

LaRouche to Berlin Seminar: We Need a New Treaty of Westphalia

Here is the keynote of Lyndon LaRouche to the EIR seminar in Berlin, on Jan. 12, 2005. He was introduced by Michael Liebig, executive director of EIR's European headquarters in Germany.

Liebig: It's a privilege to welcome you all here, for this strategic seminar here in Berlin, hosted by *EIR*. My name is Michael Liebig. I'm from the *EIR* office in Wiesbaden. And this seminar, here, today—and tomorrow—Mr. LaRouche decided that the depth of the issues which we are discussing here, necessitates a discussion which goes beyond a one-day event, so the seminar will extend into tomorrow afternoon.

So, the prehistory of this seminar, here, goes back right after Nov. 2, 2004, when Helga Zepp-LaRouche proposed, that in view of what happened then, at the earliest possible time we convene a seminar that discusses Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian relations in the context of the systemic economic, financial, and strategic crisis. . . . So Mr. LaRouche agreed, that he would be available in January, and that the topic of the discussion would be extended to address *fundamental cultural-political issues*, which normally, in discussions on Euro-Atlantic and Euro-Atlantic/Eurasian relations, tend to be pushed aside in favor of generalities and slogans. Mr. LaRouche has provided an extensive conceptual framework for that discussion in two articles printed in *EIR* magazine [Dec. 17, 2004 and Jan. 7, 2005]. . . .

Now, what is addressed in the two texts, and what will be discussed today and tomorrow, is an in-depth analysis of the political battleground within the United States. And specifically, the leadership role, both in respect to the Democratic Party and in respect to U.S. institutions, played by Mr. LaRouche, and his movement. And that an understanding, an *adequate* understanding of this situation, in the United States, which (and I speak out of personal experience), does represent a significant problem in Europe—and not just in Europe—where, in spite of a lot of knowledge and insight into the U.S. situation, there simply is a tendency for a not-differentiated-enough understanding, in terms of the internal dynamics of U.S. politics.

So therefore, correlating the understanding of the situation within the United States, to the question of building a new foundation for Euro-Atlantic and Euro-Atlantic/Eurasian relations, on a solid, sustainable, non-sloganeering foundation, will be a central feature for the coming two days.

So, saying that, I would once again emphasize, that we

would like to focus on the things that usually are *not* being discussed at such seminars—as I said, in favor of formulas and slogans—things which tend to be taboo issues, which tend to be characterized as “too heavy” for discussions of this sort. And, as we want to do this, we—and that's my hope—we do it in a Socratic fashion: in the sense that we will have a combination of contributions and free discussion. But, I would implore you all, that this occur in a Socratic fashion, so that we don't have simply the dropping of “idea-packages” or “concept-packages” one after the other, but that we have an actual discussion dynamic, which takes up the core concept evolving in the course of this seminar.

Now, we'll face certain time constraints, frictions, but I think that is the characteristic of any good seminar. And having said that, I would ask Dr. [M.K.] Saini from India to say a few words concerning the tsunami disaster, before we begin with the keynote address of Mr. LaRouche. Please.

Saini: A large number of people have died in the tragedy in Southeast Asia, particularly India, Indonesia, are the ones which were the worst hit, Sri Lanka, and we must stand for two minutes to pay our last respects to those who have died in the tragedy. We hope that their souls may rest in peace. Can we stand for two minutes?

Liebig: So, I want to ask Mr. LaRouche to start off with his keynote address, which is, as we say in German, the *Diskussionsgrundlage* [basis for discussion] for this seminar. Please.

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

What I'm going to lay before you, contradicts the diplomatic and related assumptions of discussions around the world today: That, in the coming period, especially with the onrushing financial collapse, which is inevitable now, that what people believe today, will no longer be believed. The system is coming down. The present world monetary-financial system is finished, and *will never rise again*. It's coming on now. Exactly when the official collapse occurs, is uncertain, but it will be soon. And in terms of the system itself, there will be no remedy which will ever allow for its recovery as a system, again, in future history.

So, we're going into a period of either chaos, which could be a Dark Age, or we're going into a period in which the assumptions of relations among states, especially respecting

economic and related kinds of relations, will be changed forever—either for the better, or very much for the worse.

We are looking, as I said, at a potential New Dark Age.

Now, this became clear, this process, or this part of the process, became clear on the morning following Nov. 7, 2000, when a Democratic Presidential candidate, Al Gore, earned a loss of a Presidential election by his own foolishness, and brought in a very dangerous factor—not merely a President, George Bush, who is mentally ill, and incompetent, who is essentially a puppet of people such as George Shultz, and more immediately of his Vice President, Dick Cheney; but, a Vice President and a Shultz who are committed to a policy of the use of developing new nuclear weapons as part of a retinue for *global, preventive nuclear warfare*, in which the first nation on the target list—as of the moment that Mr. Cheney was sworn in as Vice President—was Iraq.

Nothing that happened subsequent to that, had any effect on the decision to invade Iraq. It was a predetermined decision, which had been the policy of Cheney since he had been the Secretary of Defense under George Bush I. And he didn't give it up; he worked for it. There's an international group called the "neo-conservatives," who are for it.

The Nazi International

Now, these people, to make the point clear—and I exaggerate nothing in what I'm about to say: The force behind Cheney and behind Shultz, is what we knew formerly as the Nazi International. That is without exaggeration. That is not a comparison; that is a fact. The same group, such as Lazard Frères in Paris, the other groups which were involved in the Versailles agreement, which set up the Germany reparations agreements, at Versailles, were part of a plan of a process, which led through the British putting Mussolini into power in Italy, through the instrumentality of Volpi di Misurata, who is the actual author of Italian Fascism, run out of London.

And these people had a plan, by using war reparations against Germany, to crack Europe—that is, Germany would not be able to pay the war reparations, but the war reparations would be scheduled to go primarily, directly, to France and England, which were bankrupt as a result of the First World War. And that this would create a situation, in which the monetary system would collapse—the Versailles monetary system—as it did; and then they would create a new monetary system, which they created in 1931, called the Bank for International Settlements, which still exists today. A key member of the Bank for International Settlements, was Hjalmar Schacht, who was one of the authors of Hitler's government, who was a British agent: an agent of the head of the Bank of England, specifically.

The plan was to create a new monetary system, based on an international financial cartel. This financier cartel, made up of private banking interests, private financier interests of the Venetian style, became essentially the government of Europe. They planned for a war. They planned to mobilize Eu-



Lyndon LaRouche: "On the day people perceive, in general, that the system is coming down, that the institutions which they took for granted are no longer there, they're going to scream. If we provide the answer, they'll probably grab it then, where they would refuse it, before. If we don't provide the answer, then the Devil will!"

rope, under Hitler—putting Hitler into power in Germany—as their tool, to conduct the war which initially was supposed to be aimed directly at Russia, first—at the Soviet Union. But then, because of discussions between the Soviet government and the German government, the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreements as they became, the British had to change their agenda. They first, initially intended that Germany would attack the Soviets, and be caught in depth in Soviet territory; then the French and British would attack the Germans from the rear (which is a favorite British stunt).

But, because of the change—and this, of course occurred in the context of the visit of Marshal Tukhachevsky to France, in particular; and the failure of the Tukhachevsky mission was the signal that this thing was on, even before the treaty, the Molotov pact was signed. So, at that point, the British and French knew they had to bring the Americans in—they didn't want to have the Americans in, because they were afraid that if the Americans were in on the war, the Americans would come out as a dominant force. They didn't want the Americans in the war, until the middle of the 1930s.

But then, after they dumped Edward VIII, who was too close to Hitler at that time, the people who had backed Hitler, from the Anglo-Americans in particular, shifted to an anti-Hitler position—gradually—not all of them. Lord Beaverbrook was still for Hitler in May of 1940. Lord Halifax was still for Hitler, in that period. Remember, Beaverbrook then became the propaganda minister for the British for World War II; Lord Halifax was sent to Washington as the British ambassador to the Roosevelt Administration.

Then, the crowd in New York which had backed Hitler—which included Harriman, the family of Harriman; which included, of course, the father of the present Sen. Ted Ken-



Franklin D. Roosevelt (left) was committed to a post-war, American-led program for building up former colonies, into modern nation-states. When this was proposed to Sir Winston Churchill (right), during a wartime conference, the British Prime Minister exploded in rage.

nedy, Joe Kennedy; who, up until this period had been pro-Hitler, gradually changed. They were anti-Hitler, but, they were still part of the international financier cartel, which had created the Nazi overrun of Europe and the war.

The Death of Roosevelt

And the end of the war, with the death of Roosevelt, the policies of the United States changed, absolutely, strategically, on the day of the death of Franklin Roosevelt, the following day. Roosevelt had been committed to a post-war decolonization of the world. Not merely decolonization, but a specifically American-led program for building up former colonies, into modern nation-states. This had been proposed, for example, at the meeting with Churchill, where Churchill was very upset, on this proposal, detailing what the plans were for Africa, especially Northern Africa, by the United States government at the end of the war. Similar programs for India and other countries.

And the idea was, that we would use the military power, the economic power, that we had developed in the United States for the war: We would convert these industries which had been mobilized for war production, we would convert them into industries to support capital formation in developing countries. The intention was to create a world order among sovereign nation-states, as a replacement for the kind of European-dominated system which had existed before.

This could be considered the Second Treaty of Westphalia prospect: to go beyond what was accomplished by ending

religious war, as such, in Europe, with the Treaty of Westphalia—a system of nations, where the nations are each committed primarily to the common good of all nations, first, and themselves second. And by this kind of commitment, to create an order of sovereign nation-states on this planet, which would be the security system, as well as the promotion of economic growth, for the future of humanity thereafter.

On the day after Roosevelt's death, a very little man—Truman—a very stupid man, a nasty little fellow; just an instrument of Harriman and Company—these fellows did several things. A friend of mine, for example, had been involved in Italy, through the Vatican Office of Extraordinary Affairs, then under Montini who was later Paul VI, in negotiations on behalf of the Emperor of Japan with the United States and other powers, for a peace treaty. The peace treaty depended upon recognizing the position of the Emperor in the post-war period, as the head of state. The argument was, that if the Emperor remained the head of state, Japan would hold together, it would not split apart, and therefore there would be a workable solution.

The death of Roosevelt *ended that*. The Truman Administration suppressed the fact of that agreement, negotiated through the Vatican's Office of Extraordinary Affairs, *in order to drop nuclear weapons—needlessly—on Hiroshima and Nagasaki*. The purpose was, to establish a world empire, based on the assumption of Anglo-American control of nuclear arsenals. It was a policy designed by that great pacifist, Bertrand Russell, an enemy of mankind, who said, we must



President Nixon meets with Cabinet members on May 4, 1971, three months before collapsing the Bretton Woods system—a fateful decision in which George Shultz played the leading role. Left to right: Arthur Burns, John Connally, Nixon, Paul McCracken, and Shultz.

use nuclear weapons for *nuclear preventive war*, in order to establish world government, world empire.

Now, that policy, which Truman expressed, by his actions in that period, the Russell policy, has continued. What happened? The Korean War didn't go the way it was planned on the U.S. side. It was discovered that the Soviet Union had a deployable *thermonuclear* weapon, when the United States didn't have one yet. So therefore, they called off preventive nuclear war, for the time being. And there was a shift into "nuclear deterrence," developed, again, under the direction of Bertrand Russell, which became known as Mutual and Assured Destruction, MAD—which is what I tried to bring an end to, sometime later (not without some success, and not with success—anyway).

So, what happens is, now, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, instead of a new arrangement of the type we sought with the SDI—and, President Reagan was, with all his faults and other questions, was *seriously dedicated to that prospect*. He was dedicated to that, because he was, among other things, among all his faults, he was committed to the legacy of the Franklin Roosevelt Presidency. And therefore, this was his sentiment, and he expressed it sincerely and honestly. I designed the policy, in detail; he adopted it, exactly as I had designed it.

It was turned down by Andropov—and Hell broke loose, as a result. And for me, too, personally, because, what I had nearly done, had gotten the apparatus so upset, they wanted me out of the way, in any way possible. They just didn't want to take credit for it.

So, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, which was clear

in 1989—it took them all by surprise; they didn't foresee it. They say they foresaw it; they *didn't* foresee it. *They didn't understand the situation*. They were blinded by their own schemes.

Post-War Redeployment of the Nazis

But, at that time, they immediately responded, with a revival of the Nazi International. And this thing, was not something that was brought out of the grave: The Nazi International never died. For example—the case of Pinochet is an example of this, the Pinochet government. And I'll indicate the importance of this particular event, for what we're discussing today.

Allen Dulles had been a key partner, of the international backing for the Nazis, he and his brother John Foster Dulles; and in principle, the younger brother Avery Dulles, the Cardinal—now in Rome—who's relevant to the corruption of the Church. So, what they had done, on the death of Roosevelt, they had proceeded to bring in large sections of the Nazi system, into the Anglo-American system. And it eventually became an integral part of NATO. The argument was used, that these guys were the best anti-Communists, the best anti-Communist fighters; therefore, you bring them in for that purpose—and you will look the other way, when you come to looking at their credentials. Many of them went down into South America, through a "rat-line" organized by Dulles, through Schacht's son-in-law.

Then, you come to 1971: George Shultz was a key member of the Nixon Administration, one of the controllers of Nixon at that time—with Henry Kissinger as an also-ran, and people like Paul Volcker. These people, in 1971, in August,

pulled off the first step to collapse the Roosevelt-designed Bretton Woods system, the original IMF. The following year, with Shultz at Azores, fighting Pompidou, imposed upon the world a change in the world monetary system, the IMF, from the fixed-exchange-rate system to a floating-exchange-rate system.

Now, that change, and the U.S. government's participation in that change, changed the world. We were on the road to Hell, already at that point. And George Shultz was key.

One of the first products of this change, occurred in Chile: You had two groups who were part of the Synarchist International, actually: Fidel Castro, who is actually a very right-wing character, if you know his background; who changed to a left-wing character when the opportunities required it. So, he was used, with the Allende regime, to create a stunt, including this Kalashnikov display—personal Kalashnikov for Allende; and this stunt was used to create the impression, in the wild-eyed parts of the world, that there was a “Communist menace” about to take over all of South America. And they were going to deal with this first of all in Chile!

So, what they did, is they took Allende, they got him killed by Pinochet and Company; made Pinochet a dictator; and to follow it off, they took the Nazi International—that is, people who were first or second generations part of the SS!—and they organized what was called Operation Condor, a mass slaughter throughout the Southern Cone area of South America.

This was part of a “strategy of tension,” which we saw with the unleashing of terrorism in Italy. And the terrorism in Italy was done by the Nazis! It was done by the sequels of SS Gen. Karl Wolff—who ran Gladio for NATO; and who committed the assassinations, the terrorist wave, in Italy, Germany and elsewhere, during the early 1970s.

These guys are the same guys, who, with Shultz involved, are behind the present Bush Administration. Shultz, in the middle of the 1980s, actually crafted the structure of what became the Bush Administration. Cheney was his number-one man. Shultz represents international finance. He represents the same interests, which we knew as that group of private bankers, that financier cartel, which gave us the Nazi system and so forth, during the 1920s and 1930s. They're back.

The President of the United States is a mental case. This is not a characterization; this is a clinical diagnosis: The man is *mentally ill*. He's non-functionally mentally ill. But he's a puppet. And it is dangerous to have a mentally ill person, in the position of a head of state of a powerful nation, even if he's only a puppet, even if he's chiefly controlled by people like Shultz and Cheney.

Our Strategic Intervention

So, we are in a period of *incalculable* possibilities, in which the checks and balances of politics no longer can be relied upon. But that does not mean we don't have resources:

As in warfare, you have your strategic resources, you have your strategic options. And that's what we have, is strategic options.

Very soon the system will collapse.

Now, where are we right now? I raised these questions with a group of Democrats and others, during the period immediately following Nov. 7, 2000. And that began a process, which more or less directly, leads to what we're discussing here, today, the circumstances we're discussing here today. Early on, parts of the U.S. establishment agreed with me, especially people around former President Clinton, who has been listening to me, shall we say, a little more and more, as time passes on. We fought a number of issues, with the idea of trying to rebuild the Democratic Party. But, we had strong opposition to this within the Democratic Party, which has its own Nazi-connected types in there, as well as other things; as well as Republicans.

We also had a network of Republican figures, who are the same variety of Republicans: particularly people who come from the military background, intelligence services, the diplomatic services, or who are out of service, but who still are functioning in that mode, as professors of this or that, in this part of our system—this part of our Presidential system.

So, the ideas, the influence of our discussions spread. When it came to the 2004 election campaign, the determination was to keep me out of this, if at all possible. Well, they didn't keep me out. They tried; it didn't work. At the Boston Convention of the Democratic Party, we reached an agreement, agreement to collaborate. After Sept. 1 of this past year, when Clinton spoke to Kerry, and told Kerry that his present campaign was nonsense, that he had to change his ways, and that I had to be brought in, as an advisor on how to run the campaign.

We managed to salvage a good deal of the campaign. We probably actually won the Presidency, in terms of what we did. However, the other side cheated, and since that was the party in power, it was difficult to overturn it. But, recently, in the past week, we did raise the question: that we, in a sense, declared George Bush a “lame duck,” as what we call it in U.S. politics—he's already on the way out, before he's even inaugurated.

Now, we got people to take a stand on that. What we have now, you have probably about 1,500 people who form a network, largely in the Democratic Party, but also Republican pedigrees, who are part of the network that I work with; who I'm in touch with every day, directly or indirectly. That is, the policy discussion among us, passes around the network very rapidly, particularly in these days of Internet electronic communications. And therefore, the policies are discussed.

We do not yet have a consolidated control of the Democratic Party, but we have many Republicans, and many Democrats, who are oriented to finding a solution. And since we represent the United States, we think in terms of the American history, our precedents, our capabilities, what we can do, what

we must do in the world.

What that means, of course, is that we have to take actions that no other part of the world can do.

The problem is this: The present international monetary-financial system is coming down. It can not be saved. It's only a question of when—and "when" is soon. The system is finished. Now anybody who understands the system *knows that*—including my enemies, at the highest level. Their game is, how are they going to play the situation?

Now, many people say, "Well, if the financial system collapses—It can't collapse! If it collapses, what happens to our money?" This is where this illusion, the brainwashing, about belief in political economy, comes in: Money is not anything! Money is a creation of somebody. And somebody else accepts it; that makes it currency. But there's no intrinsic value to money. Money has value under various terms: Do you have a financial group, such as the Bank for International Settlements, or the bankers associated with that, who run central banking systems—so-called "independent" central banking systems, which are more powerful than governments?

The American System vs. Anglo-Dutch Liberalism

There's not a government in Europe, which is more powerful than its central banking system! The government is a flunky of the central banking system! And they even have a control mechanism, called the Maastricht Agreement of the European Union, which ensures that no country has any sovereignty, no government has sovereignty. Because, as long as you're under the control of an independent central banking system, which is independent of government control, but is controlled by a group of international financier-oligarchs, who's running the world?

Now, of course, government has the intrinsic power to *take that power away* from central banking systems. But, when you look at the political systems of the world, who has the *guts*, among the politicians, to take that, and not be shot in the morning? *Where do you have a concert of political forces, which are willing to rise in the defense of the sovereignty of their nation or of a group of nations, against the tyranny of international central banking systems? . . .*

So, the problem is, the United States is the only nation which was created with a Constitution which is adequate to this situation. And, as in the case of the immediate post-World War II period, where the United States was the only nation with any integrity as an authority in monetary affairs, so in 1944, at Bretton Woods, President Roosevelt used the American System of political economy—the *anti-British system* of political economy—and shoved it down the throats of the British, including Keynes and others, to set up what became known as the Bretton Woods system, or the fixed-exchange-rate system, based on the power of the United States to *back a gold-reserve-based* fixed-exchange system.

Now, that's the character of the United States. One has to

understand, that the United States was created as the first revolution against the establishment of the British Empire: a British Empire, which was established on Feb. 10, 1763, at the Treaty of Paris. This British Empire, which was then an empire of the *British East India Company*, not the foolish British monarch, then used the power it gained by the submission of these countries at the end of the Seven Years' War—which the British had organized! The British organized the powers of Europe, to fight one another, to weaken the nations of Europe, so that the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system of imperialism could prevail!

The one place in which this fight was staged, against this new empire, the British Empire, was in the United States. It started, actually, in that period, in the period of the Seven Years' War; at a time that people in Germany, like Kästner and so forth, from here, were involved in connections to Benjamin Franklin; where leading Europeans were working with North Americans, especially around Benjamin Franklin, to build an alliance, with the idea, that the establishment of an independent republic among the English-speaking colonies of North America, could be a precedent for bringing that effect *back into Europe*, as a precedent.

The French Revolution, which was supposed to occur in the form that Lafayette and Bailly proposed, would have been the second step, to establish the liberation of Europe, from this kind of system. But the British intervened, because the

If You Thought Adam Smith Was The Founding Father of America's Economic Strength—

Think Again.

READ

Friedrich List: Outlines of American Political Economy

"I confine my exertions solely to the refutation of the theory of Adam Smith and Co. the fundamental errors of which have not yet been understood so clearly as they ought to be. It is this theory, sir, which furnishes to the opponents of the American System the intellectual means of their opposition."

—Friedrich List

\$19.20

ORDER FROM:

Ben Franklin Booksellers

P.O. Box 1707, Leesburg, Va., 20177

1-800 453-4108 ^{toll free} or 1-703-777-3661

www.benfranklinbooks.com

e-mail: benfranklinbooks@mediasoft.net

Shipping and handling: \$4.00 for first book, \$4.50 each additional book. Virginia residents add 4.5% sales tax.

We accept MasterCard, Visa, Discover, American Express.



British *ran* the French Revolution! From July 14, 1789 on. There were British agents who orchestrated it, including Necker. It was run on his behalf.

And you had a British intelligence operation, called the Martinist freemasonic association which *ran* Napoleon! Joseph de Maistre created Napoleon! Invented him! Designed him! Based on the model of Torquemada, the Grand Inquisitor of Spain. Ruined Europe, through Napoleon! And established the power, first of all, primarily, of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system. And the Habsburgs were soon finished off, and made merely puppets of this Anglo-Dutch Liberal system, thereafter, through financial control.

So, because of that, the United States, which was beleaguered, small, weak; because Spain was collapsed, which had been an ally of the United States; because Spain and France were divided from the United States in the peace Treaties of Paris, 1782-83, by the cleverness of the British under Lord Shelburne—who was probably one of the most evil men of that century—and the creation pretty much of the British system, today: because of that, apart from the Bolshevik Revolution and similar events, there has been *no alternative, to the British Anglo-Dutch Liberal system of imperialism on the Continent of Europe, so far.*

There have been thrusts. De Gaulle made a thrust in that direction, with the Fifth Republic, with the heavy franc, which was an act of guts. But, after John Kennedy was killed, de Gaulle was more or less isolated, in point of fact, with no U.S. ally of worth. And therefore, what happened, happened.

So, the United States today has a tradition, a Constitutional tradition, which many Americans know. Those of us who understand the United States, understand it: We are capable of reviving the Franklin Roosevelt precedent, that I referred to. And in the time when the entire international financial system is collapsing, if you have the right government in the United States, the right government in the United States will, preemptively, *act*, to do what Roosevelt did. When all monetary systems are collapsing, the United States will say, “We repudiate the present IMF. It’s bankrupt! And we go back to a fixed-exchange-rate system as policy.” Under those conditions, we can crack it! And those nations which wish to be free from the slavery of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system, can then declare their freedom, which has been long awaited.

Looting by ‘Globalization’

Now, the world has not been exactly unchanged, during the past 40 years, the 40 years of decadence. In the past 40 years, Europe, and the Americas, have been destroyed: have been destroyed by a process called “environmentalism”; a process called “globalization”; a hatred against technological progress, real technological progress. The substitution of playing or masturbating with computers, as a substitute for technological progress. You’re playing with numbers, not

actually creating anything—just moving things around, according to the numbers. Bertrand Russell’s system.

Therefore, what we’ve done, is we said: “All right. First of all, we use the IMF”—from 1971-72 on—“we use the IMF to impoverish nations which have been nations.” Look at South America! Look at Mexico! Go through the period 1971 to 1982: Look at the transformation in the conditions of South and Central America. We bankrupted them! How? Through London! How? By using the international monetary system of the bankers: Through London, we organized runs against national currencies. We then said to them, “Well” (to the government in question), “you want this run to stop? You better call in the IMF and get some advice—or the World Bank, or both.” So, the IMF and World Bank, which were then the “Thief of Baghdad” of the world as a whole, now move in, and advise the country to reduce the value of their currency, arbitrarily—a currency which had been collapsed by a financial warfare attack from the London market, from the concert for the system. They dropped their currency.

Ah! “But,” the IMF says, “that’s not going to work. You’re going to have to create, on paper, a new debt, to make up for what your creditors will lose by your devaluation of your currency.” Now, all of the countries of South America and Central America, combined, have more than paid *every penny they ever borrowed! They don’t owe anything*, except the effects of this superimposed, artificial debt, dictated debt.

You have a similar situation—this happened, of course, in India, earlier, with the rupee devaluation, which was intended to break India, and to break the will of Nehru. This is what Mrs. Gandhi dealt with, all the time—till they killed her, too! And her son, too! To prevent a powerful nation from standing up against this.

So, what is the situation of the world? Now, we have created desperate nations, which no longer have the ability to develop their own economy. We now offer them, to give us their cheap labor. At slave-labor rates, to allow us *to loot* their natural resources, and their people.

Look what we’re doing to Africa. An example of this: Henry Kissinger, National Security Study Memorandum 200, written in his capacity as the National Security Advisor. Policy for Africa: Africa is overpopulated. Africa has natural resources, particularly the Southern Shield—mineral resources. *We intend to take those resources. They’re ours!* We can not allow the Africans to *eat* them! We can not allow so many Africans to live: They will eat resources, that we want for our future. We can not allow them to develop, because then they will use more natural resources, per capita. We can’t allow that: *We must conduct population reduction against Africa! Sub-Saharan Africa.*

And look at Sub-Saharan Africa, since the beginning of the 1970s. It was already started then, clearly. This was the Anglo-American IMF policy, the World Bank policy, all the way through. The IMF and World Bank have become the

Adolf Hitler of the planet. They've done more killing—. And the way it works: They would go into a country—the bankers would go in first, formerly; now, it doesn't work that way, they send the killers in, first. The bankers go in first; the bankers induce the country to take loans, under these IMF conditions. The country is then induced to bankrupt itself. Then, the IMF moves in, through its agents, and orders the country to submit to certain arrangements—under the pressure of this debt crisis. As in Indonesia, for example. And then, if the government *resists* these conditions, then members of the Nazi International, or their second or third generation, *move in to kill, assassinate heads of government, heads of state*, and other key figures who are impediments to the good interests of the IMF and the World Bank.

This is the system.

As a result of this, what did we do? We took Europe—great Europe! Great, independent, wise Europe! Great, independent, wise United States—we said, “Ah! We have cheap labor! We don't have to keep paying our wage rates to our people! We can get conditions for free that we have to pay for in the United States. We can close down our factories, and move the production of our materials, to countries where they have cheap labor. And now, we will get these things that we want to consume, from the cheap labor of South America and Asia.”

Now, therefore, we have an increase in technological levels of activity, in countries which are beneficiaries of this becoming cheap labor for the United States. But, they're also competing in cutting each other's throat, by undercutting each other with cheapness of labor. And therefore, you have a growth of employment, in Asia for example, in these categories, which may look attractive to people in Asia now—but, it is also a *threat*. It's a threat to do to Asia, exactly what they did to South America and Africa.

India, of course—India and China are the chief targets. And that will express itself, at certain times, in certain ways, as a part of this process.

If Europe were to collapse—and it can collapse, now—Europe is in a state of collapse. Germany has a very successful export program, but the export program is not enough to make up for the loss of employment inside Germany itself. Germany is bankrupt. The European Union is bankrupt. It may, because of political institutions, it may be able to pretend it's not bankrupt; it may have alternatives, political alternatives. But it's bankrupt!

The United States is *hopelessly* bankrupt! Financially.

We have a world system, which is in the order of magnitude of less than \$50 trillion a year, gross product. That is the net of gross product. And we have a financial derivatives complex, in *hundreds of quadrillions!*—of implicit debt.

The system is bankrupt. There's no way you could reorganize the system, in an ordinary way. The only thing you can do, is declare bankruptcy and repudiation of obligations to

the system. Then the state intervenes, under the principle of the general welfare, the European principle of the common good, the general welfare—and says, “The state must now act, to defend the general welfare, the common good: That means, to maintain employment, to maintain institutions which are essential to the population, and essential to the future of the nation. They come first. Everything else comes second—or maybe never.”

New monetary systems are created.

Now, that's what I want to get to, now. That's where we are, now.

Create a New Monetary System

We're at the point, the decision is on the table: Are we going to create a new monetary system, which presumes that a concert of nation-states, sovereign nation-states, will put the existing IMF system—the so-called Anglo-Dutch Liberal system—into *bankruptcy receivership*. In other words, governments would take over these banking institutions, and the financial institutions; take them into receivership, as it takes any bankrupt into receivership; and manage these bankrupt entities, in such a way as to promote the general welfare, first; and then, if there's something left over, maybe some of the claimants may get something back, if they behave themselves. But, nothing on financial derivatives, because we can't afford it. That's number one.

But the world has changed: The world of 40 years ago, no longer exists. We're in a new world.

Right at the present time, as many of you know, the only business, international business of any importance, is speculation in assets in so-called raw materials. The United States is engaged in speculation for seizing control, financial control—that is, future ownership—of raw materials assets.

Europe, in two parts—continental Central and Western Europe, are engaged in the same game, trying to reach outward, to get control of assets, mineral assets especially, from various parts of the world, for Europe's future. The British Commonwealth, which is a special predator in this thing, has its own game, as part of the European system. Russia's territory, with associated countries from the former Soviet Union, is a great raw materials power, in terms of the intrinsic resources lying within that territory.

China is not a great raw materials power, but China is a great bidder, today, in the world, for future raw materials. China has entered into contracts with, say, Brazil. It's entered into contracts with Canada, on tar-sands development. It's just recently added agreements with Argentina, and Argentina's Patagonia has one of the great reserves of mineral resources on the planet; one of the greatest potentials for development, actually, on the planet. Brazil has vast resources, under the Amazon, which the British and others are trying to keep them from developing. And naturally, countries move into these areas.



A scene in Kolkata (Calcutta), India.
"We've got to bring the poor of Asia out of poverty! And we have to do it in a generation. We can not sustain this planet, with this kind of poverty: It must be changed."

Eliminate Poverty in a Single Generation

Now, the question is this: We've come to the point, with the expansion of population—and let's take the case of India and China, who are represented here, at least by citizens who can respond to the interests and sensitivities of these countries: All right. We've got an expanding population. We have over a billion people now in India. And we have probably—moving toward 1.5 billion people in China, or something like that. Most of these populations are extremely poor. Of over a billion Indians, about 700 million are extremely poor, desperately poor. In China we have—society may be more orderly in terms of the poor, but it has a vast amount of poor. They're not developed for modern society; they're coming in on the tail-end. The same situation exists throughout Southeast Asia and South Asia.

What are we going to do? Given this crisis, this raw materials business, and this population growth? Can we provide, to the human race, a guarantee of sufficient availability of mineral and related kinds of raw materials, for the indefinite future on this planet? *Yes, we can. If we do what we have to do, to do it.*

However, this is extremely important, especially since we must lift the poor populations, the poor part of the populations of Asia, out of the extreme poverty, which is merely typified by the situation in India, and the poor in China. If you're going to have a society which can develop itself, protect itself, you have to increase the productive powers of labor intrinsic to the people, by developing the people: developing their education, developing their opportunities, creating new communities where they live a normal life. *We've got to bring the poor of Asia out of poverty!* And we have to do it in a generation. We

can not sustain this planet, with this kind of poverty: It must be changed.

Therefore, we have to have a mission-orientation in that direction.

What does that mean? Number one: We have to use the power of governments, to protect the mineral resources of the planet from being seized by private entrepreneurs, or interests or combinations of private entrepreneurs, who *hold them and will use them in speculation against populations*, and use that to tyrannize governments to reduce their populations.

Therefore, we must have an agreement among nations, to say that the question of the planet's common interest, in the management of our mineral resources, of the planet as a whole for the future of humanity, is a principle of the general welfare, and it is not a matter of private interest. Private interest can operate, but private interest must operate *under regulation*. And the regulation must guarantee the access of every part of the world to the needed raw materials, or developed raw materials, they require for their populations and those populations' development for times to come.

An Emergent Eurasian Culture

Now, when people are talking about a Dialogue of Cultures, we've come to the point, that we must, in particular, we must bring Europe and Asia together: This is inevitable. A division of labor exists, for example, like the German trade with China; the Russian trade with China, and especially with India. A division of labor exists between Europe and the countries of Asia, especially the developing countries of Asia.

Therefore, Eurasia is a reality: It is an emergent economic reality. We have before us, the prospect of a Eurasian culture

emerging. Now, of course, Russians have some experience with Eurasian culture, because Russian culture *is* a Eurasian culture; it's become that. But, we have to develop a Eurasian culture.

Now, some people approach this thing, from the standpoint of, "Let's get the religions together." I say, "Stop it! If you try to run the religions together, you're going to get a religious war. Forget it! Don't try to get people to give up their religions. Don't try to get them to compromise their religions."

Take a different approach. The different approach is the *common interest of mankind*. And what we should be aiming for, culturally, is the idea of the nature of man: that the human individual has certain inherent rights, which distinguish the human being from the animal. And rather than arguing about how that should be interpreted religiously, why not deal with the problem as governments can? Practically. Let us affirm the responsibility of government, individually and collectively, for the dignity of the human individual, as expressed by the *right* of that individual, that family, to have for their

children and grandchildren, the prospect of an improved condition of life, a worthwhile future, and the recognition of their personal identity, as a person who, in their lifetime, has been given the opportunity to *contribute* to the future of humanity as a whole—to the honor of the past, and to the benefit of the future.

So therefore, my view is, that the way we can get at a Eurasian culture, is take this crisis, right now—the system is coming down—the American System, or return to a Bretton Woods-style of fixed-exchange-rate system, is feasible. But this time, as an integral part of that, we have to recognize, we're up against the point which, without development of the management of natural resources, we're not going to be able to meet the needs and aspirations of the peoples of the world, as a whole.

And therefore, we must take the fact, that we're at a boundary condition: The planet is being strained by a lack of development. We have population growing, but a lack of development. Our friends in Russia, from institutions such as the Academy, the Geological Museum, Vernadsky Museum,

The Treaty of Westphalia

The Treaty, dated Oct. 24, 1648, brought an end to the Thirty Years' War, which had drowned Europe in bloody battles over religion. The Treaty defined the principles of national sovereignty, becoming the constitution of the new system of states in Europe. Here are excerpts.

Peace Treaty between the Holy Roman Emperor and the King of France and their respective Allies.

In the name of the most holy and individual Trinity: Be it known to all, and every one whom it may concern, or to whom in any manner it may belong, That for many Years past, Discords and Civil Divisions being stir'd up in the Roman Empire, which increas'd to such a degree, that not only all Germany, but also the neighbouring Kingdoms, and France particularly, have been involv'd in the Disorders of a long and cruel War: . . .

I. That there shall be a Christian and Universal Peace, and a perpetual, true, and sincere Amity, between his Sacred Imperial Majesty, and his most Christian Majesty; as also, between all and each of the Allies, and Adherents of his said Imperial Majesty, the House of Austria, and its Heirs, and Successors; but chiefly between the Electors, Princes, and States of the Empire on the one side; and all and each of the Allies of his said Christian Majesty, and all their Heirs and Successors, chiefly between the most

Serene Queen and Kingdom of Swedeland, the Electors respectively, the Princes and States of the Empire, on the other part. That this Peace and Amity be observ'd and cultivated with such a Sincerity and Zeal, that each Party shall endeavour to procure the Benefit, Honour and Advantage of the other; that thus on all sides they may see this Peace and Friendship in the Roman Empire, and the Kingdom of France flourish, by entertaining a good and faithful Neighbourhood.

II. That there shall be on the one side and the other a perpetual Oblivion, Amnesty, or Pardon of all that has been committed since the beginning of these Troubles, in what place, or what manner soever the Hostilities have been practis'd, in such a manner, that no body, under any pretext whatsoever, shall practice any Acts of Hostility, entertain any Enmity, or cause any Trouble to each other; neither as to Persons, Effects and Securitys, neither of themselves or by others, neither privately nor openly, neither directly nor indirectly, neither under the colour of Right, nor by the way of Deed, either within or without the extent of the Empire, notwithstanding all Covenants made before to the contrary: That they shall not act, or permit to be acted, any wrong or injury to any whatsoever; but that all that has pass'd on the one side, and the other, as well before as during the War, in Words, Writings, and Outrageous Actions, in Violences, Hostilities, Damages and Expences, without any respect to Persons or Things, shall be entirely abolish'd in such a manner that all that might be demanded of, or pretended to, by each other on that behalf, shall be bury'd in eternal Oblivion. . . .

represent a repository of people, who have experience with the Asian aspect, and other aspects, of the problem of managing raw materials, mineral raw materials, for the future of this planet. Russia is a key part of the Russia-India-China partnership for Asia. Russia is a partner, with Western Europe, in these enterprises.

Therefore, is there not a common interest which has several features? Do we not require, that Western Europe—say, typified by Germany where we’re standing here, today—must go back to becoming a high-technology exporter? Of goods, high-technology goods? *Because Asia needs that technology.* Why should Europe try to compete to get back markets from Asia? It’s crazy. Why does not Europe, as the United States, take the responsibility of developing its people, and its capabilities, for the kinds of technological *frontier development in technology*, which is needed for the peoples of the world as a whole?

Why not think of a constructive, mutually beneficial *division of labor*, rather than competition? Why not recognize, that in contributing to the common good, to the general welfare first, as the Treaty of Westphalia prescribed, that we find a greater advantage for ourselves than in trying to compete, in competing advantages against one another in a world market?

Why can’t we learn to cooperate?

This means, of course, a change in the way that we look at the individual in society, today. It means the death of what has been called “environmentalism.” It was that weapon, of the so-called “environmentalism,” as defined by the Club of Rome and others, which has done the greatest amount to help destroy, or to help induce Europe and the United States to destroy themselves; and has also contributed to oppression, which Europe and the United States have imposed, upon so-called developing countries. This has been a piece of unscientific, anti-scientific *idiocy*. We should stop it! We have to stop it, if we want to survive.

We have to now think in terms of what is good for the planet, from the standpoint of the working scientist, who says, we must develop the means to cope with any problem which presents itself to us, or to humanity in general. If we are willing to dump this mysticism, this crazy, Satanic cult of ecology, and get back to becoming what Europe was at its best, a repository of technological and scientific progress, then, we can educate our populations accordingly—and we can do things: We can create new industries.

What we need now is, of course, in this new period, a series of treaty agreements among nations, long-term treaty agreements of 25- to 50-year duration, for capital formation. And the way we can muster the capital, is by creating long-term loans, with the aid of governments, to fund, to provide credit to entrepreneurs and others, who will produce what is needed, as capital goods. This must be at low rates; it must be a fixed-exchange-rate system—you can’t do it otherwise. If you have a floating-exchange-rate system, you can not engage

in long-term treaty agreements. You must have state treaty agreements, state-to-state; or multi-state treaty agreements; 25 to 50 years’ term, as blanket agreements which cover a lot of smaller agreements, and smaller projects.

These treaty agreements then become like a banking facility: They issue loans, which they think meet the purpose of their institution, in assisting the progress of this enterprise, that enterprise, and so forth, which they think is going to fulfill the purposes of their agreement.

So therefore, I think that’s where we stand.

Serve the Common Aims of Mankind

In trying to get nations together, rather than trying to argue about bits and pieces of cultural this, and cultural that—flotsam and jetsam—why not take the most fundamental thing? The human race is in danger. We have a common interest. We have a common interest, above all, in development; in development and management of such things as the mineral resources of the planet. We’re now bumping up against the point, there are no wild areas to be raped: We now have to develop whatever we need, to provide our mineral resources.

Therefore, let us take that task, as a task of *common interest*, and let us create agreements, under a new monetary agreement, dedicated to that and include that. And then, let us look at each of our countries, and say, “What can each contribute to the general good, in this way? In way of production?” Put the Europeans back to work, in producing what they could produce, if they’re saved in time. Put them back to work! Especially in the high-technology areas, where they can produce a product which would be useful for emerging countries, emerging economies.

And define that as a *common aim of mankind*—the common aims of mankind. And let us, rather than trying to impose a cultural model upon Eurasia, and the rest of the world, why not take the one issue, which best defines our *unified*, common interest, and use that to bring us together, in cooperative ventures? And take two generations, 25-50 years. We can’t mortgage the future indefinitely, but the next 50 years is our responsibility. If we start it now, I think that’s the solution.

And that’s what I will be working for, from the United States. I will be fighting for this. It’s going to be a big educational fight—but I think we can win it. We can win it, not because people want to be won over, but because they’ve suddenly become convinced they have no alternative, *but* to be won over.

On the day they perceive, in general, that the system is coming down, that the institutions which they took for granted are no longer there, they’re going to scream. If we provide the answer, they’ll probably grab it then, where they would refuse it, before. If we *don’t* provide the answer, then the Devil will!

Thank you.