

The Welfare of Our People Comes First

After his presentation, Lyndon LaRouche engaged in a dialogue with the audience at the Pine Bluff town meeting on Feb. 23. The Rev. Dr. Henry "Hank" Wilkins IV, who also serves in the Arkansas State Senate and chairs the Legislative Black Caucus, moderated.

Reverend Wilkins: Are there any questions?

Q: Number one, you talk about reform, economic reform: Does that include, that the United States should go into the issuance of its own currency? You talk about banking reform. Does that include, that the United States government should put the Federal Reserve out of issuance of its own currency? Do you advocate that?

LaRouche: No, not quite. Something similar, though. Look, I can tell you, the banks of the world, in, say, Europe and the Americas: The banking systems of Europe and the Americas and of Japan, are hopelessly bankrupt. It's not just a little thing; they are hopelessly bankrupt. They are basket cases. That includes Citibank, this includes Chase Manhattan, J.P. Morgan-Chase Manhattan, and so forth and so on. They're bankrupt.

Now, what happened? Our Federal Reserve System, of course, is the Federal expression of the banking system. Remember what the Federal Reserve System is: The Federal Reserve System is a consortium of private financier interests, which was chartered on the initiative of Teddy Roosevelt, and under Woodrow Wilson, to become a power *over* our government. That is, private interests were able to take control, increasingly, of our currency, and our regulation of our banking system—with government participation. But it was a copy of the European banking systems; it was not our constitutional banking system. In point of fact, it can be shown, literally, that the Federal Reserve System was unconstitutional, because it's contrary to specifications of the Federal Constitution, and those provisions were never repealed.

That means that the Federal government, through the Treasury Department, is actually responsible, probably with the participation of Congress in some capacity, to put the Federal Reserve System into collective bankruptcy reorganization. That means that the United States Treasury assumes the caretaker responsibility for the Federal Reserve System, and the banks included.

Now, our objective is severalfold. In the long run, we're going to have to reorganize these finances. Most of the paper

outstanding against the banks could never be paid. Write it off—it's bankrupt. Some of this will have to be frozen, or reorganized in other ways, as we did in the 1930s. At the same time, we have to keep the doors of banks open, if the banks are necessary, because a bank not only represents a private interest, it is also an institution of the communities of the country, on which we depend for deposit, for issuance of credit, and for other transactions which are essential to the continuation of ordinary business. Therefore, when you put the banks into bankruptcy, you have to take them over, and you probably have the same bankers sitting there, the same people, doing the same things they were doing the day before, in terms of meeting these kinds of responsibilities. So it's actually operating as under Chapter 11, in bankruptcy reorganization—that function. Some banks will close down altogether—they're junk. You can't do anything with them. But any bank that has a useful public function, on the Federal or state level, must stay in business.

Under these conditions, the currency of the United States will have to become legal again. The only legal currency, under our Constitution, is a currency which is issued by the Federal government, with the approval of the Congress. And similarly, any debts that the U.S. Treasury pledges for the future, such as bonds, that sort of thing, Federal bonds, again, is a promise to pay in U.S. currency, and implicitly calls upon the authorization of the Congress to authorize the Federal government to incur this future payment, in currency.

So, what we're going to have to do, is put the banking system into banking reorganization, create a new credit line, probably using something like I've been working on, a revived Jesse Jones or Reconstruction Finance Corp., that was used by Roosevelt, as he used it, to get Federal credit, and other credit, combined, to get it into the banking system, to get it out there churning on state projects, and things of that sort, just like the TVA [Tennessee Valley Authority]. Or something like the TVA, that kind of project. So, that's what we're going to have to do. So that's what I'm talking about.

The Federal government will have to act, to prevent a chain-reaction collapse of the financial system of the United States, and do similar things in cooperation with other countries, for international transactions. This means the Federal government will take over the Federal Reserve System, and other things that have to be maintained; put them into bankruptcy reorganization—that is, not shut them down, put them into bankruptcy reorganization—and administer them. The Federal government, through that facility, will have to generate credit, Federal credit, which it will then utilize particularly in support of programs, which are deemed necessary for the national interests. Just the way the TVA was done.

This would mean, national transportation systems. My proposal is that the effective way this is done, as much as possible, you do it through state public utilities. That is, the state creates a public utility. This public utility has certain guarantees, which the states arrange. We used to use these



LaRouche told his Pine Bluff audience that the Federal government, through the Treasury, is responsible to put the Federal Reserve system through bankruptcy reorganization, and keep banks open for issuance of credit for infrastructure development and jobs.

public utilities, as in the cases of power, and so forth, these were places which, because they were regulated, poorer people could put their savings into the bonds in these public utilities, and be assured a reasonable, secure return on the investment, for their future, their pensions. What happened to 401(k)s, under the 401(k) bill, the looting of many people of their savings, by this crazy 401(k) law: We have to protect the citizen. Therefore, you would create public utilities, for water systems, power systems, transportation systems, other things that are properly in the domain of government, or government regulation; you create public utilities, you encourage people to put private savings into these things, to supplement the advance of credit from state governments and Federal governments, and use that as a great stimulus. That's essentially what we have to do.

Reverend Wilkins: I know this is a lot to swallow at one time, but—

Q: Mr. LaRouche, you created such a draconian picture of the world today, with the government, that the “Dubya” Administration has presented today, how do we as citizens, and taxpayers, put forth a position of that nature?

The world today is not like it was in the '30s, with the Republican administration, because I think what I understand you to be saying, is that the WPA projects and things that were put forth, by the Federal government into all the states, to rebuild the infrastructure, needs to be done again today. Is that not right?

LaRouche: Yes.

Q: We operate on a totally different society today. It's

more global. And a lot of the dollars that you're speaking of, are not in this country. They are in other countries, all over the world. So, how do we go about doing that?

LaRouche: First of all, we end the global system. Because our Constitution, first of all, is a national Constitution. Secondly, the globalization is dangerous. You can not have a sound economy and a globalized economy. It is globalization, in various disguises, which has caused this world depression. We went from an idea that a nation-state should have national economic security, and therefore should have the power to determine its own national economic security. That meant that you protected industries *in* your country. Look here! You've got a paper industry, right here. You've got this whole belt across the Southern states, in the evergreen area, evergreen swamp area, which has been producing paper. So what's happening across these states, and right in this community, you have the paper industry is affected, that's going under. Why? Globalization.

Q: Well, yeah, but it's the G-7 [Group of Seven nations] that sets globalization policy.

LaRouche: Yeah, I agree, but the point is: What's happening now? The world is changing. The center of power in the world right now, in terms of economic power, potentially, is between Western Europe, and a group of nations in Asia, centered around Russia, China, India, and Southeast Asia, the so-called Southeast Asian group—the trading relations. China has got the biggest projects in the world, the Three Gorges Dam, the biggest water project in the world. They're also building a still larger water project, to pull water from the South to the North. They've put in the most modern rail

system in the world, has just been started in China: magnetic levitation rail system from Shanghai to Shanghai Airport. They're going to build more of them. You know, this is like 300 miles an hour, rail system. Nice and quiet. Comfortable. I've ridden on the thing in the experimental station in Germany. Wonderful thing.

So, you have large-scale projects. The Mekong Development project, which involves China, the nations of Southeast Asia. Large projects in India, which are being mooted.

Western Europe, which is bankrupt, depends upon its exports to China, India, and so forth, for its own survival. They're going under otherwise. Russia is key to this—in the middle. So, we have, in Eurasia, a large-scale program, involving Japan, Korea, China, the ten nations of Southeast Asia, India, and so forth. These nations are now in cooperation on technology sharing, across this whole continent. And this is the basis for a great economic revival of that continent.

Our view is that, to do this, each nation must return to—away from globalization, scrap the WTO, scrap the G-7 globalization agreements. Because the G-7 are bankrupt. So therefore, they have to be reorganized. Go back to sovereign nation-state systems, like we had between 1946 and 1958, in recovering in the post-war world.

Q: But the whole world has deregulated. I think what you're presenting is re-regulation.

LaRouche: Absolutely.

Q: And that's a difficult thing to in this—

LaRouche: Not for me. Not if people are desperate enough. Not if you care. If I tell you, that if you don't re-regulate, if you don't scrap this system, you're not going to survive, are you going to do it? And I'm telling you the truth when I tell you that.

Q: Well, how is it that citizens can present this case to the Administration, or to national leaders?

LaRouche: I'm presenting it. I'm quite successful in presenting it to foreign countries, which I deal with. And I have a bill which has been adopted in Italy, for going back to a Bretton Woods system, and the majority of the Chamber of Deputies of Italy voted it up. We have bills in that direction are going forth in Europe. We have similar proposals which are—a reform has occurred in China, in this direction. Cooperation among these nations in this direction is already there. It's only the United States, because of our ever-beloved news media, that the typical citizen in the United States doesn't know what's going on in the world outside the United States, and doesn't know about this crisis, which every other part of the world knows about. We're sitting here uninformed. Well, I'm well informed.

So, step number one: I have to inform you. And that's my job. Not just to be a candidate. My job is to be an advocate of your interests. I'm not just a candidate: I'm 80 years old, I

don't *need* the job. I happen to be in excellent condition. My enemies don't like that, but I am in excellent condition.

And the point is, is to get *you* informed, in every part of the United States, through media just like this, where I can get close to a small enough number of you at one time, where we can have the kind of discussion, to thrash out some of these ideas. And you will come to the point that you'll do it. But you have to have a sense, that we are a nation, we're all suffering. I'm an expert in the area, so I can tell you what the suffering is like in different parts of the world. We're all suffering. We're sitting here with our faces hanging out, in the Northeast, the West, and so forth, we're all sitting out, just like you are here in Arkansas, and we're all suffering. We're wondering how to put it together. And once we get the *idea*, of how we can put it together, I don't think we're stoppable.

Q: Well, bringing this home locally, to Pine Bluff, you know, you've heard today that we're faced with a possible tax increase from the city government level, the county government level, on the state level, the school board systems, and we're definitely facing tax increases on the Federal level, as far as the FICA tax, and things like they do. How do we deal with that, when we're dealing with shrinking income? I mean, as a whole. How does the community deal with it?

LaRouche: I know exactly what you're saying. What you're dealing, actually, with is not just today's crisis. You're alive today. You'll be alive tomorrow. You'll be alive X number of weeks or months from now. That is not precisely the problem. The problem is, come Summer, come Fall, where will you be? The question is, can something happen in this country between now and Summer and Fall, to change the situation? You'll get by, in the short term, in the term of months. You'll find some way to maneuver and get by. But, the long-term perspective is zero, unless we change. So, the question is, how do we get moving, and begin to change the way we think about things, in time to act jointly, and to do some of the kinds of things I'm talking about?

So, I assume that today, in the state of Arkansas, you've got people here, who know somehow, how to manage the situation, to prevent a catastrophe in the short term, or in terms of months, or weeks. You get by. But, into next year, you won't get by. Therefore, in the meantime, before the election comes in the year 2004, before the January 2005 inauguration of the next President, we have to change this country.

I think that what's happened now, is the problem is, as I said, is that the obsession with this war issue has gotten our attention off the issues which affect *you here*, and affect the country as a whole, and the world as a whole. Because, if we were paying attention to the economic issue, instead of being distracted by the war issue, we will raise these issues—

Reverend Wilkins: [to questioner] I want to respond to a portion of that. What we see on television, when you turn your television on, when you look at the Today Show, when



An educator asked, "How can citizens present this case to national leaders? This is positively needed, because a lot of times, we are so misinformed. . . ." LaRouche responded, "I'm presenting it. I have to inform you. And that's my job. Not just to be a candidate. My job is to be an advocate of your interests."

you look at the evening news, that's all they're talking about, is this war, and it's creating a mind-set in America that says, "We've got to do this. Well, you know, we've started down—we've got these troops over there, we might as well go ahead and do this."

Well, in reality, we don't *have* to do a war, if we don't really want to do one. As an elected official, I see my responsibility as helping to educate the populace, because what we're going to have to have—it's clear that we don't have the national leadership mind-set to make this change from the top down. We're going to have to create a groundswell from the bottom up. And so, I see that as part of my responsibility.

I don't know anywhere else, in the state of Arkansas today, where there are people sitting down, getting this kind of information. Have you heard it anywhere else? Have you seen it anywhere else? No, you haven't. It's not happening. So, we've got to take the leadership at the ground of getting information out to people, and as we do that, I think we'll create a groundswell that will cause some Congressmen, and some Senators, and ultimately, you know, to do something—or else.

Q: I have a question, and I fear that it's going to be oversimplified, but I didn't hear Mr. LaRouche say anything about what to do with those rogues, and crooks, and I could call them a lot of other names, who've stolen all of that money, from Enron and all those companies, and while we—I say Enron: Enron is just one of many, many, many, who have caused people to lose jobs, who have caused people to lose entire retirements, and I did not hear you speak to that issue. It may be a minute part of the problem, but it is a problem for

those of us in the trenches.

LaRouche: Let me be plain-spoken and answer you directly, without going too far, and saying too much, about our President, or his friends, or others. The reason I have problems in the Democratic Party, is because of that. That there are certain people, who are tied to famous names in organized crime, who control much of our financial system, and our political system, from the top down, especially in the party organization part of the national parties.

For example, let me give one name. A guy who is the leader of an international drug-trafficking mafia. His name is Marc Rich. Now, at the beginning of February, former President Clinton was interviewed, and asked if he would pardon Marc Rich if he had to do it over again today. His answer was, "No." I was very happy to hear that President Clinton had said that. I thought it was very intelligent statement. He said, "Why? Because Marc Rich belongs to the Republicans. He's Cheney's problem." And if he left it to the Republicans to pardon Marc Rich, he wouldn't have gotten, Clinton wouldn't have gotten any flak over pardoning Marc Rich. So he wouldn't do it again.

Now, what's Marc Rich? Marc Rich is a very dirty guy. He's a part of something called the Russian Mafiya. It's tied with everything evil you want on this planet, and it controls Al Gore, for example. Al Gore was one of its progeny. Joe Lieberman is part of it. Some of the people in the top ranks of the Democratic National Committee are part of it. Many of the Congressmen know about this stuff. They don't know as much as they should, because they don't wish to: It's too uncomfortable. But they're not of that temperament.

Now, you go on the Republican side, and you find that,

not only is Marc Rich tied into Joe Lieberman and Al Gore's friends, but he's also, his lawyer is the key man for Vice President Dick Cheney. And, if you look at the Marc Rich-Halliburton relationship to Vice President Dick Cheney, you begin to see. If you look at some of the things on the Bush side, you see the same thing.

What you're talking about, are people who have looted our country. Look what Enron did. Enron is responsible for the bankruptcy of California, and similar kinds of things. 401(k) was a swindle of this type. Who did it? The same kind of people—401(k). People have lost—they went from Social Security, went from regular pensions, into this 401(k), which was a swindle, from the beginning. But greed inspired people to say, "I can get more money out of 401(k)s than I can from a solid pension." They gave it up, and they were swindled. Now we've got people running around, who thought they had pensions; they don't have them any more.

No, this crowd is all one thing. And I am well-informed about these characters, as I've intimated to you. I know who they are, and what they are, and what control it is they have over the national parties, and control over part of the Congress. And, I have made myself their enemy, and therefore, within some quarters, I'm not much liked, but I'm sort of proud of that.

Q: I want to know about Alan Greenspan. How do you feel about him then?

LaRouche: Well, Alan Greenspan, I understand, takes baths, and I hope he comes clean there, because he doesn't any place else. There's talk about him spending a long time in his bathtub monthly, with his little quacky ducky, or whatever it is. But, I just hope he would come clean there.

No, remember, back in 1979, Carter, under Brzezinski's pressure, appointed Paul Volcker as Federal Reserve chairman, and that was the beginning of the collapse of the U.S. economy, its final phase, when he went with that 21%, 22% interest rate increase, which collapsed a lot of things. Since that time, since 1979 to the present, the U.S. money system has been controlled top-down by two fellows in succession: Paul Volcker, and his successor Alan Greenspan. Alan Greenspan has created some terrible financial bubbles. He's one of the chief causes of collapses of the economy. The collapse of 1998, the GKO collapse, of Long Term Capital Management, was his creation. The IT bubble collapse was Alan Greenspan's creation. The coming collapse of the real estate bubble, which is going to hit the Washington area, and other areas—the Fannie Mae bubble, Fannie Mae-Freddie Mac bubble, he created it. This man—I call him "Bubbles."

But, he is a very vicious fellow. He was a follower of Ayn Rand, and if you wanted something really right-wing, and fascist, Ayn Rand was it. And he was the head of her fan club for a long period of time, and he carried the tradition of that fan club into the Federal Reserve System, and you've seen the results.

Q: Is it that I'm investing, throwing good money after no money? Because, I was listening to you talk about the bankruptcy of the banks, and, you know, the huge ones, Chase and Citibank, and all of these, and part of our investments, part of our stocks, these are companies where we supposedly hold stock. So, am I throwing my \$10 after no money?

LaRouche: Well, let me go to a more fundamental question, because your question pertains to it. A long time ago, you may have read the *Republic* of Plato. In there, in the second book of the *Republic*, in the dialogue among—trialogue, among Socrates, Glaucon, and Thrasymachus, there's a discussion about national policy. In the course of this, Socrates introduces in Greek a term called "*agapē*." *Agapē* is the same word used by the Apostle Paul in *I Corinthians* 13. What is sometimes translated as "charity," "love," and so forth; it means something much more, as you may know from that reading.

This term came into modern usage from the Greek, and from the Greek New Testament into Europe during the 15th Century, during the establishment of the first modern nation-state in France, as a result of the sacrifice of Jeanne d'Arc, who made that possible. And the idea that a nation-state is not legitimate—is morally illegitimate, unless the sovereign is accountable, efficiently, for the general welfare of the whole population, including posterity. Therefore the supreme law of government is that, of legitimate government.

Our Constitution specifies sovereignty. We as a people and our government are sovereign in our territory. That government is legitimate to the extent it exerts that sovereignty, and assures the general welfare of the total population, and posterity. That's our law.

The opposite law, is the tradition of apostle of slavery, John Locke, who introduced slavery into the Carolinas, as a formal system of law, called "property." The United States government today, is dominated, in the majority of the Supreme Court, by people like—by thugs, like Antonin Scalia, who says the law is shareholder value. Under the law, in any crisis, under our Constitution, under the Christian tradition, I just referred to, the government is responsible to protect the general welfare *first*, and other things second. We must defend the sovereignty of our republic, and the republic must defend the general welfare.

So, when it comes to sorting out bankruptcy, when there's any financial bankruptcy, the law dictates—if we follow the law—the law dictates that the general welfare comes first. The sovereignty, general welfare, and posterity come first. Others come afterward, if there's something left over. So therefore, those who invested in good faith, or those who have a need, someone who's invested in a pension—the responsibility of government is to make sure those pensions are met first, the stockholders last. The welfare of our people comes first.

Think more deeply. What is the implication here? I often



At the Arkansas state capitol in Little Rock, LaRouche is joined by Revenue and Taxation Committee Chairman Jimmy Mulligan (left), just before LaRouche was introduced to the State Senate and House of Representatives. At right are LaRouche aides Stuart Rosenblatt and Richard Magraw.

use this. Normally in politics, I stay away from theology as much as I can, but I can only stay away so far.

Reverend Wilkins: Me, too. [general laughter]

LaRouche: We have that problem in common. But the point—I pose the question: Why do politicians fail? Why do politicians who are otherwise bright, intelligent people, why do they fail morally? Like Hamlet, Shakespeare’s Hamlet. They fail because as Hamlet says, in the third act, is, “When we shuffle off this mortal coil . . .” What frightens Hamlet is not death; what frightens him is immortality. What comes afterward. And Jeanne d’ Arc, for example, was able to sacrifice her life for humanity, willfully accepting the alternative of being burned alive, rather than accepting the degrading conditions of not being burned alive, for the sake of all humanity, because she was sure of her immortality.

Leaders have the problem, that very few of our leaders are exactly obsessed by immortality. And some of our nice leaders are not obsessed by immortality, and therefore they make compromises: “Well, I’ve got to think of my self-interest.” But you only have one life! You only have one mortal life! And all eternity around it. And you have to say, “Am I an animal, like a monkey, that when I die, that’s the end? Or am I a human being, who’s accountable for my interest in eternity, as opposed to just this little mortal life I have?” As it’s said in the parable in the New Testament, you have a talent. It’s your mortal life. How do you spend it? For *what* do you spend it? And the problem we have today, is, we’ve become a putrid kind of heathen population, not for lack of

preachers, but for lack of Christians among the preachers. Because this question of immortality—people are more concerned: “If I go to Hell, what kind of a house am I going to get?” Or, “Is God going to intervene to pay my mortgage next month?” As opposed to, “What am I willing to live and die for?”

In former times, when we were more moral, we would say, “We invested our lives, and risked our lives for the sake, immediately, of our children and grandchildren and others, for the community of the people.” But, that is gone now. The “Now Generation” says, “What I get *now*, in the short run, is what counts. What I do for my grandchildren, what I do for the children that are coming. . . .”

Now for me, an older guy, I’ve a few frisky years before me, I assure you. But, I don’t have that many years before me. What I’ve got is

what I leave behind. What I’ve got is immortality. And the problem we have today, is, too many of our leaders, and too few of our citizens, still have that sense of immortality. Therefore, they make decisions, and fail to impose decisions upon their leaders, which are based upon that consideration.

My concern is, what is going to happen to this planet, if this depression and this war go ahead? There’s going to be hell on this planet for a long time to come. If we can prevent that, if we can save this nation, which was a beautiful creation; if we can realize all the things we’ve put in to making it something, and if we give our lives to that, even just by living out our life in a certain manner, we’ve got infinite courage, and can do infinite things. My problem is, we are too weak. And, as I say, I don’t try to get on the theology business too much, but when it comes to this question of immortality—

Reverend Wilkins: We’ve got just a couple more questions, and then we’re going to close.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, while I agree with a lot of what you said, I disagree with what you say about the war. What do you think is going to happen, if we *don’t* go do it?

LaRouche: Nothing bad is going to happen.

Q: Sept. 11 showed that the defense of this country was shattered. It proved that the government did not do what it’s supposed to do.

LaRouche: That’s right.

Q: Have you been in military service?

LaRouche: Yes, I have.

Q: I was in the military too. If we don't do something, they're going to do something to [us]. Because those kind of people got one thing in mind. If you don't believe what they believe in, they're going to kill you! And if you think that you can get away with not doing anything with them, you're sorely mistaken, sir.

LaRouche: Actually, who did Sept. 11?

Q: Nineteen Arabians, I guess.

LaRouche: No. They did not. We don't know exactly who did it.

Q: Yemenis, Arabians, whatever they were.

LaRouche: No, they weren't. What we've been told is a big lie.

Q: Well, who did it then?

LaRouche: Well, somebody inside our people.

Q: Bin Laden didn't plan it?

LaRouche: No. Not capable of doing it.

Q: Somebody inside our country?

LaRouche: Inside, at a high level.

Q: They were all proven to be nationals of some other country.

LaRouche: No, they weren't. Proof was never presented.

Q: Showed all of them on TV—

LaRouche: I know, but it's not been proven.

Q: That's all propaganda?

LaRouche: Yes, there is an investigation.

Q: So our own Americans paid 'em to do it?

LaRouche: No, not paid them to do it. They didn't do it.

Q: That's right. They didn't do it for pay, or anything, but what they were taught.

LaRouche: No.

Q: If they killed us, they were going to go see God.

LaRouche: Let me pull rank on you on this one. One of my areas is security. I was the author, the original author, of what became known as the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative]. I did that as a project, as a private citizen, with the Reagan Administration, with the National Security Council. I've been involved in this security question for a long time. I've done things for our country, as a private citizen, which are fairly high level, and very sensitive. I know the security business.

No bunch of people from the Middle East, an outfit like Osama bin Laden, was capable of doing that. What was done was a very complex operation, and it was done deliberately, *to get us into a war*.

The policy—I know who the author of the policy is. The author of the policy is on record. At the end of the Bush Administration, first Bush Administration, 41, Dick Cheney adopted a policy for a war against Iraq. It was a policy which was done together with some others, who wanted to have a Clash of Civilizations war against Islam.

Q: Islam? Against the whole nation of Islam?

LaRouche: Yes, all Islam—1.3 billion people. And the policy is there. It's called the "Clean Break" policy. This policy was developed under Cheney, in cooperation with some people in Israel. It was originally designed as a policy for the Netanyahu government—the "Clean Break" policy. It was then adopted by Cheney, and it was turned down by the Bush Administration generally. Bush went out of office, and the thing was buried.

Then, on Sept. 11, 2001, the policy was suddenly revived. Revived by people who are known proponents of it: Richard Perle, Wolfowitz, Rumsfeld, Cheney, Libby, and so forth—the Marc Rich crowd, and so forth.

So this was an operation, which was done *within* the U.S. security system—which should have prevented at least two of the planes from hitting anything. The first one might have been a surprise, but the next two were not. And our security system had been taken down, and somebody knew *exactly* how to do it. Now, this could not have been done by anybody from a foreign country. It had to be done from somebody *inside* the United States, at a very high level, and there are people who wanted that effect. And they did it.

So, we're still looking for the guys. Look, we have to deal with this realistically.

Q: If you'll allow me to be blunt with you, you are a crazy fool. I know my friend. . . I apologize: You are a nut!

Another voice from audience: Same to you.

LaRouche: I happen to be an expert.

Q: You're an expert at being a fool.

Another Q: I can remember the Oklahoma City bombing. They said the same thing, you know. They said this has to be Islamic, and found out later on it was not. So a lot of times, those people do get blamed.

LaRouche: That's understandable.

Reverend Wilkins: We'll take two more quick questions here.

Q: You said nothing will happen, would happen, if we don't go to war. What will happen if we do go to war?

LaRouche: It's incalculable.

Q: I mean, in that area.

LaRouche: It won't be limited to that area. That's the whole point. See, the United States can probably go in safely. Tomorrow morning, they can take 400 rocket-launched missiles, and they could take the high-impact non-nuclear missiles, and hit areas like Baghdad, and make mincemeat of that whole area. That could happen.

But the point is, when you fight a war, you're not going in to kill people, you're going in to win a war. Winning a war means ability to occupy that territory, or not have to occupy it, over a period of time to come. The problem is we're faced with—. You'll find most of the U.S. military professionals, the ground-force senior military, retired and serving, and Marine Corps, like General Zinni, would agree. This is a stupid war to get into. Don't get involved in it. The President has been operating under the influence of Cheney's circles, and he's bought into it. It's a mistake, a terrible mistake.

We have no problem—I've dealt with some of the people who were experts, and went into Iraq earlier on the weapons inspectors—there's no problem. There's nothing we have to fear. Yes, Iraq might be able to get a weapon, and throw it against somebody nearby. But it's not a direct threat to us. Furthermore, the people in Europe, the people in Asia, the relevant people in the Middle East, are perfectly willing to do whatever is necessary, to control the situation, to keep it from coming to a war. So, you have nothing to fear. I've been in the Arab sector, I'm known throughout the Arab world. I've dealt with these countries. I know what the operation is. It's nothing we couldn't handle. You don't *have* to go to war.

Q: So, what's the game? For these people who are advocating it?

LaRouche: The game is, that there are certain nuts, in our own country and other countries, but especially in our own, who want this kind of war. They want a war against Islam. And, for example, Dick Cheney. Dick Cheney, the Vice President of the United States, wants such a war. Dick Cheney is the rooster for the hen house that wants these things. The people who want the war, are a bunch of draft-dodgers, chiefly, a bunch of draft-dodgers who ducked service during the 1960s, during the period of the Vietnam War, and they safely stayed here. Cheney himself was a draft-dodger. Got himself an exemption. So the draft-dodgers, who don't know what war *is*, who have no idea what it is, condemn the generals, who know what war is, who say, "Don't get into the war." And everybody I know in Europe, and in the United States, who I've talked with, in all kinds of circles, we all agree, there's *no need* for this war! It's a crazy idea.

Reverend Wilkins: And by the way, some of you may be familiar with Gen. Wesley Clark, who is an Arkansan, who was the commander of NATO, who has publicly said, over and over—he's from Arkansas, he's around here all the time—who has said—and he's well knowledgeable about

these issues; he's said, this war is not necessary, it doesn't make sense, it doesn't have to happen. . . .

Yes, ma'am. We need to wrap up.

Q: I'd like to give you a statement from one of my super-intelligent students—and most of them are. They think very well. And, Mr. LaRouche, what they said, they want this George to be like the first George. They want him to *lead* the troops into battle. And will you please take that on to Washington, D.C.? My students at Pine Bluff High School, want this George to be like the first George, and that is to lead the troops into battle.

Reverend Wilkins: You're talking about George Washington?

Q: Yes, George Washington, and George Bush. [Laughter.]

Q: To Mr. LaRouche, and the entire panel: I really appreciate this information. This is not a question, this is a comment. This is positively needed, because a lot of times, we are so misinformed, and a lot of times, we as teachers always need communication, so that we can connect, and have a clear understanding, and I appreciate this information.

Reverend Wilkins: Thank you all. Thank you, Mr. LaRouche. [Applause.] Mr. LaRouche, this is the cream of the crop of Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

Now, Are You Ready To Learn Economics?



The economy is crashing, as LaRouche warned. What should you do now?

Read this book and find out.

ORDER NOW FROM

Ben Franklin Booksellers
P.O. Box 1707
Leesburg, VA 20177

We accept MasterCard, VISA,
Discover and American Express

OR Order by phone:
toll-free 800-453-4108

OR 703-777-3661 fax: 703-777-8287
\$10 plus shipping and handling. Virginia
residents add 4.5% sales tax.

Shipping and handling: \$4.00 for first
book, \$.50 each additional book.