


EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

August 7, 2020 Vol. 47 No. 32

www.larouche.pub.com \$10.00

‘To Keep the Republic, Defend the Presidency’



LaRouchePAC

LIVE

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

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

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

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

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

ON THE WEB

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

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

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

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

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

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

Copyright: ©2020 EIR News Service. All rights
reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without
permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement
#40683579

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

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

‘To Keep the Republic, Defend the Presidency’

Cover This Week

Speakers at the LaRouche PAC Symposium, "How to Stop the Ongoing Coup Against the Constitution and the Presidency," Saturday, August 1, 2020. Clockwise from upper left: Dennis Speed, Mike Steger, Roger Stone, Harley Schlanger, Barbara Boyd, and William Binney.



‘TO KEEP THE REPUBLIC, DEFEND THE PRESIDENCY’

I. ‘To Keep the Republic, Defend the Presidency’: LaRouche PAC Aug. 1 Forum

3 Opening and Closing Statements of Roger Stone, Barbara Boyd, William Binney, and Harley Schlanger

II. Giving Mankind a Sense of Purpose

16 Persevering in Pursuit of Science: Mars 2020!

by Kesha Rogers

18 Ingenuity: The First Flying Machine on Mars

by Marsha Freeman

III. Empire, Oligarchy and War

19 The World Must Distance Itself from Pompeo’s Warpath Against China!

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

22 The Battle Before Us

by Susan Kokinda

28 THE FIGHT OF FREEDOM OVER EMPIRE

Aeschylus’ *The Persians*

A review of The Persians by Aeschylus, produced by the National Theater of Greece, July 25, 2020, directed by Dimitris Lignadis.

by Dean Andromidas

30 American and European Banks, Not the BRI, Are the Culprit in Malaysia’s Corruption Scandal

by Hussein Askary

IV. LaRouche on the World Struggle Today

33 LAROCHE TO ITALIAN SENATE DEFENSE COMMITTEE

A Strategy to Defend the Nation-State

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.
June 5, 2007

I. ‘To Keep the Republic, Defend the Presidency’: LaRouche PAC Aug. 1 Forum

Opening and Closing Statements of Roger Stone, Barbara Boyd, Bill Binney and Harley Schlanger

We present here the opening and closing remarks at the live LaRouche PAC Symposium, “How to Stop the Ongoing Coup Against the Constitution and the Presidency,” on Saturday, August 1, 2020. The speakers were Roger Stone, Bill Binney, Barbara Boyd, and Harley Schlanger. The moderators were Michael Steger and Dennis Speed. The text is the edited transcript, except for Mrs. Boyd’s remarks, which are as prepared and also edited. The full 3-hour video is available [here](#).



Roger Stone

LPAC-TV

Roger Stone: Thank you very much. I’m delighted to be here with you, and I’m particularly delighted to be with a very great man and a truth-teller—Bill Binney. What we now know is that the investigation into me by Robert Mueller’s dirty cops was not even approved until October of 2017. In other words, three months after Mueller’s forces knew that there was no collusion between the Russian state and the Trump campaign. This is further proof that my prosecution was a completely political prosecution. If you read the first four pages of my indictment, it lays out the fundamental

premise that the Democratic National Committee had an online hack by Russian intelligence officers, and that the data that was stolen was passed on to WikiLeaks. It is on that basis that my trial ended up in front of Judge Amy Berman Jackson.

In other words, the prosecutors—rather than take the chance of random selection of a judge in the D.C. Circuit—insisted that my case was related to the case that they had brought against I believe it is 17 alleged Russian intelligence officers who they claim hacked the DNC. That case has never even gone to discovery; that case will never go to trial. So, as far as I’m concerned today, it’s an accusation on paper. We’ve seen no evidence that accusation is correct, but the Mueller team insisted that my case was related to that case, and they guaranteed the court that they would introduce in my trial, evidence collected in that case. They did no such thing, and they provided us with no such evidence in discovery that came from that case.

So, this was a ruse to guarantee that I would be tried before the most hostile judge they had. One who had already violated Paul Manafort’s civil liberties by putting him in solitary confinement prior to his being convicted of any offense whatsoever, effectively gag-ordering him. They also placed a gag order on him which he did not contest. So, they basically defrauded the court in order to forum-shop, to judge-shop.

Then when I wanted to disprove the underlying premise of their indictment, Bill Binney supplied my attorneys quite graciously with an affidavit. He laid out for them exactly how you would make the case that the DNC had not been subject to an online hack by the Russians or anyone else. Technologically we’re lucky that I can run my email today, so I’m not a very technological

person, but I understood that the timing here was everything.

In other words, if the Mueller investigation was a stool with three legs, and the first leg was the Steele dossier, by the time my indictment came there were already questions about the validity of the dossier. And by the time I went to trial, it had been completely debunked. No one believed it was real based on enormous public events. The second leg of the stool would be the so-called Russian troll farms. The problem with that is, no one really believes that \$100,000 worth of very poorly written Facebook ads had any impact whatsoever. As the judge in that case directed Robert Mueller, you couldn't even tie the company that posted the troll farm alleged postings on Facebook to the Russian government. So, the second leg of their stool was knocked out.

There was only one leg left, and that was this bogus argument that the Russians had hacked the DNC. Of course, even if that were true—I don't believe it is; Bill Binney can speak to this far more eloquently than I can—they could also find, after going to multiple Federal judges and magistrates and claiming that they had probable cause to charge me with treason, espionage, conspiracy against the United States, cybercrimes including unauthorized access to a computer, cybercrimes including the receipt and dissemination of stolen data, money laundering, millions of rubles in violation of the foreign campaign contributions ban, mail fraud, wire fraud, aiding and abetting a conspiracy, accessory to a felony after the fact. They had eighteen individual crimes they said I could be charged with. The only thing they didn't include was the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

And of course, once they defrauded the courts and got full access to all of my emails, all of my text messages, all of my paper records, all of my computer records, and at least the chain of my phone calls, they found no evidence of any of those crimes. They found that I had no collusion with the Russians. In fact, they learned the only Russian I had met in 2016 was an FBI informant that they sent to come talk to me.

He approached me about purchasing dirt on Hillary Clinton. It was a very short meeting; it lasted about 12 minutes. I said, "I'm not interested," and I left. That, of course, is glossed over in Mr. Mueller's report. But I was able to locate one of nine informant visas signed by the head of the FBI office in Miami, under which this gentleman got into the country. When he approached

me, he used the name Henry Greenberg, clearly not his real name. I can't pronounce his real name, but suffice it to say, his real name did not appear in the Mueller report; this is glossed over entirely. Beyond that, they could find no evidence whatsoever that I knew about the source or content of any of the WikiLeaks disclosures prior to their being released.

In essence, what they did was to criminalize perfectly legal political behavior. This is very much like what they did to Lyndon LaRouche. Lyndon LaRouche was really prosecuted because he irritated the Bushes, because he contradicted them in public. And he did so during the New Hampshire primary, and he did so with great effect. And I can tell you now that he and his supporters worked very closely with Ronald Reagan's campaign and those I was involved in, because we both had a mutual distrust of the Bushes. The Bushes are not Republicans; they're not conservatives. In fact, they have no ideology other than the ideology of money and power. Their agenda is to create wealth for themselves and their cronies. So, they're crony capitalists except for when they're dealing with communist nations; then they're not capitalists.

So, I really believe that Lyn's real sin, other than challenging the orthodoxy of his day, having a broader vision than the vision of the neo-cons, was his epic campaign for President in which he embarrassed the would-be President, George H.W. Bush. Bush was an exceedingly vindictive man, not as vindictive as his wife, however. But they were definitely scorekeepers. If you look at those involved in the prosecution of Lyndon LaRouche—Bill Weld, Robert Mueller—these are all Bush family factotums. In fact, Bill Weld's father was partners with Prescott Bush in the banking enterprise which financed the armament of Nazi Germany.

In any event, to move on, my trial was really something else, because the Special Counsel's office leaked on a regular basis, and therefore for the 16 months prior to my arrest, you would see stories predicting that I would be charged with all of those various big-picture crimes—treason, espionage, being the go-between between WikiLeaks and the Trump campaign. There is an assumption that WikiLeaks is a Russian asset. I still argue that is unproven; that is a claim by [former CIA Director] John Brennan, we don't know that to be a fact. Assange denies it; I doubt it. There is no evidence to prove it.

And then, much was made of my twitter direct message exchange with the persona of Guccifer 2.0. Now,

the interesting thing about this is that I did have an exchange with this persona. I can't tell you if it is a person, a group of people, or whether it is no one at all. But I myself released the full context of the exchange in early 2017. It's benign; it shows nothing. It's basically patter. There is no evidence of collusion, cooperation, working together. No exchange of documents other than some ridiculous voter targeting study which he sent me, which I frankly didn't even open because it was so mundane. I turned this over to the House Intelligence Committee at the time that I voluntarily testified.

It proves nothing, but the timing of it does prove something. The exchange between the persona of Guccifer 2.0 and me, took place in late October of 2016.

In other words, long after WikiLeaks had already released all of the documents they had regarding the DNC or Hillary Clinton, making collaboration or coordination or collusion chronologically impossible, unless of course I owned a time machine. So, you have the actual text which proves that it is benign; you have the timing, which proves that it is meaningless; but then lastly, I'm not certain whatsoever that Guccifer 2.0 is, in fact, a Russian asset. That's an assertion from John Brennan. There are many assertions from Brennan that are not true.

Again, most of what I have studied in terms of forensic evidence, would lead one to the conclusion that Guccifer 2.0 as an entity is more likely an asset for American intelligence, and that no actual Russian intelligence asset would be nearly as clumsy as this one appears to be. In other words, there are purposeful fingerprints, or thumbprints, left everywhere to try to give you the impression that this is a Russian entity. I'm not sure that's true, but it certainly hasn't been proved in any court of law.

Therefore, it was interesting to me, literally the day after my commutation by the President, which was an act of both justice and mercy, because the judge in my case was absolutely intent on incarcerating me immediately in a prison in rural Georgia, despite all of the legal precedents in every circuit in the country, including D.C., over the previous 30 days in which people who were convicted of nonviolent offenses were moved to home confinement, or had their sentences reduced to time served.

Despite the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Prisons regulations which had been put out in April by Attorney General Barr that mandated that those convicted of nonviolent crimes be moved to home confine-

ment to protect them from COVID-19; despite my age and health—we made very substantial submissions to the court under seal—I have suffered from asthma and other respiratory problems my entire life (I'm also a vigorous 67); and despite the fact that the judge refused to acknowledge that there were active COVID-19 in the Jessup, Georgia prison where they wanted to send me.

And on top of the fact that that very prison only two weeks before I was to go there, had released a serial rapist, a child pornographer, a pedophile, and an armed bank robber, to protect them all from COVID-19.

I was not surprised when our emergency motion to Judge Jackson was denied. In fact, when she learned that the government would not oppose that motion on my part, she demanded that they explain themselves. They simply said, well, our position is consistent with the Department's current policies. I immediately appealed that to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, and 20 minutes before the President signed the commutation of my sentence, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled against me, 3-0. So much for the rule of law. That's why I say the President's act of commutation was an act of mercy, as well as of justice.

If you'd been watching the news this morning, you'd know that some of the charges against the Boston Marathon bomber were thrown out, because of juror misconduct. Juror misconduct which is very similar to that that took place in my trial, where the jury forewoman, without any question whatsoever, was posting in 2019 on both Facebook and Twitter, beginning on the day I was arrested, attacking me; and attacked me again subsequently, actually posted a link to a piece about my indictment, and also attacked President Trump throughout the year, among other things, saying that he was a racist, and all of his supporters were racists. These postings were on a private setting during jury selection; they were on a private setting during the trial; and they were deleted after the trial.

So, when the judge rejected our motion to vacate my verdict and provide for a new trial, she said it was my lawyer's responsibility to know about this. I argued there was no way to know about it; we did our due diligence; this material was not available online at the time. And when asked specifically in the hearing about the story to which the juror had linked about me, the judge directed her not to answer the question, and actually said, "Just because Ms. Hart"—that's her name—"linked to a story, doesn't mean she actually read it."

Yeah. Also, when asked whether or not her com-

ment that all of President Trump's supporters were racist meant that I was a racist, the judge again stopped her from answering and said, "There's no evidence that Ms. Hart," a Democratic activist, a lawyer who ran for Congress, "there's no evidence that she knew that Roger Stone was an associate of Donald Trump's prior to being selected as a juror in this trial." Well, if that's true, then she had to be living under a rock.

The jury make-up itself was entirely hostile to the President. It included not one military veteran; it included not one single Republican, not one single independent, not one single union member, nobody with less than a college education, but a majority of the jurors with post-college educations; at least three lawyers who had previously worked either for the FBI or the Department of Justice, or some other prosecutor, people who worked in a left-wing think tank, a person who worked for a Democratic political action committee. This was a hanging jury to say the least.

So you not only had the active sabotage by the jury forewoman, who lied her way onto the jury, but the judge then decided in a hearing that she would not call every juror back, she would just take a sampling. But in her sampling, she just happened to choose the juror who the day before had written an op-ed in the *Washington Post* saying how great the decision had been in my trial, and how it was unaffected by politics.

This was a Soviet-style show trial. As you said in the beginning, they would not allow me to have Bill Binney testify at my trial. They would not allow us to submit any forensic evidence that would disprove their underlying theory. They would not allow me to argue selective prosecution. In other words, Mueller lied.

Well, let's start at the beginning—Comey lied, Clapper lied, Brennan lied, McCabe lied, Page lied, Rosenstein lied, Mueller himself lied, Hillary Clinton lied. All these people lied to Congress, although the difference between me and them is that they lied about material things. They lied about things of consequence.

For example, James Clapper said there was no metadata collection program on American citizens. We now know that that's false. Where is Mr. Clapper now? He's on the ethics board at UPenn, [University of Pennsylvania] when he's not being paid six figures by CNN.

So, I was not allowed to argue that.

Then, the most stunning motion of all by the government: Stone is not allowed to raise the question of misconduct by the Special Counsel, the Department of Justice, the FBI, or any individual member of Congress.

That is patently unconstitutional under *Kyles v. Whitley*, but more precisely if you stop and think about it, why would the government want to prohibit the introduction of evidence of misconduct unless they knew that there was misconduct at hand? Unless they knew that would be a makeable argument, if you will?

It's also interesting that they added members of Congress to this motion that was granted by Judge Jackson; I'll tell you why. I now believe that, based on the wording of the specific questions on which I was charged with making misstatements, all of which were asked by one Congressman, Adam Schiff, which is odd because every member on this panel, both Republican and Democrat, was given their time over my five-hour voluntary testimony, to ask questions.

It is abundantly clear that the Special Counsel, having obtained my emails, then in violation of law, shared those emails with Adam Schiff, who then crafted very tightly-worded questions that were "gotcha" questions; none of which were particularly revelatory, but all of which were a lock, as it were. Then Schiff asked these questions; I made misstatements, again I argue that they were immaterial, and therefore there was no intent to deceive. Then Schiff, in violation of both the House rules and the law, shared my classified testimony with the Special Counsel, when then crafted this very contorted indictment for lying to Congress.

How clever. Unfortunately, Schiff couldn't help but crow about it, so within 24 hours, he went out publicly and said Stone will be charged with perjury before the House Intelligence Committee. A, that's a violation of the House rules; he's not supposed to discuss my testimony at all, never mind characterize it. But secondarily, one wonders how he could possibly know that so far in advance.

There's a great piece at *RedState*, which I commend to you, in which they have taken the indictment against me and deconstructed it. It was written by Andrew Weissman. He's so clever that he left his metadata tags on the original draft. And it is extraordinarily contorted and contrived and largely fabricated, because they had to come up with some crime. They throw in witness tampering, which is ironic because Randy Credico, the witness I've been accused of tampering with, had simply said, "Oh my God! All of my progressive friends are going to know that I inadvertently helped elect Donald Trump. I'll be a pariah, what shall I do?"

I suggested that he assert his Fifth Amendment rights. In fact, we have email and testimony that Mr.

Credico threatened to shoot another witness who went to the grand jury, an exculpatory witness who supported my version of events. Threatened to shoot him in the head if he contradicted Randy's testimony before the grand jury. We also handed over 30 pages of text messages that proved indisputably that Credico was my source for the very limited knowledge I had of the WikiLeaks disclosures. That would be that they were politically significant, in fact, explosive, and that they would come out in October.

There you have it, the sum total of what I knew. Not exactly a state secret. But the Mueller investigation chose to ignore multiple exculpatory witnesses and the 30 pages of text messages, which interestingly enough, Credico himself had never supplied, but we supplied to the prosecutors. In fact, we supplied them the day before 29 jack-booted FBI agents stormed my home at 6 a.m. in the morning to arrest me. That scene, as you know, was basically orchestrated for CNN. I now know from looking at the security camera footage, which the FBI cleverly forgot to take with them, that the CNN camera crew showed up exactly 14 minutes before the FBI.

I do not hold, and did not hold a valid passport; I don't own a firearm, although I do strongly support the Second Amendment. And thanks to CNN and MSNBC, I think I'm universally recognized. So, the idea that I was a flight risk, and therefore this heavy-handed, Gestapo-style raid had to be staged, is ridiculous; proven by the fact that three hours after, when I was arraigned, the government asked for no cash bond for my release. Proving yet again that they didn't really believe that I was a flight risk.

So, one has to assume that this over-the-top extravaganza, which cost the taxpayers \$1.1 million—29 FBI agents, 17 armored vehicles, a government helicopter, 2 government amphibious units replete with frogmen. This was like the D-Day invasion; completely unnecessarily. It was staged either to intimidate me, clearly unaware of my Sicilian heritage, or to send a message to other witnesses that they should go along unless they wanted the same treatment.

I do have to point out one aspect of this, and that is, the government's surprise witness was Steve Bannon. Steve Bannon swept into the courtroom, kind of looking like an overweight Johnny Cash on a three-day bender. He took the stand and said under oath that he had discussed WikiLeaks and Julian Assange in virtually every telephone conversation we had in 2016. It

was a riveting moment. I think it helped seal the guilty verdict. The problem was that in his sworn testimony before the House Intelligence Committee, which was classified at that time, but has since been declassified, he denied under oath that he ever discussed WikiLeaks or Julian Assange with me, ever, on any occasion.

In fact, Adam Schiff made it very definitive: "Before you joined the campaign, while you were at the campaign, after you left the campaign, before you went to the White House, when you were at the White House, after you were at the White House, did you discuss these matters with Roger Stone?" "No," says Bannon. Pretty clear to me that he either lied there under oath, and that's the very crime I was charged with, or he lied on the stand. Knowing the facts, I can tell you: he lied on the stand.

So, the idea that he is one of us, that he is fighting the Deep State, is disproven not only by his conduct in my trial, but I can tell you definitively that every major neo-con that has joined this administration—I'm thinking of H.R. McMaster, or Rex Tillerson and worse—was there with the advocacy and the patronage of Steve Bannon. The idea that he is against the neo-cons is a contrivance. He is a bad actor, who would have been perfectly happy to see me die in a COVID-19 infested prison, but for the enormous courage of Donald Trump.

That kind of sums up where I have been. It has been not only a political, but a spiritual journey. I have one final comment. That is, in the discovery in my trial, we finally forced the FBI to admit that they had never inspected the servers at the DNC, and that they were relying solely on a draft redacted report by CrowdStrike for the assertion that the DNC had been hacked by the Russians. CrowdStrike said they essentially had a screen shot of the servers. That's kind of like having a photograph of the murder weapon. You can't really inspect it.

Once this fact came out and began to get picked up in the mainstream media, the government filed a sur-reply signed by Assistant Attorney Jonathan Kravitz which says, briefly, "Stone is incorrect. We have substantial additional evidence that the Russians hacked the DNC, but we cannot provide it because it is a matter of national security." I believe that is a fraud upon the court, and it is my intention to file a formal complaint with the Office of Professional Responsibility to get that very issue examined. With that, I'm delighted to be with you, and I'm happy to hear what others have to say.



LPAC-TV

William Binney

William Binney: Thank you very much. It's good to be here with you, especially you, Roger. I'm glad to see the President did exactly what he did do to pardon you. It was only just. After the sham trial that you had, and the fact that the judge wouldn't allow proof into the courtroom basically. Basically falsifying evidence against you, which is what they did to us after we left the NSA, trying to get the government to abide by the Constitution, especially when it came to U.S. citizens.

We knew they were violating it; they fabricated evidence against us, too. The difference is, Roger, I knew the type of people we were dealing with, and I was watching them, and I caught them at that fabrication, and I had evidence to charge them with malicious prosecution. I so informed them of that, and they ran away. But it just goes to show you that the people of the United States can no longer trust their government. Unless Barr and Durham start to take some action to really reinstate justice in this country, we're going to be moving on with a Department of Just Us, and we the people will never have an opportunity to get true justice.

But I would like to add one thing about Guccifer 2.0 that maybe wasn't clear in previous statements I made about the forensics of it. The Guccifer 2.0 data that we looked at, we clearly showed the speeds of downloads of that data to a thumb drive were possible, but it was not possible to send that data across the internet to Russia or anywhere else outside the United States, or even inside the United States to a lot of places. They couldn't get it because they didn't have these high-speed lines to carry that kind of rate transfer. We proved that.

Not only did we show the speeds that were involved, but we also showed that you couldn't do it. We tried to do our transfer from Albania, from Netherlands, from the U.K. The further east we got, the less speed we got.

We couldn't achieve the higher speeds going further east; it went down.

But after that also, we looked at the data that Guccifer 2.0 published, both on the 15th of June, the 5th of July, and the 1st of September. The two files he published on the 1st of September and the 5th of July 2016, if you look at them, and only looked at minutes, seconds, and milliseconds, you could shuffle them together like a deck of cards without conflict. That says the guy is playing a game with the data. He did one download, split it into two files, did a range change on the date and a range change on the hour, because he couldn't do it on the minutes because it crossed many minutes. And he couldn't do it on the seconds or milliseconds, because there are so many of those.

So, he could only do a range change on the date and the hour, which is apparently what he did, because those two files merge into one. That said he was playing with the data.

Then, on the 15th of June, he published some articles showing that it had Russian fingerprints in it. Well, our affiliates doing the research with us in the U.K. looked at that data, and found that five of those files they also found in the Podesta email documentation by WikiLeaks. That was posted on the 21st of September. That was at least the times that they had it, so the point was, those files that were in the WikiLeaks publication didn't have any Russian fingerprints. So, that meant Guccifer 2.0 inserted those fingerprints.


And then we went back to the Vault 7 material where the Vault 7 material said this program, Marble Framework, was a program that made it look like other countries did the hack, when in fact, the CIA did the hack. Well, they were able to mimic, or make it look like the Russians, the Chinese, the North Koreans, the Iranians, or Arabs did the attack. They could attack anybody and leave fingerprints making it look like someone else did it.

So, when you looked at it, that meant to us that Guccifer 2.0 was using some kind of program or process to insert those fingerprints into the data from the DNC. On top of that, in the Vault 7 material, it said that the Marble Framework program was used one time in 2016. Well, we think we found it; and that says to us that all the evidence we've been accumulating forensically from the outside is pointing back at CIA as the origin of Guccifer 2.0.

So, their entire allegation about you and the Russians and everybody, has a false premise to start with.

So, everything they introduce,— and the reason they went after you and also General Flynn was what lawyers call “fruit of the poison tree.” They set it up, they manipulated it, they contrived it, and they executed it. And you and General Flynn, and they tried to make us also, put us in jail under the Espionage Act by fabricating the evidence against us too. So, it’s really how can we ever trust the FBI until Barr and Durham really clean it up?

Stone: Agreed.



LPAC-TV

Barbara Boyd

Barbara Boyd: Clearly what happened to Roger here in his account of the case, is that he was basically treated by them as roadkill. Unabashedly so, to terrify everybody who is out there in the population who might consider joining the revolution which actually I would characterize as beginning in 2009, against globalization, which culminated in the election of Donald Trump, and the resistance to that election has been a continuing saga ever since then.

The idea of what happened to Roger is that every single argument which appears to be just, appears to be true, is simply discarded and we just run over. And then you’re gagged, and you’re not allowed to say what happened. It is a situation in which the intelligence community played the major role, no doubt about it. They had certain factotums out there like Adam Schiff, like Robert Mueller, like all of these people. But the essential message which is being sent here, and there should be no doubt about it, is if you step out of line, we have the means to come after you. What are you going to do about it?

That’s what the entire sort of type of this prosecution is all about. In the case of Lyndon LaRouche, we could talk about that, and I will be fully prepared to

discuss that in the questions and answers. But it’s very similar. Ramsey Clark described it as being in all of his experience the most meticulous process of planning to get somebody that he had ever seen. And that speaks a lot in terms of the experience of Ramsey Clark, because it was a period which began with a British government demand for LaRouche’s head in 1982. It’s explicit.

We didn’t know that until long after the appeals in the case had taken place; we suspected it, most certainly. And then it was orchestrated through the George H.W. Bush administration, as Roger speculates, there was open hostility there, as I’m sure George H.W. Bush held that LaRouche’s intervention in New Hampshire played a significant role in Ronald Reagan assuming the Presidency. And George H.W. Bush was not someone who could forgive or forget that. This is a guy, after all, who Seymour Hersh has documented in a story which has been completely quashed, was not above sending people out to actually assassinate people he considered his foes.

Where Did It Begin and How To End It?

When we talk about the keystone myth of Russia-gate, that a Russian hack of the DNC’s servers resulted in the WikiLeaks publications which occurred in July and October of 2016, it seems like we are talking about discrete events. There are two foundational legends in this psyop against the population and the world, the Russian hack story, and the dirty British dossier, promoted and circulated by MI6’s Christopher Steele, it is claimed, around April of 2016.

It seems like, a few brave men in official Washington, *Fox News*, the *Daily Caller*, other conservative outlets, will allow Steele’s dirty fake gossip sheet, to be eviscerated and prosecuted, but the big lie exposed by Bill Binney cannot be touched. Julian Assange will be forced to die in Belmarsh or a similarly brutal American prison without ever telling the story about how he actually came to possess the DNC and John Podesta emails. If the present coup against Donald Trump succeeds, Joe Biden will be crowned the Barack Obama Administration 2.0, an administration of violence-prone technocrats led by a senile and shrunken old man, without any real disclosure of Biden’s vicious role in the coup being conducted against Donald Trump.

Exactly why is that?

Maybe people did not notice that the British government had already dispatched its finest, right after Donald Trump’s election, to declare Christopher Steele

an unreliable rogue operative who had already been banished from the Queen's table.

They didn't notice that Christopher Steele destroyed all his notes on election day. They also didn't notice that Christopher Steele has recently re-emerged in the pantheon of British intelligence Mandarins, this time insisting that Boris Johnson and Theresa May had actively covered up Trump's ties to Russia and that the British elite has been largely captured by the Chinese, backed by the highest levels of British intelligence in these allegations. They didn't notice that, instead of being arrested and prosecuted, Christopher Steele has been lavishly supported all of these months by the conglomerate of Silicon Valley billionaires, called the Democracy Alliance, which has also provided significant funding to Black Lives Matter.

Can it be accidental that Steele's bona fides have been restored and he re-emerges just when Boris Johnson has announced industrial mobilization policies modeled on Franklin Roosevelt's for Britain to emerge from the COVID depression? It is most definitely not. And, Donald Trump is beginning to do the same.

I want to suggest that the reason why the Russian hack story is being allowed to survive is because its exposure would lead directly to the actual perfidies of our so-called intelligence services and those they have compromised in the Congress and elsewhere, and pulls the curtain back on the actual forces controlling "discrete events." As Friedrich Schiller said in his remarkable works on universal history, and as Lyndon LaRouche thought in his own examinations of the present and the past, processes and dynamics produce events, fundamental axioms about the nature of mankind and the universe, shape completely how events unfold.

And right now, we are in the most decisive battle we have been in, ever since the American population began to reject globalization shortly after Barack Obama was inaugurated in 2009, and Lyndon LaRouche, appropriately, crowned him with a mustache reminiscent of a certain German Führer.

And what I want to emphasize today is that this battle can be won by this population, provided we don't buy into the way they want us to think.

In the larger story, boldfaced in Bill Binney's encounters around his marvelous invention of Thin-Thread, the elites in the United States, used 9/11 to set up a surveillance police state, much more elegant than

those employed by other nations. Like the Roman Empire's pantheon of religions, it sets forth a table of controlled choices for those participating, allowing them to "choose," "right" or "left," "traditionalist" or "radical," and induces them to think that they are choosing "freely." Discussion of "events," always in the present, with little reference to the past and virtually none to the future, about which you are allowed to freely opine, not understanding that any opinion within this framework is axiomatically false, is the coin of their realm.

Bill Binney told you, in the movie, *The Good American*, how our intelligence services were privatized as corporate behemoths beginning with Ronald Reagan's Executive Order 12333, and how they proceeded to set up a system of surveillance and information warfare both for profit and for control of public opinion and modern hybrid war, here and abroad. In parallel, following the crash of the dot-com bubble, Google, in 2002, began using ads as a primary source of income in the new financial universe they were creating. If you think about it, their new economy is an economy built on mining and ultimately controlling the raw materials of human behavior. You can see more clearly what it means when you click that incomprehensible Terms of Service Agreement, without understanding a word of it, and open yourself to 24-hour-a-day surveillance.

Now, in reality, I believe it can be conclusively shown that the events which have occurred in the United States beginning in or around November of 2015 or before, are modeled upon events which occurred in Ukraine in 2014 and we are very close to blowing the whole story.

By that, I don't mean to employ the expression that the color revolution, run by NATO, British intelligence, the FBI, CIA and U.S. State Department, in Ukraine in 2014, has come to the United States, as some type of empty slogan, or that the pink pussy cat hats worn in the Women's March in January of 2017 is the be-all and end-all of intelligence analysis. *The Guardian*, this morning, carries a story that GCHQ in Britain was the first to warn about Trump's ties to Russia in or about November of 2015. In reality, that warning was part of a project seeking to neutralize all radical or resistant elements on the right or the left in upcoming advanced-sector elections, with the U.S. presidential election the primary target.

I mean to say the very same Obama Administration

operatives responsible for the coup in Ukraine were determined to elect Hillary Clinton at whatever cost in order to take the final steps in perfecting their surveillance state and surveillance capitalism at a time when they knew that the economic model of globalization, constructed when the Berlin Wall fell, had already failed, as of 2008. It was and is a desperate gambit. They were desperate to maintain their power and had chosen the myths of catastrophic climate change and wholesale suppression of any form of dissent, right or left, as the means to allow them to reduce the world's populations to the level they considered governable, even willing to provoke wars to that end.

In Ukraine, people remember the so-called riots and police actions in Kiev which killed many people as a subject of continued investigations. They have, with the rare exceptions of George Eliason, Max Blumenthal, and Ben Norton, paid little attention to the information warfare and psyops which controlled that military operation of government-overthrow and subsequent civil war. They have paid little attention to the installation of neo-Nazis, terror, and murder, as the means for immediate subjugation of those who resisted the coup, an operation run directly by Joe Biden and which Joe Biden and members of the U.S. Congress have continued to showcase and worship to this day. No one seems willing to touch the neo-Nazis and the Azov brigades run through Obama and Biden when considering the media's portrayal of Joe Biden as a "nice, but befuddled old man."

People often say, "Why won't the media cover this? Why are they in lock step, for the most part?" In Ukraine, a military intelligence operative from the United States, Joel Harding, perfected the art of information warfare as the central aspect of the coup d'état. No, and I do mean, no, independent portrayal of events was to be allowed for that population. The media was in total lockstep with the overthrow apparatus. It was not an independent force; it was the primary instrument of sedition. Similar operations like this had preceded Ukraine in Iraq.

In Ukraine, an Atlantic Council information warfare specialist by the name of Dimitri Alperovitch, who others might know as the leading force in an organization called CrowdStrike, worked with a variety of hacking groups who used their talents in psyops against both the incumbent Ukrainian government and in a hot hate campaign against Putin and Russia.

In Ukraine, a woman by the name of Alexandra Chalupa, coordinating with a gentleman by the name of Eric Ciaramella, working as an aide to Joe Biden, and her sister Andrea Chalupa, ran something called "DigitalMaidan" which coordinated with the very powerful and ridiculously neo-Nazi Banderites in the Ukrainian diaspora in the U.S. and Canada to provide money and bullets for the Ukrainian coup and subsequent civil war.

In Ukraine, a man by the name of Paul Manafort, tried to steer the incumbent government toward a compromise, having learned much about the entire U.S. operation.

In Ukraine, the U.S. State Department, FBI, and CIA employed a gentleman by the name of Christopher Steele of British intelligence in their information warfare operations.

When Donald Trump threatened to win the election and openly sought collaboration with Russia on new international arrangements, this apparatus, inclusive of British intelligence, elements of the Pentagon, the State Department, the CIA, and, belatedly, the FBI, were turned against him, directly from the Obama White House. At the same time, they had already turned against Bernie Sanders and the incipient revolt on that side of the aisle, a revolt rooted in the bailout and the deliberate deindustrialization and complete class stratification of the U.S. economy fully witnessed by the population as of 2008. The "Russian hack" revealed that side of the conspiracy, the side of the conspiracy meant to silence the "left" and create a permanent divide within U.S. culture, where independent and rebellious forces are mobilized violently, but against one another.

A little-noticed keystone event in this was the November 24th *Washington Post* story by Craig Timberg, which smeared virtually every progressive or right-wing publication in the U.S. as a tool of Russian propaganda. Joel Harding, the guy who perfected total information warfare in Ukraine, was a key operative in that operation, along with a slew of people who worked directly for the Atlantic Council and Ukrainian intelligence. Since that time, many if not most of these publications have been shadow banned or driven out of existence in the continuing coup against Trump. Some of them simply jumped on the anti-Trump band wagon for purposes of financial survival.

There is a deep poetic truth in President Trump asking the incoming Ukrainian president Zelensky

about whether the DNC server was in Ukraine in that infamous call which the House of Representatives used to impeach the president. For example, just think about this. On July 25, 2016, three days after WikiLeaks published the first trove of DNC related documents, Michael Isikoff published an article in *Yahoo News* which, in retrospect, is both a complete lie but also a complete coverup.

Isikoff worked with Alexandra Chalupa and Christopher Steele in their attacks on Trump as a Russian agent, with Paul Manafort being the first public target. Their operations were actually put into motion in late 2015.

The *Yahoo News* article tries to say that the DNC first knew they had been hacked in May of 2016 when Alexandra Chalupa received a message from Yahoo saying her account had been targeted by “state sponsored actors.” The message, Isikoff says, “triggered high level concern within the DNC, given the sensitive nature of her work. That’s when we knew it was the Russians.” Chalupa, of course, was collaborating directly with Ukrainian intelligence on behalf of Hillary Clinton, to swing the election against Trump. She continued that work, but not under direct DNC auspices. According to the DNC’s own subsequent account, CrowdStrike was already inside the DNC computers at the time of Yahoo’s alleged warning to Chalupa, as was the U.S. intelligence community.

There is great hope in all of this. Because this president has stood his ground against more and more of the decadent, stupid, and deadly apparatus which has plagued this nation ever since the unpunished assassination of John F. Kennedy has been brought into daylight. This week in Washington, Senators Johnson and Grassley continued to link the Ukraine operations against Trump with the Obama/Biden intelligence operations in Ukraine in a letter they sent demanding documents from the State Department, CIA and Director of National Intelligence.

The key to blowing this up is not with some Barr and Durham report down the line. The key to blowing this up is with you. A great deal has already been revealed, enough to tell you what is going on. No more information is really needed. The question is, what are we going to do to dismantle the nascent surveillance and police state and revive our economy with a President who is willing to do this?

You have the power to overturn all of this provided you reject the event-focused, opinion-based propa-

ganda operations which are meant to profile and cull you. You have the ability to demand the truth based on the type of thinking which our founders employed in founding the republic. It is the Socratic search for truth, looking for the longer-term causes of present events, in both the past and the future, which will save us, and your willingness to act on your discoveries, rather than countenance your fears.



LPAC-TV

Harley Schlanger

Harley Schlanger: As you’ve just heard, we now know an enormous amount about who carried out this coup attempt, and how they did it. But I think to win the fight, we have to go one step further, which is that we have to get at what is the alternative policy orientation that they were trying to stop. That is, what is the intent of the coup-plotters. And to get at that, I want to take a couple of examples, that show the parallels between, as you’ve heard, the parallels between the LaRouche case and the Russiagate case, but in particular, moments of identification of the policy issues that are underlying the fight.

Now, when Lyndon LaRouche passed away in February 2019, Roger Stone was interviewed by Associated Press, and he said he was very familiar with the extraordinary and prophetic thinking of LaRouche. And he added that LaRouche’s ideas had an important backstage role in electing Donald Trump. Now, Roger alluded to this in his comments. I want to give you a couple of examples that are striking, that show what is the underlying policy fight, that Russiagate, Ukraine-gate, the coup against President Trump, actually represents. I’ll start with the 1976 election campaign, when Jimmy Carter was running, and Lyndon LaRouche had his first presidential campaign, and through the period of 1980, when Ronald Reagan defeated Jimmy Carter.

LaRouche made an intervention on Election Eve, and what he did at that time, was attack two things, two aspects of the thinking of the establishment that were being brought in with the Carter Administration:

First, he attacked what was called the Paddock Plan for Mexico. Essentially, this was a Malthusian plan to reduce Mexico's population, along the lines of Henry Kissinger's National Security Study Memorandum 200, which was committed to a radical depopulation of the world's population.

At the time, people didn't realize that [William] Paddock was actually an associate of the person Lyndon LaRouche attacked, namely Zbigniew Brzezinski. Because it was Brzezinski who represented the geopolitical doctrines that were brought in with the Carter Administration, that led to the permanent wars that President Trump is trying to stop. Brzezinski had this idea of the "arc of crisis," which was how to use the Islamic populations, especially radicalized Islamic populations, in the arc that was under the Soviet Union and extended over to China.

And this was the geopolitical doctrine that goes back to the middle of the 19th century, what was called "the Great Game," which became the theory of Halford Mackinder on geopolitics. And that's what Brzezinski represented. And LaRouche, in that half-hour broadcast, expose both the Malthusian intent, and the desire to keep permanent warfare as the major element of U.S. policy.

Now, then let's go ahead to the Reagan campaign: There's a very important discussion that Lyndon LaRouche had with Ronald Reagan at one of the primary events in New Hampshire, and that's when Reagan became familiar, at least the beginning of his familiarity, with LaRouche's thinking. We played a leading role, as has been alluded to, in that fight. We put out a leaflet for mass circulation, entitled, "If You Like Carter, You'll Love Bush." And this had a devastating effect on George H.W. Bush in his campaign.

When Reagan came in, he was committed to the idea of avoiding war. Now, I did an interview with Roger yesterday, which will be out next week, where he talked about Reagan's idea of "peace through strength," so I won't review that here. But what became clear is that LaRouche's idea, of developing an anti-missile defense policy, that not only would protect the United States from incoming missile attack, but could be shared with the Soviet Union, that would eliminate

the desire of either country to launch nuclear strikes, would make nuclear missiles "impotent and obsolete." And this was Ronald Reagan's intent, President Reagan, when he adopted exactly LaRouche's SDI policy.

Now, unknown to virtually anybody at the time, LaRouche had already been deputized by the Reagan Administration to talk with the Soviets about whether they would accept this idea. They didn't. And this was when the "Get LaRouche Task Force" went into full force. The idea that LaRouche had access to President Reagan's policy, that he was involved in shaping internationally, a policy.

Now, combine that with the other issue that LaRouche was involved in in 1982: Dealing with Mexico and the debt crisis. He met with the Mexican President José López Portillo and drafted a program called *Operation Juárez*, which was a definitive attack on what, at the time, was the beginnings of the globalization policy to turn Mexico into a slave-labor encampment for U.S. corporations, while outsourcing U.S. jobs, outsourcing our manufacturing. LaRouche attacked this, and presented an alternative proposal for a reorganized financial system based on the ideas of the American System.

So, his attack on the geopolitics, on Mutual and Assured Destruction, on Brzezinski's "arc of crisis," as well as his commitment not just to defend the people of Mexico, but the entire developing sector from the rapacious looting of the International Monetary Fund and the major banks, this became the element which was the driving force behind the attacks on LaRouche. His commitment to that transformation of the world, from a new British Empire, where colonial regimes now would include advanced sector countries that would be looted, and instead, breaking that power.

Move ahead to the present period, to the 2016 election, I can give you many more examples of LaRouche's policies which were reflected in the campaign initiatives made by President Trump.

For example, this meeting opened with a video clip of Lyndon LaRouche speaking about the importance of a Moon and Mars mission. This has been adopted by President Trump. A very bold plan, to not only move people to the Moon, Americans to the Moon, but also to Mars. And just two days ago, an Atlas V rocket was launched which will take a rover to Mars to do experiments. President Trump has picked up on what John

Kennedy did and what Lyndon LaRouche has always promoted as the “extraterrestrial imperative” for mankind.

And part of this was the revival of scientific and technological optimism against anti-growth green fascism. LaRouche always attacked free trade, going back before NAFTA, to the establishment under GATT of the World Trade Organization, and this became a signature fight for President Trump, especially against Hillary Clinton’s gold standard, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which Trump withdrew the United States from, as soon as he became President.

Like LaRouche, President Trump has called for rebuilding American infrastructure, establishing new platforms of infrastructure, as part of an overall emphasis on reviving manufacturing. And importantly, after the 2008 crash, which Lyndon LaRouche had forecast more than a year earlier, LaRouche called for the restoration of Glass-Steagall. And this was included by President Trump in the Republican Party platform.

And finally, and extremely significantly, from what you’ve heard from both Roger Stone and Bill Binney—and what you just heard from Barbara Boyd on the exposé of the Ukraine coup—LaRouche has always been focussed on attacking those networks in the United States that use regime-change coups, proxy warfare, support for terrorism, and support for the austerity regimes of the International Monetary Fund, to prevent any nation from getting out of line. This including the coup in Libya, that was supported by Hillary Clinton; the Ukraine coup for which Biden was the chief operator of the Obama Administration in carrying out; and the attempted coup in Syria, which included the exposé by Michael Flynn, of U.S. involvement in training and arming Syrian terrorists.

What LaRouche had always advocated was cooperation through dialogue. Isn’t this what President Trump said, when he said, it’s better to be friends with Russia than to fight with them? That we can cooperate, we can work together? And he actually started doing that, with the joint efforts against terrorism in Syria, and then furthermore with the open responses back and forth, between himself and President Putin on arms control, which was the major topic of their discussion at the Helsinki summit, which the media turned into Trump bowing down to Putin, but not challenging him for his role in Russiagate. It turns out, Trump and Putin

were right when Putin said there was no Russian hacking. And all of the media and all the politicians who attacked Trump and Putin were wrong! Have they apologized yet?

Now, as a platform, if you look at these proposals I just mentioned from LaRouche, which are echoed by the Trump campaign and Trump Presidency, they would completely overturn two aspects of the modern world: neo-liberal economic policies, which are designed to create a global casino economy, in which the upper 1% control the house and make the profits, and everyone else is the subject of predatory looting. We see this over and over again, with bubbles created, stock bubbles, derivatives bubbles, funny-money operations. And when they go bad, as in the mortgage-backed securities blowout in 2008, who gets bailed out? The homeowners who were cheated out of their homes, the 8 million or so of those? No. The banks get bailed out and the people are left with the bills.

Now, that’s the neo-liberal order. The other side of this is the geopolitical strategic operation, which includes attacking any nation which doesn’t submit to this policy.

Now, this is what the establishment saw in Trump’s campaign in 2016: a radical break with the policies of George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and a number of other, previous presidencies. In opposition to unilateralism, Trump proposed national sovereignty, and relations between sovereign nations.

The establishment believed Trump had no chance in winning. It turned out they were wrong. And that’s how Russiagate became what corrupt FBI agent Peter Strzok called the “insurance policy”: If they couldn’t beat him at the ballot box, they were going to destroy him, or minimally tie his hands so he could not proceed with an overturning of this global order.

Breaking the forces behind the coup is absolutely essential, but it’s not just exposing the evil and corrupt individuals and their illegal tactics. What we have to do, is pick up on this policy operation, the end of these endless wars, as President Trump continues to stress, is key to what he’s trying to do. And secondly, rebuilding America based on the American System, reviving industry, reviving science and technology, this is what will take us out from under the control of these City of London/Wall Street financial forces, and their military-industrial complex paid operatives, and bring us into a new era in which perfectly sovereign nation-states can

cooperate in developing a world in which poverty is eliminated, disease is brought under control, and man has an opportunity—all men and women of all countries—to explore space.

Thank you for the invitation to participate today.

Closing Statements

Boyd: Sure. As I said before, we're at a stage of extremely decisive battle, which I think Bill correctly characterized in one of our latest meetings as very similar to the Civil War: We will determine in the next months, days, whether government of the people, by the people, and for the people, as Lincoln said, can continue to exist. That's really the issue, and it really is up to the people to mobilize themselves to ensure that that happens.

And as I've said before, the biggest enemy is fear. We have before us an enormous opportunity: Never before has so much of this apparatus, assembled in the wake of Harry Truman assuming the Presidency from Roosevelt, continued in an emphatic point after the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Never before have these people stood so exposed. And the question for all of us, is can we—starting today—mobilize the resources, a great deal of which is just educational material, you know, basically learning what it means to talk about the Constitution, to talk about what our forefathers actually believed, in terms of our economics; to talk about what Hamilton foresaw as the American System of political economy, and to demand nothing less than that level of thinking from our leaders, to not settle for any compromises at this point, which are pragmatic.

With respect to the coup which we've described here, absolutely, the entire apparatus which was involved in this, has to be identified and prosecuted. No deals! And the only people who can make that happen, the only reason why you're talking about a Barr or Durham report, is because the President and those who support him have actually stood their ground, to date! Otherwise, they would have succeeded in covering all of this up!

So, we're at the next stage of the battle and we have to win.

Schlanger: Just to follow up on that—look, fear leads people to pessimism, to sitting on the couch hoping that something will happen, but believing that

nothing will happen. I have so many people communicating with me regularly, who say things like, "It'll never happen." "No one will do it." "They're too powerful."

What Barbara just said: Take that to heart! They're not so powerful, and they're not so smart. They thought they could get away with this, because they thought the President would not fight. They thought the American people would accept the fraud. But as Lyndon LaRouche said right after the election, the election of Donald Trump was not just an American development, it was part of an insurgency worldwide. We saw it with Brexit, we see it with the fight in Italy. I see it here in Germany, with the collapse of all the political parties.

There's a moment where small people can start dreaming big, and acting in big ways. The only way to do that, is to give up the pessimism which is imposed on you! It's not natural! Look, Americans are naturally optimistic, that's why people came out and voted for Donald Trump. They didn't like to be lectured at by Hillary Clinton.

So, if we realize in ourselves, the potential to dream and to think big, we have to bring that out and to inspire that in others. And if we do it, we can save the country.

Binney: Well, I certainly agree with what Barbara and Harley have said. I would just like to add, that turning around this country starts with people. I mean, people don't realize the power they have! If, for example, they simply turned off all the mainstream media and looked elsewhere for their news, and media, and truth, you would never expect it, but the impact would be so great, in terms of their ratings, that they would scramble to try to get back into the goodness of truth and light. And that's what I'd say—otherwise, they'd go out of business.

And look at the *New York Times*, its diminishing circulation. When people turn it off, *they* either turn around, or they die. And that's the whole point of it. And that's how we could turn this whole thing around in this country.

Now, plus: People need to know for sure, that they never had to give up privacy for security! That was never the case. It was a lie from the beginning by those in power in this country, and they used it to gain power over everybody. And it is reversible, it is fixable, it can be fixed easily and without difficulty.

II. Giving Mankind a Sense of Purpose

Persevering in Pursuit of Science: Mars 2020!

by Kesha Rogers

We need to give mankind a sense of purpose, developmental purpose, not only throughout the planet, but through the influence of Earth on the adjoining regions of the Solar system and beyond.


—Lyndon LaRouche

Aug.1—Even in the midst of our greatest challenges and obstacles, humanity shall persevere. In a time of great fear and uncertainty, in the midst of political upheaval and unrest, a great moment of inspiration and optimism can arise that transforms little people into great leaders and inspires generations.

In the month of July 2020, three nations have launched inspiring missions to our closest neighbor planet, Mars, to seek answers to some of the most challenging questions perplexing humanity. Was there once life on Mars? If so, what does that mean for life elsewhere in the universe? How was our Solar system formed? What can Mars tell us about our own planet? Did life on Mars and Earth coexist 3 billion years ago?

The three daring missions that have ventured out to the Red Planet include the United Arab Emirates' *Al Amal* ("Hope") mission, which launched aboard a Japanese rocket; China's *Tianwen-1* ("Ask Heaven Questions") mission; and the United States of America's Mars 2020 *Perseverance* mission.

All three of these missions are now heading toward Mars and will deeply transform our understanding of the planet when they arrive in the Spring of 2021, after traveling through space for the next 6 to 7 months. The United Arab Emirates' *Al Amal* mission is designed to map out the entire Martian atmosphere for the first time



NASA/JPL-Caltech

A depiction of NASA's }Perseverance rover operating on the surface of Mars. Launched on July 30, 2020, Perseverance will land on the Red Planet on February 18, 2021.

ever. China has launched a three-pronged mission consisting, for the first time, of an orbiter, a lander, and a rover; it will land in Mars' Utopia Planitia. The scientific objectives of China's *Tianwen-1* mission include mapping the morphology and geological structure of Mars, investigating the surface soil characteristics and water-ice distribution, and measuring the electromagnetic, gravitational, and internal structure.

Perseverance was the name selected from among 28,000 essay entries. The winner of the essay contest was a young seventh-grader named Alexander Mather. He wrote: "Curiosity, Insight, Spirit, Opportunity, if you think about it all of these names of past Mars rovers are qualities we possess as humans. We are always curious, and seek opportunity. We have the spirit and insight to explore the Moon, Mars and beyond. But, if rovers are to be the qualities of us as a race, we miss the most important thing, Perseverance."

Perseverance was certainly the driving force in conquering the challenges of meeting the goal of exploring

Mars. We have overcome many obstacles, and have already seen astonishingly great achievements, but we have many miles to go.

As reported on the website of the Mars 2020 team at the Jet Propulsion Lab, “Because of the Coronavirus pandemic the months leading up to the launch in particular have required creative problem solving, team work, and determination.” When we put our creative minds to it, there are no problems we cannot solve and no obstacles we can’t overcome. “With the launch of *Perseverance*, we begin another historic mission of exploration,” said NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine. “This amazing explorer’s journey has already required the very best from all of us to get it to launch through these challenging times. Now we can look forward to its incredible science and to bringing samples of Mars home even as we advance human missions to the Red Planet. As a mission, as an agency, and as a country, we will persevere.”

Perseverance, the Mars 2020 rover, was launched successfully on July 30 aboard the United Launch Alliance’s mighty Atlas V rocket from Pad 41 at Cape Canaveral in Florida, carrying with it *Ingenuity*, the 4-pound helicopter that will demonstrate powered flight on Mars for the first time. You will learn more about this exciting mission in the article by Marsha Freeman in this issue.

The *Perseverance* rover is a robotic mission weighing nearly 2,260 pounds—about the size of a small SUV. The rover’s astrobiology mission will land at Jezero Crater when it reaches Mars in February 2021. In search for signs of past microbial life, it will collect samples for a future return mission to Earth, and will pave the way for human exploration of Mars.

Perseverance stands on the shoulders of its predecessor *Curiosity*, the Mars Science Laboratory launched aboard an Atlas V rocket in 2011 that landed in Gale Crater. *Curiosity* has made some spectacular findings on the red planet, most notably that it is a “gray planet,” meaning it now has rocks made from clays created by persistent liquid water in the form of rivers, lakes and oceans. *Curiosity* also found evidence of the organic chemistry needed to support living microbes, such as sulphur, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and carbon, as well as signs of active methane in the Martian atmosphere.

With its arrival at Mars, scheduled for February of 2021, *Perseverance* will continue to build upon the findings of *Curiosity* and other Mars missions in a remarkable way. Equipped with seven instruments, *Per-*

severance will seek to answer one of the key questions of astrobiology: Are there biosignatures that life once existed on Mars? *Perseverance* is equipped with amazing cameras and other instruments that will allow for precision landings and hazard avoidance capability. One of the most challenging parts of the mission is the autonomous entry, descent and landing of the rover onto the Martian surface. Instruments onboard the rover will allow it to touch down on its target landing spot, while avoiding hazardous areas.

The landing spot chosen for *Perseverance* is a 28-mile-wide crater named Jezero. Sometime between 3 billion and 4 billion years ago at Jezero, a river flowed into a body of water the size of Lake Tahoe. Jezero Crater is located in the largest basin on Mars. The mission will collect important data about Martian geology and climate. For the first time, the United States will attempt a very daring and complex, multifaceted, Mars sample return mission, which will be a joint mission between NASA and the European Space Agency (ESA) to get the samples to an orbiter for return to Earth.

The Mars 2020 *Perseverance* rover mission is part of a larger program that includes missions to the Moon as a way to prepare for human exploration of the Red Planet. One of the most extraordinary instruments on the Mars 2020 mission is called MOXI, the Mars oxygen in situ resource and utilization experiment. As with most of the instruments, MOXI will help answer the questions of astrobiology and prepare the way for future human missions. MOXI was designed by a company called AirSquared. The instrument will demonstrate the possibility of turning carbon dioxide on Mars into oxygen, to be used for life support and fuel.

The world now has three missions navigating through the Solar system on their way to Mars to make fundamental discoveries about the Universe and prepare the way for humanity to fulfill its extraterrestrial imperative in the Solar system.

In 2024, overcoming all obstacles, America will land the first woman and the next man on the Moon with the Artemis Program. In the very near future, we will witness the vision of the great space pioneers fully realized with the development of permanent settlements on the Moon and Mars, as we fully unleash the concept of an open world system, as Krafft Ehrlicke and Lyndon LaRouche fully envisioned, on behalf of the common aims of mankind, where there are no limitations to growth and we truly give humanity a sense of developmental purpose.

Ingenuity: The First Flying Machine on Mars

by Marsha Freeman

Aug. 2—NASA's *Perseverance* rover is on its way to Mars. Attached to the belly of the rover is a tiny, four pound, gangly-looking helicopter named *Ingenuity*.

The span of the rotor system is about four feet, out of proportion to the size of the body of the machine, which is what accounts for its odd appearance. Mars' atmosphere is only one hundredth the density of the Earth's, so the rotor blades have to be bigger to give the helicopter enough lift to fly. The blades also have to rotate incredibly fast for the same reason, spinning at about 2,400 revolutions per minute.

An extremely thin atmosphere is not the only challenge for a powered vehicle on the red planet Mars; it can virtually disappear from sight during global dust storms which are more prevalent in the Spring.

Since Martian conditions cannot be replicated on Earth with a high degree of accuracy, scientists have depended upon the massive amount of data that has been collected by orbiting satellites and rovers about Mars' weather and climate, so as to enable the miniature helicopter to try out new technology, which will increase its chances of success. Due to the communication time-lag between the Earth and Mars, *Ingenuity* is designed to operate autonomously.

Over the years, there have been numerous proposals to test a powered flight vehicle on Mars. (The most interesting proposal was to have an airplane land on Mars on the 100th anniversary of the demonstration of powered flight on Earth.) Unlike unpowered aerial machines such as balloons or gliders, which can only drift in the direction that the wind sends them, a powered vehicle could be directed to travel in a specific direction, with a specific destination. This would add qualitatively new capabilities to unmanned missions to Mars.

Flying vehicles, equipped with cameras as well as suites of scientific instruments, could explore places where rovers and people could not go and which are not



NASA/JPL-Caltech

In this artist's sketch, NASA's Mars helicopter Ingenuity is shown on the Red Planet's surface, deployed from the Perseverance rover, partially visible on the left.

seen clearly from orbit—such as the inside of polar craters in which there is evidence of caches of water ice. Mars has some of the most dramatic geological features in the Solar System, notably the largest volcano and a canyon as long as the distance from New York to California. The photographs from orbit show the largest features, while the rovers have revealed Mars in exquisite detail. *Ingenuity*, and the follow-on flying machines on Mars, will provide a literal “bird’s eye view” for the region between satellite orbit and ground, up to a few hundred feet above the surface of Mars.

This mission of *Ingenuity* is just the first step. It is purely a technology demonstration mission and carries no scientific instruments. Mission managers stress that *Ingenuity* has nothing to do with *Perseverance*'s science mission.

Ingenuity will not hit the ground running when *Perseverance* lands on Mars. It has to demonstrate its ability to carry out a list of activities. Then it will attempt its first flight. If it succeeds, the *Ingenuity* team will attempt up to four more test flights.

“We’ll be learning all along,” says *Ingenuity*'s project manager, MiMi Aung. “It will be the ultimate reward for our team to add another dimension to the way we explore other worlds in the future.”

III. Empire, Oligarchy and War

The World Must Distance Itself from Pompeo's Warpath Against China!

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Aug. 1—In a bloodcurdling speech entitled, “Communist China and the Future of the Free World” at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library in Yorba Linda, California, on July 23, U.S. Secretary of State Michael Pompeo asked for nothing less than a complete break with China and the creation of an international anti-China alliance, with the clear intention of bringing about a regime change in Beijing. If the world has learned anything from the prehistory of the two world wars of the 20th century, then it is the realization that such a systematic construction of an enemy image is always part of an urgent war preparation. All peace-loving forces around the world—including the United States itself—must counter this danger before it is too late.

The fact that Pompeo chose this place for his speech, in which he pompously asserted that Nixon's policy towards China, put in place in 1971, had failed, is a vivid expression of Pompeo's habit of trying to wrestle historical truths to the ground, just as he does with party colleagues, allies, and opponents alike. He claimed that Nixon was right when he wrote in 1967 that “the world cannot be safe until China changes.” Chas Freeman, who accompanied Nixon on his historic China visit as a translator in 1972, corrected Pompeo, who had misrepresented what Nixon wrote in *Foreign Affairs* in 1967, because Nixon also wrote, “we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations.”



DoS/Ron Przysucha
*Secretary of State Michael Pompeo,
speaking at the Nixon Presidential Library,
July 23, 2020.*

In fact, Nixon's goal was not to change the political system in China, but to strengthen China's international position in the face of deteriorating relations between the Soviet Union and China. When Kissinger arrived in July 1971 in China—a country that was still suffering from the turmoil of the Gang of Four—to prepare the journey of the deeply anti-communist Nixon the following year, China still considered the United States a “paper tiger,” and it would take until 1979, three years after the end of the Cultural Revolution, for the United States and China to establish diplomatic relations.

It was only with China's admission to the WTO in 2001 that there was the explicit intention that China would gradually adopt the

“Western” liberal economic and political system as well, if it were to integrate into global commerce.

This, however, was never the intention of China which, although it used the policy of reform and opening-up to place economic policy on a basis of permanent innovation—China is now the country with the most patent applications worldwide—it remained politically and culturally committed to the traditions of its 5000-year-old history. Travelers in China can see the carefully restored monuments of various eras—from the Great Wall to pagodas, Confucius statues, and palaces, to Buddhist temples—everywhere. China's is a completely different culture from that of the USA and Europe, and its “socialism with Chinese characteris-



NARA/Byron E. Schumaker

President Richard Nixon made his historic visit to China in 1972. Here, President Nixon and First Lady Pat Nixon visit the Great Wall.

tics” has practically nothing to do with communism such as was practiced in the Soviet Union or the GDR, but rather reflects the continuous, 2000-year tradition of Confucianism.

The Chinese Communist Party is therefore not an elite club like the transatlantic establishment, which consists of the boardrooms of the City of London, Wall Street, the DAX 500 companies, “Inside the Beltway,” or the EU bureaucracy—but instead the party has 93 million members and is based on the principle of meritocracy. Well over 90 percent of the population have confidence in the government, thanks not least to the fact that more than 850 million people have been lifted out of poverty in the past few decades, and that Xi Jinping’s motto—that protecting human life is the first priority—has just been proven in the fight against the coronavirus pandemic.

In view of the historical and cultural situation in China, Pompeo’s “Nixon speech” seems like the proverbial appearance of the “the bull(y) in the China shop”: “Changing the CCP’s behavior cannot be the mission of the Chinese people alone ... To quote


scripture, I ask is ‘our spirit willing but our flesh weak’?... Securing our freedoms from the Chinese Communist Party is the mission of our time,” Pompeo continued.

This open call for regime change in Beijing and the creation of an international anti-China alliance is not only dangerously close to a declaration of war. When the foreign minister of the strongest military power refers to Scripture as a motivation for his policies, the alarm bells should sound. In a speech at the “God and Country Rally” in 2015, Pompeo expressly said that he was working towards a biblical rapture. For this type of evangelical fundamentalism, the Armageddon assumption is part of the belief structure. It is the notion that in the “end times,” all True Believers will be lifted up to heaven, while the rest of the world will perish.

On the other hand, Pompeo admitted, in a discussion at Texas A&M University, that as CIA director he advocated the philosophy: “We lied, we cheated, we stole. We had entire training courses. It reminds you of the glory of the American experiment.” So with Pompeo, you can never be sure whether he really accepts an Armageddon as a result of his policy, or whether he has just lied again. But in the case of Elmer Gantry, one didn’t really know either, until the



DoD/Marvin Lynchard



White House/D. Myles Cullen



CC/Gage Skidmore

Left to right: Mark Esper, Secretary of Defense; Peter Navarro, National Defense Production Act policy coordinator; and Steve Bannon, former White House Chief Strategist.

bitter end. One thing is clear: Pompeo contributed to the fact that the lies about Russiagate could be continued for three years, by suppressing the forensic evidence that Bill Binney presented to him in 2017 that there was no Russian hacking.

In any case, the tirades against China by the Pomeos, Espers, Navarros, and Bannons that surround

President Trump and the mainstream media, have a dangerous effect on the views of the American people. According to a study by the Pew Research Center, three quarters of all Americans now believe that China is responsible for the worldwide spread of the corona virus, and over 60 percent believe that China has reacted poorly to this outbreak. By contrast, there is a widespread consensus among medical scientists and doctors internationally that China has set new standards in combatting pandemics.

While President Trump had often expressed respect for China and admiration for Chinese culture, and spoke of “my friend Xi Jinping” at the beginning of his term, the tone in the military establishment changed more recently with the “National Defense Strategy” of 2018, which termed China a strategic competitor and a revisionist power.

Now it is being portrayed as an opponent, enemy, and greatest threat. The reason was not something in Chinese politics that would justify this, but rather the rapid economic growth of China, and the obvious attractiveness of the Chinese model, which China has offered to developing countries with its “Belt and Road Initiative,” the new Silk Road. President Xi and other government officials have stressed in countless speeches that it was not their intention to replace the United States as a hegemonic power, but that China was striving for a partnership based on respect for sovereignty and for the various social systems.

When it became clear from March of this year at the latest, that China not only knew how to contain the pandemic much better than the United States (and most other western countries), but was also the only country to once again achieve positive economic growth, the attacks escalated. Starting with former MI6 chiefs Sir Richard Dearlove and John Sawers, and then the whole neocon chorus in the Trump administration, China was declared ever more vociferously to be re-



public domain/Domusrulez

Sir Richard Dearlove, KCMG, OBE, Chief of MI6, 1999-2004.

sponsible for the spread of the pandemic; the London-based Henry Jackson Society even had the presumption to demand \$9 trillion in damages from China. A Republican Party election strategy paper recommends that Senate candidates not defend Trump, but hold China responsible for the pandemic.

Unsurprisingly, the tone of the Chinese reaction has sharpened dramatically. Various articles warned that the mistakes of the 1910s and 1930s should not be repeated, and that China had to expand its nuclear arsenal as the only means that could limit American arrogance.

It must be clear to every thinking person that the future of the whole world will depend largely on whether the United States responds to China’s inevitable rise by hopelessly trying to stop this development, which can only lead to World War III, or whether it will bring together the two largest

economies in the world, to work together with the rest of the world to tackle major challenges such as the pandemic, economic crisis, world hunger and poverty. The dangerous hate campaign of Pompeo against China must be rebuffed.



UN/Evan Schneider

Sir John Sawers, GCMG, Chief of MI6, 2009-2014.

The Battle Before Us

by Susan Kokinda

The following is an edited transcript of a presentation delivered on July 28.

July 28—The [press conference](#) last week with Bill Binney, former NSA Technical Director, certainly upped the ante, but the enemy is also upping the ante. I think the other more substantive reason that the globalists, and in particular the British, are accelerating their drive to create extraordinary conflict between the United States, on the one hand, and Russia and China on the other, is that in probably two months, there is the potential of a summit meeting, which if we do our job, could be the first step in ending the British empire and the British imperial system.

In the beginning of January, Russian President Vladimir Putin put forward a proposal for a summit of the permanent five members of the UN Security Council. As of now, including as of a discussion between President Putin and President Trump last week, the agenda for that summit is under discussion. In other words, we could have, sitting in the same room, in about two months, President Trump, President Putin, China's President Xi, UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson, and President Macron of France.

As Lyndon LaRouche declared over twenty years ago, the combination of the United States, Russia and China is the indispensable combination needed, having the power—the economic power, the geographical power, and the military power—if those three nations were to come to an accord on shutting down the current bankrupt financial system and announcing the initial steps for a new one, a new Bretton Woods. And that would be it for the British Imperial


system. That would be it for globalization.

That British Imperial power is willing to risk the danger of confrontation between the United States, Russia, and China. Donald Trump doesn't want war. A lot of people in his administration, whether they want war or not, they certainly want conflict. So as long as Donald Trump is President, I don't think we will have war by design. But under these kinds of circumstances, there are those in China and Russia who are making parallels between the period between World War I and World War II which could lead to global conflict.

I want to take a minute to walk people through the actual causes of the wars in the 20th century, and frankly almost every other war, to understand why the globalists—why the enemy—is so terrified of a combination of the leaders of these nations, especially the United States, Russia and China, coming together with an economic policy based on the principles Lyndon LaRouche fought for his whole life, and which was developed out of the American System which was cre-

ated by our founding fathers, in particular Alexander Hamilton.

Every war in the past hundred and thirty years has been a result of the British Empire's fear that the ideas of Alexander Hamilton, of the American Revolution and the American economic system could become the basis for sovereign nations to establish policies that would ensure economic development and peace, that would allow nations to protect and defend their people and their economies from our common enemy, which is this financial parasite. At the time of the American Revolution, this parasite was known as the British East



From a painting of Alexander Hamilton by John Trumbull, c. 1804.

India Company and the Dutch East India Company.

Today, it takes the form of a conglomeration of very powerful international financial institutions—the central banks, the major financial investment houses in the world, groups like BlackRock, the largest hedge fund in the world, which unfortunately is managing the disbursement of funds to businesses in the United States during the COVID-19 crisis. But that is the British Imperial system. It has used its control of money and it has used the instigation of wars over the past two hundred years, to destroy any nation or combination of nations that might adopt American System policies, especially those nations that might come together in an alliance to adopt these policies such that the British Imperial system could be dismantled and defeated once and forever.

The American System of Development

I want to return to Bill Binney for a moment because it was about a week ago that he was in a discussion in a [town hall](#) meeting and he made a comparison of the



BlackRock headquarters in Midtown Manhattan, New York City.

CC/Americasroof

crisis of today to President Abraham Lincoln's address at the Gettysburg battlefield. Binney raised the question of whether "a nation of, by, and for the people" was going to survive. I think that's extremely important, for people to take their minds back to the United States at the time of the Civil War and what Abraham Lincoln was combatting and what he was able to accomplish.

Lincoln understood that the issue of the Civil War was not slavery. He understood very clearly—Frederick Douglass recognized this as well—that if we did not preserve the Union you


would never get rid of slavery. First and foremost, it was necessary to defend and save the Union, to defend and save and protect the Constitution of the United States, the constitutional institutions of the United States. Lincoln fought in that way and we won!

It was nothing less than a miracle that the United States came out of the Civil War not only intact, but strengthened. During the Civil War, Lincoln began a revival of the American System of political economy. He launched the transcontinental railroad; he launched the




LoC

During the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln began a revival of the American System of political economy. Shown is the Transcontinental Railroad under construction near Castle Rock, Colorado Territory.



Hulton Archive




America demonstrates its industrial and technological breakthroughs at its Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. Here, the giant Corliss Steam Engine.

land grant colleges; he established the greenback, which was a way of using federally directed credit—bypassing the grip of the private speculators—and pumping credit directly into key areas of the economy. Lincoln did all this in the midst of a civil war!

Lincoln was assassinated in 1865, but despite that, the policies that he set in motion created an economic powerhouse, later advanced by President Ulysses Grant and then by President William McKinley. The United States became the envy of the world, with its industrial revolution, railroad building, and infrastructure policies. People wanted to replicate the American System, and in some cases we sent engineers and economists to other countries; in other cases, they came to the United States.

One of the singular moments was the 1876 Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia. People from all over the world, including heads of state, came to that exhibition. Each state of the Union had its own pavilion, showcasing its most important industrial and technological breakthroughs. People looked at this



Lincoln advisor and American System economist, Henry C. Carey, in a photo by Frederick Gutekunst, c. 1865.

and said we want to have the policy that allowed you to do this. That policy, encapsulated and advanced in LaRouche's [Four Laws](#), involves the primary conception that the primary asset to grow in an economy is not money, but human creativity, increasing productivity, and thereby increasing that economy's ability to sustain more people at an increasingly better standard of living.

That is the essence of the American System. It used a Hamiltonian national bank to direct the credit where it was needed; it used greenbacks during the Lincoln Administration to direct credit; it used the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under Franklin Roosevelt to direct credit. We could use the Defense Production Act today as a sort of temporary first step. We could use the International Development Finance Corporation which, Trump said, in an executive order, could be used to make loans, not only internationally, which was the original intent, but you can make loans here in the United States to fight the pandemic and rebuild our economy. These are institutions of the American System, which has as its purpose increasing the general welfare of the nation and its posterity, which means durable, tangible scientific and physical economic growth.

The Power of Creative Citizens

It is truly amazing the extent to which other countries not only wanted to model themselves on the American System, but did adopt and implement that system. Take even one of these countries and look at the history of its American System policies. Whether it be Germany, France, Russia, Japan, and a little bit later, at the turn of the century, China under the influence of Sun Yat Sen, all these nations explicitly went to the writings and ideas of Alexander Hamilton, and of Abraham Lincoln's economic advisor

sor Henry C. Carey.

The American System policies were the policies that guided each one of these countries into a semblance of a modern economy. Sun Yat Sen, the father of modern China from the beginning of the 20th century, was an

explicit, conscious Hamiltonian. Americans need to study his life and works. His Three Principles of the People were based on Lincoln's "Of, By, and For the People." How did he find out about this? He was raised by Christian missionaries in Hawaii. That's how. Similarly, for years, the economic adviser to the last Czar of Russia—who was overthrown, I suspect, in a British operation—was Count Sergei Witte, an explicit, conscious Hamiltonian.

Put yourself in the shoes of an imperial elite. How have you ruled for centuries? And in fact, for millennia? Go back to the days of the Roman Empire, go back to Persia, go back to Sparta, go back to Babylon. Rule by keeping the population backward and stupid. Rule by having them fight each other. Little in the way of new wealth is created. Instead, wars are conducted to invade other lands to steal that which has been created there. Power is maintained through an enforced backwardness of your population, the power to loot and steal and, of course, the military power that goes with that.

Stop and think for a moment what challenges that method of rule. What if a population becomes educated? What happens when a population is armed with the knowledge of that which differentiates them from the beasts? Certainly, the question of slavery is a classic question of the British Empire, or any imperial system. A few weeks ago, we had a wonderful discussion with Bob Ingraham, on the fact that slavery is a function of empire. It is not a function of white racist founding fathers in the United States. What challenges that empire is a population confident in the uniqueness and dignity and power of the human mind to understand universal principles, to act on those principles, to improve dominion over Nature and to wittingly provide a better future for its children and their grandchildren—and their nations and their societies and their civilizations.

That is the essence of the American System. The American System is not a recipe of a national bank, Glass-Steagall, a credit system, and then some nice big projects. That is not the American System. At the core



National Archives

The signing of the peace terms ending World War I in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, France, June 28, 1919.

of the American System is the fundamental distinction between man in the image of a creator—however man may worship that creator—and man as an animal.

The only way the British imperial system is able to rule is by keeping people in a state of mind as if they were animals—not being able to think through universal principles, not being able to understand what actions need to be taken to make a better future. People want to have a better future for their children and grandchildren, but we've failed pretty miserably for the past 45 years. Unlike when I grew up, when most of us assumed our children would have a better life than we did; that's no longer the case. And that was even before the pandemic hit.

People have not mastered the ideas whereby they can make their decisions and knowably and successfully ensure the outcome in the future they desire. That really is the essence of the American System. That power to think is what the British really fear. That's why every empire is afraid of this. And that's why we have had 130 years of almost perpetual war on this planet, run by the British Empire to prevent nations from carrying out the kinds of economic and cultural policies—and for that matter foreign policies—which would allow them to become strong and prosperous. The main weapon the British have used for the past 130 years has been war.

British Manipulations

Before the outbreak of World War I, Japan was pitted against China. Russia was pitted against Japan. Then there was the outbreak of World War I, in which the nations of Europe that were going with the American System, Russia and Germany, were pitted against each other, with the British playing the critical role in the background.

What was the outgrowth of World War I? This is something President Putin recently identified in the [article](#) he wrote on the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II. The outgrowth of World War I was the Versailles Treaty which imposed upon Germany unpayable war reparations that destroyed the nation of Germany and fueled the rise of what became the fascist movement. And Putin was very explicit that the Versailles reparations were one of the major contributing reasons for the rise of Hitler and ultimately World War II.

Putin also identified the support for fascist ideologies among the aristocrats and political establishments in the west. World War II, perhaps, didn't turn out quite the way the British elites intended, but ultimately it served its purpose, because it ensured that otherwise natural allies ended up fighting each other again, and that nations that had been at the forefront of American System ideas came under attack or were pitted against each other. Remember the nations that were going with the American system: Russia, Germany, Japan, China—among the major ones.

What happened immediately after World War II? President Franklin Roosevelt intended for the major powers, the United States, Russia, and China, to come together as sovereign nations, despite our differences, our different political systems. China was still in flux, Russia was communist, but Roosevelt believed, correctly, that these nations could come together against the common enemy, namely the British imperial system.

But Roosevelt died. The Bretton Woods system that was set up had enough of Roosevelt's original intention in it that it served the world, at least the northern hemisphere, well, until 1971. It protected the economic sovereignty of nations. In Europe, in Japan, in the western hemisphere, there was real growth. But not in the former colonial countries because that is the part of Roosevelt's dream that was cut short by his death in 1945. But you see in Roosevelt's vision again what the enemy is afraid of. They are afraid of any combination



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon LaRouche delivers the keynote at an ICLC/Schiller Institute Presidents' Day Conference, Reston, Virginia, February 17, 2001.

of sovereign nations coming together to develop themselves using American System policies.

LaRouche Revives America's Mission

The consciousness of this intention went to sleep for a couple of decades after World War II, except in the mind of one person, namely Lyndon LaRouche. Perhaps there are others, but we know the history of Lyndon LaRouche best. At the end of World War II, LaRouche adopted a personal mission to finish the job that Roosevelt had intended, to defeat the empires and pursue policies of genuine economic development. He devoted his life to studying, to devising, to putting forward policies for nations, especially our own, but perhaps equally so for many nations.

How do you take these principles and put them to work in an economic system, such that each nation is protected from these financial parasites, such that each nation is organized around these principles of economic development and the lifting up of all of its people—not “equalization” by shoving everybody down to the same level, but by making the pie grow and lifting up all people?

This is why LaRouche was so seriously targeted, by the FBI, by the CIA, by British Intelligence, by Henry Kissinger, by Robert Mueller, throughout his life, because he was reviving something that was very very dangerous to the oligarchy: A conception of Man and economic policies that can finally defeat the British imperial system.

We don't have to go through the history of every war. Simply think about the British geopolitical machinations for 130 years, all in fear of the American System, which was put on even more scientific terms by Lyndon LaRouche. That is why the British Empire will be so reckless as to inflame tensions between the superpowers that could lead to thermonuclear war. This is where the war danger comes from, not by a conscious intention of the leaders of those countries, even though we do have problems here in the United States.

How can we stop this? There's no use going around saying "Don't go to war." That doesn't work, never has. War is stopped by understanding who is provoking it and what they fear and making that understanding widely known. The warmongers fear that their economic and financial power will be taken away on an international scale by LaRouche's New Bretton Woods international agreement, and be taken away here, in the U.S.A., by Donald Trump going forward with a version of LaRouche's Four Laws: a huge infrastructure program, moving on Glass-Steagall, as he discussed in the election campaign, and an even bigger space program than we already have, or a more elabo-


rated one. This is what they're afraid of.

Unless people have a clear understanding of who the enemy is, we are in trouble. Your enemy is not some woolly-headed socialist, or the even more dangerous delusion of thinking your enemy is China or Russia. Your real enemy is sitting in the shadows, as it has been for over 100 years, pulling the puppet strings to try and maintain its power over this planet. And its power at this point demands the destruction of nations, the massive destruction of populations. Famine and disease are doing a very good job of this right now in terms of depopulation.

So, the question of how we fight and who we fight is not to simply "hold the current ground." The question is, are we finally going to achieve what our Founding Fathers intended, not just for this nation, but for every nation on this planet, and defeat the evil of empire once and for all? Or are they going to drag mankind into a horror beyond anything ever seen before? In political terms all one has to do is imagine a Joe Biden-Susan Rice administration as one example of the nightmare. But the way to defeat this is not to think in terms of electoral calendars or partisan politics, per se, but rather on the field of battle as we've defined it here.

LYNDON LAROUCHE Collected Works, Volume I

This first volume of the Lyndon LaRouche Collected Works contains four of LaRouche's most important and influential works on the subject of physical economy:



- *So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics?*
- *There Are No Limits to Growth*
- *The Science of Christian Economy*
- *The Dialogue of Eurasian Civilizations: Earth's Next Fifty Years*

So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics? was first published in 1984 and has become the single most translated of LaRouche's books.

There Are No Limits to Growth first appeared in 1983 as a direct response to the Club of Rome's *The Limits to Growth*, thoroughly refuting the latter's unscientific Malthusian argument, which underlies the "green" environmentalist movement today.

The Science of Christian Economy (1991) is a groundbreaking study written by Mr. LaRouche during the five-year period he was unjustly incarcerated as a political prisoner in significant measure for the arguments he sets forth in this book.

The Dialogue of Eurasian Civilizations: Earth's Next Fifty Years (2004) follows in the footsteps of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa to establish the scientific, cultural, and theological basis for a true dialogue of civilizations, in order to successfully address the existential crises facing humanity today.

\$50

* At this time we are only able to ship to locations in the United States via our online store. Please contact us directly for inquiries about international orders: info@larouchelegacyfoundation.org.

THE FIGHT OF FREEDOM OVER EMPIRE

Aeschylus' *The Persians*

A review of The Persians by Aeschylus, produced by the National Theater of Greece, July 25, 2020, directed by Dimitris Lignadis.

by Dean Andromidas

July 31—In these times in which pandemic and potential geopolitical wars present us with personal challenges, an important international event took place on the evening of July 25 in the famous, ancient theater of Epidaurus, in the Peloponnese, Greece. For the first time ever, a performance of Aeschylus' *The Persians* was live-streamed on the worldwide web and available to an audience comprising the entire planet, giving everyone the opportunity to witness this powerful performance of the famous tragedy depicting the fight between freedom and empire. This author had the amazing opportunity to view the livestream of this event.

The performance was part of the annual Epidaurus festival, where Greek tragedies are performed at the ancient site, the Sanctuary of Asclepius, the ancient Greek god of healing. Because the COVID-19 crisis prevented the usual thousands from coming from all over Greece and around the world to the festival, it was decided to live-stream it and “invite the entire planet free of charge,” as director Dimitris Lignadis told the online audience at the opening of the event. Given the challenge to mankind posed by the pandemic, it was seen as very appropriate to perform this particular tragedy, especially in a venue sacred to the god of healing. The President of the Hellenic Republic attended the event. The performance was held under strict distancing rules, such that only 46% of the 10,000 seats were filled.



National Theatre of Greece

Queen Atossa and the ghost of her deceased husband Darius, in a scene from Aeschylus's play The Persians.

The Persians is among the earliest of Greek tragedies, first produced in 472 B.C. It tells the story of the Battle of Salamis in 480 B.C., in the second attempt by Persia to invade and subjugate Greece, in which a much smaller Greek fleet devastated a huge Persian fleet comprising contingents from throughout the Persian Empire. Aeschylus himself fought in the battle. He was also a veteran of the Battle of Marathon, in the first Persian invasion a decade earlier. Aeschylus

chose to set the play at the Tomb of Darius in the Persian capital of Susa, where the Queen and the Chorus of Elders, the latter the royal guards of the palace, hear a messenger report the defeat of Emperor Xerxes. The tragedian chose the setting, not only to more dra-



National Theatre of Greece

The Chorus of Elders laments the defeat of the mighty Xerxes at the hands of the Greeks.

matically render the magnitude of the Persian defeat, but more important, the cause of that defeat in the over-reaching arrogance of oligarchy and its infamy in seeking power through the enslavement of mankind.

There is a constant dialogue between the Queen, later joined by Xerxes, on the one side, who represent the personalities of the Persian Empire, and the Chorus which, as Guards of the Palace represent the State, and therefore the people—bring out the failings of oligarchical rule and the inevitable collapse of the empire.

Performed in modern Greek with English subtitles, the performance was extremely well done. One could see the powerful effect on the 4,500 people in the theater. At one point, Queen Atossa demands that the Chorus of Elders tell her, “Who is the Monarch who rules over the Hellenes?” The reply to her is, “Of no man are they called slaves, they obey no man’s orders.” The entire audience broke into a spontaneous cheer.



National Theatre of Greece

Queen Atossa, the mother of Xerxes, after receiving the news of the disaster that has befallen her son’s troops.

The audience gave a second cheer as the Greek fleet of 300 triremes were boldly attacking the 1,200-ship Persian-led fleet. The Greeks had attacked in powerful formation, shouting in one voice: “Liberate your country, liberate your children, your women, the seats of your fathers’ gods, and the tombs of your forebears: now is the struggle for all things.”

As important as the fight between Freedom and Empire, Aeschylus also demonstrates how empires are brought down by their own arrogant hubris, as

seen in Xerxes’ return in utter disgrace, his pleas for sympathy demonstratively rejected by the Chorus itself. Aeschylus wrote the play as a warning to his own countryman, not to turn their own victory into a cause to adopt the same arrogant hubris which they had so bravely defeated. The question of arrogant hubris is a crucial factor in today’s strategic crisis, as witnessed by the attacks against China by the living ghost of the British Empire, and by the financial oligarchy’s ongoing effort at crushing humanity.



National Theatre of Greece

Empires are always brought down by their own arrogant hubris. Here, after his defeat at Salamis, Xerxes returns in utter disgrace. His pleas for sympathy are rejected by the Chorus.

American and European Banks, Not the BRI, Are the Culprit In Malaysia's Corruption Scandal

by Hussein Askary

July 30—Finding any evidence of China's involvement in corruption scandals in developing countries—such as the case of Malaysia, with which we deal here—is as hard as finding evidence of Iraq's alleged weapons of mass destruction, which accusation led to the invasion of Iraq by the United States and Britain in 2003 and has resulted in the death of 1.5 million Iraqis so far. Nevertheless, most American and European think tanks and news media posted articles and reports in 2018 and 2019 with headlines asserting that China and the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) are the causes of Malaysia's corruption and financial woes.

Like every other case I have investigated of allegations thrown at China for causing “debt-traps” and corruption through investing in large-scale infrastructure projects in developing countries, this case shows that all these allegations are unfounded propaganda diatribes whose only objective is to throw a monkey wrench into the BRI machinery. Fortunately, these attempts did not work in Sri Lanka, Pakistan, and Djibouti, which countries have continued to actively co-operate with China. It did not function this time either.

As opposed to the media propaganda, the official investigations have shown that American and European banks (and their friends in Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates) are the key co-conspirators with former Prime Minister Najib Razak in the historical corruption case involving the embezzlement of public funds from 1Malaysia Development Berhad (1MDB), a Malaysian investment fund. Najib was found guilty on all seven counts in the High Court of Malaysia on July 28, with more trials to come on related charges. His American and other partners will be forced to pay back historically large sums to the Malaysian state, as described below.

Looking at the facts of the Chinese BRI projects blamed for the scandal, a simple fact-check shows that these projects have absolutely no connection to 1MDB.

The BRI projects were bilateral joint ventures, partially financed by China, not 1MDB. Otherwise, China has a firm policy that trade, investment, and diplomatic relations with foreign nations will not include any interference in their internal affairs.

Repeating Lies Does Not Make Them Truths

One technique that has been used in Europe and America over the past decades is to repeat lies over and over, gradually turning them into “facts” in the minds of observers. These fake “facts” take hold and become “truths” when repeated by “respected” think tanks, aca-



CC/WEF/swiss-image.ch/Michael Wuertenberg

Former Malaysian Prime Minister Najib Razak, found guilty of embezzlement of public funds from 1Malaysia Development Berhad, with the collusion of Goldman Sachs.

demic institutions and well-known media. The observers are unable or are not interested in checking the facts presented there, since it is considered a sin and “conspiratorial thinking” to suspect that there is a motivation behind these allegations.

A Google search of the terms China, Malaysia, and corruption produced these results in the top ten:

- [“The Belt and Road Initiative Is a Corruption Bonanza.”](#) *Foreign Policy* magazine, January 15, 2019.
- [“Corruption Flows Along China's Belt and Road.”](#) Center for Strategic and International Studies, January 18, 2019.

- [“How China’s Belt And Road Became A ‘Global Trail Of Trouble’.”](#)

Forbes magazine, January 29, 2020.

- [“A Malaysian Corruption Scandal Shows the Dark Side of China’s Belt and Road Initiative.”](#) *The Washington Post*, January 11, 2019.

- [“Below the Belt and Road: Corruption and Illicit Dealings in China’s Global Infrastructure.”](#) Foundation for Defense of Democracies, May 6, 2020.

Instead of presenting any evidence of China’s involvement in corruption in those countries, these articles present real corruption scandals, like that of 1MDB in Malaysia, and place the mention of those scandals in text near descriptions of Chinese projects in the country. But there is no connection, except that the authors allege that China contributes to that corruption by investing in the country’s infrastructure! The only instances in which Chinese companies were involved in transactions with the 1MDB were the purchase of assets owned by the latter, such as a power plant and a real estate project, when the Malaysian government and the 1MDB were faced with the repayment of loans to their creditors, Najib’s partners in crime. But the Chinese companies did not invest in the 1MDB fund.

The Chinese BRI projects in Malaysia—such as the East Coast Rail Link (ECRL), ports, manufacturing (steel, solar power, textile, electronics, and electrical products), industrial parks, real estate, construction and energy—were all either joint ventures with Malaysian companies (not with the 1MDB), or foreign direct investments (FDI). None of the aforementioned articles and reports give any evidence of China’s involvement in the 1MDB corruption.

The reason these mostly American think tanks and media sources were so frantic about connecting China and the BRI to the scandal in Malaysia was the launching of investigations into the workings of the 1MDB fund and into Najib’s personal dealings, which had been suspected since 2015. In 2018 Najib was defeated in the general election by former Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamad, who was one of the critics of 1MDB and Najib. Dr. Mahathir announced after the election victory that there was enough evidence to start an investigation into this matter.

The opponents of the BRI and China then started popping open champagne bottles when Mahathir decided to suspend several of the BRI projects agreed



CGTN

Work has resumed on the East Coast Rail Link, a Malaysian Belt & Road Initiative project. Here a tunnel, part of the project, is under construction, December 2019.

upon between the Najib government and China. But the suspension was not related to the 1MDB scandal but rather to the confusion of the finances of the country then in deep debt, due to the corruption fueled by Western banks and the apparent need to review the ability of Malaysia to finance such large-scale projects under such circumstances.

The two largest projects postponed by Mahathir were the \$16 billion ECRL railway project aimed at enhancing development of Malaysia’s less-developed east coast, and two gas pipelines in Sabah, one of the Malay provinces on the island of Borneo. The media portrayed this development as a big blow to the Belt and Road Initiative, saying it showed once again that China is using a “debt trap” to gain control over countries. Dr. Mahathir himself took dramatic steps to demonstrate that this was a lie, with his five-day visit to China, August 17-21, 2018.

Dr. Mahathir said that this issue is not about the Chinese. “We’re here to assure the Chinese government and its people that there will be no change of policy.... We see China as a model for development,” he said at a press conference with Premier Li Keqiang. He emphasized the issue is the corruption inside the Malaysian government itself. Until that is adjudicated, Mahathir had no choice but to put the projects on hold, and to renegotiate the projects if they are to be reinstated. The joint communiqué signed by Malaysia and China at the end of Mahathir’s visit states that the two sides will speed up the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding on Promoting Mutual Economic Development through the BRI.

The renegotiation of the projects, especially the ECRL, resulted in slimming down the scale of the project, reducing the cost from \$16 billion to \$11 billion. Malaysian local contractors were allowed to join the main contractor, China Communications Construction Company (CCCC), in building part of the [project](#), using funds extended by the Small Medium Enterprise Development Bank Malaysia. The greatest portion of the project, both in the original and modified structure, is to be financed by loans from the Export-Import Bank of China, not by 1MDB. Construction of the ECRL resumed shortly after the new agreement was reached.

Goldman Sachs Bank Pleads Guilty

By 2015, as much as \$4.5 billion had gone missing from the 1MDB, set up by Najib soon after he took office in 2009, while nearly \$700 million showed up in his personal account. The way the 1MDB fund was replenished with cash was through either international bond issuance with the assistance of Western banks, most significantly Goldman Sachs, or through investment deals with the Saudi oil company PetroSaudi International and the United Arab Emirates state investment vehicle, International Petroleum Investment Co. (IPIC). In both cases Malaysian state-owned assets, such as ports, power plants, and real estate, were used as collateral. The debt incurred through these bond issues became public debt of Malaysia, reaching more than \$10 billion in 2015.

Multiple Western banks assisted Najib and his Malaysian partners in siphoning money from 1MDB to private bank accounts in Europe and the U.S. through complicated money laundering schemes and investments. These banks took huge fees for both helping 1MDB to raise money through bond sales and helping Najib to embezzle his share. In December 2018, the Attorney General's Chambers of Malaysia filed criminal charges against subsidiaries of Goldman Sachs in connection with 1MDB bond offerings arranged and underwritten by Goldman Sachs in 2012 and 2013. The prosecutors were seeking criminal fines in excess of \$2.7 billion, misappropriated from bond sale proceeds, and the \$600 million in fees received by Goldman Sachs.

In July of this year, Goldman Sachs came to an agreement with Malaysia to end Malaysia's criminal investigation of the role of Goldman Sachs and several of its employees in the scam. Goldman Sachs will pay \$2.5 billion directly to Malaysia and perhaps up to \$1.4 billion in proceeds from assets of 1MDB. Goldman—well aware of the amount of fraud it routinely commits—had



UN/Loey Filipe

Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad, Prime Minister of Malaysia: "We see China as a model for development."

\$3 billion set aside for legal fees. The U.S. FBI is continuing its own investigation, and may fine Goldman another \$2 billion, and may also send some people to jail. The reported mastermind of the operation, Jho Low, spent unknown millions in wild Las Vegas parties, while funding the film, *The Wolf of Wall Street*.

Other Western banks being investigated are Britain's Royal Bank of Scotland, two U.S. banks, JPMorgan Chase & Co. and Wells Fargo, Germany's Deutsche Bank AG, Switzerland's Credit Suisse, Luxembourg's Edmond de Rothschild Group, and the Australian fund management company Avestra Asset Management. The only investigation in China is being conducted in Hong Kong and is related to \$250 million in Credit Suisse branch deposits in Hong Kong linked to Najib Razak and 1MDB.

Conclusion

As in almost all cases this author has encountered of an allegation about a debt-trap or corruption caused by China's BRI projects, a simple fact check shows no connection between the Chinese project and problems in the host country. Usually these financial and social problems are caused by European and Wall Street banking practices, long before the Chinese companies arrived on the scene. The Malaysian corruption story is no different. This author has shown in several articles, such as "[Why China's Debt-book Diplomacy is a Hoax](#)," "[China's Debt Trap Found to be Baseless](#)" and "[Lebanon Should Join the New Paradigm of the Belt and Road](#)," that there is no basis for the allegations levelled against China and the BRI, and that almost all of these charges are made not by economists but by political analysts with political motivations.

IV. LaRouche on the World Struggle Today

LAROCHE TO ITALIAN SENATE DEFENSE COMMITTEE

A Strategy to Defend the Nation-State

On June 5, 2007, Lyndon LaRouche addressed the Defense Committee of the Italian Senate in the context of the Committee's "Investigation of the Present State and Perspectives of the Defense Industry and Cooperation on Armaments." Here is LaRouche's testimony, followed by questions and comments by members of the Committee, and a final response by LaRouche. The remarks by Italian Senators have been translated from Italian by EIR.

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Senators, the subject of today's event focusses on the correlation between defense and economics. I want to emphasize in particular the technological aspects of that correlation.

To understand the problem, we must return to its origins, and to the basis of the character of the nation-state, which we find in the Council of Florence of 1439, and in the *Concordantia Catholica* of Nicholas of Cusa, who participated in the Council. These events marked the foundation of modern science, thanks in part to Nicholas of Cusa, whose proposals, amplified by many others who participated in that Council, led to the creation of a new form of society which we now call the "modern nation-state," and which in English, is also indicated by the expression "commonwealth society," a society in which all of the people are considered part of the nation, which must be governed in the common interest of all of the people.

Louis XI founded a state of this type in France. A second, similar state was established in England under Henry VII. Since that time, as we know from the 16th Century, particularly from the writings of a famous man from that period [Nicolò Machiavelli], on warfare, that the nature of warfare and statecraft changed with the introduction of the modern nation-state, and the countermeasures which are occurring against it; that the

Editor's Note: This article first appeared in *EIR*, Vol. 34, No. 28, July 20, 2007, pp. 42-53.



EIRNS/Claudio Giudici

"You need a multi-national world, not a globalized world. We need a system of sovereign nation-states. We need a recognition of the terrible threat that we face now. We see the need of coming together, and getting some big powers together on things that seem impossible. And then, giving hope." LaRouche is seen here in Rome on June 6, where he addressed a forum on "The Future of the Economy: Market Radicalism or New Deal."

ability of the old feudal system to come back, was impeded, as was indicated, with the role of the total people of a city, or of a nation, in warfare. In this process, what became known as modern economy, and modern technology, became a determining force in warfare.

We had a continuation of that under the influence of Paolo Sarpi, especially toward the beginning of the 17th Century, in terms of the so-called Liberal system, which became ultimately the Anglo-Dutch system of economy and statecraft. And then we had, of course, the continuation of religious warfare, into 1648, when the modern nation-state was established under the influence of Cardinal Mazarin, with the key role of Jean-



"There is tremendous pressure, especially from a formation called the hedge funds, to loot industries in every country, in every part of the world." As in the United States, heavy industry and infrastructure have been decimated throughout Europe, by the predatory locust funds. Shown here, a Fiat assembly plant in Poland, circa 1974.

Baptiste Colbert.

And if we look at the relationship between economy, technology, science, and politics, and warfare, in this period, we find that we can trace the entirety of the modern history of warfare, and military and political actions, from these roots in history. The struggle between the idea of the commonwealth society, and the idea of empire, in the new liberal form, which is typically the British Empire form, has been a continuing struggle to the present day. As today, the attempt to form globalization as a replacement for the sovereign nation-state—that is, to establish a world empire—is the center of the ongoing conflict.

And there's a constant temptation in some forces, to shut down the sovereign power of a nation over its own economy. This is called globalization; and the attempt to resist that is in trouble right now. I'm one of the resisters.

So, what we face is this: We face an attempt under certain international financier interests, who are identical with the idea of globalization, to shut down the industries, and the scientific capabilities, of nations, and to distribute these capabilities around the world, through cheap-labor societies.

For example: Europe has been stripped increasingly, especially since Maastricht, of its independent technological and military capability. The Soviet

Union, the former Soviet Union, was ruined. The nations of Eastern Europe, which were part of the Com-econ, are in far worse economic and social condition than they were under Soviet domination, as a result of this process. Germany is being bankrupted. Italy is being ruined, especially the essential industries which have been important to Italy since the middle of the 19th Century, from the time of the influence of Riemann on the scientific thinking in Italy.

We've now got to the point that the basic industries in northern Italy, in particular, are being lost. A certain amount of industry exists, but there is tremendous pressure, especially from a formation called the hedge funds, to loot industries in every country, in every part of the world. And there's tremendous pressure to destroy particularly those sections of the econ-

omy which are traditionally part of the state's economy, whether on the state, municipal, or national level. And the struggle is international.

The Fight to Save Social Security and the Auto Industry

For example: The most recent case we had of this, which affects directly today's topic, is that, during the year 2005, I had organized around me, a mobilization of the Democratic Party and others, in the United States, to defeat the attempt to loot the Social Security system of the United States—that policy introduced by the current President of the United States and some people around him. At the same time, it was obvious to me, in February of 2005, that there was a plan to destroy the automobile industry of the U.S., and to turn the automobile industry over to foreign cheap-labor producers of automobiles.

Now, this was crucial, because it was a strategic-military issue, as well as a mere economic issue. The United States, in this past century, had a very special kind of capability, which was built up since Abraham Lincoln in the 19th Century, but was significant at the end of World War I, in which we were targetted by the United Kingdom/Great Britain; and our military engaged in a number of studies which were centered

around the naval power negotiations of the early 1920s, in which the British were ganged up with Japan, demanding a reduction of U.S. naval capability to a size which would satisfy the British Empire. There were even plans by Japan and Britain and others, to conduct naval warfare against the United States, not to conquer the United States, but to reduce its naval power.

It was in this period that Japan, which was at that point, and had been since 1895, an asset of the British royal family—Japan had agreed to enter into the destruction of the Pearl Harbor Naval Base. This was back in the 1920s, at the time that Japan was an ally of Britain.

Later, the irony changed: President Roosevelt induced the British not to ally with Hitler, or at least some of them not to, and Japan continued its course and attacked Pearl Harbor anyway, as an ally of Nazi Germany.

But during this period, the U.S. military developed a policy whose impact became apparent under Franklin Roosevelt. As of the beginning of March of 1933, at the point that President Roosevelt was first inaugurated as President of the United States, Hitler had already achieved dictatorial powers, toward the end of February, right after the Reichstag's burning. So that when Roosevelt entered office, as President, in early March of 1933, he already knew that a probable war was going to happen. So, Roosevelt's policy immediately was one of both recovery—we had just suffered a 30% destruction of our economy from 1929 to 1933, so Roosevelt turned to a gentleman, Harry Hopkins, who set up a program which was both a military program and a civilian program.

Roosevelt's intention was, to use the same approach to developing industrial power, and rebuilding agriculture, to build up the civilian capability of the United States, but also at the same time, to prepare the United States to be capable of meeting its responsibilities in respect to Europe, from what was already known by Roosevelt, to be the Hitler threat.

So therefore, you had the famous phenomenon of Harry Hopkins, with the people who became significant general officers during World War II and afterwards, who were part of this program.

So, the United States' development, out of the Depression, to become the most powerful economy the world had ever seen, by 1943, was a result of a combination of military development, on a civilian economy

basis. In other words, what you were seeing then, with the United States' role in this war, was a resolution of something that happened back with the Council of Florence, back in the middle of the 15th Century, in which the commonwealth society was formed; in which the long history in European experience, of basing military power, where needed, and the power of conflict as needed, basing it on the development of economy and of all the people—a new kind of nation-state, in which we try to eliminate all relics of serfdom or slavery.

So therefore, the development of the economy, for every square kilometer, and for the population within every square kilometer, to increase the productive powers of labor, and general well-being, and development of the character of the people, was our tradition. What happened in the Treaty of Westphalia; this kind of system, while it was never realized perfectly, largely because of the wars of Britain and France, and the Dutch who came in later; nonetheless, this model has been characteristic of every successful period of development, from then to the present day.

The United States' development was merely a more perfected expression of it, because we had no legacy of oligarchical rule in our society. And that has been the difference: that whereas European systems tend to be monetary systems, or based on monetary systems, the United States system, in terms of constitutional design, is not a monetary system; it's a credit system. That is, our currency, according to law, according to constitutional law, can be created only by the government, with the consent of the legislative branch, the junior partner. And this power of the government to create and utter money, or to create credit, then becomes the financial power of government, which controls and is able to direct this force to industry, to agriculture, and general development of the people.

So, the power of the United States, the remarkable increase of the power of the United States, from being bankrupt in 1933, to the time that Roosevelt became President, and up until the end of the war: The greatest physical economic, military power in the world history, therefore, had been created in a short period of time, from depression, under the use of the U.S. constitutional provisions, which enabled us to make that kind of mobilization. We were not subject to control by foreign monetary authorities, foreign financial powers. And that was the secret of our ability to organize. And we would have done very well, if Roosevelt had not died,

if we'd kept on and developed the world, freeing the world from colonialism and that sort of thing. We didn't.

A Sudden Change

Now, today you're in a situation, in which there is an attempt to destroy this legacy of modern European civilization, a legacy established beginning with the Council of Florence. The legacy of the modern nation-state based on the political equality of the human individual, and the responsibility of the state to promote the development of the individual, and to promote the improvement of the political powers and physical powers of the individual.

Since Roosevelt died, this has been underway. It was not too obvious at first, but when Truman came in, there was a sudden change. The change was typified by two things which were conspicuous at the time. Roosevelt had been committed to the elimination of all forms of colonialism, immediately, at the end of the war. He'd also been committed to the use of the military power we had developed, to convert it back into a civilian capability, and to use a significant part of that civilian economic power, to assist freed nations, as well as rebuilding Europe, but assisting freed nations, which had been colonized nations, to give them the development which would make them truly independent nations.

That policy was abandoned. And our rate of development in the postwar period slowed down as a result. But nonetheless, we maintained that system, with the damage done to it in that fashion, until the assassination of John F. Kennedy. And John F. Kennedy's assassination allowed a different policy to be introduced. John Kennedy's assassination allowed certain forces in Europe and the United States, to proceed with what President Eisenhower had warned against, in leaving office: that a so-called military-industrial complex took, actually, political control of the destiny of the United States and pretty much of Europe and the other parts of the world.

Now, they did the same thing to us that was done in



EIRNS/Karon Long

"We have lost much of our economy. We've destroyed it largely through globalization, and largely through laws which allowed hedge funds, and similar kinds of pestilences, to move in and take us over. Take our industries, take even our government industries, shut them down, and loot them, and move on to loot the next victim." The victim in this photo is a former GM plant in Danville, Ill.

the Peloponnesian War to the Greeks. The Greeks were induced to engage, through Sophistry, in a prolonged war which destroyed Greece, which has not come back to the present day. Athens has never recovered from the long war it fought in the Peloponnesian War. The history of civilization, since that time, especially European civilization, has been that long wars have ruined us repeatedly.

As contrasted, for example, with the case of Louis XI, who was attacked by everyone on every side. He bribed even some of his persecutors to make peace with him, and he made a profit on peace, by avoiding war, because he used the occasion of freedom from war, to develop the French population, which is where modern France as a significant power emerged.

Long Wars of the Recent Period

We did the reverse. With the Indochina war, we went into an unnecessary war, a war which was launched on the basis of lies. And we got ourselves into a long war which continued until we decided to stop it arbitrarily, because it wasn't working. Then we continued with all sorts of nonsense, but then again, we got into an Iraq war [in 1991], right after the fall of the Soviet Union, but fortunately, we didn't make a horrible mistake—we got out of it, before it became a serious war of

occupation, which would have ruined us.

But then we went into the Balkan wars, which were ruinous, and we're suffering in Europe, until today, from the effects of these ongoing Balkan wars, because we haven't cleaned up the mess we made with these wars. Then, under the present Administration, we got into a long war in Iraq. We got into it by the blessing of Tony Blair from London, who lied his way all around the world on this one. And without Tony Blair's lies, which I personally got involved in defeating—and I got punished for defeating them—we got into another long war, in Southwest Asia, in Afghanistan, in Iraq. We're now engaged in a potential war in Iran. We're now engaged in a generalized war in the entire so-called Arab world, which is now spreading into Turkey, as a threat of destabilization. So, the whole region is now an area of instability.

In the meantime, we have lost much of our economy. We've destroyed it largely through globalization, and largely through laws which allowed hedge funds, and similar kinds of pestilences, to move in and take us over. Take our industries, take even our government industries, shut them down, and loot them, and move on to loot the next victim. And this is a process I've seen in Italy, as I've seen it in the United States. I've seen it in France. I see it massively, especially since the Maastricht agreements, in Germany. I see the conditions in Eastern Europe, the former Comecon territories, where the conditions of life physically are worse than they were under the Soviets. They have the freedom to contemplate and discuss their misery. But their misery is much better than it was then; that is, it's much bigger.

So, now we see a stripping of Italy the same way, northern Italy, of the basic industries which were associated since the time of the middle of the 19th Century, with the emergence around [Enrico] Betti, of the new scientific movements in Italy. And we had a great, for example, aerospace development in Italy, typical of military capabilities, other capabilities. And these industries, on which this depended, I see are now stripped.



EIRNS/ Neil Martin

Members of the LaRouche Youth Movement (center) participate in a rally against privatization of Social Security in Washington, D.C., February 2005. "There was tremendous pressure put on members of the Democratic Party, who I was collaborating with, on this question of defending Social Security." The Democrats turned tail and ran when LaRouche demanded they fight to save the auto industry.

I go to Milan, and I find areas where there were large auto industries of high technologies, and small industries—they no longer exist. I see people, skinny girls marching around on platforms, as a substitute for industry. I see threats to the Italian economy. And my concern in this, looking at it as a part of a world community, is to say, how can we save the economy from the ravages of this process of globalization?

And then go back to 2005. What I proposed in 2005 was this: that the United States government set up a special corporation, and buy up the parts of the auto industry, especially the high-tech sector, which we would not be using for automobiles, and to use this high-tech sector of the industry for developing infrastructure. For example, we had dams, rivers, water systems, power systems, municipal systems, all kinds of things that are essential for an economy, were decrepit. But in the auto industry's machine-tool sector, we had the capability of fixing every one of these problems.

I simply proposed that the United States government should make emergency legislation; don't allow these plants to be shut down; but rather keep them functioning by converting them back to infrastructure programs, and similar kinds of programs, which are ur-

gently needed anyway, and thus to keep the productive technological power of the United States at some kind of a level.

Now we see that was not done. And there was tremendous pressure put on members of the Democratic Party, who I was collaborating with, on this question of defending Social Security. We had a fine alliance, until it came to this issue of so-called bailing out the automobile industry, by converting it. And today, we don't have a U.S. auto industry anymore. We have a wreckage, which is being looted, as a chicken is being looted of the last flesh on its bones. We have a Japan industry which has moved in to take over some of it. But Japan has a cheap-labor industry, so we have a breakdown in communities, in the state of Michigan, the state of Ohio, the state of Indiana, and elsewhere—a breakdown in the economy of states which is a very serious threat to the stability of the United States as a whole, because we didn't do this.

So therefore, my concern in looking at Europe, as well as the United States, is to look at this kind of problem, and say, what do we do?

A Dual-Use Economy

Therefore, it *is* necessary, as it has been since the period of the Renaissance, it is necessary to maintain the development of economic capabilities which are also the capabilities of national defense, when national defense is imperilled. This always involves, and has involved, scientific and technological progress, and the development of the skill levels of the population. Therefore, my concern would be: How can you take the sector of the economy which is still the so-called state sector, and how can you maintain in the state sector, capabilities which are both the core scientific-technological capabilities, and maintain them in the state sector, even if they're not in the military sector as such, but maintain them where the conversion to a defense capability exists.

Now, this takes us into areas of new kinds of technologies, which is something which I'm rather notorious for: Always go to new kinds of technologies, more advanced ones, and realize that if you have to have defense, national defense action, if you're able to mobilize a competent one, it's because you have personnel who can be mobilized for that purpose who are efficient, and because you have the economic capabilities, the forms of technology and otherwise, to make that kind of conversion of the type that Roosevelt made,

toward the late part of the 1930s, by developing a program for the first day he walked into office, knowing that a world war was threatened, and he had to prepare for it. So, his plans for preparing for warfare, and his preparations for developing the economy, were one and the same thing.


So the idea of the dual-use economy, that is, an economy which has a high-technology orientation, is used immediately for necessary infrastructure or other economic purposes, which gives you the potential to do this in two ways: one way, in terms of the productive capability as such; secondly, the population.

Now the biggest problem we have, of nations today, is a breakdown of the capabilities of our younger generation. I work largely with an 18-to-35 age group. I concentrated largely, initially, on the 18-to-25 age group. I've been doing that ever since about 1999-2000. And what we run into, is the fact that very little attention is being given, effectively, where there's talk about a youth movement, and a youth political movement, very little attention is being given to developing the potential creative powers of that generation.

There is a real potential in these young people, these young adults. This is our future. For any generation in history, in my knowledge and my experience of history, it's always been the development of a young generation, young adult generation, which is the foundation of the future society. Two generations from the time of entering adulthood, to retirement age, or something like that, has been the determining factor in the success or failure of society.

As a result of certain changes in the postwar period, typified by the Congress for Cultural Freedom and things like that, we've had an existentialist trend in the thinking of the generation which was born between 1945 and about 1956-57, the first major [postwar] recession. That generation, you will observe, in the United States, is running all the top positions, with very few exceptions. They are all unresponsive—I have friends among these people—but the problem I have is, they are so unresponsive to certain kinds of problems. They postpone and evade reality. I wouldn't want them in command of a military force: They would fail. It's not the lack of military training, it's the lack of a sense of commitment to get the job done, the commitment to make the breakthrough.

And what we need, I would think in Italy in particular—I'm cognizant of the problems which exist for Italy here—but the problem, I think, is just that: Is to



EIRNS

The 18-to-35 age group are the ones who will think about the future. “They’re going to think about what the world looks like two generations from now, 50 years from now. And keeping their morale, and giving them an economy to play with—so to speak—which has dual-use capability, is the resource that you require in any crisis that’s coming up.”

have a policy of keeping this dual-use approach to economy in view; to look at this constantly from the standpoint of what may be required through crises in the future, and to concentrate especially on developing cadre levels from among the young people within the 18-to-35 age group. Because they are the people who are going to think about a future. They’re going to think about what the world looks like two generations from now, 50 years from now. And keeping their morale, and giving them an economy to play with—so to speak—which has dual-use capability, is the resource that you require in any crisis that’s coming up. The crisis we face globally today is way beyond anything Italy is going to try to take care of. It can’t be done; it’s too big. It has to be done by the giants in the world. *But*, no nation should give up its sovereignty just because it’s not in a position to run the world. It has to run its own nation; it has to be a part of the deliberation process among nations.

So that’s my general view.

Dialogue with Members of the Committee

Sen. Sergio De Gregorio, Chairman: I thank Professor LaRouche for having presented his considerations in such a detailed manner.

Before giving the floor to the other members of the Committee who wish to intervene, I would like to ask a question myself.

In your resumé, I read that you were the political author of what, in 1983, was officially presented by President Ronald Reagan as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). And you also developed an idea of your own concerning the anti-missile shield, which I would like to ask you to express clearly, in order to deal with a subject that is less general and more technical, which may bring us back to the military questions in which we are particularly interested. Thus, we would like you to discuss your theories, and do so in relation to the discussion currently underway in our Committee.



Sen. Luigi Ramponi: I would like to refer to what the Chairman just mentioned, and that is, the relevance of the anti-missile shield today.

President Bush has begun his trip to Europe. A procedure has been initiated for the installation of a strategic defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic. This has caused a reaction from Russia. The Americans claim that the system is necessary in order to prevent, deter, and if necessary, to intervene against, the threat of a missile attack originating from Iran. Russia reacts by claiming that Iran does not currently have a missile capability sufficient to justify the need for a missile shield. This is the current situation.

I believe that a solution can be found which can be a shared solution, and that it will be fairly easy to reach such a solution once those involved stop acting as separate



parties, and when both countries, if it is necessary, begin to create an anti-missile system, certainly not against Russia, but against whoever wishes to threaten global stability through vectorial nuclear attacks. Do you think that a solution will be found to this conflict? I think so.

I have always been fascinated by your theories on development, including those which are—to be frank—more detailed than what you presented today, which made reference—I will limit myself to citing a part of those ideas which I find most interesting: to the realization of large axes of development, which you defined as “infrastructure,” today, across Asia to Europe, and which even foresee a connection with the American continent. It just so happens that the cover of a magazine [*Forum International*], which was distributed to us here, shows the project for a tunnel under the sea which would cross the Bering Strait. Many of the areas you have indicated for the development of the great connections—Afghanistan, Iran, and Iraq—currently find themselves in a very difficult situation. That is where the northern line was supposed to pass.

Have you changed your view with respect to what you proposed 10 or 15 years ago? Objectively, it doesn’t seem to me that the conditions currently exist to proceed with the realization of these great axes, which however, could allow for taking a large step forward in the pacification of those territories, ensuring their development. What do you think of such an hypothesis?

You were quite prophetic in predicting a crash of the financial world at the end of the previous century. You said it early, and your prediction was—allow me to use this phrase—“right on.” What is your expectation regarding the solidity of the financial and stock market worlds today, and in the short-term?

Sen. Lidia Brisca Menapace:¹ Professor LaRouche, I listened to what you said with great interest, including because—please excuse me for pointing this out—one does not expect such an elaborate cultural outlook from an American. And thus, I feel very comfortable, as if you were a



1. An extended [discussion](#) between Senator Menapace and LaRouche is in *EIR*, Vol. 34, No. 22, 2007, pp. 45-50.

European; this is intended as a compliment. [In response to an interjection from Senator Ramponi:] I certainly don’t pretend that everyone agrees with my comments!

I was very struck by the fact that, in anticipation of the construction of the anti-missile shield, opposition is coming in particular from Bohemia [the Czech Republic]. It is very strange for an Eastern European country to react negatively to an American proposal. I would like to know if you consider it correct to think that the opposition coming from that nation is due to the fact that it was a very important location for high-level industrial production, and that there is still a memory of this, and thus the population feels almost robbed. Otherwise, I would be at a loss to explain this protest coming from Bohemia, where there are still many street demonstrations on this issue.

I would also like to know if you agree with the possibility of adding the term “scientific” to the expression “military-industrial complex,” since all of the universities are involved in the development of this policy, with the result that there is an impoverishment, a theft of scientific research, which in this case, is subjugated to other ends.

I also found it very interesting when you stated that the infrastructure which a country must preserve, even a relatively small country like Italy, which should not allow any of its potential to be expropriated, must be understood above all, at the level of civilian development, which is so interesting and complex, that it can also be used for defense. Do you believe, as I do, that in the interest of the youth, a policy should emerge aimed at combating the lack of job security (a question which concerns the civilian economy), rather than favoring enlistment in the military? Could this be a policy of civilian infrastructure which may also be used for the defense of the country, at a time when it is almost primary with respect to an explicit defense of the country?

In your opinion, was the difficulty the United States had in dealing with the [flooding] disaster in New Orleans due to the fact that a policy of civilian infrastructure has not been implemented because there was a concentration predominantly on a military policy and a military empire? Indeed, it seems strange that a rich, large, powerful country, such as the United States of America, allows New Orleans, more than a year after the disaster, to remain in conditions which are unacceptable, in which the residents still can not return, to the point that the very nature of a place which is so sig-

nificant, important, and well-known in the world's culture, risks being changed.

Sen. Gianni Nieddu: I would also like to thank the professor for his stimulating intervention.

In closing your presentation, you stated that no state should relinquish its sovereignty, even if that state is so small, that it is unable to deal with large processes at the international level; therefore, Italy is too small to deal with these processes, but it shouldn't relinquish its sovereignty. Now, what comes to my mind is the transfer of sovereignty which European nation-states have carried out in order to allow the construction of the unitary process in Europe, which guaranteed peace after the Second World War, the management of historical conflicts in the great European plains between France, Germany, the interests of Germany, France, and England, and so forth. This transfer of sovereignty involves all types of power, with the lone exception, until now, of foreign policy and defense, which have remained under the authority of nation-states; however, an attempt is currently underway concerning defense policy, to transfer part of the powers from the states to the European Union. It is a difficult, very complex, and contradictory attempt, but on defense policy as well, an attempt is underway to transfer sovereignty from nation-states to the European Union.

Well then, based on these considerations, a question arises: Was this process a mistake? If the size of the Italian state, as well as the German and French states, is not sufficient to effectively deal with the enormous financial power of the multinational corporations, which are the entities which promote globalization, with an enormous financial power which threatens the sovereignty of these states because it moves economic interests so large that they are sufficient to condition the economy, as you were saying, to the point of eliminating entire portions of those economies; if the scale of the state is too small; and if, on the other hand, it is a mistake to relinquish sovereignty in order to have a larger scale (at the continental, European level); then what is the response which would allow for making supranational



economic-financial power coincide with supranational political power?

If the Italian government does not have the power to influence the actions of the multinational corporations by means of its own laws, who can do it, if not a supranational power? We can regulate the activities of Italian companies, or foreign companies in Italy, but the power of multinational companies is so broad that they are able to avoid this dimension of politics.

Sen. Silvana Pisa: I wish to thank our guest for his very long and complex intervention. I would like to discuss the question of armaments: We are seeing a strong race towards rearmament, both nuclear and non-nuclear rearmament, and thus a very large increase in spending on armaments in Russia, the United States, and China. Today, this spending is very high, higher than it has ever been in the past.



Let's think of the question of the anti-missile shield, which is under discussion in the current period, and these technologies which the United States, by way of bilateral accords with Poland and the Czech Republic, in some manner wishes to place on Russia's borders, and which are seen by Putin (we have seen this in Putin's interviews in recent days) as a threat to the current strategic balance. I also hope, as Senator Ramponi already stated, that this matter will be resolved positively, but it currently represents an element of destabilization which frankly, we did not need at this time. However, I believe that the issue is part of a race to rearmament which I see as a serious threat to the global strategic balance. So I pose the question, for example: Why were the nuclear non-proliferation treaties abandoned? Why, going from nuclear to other fields, did the United States abandon the ABM Treaty in 1992? Why did the United States never ratify the CFE Treaty on conventional arms?

A second question: To go from warfare to a policy of civilian investment, for reconversion from military to civilian, substantial investments are needed; it's not so easy. Where can the funds be found to carry out this reconversion?

LaRouche Responds

Well, first of all, there are a number of questions, since the theme comes up again and again, I think probably I'd better start by answering that first.

The danger now is coming largely from Anglo-American interests, not from U.S. interests. Putin has an accurate perception of what his problem is. His problem is not a U.S. problem. His problem is a British problem.

Remember, look, you've got a situation in which the United States was plunged into two successive long wars, one from 1964 to 1972, and now the more recent wars. These are long wars. They are Peloponnesian wars, which have the same kind of cause as the original Peloponnesian War. They're caused by a certain kind of stupidity in the population, the leading circles of the population, called Sophistry, which means a society which has no principle, and has given up the idea of principle for the sake of popular opinion and expediency, or what is called Sophistry, is no longer capable of judging how to deal with the situation.

Remember, for example, the case of Louis XI. Louis XI bribed his enemies and made a profit on it! He bribed his enemies to prevent them from going to war. He bribed them not to attack him. And by the opportunity of peace, he built his economy up to be the model commonwealth economy of Europe, on which Henry VII modelled England. So, the modern nation-state was based on governments which had principle. The principle was the commonwealth principle. The commonwealth principle was established in Europe, in 1439, with the Council of Florence. It was established, even at a late stage, with a breakout of the Turkish wars, the disasters that struck the Renaissance with the Turkish wars.

Nicholas of Cusa replied with *De Pace Fidei*, to seek peace with the enemy, to avoid war, on the basis of the benefits of peace.

The United States Is the Target

Now this was pretty much the U.S. policy, most of the time. We had some corrupt influences, but what we have now is this: We have a determination of some forces to eliminate the sovereign nation-state. It's called the post-Westphalia policy. The post-Westphalia policy, which is centered in Britain, is the idea of getting the United States as a Roosevelt-memory state, to destroy itself, and *we are obliging in destroying ourselves*. The

destruction of the United States caused by the succession of the Indochina War, and what has been going on in Southwest Asia, what has been going on in Europe, as well as Southwest Asia, with the Balkan wars, which followed the outbreak of the first Iraq War.

These wars are destroying the United States by its own hand, just the way that certain forces destroyed Athens by its own hand, with this kind of foolishness.

So, the United States is the target. We have idiots in the United States who think they're not the target. They think they are powers that are going on to victory. The United States is not going to have any world victory coming out of this operation it's pulling now—it will not happen. It's foolishness. We're destroying ourselves. The idea that we're healthy, we're gaining, we're a power: *We are destroying everything! We're destroying our military! It will take us a generation to rebuild the military that's been destroyed in this period.* We destroyed our army entirely. We destroyed our military ground reserves. We have only air power and naval power left.

What's the policy then? The policy is, twofold, under globalization: First of all, the objective is not to put a few missiles in Czechia or in Poland—that is not the policy. That is a stunt, that's a diversion, that's a provocation. The policy is, to build a space-based system of missile systems which can send weapons descending on Earth any time they want to, and to have a U.S. control, or Anglo-American control, over that system—that's number one. Number two, is to eliminate all regular military ground forces, controlled by governments. To eliminate governmental control over military ground forces, and to use *private armies*. This is called, in the United States, the Revolution in Military Affairs, for which Cheney has been a spokesman, ever since he was Secretary of Defense under George H.W. Bush.

In fact, what you're seeing in the world today, for example, is the use of killer games, point-and-shoot killer games, which are producing a new terrorist phenomenon, of our own children who are becoming fanatics and psychotics in shooting. We have rages of these all over the world, spreading out of the killer computer games, especially since 1999-2000, when the companies that had been making money on producing computer systems, no longer had large subsidies from the U.S. and other governments, and therefore they went into a new market of producing on a mass base, games trained to kill people in mass point-and-shoot effects.

We trained police forces in this. We trained military forces in this. And we now have people volunteering to do it, on campuses and elsewhere, by killer games produced by Microsoft and others.

So, this is the key. You have now got a system where we are eliminating the U.S. military ground forces in Iraq. What are we going to replace them with? Well, look at Halliburton! The corporation that Cheney used to work with. Halliburton, and other companies of that type, are actually being funded massively to conduct the war, while the U.S. military is being destroyed and ground up on the field. And it will take a generation to rebuild what we have lost in military forces in this period.

A New Kind of Empire

So you have the idea of One World, with a new kind of empire, the new version of the Roman Empire, which is dominated by a space-based system, a monopoly of space-based weapons, which can target any point on Earth they want to. Which means, eliminate all resistance to the empire.

Number two, eliminate military forces which are national forces, which have national loyalties. Have only professional armies, of people with point-and-shoot killing capability, which you can recruit from your own youth, who have learned to do point-and-shoot activity blindly. You know, the typical soldier hesitated to kill. They hesitated to do repeated killing. For example, in Vietnam, where people would train snipers, they would export people as snipers, and they'd train them as snipers. They'd go out and they'd make one kill, and they couldn't make a second one. The idea of lying on a trail, lying in manure and everything all night, and waiting for somebody to come down the trail, and shoot them, as a sniper operation, and then do it a second time—the second or third time, they couldn't do it any more. Only very especially psychotic people can do that sort of thing.

So, therefore, we've now developed a system, which was developed in the U.S. military and otherwise, to *train* people. How can you train people to become point-and-shoot killers, with no humanity in their mind?

Take the case in the Bronx. You had a guy of African-American extraction, middle-class guy, no weapons, came out of his house, and the police outside the house said, "Show some identification." He reached into his pocket to pull out his wallet—they put 40 slugs



You can thank Alan Greenspan for the global financial catastrophe now overtaking the world: "We have flooded the world today, with the greatest inflation the world has ever imagined," LaRouche said

into him. Because they'd been through this kind of training program.

So, that's the thing we're up against. We're up against a process to destroy the nation-state as an institution, to destroy national sovereignty, and destroy the idea of civilization as a thing you're defending. So, that's where we're at. That's what we're trying to prevent.

Now, this came up again under the first question, on this question of development. There was a change in 1987—it was referred to by Senator Ramponi. In 1987, we had the depression. We had a Hoover-style depression. We had an idiot who became the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Greenspan, and Greenspan said, "Wait for me! Don't do anything!" And he came in with the idea of using the mortgage-based securities market, and other things, and also the financing of the computer industry, as a fund to print money electronically, as never had been printed before.

We have flooded the world today with the greatest inflation the world has ever imagined. There is no possibility that this monetary system in its present form can continue to exist. It's doomed, it's finished. It's gambling! The hedge funds are pure gambling. There's nothing in them. When this thing comes down, everything will come down with it.

Nuclear Energy and the Isotope Economy

Now, what's the solution? What am I doing about it?

Well, I still follow the same policy which I recommended to Reagan, and Reagan accepted, back in the beginning of the 1980s. We were working for it here in

Europe; we were working for it here in Italy. We had military here in Italy who were supporting that policy. We had people in France, military in France, we had military in Germany supporting that policy. All encouraging the United States President to go into that policy, which he did. Even after the Soviets turned us down, he went back and made it public, and made the public offer.

Now that was not just a “we don’t shoot you and you don’t shoot us.” The point was, to shift the goals of society, from military conflict goals, to economic cooperation goals. And to take and develop the kinds of systems where we could mutually eliminate the possibility of such an attack, a surprise attack, this sort of thing. And we could convert that into developing superior technologies which we’d use for other purposes as well.

Now, what’s happened recently: I was in Moscow for the 80th birthday of an old friend of mine, who was a leading Soviet economist, and other economist, who was the son of the famous Soviet Ambassador to Washington, Menshikov—Stanislav Menshikov. He’s a famous economist. And I used the occasion, leading into that, through my wife Helga, who is also involved in this, used the occasion to present to a Russian group, a proposal for the Bering Strait project.

Since then, that proposal was accepted by that circle, and since then, since I was in Moscow, there was more discussion of it. It is my understanding that President Putin is going to present that proposal at the coming G-8 convention. It’s his intention to do it; he’s already sponsored it. The Russian government has issued a very well-produced pamphlet, which, in English and in Russian, has this proposal with pictures, including Helga’s picture, my picture, that sort of thing. This has been accepted by certain people in the United States.

Our proposal is that we proceed with it now, for a very simple reason. The world has reached the point, that we can no longer survive without a large-scale conversion to nuclear-fission power sources. The water issue alone is typical. We cannot maintain freshwater



Courtesy of Framatome, ANP

“With nuclear power, and with the development of thermonuclear-fusion processes, and some of the things that go with that, this is the direction we have to go. . . . We always have to look for the peaceful use of technology, and power, and use that as the way we approach the issues of conflict.” Ling Ao 1 and 2 nuclear power station in Guangdong, China, shown here.

supplies for humanity on the basis required, without nuclear fission as a power source. We need the fourth-generation fission-type reactor, particular the Jülich type, or the pebble-bed high temperature gas-cooled reactor. We need that.

India is going with such a policy. They recognize it. Every other part of the world is moving in that direction, whether they say so publicly or not, because the issue is clear: Without a nuclear-fission policy, for dealing with such things as water and sanitation, you cannot deal with the problems of the planet at large. You’ve got 1.4 billion people in China, over 1 billion people in India. Large populations in Asia. And they have shortages of two things: potable water and a shortage of minerals, which they need for developing industry, because you cannot maintain a poor population in Asia without having an explosion. China already has internal instabilities as a result of this. India has 70% of its population as part of the same instability. Look at the conditions throughout Southeast Asia. You need this kind of development

In the long term, we need to go into what’s called an *isotope economy*, which is, we’ll be able to process the isotopes we require, at very high temperatures in effect, and thus supply humanity with the means for maintaining a growing population, with a growing technology, a

growing standard of living.

Now, this also means that we're going to change the planet from a maritime planet, into a land-based planet. The significance of the proposed bridge, the Alaska [Bering Strait] bridge, which has been around for a long time, is that, if you run magnetic-levitation systems, which are superior to the rail systems, if you run that kind of system as a freight system, as well as a passenger system, if you connect Eurasia to the Americas, and you also solve the Middle East problem, and connect to Africa the same way, by building up a perspective of a long-range system of these kinds of substitutes for rail systems, we have suddenly taken the interior areas of the continents of the world—we now have made them accessible for coordinated development.


Now, high-speed rail traffic, as well as magnetic levitation, is more efficient than air; and it costs a lot less. It's more efficient than a highway. So the cheapest way of connecting various parts of the world economy together—both freight and people—is by building a high-grade magnetic-levitation system, or a transition to that through a good rail system, as a model, so that you can easily upgrade one to the other.

And with nuclear power, and with the development of thermonuclear-fusion processes, and some of the things that go with that, this is the direction we have to go. And therefore, what we needed then was the SDI, and our purpose then, was *not* simply to develop a better military system. It was to develop a system which was necessary for the economy, was necessary for the nations, and more valuable to the nations than the advantages of winning any war.

Shifting the World's Attention to a Higher Level

And the same thing applies today. We always have to look for the peaceful use of technology, and power, and use that as the way we approach the issues of conflict. If we have to go to war, we take it from the highest level. But we also do these things, not to win a war, nor to fight it; we do these things to prevent a war, by shifting the attention of the world to a higher level. And that's where the answer lies, essentially.

The conflict today is not really—you've got Bush coming here—the conflict is not really with the United States, and Putin has never thought so. You know, when young Bush was first inaugurated as President, one of the first guys waiting to meet him was Vladimir Putin, and Vladimir Putin came up beside him, out of the



White House/Paul Morse

"What Putin has done is very conscious. The inside circles inside Russia, who look at the history books, know the long relationship of friendship between the United States and Russia. . . . That view, in Russia, is shared today in Putin's circles." Here, Putin and Bush during their first meeting in November 2001, answer questions from students at Crawford High School in Texas.

bushes, so to speak, and said, "Let's talk." And you had President W. Bush, George W., talking about his friend "Putie," in various interviews around the world.

And what Putin has done is very conscious. The inside circles inside Russia, who look at the history books, know the long relationship of friendship between the United States and Russia. And they also know, particularly, the relationship of Franklin Roosevelt and the view of Franklin Roosevelt in Soviet history, as well as in Russian history generally. That view, in Russia, is shared today in Putin's circles.

So, therefore, one of my concerns is to induce the United States to move and take up that option, and my approach is to say, "Let's take this bridge over the Bering Strait." It's a long-term project, but the idea of taking it up as a commitment, to actually go ahead with it, and to do this in tandem with the four greatest powers on this planet, which today, are the United States, Russia, China, and India. Now, I'm not proposing a four-power government of the world. I'm proposing simply that, if these four powers, which have, combined, the maximum power in the world, *agree*, then other nations, such as Italy, which is looking for partners which it can live with, can easily join with that, and be a voice in a new shaping of the order of the world.

Because this financial system we're in is coming down. It is finished. There is no way this financial system in its present form can be perpetuated. The present system of the hedge funds is *not* an economy—it's a

graveyard. It's a graveyard of nations, a graveyard of economies. It's based on looting nations' material resources. And what is then left of a nation after being looted? You might be a little bit richer in the short term, but you will have rates of inflation which are enormous. This bubble is going to pop. Therefore, on these kinds of questions we have to think about what are acceptable long-term agreements for our economies, and the welfare of the future of humanity. What are the technologies, and can we begin to discuss those agreements now to put that on the table before nations? It comes back on this question that came out up about sovereignty. Why is sovereignty important?

People don't understand sovereignty. That includes most of the people who are for globalization. Globalization is a new Tower of Babel. It was a bad idea then; it's a worse idea now. Because people have forgotten, especially the Baby-Boomer generation: What is the difference between a baboon and a human being? A human being has creative powers. No beast does. And therefore, in all these solutions, it's through culture. It's *through* our language cultures, and associated culture, that we as a people develop the ability to develop ideas among ourselves. The result of different nations, according to their culture, in developing ideas, is not a different result; it's a different *road* to the result. Because a language culture draws upon the implications of the use of the language over many generations. You reach into the soul of the people for creative powers, and that should be the objective of this sort of thing.

So, you need a multi-national world, not a globalized world. We need a system of sovereign nation-states. We need a recognition of the terrible threat that we face now. We see the need of coming together, and getting some big powers together on things that seem impossible. And then, giving hope.

Look at what's happened to the Italian people. I've seen this. What's happened to them, with the destruction of the industries? What's happened with the destruction of culture and education? It's happened in all European countries. It's happened in the United States. What's happened?

The power to think creatively, the power to make and understand scientific discoveries: Classical culture is almost an unknown quality among nations that have been a repository of Classical cultures in the past centuries. We've lost it. It's the development of the human individual mind, and particularly the power of making discoveries of principle, which are an integral part of a language culture, and therefore, a nation should be based on language culture, and the nations with different language cultures, should learn to talk to each other.

We did fairly well in European civilization in past times. I think we can do it again.

Senator De Gregorio: I thank Professor LaRouche for his presence and his contribution, which gave rise to an ample debate among the Senators present here. We are pleased with this, because it means that the remarks and ideas you provided were enthusiastically received.



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

[Watch](#) The LaRouche Case video

[Watch](#) the LaRouche Memorial video

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

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review
October 31, 2014 Vol. 41 No. 43 www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

LaRouchePAC Issues Emergency War Plan Against Ebola
Asian Investment Bank Will Finance Great Projects
Putin Speaks the Truth about NATO War Provocations

The New Silk Road: Mankind
Is the Only Creative Species!

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

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

EIR DAILY ALERT SERVICE

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



SUBSCRIBE (e-mail address must be provided.)

EIR Online

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

EIR DAILY ALERT SERVICE

- \$50 one month (introductory)
- \$150 three months
- \$300 six months
- \$600 one year (includes EIR Online)

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

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to

EIR News Service Inc.

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

Please charge my ☐ MasterCard ☐ Visa
☐ Discover ☐ Am Ex

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail _____

EIR can be reached at: www.larouchepub.com/eiw

e-mail: fulfillment@larouchepub.com Call 1-800-278-3135 (toll-free)