are innate in the situation we face.

Now at present, western and central continental Europe is in the process of dying. That is, if the trend and policy trends which are established in the euro area, so-called, in Europe, are allowed to continue, the area

The Three-Point Program

LaRouche has recommended three policies required to reconstruct the U.S. economy. Often discussed in *EIR*, they are, in brief:

1. Restore Franklin Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall law in its 1933 form, to protect commercial banks from the gambling casino of investment banking, thereby wiping out trillions of dollars of speculative debts.
2. Institute a credit system, along the lines of Alexander Hamilton's National Bank, to replace the monetarist system and provide government credit for productive job creation.
3. Implement the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA XXI), an enormous project for water diversion from where it is too abundant to where it is desperately needed. Millions of jobs will be created.

1. LaRouche forecast the 1971 takedown of the Bretton Woods system under the Nixon Administration.

will die. These former nations, and I say former nations: Portugal—a former nation, Spain—a former nation, France—a former nation, Germany—a former nation, Italy—a former nation, Greece—a former nation, and so forth. These nations—former nations—are now faced with distress, an unbelievable rate of acceleration of inflation, which is going to cause mass death unless it's stopped.

We face a similar situation in the United States, but different. We face a similar situation in much of the world. The green policy, which has been developed since, essentially, the 1960s, the greenie policy which began to take over once we had assassinated our President [Kennedy] at the time. And therefore, if we don't change these policies, if we don't recognize what's wrong with them, we're not going to make it. There has to be a change in direction. We cannot accept—and no sane person who is responsible can accept the policy of the Republican Party as stated during the recent campaign. No sane person, unless they're stupid, could accept the policy of austerity, which the Obama Administration is determined to carry forth immediately. These are mass-murderous policies. This negligence, this policy.

Austerity Is Stupid, and Evil

Now, the point is, on top of this, Obama and the Republicans, in their policy for austerity, are also stupid, as well as evil. That's a very funny combination, isn't it? Because they're stupid, because they don't understand, and don't *wish* to understand, what an economy is, and what makes it.

You have a collapse—a hyperinflationary, accelerating collapse in western and central Europe, and in the United States—and you want to reduce employment to *business employment*? What are you—a clown or a murderer?

But that's what you've got. The Republicans came into this campaign as damned fools. And Obama was worse. Now, what's our responsibility here? What's our responsibility as mankind? What's my duty, as a person, as a citizen? What's my duty?

My duty is to prevent this thing from happening. My duty is to use my knowledge, my ability to forecast, to win a war, as MacArthur, who was a real winner—not with his fists, but with his mind. As he showed, throughout his career.



Creative Commons/DBarefoot

“Mankind is the only species that can willfully increase its power as a species to develop the planet and beyond.” Dealing with threats from asteroids and other cosmic events is a primary task for the next generation.

And our job is to find leaders in this nation, who will function with their minds, not with their fists, or their brute ambition. We have to recognize that money has no intrinsic value. How can you talk about the intrinsic value of money when hyperinflation is escalating in Europe, and also in the United States. You're talking about money? You say that money represents value? Money does not represent intrinsic value. It never did. Money's just a means of exchange. We don't have any measure of value in this case.

Value is the ability of mankind, essentially, to continue to survive, and to progress in that survival. Mankind is the only creative species that we know of on this planet. The only species that can *willfully increase its power as a species to develop the planet and beyond*. Now, we've got to come to a point where you have not only all the needs on the planet, you've got some other problems, which are not much spoken of, but they're right here now.

A Defense of Earth

There is a change in process, within the nearby parts of the Solar System; and this change in process means that we're getting more and more risk of having parts of our planet knocked out by various little pieces of asteroids heading down onto the planet. And it doesn't take much; one small piece, actually, can take out the whole

Bay Area of California, or area of New York, or other areas of that type. So we're facing a threat to humanity.

Now, this threat to humanity goes beyond everything that these guys are talking about. If any of these people—including the Obama Administration, or the Republicans, had any brains at all, they would know that Obama was worse than a damn fool, for cutting NASA. Because, if we are threatened—as we are—by asteroids and things like that, which are cutting through the orbit of the Earth at all times, and at any unlucky time, can hit the Earth itself. And they do hit the Earth repeatedly, usually very small pieces, which get burned up in the atmosphere, or something which is minor in terms of its collision.

But we also face—and leading scientists of the United States have recognized this danger since the late part of the 1970s and early 1980s—that the importance of defense of Earth against asteroids, and similar kinds, and comets—which can also be extremely deadly. We have no significant defense against these threats.

Now the best thing we have here on this, is we sent a recent Curiosity installation to Mars. Now that's not going to solve the problem, but it represents the kind of action which has to be taken, on a higher level than Curiosity itself, in order to deal with some of this problem. Because it's only by the degree that we can operate *from* Mars to Earth, and build up a system of defense—first of all, to locate where these rocks are, to intersect them, to deflect them, so they will not hit Earth, will pass through the orbit of Earth, but we will deflect them. And that may take several years to do. You start to push this thing some years ahead, and you have pushed it out of the way of Earth by the time they come into that pattern. And that's one of the other things—we can blow these things up, and fragment them, and they become less dangerous. But the point is, we've got to do it.

Now, when Obama shut down much of NASA, Obama condemned a lot of human beings to potential nasty death. That's not a very patriotic or very President-like action. We need more than NASA, we need the complete restoration of NASA, and also further things, further measures which enable us to identify these rocks. And we don't even know where 90% of these rocks are, within this space, between the Mars orbit and the Venus orbit. And we have to find that out. Scientists have been employed in studying this matter for some time, for now, about 30 years. But we still are making little progress, because we need to actually get out—that doesn't mean we are going to put people on

Mars, but we're going to put instruments on Mars and we're going to build instruments, and deliver them there, which will be useful to us in isolating these threats, for a defense of Earth.

Now my operation in this connection, goes back to the 1970s, when I got involved in precisely this question, through my concern about defense against nuclear weapons and thermonuclear weapons. And that led me into playing a rather significant role at one point, in developing a defense system, a space-based defense system against various kinds of man-made and other threats. So that technology has been in progress, but very little progress over the intervening years. You know, one of our Presidents [Reagan] took a very serious view of this matter, and did support it. Others have supported it.

But we now have to realize that we're not limited in our problems, to those problems which exist within the confines of Earth itself. We're also threatened by these other conditions for which we are doing very little, or almost nothing. And we should. We must. This means that we have to go beyond the limited science we applied to Earth problems, and we must now go to a higher level of science, which can see problems we have to deal with, within the nearby area of our Solar System. And that is one of the objections—we have nothing going now, in general, on this planet—especially in Europe, in the Americas—we have nothing going now, which really is addressing, not only the kinds of *new problems* which we face on Earth, as we should see from the weather problem—Sandy—which is a new problem, and portends other problems of that nature. We're not even doing that. But we also have to plan now, because it's going to take some years, to develop the kinds of systems necessary to prepare for the defense of Earth against this great mass of mostly unknown, but known to exist, satellites. And that's where we have to go.

We Will Defend the Future of Humanity

Therefore, the important thing now—okay, the current President of the United States is utterly incompetent. That is, he is not competent to perform his function in leading the defense of the nation, or the defense of the planet. He's not competent because he's sabotaged the little things we did have, in terms of NASA, the little things we did have, which were the basis for actually developing a defense against these kinds of problems. He's not willing to put anything into that, just as he's not willing to put anything into preventing some-

thing like what happened in New York City, New Jersey, and so forth under Sandy.

And therefore, these concerns—and those of us who have these concerns, unlike this President and his rival, those of us who have these concerns, must continue to build, in private and in public, for the support of the things that are needed to defend this nation, to defend this planet's life, and to defend this nation against the dangers from nearby planets. These are missions that we must take on now. And we will be doing this every week, as we have been doing it during the period of this campaign. We will be dealing with this problem, and related problems. And we will present our insights and our solutions. And I can say, fairly, my special capabilities and skills will be available to defend this nation, this planet, and the future of humanity.

Thank you.

Dialogue with LaRouche

Leandra Bernstein: Lyn, there have been a lot of people who have been eagerly waiting for your analysis of the most recent election. And so I would like to ask the first question on the composition, the make-up of the new Obama Administration. I think that people have gotten the recent news from this afternoon that Gen. David Petraeus, Director of the CIA, just resigned from office, apparently over an extra-marital affair. *Apparently.*

Now, what has been in the background of just that case in particular is, for one, the increasing use of the CIA as a secret war appendage, through the use of drone warfare.

The other issue that has come up, is that Petraeus was going to testify in front of the Senate Intelligence Committee, on the issues of Benghazi, in this coming week. So these are also in the background.

But I would like to get your thoughts on the make-up of the incoming Obama Administration; for example, Hillary Clinton is going to leave. There are questions about who is going to take the position of Secretary of State. There is a lot of wishful thinking about really hoping for change in the new Obama Administration. So there is a lot of wishful thinking that perhaps, he could change. For example, Democrats continuing to associate themselves with Obama, ride his coattails, for example.

So I would like to get your thoughts on each of those elements. Put to rest some wishful thinking, hopefully.

LaRouche: Let's start with the case of Susan Rice, who in four addresses after the event had happened in Benghazi, lied her head off, repeatedly. Now, she is listed as one of the probable replacements for Hillary Clinton in the State Department. Do you want this lying creature to be the Secretary of State?

Now, there's contention. There's another Senator [John Kerry] who would like to become the new Secretary of State, and he did some things which I would say were unforgivable. He has his excuses—let's call them the rationalizations. But first of all, what he did was a violation of our Constitution: that the President has no right to go out and make war on his own say-so. And the fact that he involved a candidate-Secretary of State in this swindle, does not excuse him or exculpate him at all! He's guilty!

So therefore, this is typical of the kind of problem we have.

You know, Hillary Clinton had her problems with this business, and it was a big mistake, as I was concerned for her, *ever* to accept the Secretary-ship of State. She should have stayed in the Senate. And if she'd stayed in the Senate, she would have been, really, a fly in the ointment of the enemy. And if she would have done that, we wouldn't have the Obama problem; if she had made that smarter move, just gone out and done what she could do very well, to bring this guy down! She knew what he was. He was an evil thug; he was not a true American, in the sense of his loyalties. He's a British creature of the worst type; they created him out of mud or something. And this is the issue.

What has to happen is, that the very fact that will be used against Obama, and against those Republicans who do something similar, is the fact that there are forecastable conditions, which are now being generated, and *I shall report them*. Because that's a weapon I have. My forecasting is much better than theirs, and they're going to have a little trouble with me, unless they behave themselves. And therefore, it's important that we look at these things from that standpoint.

Just think of this, putting Susan Rice in as Secretary of State, after the lies on four occasions, that she spread all over the country, when the evidence was there, clear, and she was in a key position of the Administration's complements! In terms of the United Nations Organization? You'd trust *her*, who told these lies repeatedly, when there was no basis for them at all? While the Pres-



U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Susan Rice gave repeated interviews in the aftermath of the Benghazi attack, claiming that it “began spontaneously” and was “not preplanned.” This one was on Sept. 16. She was lying, and everybody in the Administration knew it.

ident was just sneaking there, out behind the bushes, and smirking, and watching. *He lied*, by not intervening! She lied, openly! And a woman who lied in connection with an assassination of agents of the U.S. government, in a war which should not have happened, because it was not authorized by Congress!

It was in illegal war; it’s an impeachable offense. He’s *still* impeachable for it. *Obama is still impeachable, for that.* And don’t forget it. Nixon was actually lightly hit, compared to this case.

And we know what he was doing: Tony Blair. Obama is nothing but a stooge for Tony Blair. That’s his record: If you look at the ins and outs of Chicago by Tony Blair, as a headquarters of the Obama family, that’s how it was run. And this is a scandal which has to be rubbed in fully, in order to do something about getting things in place.

The policies of the both parties, in this case, are not tolerable, because they mean an increase of the mass death rate, of American citizens.

The Evil of Environmentalism

Jason Ross: So, your view of man in the universe is under attack, obviously. Children in school are taught that human beings are a plague on the planet; there’s too many of us. This sort of goes everywhere.

I just wanted to read this; this is kind of creepy. This is from the Democrats in the [House] Energy

and Commerce Committee. They wrote that, “Hurricane Sandy is exactly the type of extreme weather event that climate scientists have said will be more frequent and more severe, if we fail to reduce our carbon pollution.”


Now, I’m not sure if climate scientists were predicting “exactly” this type of hurricane—obviously they weren’t—but this quote is an example; you also see it with [New York Mayor Michael] Bloomberg’s view that it’s not practical to build defenses out in the water around the city. Or, the view of some other scientists who say, “Well, Mother Nature’s bigger than us, so however big a wall we build, there could always be a bigger storm.” Or even raising the totally academic question, “Since we would have to make a decision of who gets to be behind a flood wall, and who doesn’t, this deserves serious thought, and it might be some form of racism to even build it.”

Now, so these are obviously ridiculous things. But I think what’s behind a lot of this, certainly behind the comment from [U.S. Rep. Henry] Waxman about carbon pollution and global warming and climate change and all this nonsense, is that it has behind it the idea that there is some sort of natural stasis, that unaltered by mankind, somehow our surroundings are better



New York’s Mayor Michael Bloomberg tours a Brooklyn neighborhood on Nov. 5, in the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy (Oct. 30). Bloomberg rejected the idea of building barriers to the storm surge: “Even if you spent a fortune, it’s not clear to me that you would get much value from it,” he said on Nov. 2. “What we have to do is learn, and it would be great if you didn’t put your generators in the basement.”

Video from Mayor Bloomberg’s Office



that way, inherently—like it’s the perfect Garden of Eden, and any change that we make is necessarily bad.

With that view in place, it’s very difficult—it’s impossible!—to take the approach that you’re urging with the role of NASA, for defense of the Earth against asteroids, to take the role of actively shaping our surroundings for our well-being and for our benefit. So, I’d like to know if you had anything you could say about this evil of environmentalism?

LaRouche: Yes. Well, environmentalism is clinically insane or a fraud, one of the two. That’s the only two ways you can get that. Look, we have maps and so

forth, going back some millions of years, of the animal life and other forms of life on this planet, and we have some intimations about the relationship of that to other parts of the galaxy we’re involved in. So, there has never been a case in which a species, by lowering its energy-flux density, and also its numbers, has ever occa-

sioned a survival. Every case that has attempted that, in some case of these dumb species which may have seemed to have done that, like the dinosaurs, is dead. Is extinct.

So the policy of reducing population is fraudulent. There is absolutely no scientific truth whatsoever in defense of environmentalism.

There is environmentalism of a different kind, which is changing the environment, bolstering it, developing it, to increase its energy-flux density, in terms of living growth, and things like that. So this is entirely a fraud, it’s a hoax, and you should look at some of the minds of the people who advocate this: They are not fit to lead.

And what is the process? Let’s take it, real cold-blooded: What is the Green



Richard Gifford



EU Photo

“The Green policy is officially, and has always been officially, a policy of the Queen of England or her predecessors”—and some corrupt U.S. Presidents have been part of the operation. Clockwise, from top: President Andrew Jackson (painting by Thomas Sully, 1824); Tony Blair; President Theodore Roosevelt (painting by John Singer Sargent, 1903); Queen Elizabeth.



policy? Well, the Green policy is officially, and has always been officially, a policy of the Queen of England or her predecessor. What is the Queen's policy? What did she say, repeatedly, publicly, internationally, again and again and again? Her intention is to reduce the present population—human population of the planet—from 7 billion persons, estimated, to 1. Or nearly 1.


The policy has been, ever since that British pig, Theodore Roosevelt, has been to reduce the environment, to reduce the production of value.

Humanity's function has been, not only to live. The behavior of mankind has actually been the source of sustenance of *all species on this planet*, as a generality. So, the Green policy is nothing but one, big, damned lie. And if you look, it came from people, like—well, let's get into that. We know the people who are responsible for this policy—it is a standard British policy. It was the policy of the Roman Empire. The policy of the Roman Empire was periodic exterminations of unwanted people: Population control. Disease was spread, for that purpose.

And the problem for these guys, is, that the founding of the United States, despite the bums that we've had as some of our Presidents, and so forth—we have been, from the beginning of our settlement of North America, as in Massachusetts, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, from that point on, the United States as it emerged from that kernel, under the influence of Nicholas of Cusa, who founded the whole idea of doing it, that development in the Americas, out of Europe, has been the greatest boon to the people of Europe and elsewhere, since. Because we maintained a standard which the others had to somehow measure up to. And that has given us a greater freedom; the conditions of life of people have improved by the impact, the very impact of the United States.

And the threat that the United States' influence would come into people who were struggling for freedom. We were the nation which was the most committed of all to human freedom. We may have regressed under corrupt Presidents, such as Andrew Jackson, a bum we much regret. *But*, we, as a people, have been the inspiration for people of the planet. And it's our high rates of growth, and not just growth of numbers of people, but growth in terms of the conditions of life of people, the improvement of the conditions of life—

Stuart Laycock's new book, documenting that 90% of the countries of the world have been invaded by Britain over the course of history, is getting big play in the London press, including this coverage in The Telegraph on Nov. 4.



HOME NEWS WORLD SPORT FINANCE COMMENTARY
 Women Motoring Health Property Gardening
 World War Two Battle of Britain Communism Britain

HOME » HISTORY

British have invaded nine out of ten countries - so look out Luxembourg

Britain has invaded all but 22 countries in the world in its long and colourful history, new research has found.

21 of the 22 countries that have not been invaded by Britain

until Teddy Roosevelt came along, who was actually a British agent, and started a reversal of this policy, in the beginning of the 20th Century.

And so, therefore, the argument is fraudulent. Reduction of population and lowering of the energy-flux density, especially, the lowering of the energy-flux density of human throughput, is the best way to cause a mass extinction of the human species. And people who have that policy, should be examined for mental infirmities.

The British Empire

Bernstein: I have a follow-up to that question, and I would like to challenge you, as to whether it's simply mental infirmities or pure evil.

There was recently a column published in the British press, stating that an academic actually put the num-

bers together, and came up with the figure of 90%, which is the number of countries currently in existence that have, at one time or another, been taken over by the British Empire. So, in this context, I'd like to point to fact that the election of Obama represents, in reality, the fourth Presidential term of Tony Blair. . . .

Now, there are other aspects as well, including Obama's health policy, but more important, I think, in international relations, is the interventionist policy; what is well-known as a Blair policy, initially outlined in a 1999 Chicago speech, on the international community, where sovereignty becomes an issue of responsibility. The responsibility in the event of genocide, mass starvation, other events, of an outside force, an international force, coming in to intervene into the affairs of an otherwise sovereign nation. . . .

So, that much being said, and this being the fourth term of Tony Blair in office in the United States, I'd like to know what can be done in this context? This obviously requires a drastic change. The issues of NATO, currently, if the United States were to prevent, for example, an escalation on the Syria-Turkish border, we would have to go head-to-head with NATO, with Great Britain.

So, my question to you: What are we going to do about it?

LaRouche: Well, we're going to have to do something about it, because otherwise, we're not going to have a human population; we're not going to have a human species. So therefore, we're going to something about it. We have to.

This whole business about the British Empire—people don't understand it. Even most of the history that's taught doesn't really understand that. What's convenient—there are many ways that we have access, for example, my own experience and studies of these things, going back to much earlier periods, than the siege of Troy. And that has all a separate history, including the Middle East history, and so forth. And from the area of what is now India, when the waters were lower, you had a very important culture in India; now it's under water, these areas are under water. Great rivers that were once there are now desiccated, essentially.

But the key thing is the case of Troy, because Troy is a crucial case, which shows how what's called the oligarchical system was developed, how it developed from many different kinds of sources and experiments. There was a drive at some point, toward establishing a single empire over the area of the Mediterranean Sea. This quest, which actually started in a sense, with the siege of

Troy, and when Troy was conquered, by the Horse's rear-end that got in there, the people of Troy were slaughtered, mostly, except some old men and children.

Now, out of this process, there came a sequel, which we know very well, as the Mediterranean sequel, northern Mediterranean sequel in particular, and so this became the system of all empires, including what led into the formation of the initial Roman Empire. And the Roman Empire was a continuation of this whole process, a revision of the whole process. All European history since that time has been essentially an offshoot of the Roman Empire.

Now, this is not a collection of people who are conquered; what this was, was a destruction of all opposition to conquest. And the British Empire is the present, and we hope so far, final, version of this system of empire.

But the problem we face today is not merely the history of the empire, the imperial system, which went from Rome, to Greece again, back to that; then to the first Venetian system, and then to the second Venetian system. And the second Venetian system was called the New Venetian system, which was the foundation of the British Empire.

So there's a continuous thread of development of imperialism, which finally ended up in Britain. And it went through a process which started with William of Orange and his crew, and his descendants. And in 1763, we got this treaty agreement which established the British Empire, not in Britain itself, but throughout the world. And later, the reforms which occurred inside the United Kingdom, we made a transfer so that actual England, or Britain, became part of the new Roman Empire; or the New Venetian Empire, whatever you want to call it.

Because of the influence of Nicholas of Cusa, who suggested that the solution for this problem, would be to cross the oceans, and to make contact with people on the other side of the shore of the oceans, and to develop a system which could be civilized, as opposed to the European continent.

Breeding People

So the point has been that we have a history, a cultural history, of overlords and slaves, or peasants or whatever. And that has been the system. Now, what happens is, when you raise—like you raise animals, this has an effect, breeding animals. You breed animals, and you breed to type. The effort is made to breed people to type; we kill the people who don't conform to your specifications: You destroy the education, which

you don't want the people to have; you have the system like the Roman Empire, and it's very much like an election campaign these days in the United States.

You have great mobs of people who have no idea what the hell they're talking about. They get into these great rallies, called Presidential campaign rallies—they have no idea what they're talking about. Most of these people who voted had *no idea* in the world of what they were talking about. They just got sucked into this. And it's like the Roman arena, where a Caesar, sitting in the middle of the great arena, or the Colosseum or so forth, would then, at a certain point, while they're going to crucify somebody or get the gladiators to kill, and they would have a call out, "thumbs up," or "thumbs down," on each choice—each choice, a game was played.

And that's pretty much what our national election campaigns have come to look like. People who go into these campaigns have *no idea* what they're talking about. They have no idea what they're being *talked at*, by this point. They couldn't explain it if they wanted to. They don't know what's important and what isn't. They believe that what they're being told in the press or something else, is what's important. They pay no attention to other things which actually are decisive. They're brainwashed. And the brainwashing comes as a tradition of, in particular, the Roman Empire tradition and its effect on the world.

The British Empire today, is a British Empire. It's also a British-Saudi Empire. Let's take the crucial case that makes the point: 9/11—two versions. One version, by the Bush family; another version, by Obama, the second one, in Benghazi. It was done on 9/11. It was done by Obama, specifically, to fit the characteristics of 9/11, Sept. 11.

And that was done. And nothing was done about it. And Susan Rice *lied*, lied through her teeth. Remember, her rank, as a UN representative of the United States. And she got out there and repeatedly lied. The President's press spokesman lied, or told the lie without knowing what he was doing.

Obama let this go: He lied. He evaded, but he lied. And the people who believe him were fools.

Did the people of the United States have any opportunity to select a Presidential choice *of their own choice*? Or, were they given some razzmatazz, and misled? And you found the people who were the least educated were the ones who found Obama most popular. The poor young people, who have had the poorest education, the poorest jobs, the poorest cultural level.

And this has been a farce. Because the idea of popular is not good; the idea of good should be made popular. They got it backwards. Everyone should have a high-quality education; every child should have that. Every child should have some understanding of history. Every child should know what the Roman Empire, the kind of evil it represented, and what the British Empire today represents. That's the American tradition.

We knew the British were evil. And we tried to defend ourselves against that evil. And we made a great population; we made, in the Civil War, a *great defense* of the United States against the British Empire, which was what the Confederacy was. And therefore, that's the problem.

Popular Opinion Stinks

We talk about "popular opinion." Well, popular opinion, the way it's run now, stinks. You have a press that lies, you have entertainment which is disgusting and depraved. And it goes from one depravity to another, in order to give you "variety of taste."

This is what you want to call a "democratic system"?

Let's call it a republican system, and I don't mean the Republican Party. I mean a republican system, in which the people of the United States are given access to the specific knowledge they need, in their part in choosing their representatives. The people of the United States, in this case, were given virtually *no* access to the truth. And voted for what they were passed out to choose, not what was the *truth*.

If they had known what was done in New York, in not putting up that buffer, what the swindle was on that case, and the number of people that have died on Staten Island and elsewhere, which is only a *beginning*, of the wave of death from disease and other causes, which is going to occur *in* the New York area as a result of what happened in the storm. Where the area outside of Rhode Island, other areas, as now in Louisiana and so forth, where the defenses have been put up, and economical solution was provided. *If that had been done*, if that bulwark had been placed in the area of New York, the *tragedy would never have happened*.

And now these guys say they were "saving money," by not doing that, not building that bulwark. Yes, but how much is it going to cost *to repair* the damage, that could have been prevented at a lower cost? So what kind of a degenerate is the mayor of New York? Or, is he just some damned fool? Silly, old fool?

No, the truth of the matter has to be faced. You can't

come in with terms, and say, “I’ve got this evidence, and this evidence, and this evidence,” and *leave out* the most crucial evidence. You say, the people made an intelligent decision? The people made a *stupid* decision.

But they weren’t given any chance, or assistance, in making an intelligent decision. The responsibility of government, of a democratic, elected government, is that the people have the *right to have the information on their own terms*. What they *want*, to

find out they *should* want, to find out what’s available, and not to have some large audience, where people come in half-drunk, or drunken on the spirit of the occasion, and make silly decisions.

The people who voted for Obama, were mostly just, plain silly people. And you say, “our silly people have voted for this guy.” But we made them silly.


Mankind Is an Immortal Species

Ross: Well, speaking of silly thoughts, you’ve mentioned a few times tonight, the difference between business, and national economics, where you had written in one of your recent papers that what people understand, say, for example, what Romney meant by his understanding of “business,” bore little relation to any of the important issues actually facing our nation. This might seem like a simplistic question, but, could you expand on, how it is that running a nation is different from running a business?

LaRouche: Well, let’s go to our famous chart of the growth of species (**Figure 1**), of the variety of species, and knowing that species always proceed in going from lower capabilities, to higher. And so therefore, the Green policy is against nature. And *naturally*, you can not support a Green policy.

So, the problem here, is, people believe in money. They’re brainwashed to believe in money. Now, money has no intrinsic value, none. It’s simply a means of exchange, which is properly controlled by a government, because you have to have a political institution which

FIGURE 1



has the authority to enforce these standards.

That is, it’s like a health standard, like health code: You could call it a mental-health code, which is what it’s supposed to be. The student is supposed to be educated; the student is not supposed to be educated according to somebody’s predetermined “Well, this kid only gets this kind of education, he gets only this kind of opportunity,” and so forth—no. The idea of freedom. Every child must be given an opportunity, an optimal opportunity, to develop as an adult of some consequence. Not just of some consequence, but of some ability to develop themselves further, to make some innovation in the course of their life which is beneficial to society.

You know, the idea of humanity is not a succession of you pop a baby out of your belly! And then the baby takes over, and you’re left behind. That system is not a very good system.

Look, we’re now in a century: A century is generally divided by 25 years today, for each generation; so you have four generations. And so, therefore, the process of society, the process of the human species, is a progress of a species, which is represented by the advances made by successive generations, and therefore the policy of the society is to ensure the advancement of these successive generations.

Meaning, we’re now in a place, you know the ultimate thing that we face is, that at some time, the Sun is going to blow up. And long before the Sun blows up, about 2 billion years from now, estimated, we’re going to have to move mankind to a safer place. Now, man-

kind today is in no condition to be moved to any place, and has no capability of doing so. But, if mankind is increasing its level of *energy-flux density*, per capita and per square unit of territory, then the human species is progressing in its power to exist, as we see now, as we're exploring space. We're now in a position, where we're able to actual think, say, a century from now, to at least do that, to get into there. So that if we talk about millions of years, the progress of the species, in 25 years for each generation, means that the progress of mankind will accelerate, not simply increase, but *will accelerate*. And it will correlate with the energy-flux density per capita, which is expressed.

Mankind, a thousand years from now, will be far more capable of dealing with the universe, than man today, if we do the right thing. Our objective is not to see each child and parent as something different, like it was something like an egg laid for self-development.

Mankind is an immortal species. That's the nature of mankind, is to be an immortal species, which, through successive generations is advancing as a species. The only species which can do that. All other species are not capable of doing that, only the human species can do that, of all the species known to us. Therefore, a parent

and a child and a grandchild are not different, separate interests. Those generations are a combined interest, and every part of the generation has a common, shared interest in that process. That's mankind.

And therefore, the education of mankind, the development of mankind, is to get every child to feel, "I am important. I am, of my parents' generation, and I will give forth a generation. And our generations will be stepping stones in progress for all humanity." This makes us an immortal species. We may not be immortal in ourselves, but our species will be immortal, and that's our objective. And therefore, we have to develop the powers, the capabilities, not only to meet our responsibilities, our moral responsibility to other people, on this planet, but to move forward, to take more and more charge of the Solar System, and to go beyond that. And when we've gone beyond taking charge of the Solar System, we're ready for the terrible thing that's going to happen to the Sun, sometime in the future.

But that should be our sense of what our identity is: We are a creative species, like no other species ever known to exist. That is our nature. That is our obligation. That is our morality. And that's what we have to fight for.

EIR Special Report

Obama's War on America: 9/11 Two

In 2001, the Bush-Cheney Administration was complicit with the British and Saudi monarchies in permitting and covering up the 9/11 attacks; today, President Obama's collusion with the Saudis and the British was responsible for the attack on the American consulate in Benghazi, Libya on 9/11/2012.

I. Obama's 9/11

The Obama Administration's negligence and coverup of the Benghazi murders offers perhaps the last opportunity for the patriotic leadership of the United States to remove Barack Obama from office.

II. The London-Saudi Role in International Terrorism

EIR has persistently tracked down the evidence which shows that the 9/11/2001 atrocity was an act of war against the United States, not by Osama bin Laden, but by the British Empire and the Saudi monarchy.

III. 9/11 Take One

The Cheney-Bush Administration used the 9/11/2001 terrorist attacks to attempt to ram through a fascist dictatorship, an agenda LaRouche had forecast eight months before.

Price **\$100**

(Available in paperback and PDF. For paper, add shipping and handling; Va. residents add 5% sales tax.)

EIR
Special Report

Obama's War on America: 9/11 Two



October 2012

Order from EIR News Service **1-800-278-3135** Or online: www.larouchepub.com