

AS EASY AS FALLING DOWNSTAIRS:

General McChrystal's Folly

by Lyndon H LaRouche, Jr.

September 24, 2009

Then, while the stink of the smoke was still clearing around lower Manhattan and the Pentagon, the members of the bin Laden family which had been meeting with a certain circle in Texas, were the solitary party specially allowed to fly out of the post- "9-11" U.S.A. Some wars fought by what are, in effect, the likeness of mere pieces on a set of global chessboards for a grand game of Kriegspiel, are expressions of a global game in which the umpire is actually the controller of the game being played by those puppets which only appear to be the respective, contending players

There were strenuous efforts, by aid of the Bush-Cheney administration's subsequent use of that intrinsically fraudulent and systemically anti-constitutional, "unitary executive" doctrine, a doctrine underlying the fraudulent Presidential practice of uttering "signing statements." Among the objectionable features of such efforts, were the implications of the effort to suppress the presently known evidence of the Anglo-Saudi role played by the Prince Bandar who was then Saudi Ambassador to Washington, D.C., in the funding of at least one of the key pilots in the attack against the U.S.A. on September 11, 2001.

That precedent provokes an ugly suspicion respecting the way in which that puppet on the strings of his own foolish ego of President Barack Obama, had, earlier, adopted similarly fraudulent arguments for a continuation of U.S. combat in Afghanistan, statements used as a pretext for a renewal, under Obama, of the Bush Presidency's use of the notion of the already, systemically anti-constitutional "unitary executive."

The issue of fundamental law here, is posed by the fact that the U.S. Fed-



White House/Pete Souza

By no means a Gen. Douglas MacArthur, here Gen. Stanley McChrystal meets with British puppet Barack Obama Oct. 2 in Copenhagen. Obama was there in a losing bid to get Chicago the 2016 Olympics. The politically incompetent McChrystal was there to hawk an expanded land war in Asia, this time in Afghanistan, which in the past has driven out the British and the Soviets.

eral Constitution is premised upon a subsuming scientific principle of universal natural law, a principle which is equivalent to a discovered natural law of the universe. This is a discovered, subsuming, universal law of human nature, rather than a provision subsumed under the authority of a renegotiable contract. A principle of the universe can not be negotiated; it can only be discovered.

The principled features of that Constitution which are not negotiable matters, include the recognition of the necessary sanctity of the system of checks and balances which must exert control over the willful practice of our constitutional system of government, as respecting such matters as the notion of the “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”¹ as stated in the 1776 Declaration of Inde-

1. Thus, those proposed health-care laws, which intend to regulate who shall be assigned to die, and who live, such as the Nazi-modelled IMAC (Independent Medicare Advisory Council) proposal of the present Obama administration are purely violations of the U.S. Constitution, and of natural law. Those who violate such natural law must learn to tremble in awe of the Creator’s wrath, which will be forthcoming in some appropriate fashion, in due course of time, as it came to condemned officials of the former Nazi system.

pendence, and as presented in the form of the principle of universal law stated as the Preamble of the U.S. Federal Constitution.

Notably, the principle of law in that case was, and remains of the same special nature as natural law as the 1648 Peace of Westphalia which echoed Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa’s *De Pace Fidei*. It is also of notable relevance here, that that Westphalian principle is that which has been assaulted by the depraved, now former British Prime Minister, Tony Blair.

In opposition to the mistaken conception of the meaning of “science” prevalent today, the essential feature of a truthful science today, is akin to the uniquely original discovery of a principle of universal gravitation, as that discovery was assessed, in retrospect, by Albert Einstein.

The lesser aspect of Kepler’s uniquely original discovery, on that account, is that principle ex-

pressed by the formulation for gravitation in the Solar system, which was copied by the English plagiarists of the lifetime of Isaac Newton. As Einstein emphasized, the principle underlying that specific feature of Kepler’s discovery, was also the expression of the higher aspect of his work: the notion that the demonstration of the nature of the action of gravitation within that known part of the Solar system demonstrated, as Einstein emphasized, that the universe is finite, but not as if externally bounded. Hence, the intrinsic relationship between the phenomena of gravitation and electromagnetism, as emphasized by Einstein, is a matter of crucial significance bearing on the human travel among even the near-by planets of Earth’s Solar system.²

You can not repeal the law of gravity, as Johannes Kepler originally discovered this universal law, by the mere willful assertions of any person or government. You can not repeal the distinction of life from death, nor

2. E.g., that the universe is self-bounded, as implicit in the principle of universal gravitation, but that it is, at the same time, self-bounded by a principle of universal anti-entropy.

man from beasts, nor that rejection of the essentially feudal relics of European law against which the emergence of our Federal Constitution was intended to protect us. The attempt to overthrow a system of lawful government predicated upon those and related conclusions peculiar to the essential principle of our Federal Constitution, in preference for those essentially immoral conceptions of law peculiar to British tradition, for example, is proximate to treason, since the violation of that principle of our Constitution, with its separation of powers in and of government, would be the destruction of the special nature of the existence of our republic, and, in whatever the relevant circumstances, more or less proximate to an act of destruction, as an attempt to destroy the existence of our peculiar species of self-government.

It is useful, and incurs no systemic error, to say that our constitution differs from European constitutions, chiefly, in the respect that our constitution rests upon the specifically relevant authority of a universal principle of nature, in contrast to, in particular, that British ideology which is premised on behavioralist notions antithetical to tolerating the existence of the very notion of actual natural law.

Our body of law does include contractual features, of course; but, the existence of these supplementary features is subsumed, and thus constrained by the single principle on which the constitutional existence of our special form of republic depends. Thus, certain errors in the form of merely contractual agreements, which creep, deep into the cracks within the whole body of the Federal Constitution, are tolerable to a certain degree; but, the features which define the whole body of the existence of our republic, are unique to our constituted nation, and can not be touched without thus threatening to destroy the constitutional existence of our nation as a whole.



White House photo

If he fulfills his oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution, President Obama must defend its fundamental principle of natural law, which is inconsistent with the “unitary executive” doctrine he is moving to implement.

As history has shown, in cases of such extreme national emergency, as our Civil War, and in the treatment, under President Franklin D. Roosevelt during 1933-1945, there has been no emergency, including that caused by the included complicity of certain Saudi and other interests during and following the events of September 11, 2001, which could not be addressed with sufficient force within the bounds of the provisions of our Federal Constitution. The similarities between the issue posed by the Bush-Cheney reaction to events of “9-11” and that of the orchestration of the 1933 Reichstag Fire in Germany, illustrate that point.

So, the passion of the morally corrupt among us which attempts to introduce a so-called “unitary” system of government, places the authors and institutions responsible for such corruption as agents of an attempt at systemic destruction of that principle on which the very existence of our constituted republic depends.

Those features of the Constitutional law upon which the continued existence of our government de-



U.S. Army/MC1 Chad J. McNeeley

In proposing to pursue a disastrous counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan, U.S. Army General Stanley McChrystal is acting like a virtual pawn on the chessboard, a chessboard being controlled by British imperial strategists. Here, McChrystal testifies on his nomination to lead U.S. forces in Afghanistan.

“reform” proposed by President Obama, has been steering the United States in a direction tantamount to the Nazi regime before this present time. The promotion of the frankly fascist health-care policies of Nazi Germany, the British monarchy, and the promoters of an IMAC policy in the U.S.A., is typical of that class of crimes against humanity which are associated with Nazi practices. It is necessary, to recognize that enemy by that name.

The case of the proposals associated with Lieutenant-General Stanley McChrystal’s stated intention is to be seen as one more, ignorant step typical of the consequences for human behavior more broadly considered, of ignoring the fact of the violation of constitutional principle expressed by the concept of the “unitary” principle.

pend, are not negotiable by any process of deliberation whose own existence is not predicated on the existential preconditions set forth on behalf of that Constitution.

The opinions crafted from philosophical standpoints which differ from those at the root of our Federal Constitution, have no proper authority in judging the reading of our Constitution in a way contrary to its own, historically unique principle. That foresees what the onrushing general breakdown of every economy, and even every society on this planet is about to suffer, soon, unless the uniquely underlying principle of our Federal Constitution’s intent, is enforced by us upon ourselves, and applied to promote, thus, the modes of cooperation among other sovereigns which this implies.

Meanwhile, we should recall, that without both the suppression of the truth about the “9-11” attack and his “signing statements,” it were doubtful that President George W. Bush, Jr. could have made his way through even one term in office, not two. Without that erroneous response to that attack, the world at large would not have become quite the disaster it has become today. So, from the moment of “9-11” on, the Federal government of the U.S.A. under Presidents George W. Bush, Jr. and, now, Barack Obama, has steered the way down the road to a likely fascist dictatorship, which like Hitler’s, and like the Hitler-like health-care

President Obama’s Mental Lapses

Today, only my consideration of President Obama’s typical mental lapses, such as his recklessly Nero-like, narcissist impulses, prompts me to avoid jumping to the conclusion that that President actually knows the full import of the evil which he is perpetrating. Nonetheless, there are those other persons and cliques, chiefly among the President’s imperial, and also umpireal proprietors in London, and the latter’s cronies in influential U.S. places, who know exactly what the President’s *politically incompetent* U.S. Lieutenant-General Stanley McChrystal has declared himself poised to do next in Afghanistan. It seems clear that McChrystal himself is among those who have refused to understand what a monstrous mess his blunders would foment.

Clearly, speaking strategically, McChrystal is no General Douglas MacArthur, not by the length of a football field. My point in saying that here, is to introduce you to the crucially relevant point of the McChrystal affair, that the most important thing about war, is knowing, *politically*, not only when *not* to fight it, but that you are responsible for a correct insight into whose interest you are actually serving, if you would choose to fight. General McChrystal has fallen more than a wee bit short of such needed insights into matters bearing upon such political-strategic realities of the world situation today. What he has announced himself prepared

to do, is, perhaps, easy to attempt on the chessboard, but, in real life, about as useful as a drunk's falling down stairs.

As a virtual pawn on such a chessboard, General McChrystal himself has adopted the professed role of a reputedly expert chess-player in the art of irregular warfare, but, he has, among other things, overlooked the small consideration, that Afghanistan is far from being actually the chessboard on which that global political trap lies, into which his mind is wandering, were it actually to be the game played.

The essential quality of a successfully long reign of any empire over both its intended subjects and other assorted fools of the broader world, is to induce the intended subjects to ruin one another to the intended effect that their subjugation to imperial authority might persist intact, just as the Anglo-Dutch poltroons established their presently continued world empire through the initiative of the Seven Years War. So, as Churchill and his Harry Truman saved the British empire for its chance to reign during many subsequent decades, they accomplished exactly that result, by committing the misled United States to a prolonged state of years-long warfare, again and again, among the peoples of Eurasia, among other places, and so prolonged, in particular, the British empire's reign over the nations and peoples of Southwest Asia through a presently continuing extension of the World War I period's Sykes-Picot conspiracy.

That much said, now consider the actual strategic realities of the case immediately at hand. Start with the tell-tale action by President Obama in his renewing the anti-constitutional "unitary executive" fraud which had been introduced under the incumbency of President George W. Bush, Jr.

That was a Bush who had never been the brightest of the bulbs installed in the White House, a Bush who was



"Some ambitious and political figures have shown a lust for military strategies which were motivated, similarly, as the Bible tells us, in the fashion of King David's sending his own general, Uriah the Hittite, to his death, out of David's lust for Uriah's wife, Bathsheba." Here, Jean Colombe's portrayal of David dispatching Uriah.

used for both his own administration's and Obama's own attempts at copying Hermann Goering's part in securing dictatorial powers for Chancellor Adolf Hitler. That was the Hitler who gained dictatorial powers through that "9-11"-like burning of the Reichstag, which is traced to Göring. The current Obama policy for Afghanistan, should remind us that it was not only Hitler-style health-care policies, which that deluded narcissist, President Obama, had copied from the precedents set by the Hitler regime, and also by the British monarchy and its American population-control lackeys before that.³

A Lesson From "World War II"

Take the comparable cases, of, on the one side, Hitler's lying claim of Polish "aggression" for Nazi Germany's launching Wehrmacht tanks against the horse-flesh of the Polish cavalry, thus launching what became known as "World War II," and, on the other side, the British monarchy's efforts behind the present attempt to ensure the foredoomed, and wider disaster which must be unleashed

by any expanded warfare in Afghanistan.⁴ So, once

3. There are certain decisions which might be attempted by an erring U.S. Supreme Court Justice, which would be self-nullifying because they would amount to an overthrowing of the authority of the entirety of that U.S. Court, which would lose all legitimate powers to pass judgment, if the principled basis of the U.S. Constitution were so nullified. The notion of the award of fascist-like dictatorial powers such as those implicit in the frankly fascist concept of the "unitary executive" is such a type of case.

4. Respecting the quality of strategic political folly in General McChrystal's scheme, the following should be said. Among rational historians, it were almost impossible not to assume intentional British complicity in setting up that overrunning of Poland by Hitler's forces. Without bringing the borders of Germany and the Soviet Union together, beforehand, in this manner, it were not particularly convenient to launch what London had intended should be the outbreak of war-fighting between those two great powers. That had been precisely British intention under the Chamberlain government; hence, the overrunning of

more today, as, also, in the case of the silly Kaiser Wilhelm II's falling into the British-laid trap of World War I, through the firing of Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, the great fools of the world today are at it again.

So, General McChrystal is only one among the pack of those military and other commanders who have been sucked into a part in the British use of its U.S. puppet, President Obama, to serve as part of the continuing succession of the still-ongoing, deadly "mother of all wars" in Southwest Asia: just one more British scheme for luring our United States into its own ruin, in yet another of a series of land wars in Asia, land wars through whose use the British imperialists have orchestrated the ruin of the United States, step by step, since the death of President Franklin Roosevelt. So, some ambitious and political figures have shown a lust for military strategies which were motivated, similarly, as the Bible tells us, in the fashion of King David's sending his own general, Uriah the Hittite, to his death, out of David's lust for Uriah's wife, Bathsheba.

Those are characteristics of the current strategic situation represented by the cases of Obama and McChrystal. What, therefore, are the insights needed to lead us to the remedies for their follies? First, we must know the actual nature of the game. It is

Poland and the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact. Hitler had then "double-crossed Chamberlain," by utilizing an implicitly cooperative fascist government in France, to assist in creating that posture of French military capabilities which would ensure a successful Nazi overrunning of the superior forces of France. This, of course, thus violated what Britain had presumed would have been the separation of western from central Europe, that done for the purposes of that desired mutual ruin of both Germany and the Soviet Union which London so devoutly desired. Thus, Britain's pre-1940 ally Japan, which had been committed, since the early 1920s, to attack Pearl Harbor while British-allied naval forces would attack U.S. naval strength in the Atlantic, conducted the Pearl Harbor attack in its role as an ally, not of Britain, but of Hitler. The sequence which a Hitler himself might have preferred, was put aside, thus, by obvious, deep-rooted, strategic considerations of Germany's actual military situation. Germany could not launch an attack on the Soviet Union while leaving France's military capabilities at its back. Thus, Britain has always hated the memory of the Wehrmacht much, much more than the Hitler who, after all, had been created by Britain, for Britain's own intended use. Such are the dynamics which govern the disposition of what politically shallow-minded military commanders, such as McChrystal, have proposed. McChrystal's neglect of the concept of dynamics, is obvious.



British colonialists, like Gen. Bernard Montgomery of World War II fame, shown here, often appeared to some to be more intelligent than their adversaries; in fact, they were simply more experienced in exercising imperial power over the long run, against those who tend to get trapped in their own short-term impulses, including greed.

a game whose strategy is that of the umpire in the tradition of the cult of Delphi in the past, and of the forces behind the British empire's playing with nations as if they were mere pieces on a chessboard, still today.

I. Exactly How Smart Are The British?

This brings us to a matter which must be classified under the heading of *dynamics*. I mean *dynamics* as treated in my just recently published *The Science of Physical Economy*.⁵

It often appears to the credulous, that the British empire, which actually began as the empire of a private company, in February 1763, as an empire of the British East India Company under Lord Shelburne's on-the-ground command, might have been smarter than its vic-

5. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. *Economics as History: The Science of Physical Economy* (*Executive Intelligence Review*, Sept. 18, 2009, Vol. 36, No. 36).

tims of continental Eurasia. It appears, sometimes, as now, that our own United States under more than eight years under silly U.S. Presidents such as George W. Bush, Jr. and Barack Obama, is like that.

So, India's great Jawaharlal Nehru, writing in his *Jawaharlal Nehru: An Anthology*, and his 1936 *Autobiography*, was led into wondering thoughtfully, whether or not the British victory over his ancestral cause might reveal that they had been, in some way, culturally superior to India's leadership in this defeat. It is instructive to compare the case of Bal Gangadhar Tilak.⁶ The problem has been, that the British empire's subjects', and former such subjects' weakness shown in difficulties to resist repeated British imperialist manipulations, is matched by the habit of simpering anglophilism cultivated among certain regrettable ranks of our own citizenry.

I have come to understand British imperialism extremely well in some admittedly limited, but crucially important respects. There can be no margin for doubt that the British regime is by no means superior; but, we must not overlook the crucially significant point, that the British Raj has had the advantage of having become accustomed, over about two-and-a-half centuries (1763-2009), to the practice of the Venetian-like habits cultivated in the course of managing more or less all of the rest of the world. They, when they are their most clever selves, have been devoted to perpetuating their management of the world over the relatively longer spans, where others tend to be both simply greedy and more easily provoked into impulsive reactions which prove to have been the follies from which the British empire enjoyed a harvest.

The British imperialists have thereby acquired the imperialist habit continued by the Venetians, still today,

6. Good family traditions sometimes breed a special quality of disposition for leadership, as Nehru and his family illustrate the point. Since I met with Mrs. Indira Ghandi on two notable occasions, and had other dealings with her, both directly and indirectly, I came to share the estimate of her which Charles de Gaulle had recognized in her when she had been already a young woman stepping in for her father, in France, on a notable occasion. My views to this effect were shaped significantly by my experience of the dynamics of the situation in the first half of 1946 in the Calcutta of the great mass strike reaction to the British machine-gunning of a march of protesters against a preceding, typically British atrocity of that time. Her assassination by imperialist-steered interests was a great loss to humanity generally; still today, the removal of such talent as hers in governments, is rarely regained. I have found it indispensable to let myself be absorbed by the legacy of both, as against the background of my own experiences of, especially, 1945-46 and 1977-1984.

the habit of cultivating their own belief to the effect, that they presume that they should, and could rule a monetarist world-empire by exploiting the short-tempered credulousness of those others whom they intend to harvest as their victims and future subjects. Only those among us who share a certain specifically American patriotic tradition, recently a dwindling few, are more than a match for them psychologically in the domain of thinking in ways qualified to provide global leadership. We, if, and when we have our wits about us, and the opportunity to use them, do really understand the British, in some ways much better than they do themselves: since we have nothing to be ashamed about in the way we share the anti-British tradition of our founders, consider the larger human interests of the people and nations of the world. Therefore, we also know the moral and essential intellectual inferiority which they represent, apart from their habituation to the skills attributable to both their British and brutish methods and customs which they have acquired in the course of a habit of ruling which has been enjoyed by them much too long, over too many others.

The essential power of the British empire has lain in the foolish and stubborn credulities which are to be found as rampant sorts of credulities among the leading circles of other nations. The post-1812 Vienna Congress state of Europe, is a prime example of the widespread delusion, that the British are somehow necessarily better at instructing the planet as a whole as to how to behave, as since the time that British manners had taken precedence over the post-1648 legacy of the Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-century French of Jean-Baptiste Colbert. There should be no surprise in the fact, that nations and persons which have been too much, too often, and too closely occupied in admiring the British from the rear, lack good judgment respecting the world beyond that prospect.

In our own case, inside the United States, it is those who suggest that the British might be inherently better, who drag down so many among the influentials among our citizens, still today. Just look around you: how many Americans whom you know, are such craven British "butt-kissers," that they are quickly angered by the suggestion that the Queen of England might have something to do with the international drug-traffic which none other than the British East India Company, or its successor, the imperial monarchy, has been running since the end of the Eighteenth Century, up to the present day? Or, consider the system of African en-



Creative Commons/Pavel Rybin

The worst evil which British financial and cultural domination over the recent period has wrought, has been their destruction of Classical culture, in the arts and sciences. Here, the Twisted Sister group performs in Manchester, England in June 2006.

slavement which the Nineteenth-century Spanish monarchy ran, under both British direction, and protection, for British profit,⁷ until the victory of President Abraham Lincoln over Theodore Roosevelt's uncle, the Confederacy agent James D. Bulloch operating out of London, England, and such, in the U.S. Civil War.

Or, take the case of Sir Isaac Newton, who actually discovered nothing in actual physical science, but whose fraudulent claims to discovery of gravity and the calculus, are treated as religious verities among the academic and other fools of the world, still, to the present day. Apart from a plausible claim to have invented more sexes than any other known culture of the world,⁸ what is generally claimed by British tradition is extremely modest, in fact, after deductions for plagiarism and sheer hokum, when the British performance is compared with the cultures of such other Europeans as France, Germany, Italy, and Russia.

7. E.g., the 1839 Amistad case.

8. Ostensibly, as a measure of assistance in service of population control.

My word of caution at this point in my account, is that the British are not quite as stupid, as might be suggested by their expressed policies respecting, for example, physical science. There are some in those Isles who do think seriously about science matters, but when the empire deploys politically, it is not scientific progress which is the quality they encourage in people of other nations, or even the generality of the so-called lower classes or middle class of the United Kingdom itself.

It is the destruction of the scientific and related cultural potential of their credulous victims, which the British imperial tradition is strategically dedicated to impose upon the world's population generally, exactly as Aeschylus portrays the imperial policy of the Olympian Zeus, and as the frauds by Aristotle and Euclid are intended to promote the incapacity

of the ruled to resist the tyrant.

Those types of faults to which I have pointed here thus far, are not results of genetic flaws among the inhabitants of the residents of those isles, but, rather, a satanically devout attachment to the cause of the Olympian Zeus of Aeschylus's *Prometheus Bound*. In saying that, I report nothing relevant on that account, which differs, in the slightest degree, as to essential facts of the matter from what representatives of the British royal family, such as Princes Philip and Charles promote as dedication to the Malthusian population-reduction promoted by the World Wildlife Fund, as to be seen as through Hitler-like health-care and such products of anti-science policies delivered to the credulous as anti-nuclear power dogmas, today.

In brief, the British empire, whose continuing connections to the mid-Nineteenth Century African slave-trade, are as that is illustrated by the famous Amistad case, is smart in the fashion of a thuggish pimp and drug-pusher, or a Wall Street "loan-shark" who preys, like the Adam Smith of his own 1759 *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, on both his customer's desire for a sense of

pleasure, and that client's fear of pain. It was a British empire which dumped the African slave-trade on Britain's contemptible puppet, the Nineteenth-century Spanish monarchy, to free British fleets, thus, for the more profitable opium-trade.

However, those portraits to which I have pointed, while faultlessly real, historically, are merely a continuation of the imperial maritime-based form of monetarist tradition established in the Mediterranean, and, later, the Atlantic and the oceans and seas beyond, since the defeat of the Persian empire's attempts to take full control of the regions of the eastern Mediterranean and beyond. The British empire, has represented, essentially, the Anglo-Dutch, Atlantic-based outgrowth of what had been the new incarnation, superseding both the Roman and Byzantine empires, by what had been the Venetian maritime form of the monetarist interest which had dominated the Mediterranean monetarist form of maritime interest since Byzantium slipped into decline about A.D. 1000.

Yet, Like Satan, the Brits Are Stupid, Too!

Somewhere, some one must certainly have written something about Satan's reflection on his own plight. Here, it is reported, that he has risen to the top rank of his profession, and, yet, he remains unconsolated by his certainty that, in the end, he is an awful failure. The British ruling circles are like that. So, they have no higher calling in their existence, than to promote as much mischief as seems possible for their ultimately doomed cause, while they still can. Possibly some controller of the British royal household has confided those facts to the monarchy, but whether that has occurred, or not, is of little importance in the long run. It is, ultimately, simply bound to come to that.

If an impulse might surpass your better judgment, you might hear yourself asking: "Your Majesty! How in Hell are you doing, today?!" Somewhere, hearing such banter, Satan is wincing, reminded that that disgusting sort of important company is scheduled to visit him.

Many great, and other mortal thinkers have speculated in that spirit, and, for that, they usually had good reasons, as I have done, on occasion. However, our principal occupation must be to put Satan and his British oligarchy into our past. The good is not the absence of evil, but, rather, the destruction of evil is to be considered as only a by-product of the removing of obstacles to the better quality of a future for mankind, a future which we must be freed to bring into existence.

So, we are presented with the wickedness of General McChrystal's scheming which is to be addressed here.

In that view, there were two principal evils which a British caricature of Don Quixote, Winston Churchill, and his burlesque sort-of-Sancho Panza, Harry S Truman, brought upon the world in the wake of President Franklin Roosevelt's death.

Let us, therefore, prepare ourselves to treat the strategic situation in which General McChrystal's presently intended folly is situated, by considering it itself as an outcome for today of the circumstances which existed in the immediate aftermath of President Franklin Roosevelt's death on April 12, 1945. That was the day on which the influence of the circles of the OSS's General Donovan were pushed into the background, by the ascendancy of the surviving, rabidly anglophile veterans of the order of "the white shoe" who were tied to the same Brown Brothers Harriman whose Prescott Bush, the same grandfather of President George W. Bush, Jr, was famous for "laundering" the financial rescue of a bankrupt cause of Adolf Hitler in time to bring Hitler to power in Germany shortly after that. I know that crowd; I have known them to be a leading enemy of our republic and its Constitution, and also of mankind generally, for sixty-four years, since my service in Burma and India when I looked the British empire in the eye, close up, when local elements of British intelligence were, for a certain time, in Calcutta, "hot on my tail," and I was, in a very modest way, on theirs.

During those sixty-four years, I have, indeed, witnessed evil by that faction, both the British elements and their accomplices among us. However important those considerations were, the worst was not as much what they did, as what was the good which their wicked devotions, and the power which they should not have been allowed, prevented others among us from doing which needed to be done. In permitting that, many people I knew back then, degraded themselves more by what they did not do, than what they did. I explain this crucially important point.

The life of individuals among those in our republic today runs as long as a span of ninety to a hundred years. The evil, or something like that, which people do within some part, or more of that span, is a factor; but, the worst of it all is that they do not do, that which they might have done. While the meaningful options of life linger, untended, the time of each person's life runs out. I look into the faces of men and women, for whom the



U.S. Navy/Hospitalman Dan K. Marker

“Among actually civilized people today, war is not a privilege adducible of national prerogatives, but only to preserve civilization when no other remedy is afforded,” LaRouche writes. War in Afghanistan, now in process for eight years, is thus worse than useless. Here, a Marine is bandaged after being wounded in a fight with the Taliban.

time which could have become their fruitful years, has nearly run out. As the wasted years continue for them as individuals, entering the late years of their active role in society, they lose their sense of purpose in life, as if inch by inch, while life runs out with time. I think of my own enjoyment of a full life of fruitfulness now, at my own present age in life, and consider, so, the attrition of mind and spirit of those of my own and somewhat younger generations, for whom life is running out as much for wasteful neglect of the use of their human powers, as for any other reason.

I think of the scheme, promoted by President Obama, for the role of his Nazi-like IMAC policy in willfully wasting the lives of young children and the aging, while, at the same time, neglecting, even crushing, those activities by our people which make life rich in a sense of true accomplishment. What Obama is doing on that account, is, granted, already evil, perhaps beyond the mere powers of description; but it is the crushing of increase of the expression of the scientific and Classical-cultural progress of national cultures, such as our own, which aggravates these British-spread policies of killing people, not only by crushing their bodies, as the Obama administration is doing now, but by crushing the expression of their scientific

and Classical-cultural powers, which also murders their souls.

The greatest source of evil, is preventing the progress of the good expressed as Classical modes of artistic and scientific progress. Preventing the benefits of such progress is already wicked. Preventing the generality of our population from participating efficiently in creating that progress, is the expression of the truly evil.

This is where the British are at their most evil.

II. How To Win The Peace

I propose that it can be fairly said, that the most lasting benefit which society might expect to enjoy from the productions of my personal lifetime, will be my attacks on the infantile presumption that physical science and Classical artistic composition are virtually antithetical factors in the personal and social experience of the society in general.

The very worst expression of fascist-like social tendencies in Europe and North America today, is, therefore, the product of the combination of existentialism in the tradition of the so-called “Frankfurt School” generally and the utter moral and intellectual depravity of the



Man's responsibility is to develop those creative powers, in Classical art and science, which distinguish him from the beasts. Here, Rembrandt van Rijn's etching of St. Jerome Reading (1634).

influence of the European Congress for Cultural Freedom. What only the avowed, dionysiac, enemies of civilization, such as the existentialists, seem to have grasped in a general way, is that the introduction of the debased forms of entertainments associated with the cultish practices of the existentialist, has been a direct attack on the potential creative-mental powers of victims by the post-1945 spread of the existentialist cults and their by-products infecting the general population through the roles of the fields of popular entertainment.

As I have detailed the problem thus represented, in my writings which are of specifically scientific relevance, the creative powers which we are accustomed to associate with physical-scientific productivity, do not arise through the influence of mathematics as such, but through the harnessing of those powers of the self-disciplined imagination which are otherwise expressed in the modes of Classical artistic composition, to provide the creative stimulus on which the scientific and other advancement of mankind absolutely depends.

McChrystal's War

Therefore, among actually civilized people today, war is not an adducible privilege of national prerogatives, but only to preserve civilization when no other remedy is afforded. We must defend our United States by all necessary means because it embodies a treasure for present and future mankind as a whole; it is that treasure, above all else, which we must defend, whether against the British or any other expression of evil being wreaked upon mankind. It is not a right to rule, but a right not to be ruled by corrupt systems of reign over mankind, whether that evil be foreign or domestic. However, attached to such rights is the obligation to know what they mean in practice, as follows.

The essential distinction of people of all national cultures, is be human in respect of those powers of scientific and related creativity which distinguish the human individual, and his or her society, from the ways of the beasts. As *Genesis* 1 makes that point: man and woman are made in the likeness of the Creator, *as distinct from those beasts who do not use fire as an instrument for the increase of the power of mankind to change the universe we inhabit for the cause of the betterment of the human species, relative to the natural ways of the beasts.*

That power of creativity which distinguishes the human individual from the beasts, is locatable, not in formal mathematics as such, but in those creative powers of the human imagination which are located, not in mathematics as such, but in the progressive development, through aid of practice, of the creative powers of Classical artistic composition and its use. That is the power to which the poet Percy Bysshe Shelley referred in his A Defence of Poetry, as in the principle of Johann Sebastian Bach as employed, in exemplary fashion, by Wolfgang Mozart, Ludwig van Beethoven, Franz Schubert, and Johannes Brahms. This power, which is attempted in Classical development in poetry, as since the example of Chapman's Homer, was given a more precise artistic discipline in the work of Bach, as in the work of such as Leonardo da Vinci and Rembrandt.

On the contrary, there are the expressions of a commitment to destruction as such in the action proposed by General McChrystal:

As Friedrich Schiller observed, respecting the religious wars waged by Spaniard against Dutchman, man was killing man not as man, but as beasts. It is the same issue which characterizes what the Habsburg tyranny

unleashed, not only against human beings, but among human beings, in the 1618-1648 Thirty Years War, or the role of the evil Delphi cult's prompting of Peloponnesian wars, or the creation of the system of world war launched by the British monarchy, beginning with the British Empire's orchestration of Japan's war against China, Korea, and Russia, among other victims over the span of 1895-1945, and both so-called "World Wars" of 1914-1945, or the colonialist wars launched by no one as much as Britain, with complicity of President Harry S Truman over the entire period to date since the death of President Franklin Roosevelt to the present moment today.

All questions of policy-making relative to the matter of war and peace, must be adjudged according to that specific nature of human beings which distinguishes the nature and destiny of mankind from the mere beasts. That nature is the exercise of that power of creation which is unique to the human individual, in contrast to all beasts. Prohibition of the prevention, or stultifying of the appropriate expression of what is uniquely and specifically human powers of creativity traced in their expression in archeology to man's advancements in the use of fire, is the root of all moral law of nations and peoples, and their cultures, which are not depraved.

It is when a nation, or its people become beastly, as by prescribing the rights of human beings in terms of the language appropriate to describing the character of beasts, that evil is unleashed among nations.

As a practical consequence of that principle, since human progress is typified in expression by mankind's increased power to employ the principle of fire, the increase of the forms of generation and use of higher forms of energy-flux density is a necessary moral law of practice among those cultures and societies which may be deemed civilized.

The British empire, premised on what is essentially an existentialist principle, is the most notable and also influential expression of the reign of the cause of bestiality in the world today. The issue of war or peace comes, thus, to which side are you and your choice of practice on: increased power over men and women, or increased creative power achieved and used by mankind. If you are not for progress in man's use of the power of fire, you are a beastly danger to your fellow-human being.

Think about it. Implicitly, General McChrystal did not. If we are sufficiently devoted to the good of all mankind, we are not likely to do more evil.