
Dialogue with LaRouche

What Should Democrats Do Next?

Freeman: As part of the questions which have been submitted, these webcasts in Washington have been principally characterized by an ongoing dialogue between Mr. LaRouche and leading institutions attached to the Federal government, and that will continue today. And in some cases, what I will do, because we get a lot of questions on the same topic, where necessary, and where it's convenient, I'll group those questions together.

Lyn, the first question is this, it's a simple one, really. It comes from a Democratic policymaker, who has the task of figuring out strategy for the party as a whole nationally. And what he says, is:

“Mr. LaRouche, in the aftermath of John Kerry's concession to George Bush, we were in a state of what might diplomatically be called ‘disarray.’ We were fighting over what we'd done wrong, and what we needed to do next. At that time, you defined a clear focus and direction. Your proposal was that we take up two principal issues: One was the question of voter suppression. And the other was the question of stopping the privatization of Social Security.

“To be honest, I really didn't think it would work. But for lack of any better idea, we went with it. And as the events that followed showed, you were right.

“Right now, the situation is more complicated, but it is the case that we need an order of battle. Can you define, in the way that you did then, a couple of issues, a couple of principal issues that we should be proceeding on? And let me just ask you, in advance, if you would identify dealing with the Dick Cheney question as a similar proposal?”

LaRouche: Well, the problem we have is one of gutlessness of a certain kind. The gutlessness is—for example, the case of dealing with the Democratic challenge of Bush, was easy. You had a fraudulent process of election. It had different elements, so you could not easily pin down one element, such as the vote count as a way of showing the fraud. That vote suppression, you had other factors in there, all of which combined to the *intent*, by various devices to defraud the American people of the knowledge and the ability to discriminate in the way they wanted to, in vote selection.

So, this was a gut issue which was obvious, and it had a lot of pent-up anger behind it. So, when people heard that, as I had warned, Bush was going to come on with an attempt to steal Social Security, a lot of Democrats realized I had been right, and our campaign essentially was, to change the Democratic Party *back* from an *anti*-Franklin Roosevelt party, to a *pro*-Franklin Roosevelt party.

Now, in certain degree we succeeded. And it's a little bit dangerous now, to run around and say you hate FDR in the Democratic Party. Republicans won't trust you if you say that. They figure that you're some kind of a crook; they'll start seizing their pockets and things like that.

Today, the problem is still the same, but now it expresses itself as a broader principle: The enemy has to be defined properly. Who is the enemy? Well, Cheney is ready for the rubbish bin. He could go quickly—he's earned it. I mean, the Lautenberg-Waxman report on the way he's ripped off the American budget, the American till with aid of his Halliburton associates, and how he has profited by what Halliburton has done by way of the "steal business," really puts him in jeopardy. He's not a popular guy. He's hated. Unfortunately, he's also feared. And cowards fear him.

But the enemy is not Cheney. Cheney is only a tool (as his wife describes him). The enemy is the Venetian faction.

The problem today, is economy, which has to be addressed—and this is where Democrats lose their nerve, in the Senate and elsewhere, they lose their nerve. It is not that they don't lack inspiring causes to go to. But when they know, and they are informed, by people like Felix Rohatyn, that they are treading in dangerous waters which they might not like to find themselves in—*they wince*.

The biggest support we have, is the defection of Republicans from the Republican cause. Not the Republican Party as such, but from what the neo-cons represent in the Republican Party. So you have a mass defection of Republicans, who can not support what stinks. But you don't have Democrats, with a few exceptions, who are stepping up to the plate, as is said, on issues: Because they're afraid—of what? They're afraid of the financial interests. We have to realize that the enemy of humanity today, is the same enemy that Franklin Roosevelt had when he was alive, which sometimes are called the "bankers," but he didn't think of the "bankers." He had it right: He understood that the financial oligarchy, including the grandfather of the present President, Prescott Bush, had been the



Felix Rohatyn and Donald Rumsfeld at a meeting of the National Economic Council in 1988. Rohatyn represents the financier-oligarchy, “which says clusters of these bankers are going to run the world, and no government will challenge the authority of these bankers, or their money.”

EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

authors of funding Hitler’s being put into power in Germany. That these people in the American oligarchy—the Wall Street oligarchy—the backers of Coolidge, the controllers of Hoover: These were the people who had put Hitler into power, and Mussolini before him, and Franco afterward. These were the people, who were prepared to support Hitler all the way, and his system, if he had only gone East first, against the Soviet Union, rather than against France and England.

They turned against Hitler—many of them didn’t turn until 1940. But they began to turn against Hitler, when it was learned, that the German military was prepared to strike westward first, before striking eastward. So, they became *anti*-Hitler, because they didn’t like his direction. They liked his methods, but not his direction. And they supported him, by bringing fascism, Nazism, into power in Germany; and fascism into power throughout Continental Europe.

Now, you understand then—you have to go back deeper: That fascism, Nazism, which is largely a product of a group known as the Synarchist International, it’s a group of bankers, in the Venetian tradition. These are independent family banks, family financial interests, which cluster like a slime-mold together, and have individuality, but they also are a slime. This is the problem.

These guys have come to the point, where since 1989, since there was no longer a Soviet Union as a contender, they felt free to destroy Western Europe and the Americas. Because they no longer needed Western Europe and the Americas as economic and military strength, to *control the Soviet Union*. Once the Soviet Union was gone, they said, “history has ended,” as Francis Fukuyama put it. History is now at an end: Now the empire can return.

Now, the empire means the Venetian model. Which means the British model. It means the Anglo-Dutch Liberal

model, under which, in their view, the nation-state either should not exist—and they intend to eliminate most nation-states, which was what the real purpose was in Iraq, not to defeat Saddam Hussein. It was to destroy Iraq, which they’re doing! Their intent is to destroy Syria; their intent is to destroy Iran; their intent is to destroy Israel: The intent is to destroy *every part* of that region of the world—and beyond. And they called them “failed states.” Why has it failed? ’Cause it got killed. That’s why it failed.

What about the other states? They *do not want to tolerate* in Europe, or in the United States, a government which does not submit to the power of a financial oligarchy!

Now, what these guys are up against, which Felix Rohatyn merely typifies, is, they represent a financier-oligarchy, which says clusters of these bankers are going to run the world, and no government will challenge the authority of these bankers, or their money. That’s what the issue is. And they not only use the threat of financial campaigns against politicians and their constituencies. They also kill! They commit murders. They murder officials! They murdered Kennedy. They murdered McKinley. They murdered other people—*en masse*. They are killers. They don’t do it personally, generally. They give the orders. And they can find Nazi types, like the Pinochet types and so forth, who will go out and carry out those orders. That’s the way it’s done.

So there is a genuine fear of these bankers, or these financier interests, among people who know that they hire killers. Most of the assassinations of the world are run, orchestrated by these financial agencies. They kill! They are poisonous cockroaches in our system, inhabiting the pores of our system. And that’s what the problem is. People are afraid of them.

Again: The answer is what I said just a while ago. The answer is, *if you don’t have a sense of immortality, of an*

immortal interest in your life, you don't have the source of courage to make the kinds of decisions to challenge power, evil like that. What they represent, what Felix Rohatyn typifies, in his own small way, is *Satan*. You want a figure for Satan? That's him. Not him personally, as such, but he typifies what is Satanic in society today. This is the evil.

And people are afraid to stand up against evil. They say, "Look, I'm willing to do whatever is possible to reform the society for the better. But, look! Don't get me in trouble!"

How Can We Deal With the Pension Crisis?

Freeman: The next question comes from the senior economists at a Democratic Party-affiliated think-tank.

"Mr. LaRouche, it seems to be a pervasive trend in the airline industry, and it may be extending to other industries as well, but as you know, Northwest Airlines and Delta Airlines have followed USAirways and United into bankruptcy protection, raising again the issue of the pension promises that companies have made to their employees. The growing concern comes with very good reason. USAirways and United have already terminated some or all of their obligations. Beneficiaries who had counted on and worked for these promised benefits, can now expect substantially less retirement income than originally anticipated. At the same time, the government's insurance company for defined benefit pensions, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, has had to absorb billions of dollars in unfunded pension promises, contributing to a total loss of approximately \$23 billion in 2004 alone. These new bankruptcies raise crucial questions about the security of airline pensions, which we are currently studying and being asked to answer. Can airlines maintain their promised obligations to their employees and retirees? What will happen to beneficiaries if the pensions are terminated? Can the existing insurance system for defined benefit pensions absorb more terminations? Will taxpayers have to foot the bill? What does this mean for the airline industry, for airline employees, and for consumers?"

While I don't expect you to answer each question specifically, please be as specific as you can."

LaRouche: Okay. I'll take that.

The problem here is, again, what I just said: it's the slime-mold. It's the financiers.

But it's also the people. The shock of what has happened has to be made clear to the people, brought home to them. *They said they would go along with deregulation.* They voted for it! They voted for it in Carter. The Carter vote was for deregulation. Deregulation was the policy of the Reagan Administration, despite Reagan himself, who had divided views on that. On one side, he was a traditional Democrat of the Roosevelt type. On the other side, he'd been brainwashed by GE and others, and he was crazy on the question of economy. But, in effect, the Reagan-Bush Administration, every administration since 1971-72, especially since 1977—has been *for deregulation!*

And deregulation has been a form of stealing, of looting.

Look, look at the stealing. People have been collecting profits. How? By letting the public utilities decay. Look at the public utilities we had in 1971-72; look at what we have today. Look at all the long-term capital investment. What happened to it? We didn't maintain it! We used it up! We burnt it up, like firewood! We don't *have* much of it, any more.

Now, what you're looking at in terms of the airline industry is exactly that. We burnt it up! We burnt it up, with deregulation, under Carter. Which was under Brzezinski. I don't think Carter ever understood economics. But we did it! And nobody changed it.

The Democratic Party adopted that policy, of deregulation. It adopted the policy of so-called environmentalism, which is largely insane, it's fraudulent—but it's popular. People believe it. It's destroying us. How many people adopted the idea of a change from a producer society to a services economy? Who accepts that? Who says we have to live with that? How many leading politicians in the Democratic Party, as well as Republicans, say that? *This is the price!* This is the problem!

Give me the power as with the Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt; I could fix this, in the way I indicated. This system has to go into bankruptcy reorganization. We're going to keep the airlines. We're going to pay pensions. We're going to keep things going. And we're going to grow, at a rate that we can pay for it. And it has to be done by the Federal government, chiefly.

Which means: Don't tell me you want to "fix this." Tell me: *Are you willing to repeal deregulation?* Huh? Are you willing to go to a fair-trade policy, not a free-trade policy? Are you willing to overthrow pro-free-trade agreements, international agreements—repudiate them? Are you willing to reverse the mistakes you've made, since the middle of the 1960s, alone? To reverse those policies, which you now deem sacred, policies construed *to destroy* our economy, policies construed to destroy our people and their institutions.

Look at our health-care system. Look at everything! You guys (I say to the American people), you did it, you idiots! You did it to yourselves! You decided to go along with popular opinion.

Let me go back one deeper, on this thing. Because I've said this, on other occasions, let me say it here. It'll come up again in different form. But:

How were we changed? All right, the minute that Roosevelt died, Harry Truman, who was not a good guy—he was never a good guy. He was a Missouri racist, and he never changed. He was also a bad guy in other ways. He was shoved on Roosevelt, because Roosevelt wanted to maintain the continuity of government into the postwar period, even though he was already virtually dying. So he ran for a fourth term, to keep the mission going, because he knew the sharks were out there, just waiting for the war to end, to eat up everything he tried to do. So, under those conditions, under pressure, he

took this swine Truman. And I say “swine,” advisedly. (I checked with the pigs, and they agree.)

Now, what Truman did—remember, at the end of the war, we’re now at the close of the war, just before the war had ended. And many people like Patton—George Patton. George Patton was not a nice guy; he was a killer, but not a nice guy. He was hired to be a killer, that he did well. Nice guy—he was not hired for that. He never accepted that job.

What happened was, Winston Churchill, who knew—as then, Truman did not—that the United States had developed a prototype, three prototypes of a nuclear weapon. One was tested at Los Alamos. Two were remaining. They were not production-line weapons. They were laboratory-test operational prototypes. One was a uranium bomb; the other was a plutonium bomb. The intention of Winston Churchill was to drop one or both of these bombs, when completed, on Berlin. But, as luck would have it, Hitler was gone! Couldn’t do it any more.

We now had, at that time, a peace agreement, negotiated through the Extraordinary Affairs Department of the Vatican Foreign Office, with then-Monsignor Montini; who later was Paul VI, the Pope. And there was an agreement, which was the agreement under which the occupation peace treaty with Japan was signed, involving MacArthur. What Truman did, was postpone the recognition of Emperor Hirohito, which was the condition on which the signing would occur, which the Emperor said he would have the authority to tell the military to shut down. They postponed it *in order to drop the two prototype nuclear weapons* on Hiroshima and Nagasaki—which were largely civilian population centers—in order to launch a policy, which the British had organized, and associated with Bertrand Russell, who was the author of the policy. Many people call Bertrand Russell a peacenik. Well, if you kill everybody, you’re going to have peace, of course. And Bertrand Russell was a nuclear bomber: He was the one who put out the Cheney policy, of *preventive nuclear warfare*, pre-emptive nuclear warfare.

And it was the Russell policy of pre-emptive nuclear warfare which was implemented on Hiroshima and Nagasaki by Truman! The intent was to crank up a production arsenal of nuclear weapons, to launch a pre-emptive nuclear attack on the Soviet Union.

All right: Now, the United States went through Hell under Truman. We went far to the right. We went in the direction of a fascist outlook, and people returning from war, as I did, in 1945-46—I came back in ’46—had returned to a United States which was turning fascist. In which the *same financial interests which had backed Hitler, in 1930-33*, the same financial interests, from Washington and London, were now running the Truman policy and the policy of the United States! And this, was the so-called “right turn.” A tendency toward fascist dictatorship, under Truman, in the United States.

What happened is, in the course of time, you had a development, such as the Soviet Union developed nuclear weap-

ons. Ar-r-gh! It’s a different thing to attack a nation which has no nuclear, and one which has one. They can shoot back.

They got nervous. The Korean War didn’t work too well; they got nervous. It was a stalemate war. They got nervous. Quagmire war. And then, the word came back: The Soviet Union had developed a *thermonuclear weapon*, and we didn’t have one. Pre-emptive nuclear warfare was off the table for the time being.

Somebody told Truman, in language he could understand: “Git!” And he “git!” And Eisenhower came in, and Eisenhower saved the United States from nuclear warfare. And did a lot of other good things, both as President and after being President, up through 1968. Many of the things that Eisen-

*Don’t tell me you want to “fix this.”
Tell me: Are you willing to repeal
deregulation? Huh? Are you willing
to go to a fair-trade policy, not a
free-trade policy? Are you willing
to overthrow pro-free-trade
agreements, international
agreements—repudiate them?
Are you willing to reverse the
mistakes you’ve made, since the
middle of the 1960s, alone?
To reverse those policies, which
you now deem sacred, policies
construed to destroy our economy,
policies construed to destroy our
people and their institutions.*

hower and his team were working on, in the 1960s, were excellent projects, such as Middle East peace, things like that. Atoms for Peace was a great idea, an Eisenhower idea. But he had a thing like [John Foster] Dulles on his back, and he had a thing like Arthur Burns on his back on economic policy. They were limitations.

Kennedy came in. Now, Kennedy had, of course, a fascist background in his father: Joe Kennedy was a friend of Hermann Goering, and an opportunist who would not inter-vene to save a single Jewish life. So, Kennedy originally started out in the postwar period, like his brother Bobby, as a right-wing fanatic. And then, as John decided to run for President, he changed his line, and he went to Mrs. Roosevelt, and said he was going to try to be like Franklin Roosevelt, and he changed his profile. But he had trouble getting his

gears meshed on that one—and about the time he began to get his gears meshed, he got killed, by this same crowd, in order to get the Vietnam War started. He was killed, by the usual crowd, the banker crowd, the crowd I referred to.

We went through a transformation in the meantime. Because, people who were born in 1945, or slightly after that, were not the same people who were born before then. People born after that time, were subjected to, first in their parents' families, the terror of "McCarthyism," as it was called. It was actually Trumanism.

Then, they formed the league of fascist-Marxists and existentialists: They were called the Congress for Cultural Freedom. And whether you know it or not, the school system, and the institutions of the United States and Western Europe, were taken over culturally, by this fascist gang of Marxists—like Sidney Hook and company. They were the people who directed the *cultural transformation* of the culture of the United States, through many things. For example: You couldn't hear Beethoven any more. You had to have some "Chopsticks" in there in the middle. You couldn't have any kind of decent entertainment, you had to screw it up in some way, Bertholt Brecht style, piggish style.

You couldn't get decent education any more—it got worse and worse. And you had a generation of people born around 1945 or later, their parents had capitulated to fascism, like the cowards they were, or had become. But the children were the victims of it! They didn't know any better! They were born into it! They were born into a fascist culture, that of Truman and what followed, through the Congress for Cultural Freedom. They were brainwashed in the schools; they were brainwashed on television.

They were frightened. "Don't get your father into trouble! Your father will lose his job—be careful what you say!" They were children who were raised *not to tell the truth*, but to "be careful what you say." They were children of the Delphi code, the Apollo Cult of Delphi, which created Sophistry in Greece, to destroy Greek culture, and succeeded with the Peloponnesian War and other things, beginning of the 5th Century B.C.

This is what's happened to these people! The people who are called the Baby Boomer generation, those born shortly after 1945, are a lost generation! And their children, today, know it! Young people today, now between 18 and 25, are experiencing the brainwashing of their parents' generation by these circumstances. And that's what makes their parents tick. They were brainwashed into becoming Sophists. And we, the United States, are being destroyed the same way Greece, which had been a great culture, was destroyed—and destroyed *itself*—in the Peloponnesian War, through the influence of Sophistry.

We are a nation of Sophists. And the problem with our government today, is that the Sophists, or the Sophists' generation, those who were born, who have lived between the interval-bookends of 1945 to the present time, who are now in their 60s or approaching their 60s—that is the generation

which has been brainwashed. They don't know any better! They don't know what truth is. They were educated, you have to look at the program they were taught: They were taught *there is no truth*, there's only opinion. There is no truth, there's only sensitivity. If you try to tell the truth, then you're an authoritarian.

The way we got the right wing today, among the right-wing Republicans around these nuts—this 30% of the American population which is absolutely *nuts*—religious fanatics—we got them, because of a reaction against the 68ers! The 68ers were the ones who were used to destroy the U.S. economy. They were the ones who were out to destroy industry, to destroy technology, to eliminate nuclear energy, to eliminate infrastructure, to eliminate high technology, to transform the society from a producer society to a services economy! They did it!

And the reaction by my generation, to *this*, was the Reagan phenomenon: the hatred of the 68ers! And it was a legitimate hatred, because the 68ers were destroying the United States.

The reason Carter was rejected, the reason Bush lost to Reagan in New Hampshire, was that reason. I was in the center of it. Bush represented the Trilateral Commission. He represented the no-future society. He represented all these funny things that Brzezinski represented. And the voters in New Hampshire hated his guts! And Reagan won the nomination because of that. The Reagan Democrat, was a Democrat who *hated* the 68er! Because the 68er was destroying the country, destroying the nation—and he was right.

The 68ers are now running the country, in the highest positions of business. The immorality, Enron, is created by the 68ers! The people who are running, and ruining General Motors, and the auto industry, were created by the 68ers. That's the secret of politics in this country.

And that's what we have to understand, is that issue.

Now, when you look at the airline industry: *It was deliberately destroyed!* It was not some accident, it was not mismanagement: *It was deliberately destroyed as a matter of policy!* Tell me: What happened to Pan American Airways? What happened to all the leading airlines of that period, or virtually all of them—what happened to them? They went quick. What's happened to all of them? The same thing: *It was deliberate!*

What happened to our industries: *It was deliberate!*

Why the mismanagement of the automobile industry: It was deliberate!

And it was two things: It was this intention, behind this, of this banking crowd—the guys who were actually Nazis, Nazis in the sense of followers of those who put Hitler into power in Germany in the first place! In our own country, like Prescott Bush, the grandfather of the present stupid President: *These* are the guys, who intended to do this, to destroy the United States. Why? *Because the United States, and what the United States represented from its creation, its inception, was the alternative to the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system.* And they



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

The religious fanatics emerged as a reaction against the 68ers, and today represent the core of the right wing in the United States. Here, a Washington for Jesus rally in Washington.

wanted to destroy it.

And they couldn't destroy it from the outside, so they destroyed *from the inside*.

And if we recognize that we have been betrayed, and are being destroyed in this way, for that reason, and that we once had a great country with a great promise, and decide to take it back, under *its* Constitution: then we can win. If we're not willing to do that, we won't win. We'll lose.

Don't We Have to Tackle Fraud in Government?

Freeman: The next question is from the Senate Judiciary Committee: "Mr. LaRouche, the sudden discovery of *New York Times* reporter Judith Miller's notes, which, as you know, detail a conversation she had with Dick Cheney's chief of staff, Louis Libby, on June 23, 2003, would seem to establish that the White House started targetting Joe Wilson and his wife weeks before Wilson publicly accused the Bush Administration of twisting intelligence on Iraq, to promote their war. The fact that this meeting has heretofore gone undisclosed, would seem to add charges of conspiracy, perjury, and obstruction of justice to the original charges that the White House knowingly revealed the identity of an undercover CIA operative.

Now, some argue that this is the business of special prosecutor Fitzgerald, and not the business of the United States Congress. They say that the more compelling issue for Congress to consider, is the fraud that was perpetrated to get us into the war in the first place. There is yet a third argument that is batting around, which is that Congress shouldn't concern itself with either of those two questions, but should instead deal with the current situation. But the simple fact that

there doesn't seem to be a way out of Iraq, without first dealing with the fraud, especially since that fraud was perpetrated under the direct command of the Vice President, with the complicity of the President himself, is an issue that troubles me.

My question to you, really, is what are your thoughts on this? What is the appropriate course for us to take in considering this overriding problem?

LaRouche: The complicating problem is one addressed by the former First Lady, and now Senator, Hilary Clinton, in a recent press conference this past week. And that was, that there's a certain kind of a creature, a crawling creature, that works for the *Washington Post*, called April Witt. And she's half a wit. I don't know which half, but anyway. There was a feature published in the *Washington Post*, under her name, which was a really disgusting re-warming of an operation, in which the FBI used, among other things, a complicit member of the extended Kennedy family, to set up the Clintons for a scam against them, or against their fund-raiser, in a Hollywood fund-raiser. Now, she ran the story in spades and in color, which was actually run by the *Washington Post*, which is not a center of purity in these vicinities. It was run as an operation against Bill Clinton and Hilary, because that's all in the past, in the former Clinton Administration, when Hilary was the First Lady. And it was run by an FBI sting, scam operation, against the President of the United States! Now, where's the morality there? And a member of the extended Kennedy family was complicit in assisting an FBI sting operation, run by the FBI against the President of the United States!

That's to begin with. But then, take how these things develop: You've got to get the total picture of what we're up against. You've got to get the dynamics of this, not just the



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

The 68ers, who destroyed the economy, technology, and industry, are now running the country. Here, a New York City "Pot Parade" in 1981.

detail, one detail or the other. It's come to, what is our policy on this question? To answer the question: What is the policy? I think that's the intent of the question. So, anyway, naturally, at the first occasion, the customary press—which is really like a pack of locusts, most of the time, in the cornfield, you know?—she came out at the press conference, and they began to pounce on her about this reported scandal against the Clinton family, in connection with his fund-raising this time—which was a sting operation against the President of the United States. They're not shocked by that. They want to go along with the *Washington Post*, which has published a piece of filth, using a filthy mouth to get it out of—April Witt, a notorious piece of filth.

Now, Hilary's answer to this pounding of her, to demand a response on this question about this *Post* article, was, "Well, Judith Miller is not the only government agent in the press corps"! The press corps went wild, because—you have no idea, or perhaps you do, of what percentile of the so-called

leading members of the press, are agents of government agencies of some kind, as in the case of Judith Miller. Judith Miller is not a reporter. She operates out of the cover of being a reporter. It's like a beetle wearing a suit and saying, "I'm your cousin"! Now, one of the things to answer is the holier-than-thou U.S. press corps, is an essential part of the corruption.

Now, there's another aspect of this thing, which is mentioned in the question, which is crucial, and which goes to the great irony of the thing. Now, how would Cheney-acs know to try to set up Joe Wilson and his wife, before Wilson had published his article? How would they know? Well, because Wilson made his report *to whom*? The report on the yellow cake operation from Niger—who did he report to? The CIA! Now, how would anyone in government find out what Wilson had said to the CIA? Because his report to the CIA actually discredited Cheney's story on Iraq. So obviously, the inception of the fraud against, and the violation of law, against Wilson's wife, had to come through some kind of a security leak. Who had access to that security information? Who would go to visit the CIA headquarters? What does the former head of the CIA have to say about this! Did he give out this information? Did this information come out of his office, into Cheney's hands? Into whose hands was it delivered? How did they know they had the problem, unless somebody told them?

So, the point is, the question is, the direct question: Was there corruption inside the Bush Administration which generated this thing in the first place? It was not, did the information leak, information that should not, which was entrusted to a reporter? That's a phony story! Because the operation was in place before Wilson was disposed, and Wilson was breaking this story only because it had *not* broken. He thought it was important to get it out. And the other side was the gutlessness of members of the Congress, especially the Senate, in failing to take this into account. He had said that what Cheney was saying was a lie, and the members of the Senate were afraid of Cheney, and they wouldn't buck him, even though the evidence was available to them. They didn't do a damn thing about it. Why didn't they? Because Cheney said he swore, and it was a question—to challenge this information was to challenge Cheney personally. Not Bush. Bush doesn't know where Iraq is yet. Sometimes he can't find Cheney.

The Issue Is Constitutional Law

So, we have to look at this from that standpoint. We have to look at these things, not from the standpoint of legalisms in the narrow sense. When you're in a crisis, the law has to be the conception, which is our constitutional law as such. This is not British law. This is our constitutional law, and our constitutional law is specified essentially in the Preamble of the Constitution, and by the powers and responsibilities assigned to the Executive Branch, and the Congress, and the Supreme Court, by the Preamble of the Constitution, which is the overriding authority on all of them, when it comes to matters of law.

When a thing like this occurs, the Federal government is responsible to enforce the law, not the law as such, but especially the Executive Branch and the Congress, especially the Senate, are responsible in a case like this, or there may be no law. They can't sit back and say, "We don't have a law that covers the situation." Yes, they do have a law that covers the situation. The Preamble of the Constitution. That's the law! The general welfare. Their obligation to defend and promote the general welfare, for ourselves and our posterity. So whenever the security of the United States is at stake, the Constitution specifies that the Executive Branch and the Senate, in particular, are responsible for making a finding, and to get a community of agreement among the houses of the Congress and the Presidency, a finding of agreement of what is required in due process. You don't need a new law. That *is* a law! A declaration of war is a law. You don't have to have a special law to make war! It's in the Constitution: The powers to make war, the checks and balances. In this case, the power to make war, or the power to *prevent* an unnecessary war, are constitutional matters, not matters of positive law.

See, the Constitution as such has to be understood. The Constitution has to be understood historically, not on the basis of some British advisor. The British don't have law. They never did have a Constitution. They have habits. Sometimes they wear them, sometimes they use them. Sometimes the habits use them. But we are a nation under constitutional law, in the tradition of Solon and Plato's Republic. We have a Constitution which reflects that. That is our law. Our Declaration of Independence is still our law. It's the intention under which this nation was founded. The establishment of the Federal government is an implementation of the intention of the Declaration of Independence. You have the Leibniz clause in the Declaration of Independence, which is against slavery. The pursuit of happiness is Leibniz's denunciation of John Locke. So any argument in law which is based on John Locke, is unconstitutional. It's against the founding principle of the United States. The idea of property right as such, is unconstitutional. The highest authority of law is the pursuit of happiness, which is reflected in the Constitution as the realization of the mechanism by which the pursuit of happiness would be promoted.

And therefore, when we get into a situation like this, you're not dealing from the bottom up with a violation of trying to figure out where you carry it. You go from the top down, because what is at stake here is, the United States was put into an unlawful war by fraud. Various mechanisms were used. There are various dynamic aspects, elements, to this process. And therefore, things should come from the top down. Any agency, in my view, any agency of government, authorized government, has the responsibility and right to proceed with its responsibility in the matter.

And the question is—for example, is Judith Miller really a reporter? Her fellows at the *New York Times* didn't want to

cosign any articles with her. Is she really a reporter? Is she an agent of [John] Bolton? Is she an agent of some intelligence service, operating out of the cover of a reporter? Will the *Times* tell us that? Will the *Times* tell us whether she's really a reporter or not, or whether she's an agent they had planted? These are the kinds of questions which are posed, and I say we go back to the essential thing here: The first thing to look at is, where was the actual genesis of this operation against Valerie Plame? Didn't it come prior to the fact that Joe Wilson had published an article? Didn't it come through his report to the intelligence community? Isn't that where the genesis was? Wasn't somebody angry, like Cheney, because Cheney was the author of this war in Iraq—it wasn't Bush, it was Cheney. Was Cheney very angry that Joe Wilson, by saying the yellow cake story was a fake, had jeopardized Cheney's private interests? And wasn't Cheney already putting the machinery into play to get Joe Wilson for this, and to silence the CIA by this kind of process?

The Bankruptcy of Delphi

Freeman: We are very close to being out of time, but we have an overwhelming number of questions on General Motors and the recent bankruptcy filing of Delphi. I am going to ask Lyn a question that was submitted by the Manufacturing Caucus, which touches on various of the questions that folks here have submitted. And, Lyn will answer it as he sees fit. You will certainly have the opportunity later on, to ask him more about this. This question is:

"Mr. LaRouche, earlier this year you warned that General Motors was moving toward bankruptcy. We were visited by delegations representing you who demanded that emergency action be taken to protect the auto sector in various ways. Some of your critics here on Capital Hill argued that what you were essentially doing was calling for the nationalization of the auto industry. Now, some months later, GM is still with us, but Delphi, the largest manufacturer of auto parts in the nation, has indeed filed for bankruptcy protection and GM is in big trouble. So, in your view, where are we right now, and where do we go? And please, since it did emerge as such a point of controversy, are you recommending the nationalization of the auto industry?"

LaRouche: In the past we have, in situations like this, we have put an entity or a group of entities under Federal protection, not with the intent of privatizing them, but of reconstituting them. I don't think you'd get many people enthusiastic about bailing out some of the management of General Motors, or Delphi. As I said, what's happened, what the management of those two entities have done, means that the U.S. government owes Martha Stewart an apology!

This management is evil. Just this question of the pensions. Here they are, with the bankruptcy law coming up, what are they concerned about? They're not concerned about the entity. They are concerned about increasing their pensions, their withdrawal rights, while they are stealing everybody

else's! And, if the bankruptcy went through later, then they'd come under the new bankruptcy law and they wouldn't be able to steal quite as much from these special withdrawal funds. So they wanted to bankrupt the things *now*, in order to run away with large pensions which they can do now, but they won't be able to do when the new bankruptcy law kicks in. Now for this kind of scoundrel, I have very little sympathy. For the stockholders of these companies, that's another question. They should take their licks like everybody else in the industry. But, from our standpoint, we have to look at this as a government, from a standpoint of national interest, national strategic interest.

Now, the problem in the Congress is, that there is a lack of understanding of the ABC's of economics. And, that's because they are Baby Boomers. They are part of this generation of the '68ers. They are people who have been conditioned to believe in the mysteries of *service economy*. Free maids, for example, eh? Or, changing your sex, and wives, and husbands, and so forth. Marry a turtle, whatever, eh? So, these fellas have a little confusion about things about the general welfare question. And, therefore it's going to take a lot of effort to get them to understand this problem.

But, *we need machine-tool capability*. We need the means to implement machine-tool capability. We have tremendous needs in this country for a railway system, for a magnetic levitation system, for improved, many kinds of systems. We do not need to save the capabilities of GM, Delphi and so forth for the specific business of automobiles! We need to save the *capacity* for producing the kind of product this combination can produce. And, producing it in the areas in which people are presently employed, because, the other side of the thing is, you don't really have people working in some *place*. You have people who have families imbedded in communities. There are several generations, in communities. These are family-related communities. There are all kinds of complexes, stores, other industries, all kinds of things tied together.

So, you want to take an area like western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, for example, which are prime areas; the Ohio River basin, the Great Lakes, Ohio River basin. You want to take that area and make sure you stabilize that. You stabilize that by keeping people where they are. So, now you keep people where they are and you come up with some new work for them to do. Work we need. Do we need a national railway hookup? Yes, we do. Do we need to increase employment? Yes. Do we need to get the other employment which will come as a spinoff of maintaining these firms in operation? Yes. Does it have to be automobiles? No. It has to be the combination of machine-tool capability, science driven, machine-tool capability, which turns design of a product and the tools of the production of that product into a product which is produced by masses of people working in that industry, the way we did in World War II. We broke the job down to fit the skills of the people. We got things

designed and produced that worked. The case was the same as [Henry J.] Kaiser's work about building ships, by building the victory ships and so forth, these kinds of things. This was done as a machine-tool job. What Kaiser did was a miracle, with this stuff.

We can do that again. And, you don't need to have everybody know how to do it. If you have a cadre of people, just like a military cadre, you have a cadre of people, an inside team, the hard core of the design engineers. That's the hard core. You design the basic product around that. Now, you have a cadre around them of machine-tool engineers and skilled people who now break the job down as designed, and are trained and know how to do that. Now you take your design and now you put it out into a production line. And, you'd be surprised how rapidly, as we learned from World War II experience how rapidly, from almost zero, we can go into a large-scale production, if you are willing to accept a high rate of errors, a high rate of scrap in your initial stages. We can produce almost anything. We can change this economy quickly.

Now, what we need is, we need a mass transit system. Preferably we need a maglev system, because, with a maglev system we can get people from a railroad station on the West Coast to a railroad station on the East Coast about as fast as you can get there by plane, when you think of all this stuff about going through the ticketing and all the moving back and forth to airports and so forth. You can certainly do that with that kind of system; your intercity connections become highly efficient. You would never use short haul air flights as a way of transportation between urban centers, because you can do it more cheaply and quickly by maglev. You even have high-speed rail, which is a compromise in many cases. We have improved qualities in high-speed rail which we are using in some parts of Europe, for example, that work.

We could do that. We could produce plants. By breaking the job down, we could produce power plants; new ways of making power plants. Now it takes a number of years, three, five years to build a power plant. We can speed that up by redesigning the job. We know how to make the thing work, we just have to design the way that we put it together, eh? Like this whole curing of concrete, and so forth, in some cases.

So, therefore, we need the increased production. We have to change from a services economy to a producer economy, *now*. If we don't maintain the integrity of our machine-tool sector, our machine-tool industrial sector, *we can't do it*. We become a Third World country. And, I think some people want to destroy us.

So, we are talking about saving the nation. And, if we have to put the industry under Federal protection to keep it running, in order to maintain the capacity and keep these communities functioning, the tax-paying communities, maybe that will get through to some of the Congressmen, eh? Then we should do it. It's not a question of nationalizing! This is stupid propaganda by some idiot advisor.