

Kennebunkport, the BAE Scandal, and The Need To Get Cheney Out Now

Lyndon LaRouche was on the Jack Stockwell Show on K-Talk radio, KTKK 630 AM, in Salt Lake City the morning of July 9. This is an abridged transcript of the two-hour interview.

Jack Stockwell: Lyndon LaRouche is my guest this morning. This is a very important time to have him on: Two major things that I wanted to cover this morning, was this British Aerospace thing that is breaking in London and the U.K.—and has yet to show up in the American press, but it should be here before too long. And also I want to talk about the “Lobster” thing up there in the Kennebunkport, and what it means when the President of Russia comes to the United States. Especially, of all places Kennebunkport—not Camp David, not the White House—but to Kennebunkport.

So, welcome back. Mr. LaRouche was on my show the morning of 9/11. We had scheduled him that morning for an interview, and I don’t even remember what we wanted to talk about that morning. But as the program began, the attack on the World Trade Center began immediately, and so that took the course of our discussion for the next two hours. And interestingly enough, the things that Mr. LaRouche said at that point in time, have played out. We don’t need to go into that now. That’s a matter of record. . . .

So, Lyn, welcome to the show again this morning. I’m glad to have you here. You are still alive—can you believe that?

LaRouche: Well, yes, I can. Because, I have, in a sense, a charmed life. My enemies would not like to have me dead on their doorstep!

Stockwell: Well, the more I read this *EIR*, it seems to me, the more enemies you might be accruing.

LaRouche: Yes, but I’m getting also some enemies who are behaving themselves. As, for example, Kennebunkport: Probably you want the story, but this happened just before I got to Russia. I was scheduled to be in Russia for a meeting on the Bering Strait Project, which would link Siberia to the United States through Alaska, and would, in a sense, take the three major continents of the planet—the Americas, Eurasia, and Africa—and would tie them together by what would become very soon, a maglev system, which would be seriously more economical than air, more efficient than air, and cheaper. And it would also replace very expensive, in effect, highway sys-

tems, and inferior rail systems.

But, since I was going to Russia later anyway, for a meeting at the Academy of Sciences, I sent a message to the Bering Strait conference, and attended a meeting a couple weeks later in Russia. And during this period, the same things I was discussing in Moscow, were coming on the agenda inside the United States, involving Kissinger, involving the two Bushes, father and son, and the former President Clinton. And in this process, something uncorked: a recognition, first of all, that the confrontation with Russia will not work; confrontation with China also won’t work.

Stockwell: Now, by confrontation, are you referring to circling Russia with radar stations and missile launch sites?


LaRouche: No. The threat to Russia is coming from the British Isles, from the British monarchy who have targetted Russia and China, as part of an extension of what is already happening in Southwest Asia. In other words, the buildup of wars in Southwest Asia, since the fall of the Wall in Berlin, is spreading now, so that Russia itself, and China, and down the line, India, are all targetted for destruction by a faction which was typified by Tony Blair and his crowd in London.

Now, what’s happened is, that people in the United States have moved away from that faction in London, and have decided not to have Hell on Earth, but are now reaching out to accept offers of cooperation from President Putin of Russia.

Stockwell: Now that’s the essence of Kennebunkport?

LaRouche: It’s more than that: It’s also the essence of what’s going on in the White House. The current President, whose animus against his own father is rather notable, suddenly reached out to his father. Because the Cheney mess, the Cheney threat to civilization, has become for the incumbent President, an impossible situation for him to handle. And therefore, he turned back to his family to get some help. And he got help, from Kissinger, from his father, and from Bill Clinton—and from me! So, that’s essentially what’s happened.

I’ve been always careful to say: We have to get rid of Cheney immediately, but it would be a mistake to put Cheney and the President in the same position. Cheney should be removed from sight, and smell. The incumbent President involves the institution of the Presidency, and we have to deal



U.S. Navy/Denny C. Cantrell

Dick Cheney looks as though he's ready to retire to his potato patch in Wyoming. Says LaRouche, "Just get him outta there! The country demands it: In the interest of the nation, get him out! And get him out now!"

with that accordingly. So, get rid of Cheney: He's the key to the problem—he's not the source of the problem, but he's key to it. And then, since the whole financial system is coming down anyway, and since we have to get into a new set of economic agreements, to circumvent what would be the biggest crash the world has ever known, and since this involves cooperation among the United States, China, Russia, and India, among other nations, you don't want to start another war, with those with whom you have to cooperate, to deal with the on-rushing major crisis of the planet as a whole.

Stockwell: So, does this mean that we might be stepping down from a limited nuclear confrontation with Iran?

LaRouche: Well, the confrontation with Iran is part of the Cheney policy, and it involves as many Democrats as Republicans. The Democratic Party officially is, of course, the pro-peace party on this question, but effectively, if you look at all the players, you'll find that bad guys in the Democratic Party and the Republican Party are about equally numerous.

So, we're getting to a point where there is going to be a reshuffle of the political agenda in the United States. As you

can see from pre-Presidential campaigns, that's a mess that isn't going to fly. It's a complete piece of insanity. Not all the figures are obscene in that, but the campaigns, as of now, are absolutely obscene, and have no relevance or benefit for the United States.

So, there is going to be a major reshuffling of international politics and also national politics.

Stockwell: Simply because the Bushes got together in Kennebunkport with President Putin, to begin what might be overtures to China and India, as well?

LaRouche: It's more than that. Of course, Clinton was in Yalta for a conference, and was with the senior Bush at the Yeltsin burial. Clinton, being Clinton, used the [former] occasion to propose the revival of what President Reagan called SDI, which I had designed, over a quarter-century ago. So that was on the agenda. In the meantime, there were discussions in Moscow. Kissinger, in the same timeframe that I was in Moscow, was involved also in a complementary role, in putting this together. In this process, the elder, former President Bush invited Putin to Kennebunkport, and brought the son along—the son was willing on this thing. Cheney was kept out—that's the key thing: Cheney was not allowed at Kennebunkport.

So you had an agreement with Putin, which is very limited, very simple, but it's a first step, if the follow-on continues.

Stockwell: So, somebody has thrown a major curveball, at this point in the game. Now, this kind of began with the Hamilton study group, didn't it?

LaRouche: No, it began with me. It started in 1993. It was introduced as Clinton was coming in as President. Clinton was onto my role, once he became President, and was becoming President, and was briefed in that period on my role in the SDI—my role behind Reagan's operation in the SDI; and was briefed by many people on my skills in this area. So that, he started to move in that direction, as he's explained in various interviews he's given recently, how he started this. So, he has been, off and on, on this for a long time. The Soviet Union has collapsed, what do we do? What we do now, is, we don't look for a new confrontation, we try to look for forms of agreement, which will deal with the problems at this moment of our advantage. That was Clinton's policy.

He was opposed to a military buildup because he thought it was too expensive, and because there was no reason to do so. But he, as you've probably observed, has kept his options open on a lot of things. Clinton is like that.

Stockwell: There must be a split going on, between the Anglo-American empire that has been pushing for World War III, and some of the characters who were principal to that, who now seem to be dragging their feet and want to go in a different direction.

LaRouche: This is systemic. I enjoy it, as you can imagine.

Stockwell: Oh, this is the stuff of which talk shows are made. I enjoy this, too!

LaRouche: I mean, it's systemic in the sense that it goes back to the nature of our nation, which I think a lot of people in our country don't know: That, we were created—we're Europeans in a sense, in our culture. *But!* with one very important difference: The founders of this nation came over here, to bring the best of European culture to what they hoped would be a safe place, here. But also to get away from the oligarchical traditions of Europe.

So, we have within us—and of course, I have ancestry going back to the first half of the 17th Century, here in the United States, so I have a little family insight into this, as well as everything else—but we have a deeply embedded culture in us, of which most Americans today are not really aware. They don't really understand this. They haven't studied it, they don't get the education where they could understand it. But we have a special kind of affinity, which once in a while brings an Abraham Lincoln or a Franklin Roosevelt, or someone like that, out of the clouds and out of the mists, into a position of power, when we might just need them the most.

And we're in one of those periods in which the force of events says that everything that we've been doing, since the Baby Boomers were invented in about 1945-46—the anti-Roosevelt Baby Boomers, who didn't know they were Baby Boomers then, because they were still babies—but that generation that was born, as a white-collar generation, that didn't like working people, that didn't like farmers, didn't like science, but they're real sophists; and trained to be sophists from the white-collar generation of the 1945-46-58 interval, they're now on top. But underneath that, we are Americans, who have embedded in us, not always suspecting it, the traditions on which our country was founded. And from time to time, we go through bad times, but that thing comes to the surface, again.

We're in a period in which the hope of this nation is, that will happen: That this global warming insanity will go away; that the crazy financial system which is now disintegrating, will go away, but leave us to mind our business. And what you're seeing, is unlikely people, suddenly find themselves pushed into positions of leadership, to play a role which is contrary to everything they seem to have stood for up to that time. Such is the case with Kissinger; such is the case with Papa Bush, and such is the case with the Bush White House. And the Bush White House has come out of the Cheneyac dreams, and has realized that it has to grope for a way out of this stinking mess which is becoming impossible to manage.

And that's essentially what happened. The son realized he needed his father's help: The family got together, they brought Putin over to Kennebunkport, to have a talk with Russia. And specifically to have a negotiation with Russia, an understanding which nobody else would become involved in. Because they wanted to have that talk and settle something. They didn't settle very much. They came up with one signed agreement,

on nuclear power, and intend to cooperate, and *that's very good*. It's not the whole bag.

Stockwell: No, because there are more issues to discuss. But isn't this the beginning of something, that suddenly, China is going to want to be a part of? India is going to want to be part of this? France and Germany, and people who are starving in the European Union, who want to go back to their own sovereignty, isn't this something that they're going to start waving their hand, and say, "Hey! How 'bout us? How 'bout us?"

LaRouche: This is where leadership comes into play. You know, mass movement is important. The sentiments of a majority of a population are extremely important. But the initiative, which summons a people to act, as an aggregate, in its own interest, always comes from leadership. And in our case, when we're lucky, we get one of those leaders, like Washington, or Lincoln, or John Quincy Adams, or Franklin Roosevelt, or, in a sense, Eisenhower, who did what he could in his time. And sometimes, you get a leader who can pick up the message they have to deliver, the message which they have to use to mobilize the people in general, to do something that the people in general really want.

You know, the sense of politics is not democracy, because the majority of public opinion is always wrong. What is needed is leadership, which can activate within the people a recognition of their own interests, where the interests of the people voluntarily come into coincidence with the kind of leadership they're getting. And that's when we're at our best. . . .

Stockwell: You mentioned a moment ago, you were talking about these bad things going away, and you were talking about how the monetary-financial collapse would go away. But that can't go away! Don't we have to do something of a proactive nature, to take care of this? Because it's not just the United States, it's not just the dollar and the effect of its collapse on the United States. Every other nation on this planet is going to have some very serious problems, including those involved with the euro, should the dollar go under.

LaRouche: Well, if the dollar goes under, the whole planet goes under.

Now, we're going to have to take some very drastic measures, which I don't think the present Presidency is prepared to take. But they might come into that sideways, with a little bit of help.

What's going to have to happen very soon, because, if the dollar goes down, the whole world goes down. If you look at one very simple fact: What is the debt of the United States to the dollar, and how much of the nominal assets of the rest of the international financial system depend upon the value of the dollar? That is, if the dollar were to collapse suddenly by about 20% in international market value, you would have a chain reaction which would blow the whole planet out. You're at the point, a very fragile point, at which very *slight* maneuvers, can set forth a chain reaction, a collapse of the housing bubble, for example, a complete bubble. Similar things in Eu-

rope. We're ready to blow the system out.

Now, the only thing you can do, in such a case, is you have to say: *"Don't follow the currency. Don't let your currency run your country. Let your country run your currency."* And set up agreements with other countries, whereby you freeze certain currency values, by government agreement, and you do what you have to do to reorganize the currency, to prevent a collapse of what is, in effect, the world's, still, current reserve currency: the U.S. dollar. That is, the debts denominated in dollars, debts *by* the United States, denominated in dollars, to itself and to foreign countries, if that dollar goes down, *the whole world system blows out!*

Stockwell: In order to freeze, then, that kind of value, in agreements from one country to another, so that the medium of exchange between them would be held at a constant value, you're going to have to have something besides the faith and trust of the United States behind that money.

LaRouche: What I've proposed, and what I was continuing to do, when I was in Moscow this year—was to propose, as I had proposed publicly, that the United States should work with Putin, and with China, to bring together four major nations—the United States, Russia, China, and India. Remember India is now 1.1 billion people; China's 1.4 billion people. Russia's a large nation with a tremendous area, and a very key role in the world economy as a whole, that is, physical economy. Therefore, if we say we're going to sponsor a change in the IMF system, with these powers, and bring the other countries in to support it, it'll work. If you try to bring one country in at a time, into reform, and negotiate through the United Nations or other channels, you're going to get nowhere. You're going to blow the thing out.

You have to have a powerful intervention which says, *"We're going to freeze this as of now!"* And if you've got four major powers, which represent a great part of the population and territory of the world, who agree on that, and say, *"other powers come in, let's do it together,"* most other powers of the world would join those four, and you would have a complete revision of the international system, including the United Nations system. Under those conditions, you could have an immediate freeze of values of currency, and you would not try to let the currencies float into some kind of equilibrium: *Rather* you would let the prices move into more equilibrium status, to support this fixed-price arrangement.

Under those conditions, we could then go back to the American System. Forget the monetarist system. The monetarist system, the British System, doesn't work under these conditions. *It can't.* A free-trade system can't work.

So therefore, you have to have a fixed-exchange-rate system, with various kinds of controls, Roosevelt-style. And you have to encourage *prices* to move into a state of equilibrium. You have to move away from a speculative economy, back to a physical economy: that is, back to agriculture, to basic economic infrastructure, to manufacturing, and to high technol-



USDA/Bruce Fritz

We can prevent a general collapse, LaRouche said, but this means we "have to move away from a speculative economy, back to a physical economy: that is, back to agriculture, to basic economic infrastructure, to manufacturing, and to high technology. Forget all this funny stuff we've been doing, especially since 1971." Here, a high-tech combine, using a GPS antenna.

ogy. Forget all this funny stuff we've been doing, especially since 1971.

Under those conditions, we can prevent a general collapse of the world financial and economic systems. Without that, we can't...

Stockwell: You've got the Federal Reserve and the monetarist system of the U.S. Treasury right now, or on which the U.S. Treasury is based, in the way.

LaRouche: It's easily fixed under our Constitution. The wonderful thing about us, is, you know, our Constitution is much smarter than many of our citizens are! That, when we use it, and apply its principles to our problems, we can solve them. And we have sovereignty; we are a sovereign nation. The dollar is *not* a power above us, unless we let foreigners use it that way. The dollar is our *debt*: Under our Constitution, money is issued, or the authorization for issuing the money, uttering the money, is a matter which has to be voted up in the House of Representatives, and acted upon by the Executive branch. We are a *credit* system, not a monetary system. We do not allow money to run our economy, we use the management of money to run our economy. We use the management of our economy,

to ensure that things that need to be done, have priority: such as, agriculture, maintenance of the land area, industry, basic economic infrastructure, health-care, for example, and we defend our nation and its security. That's what money must do for us. It's a credit system.

We are not investing in things we should invest in any more. We stopped it, increasingly, since 1971, especially since 1981, and therefore, we're destroying our economy, with our own financial policy, and our own legislation, particularly that of the past 25 years. So, all we have to do, is go back to our system, back to our Constitution, and do what we've done every time we've been successful....

Stockwell: If you're going to go in, and just declare the whole dang thing bankrupt, and you move in through Congressional decree to do that very thing, what about pensions, what about Social Security, what about the bonds that are tied to the debt?

LaRouche: That's what you do, you freeze—see, you don't close it down. You put it into receivership, like you put a firm that's bankrupt, but you want the thing to operate, you take it into receivership and you help it—to ease this, help that, do this. To get it back into shape so it's back in productive shape again.

Stockwell: So, people still get their bond payoffs, they still get their pensions, they still get their Social Security; it's just, the insidious virus that caused the destruction of those values because of inflation and whatever else, that is what's being altered into a new system, that will underscore the future of those very things.

LaRouche: Yes. A very specific problem: Most of money, today, is not real. That is, the hedge funds, for example. The international monetary system is a complete bubble, it's a John Law bubble. Now, what do you do? You put this thing into bankruptcy. You say, "Let's look at all these accounts, these claims on banks," because it's our banks that're about to go under; our private banks are all in jeopardy, the major ones, because they're in hock to these international systems. We act, together with other nations, and we say, "Each of us, as nations, we together are going to defend our system, that is, our national system, against these predatory things like the Cayman Islands, and the hedge funds and things like that; and we're going to put the thing into receivership."

Now, when you put a bank or banking institution into receivership, what do you do? You say, "This will not be paid. Freeze it, or tear it up. This will be paid." So therefore, you have to set the policy guidelines for what will be paid....

Let's take a concrete case, a big one: the real estate bubble. Now the real estate values in the United States, and in England and elsewhere, are about to collapse, and they'll probably collapse by as much as 50 or 60%, or more. Because this is just a big bubble. *Behind this*, is a highly inflationary gambling system. The hedge fund system is a gambling system. Therefore, the first thing you do—and you get the Con-

gress to agree, because the constituencies will lynch the Congressmen if they don't agree!—gambling debts are not paid, and hedge funds are gambling debts. What you do, is you move in to save the banks, but not the hedge funds; you move in to keep the pensions, to keep the things that are necessary. How do you do that? You do it quite democratically: You let the representatives of the people in the Federal Congress, with the Federal government, respond to the pressures of the people, to say, "This has to be paid. And this is going to wait, or it's going to be cancelled." And that's how you handle it.... But the key thing here, is you don't have a dictator saying what will be paid and what won't be paid. Under our system, you have a Congress, and the legislation governing the way the bankruptcy will proceed, will go through the Congress, especially the House of Representatives. Therefore, the voice of the people, will be manifest through their representatives.

Stockwell: You've been preaching this for decades. What kind of response—even though I know there's an awful lot of it that's kind of behind the scenes, behind the curtains—are you getting from members of Congress?

LaRouche: They're a bunch of cowards! We've got some good ones, but they're frightened. They need leadership, and they don't have leadership. The Democratic Party doesn't function in terms of leadership. Clinton is capable of functioning, but a lot of the others—. Anyone can look at the election campaign, the Presidential election campaigns, pre-campaigns: Anyone, with any brains, knows that this thing is a crock! This entire Republican-Democratic pre-Presidential primary is a mess! It's silly! It's disgusting! It should go away! We should scratch the whole thing and start all over again. Because, anyone who is imprisoned by the standards of the present pre-Presidential campaigning, is not qualified to be President! They've eliminated themselves by running. We're going to have to go back, and scratch it, and start all over again.

I think it will happen. Take the case of Al Gore: There are a lot of people, not only Democrats, and nonpartisan, so-called, but some Republicans, who are Al Gore supporters on what is the greatest, most dirty swindle in all modern history! Called global warming: There is not one stick of truth to the whole thing! It's all one big lie. It's a copy of what got Hitler elected: That was the Nazi Party policy, when it was called eugenics! And Gore is essentially following in Adolf Hitler's footsteps....

Now, what I'm concerned about in this, is we're going up to the end of February—if we get that far—of 2008. What I'm afraid of, is that a run of mavericks of many varieties, will create a campaign of indecision in 2008, when we need a year of decision. Therefore, I think the important thing now, the public has got to get wise to this phony Presidential campaign that's running on now. Some of these guys are serious people. I mean, Hillary, I would support in the Senate. Others, Democrats I know, I would support in their present position. But the campaigns that they are running, or that are being run for



EIRNS/Will Mederski

If any of the Democratic Presidential pre-candidates were serious, they would tell Al Gore to “get lost,” and take his lies about global warming with him. Here, Gore at a town hall meeting in Seattle on June 4.

them, are to me, *a national disaster*, a national tragedy, every one of them.

Stockwell: Most of their campaign money is coming in from hedge funds.

LaRouche: That’s a part of it, but it’s worse than that. The problem is largely generational. The Al Gore syndrome is that: If any of these guys were really serious, they would tell Al Gore to “get lost!” Don’t show up around this country; keep away from this planet for the next two years. And that’s where their weakness is: They allow a fraud, like this global warming swindle to be foisted—now, we just had it in New Jersey. It’s crazy! Corzine going with that thing is crazy! It’s insane! It’s immoral! And these candidates are like that: They’re acting like Baby Boomers! They’re 68ers amok! They may not have been out in the streets in 1968, but they’re part of a group which associates itself with those who were. And that’s the tradition, and that’s what’s killing us.

Stockwell: I want to go in a different direction: On June 6, just a little over a month ago, the British Broadcasting Corp. revealed, brought forth, announced this rather sensational story involving a longtime Ambassador of Saudi Arabia to the United States, Prince Bandar bin Sultan: that the BAE System, the British Aerospace group there, one of the largest arms dealers on the face of the planet, had been bribing the Saudi Arabian Ambassador to the United States, bribing a bunch of other people; this thing exists throughout many international characters, not the least of which goes back as far as Margaret Thatcher, maybe further than that. They were all involved in this kind of early move towards globalism, but an early move towards creating a situation for the industrial complex to get the kind of power and control that Eisenhower warned about.

Now, when an Ambassador to the United States is in-

involved; when this Ambassador to the United States from Saudi Arabia, paid money in California, paid money to people who were flying jets into the World Trade Center buildings—and this is all coming out of the BAE Systems in England—what does this mean? The European press is calling this the “scandal of the century,” we don’t hear about any of it over here: What’s going on?

LaRouche: Well, that’s why you hear about that only in Europe, only the United Kingdom itself. And that’s from some people in the United Kingdom.

Now, over here, you have two problems. First of all, everyone, as I said as recently as June 21st: Everyone who understands, from the top down, what happened in the year 2001, including September, knows that there was big money, which was off-the-shelf money, in the order of up to a trillion or so, behind the orchestration of a private attack on the United States, which was run through the same channels that coincide with the BAE.

Now, you say, “What is the BAE?” Well, the BAE is actually a modern form—it’s tied to Cheney. Cheney is actually the Vice President from BAE, and his wife is even a higher ranking person in that, than he is. Now, we know this. All of us, who know anything about that, know that this is the case. Some details we don’t know; if we had the case down solidly, with solid proof, we could act. We don’t have solid proof, but we have the basis for knowing what the direction of the investigation is that we have to conduct. We also know that there’s some things we’ve got to change, now, even before we complete the investigation, because it’s obvious they should be changed for that reason.

Now, what you’re looking at, is a revival of the British East India Company, which, remember, it ran India as an empire; it destroyed China with the opium trade, *all through private channels*, which were the controlling financier channels

behind the British Empire, before it became officially an empire. That's what the crowd is. The biggest concentration of money of this type, flows through places like the Cayman Islands, which is entirely a province of the British monarchy, and other channels of the same type. I know the list, through various parts of the world.

So therefore, you're dealing with something which has a policy behind it: The policy behind it, is what Eisenhower referred to as the "military-industrial complex," which was set into motion as an anti-Roosevelt operation immediately right after Roosevelt's death. And this thing has been around. It took a new form, which Cheney is associated with, since his function as Secretary of Defense, under George H.W. Bush: It was called the "Revolution in Military Affairs." The Revolution in Military Affairs says, "We're going to be an empire; we're going to destroy the United States, by getting it involved in war, *through which it will destroy itself.*" The Vietnam War was that thing; the wars in Southwest Asia, including the Iran-Iraq War, were part of the same thing. The current Iraq War, the crisis in Southwest Asia, part of the same thing.

The Revolution in Military Affairs—look at Halliburton. Cheney, who is actually a part of this, and Cheney is much more guilty in one sense, than Prince Bandar; he's much more on the inside, than Bandar is. Bandar is a British asset, who comes from Saudi Arabia, which is not the biggest place in the world. Cheney represents powerful forces *inside* the United States, as well as those which control him from London.

They're out to destroy the United States, to go for globalization. What do they do? They say, "We're going to keep power, in terms of a space-based system, that can shoot rockets down with nuclear missiles and so forth inside them, on Earth at any place we want to. We're going to run a world empire. We're going to destroy the nation-state, we're going to run a world empire, run it from space-based weapons. We're going to eliminate ground forces, national ground forces. We're going to eliminate armies. We're going to get nations *to destroy themselves.* We're now going to have *private armies*, like the Legions of the Caesars—private armies, such as Halliburton."

Look at the budget! Look at where the trillion-dollar budget for Iraq is: What do we have over there? The soldiers aren't getting taken care of. They don't get health care; they're dumped when they get back here, wounded, without help. They don't get the protection, they're not supported. Our military ground forces *are being destroyed!* *By the intention of acts of government*, through this war in Iraq and its continuation. But what's happening? *Private interests* are now *paid—trillions of dollars are paid to private interests* to run the mechanisms of warfare through private mercenaries, who get no pensions.

And so, this is called the Revolution in Military Affairs, which is currently headed in the United States by spokesmen such as George Shultz, or Felix Rohatyn. Felix Rohatyn and George Shultz are the people who put Pinochet into power in

Chile. Remember, Pinochet was part of BAE in his later years. And they put him in there. Felix Rohatyn is essentially a fascist. He's the guy who's behind Pinochet in the banking sector. He, at Middlebury College, and so forth, runs a base for teaching the doctrine, and promulgating the Revolution in Military Affairs—in which he is supported by George Shultz, the guy who orchestrated the creation, the crafting of the George W. Bush Administration.

So, this is the kind of situation we face. What's my answer? Okay, people who are guilty should accept their guilt, and face it. *But!* The key thing is, we've got to change the *system*, to get this out of our *system*. So hanging somebody even for crimes, even a crime as great as complicity in 9/11, is justice, but that doesn't solve the problem. You've got to eliminate the factor in our system, and international systems, which coincides with the Revolution in Military Affairs, which is shamelessly advocated by George Shultz, by Dick Cheney, and by Felix Rohatyn. And if you aren't willing to get those guys, and what they represent out, then don't complain about 9/11: Because if those guys were not *in* the positions they were in, *that couldn't happen.* And that's what we have to fix.

Punishing the past does not solve the problem of the future. Correcting the mistakes of the past, for the sake of the future, is what's required....

Stockwell: Will the BAE scandal be what's necessary to bring down Dick Cheney? You mentioned, in your 21st of June address, that his handlers, as far as the European banking circle is concerned, they're not so unhappy with him for what he has done, as for what he has *not* been able to do up to this point.

LaRouche: Well, what we face now—Cheney should be impeached, but that's too long. You want Cheney to one day miraculously say, that he's got to go back to Wyoming and take care of his potatoes, as I said the other day. That can be done. What you need is, you need a bunch of people, dignitaries, to walk in to President George W. Bush, Jr., including his daddy—and his mother also—and say, "He's got to go. We'll get rid of him for you, if you support it," to the President....

Just get him outta there! The country demands it: In the interest of the nation, *get him out!* *And get him out now!*

And people who don't understand that shouldn't be in politics. Because that's one of the things about statecraft: We're not a kind of country that shoots people to make improvements in government. We do have other means, which are much gentler, but also equally effective....

Stockwell: If that were to happen [getting Cheney out], it seems to me the smart thing for the Republican Party to do, would be to replace him, with somebody that has a very good chance of taking the Republican seat in 2008.

LaRouche: It's already been said, that, stick Colin Powell in there as a *pro tem* vice president. That's one suggestion that has come out, right? That'd work. But, see, the Republican Party's got a problem: The Republican Party has an identity

problem. And therefore, you've got an election campaign coming up, and it's important that the major parties have serious election campaigns to help shape the next Presidency, so that we have a functioning Presidency. Therefore, our key thing is, get this guy outta there, to give the Republican Party, as well as the Democrats, a chance to think over where we're going, and to come up with a new profile, so you either get a new Republican Party, and possibly a new Democratic Party out of that, in terms of character; *or*, you will get an evolution toward a regrouping of the party structure, as we've had in the past. You may have the Republican Party as it exists now, and it essentially goes out of business, but it reappears, reemerges in another guise with some Democrats, and vice versa. We're in that kind of period where that is what has to be expected.

Stockwell: You've got Voinovich, [Domenici, Lugar]—the three Republican Senators that were moving away from the President's plan. It looks like the Republican Party is splitting in three different directions.

LaRouche: That's right. But we don't want that, in a sense. Since we're going into elections, we want party systems that can deliver us a suitable President. Right now, *none* of the campaigns of the two parties, looks like it's going to produce a viable President. Therefore, we need to change the party thinking, we need to change the scenery—now. We need to do it, before November of this year. And you've got to say, on the Republican side, "We want the Republicans who are viable, to find themselves a new identity for the time being." To get the Republican Party a new identity, and then force the Democratic Party to take a new identity, and then let things roll.

Stockwell: Are they going to try and resurrect the Reagan image?

LaRouche: No. Don't kid yourself: You got to go to a Franklin Roosevelt image. There's no shortcuts. I mean, this is pay-up time, long awaited. . . .

Stockwell: All right. Let's wrap this up, we've only got a few minutes left here. We've got a bunch of knuckleheads running for office. We've got the most dangerous Vice President in the history of this country, probably, right now. We still have a couple of battle task groups sitting off the Persian Gulf; we haven't even talked about Israel's hand in all of this, and the coming civil war in Gaza. Even though I have an awful lot of hope, listening to what you talk about—there is still, an awful lot of conflagration going on in every direction we look.

So, what do you see between now and February of next year?

LaRouche: Well, I see, essentially, the same thing—if you look back at the birth of Christianity, and some other things that preceded that, and you see what happened to the Christians over most of those centuries under the Roman and Byzantine Empire, and so forth; and you say, looking back to the time of Christ, what became of Christ's mission on Earth?

And you say, "Wait a minute, buddy? You're talking about an individual achieving success, in the sense of a simple mortal success. But that's not human." What's human is recognizing that you act on behalf of principles which are dedicated to a future outcome for humanity as a whole, and for the universe as a whole. And you act for those. And your expectation must be, that your actions today will radiate through coming generations, to produce sooner or later, a kind of benefit which you might foresee, or might not, but it will be good.

And therefore, when we fight our kinds of fights, as I fight this kind of fight, I'm fighting for immediate victory on a time schedule. That does not mean that I can guarantee to anyone that that's going to work. I can't. But if you think from the standpoint of the history of Christianity, it becomes clear: You must act in your personal lifetime, *to further that which must be furthered for the sake of the future*. And you must at the same time, not simply wish for it, but you must commit yourself to those actions which, in your best judgment, will contribute to bringing that outcome, eventually, even an outcome beyond what you imagine, but for the good.

And therefore, . . . you think two or three generations ahead. When I look back, I can go back over 200 years, in terms of what I know of family, and immediate predecessors of my known family. And that's the way it is.

If we lose sight of the *immortality* of the individual, and lose sight of acting for *primarily* out of a sense of one's immortality, rather than one's sense of gratification in the short term while you're alive, then you don't have morality! And the problem here, is the Baby-Boomer generation, by adopting existentialism, which is a denial of morality, a denial of this kind of continuity, that you lose that. . . .

Stockwell: . . .The worldview that you have, is very much the worldview that I have: One of the American System being revitalized, the rebirth of the American nation, the rebirth of everything that was good about this country, and can be good again. And it is epitomized in my mind right now, by Mr. Cheney has simply got to go!

We've got about a minute left, Lyn. Anything you might want to add?

LaRouche: Yeah, I'm hopeful. But we have to realize that being hopeful is like fighting a war you know you have to win, but no guarantee that you will. And that makes you fight all the harder.

Stockwell: Yes, yes. Because the alternative is unacceptable.

LaRouche: Yep. I can't consent to it.

Stockwell: And so, you must fight, all the harder.

LaRouche: I can't consent to it. I can not consent.

Stockwell: Yeah, well, that's a good way to put it. I can not consent to the alternative. I can not consent to a world that fits into Mr. Cheney's paradigm.