

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

November 2, 2007 Vol. 34 No. 43 www.larouche.com \$10.00

The Patriot File, Unearthed
How Long Can Congress Deny the Depression Crash?
LaRouche: 'It's Time For Speaker Pelosi To Go'

Attention Patriots!
What Must Be Understood



Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Muriel
Mirak-Weissbach, Antony Papert, Gerald Rose,
Dennis Small, Edward Spannaus, Nancy
Spannaus, Jeffrey Steinberg, William Wertz

Editor: Nancy Spannaus

Managing Editor: Susan Welsh

Assistant Managing Editor: Bonnie James

Science Editor: Marjorie Mazel Hecht

Technology Editor: Marsha Freeman

Book Editor: Katherine Notley

Photo Editor: Stuart Lewis

Circulation Manager: Stanley Ezrol

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Counterintelligence: Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele
Steinberg

Economics: Marcia Merry Baker, Paul Gallagher

History: Anton Chaitkin

Ibero-America: Dennis Small

Law: Edward Spannaus

Russia and Eastern Europe:

Rachel Douglas

United States: Debra Freeman

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Bogotá: Javier Almaro

Berlin: Rainer Apel

Copenhagen: Poul Rasmussen

Houston: Harley Schlanger

Lima: Sara Madueño

Melbourne: Robert Barwick

Mexico City: Rubén Cota Meza

New Delhi: Ramtanu Maïtra

Paris: Christine Bierre

United Nations, N.Y.C.: Leni Rubinstein

Washington, D.C.: William Jones

Wiesbaden: Göran Haglund

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirms@larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Webmaster: John Sigerson

Assistant Webmaster: George Hollis

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly (50
issues), by EIR News Service, Inc., 729 15th St. N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20005.
(703) 777-9451

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach
2308, D-65013 Wiesbaden, Bahnstrasse 9-A,
D-65205, Wiesbaden, Federal Republic of Germany
Tel: 49-611-73650

Homepage: <http://www.eirna.com>

e-mail: eirna@eirna.com

Director: Georg Neudekker

Montreal, Canada: 514-855-1699

Denmark: EIR I/S, Sankt Knuds Vej 11, basement
left, DK-1903 Frederiksberg, Denmark. Tel.: +45 35
43 60 40. Fax: +45 35 43 87 57. e-mail: [eirdk@
hotmail.com](mailto:eirdk@hotmail.com).

Mexico: EIR, Manual Ma. Contreras #100,
Despacho 8, Col. San Rafael, CP 06470, Mexico, DF.
Tel.: 2453-2852, 2453-2853.

Copyright: ©2007 EIR News Service. All rights
reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without
permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement #40683579

Postmaster: Send all address changes to EIR, P.O.
Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

EIR

From the Managing Editor

We can all agree that the credibility of President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and the U.S. Congress is shot. The whole world looks at Bush as either evil or a moron; and as for the Vice President, Hillary Clinton's jab at "Darth Vader" was widely appreciated. The Democratic-controlled Congress has squandered all the considerable political capital it had after the election two years ago, and is down to a 10.7% approval rating in the polls—somewhere below Dick Cheney's numbers. What's behind these developments, and where they are leading, are elaborated in the lead articles to our *National* and *International* sections.

But viewing the situation as from abroad—say, from Russia—where do America's friends look, for hope to change the situation, before we are all consumed in a conflagration of worldwide depression and war? That is the issue posed in Lyndon LaRouche's memorandum on "What Must Be Understood." He says frankly, that when the official institutions and leaders of our government prove inadequate to the task at hand—or even traitorous—there are historical precedents that can be of benefit to policy-makers today. The Society of the Cincinnati is a leading example: a private organization formed of veterans of the Revolutionary War, who assembled as the informal intelligence organization of the young United States. "That tradition, however wounded and seemingly frail, persists, still, inside the U.S.A. today," LaRouche writes.

The influence of such private patriotic organizations obviously suggests that of LaRouche's own association today. LaRouche has said that he will not seek the Democratic Presidential nomination, due to his age (85). Yet all the Presidential contenders on the TV screen today, Democratic and Republican, are inadequate to the job of governing the republic in this time of deepening crisis. Is it possible, in the months remaining before Election Day 2008, either to *find* or to *create* a candidate in the image of Franklin D. Roosevelt, for example? That's what we're out to do. *EIR's* series on *The American Patriot*, drawing on 30 years of our association's historical research, is motivated by that intention. In this issue, we publish the second installment, Anton Chaitkin's investigation of *The Patriot*, newspaper of the private networks of American System "conspirators" of the 1820s and 1830s. More to come!



Cover This Week

A famous sea battle of the American Revolution: The USS Bonhomme Richard, captained by John Paul Jones, battles (and defeats) the HMS Serapis in 1779.



National Archives

4 Attention: Patriots! What Must Be Understood

In American history, Lyndon LaRouche explains, the Society of the Cincinnati best illustrates the importance of private individuals securing the survival of our republic, given that the dying out of the generation of relevant patriots from among the veterans of the 1939-1945 war has left the U.S.A. with governing strata which are far more poorly equipped, culturally and intellectually, to cope with the breakdown-crisis of the world's present monetary-financial system, and to launch a new world monetary-credit system. LaRouche writes that history cannot be made only by carrying out existing official policies. The future of any nation depends upon the creation and adoption of fundamental scientific and other necessarily revolutionary discoveries.

The American Patriot

6 The Patriot File, Unearthed

By Anton Chaitkin. The author's study of *The Patriot*, a New York newspaper published in 1823-24, opened a window into the minds and actions of its sponsors and writers, an extended circle of many of the leading strategists guiding America in military, political, economic, and literary fields. The work of this patriotic grouping and their collaborators, is at the heart of the story of America as an anti-oligarchic project, and of the modern world made possible by the ideas of Gottfried Leibniz, Benjamin Franklin, and their intellectual heirs.

14 Selections From 'The Patriot,' 1823-24

17 The Erie Canal: How American Patriots Had To Battle for Infrastructure

International

22 Berserker Cheney Escalates Push for World War III

Despite intense diplomacy working to avert a war with Iran, the propaganda push by Cheney and the President aimed at provoking Tehran into providing a pretext for war, represents a very real danger. From Gen. Wesley Clark (ret.) to Russian President Putin, policy-makers are warning of the threat.

24 Why the India-U.S. Nuclear Deal Hit a Brick Wall, and What To Do About It

A rapid about-face by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh can only be explained by the intense domestic opposition to an agreement which would undermine India's nuclear research program, including its potential for thorium reactors. But even larger policy issues are posed.

27 Italy at Crossroads: 1924, or LaRouche

29 International Intelligence

National

30 **LaRouche: ‘It’s Time for Speaker Pelosi To Go’**

In the ten months since the last national election, the new Democratic majority has squandered the opportunity to do something about the war in Southwest Asia, and about the attacks on the General Welfare. Lyndon LaRouche places the blame squarely on House Speaker Nancy Pelosi.

32 **LaRouche Youth Mobilize in New England for Housing ‘Firewall,’ General Welfare**

New England is being hit hard by housing foreclosures, and the LaRouche Youth Movement is organizing constituency leaders and other citizens to get LaRouche’s Homeowners and Bank Protection Act passed.

34 **A ‘Prairie Fire’ of Maryland Foreclosures**

Economics

42 **How Long Can Congress Deny the Depression Crash?**

The stunning report of outflow from U.S. Securities, reveals the financial crash that is underway. Making the situation even worse, the Fed is responding by printing money at hyper-inflationary rates.

44 **Myanmar To Be Site of Sino-India Cooperation?**

47 **China Sends Its First Spacecraft to the Moon**

49 **Nuclear Energy for Transportation: Electricity, Hydrogen, and Liquid Fuels**

Masao Hori prepared this paper for the Schiller Institute’s Sept. 15-16 conference on “The Eurasian Land-Bridge Becomes Reality,” held in Kiedrich, Germany.

Book Reviews

35 **A Patriot’s Guide to Cheney’s Power-Grab**

Takeover, The Return of the Imperial Presidency and the Subversion of American Democracy, by Charlie Savage; *The Terror Presidency, Law and Judgment Inside the Bush Administration*, by Jack Goldsmith; *Unchecked and Unbalanced, Presidential Power in a Time of Terror*, by Frederick A.O. Schwarz, Jr. and Aziz Z. Huq.

Art Reviews

39 **Metropolitan Museum Deconstructs Rembrandt**

“The Age of Rembrandt,” at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.

Editorial

56 **Cheney, Pelosi, and the Next War**

ATTN: PATRIOTS!

What Must Be Understood

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

From the beginning of the systematic European colonization of North America, during the early Seventeenth Century, the patriotic currents which generated U.S. independence organized what became, in the course of time, the leading national intelligence organization of the U.S.A.; such was the Society of the Cincinnati, as a private organization. That tradition, however wounded and seemingly frail, persists, still, inside the U.S.A. today.

There are comparable experiences in other nations. Contrary to some widespread doctrines, the successful making of history is not limited to the conduct of presently adopted official policies; the future of any nation depends upon the creation and adoption of fundamental scientific and other necessarily revolutionary discoveries, on which the continued vitality of any culture depends. The case of the Society of the Cincinnati is, like the tradition of the rigorous Classical composition of J.S. Bach through Beethoven and Schubert, among the best illustrations of that point. Those abroad who have not yet understood this fact about the foundations and development of the U.S.A. could not comprehend the nature of the existential challenge which confronts global civilization at this moment.

The role of such private associations, whether formally constituted, or informally organized in some efficient way, has been made indispensable by the fact that even notable Presidents or Vice-Presidents of the U.S.A. have been traitors in fact, such as the British Foreign Office's agent Aaron Burr; or Presidents Andrew Jackson, Martin van Buren, Polk, Buchanan, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson, or wretched agents of foreign-directed factions, such as President Richard Nixon. Circles of men and women of suitable skills and well-crafted conscience devote themselves privately to nourishing the intention of our republic.

The situation inside the U.S.A. on that account is far worse than during the immediate two decades following the death of President Franklin Roosevelt, especially since the replacement of well-informed patriots of my own generation by a presently dominant generation born between 1945 and 1958; as the government of Russia's President Putin's search for cooperation with the U.S.A. illustrates the point, the dying out of the generation of relevant patriots from among the veterans of the 1939-1945 war has left the U.S.A. with governing strata which are far more poorly equipped, culturally and intellectually, to cope with the most crucial challenges of our planet now, than the relevant veterans of the last great war.

Nonetheless, despite those relevant difficulties of diplomacy now, the only hope of avoiding an early and disastrous outcome of the presently onrushing, global economic breakdown-crisis, is the kind of informed cooperation between Russia and the U.S.A. which could come, from the U.S. side, only from the deep forces of a tradition traced back to the Society of the Cincinnati. Russia and the U.S.A. could not decide the outcome of the present global crisis; but, without their appropriate cooperation, no solution for the world at large exists. The Bering Strait transport tunnel-project is an excellent illustration of the practical point.

I think it most useful, at this time, to share some relevant thoughts with sensitive citizens of our prospective partner, Russia. Into what kind of cooperation shall we engage, in cooperation with relevant other nations, to rescue a menaced world from its present deadly mess?

For an example of this, consider the following features of the present world crisis-situation.

The best pedagogical precedent for what is happening to the world-wide economy right now, is what happened to

Weimar Germany within the hyper-inflationary breakdown-crisis of 1923. The Anglo-Dutch Liberal allies which had prepared and created the great war of 1914-1917, had imposed what became a monetary hyperinflation upon the Reichsmark of post-war Weimar Germany. That inflation put the productive potential of Germany fully at the disposal of the Anglo-Dutch Liberals who had orchestrated the two, general, geopolitical wars of 1895-1945. Through the takeover of Germany's financial system through the 1931 founding of the Basel, Switzerland Bank for International Settlements (BIS), the Anglo-Dutch Liberal backers of Adolf Hitler's rise to dictatorship would have permanently crushed continental Eurasia, but from the unforeseen rise of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to occupy the U.S. Presidency.

The situation in the world today, represents a resumption of the essential features of the same Anglo-Dutch Liberal imperialist ("neomalthusian," "geopolitical") policy. From the very instant President Franklin Roosevelt died, the accommodation of President Harry S Truman to the anti-Franklin Roosevelt policies of Winston Churchill et al., was the intention to orchestrate the functional equivalent of "geopolitical World War III" again, as today.

The present world monetary-financial crisis, is not a U.S. dollar-crisis; it is a breakdown-crisis of the world's present monetary-financial system, a breakdown comparable in essentials to the 1923 collapse of the Weimar Reichsmark, but on a world scale. This present crisis was actually triggered by a recent, lunatic series of actions (concerning both China's currency and Taiwan) conducted against China (despite my repeated warnings to the Senators). That provocation against China was crucial in prompting a very significant July dumping of the U.S. dollar by China and Japan; however, if it had not happened that way, the situation was already rotten-ripe for another event with similar consequences. The world monetary-financial system is, presently, hopelessly doomed. There will never be a recovery—under the present world monetary system—from the on-rolling global financial-breakdown-crisis.

Only the launching of a new world monetary-credit system could halt the breakdown-crisis, and permit the development of a new monetary-credit system which could halt the presently mounting global panic.

Therefore, the crucial point to be made here, is that unless the U.S.A. overturns its present policies, the world-wide monetary-financial collapse entering its concluding phase now, will tend to create a hopeless situation for humanity, globally, for generations still to come. Without the activation of patriotic forces within the U.S.A., to take joint remedial action with some other leading powers of the world, there is no reasonable hope for humanity, globally, for generations still to come.

Thus, for Russia, as for other nations, the crucial question is, what forces within the U.S.A. are likely to attempt to

change current U.S. policy-trends into a sane direction, away from the trends of, most emphatically, the recently nearly seven years? The memory of the Society of the Cincinnati comes, thus, to the fore.

That memory is also prompted by the tremendous collapse of the credibility of the U.S. Congress under Democratic leaders Senator Harry Reid and Representative Nancy Pelosi over the interval since the November 2006 mid-term election. (The credibility of Republicans, with the Bush-Cheney albatross hanging around their necks, is even worse.) The popularity of the Congress with the citizenry has dropped from a more or less clear popular majority then, to about 10.7% calculated presently. The onrushing mass-foreclosure of mortgages of the citizenry and menacing collapse of leading banks, creates fears of who might be hanging from the 2007 Christmas tree, if there actually were a Christmas tree available. The situation through western and central Europe is actually no better, either politically, or economically.

The world situation today, is, therefore, either a hopelessly disgusting situation, or, speaking literally, a revolting one. The issue is: what sort of a revolt against the present state of gross misleadership were possible?

The first step which must be taken very quickly, is the adoption of the draft legislation freezing all foreclosures on housing and protecting all Federal and state chartered banking institutions for their socially essential normal functioning within the relevant community. Only a socially dangerous incompetent in our government would object to that emergency legislation.

However, such measures are no more than absolutely indispensable stop-gaps—to stop the bleeding, so to speak. The objective is to prepare the way for: 1) The launching of a general economic-recovery program, based largely on Federal constitutional credit used to launch essential building of basic economic infrastructure; 2) The use of such infrastructure programs as creating the markets for the recovery of the private sector.

Those recovery measures must be matched with a return to a global, fixed-exchange-rate, protectionist model of monetary system. Without that, there would never be an economic recovery for generations to come.

To establish such a global system, quickly enough to be effective, and in a coordinated way, U.S. partnership in this project with major nations such as Russia, China, and India, is indispensable. Four major nations can provide the pivot around which to bring the world's smaller nations into a new, equitable, fixed-exchange-rate system. Without such action, there is presently no hope for humanity at large from generations yet to come.

Thus, in New York, Lady Macbeth steps to the front of the stage, crying "Out, damned spot!" and then throws Mrs. Lynne Cheney into the pit, to the accompanying cheers of a vast, and vastly grateful audience!

The Patriot File, Unearthed

by Anton Chaitkin

Introduction

Biographers of Martin Van Buren refer to a newspaper, put out in 1823 and 1824 in New York, called *The Patriot*, which they say was created solely to attack and undermine Van Buren. These biographers identify four main men behind the paper: Gen. Winfield Scott, Gen. Joseph Gardner Swift, Secretary of War John C. Calhoun, and Samuel Gouverneur, son-in-law of then-President James Monroe.

I searched out that daily newspaper, mentioned in this anti-Van Buren context, but otherwise unheralded in 20th-Century historical literature. I found a set of four bound volumes of the paper, moldering in the Maryland warehouse of the Library of Congress, and took about 200 digital photographs from its first issue, May 28, 1823, to the end of December 1824.

Study of *The Patriot* opened an unusual window into the minds and actions of its actual sponsors and writers, an extended circle (beyond those named by Van Buren's scribbling biographers) of many of the leading strategists guiding America in military, political, economic, and literary fields.

This kind of valuable window—material that is alive and first-hand, not filtered through the later accumulations of ignorance and prejudice; reports on then-current politics, history, and international affairs—naturally directs the student to peer into that period, and backward and forward in time, to the thoughts and work of the predecessors of these patriots, and to those who were later to follow in their footsteps—and to look across the globe, to the wider sphere of strategic contests, which *The Patriot* shows to be the proper context of the current events on which it reports.

We are thus aided in forming a more authentic idea of the historical and global continuum that is active in the minds and motives of those shaping that period. This helps us outflank the habit of academic/commercial historians to load us with their degraded explanations of why historical figures acted as they did.

Within Lyndon LaRouche's multi-millennial historical

and scientific frame, this study is illuminated by the work of Graham and Pamela Lowry, the investigations of Philip Valenti and David Shavin, and the published and ongoing work of many other associated thinkers.


The intended purview (and the work to be done) extends across three overlapping time-arenas: 1) Gottfried Leibniz and his allies in colonial America and Europe, coinciding with the lives of Cadwallader Colden and Benjamin Franklin; 2) the American Revolution and its immediate aftermath, with George Washington, the Marquis de Lafayette, Alexander Hamilton, and their Society of the Cincinnati; and 3) the nationalists, West Point, the Whigs, the mentors of Abraham Lincoln and his successors. Franklin D. Roosevelt, to conceptualize his course of action, reached back, around the evils of the Teddy Roosevelt/Woodrow Wilson/Andrew Mellon era, to this earlier humanist legacy. This is the heart of the story of America as a project, and of the modern world made possible by the ideas of power supplied by Leibniz and Franklin and their heirs.¹

The chronology given below focusses on what was initially seen through the window of *The Patriot*, its general period and locus of action, only touching on certain available-to-hand aspects of the earlier and wider reality which will be the proper subject of historical inquiry. The current document is intended to spur interest and collaboration, with in-depth analysis to come in future articles.

1. Prehistory

1715-16: Scotland-born *Cadwallader Colden* is in London, amidst the Leibniz-Clarke battle (the debate of Leibnizian science versus Newtonian dogma). Colden then goes to America, lives in Philadelphia, marries James Logan's cousin. At the

1. Anton Chaitkin, "Leibniz, Gauss Shaped America's Science Successes," *EIR*, Feb. 9, 1996.



The first edition of *The Patriot*, May 28, 1823.

invitation of New York governor Robert Hunter (ally of governors Spottswood and Keith, the colonial leaders sponsored by the Swift-Leibniz-Queen Anne faction,² Colden moves to New York and becomes surveyor general of the province.

1724: Colden writes the first document on the need to improve the route which was to become the Erie Canal. Colden addresses to Gov. William Burnet, Hunter’s chosen successor, “A Memorial Concerning the Fur-Trade of the Province of New York,” stressing the necessity to develop the river/portage route from the Hudson River along the Mohawk Valley to Lake Erie. This memorial is published a century later as an appendix in the 1829 book, *Memoir of DeWitt Clinton*, by David Hosack, the physician who attended the Burr-Hamilton duel and cared for the dying Hamilton.

1727: Colden’s “The History of the Five Indian Nations Depending on the Province of New York” is first published. Colden studied the problem of achieving peace with the Indians whom the British and French oligarchs and Jesuits were using against American continental development.

1731: Colden hires immigrant Charles Clinton as a surveyor. Over the years Colden advances Clinton’s career and brings him into prominent society.

1747: Abraham Kästner³ receives his copy of Colden’s

2. H. Graham Lowry, *How the Nation Was Won: America’s Untold Story, 1630-1754* (Washington, D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 2004 reprint of 1988 edition).

3. David Shavin, “Leibniz to Franklin on ‘Happiness,’” *Fidelio*, Spring 2003.

1745 anti-Newtonian work on the physical nature of the universe, *Principles of Action in Matter*.

1748: Kästner publishes a German translation of Colden’s work.

1751: Colden’s work is published in Paris, by the networks of *Benjamin Franklin*.

1752: Colden receives the 1748 German edition of his book, translated and critiqued by Kästner. Colden writes to Franklin about having received it and not knowing German, and “I find my name often in company with those of very great ones Newton, Leibniz, and Wolfius and Leibniz’s Monades often mentioned a New Doctrine which perhaps you have seen and is of great repute in Germany.” Colden then has Kästner’s commentary translated into English by Reverend *John Christopher Hartwick*.

1752: Colden and Franklin collaborate on electricity and on the attack against Newton. Swiss mathematician Leonhard Euler attacks Colden, who writes to Franklin that Euler “writes much like a Pedant—highly conceited of himself.”



1753: Franklin and Colden send a reply to Kästner. Kästner’s known response was to organize the Leipzig scientific community to sponsor a trip to America for his protégé, Mylius, who unfortunately died before he could reach Franklin

What Is an American Patriot?

This article is part of a series aimed at unearthing the real history of the American patriotic tradition, and causing its revival. The purpose is to create the political and intellectual climate in which a genuine American patriotic candidate can emerge for the 2008 elections—a candidacy which does not yet exist.

Of special relevance in this fight is the period of the early 19th Century, when patriots had to fight in the context of series of poor, or even treasonous Presidents (cf. Jackson, Van Buren, Pierce, Polk, Buchanan). The fact that our greatest President, Abraham Lincoln, was produced from this political environment, testifies to the effectiveness of the network of republican forces from this period, many of whom are totally unknown to the American public today. The LaRouche movement has worked for decades to uncover the original writings and other evidence of this network, materials which will form the basis for many of the articles in this series.

We began this series in the last issue, with the work of an exemplary patriot, James Fenimore Cooper. In this issue, we expand that story.



Founders of The Patriot (clockwise from the top left): Gen. Winfield Scott, top U.S. military strategist; Gen. Joseph Gardner Swift, leader of West Point; John C. Calhoun, pro-nationalist statesman, before succumbing to intrigues and becoming a "Southern" fanatic; President James Monroe, who sponsored the paper politically, and whose son-in-law, Samuel Gouverneur, financed it.

and Colden in America.

1754: Franklin is at the Albany Congress, in Colden's New York province.

1756: James Clinton, son of Colden's surveyor, enters the colonial militia.

1757-62: Franklin goes to England, spurs and guides the humanist inventors and developers of the Industrial Revolution.

1760: Colden, James Clinton's family sponsor, becomes lieutenant governor of New York.

1761: Philip Schuyler, colonial militia officer, goes to England. He inspects the newly completed *Bridgewater Canal*, which Franklin's circle had organized the Duke of Bridgewater to construct. This canal opens Manchester to industry, and the little Franklin circle quickly builds other canals, numerous inventions, mining, and the first steam engine. Schuyler determines that such a canal must be built in America.

1760s-1770s: Franklin directs the American strategy for the development of the West. He creates the Illinois company, which comes under the management of Robert Morris and James Wil-

son, Illinois planned to be populated by government-aided settlers with cheap mortgages. Under the British yoke, Franklin struggles to create Ohio. *Lord Shelburne* dissembles to Franklin that although he approves of Franklin's Ohio scheme, other Brits oppose it, because they will not permit the establishment of a settled power in the interior of North America.

1769: Birth of James Clinton's son, *DeWitt Clinton*.

1775: James Clinton becomes a colonel in the Patriot militia, a brigadier general the next year.

1775-83: The American Revolution. The Americans take areas of the West from the British. But the British remain there, surrounding and menacing the first settlers from British Canada. The West is cut off from the new U.S.A. to the east, by the mountains.

1776: *Jonathan Williams* (age 26) joins his great uncle—Benjamin Franklin—in Paris. Williams sets up his base in Nantes, as the Continental Congress agent in charge of arms supplies being shipped from France.

1777: George Clinton, brother of Gen. James Clinton and son of Colden's surveyor, becomes the first governor of New York State (governor 1777-95, 1801-04). His nephew DeWitt begins political life as secretary to Governor Clinton.

Elkanah Watson goes to France bearing messages to *Franklin*, then tours and intensively inspects the canals in Holland.

1778: British and Tories direct the Indians in the horrible, long-remembered massacre at Cherry Valley, N.Y.

1779: Gen. James Clinton, ordered by Washington to take command at Lake Otsego, to punish the Cherry Valley massacre perpetrators, famously dams the lake at its outflow into the Susquehanna River, raising the lake level, and when ready, bursts the dam so that his heavily laden supply boats get swept down the river to reach General Sullivan.

1780: *Alexander Hamilton* marries Elizabeth, daughter of Philip Schuyler.

1783-89: At Revolution's end, *George Washington* works in New York plotting the route for a canal to Lake Erie, and in the middle Atlantic for routes to the Ohio River. Organizing for these canals by Washington and Hamilton leads to the assembling of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia.

Elkanah Watson, back from Europe, meets with Washington to discuss the development of a New York canal to Lake Erie.

1785: *William Cooper* of New Jersey visits Lake Otsego. Originally a skilled worker, Cooper is an avid reader of Jonathan Swift, of history, and of London political literature, in the library set up in Burlington, N.J. by Philadelphia-based Quakers, an apparent spin-off from the Logan-Franklin library.

1786: William Cooper acquires 40,000 acres at the lake, including the site of Cooperstown, on the interior frontier contested with Britain. Alexander Hamilton is Cooper's political sponsor and lawyer, and Cooper's partners include Robert Morris, Tench Coxe, and Benjamin Rush. Cooper rapidly populates his area with settlers getting cheap mortgages, allowing them to pay just about anything to get their land.

1790: One-year-old James Fenimore Cooper arrives at the settlement of his father William.

The Cooper land adjoins the 24,000-acre patent owned by *John Christopher Hartwick*, who translated Kästner's version of Colden's Leibnizian physics. Hartwick turns over to William Cooper the entire management of his land. Hartwick dies in 1796. Hartwick's Cooper-managed estate sets up an Indian School which becomes Hartwick Seminary and then Hartwick College. In 1990, the papers of William Cooper were donated to the Hartwick College Archives as the bequest of Paul Fenimore Cooper, Jr., great-great-great grandson of William Cooper. Around 1983, a member of the Cooper family took me to lunch at the Yale Club and into the Century Club, where a portrait of Aaron Burr was hanging over the fireplace, and we discussed the 1809 *assassination* of William Cooper by Burr's people.

Aaron Burr was the attorney for the *Prevost* family,⁴ the Martinist-allied British intelligence figures who contested in the court system against William Cooper and his family for ownership of this strategic landholding on the frontier in New York.

In 1940, the New York State Historical Association held a 150th-anniversary commemoration of James Fenimore Cooper coming to Cooperstown. In the pageant, participants performed the roles of John Christopher Hartwick, Gen. James Clinton, and Lieutenant Prevost of Switzerland (nephew of two British commanders in the Revolution and the War of 1812).

1792: Philip Schuyler, assisted by Elkanah Watson, creates the Western Inland Lock Navigation Company to build the *Erie Canal*. Schuyler begins construction, but needs the government to take over to get the job done.

1794: DeWitt Clinton, a member of the New York State Board of Regents, addressing the Legislature, says: "Great



Cadwallader Colden, anti-Newtonian American scientist; he and his descendants ardently promoted the Erie Canal.

Improvements must take place which far surpass the momentum of power that a single nation can produce, but will with facility proceed from their united strength. The hand of art will change the face of the universe. Mountains, deserts, and oceans will feel its mighty force. It will not be debated whether hills shall be prostrated; but whether the Alps and the Andes shall be leveled; nor whether sterile fields shall be fertilized, but whether the deserts of Africa shall feel the power of cultivation; nor whether rivers shall be joined, but whether the Caspian shall see the Mediterranean, and the waves of the Pacific lave the Atlantic."

1800: Aaron Burr, having organized the anti-Federalist vote in New York State for the Jefferson Presidential ticket, is encouraged by Albert Gallatin to try to get the Presidency himself, with backing of anti-Union Northern Federalists. *DeWitt Clinton* and *Hamilton* block this; Hamilton convinces enough Federalists to back Thomas Jefferson and elect him through Congress action.

1802: *The U.S. Military Academy (USMA)* is established at West Point. The Academy was in some respect Hamilton's project. He had prepared the legislation for its creation for Congress, proposed the general curriculum, and inspected the West Point fort as the intended site for the Academy. Congress passes legislation to set up the USMA only after Jefferson became President.

Jonathan Williams is founding superintendent. *Joseph Gardner Swift* is the first graduating cadet.

In his memoirs, Joseph Swift writes that in October 1802, he and his mentor, Col. Jonathan Williams, traveled together to Albany and met Hamilton, then titled a U.S. General:

General Hamilton ... invited me to dine with him at his father-in-law's—General Philip Schuyler's. After dinner, among the subjects of conversation was the canal and improved navigation of the Mohawk.... It was graphically described by General Schuyler.... He regretted that the locks were too small, and the Mohawk unmanageable. He spoke of the object of the tour of Washington in 1789 to be, among other enquiries, to learn what improvements could be made to connect the Hudson and the lakes....

The following day General Hamilton, Colonel Williams and General Schuyler discussed the subject of the Military Academy, the colonel giving his ideas and purposes to encourage an enlargement of the present plan; General Hamilton approved....

Colonel Williams and myself examined the old octagonal Dutch church, that stood at the junction of Market and State Streets, and the old hall where, in 1754, a

4. On the allied Prevost and Mallet families, British intelligence and enemy agents inside the United States such as Burr and Gallatin, see Anton Chaitkin, *Treason in America, From Aaron Burr to Averell Harriman* (Washington, D.C., Executive Intelligence Review, 1998).

Congress had been held, which had been described to him by his friend and relative, Dr. Franklin....

On the 12th [of November 1802] a meeting was assembled in the "long room" of the Academy, consisting of Lieutenant-Colonel Williams, Major Wadsworth, Professors Barron and Mansfield, Lieutenants Wilson, Macomb, Swift and Levy, and Cadet Armistead, for the purpose of forming a *Military Philosophical Society*, to promote military science and history. This society soon embraced as members nearly every distinguished gentleman in the navy and Union, and several in Europe. Its funds were invested in New York city stock [i.e., city bonds].

The Military Philosophical Society included DeWitt Clinton and John Quincy Adams. In the Society's minutes as of 1807, Joseph Gardner Swift is listed as the corresponding secretary.

1802-03: *Pamphlet War* between the Aaron Burr organization and the DeWitt Clinton organization. (Clinton is in the U.S. Senate; he then becomes mayor of New York City. Burr is Vice President.)

DeWitt Clinton shoots Burr's aide John Swartwout, in a duel at Weehawken, N.J. Clinton's arranged duel with Burr ally Sen. Jonathan Dayton (N.J.) is called off.

Martin Van Buren begins his political career in the law office of Burr's aide *William P. Van Ness*, the main author (pseudonym "Aristedes") of the Burr group's pamphlets attacking DeWitt Clinton. (Peter Irving, Washington Irving's brother, writes *pro-Burr* articles in this pamphlet war! Thus Washington Irving is in the middle of this affray from the very beginning.)

The DeWitt Clinton organization replaces the Burr organization as leaders of New York State politics in the Jefferson party.

1803-06: James Fenimore Cooper is at Yale. His science teacher is Benjamin Silliman.

1804: President Jefferson chooses New York Gov. George Clinton (DeWitt's uncle) to be Vice President for Jefferson's second term, replacing Burr. Burr seeks the vacated New York gover-



Library of Congress

DeWitt Clinton, ally of Hamilton against Burr, "Father" of the Erie Canal.

norship, and conspires with Federalist secessionist New Englanders. Hamilton goes against his own party, exposing Burr as a would-be Napoleon.

Burr shoots Hamilton in duel at Weehawken, N.J. John Swartwout, earlier wounded in a Weehawken duel by DeWitt Clinton, is Burr's second. William P. Van Ness, Martin Van Buren's mentor and boss, awakens Burr for the duel.

1804-06: Aaron Burr, in league with British Amb. Anthony Merry, Sen. Jonathan Dayton (Clinton duel challenger), John Randolph of Roanoke, Va. (first cousin of chairman Tucker of the East India Company), and Andrew Jackson, aims at conquest of Louisiana and Mexico for a new, British-backed empire.

1806-11: *James Fenimore Cooper* is in the U.S. Navy, rises to lieutenant; warships take him to England and Spain.

1807: Robert Fulton, a member of the Military Philosophical Society, demonstrates the operation of a steamboat on the Hudson River. (Beyond the scope of the present chronology are Fulton's life and projects in tandem with Franklin, Hamilton, et al., the origin of heat power/steam power from Leibniz and Franklin, the crucial early role of steamboats in the West, and in Ambassador J.Q. Adams' proposal for Fulton steamboats to Czar Alexander I.)

1807: Jefferson puts Burr on trial for treason. At the trial in Richmond, Va., Andrew Jackson, called as a witness, harangues in the street against Jefferson. John Randolph is the grand jury foreman, conspiring with Burr and, like Jackson, haranguing against Jefferson.

Observers at the Burr trial, young lawyer/patriot *Winfield Scott*, and *Washington Irving* meet, and they become life-long friends. Scott enters the Virginia militia and without authorization captures British sailors who have been raiding the Virginia coast.

1807-08: *James Kirke Paulding* and Washington Irving collaborate to write satires, including "Salmagundi." Paulding, Irving, and a few friends form a literary/intelligence set. Paulding later writes *The Lay of the Scottish Fiddle*, a famous satire on Sir Walter Scott.

1809: William Cooper is assassinated in Albany while his son J.F. Cooper is in the Navy.



Library of Congress

Aaron Burr, U.S. politician, asset of the British Empire; he and his cohorts killed Alexander Hamilton and William Cooper, and dueled with DeWitt Clinton.

2. Breakout for the 'Continental Republic' of Leibniz/Swift/Franklin

1809-12: *Henry Clay* (migrant to Kentucky under lifelong sponsorship of Society of the Cincinnati, who as a grouping, are the direct founders of Kentucky) and *John C. Calhoun* of South Carolina, jointly organize the "War Hawks" for defensive war against Britain. (Calhoun is known to most people today only as the "Southern rights" fanatic he later became, after being ground down by the British-run enemy oligarchy.) With the 1814 publication of Mathew Carey's *Olive Branch*, the nationalist movement (which Clay and Calhoun lead together) successfully promotes Hamilton's program within the Jefferson party!—protective tariff, Second Bank of the United States, and internal improvements—i.e., government-financed infrastructure projects.

1812-15: U.S. war against Britain, known today as the War of 1812, known then as the Second War of Independence. Monroe becomes war leader, Secretary of War, and simultaneously Secretary of State. During the war, *Washington Irving* is aide and *military secretary* to New York Gov. Daniel Tompkins.

1812-13: British intelligence leader Jeremy Bentham's agent *Aaron Burr* quietly returns to the United States just before war breaks out. He collaborates with Martin Van Buren on political strategy.

1810s: The sons of Augustine Prevost, Jr. press their suit against the Cooper family, seeking to ruin them and disrupt their position in central New York State.

1815: DeWitt Clinton resigns as Mayor of New York City. On Dec. 30, there is a meeting of Clinton and the city fathers to organize support for the state to take over construction of the *Erie Canal* from Schuyler's private enterprise. Co-organizer of the meeting is *Cadwallader David Colden*, the president of the anti-slavery Manumission Society and the grandson of the Leibniz/Franklin man, Cadwallader Colden.

Washington Irving sails for England. He befriends Sir Walter Scott and the cream of British high society.

1816: The Bank of the United States is restored, and a protective tariff passed under Treasury Secretary Alexander Dallas, co-leader with Mathew Carey of Pennsylvania's Jefferson Party.

Monroe is elected President. Appoints Calhoun Secretary of War, John Q. Adams Secretary of State. North and South are united behind nationalism and Jeffersonian anti-British politics. Political parties essentially go out of existence.

1815-23: *Martin Van Buren* creates the *Albany Regency*, a New York State organization, succeeding the moribund Burr



Washington Irving, America's happiest writer; military and political intelligence leader.

organization, for the purpose of fighting the Monroe Administration, and explicitly to revive the party division and bitter rancor in the country. Van Buren's group in New York City is called the Bucktails. He organizes them to fight *against the development of the Erie Canal*.

1815-18: *Joseph G. Swift* is Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He had served with Winfield Scott in the War of 1812. Calhoun, Scott, Swift, and, in France, young Sylvanus Thayer, Lafayette, and Alexander von Humboldt, all collaborate on upgrading the Military Academy at West Point.

1817-19: *General Swift* organizes creation of the *West Point Foundry*, as a private enterprise across the river from the Academy. The main owner is Gouverneur Kemble, brother-in-law of *James Kirke Paulding*.

The salon of Washington Irving's group, with General Swift, establishes the informal but rigorous continuation of the Military Philosophical Society: A dinner is held every Saturday night at the Kemble home at the Foundry, where officer-teachers and cadets meet with strategists and distinguished foreign guests, from about 1819 until after the 1861-65 Civil War. *Joel Poinsett* of South Carolina is a member of the inner circle of the group.

The West Point Foundry, on government contracts, makes about one-third of all U.S. artillery up through the Civil War, including the famous rifled Parrott guns (Robert Parrott is superintendent of the West Point Foundry, 1837-67). The Foundry factory produced steam engines, and America's first iron ship (the cutter *Spencer*). The engine for the first American locomotive, the *Best Friend*, is cast at the Foundry, as are the locomotives *DeWitt Clinton* and *West Point*, metal fittings for the Erie Canal locks, and cast-iron piping for the New York City water system. The Foundry employs at its height over 1,000 workers, and can produce 10,000 tons of cast iron per year.

1817: DeWitt Clinton, elected governor, wins overwhelming popular backing for the state to build the Erie Canal. Albany Regency boss Martin Van Buren, acknowledging enormous public pressure, changes course to back the canal in the state Senate, while his New York City Bucktails still oppose it.

1817: James Fenimore Cooper joins the state militia, becomes military aide-de-camp to Governor Clinton. Now living in Westchester County, Cooper stays close to his father's friend, old *John Jay*, co-author with Hamilton and Madison of *The Federalist* papers. Jay tells Cooper the story of the American secret agent during the Revolution, in Westchester County, which Cooper later makes into his book *The Spy*.

1818: *Ethan Allen Brown* is elected Ohio governor, on a

platform of canal building to link up with New York's Erie Canal, then under construction. Brown started out in public life as an assistant to *Alexander Hamilton*, in Hamilton's law office in New York, 1797-1802.

1819-20: Washington Irving's *The Sketch Book* comes out, including the short story "Rip Van Winkle"—the modern world awakens from British colonial backwardness.

1820: James Fenimore Cooper is Secretary of the Clinton Republicans for Westchester County, organizes the county for Clinton's re-election as governor, versus the Van Buren "Bucktails," which Cooper says includes many anti-national Federalists.

1820: General Swift, in Philadelphia, negotiates for the development of Pennsylvania's anthracite coal, and outlines the creation of canals that must carry the coal into New Jersey and New York. Swift writes that the first anthracite coal that was burned in New York City, was burned in his own office.

At precisely this point in his memoirs, General Swift also discusses his work as the president of the Handel and Haydn Society (he was a later founder of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra.)


We take note of the cultural contrast between America's military nation-builders and the present current of Utopians and assorted losers.

1820 to late 1820s: Mathew Carey and Nicholas Biddle, in league with the Society of the Cincinnati circle, organize the first large-scale American coal mining: to begin with, anthracite, then bituminous. Coal production goes rapidly from virtually nothing, only local dribbles, to globally significant millions of tons. See below.

1820-22: James Fenimore Cooper moves to New York City, reviews books for *Col. Charles K. Gardner's* magazine, *The Literary and Scientific Repository*. Cooper had served with Gardner in the military, and Gardner had served with Winfield Scott in the War of 1812. Gardner's magazine is promoted by General Swift and Cadwallader D. Colden, grandson of Franklin's collaborator, and mayor of New York (1819-20). Cooper writes *The Spy*, published December 1821.

1823: President Monroe appoints Nicholas Biddle president of Bank of the United States. The Biddle family and the Carey family become Fenimore Cooper's main confidants in Philadelphia. Cooper's *The Pioneers* (1823) is modeled on his father William Cooper (later, the circles of Teddy Roosevelt considered Cooper's historical treatment false, and too sympathetic to the Indians). In New York City, Cooper creates the *Bread and Cheese* club, meeting in the back room of Charles Wiley's bookstore.

1823: On May 28, the first issue of New York's *The Patriot*



Library of Congress

Martin Van Buren, successor to Burr in the British Empire's underground machine, later U.S. President; The Patriot was established to counterattack his treason.

daily newspaper appears. *Gen. Winfield Scott* and *Gen. Joseph Gardner Swift*, assisted by *James Fenimore Cooper*, formulate the paper's viewpoint and coverage, along with writer Henry Wheaton of the Irving circle. Finances and overall organization are arranged by *President Monroe's son-in-law, Samuel Gouverneur*.

Col. Charles K. Gardner, Cooper's magazine publisher, is the editor of *The Patriot* [see box, p. 14].

Under the condition of global menace from the British-Hapsburg Concert of Vienna, the main purpose of the newspaper is to combat Martin Van Buren's "Albany Regency" and its new political axis with the wildest Southern anti-national, anti-industrial forces, arranged through London's John Randolph of Ro-

noke and his Richmond friends. The patriots must hold the Union together, industrialize, develop the West, create a new North American physical/political geography, and thus overcome the European-supported plantation slavery political universe, with a new American universe.

This is the next to the last year of Monroe's Administration, and the control of the Presidency is at issue.

For the 1824 election, *Van Buren* backs free-trader William Crawford of Georgia, who was then Treasury Secretary. *Van Buren* picks old *Albert Gallatin* for Crawford's Vice Presidential running mate—this has special significance when Crawford has a stroke, since he would likely die in office if elected.

The Patriot's candidate is John C. Calhoun, Monroe's Secretary of War. Calhoun has called for using the revenues from the Bank of the United States to fund a national system of roads and canals. Calhoun writes to Samuel Gouverneur and Generals Scott and Swift, that they have to launch *The Patriot* to break *Van Buren* and the Richmond junta, who combine to spread states-rights "radicalism" in the South and West.

The Patriot boldly defends American System economics and the government's Constitutional powers, against the Regency attacks, hitting directly at Mordecai Noah, editor-stooge for *Van Buren*.

The Prospectus of *The Patriot* newspaper says:

... In the present crisis of European affairs, it is important to sustain the attitude of defence, heretofore indicated by the measures of Government; it is important to adopt such a course of policy, as will tend to encourage the domestic manufactures of our country; to sustain our shipping interests, by a proper provision of naval forces; to provide for a system of internal im-

provements, by which our internal trade may be extended, and our reliance upon ourselves increased; and finally—to harmonize the Agricultural, Manufacturing and Commercial interest; showing that the whole may be advanced by a system of well concerted measures. In supporting these, we shall advocate the Republican cause, without reference to geographical divisions; and we shall reprobate any attempt to introduce the odious and impolitic distinction of slave and non-slave holding states.

Besides political subjects ... our press will be devoted to a discriminating defence of American Literature: As in Politics and in the Arts, we would achieve our independence of other countries also in Literature....

On the front page of *The Patriot's* first issue, a long article entitled "Washington Irving" boasts of Irving's talent, disparaging Walter Scott and Lord Byron. Also on the front page, and continuing for many weeks, is an ad for Charles Wiley's bookstore, offering *The Spy* and *The Pioneers*, and Washington Irving's works, and Catholic books for sale (DeWitt Clinton was known as the champion of Irish immigrants).

We note here that *The Patriot's* leader, Winfield Scott, acts with his friends Irving and Cooper as both a maker and a writer of history, and acts from the historical perspective of a fight across the centuries for mankind against the oligarchy, identical to our perspective in publishing the present report.

In the preface to his *Memoirs*, published in 1864, General Scott lamented the paucity of autobiographies by those who had actually themselves shaped history. He says that those who knew of the secret councils of rulers, and how the leadership thought, have not generally written about these things, though there have been good *writers* writing history.

Then Scott speaks of *Jonathan Swift*—whom most people would think of only as a literary figure—as follows:

"This friend and counselor of [Henry] St. John and [Robert] Harley, brought them to power (and, according to Dr. Johnson, dictated public opinion to England) mainly by a pamphlet—*The Conduct of the Allies*—that broke down the Godolphin ministry.... The masterly narrative—*The Last Four Years of Queen Anne*, seems to complete Swift's claim to a place in the small category of makers and writers of history."

The Patriot carries dispatches from Mexico, Colombia, and Peru, on the desperate political and military fight against Spain and the Concert of Vienna.

The Patriot spearheads a short-lived New York State *People's Party*, electing its candidates (Wheaton, Gouverneur, et al.), and breaking Van Buren's hold on the state legislature—which body selects the state's Presidential electors.

1823: President Monroe enunciates the Monroe Doctrine, which J.Q. Adams had worked out in response to the menaces of Russia's ambassador to the United States, *Baron Van Tuyl Van Serooskerken*, and against the imperial pretensions of the British.

DeWitt Clinton, advised by General Swift, asks New Jersey leaders to proceed with their canal project, which is headed by Cadwallader D. Colden. Clinton says we must get the Pennsylvania coal into circulation, to industrialize, and we must become nationally independent, and with state projects we avoid subjection to the narrow consideration of foreign and domestic capitalists.

As of 1823, the strategic question is hanging fire: Will the Erie Canal and related canals be completed, altering the natural geography of North America so as to permit the Western settlers to ship and travel to the East without having to go through British territory? Or will the enemy overturn the whole breakout by putting in a rotten successor to President Monroe?

1824: *Lafayette* tours New York, greeted by Cooper's Bread and Cheese club, and by DeWitt Clinton, and is taken to West Point by General Swift. Cooper writes a beautiful account of the celebration honoring Lafayette. Lafayette's translator, Friedrich List, settles in Pennsylvania in association with Nicholas Biddle and Mathew Carey. This is the Pennsylvania grouping which starts, virtually overnight, the U.S. production of anthracite coal, which leads to the production of bituminous coal. In response to the Erie Canal project, they pass through the Pennsylvania legislature a huge canal-building program, the chief use of which is to put the coal onto the market to industrialize the country.


The Presidential election hinges on New York as the key battleground state. A dramatic turning point is the action by the Van Burenites—April 12, 1824—kicking old DeWitt Clinton out of his chairmanship of the Canal Commission, before the Erie Canal is finished, and when Clinton holds no other office. The patriots, led by General Swift and his allies, jump on this with mass protests, producing an emotional public reaction. DeWitt Clinton is swept back into the governorship. The head of *The Patriot*-promoted People's Party, War of 1812 Gen. James Tallmadge, Jr., is elected lieutenant governor and serves 1824-26 under Governor Clinton. *William Paulding*, friend of Washington Irving and brother of West Point Foundry's James K. Paulding, backs *The Patriot* and is mayor of New York City (1824-26).

Throughout and behind these events, the combined actions of the circle of Lafayette and Hamilton may be seen.

Congress passes the 1824 *General Survey Act*, allowing the President to assign Army engineers to work in non-Federal enterprises. Congress passes a seriously protective tariff, especially for iron.

John C. Calhoun drops out of the Presidential race. Calhoun later changes sides under blackmail, and phony South Carolina slave-revolt hysteria, and succumbs to the combination of those who join with Martin Van Buren's scheming with the Venetian/British party of slave-owners.

1825: The Erie Canal is completed, the triumph of Gov. DeWitt Clinton. *Alexander Dallas Bache* graduates from West Point. Bache is Benjamin Franklin's great-grandson, named for his maternal grandfather Alexander Dallas, Mathew Car-



John Quincy Adams, a Promethean statesman; his Presidency successfully employed the West Point-political alliance to begin U.S. industrialization.

ey's Pennsylvania political partner who, as Treasury Secretary, restored the Bank of the United States (see above, 1816).

John Quincy Adams becomes President, the vote in Congress swung by New York's Stephen Van Rensselaer. Adams activates the Army to design the first U.S. railroads. The *Army Engineers' Board of Internal Improvements* is tasked with choosing appropriate projects, beginning with the city- and state-funded Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Gen. Joseph G. Swift is the mentor and co-worker for most of the railroad-building engineers. Swift's brother-in-law and protégé, George Washington Whistler, engineers many of the first lines.

President Adams puts through Federal money for the creation of *Midwest canals*. Under state leadership, with Bank of the United States funding, these canals connect the Erie Canal, Lake Erie, and Lake Michigan with the Ohio River, Indiana, Illinois, and the Mississippi River. DeWitt Clinton's aide Cadwallader D. Colden is New York's emissary to the Midwest states to organize the canal system. The Erie Canal makes New York City a giant.

Abraham Lincoln runs for the Illinois legislature (1831) on this strategic infrastructure program. Based on the success of the Erie and Midwest canals, Lincoln and his immediate circle create the city of *Chicago*.

The iron industry, coal-mining, canals, and railroads take

Selections From 'The Patriot,' 1823-24

May 28, 1823: Prospectus [see facsimile, p. 7]

Article on Washington Irving

Wiley books advertisement

Dispatch from Vera Cruz, Mexico, April 10, 1823; 1822 coup attempt, attempt to disrupt Mexico's Congress.

"Catholic books" advertisement

May 29, 1823: History of Battle of King's Mountain

Dispatch from Colombia, South America: Our country is "wanting the Promethean fire of life and emotion."

Defeat of Colombian naval forces by Spain

Article defending Commodore Porter from gossipy public insinuations

May 31, 1823: "The greater interests of the State of New York are undoubtedly those of Manufactures and Internal Improvements." A letter to the editor attacks the *Advocate*, the paper run by Mordecai Noah on behalf of Martin Van Buren.

Spain's military expedition against Peru.

Dispatch from Rio de Janeiro, dated April 9, 1823

On the Susquehanna Canal—Baltimore report

On Gen. Andrew Jackson, from a Baltimore paper

June 2, 1823: "In republics, the leaders of factions and intriguers, are the same vile race, which in monarchies are known by the name of courtiers, sycophants and parasites ... dictators

and their instruments." (speaking of the Van Buren gang)

June 5, 1823: "Republican General Cttee will meet at Tammany Hall on June 5—William Paulding, Junior, Chairman

"At a meeting of the Republican General Cmttee held June 5, it was resolved that the *New York Patriot* be recommended. . .—W. Paulding Jr., chairman"

June 7, 1823: Defense of Judiciary and U.S. Constitution from attack by *The Advocate*; "Was Washington, or Franklin, or Madison . . . an enemy of freedom?" Defense of implied powers, and of a national bank and the Supreme Court, against "a faction of state bankers and brokers."

June 10, 1823: Report that a systematic opposition has been formed against the Administration of President James Monroe, with "secret intrigues"

Crawford vs. Calhoun, internal improvements and tariffs

Aug. 28, 1823: Pro-Calhoun letter

Internal improvements national story—canals history—Erie progress—address by Dr. Mitchell

Anti-Crawford, anti-Noah

Nov. 16, 1823: Dinner in Washington, D.C. discusses canals, anti-Crawford

Letter Oct. 24, 1823: DeWitt Clinton on the Morris Canal

Nov. 18, 1823: Need to reform New York State election laws to bring about popular election for U.S. President

On the "rats" (Van Buren, Crawford)

The Holy Alliance, France and Spain, vs. Colombia

Dec. 4, 1823: Editorial against Crawford

off, to begin America's industrialization.

1827: Martin Van Buren travels to South Carolina, with fast horses and carriage provided by Russian Amb. Baron Van Tuyll (the Baron's descendant, in the 1930s, would organize the Military Christian Fellowship, uniting Brits and Nazis, and would aid Joseph Rettinger in the 1950s "Bilderberger" schemes).

Van Buren conspires with John Randolph of Roanoke (who reportedly vows never to wear clothing made in the U.S.A.) and with the anti-U.S. extremists in Charleston, to create a new "Democratic Party." Van Buren becomes the main national organizer for the Presidential candidacy of Andrew Jackson, whom Van Buren had not supported in 1824.

Late 1820s: President John Q. Adams' ambassador to Spain is Alexander Everett, who was his private secretary when Adams was ambassador to Russia. Everett goes to see Washington Irving in Paris, and recruits him to come to Spain, under the sponsorship of the Adams government. At issue is Spain's role in the Americas, the heritage of America versus the heritage of the Inquisition, and the role of Russia with respect to all of this.

Adams' man Everett officially asks Irving to work on biographical material relating to Christopher Columbus. At this time, the Adams Administration is seeking Russian help to keep Spain from doing mischief in Ibero-America.

Irving moves to Spain with an official connection to the U.S. Embassy. He becomes partner with Russia's Prince Dolgorouki (of that pro-republican Russian family) who is attached to the Russian Embassy in Spain. Irving and Dolgorouki live and work together in the old Muslim palace, the Alhambra, in Granada. Irving writes pioneering works on Islam, and the Muslim greatness in Spain, and a biography of Columbus—a celebration in response to British/Hapsburg anti-American fulminations.

1828: Andrew Jackson, presented as a pro-nationalist, is elected President.

Late 1820s-early 1830s: James Fenimore Cooper is in Europe, the close collaborator of Lafayette.

1831-32: At Lafayette's request, Cooper writes a 50-page pamphlet ("Letter to General Lafayette," Paris, December 1831) and a newspaper series defending the U.S. Constitutional government. For this, Cooper comes under attack in *Whig Party* U.S. newspapers. Cooper counterattacks.

1831: Cooper's *The Bravo* is published, showing that a banking oligarchy could mask its power behind the front of a "republic."

1832: *Henry C. Carey*, son of Mathew Carey, and later the principal strategist for nationalist politics everywhere, arranges the publishing of Cooper's *The Heidenmauer*. Cooper shows

"National Industry"

The cause of the Greeks

William Bayard, Charles King

Europe's recent history

In response to commentary on the Monroe Doctrine, an editorial stating that we must *not* enter into an alliance with Britain

Jan. 1, 1824: "Matthew Davis [aide to Aaron Burr, and later Burr's executor and biographer] is busy again, in the *Advocate*, defeated but not subdued, he is still working as an insidious enemy to the government of his country, and as a conspirator against the people whom he dare not openly confront ... [taking part in] Van Buren's party ... the proceedings of the next legislature will exhibit two parties, the PEOPLE and Principle, against VAN BUREN and Intrigue. The adder, that the People have heretofore nursed in their bosom, must be crushed and effectively obliterated, before his venom poisons the whole fountain of power. ..." The writers in the *Advocate* claim a contrast between J.Q. Adams, Clinton, and Calhoun.

Advertisement for Cooper's *The Pilot*, just published

April 17, 1824: Short item on the Hero of New Orleans—Andrew Jackson, then considered a potential nationalist

Commenting on the attack against Jackson in the Van Buren paper, *The Advocate*

Defending Jackson's actions in Florida

May 1, 1824: Letter defending J.Q. Adams against

charges of conspiracy with Henry Clay

Somehow dated Oct. 15, 1824: Memorial from the Cherokees, against Georgia

Letter from Franklin to Lafayette, Aug. 24, 1778

New York canal history

Report: Crawfordite newspaper talks of separation of the Union

ca. Aug. 11, 1824: Concerning the Tariff

Albert Gallatin's sons revile President Monroe; report on Gallatin as a betrayer and VP candidate.

Report from Ireland, ugly sight of an Orange Procession; history of British oppression of Ireland

Sept. 6, 1824: Austria and Italy

Lafayette's visit to New York

Lafayette will dine today at the Cincinnati society at Washington Hall

Oct. 20, 1824: People's ticket—Wheaton, Gouverneur

On the redemption of the state from the disgrace and "intrigue of the Caucus King and his devoted Regency at Albany"

Dec. 31, 1824: One article favors Andrew Jackson over John Quincy Adams, while other reports had favored Adams. (The paper's nationalists were still mulling over their course of action, as the 1824 Presidential election was thrown into the Congress. With nationalists' support, Adams was chosen on the first ballot on Feb. 9, 1825.)

Winfield Scott left West Point for Washington.

the oligarchical interest that pushes Luther's Reformation, while at the same time he spotlights the duplicity of the Benedictines, who manipulate superstitious public opinion.

1833: Cooper's *The Headsman* is published; it is set in Switzerland, based on the figure of the executioner, the type so beloved of Catholic fundamentalist and freemason Joseph de Maestre (1753-1821).

1829-1830s: President Andrew Jackson appoints Martin Van Buren as Secretary of State. Van Buren gets the insane John Randolph of Roanoke in as U.S. Ambassador to Russia. Van Buren resigns from the Cabinet in a successful scheme to finally destroy the nationalist connections of John C. Calhoun, then the Vice President. Calhoun becomes the spokesman for Nullification, anti-tariff agitation, and Southern states-rights. Van Buren consolidates the regime's attacks against internal improvements, and destruction of the Bank of the United States. The Bank of England withdraws credit from the U.S.A.

1837: For a eulogy of the recently deceased Mathew Carey, Edgar Allan Poe writes in the *Southern Literary Messenger* a review of Carey's *Autobiography*; Poe calls Carey a truly great man.

1837: Van Buren becomes U.S. President. The economy crashes, mass poverty and chaos follow. Western states are bankrupted, canal- and railroad-building are blamed! Laws and new state Constitutions are put in place, banning state sponsorship of internal improvements.

And yet, shaping the Presidency is not a simple matter.

Consider these strange facts concerning the Van Buren Administration.

James K. Paulding is Van Buren's Secretary of the Navy, and is one of Van Buren's closest personal counselors. *Joel Poinsett* is Van Buren's *Secretary of War*, continuing the pro-Union role Poinsett played in leadership in South Carolina under President Jackson and Army chief Winfield Scott, in the Nullification crisis.

Paulding and Poinsett team up to organize and send out the bold *Charles Wilkes* naval exploring expedition (1838-41), to discover the South Magnetic Pole, a project based on the program of *Carl F. Gauss* and to map the Pacific and Antarctic. (This is the same spirited Wilkes who would later capture the Confederate commissioners on the British steamer *Trent*, in the early days of the Civil War.)

"Jackson Democrat" Alexander Dallas Bache is sent to Germany by Nicholas Biddle (who himself had voted for



GNU/R.A. Nonemacher

James Fenimore Cooper, U.S. military and global intelligence strategist, an organizer of The Patriot; his writings showed the world the real America, and the nature of the European imperial beast. The statue pictured here is in Cooperstown, N.Y.

Jackson); Bache meets with Humboldt and Gauss and forms with Gauss the *Magnetischeverein* or World Magnetic Union, whose geodesy and global-magnetic experimentation Bache had spread through the United States.

"Jackson Democrat" Friedrich List is already in Europe as a U.S. diplomat organizing for the American System.

1838-39: "Jackson Democrat" James Fenimore Cooper is in Philadelphia, researching for his *History of the Navy of the United States of America*. Thurlow Weed and other Whig Party scoundrels attack Cooper in their newspapers, and Cooper thrashes them all in successful legal actions. Yet Cooper is the most potent opponent of Jackson's degenerate racism and of the Van Buren anti-national agency acting through Jackson. Cooper later organizes the Presidential candidacy of Gen. Winfield Scott, who becomes the Whig Party's 1852 nominee.

1842: Gen. Joseph G. Swift and his brother-in-law George Washington Whistler plan the building of Russia's

first railroad, by former Army engineer Whistler.

From General Swift's Memoirs:

May 7, 1842: Whistler and myself to Washington, ... meeting Major Bautatz of the Russian service, and General Tallmadge [of the old New York "People's Party"], who gave Whistler some points in the character of the Emperor Nicholas, in reference to his industry and desire to improve public works, that may be useful to Whistler.

On 8th met the Russian ambassador, Mr. Bodisco, and arranged for Mr. Whistler's service at Twelve thousand dollars a year. Had with Mr. Bodisco an interesting conversation on the difficulties of a Russian campaign across the Indus and the sands to India, and of its inutility, while England had the supremacy of naval power.

Whistler builds the Moscow-to-St. Petersburg railroad, and fortifications, and is much beloved in Russia, where he dies in this service.

1850s-1860s: Abraham Lincoln personally organizes the building of the railroad grid in Illinois, complementing the canal system. Then as President, he builds the Transcontinental Railroad, thus opening up the West as the heirs of Leibniz had planned. And Lincoln joins hands with the heirs of Leibniz in Russia, to preserve the Union, and break the United States finally out of colonial backwardness.

The Erie Canal: How American Patriots Had To Battle for Infrastructure

by Judy Hodgkiss

The following words are engraved on a capstone for the Buffalo locks system at the Lake Erie end of the Hudson River to Lake Erie Canal, which demonstrate how the canal's builders situated its importance for improving the general welfare of the United States, and for forging the way for any country, not dominated by an oligarchic system, to do likewise:

ERIE CANAL. Let posterity be excited to perpetuate our free institutions and to make still greater efforts than our ancestors, to promote public prosperity, by the recollection that these works of internal improvement were achieved by the *spirit and perseverance of REPUBLICAN FREE MEN* [all emphasis in original].

And the following are the last two lines of Samuel Woodworth's poem read at the 1825 opening ceremonies:

It is, that the vassals of Europe may see
The progress of mind, in a land that is free.

Under the Presidencies of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, the nationalist policies of Washington and Hamilton

were abandoned, the Bank of the United States was closed, and the young nation's commitment to development and expansion began to falter. The British imperial forces had regrouped, with the aim of destroying our fledgling country's economic capabilities from within, and of embroiling us in wars abroad.

As America was increasingly isolated and threatened, as a result of the degeneration of the (British-controlled) French Revolution, and the resultant rise of the evil Napoleonic regime, a sense of pessimism and gloom had begun to sweep the nation.

That this tide of pessimism was turned, was largely due to the fight which took place in the state of New York around the question of the Erie Canal: Here, instead of pessimism, the idea of America's "Manifest Destiny" began to take concrete form. It was only after the spectacular success of the canal project, that the U.S. Congress and the other states demanded similar projects for the rest of the nation.

Today, one might think that the building of the Erie Canal should have been obvious; actually, the undertaking was as challenging as the idea of putting a man on the Moon was in the 1960s. For example, President Jefferson, in 1810, when approached by a delegation of New York legislators asking



Canals in the 1840s. The Erie Canal linked New York and the eastern seaboard to Ohio and other western states, without going through British-controlled territory. Subsequently, canal networks were built in Ohio, connecting Lake Erie to the Ohio River, providing the basis for industrializing what was then the western part of the United States, and connecting the eastern seaboard to the Mississippi River.

for Federal funding for the canal, was overwhelmed by the enormity of the project:

It is a splendid project . . . and may be executed a century hence. Here [at the Potomac] is a canal of a few miles, projected by General Washington which has languished for many years because the small sum of \$200,000 . . . [could not] be obtained. And you talk of making a canal three hundred and fifty miles long through a wilderness! It is little short of madness to think about it.

But where the British imperial footprint was most evident, was where we find the young Martin Van Buren, heir to the New York political machine of the British-controlled traitor, Aaron Burr, cutting his political teeth in the fight to kill the canal project, which he labelled the “Ditch of Iniquity.”

Fortunately, our American optimism and commitment to the pursuit of happiness prevailed.

In 1819, long before the United States had even one mile of railroad track in any part of the country, the Governor of New York, DeWitt Clinton, a man who would dedicate a decade of his life to the idea of the “Grand Canal,” urged the population of New York to stand fast for the faltering project, on behalf of the future “stock of human happiness”:

The greater part of the United States . . . form one vast island, susceptible of circumnavigation to the extent of many thousands of miles [i.e., the Atlantic Ocean, to the Gulf of Mexico, up the Mississippi River, to the Great Lakes]. The most distant parts of the confederacy will then [with the canal] be in a state of approximation, and the distinctions of eastern and western, of southern and northern interests, will be entirely prostrated. To be instrumental in producing so much good, by increasing the stock of human happiness—and by extending the empire of improvement, of knowledge, of refinement and of religion, is an ambition worthy of a free people.

West Point Inspires the Erie Canal

Both DeWitt Clinton’s father, Brig. Gen. James Clinton, and his uncle, Revolutionary War Governor of New York, George Clinton, had been collaborators of George Washington and Washington’s aide-de-camp, Lt. Col. Alexander Hamilton, in the effort to establish the fort at West Point as the major strategic fortification of the American Revolution. Even though West Point would not be formally established as an Academy until 1802, and its civilian engineering program not established until 1825, Revolutionary-War West Point, as America’s premier fortification, served as an *ad hoc* war-time engineering school. Involved in its programs were a group of French military engineers, led by Gen. Louis Duportail, Wash-

ington’s Chief of Engineers, who had travelled in Washington’s entourage, and who had been trained in the engineering program of the famous Marshal Vauban. And, at the head of the West Point engineering team, on site, was the Polish engineer and patriot, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Before the war, in 1775, James Clinton and Christopher Tappen had conducted a survey for the construction of a permanent fort at West Point. Clinton, a colonel in New York’s colonial militia at the time, had previously been appointed surveyor on behalf of the colony, by Lt. Gov. Cadwallader Colden. Colden, in turn, had earlier served as surveyor for the Colony, and had, in 1724, been the first American to map out a potential route for a canal system that might connect the Hudson River to the Great Lakes.

Cadwallader Colden, a scientist, medical doctor, and public health authority, had been a key collaborator of Benjamin Franklin;¹ he had engaged, along with Franklin and the German scientist and mathematician Abraham Kästner, in a battle over epistemology against the Leibniz-hating Leonhard Euler.²

On Nov. 7, 1777, during the Revolutionary War, Gen. James Clinton, Gov. George Clinton, and Gen. Israel Putnam sent a joint proposal to George Washington (then at Valley Forge), concerning the proposal for the fortification of the Hudson River and the blocking of its navigation at its choke point, at a cliff overhang called West Point.

Putnam wrote to Washington: “All of these circumstances considered, we [he and the two Clintons] have concluded to obstruct the navigation at [West Point], and shall go about it immediately.”

Unfortunately, Putnam then proceeded, in an act of insubordination, to leave the area, in order to build up his forces further south on the Hudson. Alexander Hamilton met with the two Clintons, and then wrote back to Washington: “I fear, unless you interpose, the works here will go on so feebly for want of men that they will not be completed in time . . . Governor Clinton will do everything in his power. I wish General Putnam was recalled from the command of this post, and Governor Clinton would accept it.”

Washington then wrote to Governor Clinton: “Nothing would be more pleasing to me, and I am convinced more advance [sic] of the interest of the States, than for you to take the chief direction and superintendance of this business.”

By July 1778, when Washington visited West Point for the first time, it had been functioning for a few months, not only as the nation’s largest fortification, but also as an engineering school under the direction of its Chief Superintendent of Engineering, the Polish engineer who had been recruited by Benjamin Franklin in Europe, Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Gen. James Clinton and Kosciuszko gave Washington a tour of the

1. Phil Valenti, “The Leibniz Revolution in America.” *EIR*, Aug. 13, 2004.
2. David Shavin, “Leibniz to Franklin on Happiness.” *Fidelio*, Spring 2003.

grounds. By July of 1779, another of Franklin's European recruits, Baron von Steuben, who had been at Valley Forge, would arrive at West Point, as officer in charge of training.

At that point, the son of General Clinton, DeWitt Clinton, would have been ten years old.

The Grand Canal

In 1772, Benjamin Franklin had completed a study of Britain's canals, and sent the report back to his friends in Pennsylvania. One of them, Samuel Rhoads, a Quaker businessman in Philadelphia, responded enthusiastically, and Franklin wrote to him on Aug. 22, 1772:

I am glad my Canal Papers were agreeable to you. If any Work of that kind is set on foot in America, I think it would be saving Money to engage by a handsome Salary an Engineer from hence who has been accustomed to such Business. The many Canals on foot here under different great Masters, are daily raising a number of Pupils in the Art, some of whom may want Employ hereafter; and a single Mistake thro' Inexperience, in such important Works, may cost much more than the Expence of Salary to an ingenious young Man already well acquainted with both Principles and Practice. This the Irish have learnt at a dear Rate in the first Attempt of their great Canal, and now are endeavouring to get Smeaton to come and rectify their Errors.

The Smeaton to whom Franklin refers, was his close friend and collaborator at the London Royal Society, John Smeaton. It would be no coincidence that, again, a chief proponent of canal building, in association with Franklin, would also be involved in a battle at the Royal Society, promoting Leibniz's notions of power and force, as against the incompetent Newton.³

After the Revolution, and before he was called upon to be President, General Washington, who had retired from the Army and Congress, turned his attention to the idea of a canal system that would connect the Potomac River with Ohio. He motivated his plans with the following remarks: "The western settlers ... stand as it were upon a pivot. The touch of a feather



The monumental Erie Canal project, called a "Sheer Folly" by its detractors, paid for itself in ten years, and fostered rapid industrial growth, making New York the "Empire State," giving the North an industrial economy more powerful than the slave-based economy of the South. Here, the biggest engineering challenge to the project, scaling the more than 60-foot Niagara Escarpment in Locksport.

would turn them any way ... smooth the road, and make easy the way for them, and then see what an influx of articles will be poured upon us; how amazingly our exports will be increased by them, and how amply we shall be compensated for any trouble and expense we may encounter to effect it."

In 1785, Washington met with Elkanah Watson, just returning from Europe. Watson had been a courier to Europe during the War, moving between Philadelphia and Ben Franklin in Paris; after the War, he stayed on in Europe to study the long history of canal systems of France, Holland, and elsewhere in Europe, going back to the groundbreaking work of Leonardo da Vinci in the 15th Century. Prior to da Vinci, the medieval locks had consisted of huge plank constructions that rose or fell dangerously in gigantic guillotine-like frames. Da Vinci's elegant solution, designed for the Duke of Milan in 1485, was extremely successful. Da Vinci built locks

that were double-gated and mitered: the two gates of the lock came together to form a V, pointing upstream; as the pressure of the water pushes against that V, the mitered gates simply press more firmly against each other, preventing any water from coming into the chamber behind.

In 1642, French engineers used 41 of Leonardo's double-gated mitered locks in the Canal de Briare, connecting the Seine and Loire rivers. The French then followed through in 1681 with the grand Canal du Midi (canal across the "middle" of France), built by Jean-Baptiste Colbert for Louis XIV.

Upon arriving in Virginia, Watson found Washington frustrated in his efforts in the mid-Atlantic states; Watson next traveled to New York, to begin a survey of the possible Hudson to Lake Erie canal route. In 1789, Washington joined Watson in an expedition to survey the territory.

In 1791, Watson published his survey findings in a pamphlet, in hopes of obtaining Federal funding for the project. The pamphlet was a collaborative effort with several prominent New Yorkers: Gen. Philip Schuyler, recently elected U.S. Senator; Simeon De Witt, New York's Surveyor-General; and Gov. George Clinton.

Schuyler (whose daughter had married Alexander Hamilton) and Watson would soon create the Western Inland Lock Navigation Company, to begin building a few miles of the Erie Canal as a private enterprise. Schuyler later pushed for the state to take over the vast project, and his company built locks on various canal projects in upstate New York, some of

3. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, Vol. 66, December, 1776, p. 450.

which would function in conjunction with the state-built canal.

Simeon De Witt, DeWitt Clinton's cousin, had been the head of Washington's Geographical Department during the War, and was known as the Cartographer of the American Revolution. He went on to become a founder of the Albany Institute, America's foremost scientific institution in the early 1800s, and he also became the mentor of a young Joseph Henry, the inventor of the electrical telegraph and discoverer of electrical induction.⁴ De Witt and Henry collaborated in studies of geomagnetism at the Albany Institute, as the Erie Canal was being built nearby.

By 1810, with no prospects of Federal help, the New York legislature alone passed an act to fund an official survey to determine the route for the canal. They established a Board of Canal Commissioners: Stephen van Rensselaer, Simeon De Witt, Thomas Eddy, Peter B. Porter, William North, Gouverneur Morris, and DeWitt Clinton (at the time, serving as both a state senator, and as mayor of New York City).

In 1811, a Canal Bill, pledging state-backed credit amounting to \$5 million, passed the New York state legislature, in spite of opposition led by the Martin Van Buren "Bucktails" faction. Van Buren labeled the canal, the "Ditch of Iniquity."

The War of 1812 with Britain put everything on hold. The war hit New York state particularly hard, and when the legislature convened in 1814, the Van Buren Bucktails used the devastated post-war budget to convince the legislature to reverse itself on the canal.

DeWitt Clinton proceeded to organize "canal mass meetings" throughout the state, and in 1816, was victorious over the Van Buren machine in the race for Governor. The legislature then passed a bill funding only another survey for the canal. But it was a beginning.

In 1817, the legislature passed the entire canal bill again. Clinton said (presaging John F. Kennedy's "man on the Moon in ten years" speech): "The day will come in less than ten years when we will see Erie water flowing into the Hudson."

Cooper and Lafayette Join the Celebration

Judge Benjamin Wright was immediately appointed Chief Engineer for the Canal Project. He had no engineering background, only surveying, along with a love for "pure" mathematics (along with his friend, Simeon De Witt). The six associate canal "engineers" who were appointed, also had no professional training in engineering; but, by the time the project was completed, the group was known as the "Erie School of Engineering." They started out as surveyors, but finished the project as the nation's foremost hydraulic engineers. (West Point Academy had no input into civilian engineering at that time.)

The job, in 1817, looked formidable: The canal would be 363 miles long, with a descent from Lake Erie of 555 feet—

although not a direct descent, but a complicated up and down, gully and mountain roller-coaster descent. Hence, the need for 83 locks of the regular kind; and, in addition, at Lockport, near Buffalo, a new kind of lock had to be built to mount the 75-foot-high limestone face which forms the Niagara Escarpment. A double series of five interconnected locks was needed to surmount the escarpment, and allow the canal to connect to Lake Erie.

Also, 18 aqueducts were to be constructed, to literally lift the canal over various intersecting river systems, the largest being an unprecedented 750-foot aqueduct to carry the canal over the Genesee River.

The state legislature provided for a division of labor between the private contractors, and the directly hired state workers: the individual connecting segments of the canal were to be the responsibility of private contractors, with state-sponsored credit; the government took direct responsibility for the difficult jobs of constructing the locks and the aqueducts.

The most difficult dilemma of all, though, for the surveyor/engineers, was one with which no European engineer had to deal: where to find a source of pumice stone for hydraulic cement for the locks. What was plentiful in Europe, was not to be found at all in the eastern United States; the canal team, therefore, had to choose between the use of wood, which is highly perishable, or face the exorbitant price for imported cement.

The associate engineer, Canvass White, who had just returned from a tour of Britain's canal system, decided to tour the northern states to make a final effort to discover a U.S. mineral substitute for the cement. At the point of total discouragement, White was finally contacted by a construction contractor back in New York, in Chittenango, who claimed to have discovered the substance White was looking for: a peculiar kind of limestone, which, in a powdered form, does not "slack," or become diluted in water, but, on the contrary, becomes more solid.

Later, the painter Noble Whitford visited the shop of the Chittenango contractor, and produced a fanciful painting that depicts White's delight at seeing the material demonstrated.

In spite of the enthusiasm, the canal got off to a slow start. In addition to the engineering and technical difficulties, 1,000 laborers working in the marshes near Syracuse were stricken by a variety of diseases—malaria, ague, typhoid fever—and many died. Clinton had to ask the legislature for \$1 million each year, over the following three years.

In 1822, Clinton lost his bid for re-election, despite the mobilization of support for his campaign by such notables as James Fenimore Cooper, who was the Secretary of the Clinton Republicans for Westchester County. Cooper had joined the New York state militia after serving as an officer in the U.S. Navy; he soon became the military aide-de-camp to Clinton. Also campaigning for Clinton was Cadwallader David Colden, the grandson of Ben Franklin's close friend in the colonial period. Cadwallader D. Colden had succeeded Clinton as Mayor of New York City, and, after the canal was finished,

4. Judy Hodgkiss, "The Story of Joseph Henry," *New Federalist*, Feb. 14, 2000.

Colden was commissioned by the city to write the story of the canal's construction, in a pamphlet for mass distribution.

By 1823, mainly because of Yankee ingenuity in the field, the pace of construction began to pick up. The Rochester-to-Albany segment was completed first, and the cost of freight on that line dropped from \$100 to \$5/ton, compared to over-land hauling.

Two inventions in the field were hurrying completion: 1) a "stump puller," an ingenious device that enabled a half dozen men and a team of horses to remove 30-40 stumps a day; and 2) an "endless screw" device, the "sprig of Shillelah," made up of a cable attached to the top of a tree as tall as 60 feet, which winds up the tree so tightly, that one man can single-handedly bend it over and break it to a stump.

The Irish "paddys" working on the canal composed a ballad:

I learned for to be very handy;
To use both the shovel and spade;
I learned the whole art of canalling;
I think it an excellent trade.
I learned for to be very handy,
Although I was not very tall,
I could handle the "sprig of Shillelah,"
With the best man on the canal.

But the technical difficulties with the locks and aqueducts were adding to the costs, and the canal was the object of extreme controversy among New York taxpayers.

In 1824, the legislature, now controlled by Van Buren's Bucktails, voted Clinton out of the Canal Commission itself. Van Buren was out of town at the time of the vote, and, on his return, accused his party of going too far, saying: "There's such a thing as killing a man too dead."

In the face of this setback, Clinton proceeded to rally the population, formed a new party, "The People's Party," and, on the eve of the completion of the canal, was voted back in as Governor.

On June 6, 1825, General Lafayette, on tour in the United States, visited the site of the near-completed spectacular Buffalo locks. The workers saluted him with the biggest powder blast into the limestone that they could muster.

Finally, on Oct. 26, 1825, the canal was completed.

Thousands readied themselves along the route of the canal for the celebrations accompanying the first vessels to travel the route to New York harbor, where President John Quincy Adams, Lafayette, and four former Presidents—John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe—were waiting.

The historian, Carl Carmer, in "The Hudson," describes the jubilation:

The "Seneca Chief," elegant packet, moved from Lake Erie into the new canal, "Hellespont of the West," at ten o'clock on Wednesday morning, Octo-

ber 26, 1825. At once a battery five hundred miles long began to fire. The gunners of Rochester heard a booming in the west and pulled their lanyards. The Syracuse cannoneers sent the sound echoing over the hills to Utica. The valley of the Mohawk gave it channel toward Albany. Spurts of white smoke crowned the high promontories of the Hudson, and the Catskills resounded with sharp explosions. Man-made thunder shattered against the columned walls of the Palisades. The first message ever carried on sound waves from Buffalo to New York had arrived in eighty-one minutes. The answer was back in Buffalo eighty minutes later. The whole state knew that by a new channel Erie water was running to the sea.

"Who comes there?" shouted the captain of the "Young Lion of the West," waiting beside the stone aqueduct at Rochester.

"Your brothers from the West on the waters of the Great Lakes."

"By what means have they been diverted so far from their natural course?"

"Through the channel of the great Erie Canal."

"By whose authority and by whom was a work of such magnitude accomplished?" called the catechizer.

"By the authority and by the enterprise of the people of the State of New York."

With that the whole valley of the Genesee shook with the cheering of crowds and the salute of guns and the explosion of fireworks.

Col. William L. Stone delivered an address to the celebration in New York City: "[The builders of the Erie Canal] have built the longest canal, in the least time, with the least experience, for the least money, and to the greater public benefit."

In addition to the economic impact of the corridors of development opened up along its route, the canal directly paid back to the state, in tolls alone, \$495,000 in 1825, and more than \$1 million/year afterwards.

An English tourist at the time, Francis Kimball, commented: "The Erie Canal rubbed Aladdin's lamp. America awoke, catching for the first time the wondrous vision of its own dimensions and powers."

A Philadelphia journal wrote, jealously:

New York has celebrated the completion of the Erie Canal with excess pomp and ceremony remindful of the days of ancient Rome. Obviously the success or failure of the Erie will greatly affect the future of Pennsylvania's proposed system of canals. We shall await the outcome with interest and, hopefully, be guided accordingly.

And then, not only Pennsylvania, but the entire country was guided accordingly.

Berserker Cheney Escalates Push for World War III

by Jeffrey Steinberg

The Bush Administration, led by Vice President Dick Cheney, has again escalated its drive for senseless military action against Iran, through a combination of new unilateral sanctions against the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, and a new hyperventilating propaganda push, led by the Vice President and President, aimed at provoking Tehran into providing a pretext for war. At the same time, anti-war forces around the globe—including Russian President Vladimir Putin, and some factions within the Bush Administration itself—have taken some extraordinary actions, aimed at averting an attack on Iran, that would almost certainly escalate out of control to global war.

One of the most stunning denunciations of the Cheney war schemes was delivered in Washington on Oct. 17 by Wesley Clark, a retired five-star general and former candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination. Speaking before several hundred American and Arab policy-makers at the 16th annual conference of the National Council on U.S.-Arab Relations (NCUSAR), Clark urged a vigorous public debate on the Iran situation, leading to a new diplomatic dialogue with Tehran, and denounced the Bush Administration's war policies as part of a continuing "political coup d'état" that was carried out, from the White House, after the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks.

Clark charged that, following 9/11, a small group inside the Bush Administration imposed a new strategy, without debate, without Congressional authorization, and without consultation with America's allies. Clark recounted a May 1991 private conversation he had with then-Pentagon official Paul Wolfowitz and his deputy Lewis "Scooter" Libby. Clark recounted Wolfowitz's berating of then-President George H.W. Bush, for failing to conclude Operation Desert Storm with the overthrow of Saddam Hussein. Wolfowitz told Clark that,

within "the next 5-10 years," the United States must overthrow a string of "former Soviet client-states," including Syria, Iraq, and Iran. Wolfowitz told the flabbergasted general that the United States would have that window of opportunity to "use military force with impunity" before a new, as-yet unknown "superpower" emerged to challenge American global military hegemony.

General Clark recounted that when then-Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, along with Wolfowitz and Libby, took their "Roman Empire" scheme to National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft and President Bush, they were forcefully rebuked. After 9/11, Clark charged, Cheney and Wolfowitz resurrected the scheme, but never informed the American people or the Congress, because "they would have been laughed off the stage," and denounced for "flights of fantasy." Nevertheless, Clark reported, a written plan was circulated in the Rumsfeld Pentagon right after 9/11, listing seven regimes to be overthrown in the next five years: Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Iran, Libya, Sudan, and Somalia. Now, Clark concluded, "we are living with the consequences," including the \$800 billion spent to date on Iraq and Afghanistan. "The U.S. is weaker, our adversaries are stronger."

In response to a question from *EIR*, Clark urged diplomacy with both Iran and Syria. "Find common interests, avert war, and help our friends in the region," he demanded, asking, "Aren't we big enough to do this?" The alternative, he warned, is a two- to three-week bombing campaign, that will render Iran "a failed state," but with the most dire consequences for the United States and the world.

Putin Leads War-Avoidance

The message delivered by General Clark resonated throughout the two-day conference. It paralleled an escalation

of war-avoidance initiatives by leading international players, including President Putin. The Russian leader has engaged in a whirlwind of diplomacy, beginning with his two-day summit in Moscow earlier this month with French President Nicolas Sarkozy. Sarkozy came in to the Moscow meeting, having joined the Cheney chorus, threatening that Iran's alleged pursuit of a nuclear weapon could lead to World War III. But in the meeting with Putin, Sarkozy, according to informed U.S. intelligence sources, tilted into the war-avoidance camp, under the weight of simultaneous pressure from the Russians and from circles within his own French military/intelligence institutions.

Putin next hosted U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice for several days of talks with their Russian counterparts. Putin invited the Pentagon chief to address a Russian military academy, and privately signalled that the American proposal for settling the dispute over the planned deployment of U.S. anti-ballistic-missile systems in Poland and the Czech Republic, was a positive, albeit insufficient step. According to Washington sources, Gates proposed that Russian military observers could be stationed at the Eastern European missile defense sites, as well as at U.S. command installations.

Gates, in turn, told reporters during a stopover in Europe for a NATO-Russian conference, that the United States could possibly delay activation of the ABM sites, pending firm evidence that Iran possessed missiles capable of striking Europe. As Gates was delivering these hopeful remarks, Bush was issuing the message that the U.S. was hell-bent on deploying the ABM system on Russia's border.

During Putin's historic trip to Tehran, to attend a Caspian Sea heads-of-state meeting, he clearly signalled that Russia would strongly oppose any U.S. military action against Iran, while, at the same time, pressing the Iranian government to avoid any provocation that could give Cheney the pretext to attack. Reportedly, in his private meeting with Iran's Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei and President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Putin minced no words, in warning that the Bush-Cheney Administration *would* launch a devastating bombing campaign against Iran, if given the pretext. Russia clearly does not want another American war on its border.

According to U.S. intelligence sources, a huge political brawl is taking place behind the scenes in Tehran, over how to respond to the U.S. provocations and the Putin intervention. The latest Cheney provocation was announced on Oct. 25 by Rice and Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson: Economic sanctions against the Revolutionary Guards.

World War III Rhetoric

In response to the wildly provocative speech by Vice President Cheney at the annual conference of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy (WINEP) on Oct. 21, pushing for military strikes against Iran, Putin delivered a tough retort, drawing a parallel to the U.S.-planned deployment of ABM

systems in Eastern Europe, to the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis.

In his WINEP speech, Cheney had warned Iran of "serious consequences" if it did not abandon its nuclear enrichment program, and its intervention into Iraq. Practically daring Iran to respond, Cheney ranted, "Given the nature of Iran's rulers, the declarations of the Iranian President, and the trouble the regime is causing throughout the region—including the direct involvement in the killing of Americans—our country and the entire international community cannot stand by as a terror-supporting state fulfills its most aggressive ambitions. The Iranian regime needs to know," Cheney concluded, "that if it stays on its present course, the international community is prepared to impose serious consequences."

In a clear warning to the Bush-Cheney Administration, Putin told reporters in Lisbon, Portugal, during a European-Russian annual summit, that the U.S. ABM deployment was "technologically similar" to the Cuban Missile Crisis of the 1960s. "Let me recall how relations shaped up in a similar situation in the mid-1960s," Putin told reporters. "Similar actions by the Soviet Union, when it deployed missiles in Cuba, provoked the Caribbean crisis. For us, technologically, the situation is very similar." However, Putin concluded that there was no danger of the situation escalating out of control, because Russia and the United States are "not enemies anymore," and President Bush is his "personal friend."

Just days earlier, Bush had babbled to reporters that Iran's pursuit of the "knowledge" of how to build a nuclear bomb could trigger World War III. "I've told people that if you're interested in avoiding World War III, it seems like you ought to be interested in preventing Iran from having the knowledge necessary to make a nuclear weapon," the President threatened.

Putin's Israel Play

Days after his Tehran excursion, Putin hosted Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert in Moscow, for talks also aimed at cooling down the rhetoric for World War III. Immediately after their talks, Putin dispatched a high-level Russian delegation for a week of talks in Israel. The delegation, led by Deputy Foreign Minister Alexander Saltanov and special Middle East peace envoy Sergei Yakovlev, assured the Israelis that Russia is equally adamant about preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear bomb, but cautioned, according to *Ha'aretz*, "The difference between us and you, is that you're basing yourselves on estimates, whereas we're basing ourselves on precise information. When we see that the situation is sufficiently dangerous, we'll know how to stop the Iranians, and if we want to, we can do this without difficulty."

At no point in recent history, has there been so much high-level diplomacy aimed at averting world war. But by the same token, the 9/11 "political coup d'état" at the White House, led by Cheney's team of berserkers, has not been defeated, and therefore, the danger of global conflagration cannot be underestimated for a moment.

Why the India-U.S. Nuclear Deal Hit A Brick Wall, and What To Do About It

by Ramtanu Maitra

After shouting from the rooftop for more than two years that the India-U.S. nuclear deal would bring about a drastic positive change to the Indian economy, a deflated Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh telephoned President Bush Oct. 13 to tell him that the deal had run into difficulties because of opposition from his communist coalition allies. Singh had promoted the deal as the keystone of success of his Congress Party-led United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government that assumed power in May 2004.

“The Prime Minister explained to President Bush that difficulties have arisen with respect to operationalization of the India-US civil nuclear co-operation agreement,” the Indian government said.

The process that led to Singh’s Oct. 13 telephone call was most interesting. Barely 24 hours before the call was made, Congress Party chief Mrs. Sonia Gandhi, who is surely the main power to reckon with in the Congress Party, told a public meeting in the state of Haryana: “We must understand that such elements [opposing the nuclear deal] are not only the enemies of the Congress, but they are also enemies of progress and development. We have to give them a strong and befitting reply.” Those strong words, at a ceremony for laying the foundation of a power plant, indicated that the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government intended to push through that dynamo of “progress and development,” come rain or shine.

Also of interest is that the deal seemed to be on when International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) chief Mohammed ElBaradei was in India on Oct. 12, meeting with Prime Minister Singh. ElBaradei’s visit specifically concerned IAEA safeguard negotiations, a required step in implementing the India-U.S. deal. News reports indicate that Singh told ElBaradei what was known publicly, that India’s Left groups opposed the deal. Because the minority UPA government’s survival depends on the Left’s support, Singh reportedly hinted to ElBaradei that after extensively discussing the deal with the Left parties, the government would take a political call on beginning negotiations with the IAEA.

If these reports are correct, it shows that the deal was very much on, when the Singh-ElBaradei meeting took place. All that India needs is a bit of time, the Indian Prime Minister indicated to ElBaradei.

A Quick Change

But all that changed within 24 hours. After announcing Oct. 12 that New Delhi was not even considering a delay in the deal, Mrs. Gandhi and External Affairs Minister Pranab Mukherjee reportedly went to see Singh on Oct. 13, to tell him that the deal could not go through. Singh was then left with two choices—either to push the nuclear deal without a government (which would be absurd), or to keep the government in place and live to fight another day.

What was the urgency that led the Indian Prime Minister to phone President Bush to say that the deal had hit a brick wall? India’s Left parties were scheduled to meet on Oct. 22 to formulate their views on the issue one more time. Why couldn’t Singh wait another ten days before throwing in the towel? He had, after all, wholly identified himself with the deal for more than two years, making it look like his government’s single-item agenda.

The level of urgency suggests that the rebels against the deal were not only on the Left, but were swirling all around the Cabinet, and perhaps, beyond.

The nuclear deal does have problem areas, although the Left opposes the deal simply because it is with the United States, which, in line with its recent history, will eventually use the deal to undermine India’s sovereignty. No matter how insightful this argument is, it is in essence an “anti-United States” agenda.

A Problem-Infested Deal

But the deal has a few problems in itself. To begin with, the Bush Administration had to seek the permission of Congress, in order to make an exception for India, which has not signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and is an “illegal” possessor of nuclear weapons and nuclear-power-related equipment, including nuclear reactors, fuel, and technologies. Congressional permission came in the form of H.R. 5682 (the Hyde Act), which was voted up on July 26, 2006. The Act said, among other things, that “it is in the interest of the United States to enter into an agreement for nuclear cooperation as set forth in Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) with a country that has never been an NPT member with respect to civilian nuclear technology....”

The negotiations between Washington and New Delhi of



Press Information Bureau of India

Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Congress Party leader Sonia Gandhi were unable to push the deal with the United States through, in the face of fierce domestic political opposition. Here, Singh (center) participates in a Hindu festival on Oct. 21; Mrs. Gandhi is to his right.

Section 123 of the U.S. Atomic Energy Act of 1954 were completed on Aug. 3, 2007. Those negotiations concluded that after India agreed to full-scope safeguards with the IAEA, and after India obtained approval of the 45-member-nation Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) for supply of nuclear-related material and equipment, the agreement would go back to Capitol Hill for approval, and then the deal would become operational.

Among the various procedural delays, there were a few poison pills embedded in the Hyde Act, and in the Section 123 Agreement, that disturbed some in New Delhi. For instance, under Sec. 4: “Waiver Authority and Congressional Approval,” one item said: “Secure India’s full and active participation in United States efforts to dissuade, isolate, and, if necessary, sanction and contain Iran for its efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction, including a nuclear weapons capability (including the capability to enrich or process nuclear materials), and the means to deliver weapons of mass destruction.” In addition, the Hyde Act urged the White House to seek India’s full participation in the Proliferation Security Initiative.

India has a strong cultural and political relationship with Iran that goes back centuries. In addition to its thriving trade with Iran, India uses the Iranian transportation network for trade with Russia. Also, Iran is involved in negotiations with both India and Pakistan to supply its surplus natural gas to the subcontinent, where it is in high demand. Naturally, some in India thought it would be suicidal for New Delhi to take an irrational position against Iran, based on what Washington tells it to do.

Another concern is the Proliferation Security Initiative, a contribution of rabid neocon John R. Bolton, when he was U.S. Under-Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security. The initiative was announced by President Bush on May 31, 2003. This is an international effort led by the United States to interdict transfer of banned weapons and weapons technology, and is primarily focussed on combatting proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and materials.

In September 2005, the People’s Republic of China announced that it would not participate in the initiative, because of concerns over its legality, and India has so far resisted signing on to it. However, India, the United States, Japan, Australia, and Singapore conducted Proliferation Security Initiative exercises (the Malabar Exercises) in the Bay of

Bengal in September 2007.

In addition, some in India were concerned that adhering to the deal will prevent India from improving its nuclear weapons, thus short-changing its nuclear defense capabilities vis-à-vis China and Pakistan, the two neighboring nuclear-weapons nations. Some even pointed out that the deal is a back-door implementation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by India. Article 1 of the Treaty states that 1) “Each State Party undertakes not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion, and to prohibit and prevent any such nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control,” and 2) “Each State Party undertakes, furthermore, to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion.”

Ironically, while the United States pushes countries to sign this Treaty, the U.S. Congress never ratified it.

But the difficulties embedded in the Hyde Act and the 123 Agreement were brushed aside as “non-binding” by those in India, and by the U.S. India lobby, operating in conjunction with the American-Israel Political Affairs Committee (AIPAC), which have hitched their wagon to the Bush Administration. Thus, said supporters of the deal, it is unnecessary for the opposition in New Delhi to run around like “headless chickens”—a phrase used by the Indian Ambassador to the United States, Ronen Sen.

The real stickler, however, is a clause stated clearly in the 123 Agreement: “Taking into account Article 5.6 of this Agreement, India agrees that nuclear material and equipment transferred to India by the United States of America

pursuant to this Agreement, and any nuclear material used in or produced through the use of nuclear material, non-nuclear material, equipment or components so transferred shall be subject to safeguards in perpetuity in accordance with the India-specific Safeguards Agreement between India and the IAEA . . . and an Additional Protocol, when in force.”

This clause raises two problems. To begin with, the use of the word “perpetuity” suggests that the safeguard requirements would remain in force, even if the Non-Proliferation Treaty changes. Second, once India signs this agreement with the IAEA, and if the India-U.S. nuclear deal does not go through, or if India wants to shelve the deal later on, the IAEA safeguard requirements will remain set in stone. The safeguard requirement, in other words, is an agreement with the IAEA and, in essence, independent of the nuclear deal, although it is required in order for the U.S. Congress to grant the final enactment of the Hyde Act, which will make the nuclear deal operational.

Does this technicality make it look like India would be agreeing to a major part of the so-called disagreeable Non-Proliferation Treaty? To some in India, the answer is “yes.” It is likely that among those in New Delhi who met Mohammed ElBaradei on Oct. 12, the clarification of this “perpetuity” clause made all the difference.

The Deal That India Must Demand

The deal-pushers in the United States and India claimed repeatedly that this is the best that India can get. Many in India claim that through this deal, the United States has “indirectly” recognized India as a nuclear weapons state. In other words, make the best of a bad bargain.

No matter how the Manmohan Singh government, and his lobbyists in Washington, under the tutelage of an unthinking Indian Embassy in Washington, present the deal, it is still a back-door deal. And, like every back-door deal, it ran into problems. Although it does not pose a threat to India’s sovereignty (and, for sure, India’s Left parties are barking up the wrong tree hoping to get some political mileage out of it), the deal could cause serious problems for India’s indigenous nuclear power program, by delaying the absolutely essential development of thorium reactors. The thorium issue could also become an area of constant friction between the United States and India.

Since the Cold War days are over and India has emerged—thanks to its previous leaders’ commitment to feed its 1 billion-plus people—as a nation which could be one of the poles of global power in the future, it is not in India’s interest to cut a back-door deal with the Bush Administration, whose principal interest in the nuclear deal is to make India a dependent ally and a bulwark against the rising power north of India.

To put it bluntly, if the Indian leadership had a vision, and adequate self-respect, it would present to the Bush Administration, a package with a message: If you want India to devel-

op and progress, India will not accept any part of the package except the whole. The package is:

- India will sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- India will join the five official nuclear weapons states, becoming the sixth such nation.
- India will join these same five nations as a permanent member in the United Nations Security Council, the sixth such member.
- The signing on to all three items would be simultaneous.

Since the Non-Proliferation Treaty opened for signature in 1968 and entered into force in 1970, India has stayed away from it, calling it “discriminatory.” The most cited discriminatory clause in this nine-article treaty is Article VI, which says: “Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.”

What India rightly claims, is that since 1970, the five nuclear weapons states, under the pretext of the Cold War, had embellished their nuclear arsenal. No attempt was made for these states to impose upon themselves the same laws they often used, to impose by force, or threats of military invasion, on other nations.

The issue at stake is the five members of the United Nations Security Council—the nuclear-weapons states. It is evident that the actual source of power emanates from the conjunction of these two categories, permanent membership in the United Nations Security Council, and status as a nuclear weapons state.

How did these five nations become members of this exclusive club? In particular, how did Britain and France, with a fraction of India’s population and a fraction of India’s potential, become members of this exclusive club? The story is that they, along with the United States and Russia, were the victors of the Second World War—an event that occurred more than 60 years ago, when India, among many other of today’s important nations, were under foreign subjugation. But, if this is a club of the World War II victors, why is China included, and not India?

The answer is that the entire setup is discriminatory, a fact that India has accepted without a whimper. Yet, India would not sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, because it is discriminatory!

Now, however, there is no reason to accept this discriminatory United Nations system exercised by the Club of Five. The only way to change the situation is for India to tell Washington, “If you want to be an ally of India, rearrange the Club.”

It is time for India’s leaders to stop waiting for hand-me-downs and use the leverage that the 1.1-plus billion people of the nation have earned, to demand what is good for the country in the long term.

Italy at Crossroads: 1924, Or LaRouche

by Claudio Celani

Italy threatens to become the first large European country to fall prey to a fascist dictatorship, similar to the one that Lyndon LaRouche has warned is looming over the United States. There is a genuine, mounting popular dissatisfaction with political institutions, which have abdicated their responsibility to serve the Common Good. The threat is that the oligarchy will manipulate the popular sentiment towards a dictatorship, as it did in the 1920s under Mussolini. Still, there is time to save the country, as a few individual leaders are responding to the leadership of Lyndon LaRouche and his Italian associates.

The days of the current Romano Prodi government are numbered. Similar to what happened with the U.S. Congress, 18 months after the center-left coalition won the elections, its popular support has collapsed enough to guarantee a large majority for the opposition, if elections were held today. The reason is that, far from improving, as per electoral promises, social conditions for most of the population have worsened. The main campaign issue is that most Italian youth cannot find a job unless they accept *precariato*, short-term, low-paid jobs, which make it impossible to pay rent, buy a house, or build a family. Today more than 4 million Italians (out of a population of 58 million) are officially part of the *precariato*. In addition, the global economic collapse is causing a social crisis with rising housing and food prices. It has been calculated that 3.6 million families—1.9 million homeowners and 1.7 million rent-payers—are having trouble making their house payments.

Demonstrations against the government have had impressive popular participation: About 1 million people marched in each of two different demonstrations against the government in Rome, one organized by the right wing, and another one by left-wing parties (the latter being part of the government coalition).

In October, more than 3 million people participated in national primaries to elect the leader of the newly born Democratic Party, an indication of a mandate for change. However, Italian citizens are once again empowering the wrong people: Democratic Party Secretary-elect Walter Veltroni, who is supposed to replace Prodi as Prime Minister sooner or later, announced that he will enforce a shock-program to cut down the debt, by selling state assets. Thus, more doses of the prescription that has already destroyed the country. Behind Veltroni's "Democratic Party" platform, lurks the oligarchy, ready with

its dictatorial option at the end of the tunnel.

The oligarchy is using the same methods used by the French Jacobins in the 1779 revolution, and by Mussolini's fascists in 1922: populism, and the discrediting of all institutions. The center of the populist manipulation is the group of "families" centered around the largest national daily, *Corriere della Sera*. The current phase of manipulation started with a book published by two *Corriere* journalists entitled *The Caste*, which describes the political class as a corrupt caste of untouchables, dedicated to wasting public money. As usual, a partial truth is used to fabricate a false totality, and the result has been that since it hit the bookstores, *The Caste* has become the number one item in all the media.

Then, last May, as the Prodi government was celebrating its first anniversary in office, one of the owners of *Corriere*, the aristocrat Luca Cordero di Montezemolo, launched a scathing attack on the government and the political class, at the annual meeting of the Industrialist Association, of which he is national chairman.

As politicians feebly tried to counter what they named as a wave of "anti-politics," a popular comedian, one Beppe Grillo, called for a national day of protest which he called "V-day," where "V" does not stand for "victory," but for the Italian equivalent of "F___ You!" (*Vaffanculo*), addressed to the political class. Grillo was able to bring 300,000 people into the street, ritually shouting "Vaff..." to a gallery of ministers, politicians, public officials, and, foremost, to the political parties themselves.

Grillo's speech was correctly likened to the one Prime Minister Benito Mussolini gave in 1924, when, on the eve of national elections, he announced the dissolution of political parties, calling them "useless," in favor of a unique list, which was called the "Listone." That was the end of parliamentary democracy. The rest is history.

Grillo may not be able to run a party and win a majority vote in the next elections, and he probably will not be the new Mussolini, but the next election might be the last one, unless the current dynamic is not reversed.

A Government on Life-Support

The Prodi government is now on life-support. On Oct. 26, Prodi's coalition lost seven successive Senate votes, before it was able to get part of its budget law approved. Several scenarios are being floated in case there is a government crisis, all involving early elections. The most radical scenario sees a "transitional" government, run by Mario Draghi, the current central bank governor. Draghi, a schoolmate of *Corriere's* Montezemolo, is a man of the financial oligarchy. He was exposed by *EIR* after he participated in the 1992 meeting on-board the British royal yacht *Britannia*, to discuss privatizations with London bankers. Since then, many have called him "Mr. Britannia."

In the 1990s, Draghi ran Italian privatizations as direc-

tor-general of the Treasury Ministry. After that, he became the European deputy chairman of Goldman Sachs. At the end of 2005, Draghi was appointed governor of the Bank of Italy, in the coup that watergated central banker Antonio Fazio, who had opposed a foreign takeover of two Italian banks. Draghi is also chairman of the Global Financial Stability Forum, the so-called “plunge protection team” which is supposed to coordinate the central banks’ response to a systemic collapse. Recently, he joined his old schoolmate Montezemolo in openly criticizing the Prodi government because, instead of using surplus tax revenues to pay the debt, Prodi had decided to redistribute those funds for social purposes.

In the face of this crisis, the Italian LaRouche movement has stated that the only way to save the institutions is to give credible signs of a policy for the Common Good. One such action would be the introduction in Italy of “firewall” legislation to protect homeowners and banks, similar to the LaRouche legislation in the United States.

Another such action would be a reversal of the anti-technological policies that have plagued the country for at least three decades. The top priority is a return to nuclear energy, a field which Italy was a continental leader in the post-war period, until the oligarchy imposed a referendum in 1986, and a shutdown of all nuclear plants. Now, Italy is 85% dependent on foreign imports for energy (including imported nuclear energy); a large-scale nuclear program would be a signal that the political class wants a change for the better.

Parliament has started a discussion on the issue, and a bill has been introduced to reduce energy dependency by 50% by the year 2020, but parliamentary procedures to achieve “consensus” have stretched out the schedule so that it will take several months before there is a compromise on when, and how, a program will be started. This is not good enough.

One politician who has realized the urgency of a shift in order to avoid dictatorship, is Giulio Tremonti, former Finance Minister and current deputy head of the Chamber of Deputies. Tremonti is a member of former Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi’s Forza Italia party, which is populist and neocon oriented, but Tremonti is a maverick with an independent mind. He has been reading LaRouche’s writings for years, and has associated himself publicly with LaRouche on the idea of the Eurasian Land-Bridge. Recently, Tremonti has shown that he has learned more than that.

Tremonti Takes on Globalization

On Oct. 23, Tremonti appeared on the popular TV talk show “Porta a Porta,” on Italian national television. He shocked all participants, host included, when he called for stopping discussion of petty issues and for addressing “those issues which are the real concern of the population: food price increases, home mortgage rises, unemployment.” Globaliza-

tion has “taken hope away” from families, Tremonti said, and he called for “going back to the system that gave us secure, stable jobs.... Once, decades ago, it was not paradise, but people had secure jobs, could pay their mortgages, and, in general, had hope for the future.... Through globalization, hope has been stolen away.”

Tremonti continued: “Those madmen introduced uncontrolled capital flows, and competition from low-wage countries [such as] China and India. And what about the euro?” The purchasing power of the euro has fallen, such that a family can no longer be sustained on the euro equivalent of what they formerly earned in liras.

The shocked host and the other guests tried to dismiss Tremonti. But the first person to speak from the audience enthusiastically endorsed Tremonti: “I recognize myself fully in the picture Mr. Tremonti gave,” saying that he and his wife earn 1,300 euro a month and cannot make it once they have paid their rising mortgage costs. “They took our hope away,” he said.

The other political representative on the show, Franco Giordano, who is secretary-general of the PRC (Communist Refoundation Party), said that he fundamentally agreed with Tremonti’s analysis of globalization. The difference is that he, as a communist, thinks that corporations also exploit the workers.

Tremonti then escalated his attacks on globalization, saying: “Those madmen have abruptly enlarged the European Union, and now they realize we are having a problem. They used food to produce gasoline, and now food prices are rising.... Those idiots, they used to come to us and say: ‘We have 10 million unemployed? It is the free market.’ Now, where is the free market when central banks intervene to rescue endangered banks?”

Tremonti then confronted the government with the fact that they have just reduced taxes for banks, “not for industries that invest, produce something, but for banks!... There is no magic wand,” Tremonti said, “but I think we should go back to the system that worked. We need to go back to a system of secure jobs. Even the Pope said that. People need secure jobs to build a family.”

Finally, in a rebuke to those who think only locally, he said, “I tell you: If we do not deal with the thing out there, the thing will deal with us!” Giordano said he fully agreed with that. The journalists and the other idiots on the show had no reply.

This episode, limited but important, shows the effect of the LaRouche leadership, and indicates that it is possible to have popular support for existing institutions, thus saving them from the threat of a dictatorship. What’s necessary, is for men and women representing those institutions to stop acting as servants of the oligarchy, and act instead like Prometheus in defense of the Common Good. The programs—the Eurasian Land-Bridge and the New Bretton Woods—are there. The time to act is now, before it is too late.

International Intelligence

LaRouche Addresses Italian Businessmen

The founding conference of the local branch of the Association of Small Enterprises (Confapi), meeting in the Italian city of Ascoli Piceno on Oct. 23, heard a presentation by Lyndon LaRouche representative Andrew Spannaus in person, and from LaRouche himself via telephone. At the beginning of the meeting, LaRouche, who had visited the area in 2000, spoke about his current fight to rescue the world economy, and answered a question about the danger of general war.

Spannaus gave a 40-minute presentation on the history of the current financial collapse, and the fight to defeat the oligarchical forces behind globalization and the policy of permanent war. He used animations developed by *EIR* to show the collapse of the physical economy in both the United States and Europe in recent decades. LaRouche's emphasis on saving small and medium-sized enterprises as the backbone of a productive economy, formed a significant part of Spannaus's address.

The national leader of Confapi, a group of young industrialists, was present, along with the chairman of the local Chamber of Commerce. The presentations were well-received. Such an event reflects the way in which forces in Italy are looking to LaRouche for leadership, in this period.

Document: BAE Bribes Go Back to the 1970s

On the eve of a state visit to England by Saudi Arabia's King Abdullah, a document has surfaced indicating that British Aircraft Corporation (BAC), the forerunner of BAE Systems, was bribing officials of Saudi Arabia as early as the 1970s. During 1985-2007, BAE paid bribes to Saudi Prince Bandar in the amount of about \$2 billion, a small part of what Lyndon LaRouche has called "the scandal of the century." Then-Prime Minister Tony Blair killed the investigation into

that deal at the end of 2006. The document, which was filed in Britain's National Archives last July, was a secret draft memo from the 1970s, written by the Defense Export Services Organization (DESO), which reports to the Ministry of Defence (MoD). It said that "technical consultancy" fees "amount in practice to the exertion of influence to sway decisions," i.e., bribes. The document deals with fees on two contracts, including the sale of Lightning aircraft, which later formed the basis for the 1980s multi-billion-pound Al-Yamamah agreement. The deals were struck between the British and Saudi governments. The main supplier was BAC.

The memo said Saudi officials "would certainly not officially approve the payment of fees, although they undoubtedly expect appropriately discreet arrangements to be made." The document claims that such sentiments were expressed by figures as senior as King Fahd when he was Crown Prince. This assertion was removed from the final letter.

Cross-Border Projects, Not Cheneyac Plans for Mexico

The way to lift Mexico out of the devastation caused by two decades of free-market policies, and 14 years of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), is through the aggressive construction of cross-border infrastructure projects that will benefit both Mexico and the United States. Water, energy, transportation, and other development projects are the only sane way to address such pressing problems as unemployment, poverty, violence, and illegal immigration into the United States.

Instead, the lunatic Cheney-Bush Administration has come up with a U.S.-Mexico "anti-drug" plan, dubbed the "Merida Initiative," announced by Bush Oct. 23 as a request for "emergency financing for critical national security needs." Tacked onto the \$46 billion supplemental budget request for war funding, the plan proposes \$1.4 billion over two years, to supply Mexican police and military with technology, equipment, and training to aid them in combatting drug

cartels and cross-border violence, as well as "corruption" within their ranks.

But as Mexico faces an imminent social crisis, brought about by the IMF's economic policies and NAFTA's destruction of the country's agriculture and food supply, the only thing the Merida Initiative will do is plunge the nation into deeper crisis, while trampling on its sovereignty and national interests. President Felipe Calderón has proclaimed that "combatting the cartels" is his top priority; but by leaving free-market policies intact, he will accelerate Mexico's political and economic disintegration.

Mexican legislators and other analysts are aggressively questioning the plan, which has been shrouded in secrecy, charging that it is really just a Mexican version of Plan Colombia, the multi-billion-dollar security plan which has imposed large numbers of U.S. military personnel and private contractors on that Andean nation as part of an unsuccessful counter-narcotics strategy.

Philippines Exports 85% Of Its Medical Experts

The Philippines Department of Health has determined that merely 15% of Filipinos trained in the health-care professions "are continuing to stay in the country to practice their medical know-how," according to the *Daily Tribune* of the Philippines.

Health Secretary Francisco Duque III has acknowledged that the medical sector is in crisis as a result of the emigration of 85% of Filipino doctors, nurses, and others in related fields. He said the ratio of government doctors to patients is now 1 to 28,000.

"The health care delivery system in the Philippines has gone critical, almost desperate... By any meter stick, the ratio could only mean the under-delivery of medical services to many of our countrymen," Duque said.

He further lamented that the best doctors are concentrated in metropolitan Manila and other urban (and resort) centers, where medical practice is more lucrative, while medical care in rural Philippines, which is most of the country, is unaffordable or unavailable.

LaRouche: 'It's Time for Speaker Pelosi To Go'

by Harley Schlanger

In the U.S. elections of November 2006, voters delivered what should have been a fatal blow to the Cheney-Bush Administration, with its record of dangerous and incompetent policies. Led by an unprecedented turnout of young voters, spearheaded by an organizing drive of the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM)—which was identified by Democratic Party statesman Lyndon LaRouche as the “New Politics”—the rejection of the incumbent Administration’s war in Southwest Asia, and the attack on the General Welfare, swept into office a Democratic majority in Congress, with a popular mandate for wholesale change.

In ten months in office, that new majority appears to have squandered that great opportunity, as the most recent polls show support of the Congress at below 11%. How did such a dramatic turnaround occur?

In a series of stinging comments this week, LaRouche laid the blame squarely on House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, who has used her office to act, repeatedly, against what LaRouche called “the most vital strategic interests of the United States.”

Pelosi’s ‘Ms.-Leadership’

While the Cheney-Bush Administration is “staying the course,” of war, with preparations complete to attack Iran, despite the continuing failure in Iraq and Afghanistan, Pelosi has taken impeachment of the war-mongering Dick Cheney “off the table,” and has blocked Congressional action to prevent a new war against Iran. And, while millions of American households face foreclosure, factory closings, outsourced jobs, and crumbling national infrastructure, Pelosi has acted against members of Congress who were moving, in collaboration with LaRouche, to address these crises. In particular, she has blocked motion in support of LaRouche’s Emergency Reconstruction Act of 2006, and the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act of 2007.

LaRouche charged that “Pelosi is the policy instrument of fascist banker Felix Rohatyn, and his circles running the hedge funds,” which have a stranglehold on the Democratic Party, in collaboration with fascist George Shultz, “who designed the Bush Administration and the Schwarzenegger clown-government of California. In fact, two of the leading national Democrats, who are both from California—Pelosi and Sen. Dianne Feinstein—are both under the thumb of Rohatyn and Shultz. And other Democrats in Congress, who oppose the war, are capitulating to them.”

LaRouche continued: “Any Congressman who’s opposed to the war policy, but is continuing to support Nancy Pelosi after her action against the impeachment of Dick Cheney, and on related destructive economic policies, is really rolling out the red carpet for war,” with Iran, or Syria, or beyond. “That’s what it means when they publicly oppose some mechanism of the process by which new wars are being prepared, but don’t act to remove the author of the war policy. That’s what they’re doing when they agree to Pelosi’s leadership of the House.”

Pelosi’s adherence to the Rohatyn-Shultz war policy and their free trade, pro-deregulation, anti-Franklin Roosevelt economic policies, has undermined those Democrats who would otherwise fight. Freshman Democrats, who rode into office on the wave of the “New Politics,” as well as seasoned fighters in the party, have backed off, time and again, from taking effective action against the Administration, under heavy pressure from Pelosi. One party leader from California said he has never seen such demoralization and impotence among Democrats as a result of the capitulation in Washington, D.C..

Responding to this situation, LaRouche added this warning: “The 2008 election will be a farce unless Pelosi goes. There will be no serious alternative presented by the Democrats. She is killing the Democratic Party.”



Ms.-Leadership, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi

Thus, LaRouche concluded on Oct. 25, “It’s time for Nancy Pelosi to go.”

‘California Is Burning’

The sabotage by Pelosi and Feinstein of the intention of the voters in 2006 for a significant change of direction is nowhere more clear than in California, their home state and power base. Under Shultz’s chosen instrument to dismantle representative government and enable Enron-style looting of the once-Golden State, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger (R), the state is burning up. Though forest fires are an annual event, this year’s fires are worse than ever, largely due to the effect of austerity imposed by Schwarzenegger. As the state is moving into a new budget crisis, fueled by the blowout of the housing bubble, neglect of infrastructure is taking a deadly toll, as fires spread in southern California.

Arnie has been highly visible, with a Hollywood-style show tour, in which he was joined by President Bush, as both are trying to avoid a repeat of Bush’s no-show leadership during Hurricane Katrina. However, such gestures are hollow, as nearly 1 million people have been evacuated, and more than 420,000 acres are being devoured by fires. Firefighters are plagued by lack of manpower and equipment, the result of budget cuts and the deployment of National Guard units, and their equipment, to Iraq and Afghanistan.

Further, recommendations made by a state Blue Ribbon Fire Commission following the 2003 fires which hit San Diego County, were never implemented, according to state Sen. Christine Kehoe. The *Los Angeles Times* reported on Oct. 23, that only one fire station had been built in L.A. County since 2003, and fire departments are chronically underfunded and understaffed.

The fiasco surrounding the fires is only the latest outcome of Schwarzenegger’s drive to implement the fascist austerity designs of Shultz and Rohatyn. Arnie himself is nothing more than a once-muscle-bound thug, who traded in a career as a mumbling bad actor for one as a would-be Mussolini. His sei-

zure of power in a recall was orchestrated by Shultz, using the crisis created by the Enron-sponsored deregulation of electricity in the state, to scapegoat incumbent Gov. Gray Davis (D).

The loss of more than \$70 billion in California, due to the deliberate looting policy steered by Enron and its supporters—such as Dick Cheney, and Arnie-backers Shultz and Warren Buffet—cleared the way for Schwarzenegger to replace Davis. The Democratic Party was complicit in Schwarzenegger’s victory, both through sabotage against Davis, coming from Kennedy-machine-connected operations on behalf of their in-law (Arnie’s wife is Maria Kennedy Shriver), and their inability to offer an alternative to the policies of deregulation and free trade championed by the Shultz team. (Some say of the Kennedy connection that Schwarzenegger is the Austrian Nazi son that the pro-Hitler Joe Kennedy never had!)

Pelosi and the Dime-Store Mussolini

Once he became governor, Schwarzenegger began an assault against traditional Democratic constituents, such as union members, the elderly, minorities, the poor, and disabled. His broad agenda, drafted by Shultz, included a plan to turn the state’s pension funds over to Wall Street, and the privatization of public infrastructure.

The Democratic Party offered little resistance, despite a nearly two-thirds majority in both houses of the state legislature. It was the newly emerging forces of the LaRouche Youth Movement which took leadership against the Governor, beginning with the only serious defense of Gray Davis during the recall. As Arnie strutted, Mussolini-style, through shopping malls across the state, taunting impotent Democrats as “girlie-men,” LYM activists confronted him, telling the truth about the Shultz-Rohatyn hands pulling his strings, while Pelosi and Feinstein were invisible.

Emboldened by the LYM, rank-and-file Democrats rose to deliver a crushing blow to Arnie in November 2005, defeating every ballot initiative he supported. Instead of finishing him off, Democrats were again outflanked, when Shultz and Rohatyn reinvented him in January 2006, as an advocate of infrastructure building. His so-called infrastructure plan was a Wall Street-concocted bond issue, which would pave the way for privatization, while piling debt on Californians.

His re-election was insured when Democrats nominated Phil Angelides. As State Treasurer, Angelides had allied with Rohatyn to back his Public Private Partnership (PPP) initiative to privatize infrastructure—meaning that he had nothing to offer to counter Schwarzenegger.

The paralysis of the Democrats has been compounded by Schwarzenegger seizing the mantle as the leading “environmentalist” in the state.

Honest patriots are thus confronted with the obvious question: Who has the guts to take on Pelosi, Feinstein, and Schwarzenegger, the clowns run by Shultz and Rohatyn? The future of the nation, and humanity, depends on the answer.

LaRouche Youth Mobilize in New England For Housing ‘Firewall,’ General Welfare

by Frank Mathis and Jennifer Getachew,
LaRouche Youth Movement

As one drives through Worcester, Mass., one sees the remnants of a once-proud city, gone to ruin as a result of decades of post-industrial economic policies. This was once a city with an active machine-tool sector and a population with a purpose, who have been left unproductive and forgotten.

In Worcester, the magnitude of the crisis is not just expressed in the 3,097 currently pending foreclosures, or in the one out of every 101 households in foreclosure, or by the increase in foreclosures by 374% since beginning of 2006, but in the overall increase in cost-of-living. This was expressed by one 22-year-old man who earns \$40,000 a year, and still can barely live day to day.

If you think this is an isolated event, you be trippin’! Let’s look at the other major New England cities threatened by high foreclosure rates. New England has five among the top 50 U.S. metropolitan areas ranked by the number of foreclosure filings per number of households: New Haven/Milford, Conn. (#28); Worcester, Mass. (#35); Hartford, Conn. (#44); Springfield, Mass. (#47); Bridgeport/Stamford/Norwalk, Conn. (#48). (This according to Realtytrac.com as of Aug. 14.)

When confronted about the escalating crisis, a Massachusetts Congressman quickly dismissed the idea that this is anything remotely like the 1930s Depression. However, when we have discussed the same topic with city councilmen, they immediately report numerous tragic stories of their constituents being foreclosed on, and there is a sense of desperation, and frustration at the lack of leadership by the Congress and state legislature. Many city councilmen have even reported that the state officials are ignoring their phone calls.

In a desperate call for help, two working-class middle-aged women called into the LaRouche PAC Boston office, as a last resort for help in saving their homes. Each woman’s mortgage had increased by almost 40%. Both with four children, they were going to be out in the street by November. A Worcester woman reported that with the collapse in real estate, the apartment building next door to her now houses drug addicts and dealers, so she is forced to clean up the drug paraphernalia left on the sidewalk overnight, so her children will not encounter it when they are playing.

Is this the condition that the population of a great nation should be reduced to? More importantly, why would the leadership of that great nation, tolerate such conditions?

LaRouche: Mobilize the Masses!

Economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche addressed that question while speaking to a group of young people on


Oct. 21. He said, “Our problem is that the Congress, including our Democrats, has earned a popularity of less than 11%—below the popularity of this idiot, the President and this fascist, the Vice President! And you want to sit back and accept leadership from politicians who are controlled by George Shultz, George Soros, and Felix Rohatyn? You are accepting that? You should be ashamed of yourselves!”

LaRouche does not intend for this to be an excuse for you to complain cynically about the Congress. In the same address, LaRouche also discussed the solution:

“Some people say, our members of the State Assembly, our members of the Congress, don’t agree. How’re we going to do it? We can always lynch them—I don’t mean physically lynch them, but we can politically lynch them! We can terrify them, politically, into going along with it! And that’s precisely what we have to do. How do you do that? Very simply. Mobilize the masses. Mobilize the mass population, and say, ‘Your ass is on the line. Your survival is on the line. If you don’t get this act through, you personally are finished.’ And that will get a response.”

The people who put the current Congress into office were those very city and state officials who are now desperately seeking answers for their constituents: those officials whom the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) has been mobilizing since 2004, to revive the soul of the Democratic Party. This fight was waged through the campaign to save the auto sector, and to win a Democratic majority in Congress in 2006. Now these state and local officials are being challenged to lead the same fight Franklin Roosevelt made for the Republic, and to protect the General Welfare by keeping millions of families in their homes. For many of them, this is a no-brainer.

Since LaRouche issued the call for a Homeowners and Bank Protection Act of 2007 (HBPA), on Aug. 22, state and local leaders around the country have been joining the fight to freeze home foreclosures, and to place Federal and state chartered banks under bankruptcy protection—the core provisions of the HBPA. The accompanying map shows the progress to date of efforts to get state legislatures and other governing bodies to pass memorial resolutions, demanding action from Congress to pass this proposed Federal legislation. The LaRouche PAC and others are circulating a resolution on LaRouche’s HBPA, for endorsement by elected officials, labor leaders, and constituency group leaders (the text is at larouchepac.com).



Mobilizing the Northeast’s Real Leaders

The Boston LYM has been organizing among state and local constituency leaders for months, including securing the passage of a resolution on the housing crisis by the Massachusetts Democratic Convention on May 18-19. The resolution called on the state’s Congressional delegation “to act as Franklin D. Roosevelt did in dealing with the housing crisis in the 1930s. We call on our Congressional Delegation to introduce emergency measures which would immediately freeze the current debt and mortgage obligations, as well as the chain of financial instruments built upon them, until such obligations can be sorted out and reorganized in the context of a larger bankruptcy reorganization of the U.S. banking system, while placing a moratorium on foreclosures to keep the homeowners in their houses and prevent mass homelessness of thousands of American families in the near term.”

As the reality of the collapse of the real estate bubble became more and more obvious to everyone, the Massachusetts Attorney General held four hearings Sept. 17-20, in Worcester, Brockton, Springfield, and Boston, on the subject of certain limited, state-level initiatives to combat the foreclosure crisis. The LYM testified on the HBPA at the hearings, emphasizing the fact that only a national solution—an FDR solution—will succeed, since the problem is national, and indeed international, in scope. The LYM ended its testimony in Brockton, by reading FDR’s remarks to Congress in 1933, proposing emergency action to stop foreclosures.

LYM organizers also travelled to state houses all over New England in September, building support for the HBPA, and aggressively countering the pragmatism and cynicism of

those who insisted that “Congress will never do it,” or “the market will determine what happens.” With this work by the LYM, and with the damage the foreclosure crisis has done to New Englanders, wrote Lewis Whilden in *EIR* on Oct. 5, “a breakthrough on the northeastern flank is imminent.”

In October, the scope of the LYM’s work across New England yielded an unprecedented response. For example, in the Massachusetts city of Lawrence, a city councilwoman responded seriously to multiple calls from one LYM organizer, and agreed to meet immediately. The minute they sat down for discussion, this councilwoman endorsed the petition, and laid out her own plan to organize her constituents and fellow councilmen around the HBPA, and even offered to hold a town hall meeting on the subject.

In Providence, R.I., another city councilman endorsed the petition for the HBPA and offered to mass organize all his political circles, including the Congressman of his district. The distinctive approach of this councilman emerged in a discussion about his own campaign to defeat an 11-year incumbent city councilwoman in the 2006 elections. How did he do it? He personally organized young people and minorities in the poor areas, who thought they did not have a voice in politics.

We have discovered, through the intensity of our organizing, that among these elected officials, there is an impulse to join our fight to freeze foreclosures and keep people in their homes, because it is part of these councilmen’s identity as leaders and American patriots. The fight to keep people in their homes will not be won by social workers and counselors, but by American patriots who understand that government’s role is to protect the people first.

A 'Prairie Fire' of Maryland Foreclosures

by Nancy Spannaus

Foreclosures increasing anywhere from 600 to 26,000% over the last year? Unbelievable? Not on your life. Those were the figures presented to the Maryland Senate Judiciary Committee's public hearing on the "Foreclosure Process" on Oct. 23, by the Secretary of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation, Thomas Perez. "This looks like a prairie fire," Perez said, as he described what he called a "financial bug" spreading across the entire state.

Attending the hearing were consumer advocacy groups, representatives from Maryland banks, about a dozen Senators, and two organizers from the LaRouche Movement. As could be expected, the only solution to the shocking dimensions of the crisis was presented by the LaRouche representatives, who testified near the conclusion of the hearing, on the principles of LaRouche's Homeowners and Bank Protection Act (HBPA).

Perez's testimony was dramatic, to say the least. He began by telling the Senators that, just ten minutes before he was scheduled to speak, he had received updated figures which showed an explosion of foreclosures from the second to the third quarter of 2007. He said he wished he could say that the wave of foreclosures had reached a peak, but he could not: The Center for Responsible Lending forecasts that Maryland will soon be at the top of the list of national foreclosures, he said.

Perez began by describing the statewide level of increase in what are called "foreclosure incidents," a term that encompasses a number of stages, comparing the third quarter of 2006 to the third quarter of 2007. But this figure, 639%, pales in comparison to the increases in individual counties over the same period. Below are the areas which had ten times as many foreclosures in the third quarter of 2007 as one year before:

Carroll County	1,114%
Frederick County	1,349
Allegany County	1,967
Montgomery County	3,320
Worcester County	4,300
Baltimore City	8,785
Harford County	26,400

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that the skyrocketing foreclosure rate has hit all of the state's 24 counties, urban and rural.

While Perez admitted that the crisis hitting Maryland was national, he did not attempt to present a solution on that scale. He recommended that efforts be made to get information to people facing foreclosures in time for his agency to help them



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

The collapse of housing in Baltimore.

renegotiate their loans, before the "foreclosure scam artists" got to them; to put clear criminal statutes on the book regarding mortgage fraud; and to lengthen the foreclosure process, so that people would have more time to figure out solutions.

Perez's testimony was followed by that of various consumer advocacy groups and lawyers, who recounted horror stories about the foreclosure process. The leader of one group, all from a condominium complex, described how a group of lawyers was trying to force the condo owners into foreclosure by doubling the condo fees, so they could make the property available for real estate speculation. The testimony was sufficiently compelling that the chairman of the committee asked the witness to talk with a representative from the state Attorney General's office.

There was considerable excitement among a few of the community leaders present in response to the testimony of LaRouche PAC representative Mike Reeve. Reeve presented LPAC's petition for HBPA, along with the names of those who have already signed on, to all members of the committee. He explained that the only solution to the crisis was to enact a temporary freeze on foreclosures, nationally, for several years, and to keep the banks open, through the establishment of "rental" fees which would be paid to the banks, under the administration of the state government.

LPAC will be escalating pressure on the Maryland legislature to join those of New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Missouri, Tennessee, Florida, and Alabama, where memorializations of the HBPA have either been introduced, or have been prepared for introduction as soon as the legislature reopens. Maryland, like many other states, is in the throes of a dramatic budget crisis, driven in part by the collapse of tax revenues from the deflating real estate bubble.

Book Review

A Patriot's Guide to Cheney's Power-Grab

by Edward Spannaus

Takeover, The Return of the Imperial Presidency and the Subversion of American Democracy

by Charlie Savage

New York; Little, Brown and Company, 2007

400 pages, hardcover, \$25.99

The Terror Presidency, Law and Judgment Inside the Bush Administration

by Jack Goldsmith

New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 2007

256 pages, hardcover, \$25.95

Unchecked and Unbalanced, Presidential Power in a Time of Terror

by Frederick A.O. Schwarz, Jr. and Aziz Z. Huq

New York, The New Press, 2007

276 pages, hardcover, \$25.95

With our nation and the world plunging, at this very moment, into an economic-financial crisis of unprecedented dimensions, these three books perform a valuable service. Each makes it clear, from differing vantage points, that the unconstitutional seizure of dictatorial powers by the Bush-Cheney gang was not a spontaneous response to the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, but a planned move toward dramatically undermining our Constitution.

The lesson must be drawn: Unless this Administration is removed, its claims of unbridled, unilateral authority for the Executive Branch represent an appropriation of power that can pave the way for a fascist dictatorship.

The first of these three books to be published was *Unchecked and Unbalanced*, in April of this year; it presents the most in-depth historical analysis of the argument for unchecked executive power, and reveals its British pedigree. Its authors are both associated with the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University: Aziz Z. Huq directs the Liberty

and National Security Project there; F.A.O. Schwartz, Jr. was the chief counsel for the Church Committee, the special Senate committee, created in 1975 to investigate intelligence abuses.

The other two books were published in early September. Savage's *Takeover* is the most comprehensive account of the Cheney-Addington power grab.* Savage is a *Boston Globe* reporter who did pioneering work on this Administration's unprecedented use of "signing statements" to declare its intention to ignore and override legislative enactments with which it (more precisely, David Addington, Cheney's legal counsel) disagreed.

Shortly after the disclosure of the Administration's warrantless wiretapping program, Dick Cheney told reporters that the President had all the authority he need to override the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act or any other law, based on his inherent powers as Commander-in-Chief in time of war. Cheney directed reporters to the minority views appended to the 1987 report of the Joint Congressional Committee investigating the Iran-Contra affair. Savage took Cheney's advice, and dove into not just the Iran-Contra investigation, but into Cheney's role during the Nixon and Ford Administrations—the heyday of what historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. called the Imperial Presidency. Digging into the Cheney files at the Ford Presidential Library, Savage found material that sheds light on the formation of Cheney's views toward Executive power, but it doesn't explain the why, or who is pulling Cheney's strings, although it's obvious that the Vice President is not exactly an original thinker.

Completing the trilogy is *The Terror President*, by Jack Goldsmith, who headed the pivotal Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) in the Justice Department from October 2003 until June 2004, at which point he resigned over his disagreements with the Administration's policies. The OLC is charged with providing advice to the Executive Branch on the legality and constitutionality of proposed actions. Goldsmith was selected for that position due to his apparent agreement with the Administration's anti-terror policies, but when he actually reviewed the secret memoranda prepared by his predecessors in OLC, he was appalled by their shoddy and unsupportable legal reasoning—which quickly pitted him in bitter confrontation with David Addington.

* To this reviewer's knowledge, he was the first to disclose, in December 2001, that aides to Cheney were involved in drafting the Military Order which created military commissions, and since then, *EIR* has highlighted the role of David Addington, who was initially unknown to the public and even to reporters covering these matters. (I was alerted to Addington's and Cheney's role by military and military-linked lawyers who were furious at the civilian-concocted military commission scheme, which they saw as a stain on the long and honorable tradition of military justice in the United States.) It is, in one sense, gratifying to see, five or six years later, that Cheney's evil legal genius Addington is getting the attention he deserves. However, it is pathetic that Addington and his boss are still in positions of power, long after they should have been driven out by patriots determined to save the Republic—were more than a handful of any such persons to be found in the U.S. Congress.

A Monarchy or a Republic?

As important as is Schwartz's and Huq's recounting of the Church Committee's findings about the FBI's Cointelpro, the CIA's Operation CHAOS, and the NSA's surveillance of Americans, far more valuable is the book's leitmotiv: that the powers claimed by Cheney and his allies in this Administration are the powers of a European monarchy, completely unsuitable for our republic, as established by the 1787 Constitution. The book opens with Nixon's infamous statement that "when the President does it, that means it's not illegal," and then proceeds to the damning follow-up statement in the Minority dissent to the 1987 Iran-Contra report—which Cheney suggests was written by Addington—that, "the Chief Executive will on occasion feel duty bound to assert monarchical notions of prerogative that will permit him to exceed the laws."



The authors show that this idea, that the Executive can set aside legitimately enacted laws in times of war or national emergency, is nowhere to be found in our Constitution, but rather, "This claim finds precedent in the seventeenth-century British kings' royal 'prerogative' power to 'suspend' or 'dispense' with laws enacted by Parliament."

Within the Bush-Cheney Administration, the argument that the President inherited the plenary powers of the King was explicitly argued by John Yoo, the deputy head of the OLC. This was not new for Yoo; in academic articles written in 1996-97, Yoo praised the British model of government, and argued that British history ought to guide the interpretation of the war-time powers of a U.S. President. Schwartz and Huq take note that Yoo cited John Locke to the effect that cumbersome legislatures "should not interfere in the executive branch's war decisions."

"It was Locke who furnished the closest model for the power the Administration seeks today," Schwartz and Huq write, and it was Locke in particular who argued for a prerogative power by which the prince could act in contradiction to the law. But, they write, quoting one historian, "by the time of the American Revolution, the Founders viewed Locke's prerogative as 'so odious in its very name ... but nobody ever thought but to hate it, and to thank God it was utterly exterminated.'"

In a 2004 article (after he left the Justice Department), in which Yoo defended the practice of extraordinary renditions, he was still basing his arguments on British practice, and writing that that understanding of the Constitution's allocation of powers between Congress and the President is informed by the unwritten British Constitution's allocation of powers between Parliament and the Crown.

"For Yoo, the 'original understanding' of the Constitution is not Madison's. It is King James I's," Schwartz and Huq write. And not surprisingly, they point out, this view of pre-



Independence practices associated with European monarchies, was incorporated into the most infamous of what became known as the torture memos, the Aug. 1, 2002 "Bybee Memo," which contended that Congress has no power to legislate anything which would interfere in the Commander-in-Chief's power to control methods of interrogation.


Lincoln and FDR: Not a Precedent

This takes us into the theme of the "Imperial Presidency"—but before taking that up, we should dispense with the simple-minded notion that the necessity for strong Presidential powers in times of crisis, means conceding the argument to Addington and Yoo, or to the advocates of the "unitary executive."

To their credit, all three books make a sharp distinction between the manner in which emergency powers were exercised by Presidents Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and what the "presidentialists" of today promote. Even Jack Goldsmith, a conservative who accepts the notion of prerogative power, notes that although Lincoln, after the attack on Fort Sumter, took a number of actions which are reserved to the Congress under the Constitution—raising an army, borrowing money on the credit of the United States, suspending the writ of habeas corpus, imposing a blockade on the South—but, in contrast to the secrecy and unilateralism of the Bush Administration, Lincoln informed Congress (which was not in session at the time of Fort Sumter), publicly defended his actions, and asked Congress to ratify them.

Likewise, FDR took emergency actions outside of his formal authority as President, but always openly, explaining what he was doing, and challenging Congress to use its Constitutional powers to take action to avoid disaster.

Addington, whom he observed first-hand, "had no such instincts," Goldsmith writes. "To the contrary, long before 9/11 he and his boss had set out to reverse what they saw as



Congress's illegitimate decades-long intrusions on 'unitary' executive power." Addington's notion of the "unitary executive," Goldsmith contends, was far different even than the version propounded in the 1980s Reagan Administration, which was that the President should have complete control over Executive Branch agencies. To Addington, it meant that the President could rule *without* Congress, and that Congress could not in any way infringe

on the President's powers as Commander-in-Chief. Lincoln and Roosevelt were not "executive power ideologues," says Goldsmith; neither was concerned with expanding executive power as an end in itself, as are Cheney and Addington.

Savage, in *Takeover*, makes the case that this is not a partisan issue, and that it has been Democratic Presidents, as much as Republican, who were responsible for establishing the "Imperial Presidency."

The seeds of this were laid down by Teddy Roosevelt, Savage demonstrates, who declared that the President had a broad "residuum of powers," to do anything he was not specifically forbidden to do. "Without seeking prior Congressional approval, [Teddy] Roosevelt launched the project to build a canal in Panama, sent the U.S. fleet around the world, and dispatched U.S. troops to intervene in the Dominican Republic and Cuba."

To the contrary, Franklin D. Roosevelt vastly expanded the scope and powers of the Federal government, but always by working with Congress. When the Supreme Court balked, Roosevelt called on Congress to take perfectly legal and constitutional measures to expand the Court. (Although Savage and the others don't mention it, FDR's March 9, 1937 Fireside Chat, in which he explained his so-called "court-packing" scheme to the American people, in terms of the Constitution's commitment to the General Welfare, and sought the population's support, is exemplary of how a morally strong President approaches such matters in times of national emergency.)

Likewise, when FDR sent supplies to Britain in 1940, in apparent violation of the Neutrality Act, he did not claim that he had an "inherent" right to violate a law passed by Congress. And as Goldsmith also points out, in stark contrast to the current occupants of the White House, FDR consulted with Congress, and educated the public, every step of the way, also doing the same with the Lend-Lease program in 1941.

There was another model of a "strong executive" during the 1930s Great Depression. As we have previously shown (*EIR*, Jan. 6, 2006), the *Führerprinzip* doctrine, authored by Carl Schmitt, the "Crown Jurist" of the Third Reich, is another way of saying that in times of emergency, the leader *is* the law. Schmitt's doctrine, that in war-time, when the state confronts a mortal enemy, all law flows from the leader for the sake of the preservation of the nation, is the real precedent for the "unitary executive" doctrine as promulgated by Addington and Yoo.

This is not taken up in any of the three books under review, but it must be kept in mind to understand the true significance of the evil policies put into practice by Cheney's cabal of lawyers.

Truman, Nixon, and the 'Imperial Presidency'

We return now to Savage's account, which pinpoints the post-war Administration of Harry Truman as crucial in the rise of the "Imperial Presidency." Whereas previously, Congress had normally reclaimed the powers it had ceded in war-time, Truman used the emergency climate of the onset of the Cold War to expand his powers as Commander-in-Chief, claiming for the first time in U.S. history that he could take the country into a major war on his say-so alone. In 1950, he sent U.S. troops to fight North Korea without Congressional authorization, asserting his "inherent" powers as Commander-in-Chief. Similarly to today, Congress, not wanting to appear soft on Communism, did not block Truman's action.

Two years later, again citing his inherent powers, Truman took over the nation's steel industry to block a strike which he claimed would endanger the war effort. This was invalidated by the U.S. Supreme Court, in a landmark ruling which Addington, Yoo & Co. utterly ignored in the early years of this Administration.

By the time Nixon became President, the powers of the Presidency to act without Congress were inflated beyond anything in U.S. history. Nixon, with Cheney at his side, pushed matters to their breaking point.

Savage points out that Cheney's first job in the Nixon Administration was as Donald Rumsfeld's assistant at the Office of Economic Opportunity, which had been established by Congress as part of Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. Rumsfeld's charge was to bring OEO to heel, and to dismantle Congressionally mandated anti-poverty programs he didn't like, such as the Office of Legal Services. Cheney threw himself eagerly into the task.

After Nixon's forced resignation, Rumsfeld was made President Gerald Ford's Chief of Staff, with Cheney again as his deputy. When Rumsfeld was appointed Secretary of Defense, Cheney, 34, became White House Chief of Staff. One of his principal functions there, was to stonewall the Senate investigation of intelligence abuses being headed by Sen. Frank Church, a former Army Intelligence officer.

Even during his sojourn in Congress, beginning in 1979,

Cheney was a leading proponent of unfettered Executive power, strongly backing aid to the Contras in violation of Congressional prohibitions, and loudly supporting the U.S. invasion of Grenada, the bombing of Libya, and other military deployments abroad.

The outlines of the rest of Cheney's career are fairly well known. Suffice it to say that by the time Cheney selected himself as George W. Bush's Vice President, his agenda was fully formed. What Savage fleshes out, is the scope of Cheney's setting and controlling the agenda for the Bush White House. Apart from the well-known stories of how Cheney and Addington rammed through their detention and interrogation policies over the opposition of the uniformed military and the State Department, the almost air-tight secrecy surrounding Cheney's energy task force, and the blugeoning of Congress around the Patriot Act and its renewal, Savage details Cheney's control in lesser-known situations, such as in selecting Supreme Court nominees, his long-time fight to place the Judge Advocates General in the military services under the thumb of civilian appointees, and his demand that *all* legislation be routed through the Vice President's office before going to the President for signing. This was, of course, to enable Addington to go over bills with a fine-tooth comb, looking for provisions that should be the subject of Presidential semi-secret "signing statements," asserting the President's right to ignore any laws Addington deemed inconsistent with his doctrine of the "unitary executive."

One element Savage does not take up, is Cheney's putting himself in charge of all emergency and counter-terrorist planning in May 2001. Between that time and Sept. 11, while counter-terrorism coordinator Richard Clarke was begging for action, Cheney's task force never met, and the Administration, for reasons yet to be explained, made no preparations for the type of attack which hit on 9/11. The previously well-functioning Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) was virtually dismantled, with the consequences evident in the Hurricane Katrina disaster.

What is particularly valuable in Goldsmith's book, are his first-hand descriptions of the inner workings of the White House. He shows how the ever-present Addington controlled discussions in the White House Counsel's office, noting that there is no reason that the Vice President's lawyer should even be in the room when the head of the OLC is advising the counsel to the President. He attributes this to former White House Counsel Alberto Gonzales's utter lack of experience in dealing with military and national security matters, contrasted with Addington's 20 years of maneuvering through the Federal bureaucracy on the minutiae of national security law, combined with the fact that Addington wielded enormous clout because it was understood that he spoke for Cheney, who exercised a powerful influence over President Bush.

Upon taking charge of the OLC, Goldsmith began reviewing the office's key policy memos, mostly drafted by his friend John Yoo, and found them to be fundamentally flawed. This

threw him almost immediately into increasingly bitter conflict with Addington, who did not take well to hearing disagreements from anyone in the inner circles of power.

The first point of confrontation was over the application of the Geneva Conventions, and detention and interrogation policies. This was followed by Goldsmith's review of the warrantless wiretap program, which he concluded was unlawful. He took his concerns to Attorney General John Ashcroft and Deputy Attorney General James Comey, who agreed with him; this led directly into the now-famous confrontation in Ashcroft's hospital room, and the unprecedented threat by as many as 30 top Justice Department officials to resign, if the program was not changed.

The substance of what was at issue in the wiretap program is still not known, although there is abundant reason to believe that it involved massive scooping-up of telephone call and e-mail information on Americans, and then subjecting this information to data-mining programs similar to the Poindexter "Total Information Awareness" program which Congress tried to shut down in 2003. For Congress to now even be considering legislation on electronic surveillance, without knowing what was done previously and what triggered the threat of mass resignations, is the height of irresponsibility, and a gross violation of its Constitutional duties.

A Permanent Threat

After the publication of the Goldsmith and Savage books, a friendly debate broke out between the two. Savage pointed out the contrast between his view of the permanence of expansions of Executive power at the expense of the other two branches, with that of Goldsmith, who argues that Cheney & Co. overreached, triggering a backlash which resulted in a net weakening of Executive power.

Speaking at a Sept. 17 Constitution Day event sponsored by the Law Library of Congress and the Constitution Project, Savage stated that the vast expansion of Executive power promoted by Cheney and Addington is likely to result in permanent damage to the Constitutional system of checks and balances.

During the question period, this reviewer asked Savage about the implications of the Cheney-Addington drive toward dictatorial powers, under conditions of economic crisis and social unrest. Savage said he had not considered it in those terms, but he did elaborate on his view that these changes in the constitutional structure will tend to be permanent. Another panelist, former Congressman Mickey Edwards (R-Okla.), who is quoted a number of times in Savage's book, pointed out that under conditions of economic distress, people tend to look to a strongman, and he recommended *It Can't Happen Here*, Sinclair Lewis's 1935 novel about an anti-FDR fascist coup d'état in the United States. Edwards concluded by saying that he agreed that the precedents set by Cheney are very dangerous, "if what you're suggesting [about the economic crisis] is true."

Art Review

Metropolitan Museum Deconstructs Rembrandt

by Bonnie James

The Age of Rembrandt

Metropolitan Museum of Art
New York City, N.Y.
Sept. 18, 2007-Jan. 6, 2008

Imagine you are attending a concert of works by Bach, Mozart, and Beethoven, and you suddenly discover that, in this performance, the movements of the three pieces are all scrambled together. The third movement of the Bach precedes the first movement of the Beethoven, which is followed by the second movement of the Mozart, and so on. Each part is beautiful, but there is no unifying concept.

This is essentially what the Met has done in its current exhibition, "The Age of Rembrandt: Dutch Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art." The masterpieces presented here (20 Rembrandts, 5 Vermeers, 11 Halses, etc.) represent a treasure house of Western art from the high point of the Northern Renaissance. All 228 paintings are from the Met's own collection; here was an opportunity for the great New York museum to really strut its stuff. Unfortunately, under the baton of Met director Phillippe de Montebello, instead of a conceptual tour de force that might have been, we have a travesty, in which these great works are organized into groups by *donor*! In the first gallery, you will find "The 1871 Purchase," paintings donated by Met vice president of the time, William Blodgett, including "genre subjects, rustic groups, and landscapes," as described in the wall text, a hodgepodge with no unifying theme. This continues throughout. Each of the galleries presents, chronologically, the gifts of various donors, so one finds, in the 1889 Marquand collection, a painting in the style of Rembrandt, "Man with a Beard," and Caspar Netscher's "The Card Party," with no sense of their relationship, except that they were donated by the same wealthy benefactor.

What a flagrant offense to Rembrandt, whose great works celebrate the universality of mankind's goodness, not the preciousness of a collector whose criteria might be anything from his "personal taste" to what might be a "good investment." To show Rembrandt in the context of his predecessors, contemporaries, and followers, as the Met could have done, would have been a pedagogical triumph. It could have offered in-

sights into the influence that Rembrandt exerted on the younger Vermeer, especially in the study of light; or on his students, such as Govert Flinck, Ferdinand Bol, and Gerrit Dou, whose works are scattered about. By far, the greatest number of works are those of Rembrandt, and the Met boasts of its superb collection; indeed, rarely is one able to see all these masterpieces in a single showing. Yet for Rembrandt (1606-69), whose 400th birthday was celebrated all over the world last year, presenting his life's work, as well as those of his celebrated contemporaries such as Johannes Vermeer (1632-75) and Frans Hals (c. 1580-1666), according to the wealthy donor who collected, and then bequeathed them to the museum, would have been ridiculous. I can imagine Rembrandt laughing, perhaps ruefully, at the crass commercialism of it. After all, it was the Dutch forebears of our modern collectors and financiers who persecuted Rembrandt, and drove him into bankruptcy in the 1650s.

As the Met's news release on the exhibition explains: "Many of the paintings in this gallery were given to the Museum by leading financiers of the early twentieth century or were purchased with funds that were donated specifically to support acquisitions. The most familiar figure is the legendary banker, J. Pierpoint Morgan (1837-1913), who became the Museum's fourth president, in 1904, and transformed the institution by aggressively collecting curators [!] as well as hundreds of Egyptian, Greek, Roman, medieval, and later European works of art."

One might ask what these works of art meant to Morgan, the *ne plus ultra* of moneyed privilege, whose "gifts" to the great museums bought him both priceless public relations and huge tax deductions.

'Freedom of the Human Spirit'

Contrast the Met's approach, to that taken by the National Gallery of Art in its exhibition for Rembrandt's 400th birthday. Titled "Strokes of Genius: Rembrandt's Prints and Drawings" (Nov. 19, 2006-March 18, 2007),* the National Gallery's show, like the Met's, was drawn entirely from its own extensive collection, and though smaller, with 190 prints and drawings (no paintings), it was exceptionally well presented. It invited the visitor to follow Rembrandt's development as a graphic artist throughout his career; the works of art were organized by subjects, such as portraits, street scenes, landscapes, and biblical themes, each of which was organized chronologically. But, what most distinguished this particular show, was the presentation of multiple impressions of the same print, rarely, if ever, displayed together before, offering an opportunity to compare them, and to look into the master's mind as he "edited" his work.

While the National Gallery also got its start with an extensive collection from oligarchical benefactors, notably the an-

* See Bonnie James, "Rembrandt's 'Thirty Years War' vs. Anglo-Dutch Tyranny," *EIR*, Jan. 26, 2007, for a discussion of this exhibition.

glophile financier Andrew Mellon, it was given as a gift to the nation, by President Franklin Roosevelt. In 1926, FDR had denounced Mellon as “the master mind among the malefactors of great wealth.” Again, during the 1932 Presidential campaign, Roosevelt condemned the “financial Titans” such as Mellon, who denied that “the business of government was not to interfere but to assist in the development of industry. . . . The day of the great promoter or financial Titan, to whom we granted everything if he would only build or develop, is over.”

In 1936, Mellon went on trial for charges of tax evasion, relating to a scam involving phony donations of art to charity. The grand jury found that Mellon bought paintings, and hid them in the basement of the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington. The paintings were then “donated” to the Andrew W. Mellon Charitable and Educational Trust, in return for substantial tax deductions. Mellon went to Roosevelt and offered to donate his paintings and some funds for an endowment to the United States, as the basis for the National Gallery of Art, in an appeal to FDR to rescue him from his legal difficulties. Roosevelt accepted Mellon’s offer. The President intended to establish a great museum for the American people, to inspire them as they prepared to confront the coming horrors of war.

FDR spoke at the dedication of the National Gallery of Art, on March 17, 1941, as the United States was gearing up for war, a war that was already devastating Europe, and which would soon draw the United States into its cauldron. He spoke about the universality of great art, which transcends a particular time and place, and speaks to all people, everywhere, through the ages:

“The people of this country know now, whatever they were taught or thought they knew before, that art is not something just to be owned, but something to be made: that it is the act of making and not the act of owning that is art. And knowing this they know also that art is not a treasure in the past or an importation from another land, but part of the present life of all the living and creating peoples—all who make and build; and, most of all, the young and vigorous peoples who have made and built our present wide country.

“It is for this reason that the people of America accept the inheritance of these ancient arts. Whatever these paintings may have been to men who looked at them generations back, today they are not only works of art. Today they are the symbols of the human spirit, symbols of the world the freedom of the human spirit has made—and, incidentally, a world against which armies now are raised and countries overrun and men imprisoned and their work destroyed.

“To accept, today, the work of German painters such as Holbein and Dürer, of Italians like Botticelli and Raphael, of



FIGURE 1
Rembrandt van Rijn, "Aristotle Contemplating a Bust of Homer" (1653)

painters of the Low Countries like Van Dyck and Rembrandt, and of famous Frenchmen, famous Spaniards—to accept this work today for the people of this democratic Nation is to assert the belief of the people of this democratic Nation in a human spirit which now is everywhere endangered and which, in many countries where it first found form and meaning, has been rooted out and broken and destroyed.

“To accept this work today is to assert the purpose of the people of America that the freedom of the human spirit and human mind, which has produced the world’s great art and all its science shall not be utterly destroyed. . . .

“The dedication of this Gallery to a living past, and to a greater and more richly living future, is the measure of the earnestness of our intention that the freedom of the human spirit shall go on, too.”

The Met Exhibit

Despite its fallacy of composition, this show is still worth visiting, simply because it is a treat to view so many wonderful paintings together. What the Met might have done, is suggested in the following discussion of three of the works of art on view in this exhibition.

Rembrandt’s “Aristotle Contemplating a Bust of Homer” of 1653 (**Figure 1**), is among his greatest paintings, and illu-



FIGURE 2
Rembrandt van Rijn, "Flora" (1654)

mines the artist's deep knowledge of the Classics. Here is Aristotle, philosopher of the senses, elaborately dressed, a heavy gold chain across his chest, which he fingers with his left hand, while "contemplating" the bust of Homer, the poet of the Iliad and the Odyssey, with his right. Homer, of course, is blind, and Rembrandt places his eyes in shadow, while a bright light shines on his forehead, suggesting his thinking "sense." Lacking a sense of sight, yet he seems to "look right through" Aristotle, to "see" him as he really is. But the brightest light in the painting falls on Aristotle's nose!—the sense of smell—and on his sumptuous garment, signifying his worldly success. In this simple composition, Rembrandt ridicules the folly of Aristotelian sensual knowledge versus Homeric intellectual beauty.

"Flora" (Figure 2), a portrait of Rembrandt's first wife Saskia, is a loving memorial to her, painted in 1654, twelve years after her death. He recalls her as the goddess of Spring; she has gathered flowers in her golden yellow apron, and offers them to an unseen recipient, from her outstretched right hand, where her gaze is directed. This painting, executed the year after the "Aristotle," is eerily reminiscent of it. Flora/Saskia is wearing the same blouse as Aristotle wears, with its elaborate, heavy folds, and she strikes a similar pose.

Both paintings are metaphors for the transience of the things of this world, and the immortality of the sacred personality, one who contributes something to future generations, as both Saskia, the beloved wife, and Homer, the beloved poet, have done, while poor Aristotle remains, through the centuries, forever blind to the truth.

There exist only 40 known paintings by Johannes Vermeer (1632-75), of which the Met owns five; they are all on view in this exhibit. In "A Young Woman with a Water Pitcher" (Figure 3), we find the same ironic juxtaposition of "sense certainty" versus cognition, in a similarly organized space, as those we have seen in the two Rembrandts. A young woman, surrounded by ordinary, yet beautifully rendered domestic objects, peers out of a window on the left side of the picture. What is the subject of this painting? It is none of objects which draw our eyes, but rather, the thoughts of the young woman, as she gazes outward, to an unseen vision beyond the stained-glass window. This "outwardness" is subtly reinforced by the large map on the wall behind her. But, then we notice, as with Rembrandt's Homer, that we cannot see her eyes, which are cast downward; and as with Homer, the light falls on her mind. Is she looking out the window, or inward to her thoughts? Vermeer doesn't say; this is one of the many ambiguities in the painting.



FIGURE 3
Johannes Vermeer, "A Young Woman With a Water Pitcher" (1664-65)

How Long Can Congress Deny The Depression Crash?

by Paul Gallagher

Over the two weeks, between U.S. Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson's strange Oct. 15 announcement about a mysterious "Master Liquidity" scheme to save huge banks from huge losses, and Moody's Investors Service's Oct. 26 move to a massive international downgrade of bonds collateralized by mortgage securities, every economic sign has flashed the raw red of depression collapse underway.

The U.S. dollar, after Paulson's giveaway announcement that the fear of bank collapses is widespread in his high financial circles, rapidly sank by another 5% against the euro (for example) within ten days. The Treasury's Oct. 16 report of net investments into/out of U.S. securities in August (Treasury International Capital Statistics, or TICS) was a shock that opened a view of the financial crash. One Royal Bank of Scotland economist quoted by the *Financial Times* called the report "a truly stunning TICS number, the likes of which I have never seen." The Treasury reported that there was a huge net *outflow* of \$163 billion from U.S. securities in August, as everything but short-term U.S. T-bills (the flight to safety) was massively dumped. The U.S. mortgage-based bubble was where the junk, subprime, high-interest action was for banks and funds worldwide, blowing that bubble to \$20 trillion proportions until it collapsed—and everybody had to dump the toxic crap.

Central banks of Asia and other countries holding major dollar reserves, dumped U.S. government securities to the tune of nearly \$80 billion in the past six months, according to Treasury reports; only the Bank of England and British investors bought them on a large scale, masking the effect until now. According to *China Daily*, Chinese and Japanese sales of U.S. treasuries grew in August, "at a pace unprecedented in the last five years, as the U.S. subprime mortgage crisis triggered the biggest sell-off of dollar assets since Russia's 1998

default." China cut its holdings of U.S. treasuries by 2.2% or \$9 billion, to \$400 billion, while Japan dumped 4% of its total holdings [or \$24 billion], the most since March 2000. Taiwan's ownership of U.S. government bonds fell sharply by 8.9% to \$52 billion.

The sales of homes in the United States during the July-September period was revealed, by official reports, to have sunk to 5.5-5.7 million per year—when 6 million sales a year was typical *three decades ago*. Median home sale prices—of new homes and resales—were shown by the same reports to have fallen by 8-10% during 2007, a drop unique to the Great Depression, but only just accelerating now. Medium-sized homebuilders, like Neumann Homes in Chicago, are following mortgage lenders into bankruptcy, and the biggest builders spent the last two weeks reporting multi-hundred-million-dollar losses. 100,000 construction jobs, net, have disappeared this year. Home ownership is back to the level of 2000.

That 2 million or more households could lose their homes to foreclosure next year, after 500,000 this year, is agreed by every report of the situation.

No Action on Industrial Collapse

Despite \$700 billion in defense spending, orders for durable goods in the U.S. economy have fallen by 6% over the past 12 months, from \$223 billion in September 2006, to \$211 billion as of latest statistics, including drops in June, August, and September 2007, according to Commerce Department reports. Sales of autos in 2007 are heading for a total below 16 million—back to the level of 1994-95, and a level after which at least one of the big automakers will go into bankruptcy during 2008. Auto plants continue to be closed down, and some 150,000 U.S. manufacturing jobs

were lost in the first three quarters of the year.

In a sad drama enacted throughout the auto shops during September-October, 250,000 unionized auto workers are being forced to accept new contracts under which the average wage is falling to \$15-18/hour, wiping out the largest remaining source of middle-class incomes in the United States. This is a major factor in the explosion of home foreclosures across the Midwest and Mid-Atlantic states.

Banks and other financial corporations have announced, or carried out, about 100,000 layoffs during 2007, as they are hit by mounting losses in the mortgage-bubble meltdown. Another 30-40,000 people have been laid off by mortgage lending companies, from New Century Financial to Countrywide.

U.S. non-financial corporations, according to Federal Reserve reports, continue to spend *more than their total net profits in dividends and similar payouts*—in other words, they are not investing.

Just what “economic fundamental” is it, that remains strong?

Has Congress enacted a halt to foreclosures to prevent social chaos and impoverishment? So far, it has refused to do so. Has it lifted a finger to stop three years of collapse of the auto/machine-tool sector? It has not. Has it issued credit for investments in economic infrastructure to reverse this collapse? That is “off the table” in Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi’s Congress. Would President Bush allow such investments by Congress? Not if he can stop them by veto, as he showed with Congress’s one attempt, the Water Resources Development Act.

Outrageous and Desperate Fed

At the time of publication of this issue of *EIR*, the Federal Reserve board will likely be cutting short-term interest rates by another one-half percent, in a worried attempt to keep Countrywide Financial Corp., Citicorp, Merrill Lynch, and other banks, mortgage lenders and insurers, and brokerages from failure. The broad U.S. money supply, what was called “M3” until the Fed suppressed reports on it last year, is estimated by private economists to be growing at a nearly 15% annual rate as of October—an absolute flood of Fed money-printing. As the dollar sank after Paulson’s Oct. 15 forced blunder, an explosion of hedge-fund speculation and hyperinflation hit oil, energy commodities, metals, and agricultural commodities. This will accelerate further, after another “emergency” rate cut by the Fed.

Most outrageously, *EIR* learned that on Oct. 12, the Fed agreed to extend huge lines of credit to two *British* banks—\$10 billion to the Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS), and \$20 billion to Barclays, two of Britain’s Big Four banks—to cover their “need of short-term liquidity to finance their holdings of securities and certain other assets,” including “residential and commercial mortgage loans and mortgage-

backed securities, asset-backed securities, commercial paper and structured products.”

These mortgage-backed securities (MBS)—as shown in a sale of them just made by bankrupt American Home Mortgage Holdings—are sellable *at best* for 80 cents on the dollar, where the underlying mortgages are being paid completely up to date, and for no more than 55-60 cents on the dollar when *any* of the underlying mortgages are delinquent. Thus the structured investment vehicles (SIVs) that hold them, and the banks that are on the hook for them, want at all costs to avoid their sale, and instead to repurchase them internally, and hold them off their books. For that, they want bailouts from the central banks.

In a signal of desperation, the Fed explicitly authorized RBS and Barclays to extend these entire credit lines from the Fed, totalling \$30 billion, to their “affiliated broker-dealers,” which would then extend the funds to the two banks’ collapsing SIVs. RBS did so immediately, with the failed Cheyne Finance, a \$6-7 billion SIV of London-headquartered Cheyne (that’s pronounced “Cheney”) Capital.

Thus the Fed is creating hyperinflationary funds for multi-billion-dollar, super-leveraged instruments designed in London for speculation in the \$20 trillion U.S. mortgage bubble, registered in offshore British protectorates to avoid taxes and regulation, and now at the center of the global banking crisis.

On Oct. 25, the Bank of England’s desperate cash infusions to Northern Rock bank officially reached \$40 billion; this big mortgage bank was hit by huge runs by depositors in September, and is headed for failure.

All of the hedge fund SIVs designed to spread the risk of huge losses *away* from the big banks in a bubble implosion and credit crisis, are now coming back to hit . . . the banks.

In September, bank analysts estimated publicly that \$1.3 trillion in losses had occurred in the August-September crisis. But a very knowledgeable European banker consulted by *EIR* in late October, estimated that at least \$2.4 trillion in *unrealized losses*—that is, losses unacknowledged, so far, in the collapse of mortgage and mortgage-securities bubbles—remain on and off the books of U.S. and European banks and financial institutions. In the next several months, those losses will have to be acknowledged and taken. The “super-conduit bailout” Paulson had talked up, of somewhere between \$80 billion and \$200 billion, might bail out the dead assets *of Citicorp alone*, the banker said—not the losses of the system.

All of the desperation money-printing of central banks, epitomized in the actions of the Federal Reserve described above, is an attempt to postpone those losses, and liquefy those dead, illiquid assets—whose only effect is to collapse the dollar, and create hyperinflation and financial markets chaos.

Yet the banks could take those losses and survive, under new policies by the most important governments, to create “national firewalls” protecting both essential eco-

conomic sectors and chartered banks from the unstoppable collapse of the rotten financial and monetary system.

The Merrill Lynch Revelation

The fact that Merrill Lynch's estimate of the mortgage-bubble losses it would have to write off, rose rapidly from \$4.5 billion on Oct. 10, to \$7.9 billion in its Oct. 24 third-quarter report, exposed the entire banking system, in the United States and Europe, as sitting on the kind of losses indicated to *EIR* by the European banker. "A couple of weeks ago, we thought the line had been drawn under the losses [of the mortgage bubble collapse]—and it hasn't," said a scared London securities dealer to Reuters on Oct. 25. Some estimates were that Merrill Lynch would soon have to fess up to, and write off, \$20 billion more, which could sink it for good.

Many money-center banks, and nationally chartered banks, have reported big write-downs, and in some cases large net losses overall, in their third-quarter reports. Bank of America immediately cut 3,000 jobs, and National City Bank in Ohio, the ninth-largest U.S. bank, cut 2,500.

But, Reuters quoted a Bear Stearns banker, "The Merrill result means all bets are off." The banks have only been showing the tail of the dog of what their real losses are, denying the illiquidity of the assets in all their "special investment vehicles" and so forth, for as long as possible. "We are somewhat nervous" about European announcements about to come, said a bank analyst for Royal Bank of Scotland.

On Oct. 26, Moody's, having just downgraded \$33 billion in mortgage-backed securities in one fell swoop, downgraded an even bigger mass of collateralized debt obligations (CDOs), tied to \$52 billion of downgraded mortgage bonds. The widely watched index of value on these securities dropped to about 82 cents on the dollar. This shock began to collapse the stocks of large insurance companies that insure mortgage securities—most notably Hank Greenberg's AIG Corp., and also MBIA, Ambac Insurance, Radian Group, and other insurance giants—which also insure municipal bonds and mutual funds.

The credit collapse of July-August—after roughly \$1.5 trillion in liquidity injections has been thrown at it by the Fed, Bank of England, and European Central Bank through October—is back on again going into November, and on a bigger scale.

The financial system is collapsing. Congress must act to put a "firewall"—a Homeowners and Bank Protection Act—between the financial collapse, and real households and the real economy. That opens the door to other emergency actions to invest in a new national economic infrastructure, to revive the industrial economy. Congressional leaders who are denying this systemic collapse, and basing their response to the foreclosure crisis on that denial, will have to eat their words.

Myanmar To Be Site of Sino-India Cooperation?

by Ramtanu Maitra

In mid-October, Indian officials in New Delhi indicated that the Manmohan Singh-led United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government is on the verge of signing an agreement with Myanmar's military junta to develop the port of Sittwe.

The development of Sittwe provides an opportunity to both New Delhi and Beijing to utilize the port for national development, and to enhance trust between India and China. This is particularly important for China since China's presence along the Bay of Bengal and in the Andaman Sea is cited in New Delhi as a sign of Beijing's lack of trust in India's goodwill toward China. China is in control of Myanmar's Coco Islands with a powerful Russian-made radar and electronic surveillance system and has subsidiary electronic listening posts in Man-aung, Hainggyi, and Zadetkyi Island.

Indication that New Delhi is getting ready to sign an agreement with Yangon to develop Sittwe port came eight days before the foreign ministers of China, India, and Russia were scheduled to meet at Harbin, China, for two-day talks Oct. 24-25, to find ways to enhance triangular relations. The three nations held their first-ever summit meeting in July, last year, in Russia. The summit was attended by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, Chinese President Hu Jintao, and Russian President Vladimir Putin.

In addition, India's Congress Party (INC) President, Mrs. Sonia Gandhi, accompanied by a number of INC leaders, is scheduled to embark on a five-day visit to China, beginning on Oct. 25, on invitation from President Hu. Mrs. Gandhi, whose visit precedes Singh's trip to China later this year, will be the first foreign leader to meet Hu after he was re-nominated on Oct. 21 as the general secretary and head of the standing committee of the Chinese Communist Party (CPC) politburo, the most powerful political body in China.

Important Initiatives

In other words, in the short term, these few days have the potential to bring together a much clearer understanding among the three great nations of Eurasia. Reports indicate the two-day meeting of the foreign ministers of China, India, and Russia could discuss the viability of broadening the agenda to include cooperation in transport infrastructure, health, and high-tech areas such as IT and biotechnology.

The visits of Mrs. Gandhi and the Congress party leaders, including Foreign Minister Pranab Mukherjee, who will be in Harbin for two days before travelling to Beijing, take place in the wake of reports which suggest that India and China were

FIGURE 1



EIRNS

close to a breakthrough in their bilateral dialogue covering a range of issues—including the border dispute, tensions over Indo-U.S. nuclear deal, and New Delhi’s case for a permanent seat in the UN Security Council, according to the India Abroad News Service.

Although it has been left unsaid, the discussions in Harbin will surely touch upon security issues. Even if such security issues may, or may not, include military or defense-related matters, it would certainly include the Myanmar issue. China, which has invested heavily in transportation infrastructure, as well as in security areas within Myanmar, to get a land-link to the Southeast Asian nations, has already made clear that a change from the military to a semi-democratic rule in Myanmar should take place through discussions with the Yangon authorities, and not through imposition of further punitive sanctions.

Moscow’s Presence in the Area

Russia, on the other hand, has also begun to develop a special economic interest in Myanmar since, according to the recently released report by the Power and Interest News Report (PINR)—an independent organization—during the past few years, Russia has entered into various business dealings with the country. In May 2007, for example, nuclear equipment export monopoly AtomStroyExport forged an agreement to construct a nuclear research center in Myanmar. Leading foreign energy trade company Zarubezhneft, natural gas producer Itera, and Silver Wave Sputnik Petroleum are currently producing oil from Myanmar’s offshore oil deposits alongside

the Chinese company PetroChina, after forming a link with the south Russian republic of Kalmykia, PINR report pointed out.

Additionally, Myanmar purchased 15 Russian MiG-29 Fulcrum fighters for approximately \$150 million in 2001. And, it is negotiating with Russia’s state-controlled arms exporter Rosoboronexport on the establishment of an air defense system using the Tor-M1 and Buk-M1-2 missile systems. These business dealings, with a special emphasis on the energy-related deals, are especially important to Russia.

While India has also developed transport infrastructure in western Myanmar, and has long been seeking a port that would allow easy and cheap transport of goods to India’s remote, restive northeastern states, pressure was brought upon India recently by the United States and European Union, in particular, over the Myanmar issue. UN special envoy Ibrahim Gambari arrived in New Delhi on Oct. 21 to urge the government to exert pressure on Yangon to start the process of democratization of Myanmar. But the next day, when he met Indian Foreign Secretary Shivshankar Menon, he was told that while New Delhi favored democracy in the neighboring country, it opposed coercion.

U.S. Pressure on India

Gambari’s trip to India took place two days after U.S. President George Bush imposed a new round of economic sanctions against Myanmar Oct. 19, targeting 11 additional members of the military-run government responsible for a the August crackdown on pro-democracy demonstrators. Bush said, “I ask other countries to review their own laws and policies, especially Burma [Myanmar]’s closest neighbors, China, India, and others in the region.”

During his meeting with the UN special envoy, Menon made clear that India had to keep in mind its interests in Myanmar, while seeking reconciliation and democracy in the military-ruled country.

In light of these developments, the Indian decision to develop the Sittwe port in Myanmar is of particular significance. “We are now in a final stages of negotiations and the agreement should be through within a month,” said an Indian foreign ministry official. Under the agreement, India will invest \$103 million to develop the port and put in place facilities to use the Kitsapanadi River.

Goods will then be shipped from ports in eastern India and taken to the landlocked northeast Indian states in smaller vessels. Logistics experts say it will take three years to complete the project after the agreement is signed. “Once that happens, it will hugely benefit northeast India and save transport costs to the region by 40%, even 50%,” said Atin Sen of the Calcutta-based Asian Council of Logistics Management. Delhi had long been seeking the use of a port to carry goods to the northeast from the southern and western coasts. It started negotiations for using Sittwe once it became clear Bangladesh would not allow Chittagong port to be used.

Sittwe port will allow cargo vessels from India's landlocked northeastern Mizoram state to navigate the Kitsapanadi River, formerly known as the Kaladan River, all the way to Sittwe, where it spills into the Bay of Bengal.

"The northeast region [of India] is rich in resources, but due to lack of access their potential has always been underutilized," Dipankar Chatterjee, chairman of the Confederation of Indian Industry's Northeastern Council, was quoted by an international news agency as saying. "A gateway through [Myanmar] will allow resource-led growth in the northeast." "If this project becomes a reality, the connectivity of the rest of India with the northeast and northeast Asia would improve significantly. Myanmar will benefit from additional revenue collected through goods going to India. It will also have a 225-kilometer-long navigable waterway in the bargain," another analyst added.

The nearest available seaports for India's seven northeastern states are Kolkata and Haldia, both in West Bengal state, and a long drive for trucks.

India's interest in and involvement with Southeast Asia has been growing steadily over the past decade, and its concern for development of the Andaman basin has grown accordingly. In 2004, an agreement was signed in Yangon by the foreign ministers of India, Myanmar, and Thailand to develop transport linkages between the three countries. When complete, the 1,400-kilometer road corridor will be a highway of friendship linking the peoples of South and Southeast Asia.

Building Sittwe port also has security implications for the Indian Navy, which has now pretty much sorted out the technical and financial details of its ambitious Far Eastern Naval Command (FENC) project at Port Blair, off the Andaman and Nicobar Islands coast. FENC will extend the navy's nuclear/strategic combat capability and aid in getting it "blue water" status. Sittwe is located across the Andaman Sea on the Myanmar coast due north of the FENC.

China's Long-Term Perspective

Beijing's move to gain access to the Indian Ocean via Myanmar and the Andaman Sea is based on long-term perspectives. A number of forecasts about China's economic future make it evident that it will need more and more oil, gas, and coal to drive its massive economic engine. But China's east coast infrastructure is already getting jammed up, and it must develop other inlet points to feed southern and western China.

While developing a deep-sea port is a step toward getting

energy resources into vast southern China, Beijing is already moving quickly to get direct imports into western China. Some of it will come from Central Asian sources by land. But it is surmised that as China grows economically, it will also need Arabian oil and gas to develop western China.

China is involved in developing Gwadar Port on Pakistan's southwestern Makran coast of Balochistan. Gwadar is almost at the mouth of the Persian Gulf, 72 km from Iran, and about 400 km from the Strait of Hormuz. The Gwadar project commenced in March 2002, and reports claim that China has contributed a significant amount to the estimated \$1.16 billion cost.

In addition, China is also planning to extend the Karakoram Highway to bring oil and gas by road into western China. Since the area is sensitive for geo-strategic reasons, and India is involved in two major land disputes in the general area—one with Pakistan on the ownership of the state of Jammu and Kashmir, and the other with China on the disputed status of Aksai Chin, New Delhi is watching these developments carefully. However, the level of instability that has been unleashed in Pakistan, particularly in its western part, due to the U.S. and NATO military involvement in Afghanistan, plus Washington's military pressure on Iran, and the growing strength of the anti-U.S., anti-Islamabad Islamic militants in that part of Pakistan, makes the effectiveness of the Gwadar port, in the short and middle term highly questionable.

The Prospect for Cooperation

India and China, despite their long-standing historical and cultural differences, now appear ready to cooperate for their mutual benefit.

Indeed, this process has already begun in Sudan, where China and India have come together to exploit Sudan's oil and gas resources. Many claim that the cooperation did not exclude competition. Addressing the issue, a high-level advisor in the Energy Research Institute of China's National Development and Reform Commission, Zhao Fengqi, pointed out to Lahore's *Daily Times* recently, that "although there is competition, both sides share a common aim." A similar view was expressed by India's former petroleum minister, Mani Shankar Aiyar, who pointed out in 2005 that both countries "are always pitted against each other to the advantage of the third country."

As both countries reach out to ensure their oil and gas supplies for the future, they will compete and they will cooperate. Myanmar is one country in the region where this convergence of interests may be demonstrated. China's oil and gas from Arabia can come through the Andaman Sea to Sittwe, reducing traffic that otherwise must go through the Malacca Strait. Besides the jamming of tankers in the increasingly congested Strait, which would delay passage of ships and create environmental hazards, the Andaman Sea port-highway connection to China would reduce delivery time of petroleum products from Persian Gulf to southern China significantly.

To reach us on the Web:
www.larouchepub.com

China Sends its First Spacecraft to the Moon

by Marsha Freeman

At 6:05 PM local time on Oct. 24, the China National Space Administration successfully launched its Chang'e spacecraft into Earth orbit. After its on-board systems are checked out on Oct. 31, it will be sent on a translunar trajectory to the Moon. Six days later, it will begin a one-year mission to explore Earth's natural satellite from orbit, as China joins the United States, Russia, Europe, and Japan in demonstrating the capability to explore the Solar System.

It was reported by *China Daily* that at least 1,000 foreign and Chinese journalists were on hand to cover the launch, which was carried live on television. Chinese citizens had been invited to be on site at the Xichang launch center for the event, in the first-ever real-time public coverage of a major Chinese space launch. Prior to the launch, according to a survey of more than 10,000 respondents, conducted by *China Youth Daily*, 99% said they expected to follow the mission, and 68.9% said they would watch the broadcast live. More than 90% of the respondents said they expect to visit the Moon one day.

China's Vice Premier Zeng Peiyan, was at the lift-off, and at a post-launch press briefing, he thanked the scientists and engineers working on the lunar program, and outlined the challenges and risks that lie ahead in achieving mission success. President Hu Jintao sent his congratulations to the launch team.

Following the launch, NASA issued the following statement: "NASA applauds China's achievements in human and robotic space exploration, and wishes China the best, with the Chang'e mission." The reference to China's manned space program is notable, as the U.S.A. has, so far, been unwilling to cooperate with China in manned space flight. A week before the launch, on the sidelines of the 17th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, government officials once again expressed their interest in participating in the International Space Station, which would require the agreement of the United States.

The Chang'e orbiter is the first phase in China's lunar exploration program. In 2012, China plans to carry out the second phase, with the launch of a craft to land on the Moon, which will release a rover. In the third phase, another rover will land, and then return to Earth with samples of lunar rocks and soil, around 2017. Chinese space officials have also indicated that a manned lunar mission could take place in approximately 2020. NASA administrator Mike Griffin recently stated that, at the rate the U.S. exploration program is being [under]funded, China may land men on the Moon before the United States does.



Chinese Academy of Space Technology

On Oct. 24, China launched its first deep space mission, Chang'e, seen in this artist's drawing of the lunar orbiter.

Although much of the world media has tried to turn the current crop of lunar missions into an "Asian space race," between Japan, which launched its Selene craft in September; China; and India, which will launch its Chandrayaan-1 lunar craft next year, each nation has been determined to take this difficult step forward only when it is ready.

Goddess to the Moon

China's lunar spacecraft is named for the mythical goddess, Chang'e, who flew to the Moon in a Chinese fairy tale. Interest in a Chinese lunar program actually began in 1978, when the United States presented the Chinese government with 1 gram of a lunar sample, brought back from the Moon by Apollo astronauts. In 2004, the government approved a three-phase lunar program, which is China's first foray beyond Earth orbit.

Chang'e will be placed into a 200 kilometer polar orbit, so the entire Moon will be visible to its instruments. Its objectives include a three-dimensional "portrait" of the Moon, using its stereo cameras, with particular interest in the poles. Previous spacecraft have indicated there may be caches of water ice trapped inside the eternally dark craters at the poles, which would aid in later human settlement.

Chang'e's five scientific instruments will also analyze 14 minerals on the surface of the Moon, to determine its chemical composition, in more detail than earlier missions. Between the Earth and the Moon, the spacecraft will study the cislunar environment.

According to lunar chief scientist Academician Ouyang Ziyuan, China will also focus on improving the understanding of reserves of helium-3 on the Moon. This rare isotope of helium, not available in any abundance on the Earth, will be needed as a fuel for tomorrow's fusion power plants. "The current estimate is between 1 million and 5 million tons [of helium-3 in the lunar soil]," Ouyang told *China Daily* last



People's Republic of China

China's lunar mission is named after the mythical goddess Chang'e, who flew to the Moon.

year. Were fusion to be used to meet global energy needs, he explained, "each year three Space Shuttle missions could bring enough fuel for all human beings across the world." But, as of now, a more refined estimate of the lunar helium-3 reserves is needed.

China has established an "expert committee," involving up to 100 universities and institutes to carry out research using the data that will be sent back to Earth by Chang'e. One major purpose of the program is to attract talented young people to aerospace science and engineering studies. During a roundtable discussion on China Central Television following the launch of Chang'e, Dr. Guan Xingzhong, Assistant Professor at Beijing University, explained that if there are not exciting space projects, there could be a "brain drain," where young people may go into other careers.

It is estimated that China has spent about \$175 million for its lunar program, so far. To the criticism that this money could be better spent on other "Earthly" programs, Ouyang responds that there will be huge benefits to the population, and that the same amount of money builds three kilometers of subway in Beijing.

Participating in the post-launch roundtable discussion, Dr.

John Lewis, Professor of Planetary Sciences at the University of Arizona, and now teaching at China's prestigious Tsinghua University, said that some of his Chinese students "ask why China should be spending money exploring space." He explained, emphatically, that "a mission such as this, costs *one yuan* per Chinese citizen. That's nothing," he insisted. When asked the same question, NASA Administrator Griffin has similarly pointed out that each U.S. citizen spends 15 cents per day on its space program.

A Worldwide Great Project

One issue that is a frequent topic of discussion is, how much technology in the Chinese space program is indigenous rather than imported, and what did China have to develop to carry out this deep space mission. A second question is, why it is important for China (or India or Japan), to do what the United States and the Soviet Union already did nearly 50 years ago?

Discussing the technical aspects of the Chang'e program, Dr. Peng Jing, senior engineer at the China Academy of Space Technology, explained that China "looked back at the past lunar missions of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.," and "learned a lot." Some components, China did buy abroad, he said. But other things, China had to "develop by ourselves; for example, the solar arrays, and the integration of the systems."

Dr. Lewis added that this mission "represents exploration done by a new partner in the game, and represents the application of year 2007 technology, instead of 1959 technology." China is taking this program "step by step," he said, and is "learning from experience."

Zhang Wei, director general of the Foreign Affairs Bureau of the China National Space Administration, stressed the importance of international collaboration, telling a China Central TV reporter that the Chang'e mission could not be successful without participation from the European Space Agency, Italy, and Australia. The European Very Long Baseline Interferometry network allows China to monitor the health and position of the spacecraft 24 hours per day. This would not be possible, if China had to rely only on its land- and ship-based radar observation system.

Zhang, who was interviewed last year by *EIR* (see Aug. 25, 2006 issue) said that this first step in lunar exploration has been taken alone by China. "For the second stage, of returning and landing, we should consider international cooperation," he proposed. "Science has no boundary of any country," he added. "We have already agreed to cooperate in data applications" with the European Space Agency, the Japanese space agency, "and other countries," he said. "We will continue to open our door to science and exploration programs, worldwide."

Asked by the television commentator why mankind wants to go to the Moon, Dr. Peng said that "curiosity is the nature of humankind. We want to know more about other worlds. We send robotic probes to know more about ourselves, about the origin of the Earth, about the origin of life."

Nuclear Energy for Transportation: Electricity, Hydrogen, and Liquid Fuels

by Masao Hori

Masao Hori, based in Tokyo, has served in the nuclear industry for many years and has worked to promote nuclear development internationally. He was chairman of the committee on Vision for the Second Fifty Years of Nuclear Energy, which published its report in 1996. More recently, he chaired the International Nuclear Society's Task Group on Nuclear Energy's Role in the Future, which in 2004 published the groundbreaking work, Nuclear Production of Hydrogen Technologies and Perspectives for Global Deployment. He can be reached at mhor@mx.mesh.ne.jp

This paper was prepared for the Schiller Institute's Sept. 15-16 conference on "The Eurasian Land-Bridge Becomes Reality," held in Kiedrich, Germany. It is based on his lecture at the International Symposium on Innovative Nuclear Energy Systems, held in Yokohama, Japan, on Nov. 27, 2006.

The transportation sector consumes about a quarter of final energy in Japan and worldwide, and presently most of this energy is supplied by petroleum. For the sake of the global environment and resources, it is important to seek possibilities of replacing a substantial part of this transportation energy by nuclear energy. There are several ways to do this, using energy carriers like electricity, hydrogen, and synthetic liquid fuels to fuel transportation vehicles. These energy carriers can be produced from nuclear energy alone, or synergistically with other primary energies like fossil fuels or biomass.

In this paper, we review the possibilities and impacts of these energy carriers, and examine the measures and tasks for using nuclear to supply the energy carriers. In converting the primary energies into the energy carriers, synergistic processes may be more advantageous than the individual process. Some of the exploratory processes to produce synthetic liquid fuels from fossil fuels and nuclear energy are presented.

About one-third of the world's primary energy is converted to electricity at present. The remaining two-thirds is consumed in such non-electric applications as process-heat for industry, space heating, and transportation. Although the ratio of electricity will likely increase to about one-half by the end of the 21st Century, that still leaves one-half of the world's primary energy being used for non-electric purposes.

As it is essential to reduce the global use of fossil fuels, it is important to explore the feasibility of nuclear energy replacing fossil fuels as the power source for non-electric applications.

1. Introduction


The transportation sector consumes about a quarter of all energy used in Japan, which is similar to the global average. Most of this consumption is in the form of petroleum fuels, such as gasoline or diesel oils, used in automobiles. Japan's electricity, which also makes up a quarter of the nation's final energy, is generated from nuclear (32%), coal (25%), natural gas (24%), petroleum (10%), and hydro (8%) (2005 figures). Thus, in the power-generation sector, the dependence on fossil fuels is now below 60%, and the security of energy supply and the reduction of CO₂ emissions are progressing by decreasing the petroleum and carbon consumption.

There would be significant advantages for energy security and the global environment, if the energies for the transportation sector were to be supplied by nuclear energy. At present, the energy carriers to power the vehicles are such hydrocarbons as gasoline or diesel oil. Promising energy carriers capable of replacing these hydrocarbons are, as shown in **Table 1**, hydro-

TABLE 1
Nuclear-Derived Energy Carriers for Transportation

Primary Energy	Energy Carrier	Transportation Application
Nuclear Energy (Synergistically with Fossil Fuels or Biomass)	Hydrogen	Automobiles
	Electricity	Airplane
	Synthetic Fuels Biofuels	Railway Ship

FIGURE 1
Energy Flows to Vehicles with Various Power Trains



gen, electricity, synthetic liquid fuels such as DME (dimethyl ether), methanol, or Fischer-Tropsch (FT) oils, and biofuels such as ethanol or ETBE from biomass. These energy carriers can be produced from nuclear energy by itself, or by a synergistic process using both fossil fuels (or biomass) and nuclear energy. The merits of using nuclear energy for production of these energy carriers are that there is no CO₂ emission, a sustainable bulk supply capability, and a high energy density, facilitating energy security.

For the case of automobiles, the energy flow to different types of power trains is shown in **Figure 1**. These include internal combustion engine vehicles (ICEV), hybrid electric vehicles (HEV), plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEV), battery electric vehicles (BEV), and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles (FCV). Thus, through the paths of synthetic fuels, electricity, and hydrogen, nuclear energy could power these vehicles.

In this paper, we review the possibilities and impacts of these energy carriers for powering transportation means, and we examine the measures and tasks required to supply these energy carriers by nuclear energy.

2. Hydrogen

Application to Transportation

The term Hydrogen Economy means a society which uses electricity and hydrogen predominantly as its energy carriers, replacing the now-dominant hydrocarbons in the transportation sector with hydrogen.

The energy sources we use for industrial and consumer purposes are called energy carriers. These are sources of energy which are derived from primary energy sources. Gasoline and electricity are familiar examples of energy carriers. After electricity, hydrogen is one of the most promising energy carriers for the future, because hydrogen is not only clean and efficient, but also can be stored. Essentially, water is the only emission when hydrogen is used.

The chemical energy of hydrogen can be converted to power most efficiently by a device known as a fuel cell. Combustion of hydrogen, as in an engine, could also be used for obtaining power. Hydrogen is easier to store than electricity,

but hydrocarbons, especially liquid fuels, are much easier to store than hydrogen.

Hydrogen is the most abundant element in the universe. However it does not normally exist on Earth as a gas (H₂), but is rather found in the form of chemical compounds. It is most often found combined with oxygen in water (H₂O). It is also found combined with carbon in the various hydrocarbons. To produce hydrogen gas from compounds, it is necessary to use energy to break the chemical bonds which hold the hydrogen. Nuclear energy and renewable energies are ideal to do this, because they do not emit CO₂ or are carbon neutral. Renewable energies like wind and solar are inherently dilute, so their hydrogen production capacity is naturally limited.

Utilization of hydrogen in automobiles, through fuel cell technology, is one of the primary goals of the Hydrogen Economy. There are still major problems to be solved before the commercialization of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles can be realized. The biggest challenge we face is the cost of the fuel cell.

Other challenges are the method of storing hydrogen on board the vehicle to ensure an adequate cruising range, the creation of hydrogen distribution infrastructure, and so on. Because hydrogen is the most promising energy carrier, it is expected that application technologies will evolve by breaking through the various problems we encounter now, although it might take a few decades.

There are other transportation applications of hydrogen fuel: for fuel cells to supply electricity to railway trains, marine vessels, and aircraft, and for jet engines to propel

aircraft. If the application of hydrogen to jet engine aircraft is actualized in the future, nuclear-produced hydrogen is the best suited to the supply at hub airports for its features of no CO₂ emission and bulk supply capability.

It is expected that we will ultimately achieve the Hydrogen Economy. In the course of evolution, nuclear hydrogen may be employed for broader uses, such as a material for producing synthetic liquid fuels from heavy oils and coal, as discussed in later sections.

Supply by Nuclear Energy


Hydrogen can be produced from any of the primary energy sources (fossil fuels, nuclear energy, and renewable energies). Nuclear hydrogen will be expected to supply the base load, because of its characteristics. Many processes have been proposed for production of hydrogen using nuclear energy (Figure 2). The leading processes presently under research and development are:

- Electrolysis of water by nuclear electricity;
- High-temperature electrolysis of steam by nuclear electricity and heat;
- Thermo-chemical splitting of water by nuclear heat, or by both nuclear heat and electricity; and
- Nuclear-heated steam reforming of natural gas, or other hydrocarbons.

Although it is not certain what course the commercialization of nuclear hydrogen production will take, a typical prospect based on the current state of knowledge (Hori and Spitalnik, 2004) could be as follows:

1. In the near term, electricity generated by light water reactors (LWR) can be used to produce hydrogen from water by electrolysis. This process can be commercialized, in some cases by using off-peak power, because the relevant technologies are already proven.
2. In the intermediate term, nuclear-heated steam reforming of natural gas, using medium-temperature reactors, could be utilized, in spite of some carbon dioxide emissions, because of its advantages in economic competitiveness and in technical feasibility. Also, high-temperature reactors could be used to carry out high-temperature

FIGURE 2
Methods for Hydrogen Production by Nuclear Energy



steam electrolysis, with higher conversion efficiency and fewer materials problems.

3. In the long term, high-temperature reactors would be coupled to thermochemical water splitting. These bulk chemical processes benefit from economy of scale, and may turn out to be the best for very-large-scale nuclear production of hydrogen for a mature global hydrogen energy economy.

3. Electricity

Application to Transportation

Introduction of electric automobiles, such as a battery electric vehicle, into the market enables the supply of nuclear energy to transportation sector. However, the battery electric vehicle is still high in cost, because the battery capable of propelling an ordinary cruising distance is pricey, so it is still in a niche application.

A plug-in hybrid electric vehicle is a hybrid electric vehicle with increased battery capacity, capable of being recharged from an external electrical plug. Up to a certain distance, which depends upon the battery capacity, the plug-in hybrid electric vehicle is powered solely (or mostly) by the battery, like a battery electric vehicle. Only after

that certain distance, does the plug-in hybrid electric vehicle rely on an internal combustion engine, like a hybrid electric vehicle.

By this means, the plug-in hybrid electric vehicle can save on fuel consumption as compared to an ordinary hybrid. All of the energy powering a hybrid electric vehicle comes from petroleum (gasoline or diesel), while the energy powering a plug-in hybrid electric vehicle comes from both petroleum and the primary energies which generate the electricity used to charge the battery when plugged in.

According to Robert E. Uhrig, Professor Emeritus of the University of Tennessee, who analyzed the effect of introducing plug-in hybrid electric vehicles into the United States, transportation petroleum use could be reduced by about 74% by powering the plug-in hybrid electric vehicle with electricity from a battery of 35-mile cruising capability.

Assuming that all of the 225 million light transportation vehicles (automobiles, SUVs, pickups, vans, etc.) are plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, then 422 GWe would be required to charge the batteries during eight hours at night. Uhrig concluded that, considering spare generating capacity at night, perhaps 200 new 1,000-MWe nuclear power plants are needed.

From my research in Japan, the estimate is that on any given day, on average, 50% of Japanese vehicles are driven less than about 20 kilometers. Thus, a battery capable of powering a plug-in hybrid electric vehicle for a certain distance, say 35-60 kilometers, depending on the categories of vehicles—which is far less than the capacity required for an ordinary battery electric vehicle—could power for about 70% by distance, on average, by electricity alone, and thus save a substantial amount of gasoline.

With the recent rapid evolution in battery technology, especially in lithium ion batteries, there is a possibility that plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (more so than battery electric vehicles) can be commercialized within several years. Now the Japanese government, as well as the U.S. and other governments, are pushing the development of advanced battery technology to be applied to plug-in hybrid electric vehicles.

There were about 77 million vehicles altogether in Ja-

TABLE 2
Energy Utilization Efficiency for Electric and Fuel Cell Vehicles

Nuclear Reactor	Electricity / Hydrogen Vehicle Power Train	Efficiency Reactor → Battery/Tank	Efficiency Battery/Tank → Wheel	Overall Efficiency Reactor → Wheel
LWR	Steam Turbine BEV	30%	70%	21%
	Electrolysis FCV	23%	50~60%	12~14%
SFR	Steam Turbine BEV	39%	70%	27%
	Nuclear-Heated Steam Methane Reforming FCV	77%*	50~60%	38~46%*
VHTR	Gas Turbine BEV	45%	70%	31%
	Thermochemical FCV	45%	50~60%	23~27%

- > Thermal efficiency: LWR steam turbine 32%, SFR steam turbine 41%, VHTR gas turbine 47%
- > Efficiency of H₂ production: Electrolysis 80% from electricity and Thermochemical from heat 50% (LHV) Reforming 85% (* Based on the sum of both primary energies)
- > Transmission & distribution loss for electricity: 5%, Compression & transportation loss for H₂: 10%

pan as of 2003. From the size and the driving pattern of vehicles, the categories suitable for the plug-in hybrid electric vehicles are the personal-use, passenger vehicles, which number 54 million. They are classified into the registered vehicle and the light vehicle, depending on the size of body and engine.

The average daily travel distances of these categories of vehicle are estimated from the statistical survey data by the Ministry of Land Infrastructure and Transport (MLIT), on the relationship of passengers carried with a distance band. From the estimated driving pattern of Japanese passenger vehicles, it is presumed that 50% of Japanese vehicles are driven less than about 20 km (18 km for the light vehicles and 22 km for the registered vehicles).

Also estimated is the relation between given capacities of equipped battery and the average fraction, by distance, of travelling in the electric vehicle mode (Hori, 2006-2). Assuming that plug-in hybrid electric vehicles are introduced in the category of private passenger vehicles, about a 70% savings in gasoline, and consequently a 70% reduction in CO₂ emission, would be realized by using batteries with a range of 35 kilometers for the light vehicles and 60 kilometers for registered vehicles. For powering all of the 54 million private passenger vehicles in Japan, the electric power needed for charging the batteries in eight hours at night would be 35 GWe.

Supply by Nuclear Energy

Since there is about a 50 GWe difference between the peak hours and the nighttime usage in the power supply currently in Japan, the 35 GWe power for plug-in hybrid electric vehicles could be supplied by the existing spare generating capacity.

Because nuclear power is presently used as the base load in Japan, additional power requirements would have to be supplied by increasing the operation of fossil-fuel-powered plants. For energy security and the global environment, it were better to shift the power supply structure to more nuclear electricity, replacing fossil fuel electricity, while converting vehicles to plug-in hybrid electric.

4. Efficiency of Hydrogen and Electric Paths

It is essential to utilize available primary energies as efficiently as possible for the global environment, resources, and the economy. Therefore, it is important to choose efficient paths, both in the conversion process of primary energies to energy carriers, and in the utilization method of energy carriers to final applications.

The energy utilization efficiencies of a nuclear energy base by the battery electric vehicle and the fuel cell vehicle are compared in **Table 2** (Hori 2006-1). Here, the efficiencies from three kinds of nuclear reactors are examined, namely LWR (the Light Water Reactor, typical of low-temperature reactors), the SFR (Sodium-Cooled Fast Reactor, typical of medium-temperature reactors), and the VHTR (Very High-Temperature Gas-Cooled Reactor, typical of high-temperature reactors).

As for the LWR-based energy flow paths to vehicles, one path is the electricity from the steam turbine generator of the LWR being supplied to battery electric vehicles, and the other is hydrogen from water electrolysis by the LWR electricity being supplied to fuel cell vehicles.

As for the SFR-based energy flow paths to vehicles, one path is electricity from the steam turbine generator of the SFR being supplied to battery electric vehicle, and the other path is hydrogen from the SFR heated steam reforming of natural gas being supplied to fuel cell vehicle. As for the VHTR-based energy flow paths to vehicles, one path is electricity from the gas turbine generator of VHTR being supplied to the battery electric vehicle, and the other path is hydrogen from the thermochemical splitting of water by VHTR heat being supplied to the fuel cell vehicle.

As shown in Table 2, in either the LWR or the VHTR case, the path to a battery electric vehicle is more efficient than the path to a fuel cell vehicle. This is due to the following two reasons:

1. Both electricity generation by turbine generator and hydrogen production by electrolysis or thermochemical splitting of water, have to go through the heat engine cycle, where conversion efficiency is limited by thermodynamic law (the Carnot-cycle efficiency is at the highest for the case of the steam turbine).

2. The power train efficiency is higher in the battery electric vehicle (70%) than in the fuel cell vehicle (50-60%).

Contrary to the above, in the SFR case, the path to the fuel cell vehicle becomes more highly efficient than the path to battery electric vehicle, where hydrogen is produced by the process of nuclear-heated steam reforming of natural gas (methane). In this hydrogen-production process, the chemical energy of methane and nuclear heat is converted to chemical energy of hydrogen, regardless of the limitation of thermodynamic cycle efficiency.

In the case of nuclear-heated steam reforming of methane, although it is inevitable that the process produces CO₂, the amount is reduced about 30% as compared to the case of conventional methane-combusted steam reforming of methane.

A medium-temperature reactor with outlet temperature 500-600°C, such as the SFR, is the best suited for the membrane reformer hydrogen production method using palladium (Pd) as a membrane material (Tashimo 2003 and Uchida 2004).

It can be concluded that, in the nuclear-based energy flow to vehicles, the path to electric vehicles is more efficient than the path to hydrogen fuel cell vehicles, except in the case of using hydrogen produced by nuclear-heated steam reforming of methane.

5. Synthetic Liquid Fuels

Application to Transportation


Liquid fuels containing carbon, such as gasoline and diesel oil, are far higher in energy density than compressed gaseous hydrogen and battery-stored electricity, and are more easily delivered and stored onboard for transportation purposes.

Therefore, these liquid fuels will remain useful for decades as energy for vehicles. These liquid fuels have been produced from petroleum by refining the crude oil. Now, because of concerns such as the forecast of “peak oil” and price hikes, there are alternate solutions under development to produce synthesized crude oil from oil sands and other unconventional oils.

For example, to produce dimethyl ether (DME) and Fischer-Tropsch oils, from natural gas by gas-to-liquid (G-to-L) and coal by coal-to-liquid (C-to-L) processes, and to produce

FIGURE 3

Nuclear-Heated Steam Reforming for Upgrading Bitumen to Synthetic



carbon/hydrogen ratio) crude oil, oil sands, and other ultra-heavy oils, the emission of CO₂ in the production process increases, because energy/fuel is necessary for hydrogenation and heating in the production process.

When the FT oils are produced from coal, emission of CO₂ in the production process increases, because energy/fuel is necessary for heating in the gasification process and for hydrogen in the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis. In the case of FT oil produced from coal, the CO₂ emission in the production process would be as large as 1.5 times that from the tail-pipe by combustion in engine (Marano, 2001).

To reduce the total life-cycle CO₂ emission per kilometer, it is necessary to supply heat and hydrogen produced from a non-carbon-emitting energy source. Nuclear heat supply and/or nuclear hydrogen supply can be adopted for this purpose if their costs are reasonable.

Supply by Nuclear Energy

Figure 3 shows a schematic flow of the upgrading process of the bitumen extracted from oil sands into the synthetic crude oil using nuclear energy (Hori, 2005). In this setup, the hydrogen used for upgrading is produced by nuclear-heated steam reforming of a part of the synthetic crude product. Together with the nuclear supply of electricity and steam (heat) to the whole process, the nuclear supply could eliminate the combustion of fossil fuels in the extraction and upgrading process.

In the process of C-to-L, which is gasification of coal to produce the synthetic gas (carbon monoxide, hydrogen gas), and the subsequent conversion of the synthetic gas into an FT oil by Fischer-Tropsch synthesis, the contribution of nuclear energy is the supply of heat and hydrogen, as shown in Figure 4.

In these processes, nuclear heat replaces the heat necessary for the gasification process, which is usually produced by the partial oxidation of feed coal, and nuclear hydrogen replaces the hydrogen necessary for the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis, which is usually produced by the shift reaction of carbon monoxide in the synthetic gas, thus eliminating the combustion process of coal and the CO₂ formation process from carbon monoxide.

High-temperature reactors like the VHTR hold the promise of application for various chemical processes that need high temperature, especially for coal processes, to produce hydrocarbons and hydrogen. However, in high-temperature reactors, because of the cur-

ethanol and ETBE from biomass by biomass-to-liquid (B-to-L) processes.

These liquid fuels emit CO₂ from the tail-pipe when they burn in the engine. So far, the emission of CO₂ in the production process of gasoline and diesel oil from crude oil has been small, as light (low carbon/hydrogen ratio) crude oil has been used. When the liquid fuels are produced from heavy (high

FIGURE 4

Supply of Nuclear Heat and Hydrogen to the Gasification and FT Synthesis Processes




TABLE 3

Status and Prospect of Three Paths

Primary Energy	Path / Energy Carrier	Status		Prospect
		Nuclear Conversion Process	Automobile Application	
Nuclear Energy (Synergistically with Fossil Fuels and Biomass)	Hydrogen	R&D In progress	FCV; A few decades more	Long Term Broader uses
	Electricity	Commercialized	PHEV; In several years	Early Impact; Continue in effect
	Liquid Fuels Synthetic Fuels Biofuels	Proposals / Research Started	Engines; Almost ready	Intermediate; Environmental Compatibility

rent materials limitations, the pressure of the chemical process should be in the same range as the primary coolant pressure, which may be a hindrance factor in some applications.

In the medium-temperature reactors like the SFR, the pressure of the chemical process can be different from the primary pressure. Usually, chemical equilibrium may be not favorable, in the medium-temperature range, for processing fossil fuels, but such technology as membrane separation could be used to alleviate this disadvantage.

The role of nuclear energy in the production of synthetic liquid fuels is mainly for the supply of hydrogen and/or heat. The contribution of nuclear energy in these synergistic processes is usually subsidiary in the energy quantity. However, the following features are noteworthy:

- Reducing CO₂ emission by eliminating the combustion of fossil fuels in a production process;
- Saving resources of both fossil fuels and nuclear energy by processes of higher energy utilization efficiency;
- Lowering production costs by the lower heat costs of nuclear energy.

6. Concluding Remarks

I have reviewed the three paths to supply nuclear energy to the transportation sector by way of hydrogen, electricity, and liquid fuels as the energy carrier. The status and prospect of these paths are summarized in **Table 3**.

Hydrogen: As a breakthrough is indispensable in onboard hydrogen fuel cell and storage technologies, we would expect

a long-term or ultimate deployment of FCVs, while seeking broader uses of nuclear hydrogen, such as in jet engine fuel in airplane and synthetic fuel production.

Electricity: As nuclear power generation by light water reactors is already commercialized, and PHEVs are expected to be introduced by about 2015, the electricity path has an early impact, while the plug-in hybrid technology will continue in effect for decades, by combining the battery with a biofuel or synthetic fuel engine, or with a fuel cell.

Liquid Fuels: While the technologies for nuclear-assisted synthetic fuel production are at the stage of proposals or the early stages of research, the use of synthetic fuels in engines is almost ready. So the nuclear synthetic fuels path may be realized in an intermediate term, and will continue to be practical, as long as compatible with the environment.

By supplying nuclear energy to the production processes of transportation energy carriers, nuclear energy can expand its contribution to the energy security and global environment by far beyond the current level.

References

- Hori, M. and Spitalnik, J. (eds.), "Nuclear Production of Hydrogen Technologies and Perspectives for Global Deployment," *INSCs Current Issues in Nuclear Energy Series*, American Nuclear Society (November 2004).
- Hori, M., et al., "Synergy of Fossil Fuels and Nuclear Energy for the Energy Future," OECD/NEA Third Information Exchange Meeting on the Nuclear Production of Hydrogen (October 2005), Oarai, Japan.
- Hori, M., "Effect of Using Plug-in Hybrid Vehicles—Supply of Nuclear Energy to Transportation Sector," *Proceeding of the 2006 Annual Spring Meeting of the Atomic Energy Society of Japan* (in Japanese) (March 2006), Oarai, Japan.
- Hori, M., "Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles for Energy and Environment" (text in Japanese and extended summary in English), Paper No. 122, *2006 JSAE Annual Congress* (May 2006), Yokohama, Japan.
- Marano, J., et al., "Life-Cycle Greenhouse-Gas Emissions Inventory for Fischer-Tropsch Fuels," prepared for U.S. DOE National Energy Technology Laboratory (June 2001).
- Tashimo, M., et al., "Advanced Design of Fast Reactor-Membrane Reformer (FR-MR)," *Proceedings of Second Information Exchange Meeting on Nuclear Production of Hydrogen* (October 2003), Argonne National Laboratory, U.S.A.
- Uchida, S., et al., "Concept of Advanced FR-MR," 15th World Hydrogen Energy Conference, Paper No. 30D-08 (July 2004), Yokohama, Japan.
- Uhrig, R., "Nuclear Generated Electricity for Hybrid-Electric Vehicles," *Transactions of the American Nuclear Society* (June 2005), Volume 92, pp. 86-87.

Cheney, Pelosi, and the Next War

Congressman Dennis Kucinich announced, on a nationwide phone hookup Oct. 23, that he will go before the U.S. House of Representatives to introduce a “privileged resolution” for the impeachment of Vice President Dick Cheney, to force a floor debate on removing the president of vice. Kucinich said he will do this before Thanksgiving. “This House cannot avoid its constitutionally authorized responsibility to restrain the abuse of Executive power,” the Ohio Democrat said. “Impeachment may well be the only remedy which remains to stop a war of aggression against Iran.”

Kucinich’s action should be supported, responded Lyndon LaRouche. But reality is that most Democratic members of Congress are prepared to punk out once again, as they kowtow to the so-called Party leadership represented by House Speaker Nancy Pelosi. Kucinich’s Resolution 333, which calls for formal impeachment proceedings against Cheney, has garnered only 22 cosponsors, and they, and their constituents, have been unable, or unwilling, to get Judiciary Committee chairman John Conyers to buck Speaker Pelosi’s ukase that impeachment should be kept “off the table.”

LaRouche has called for the immediate removal of Pelosi, as we report elsewhere in this issue, but he is concerned to convey the depth of what the Pelosi problem represents. It’s not just that Pelosi is an asset of the George Shultz/Felix Rohatyn crowd; she and her family are also an asset of the Kennedy family.

“Pelosi is acting as a quasi-Republican spy, an agent, but she’s actually acting as a Kennedy agent,” LaRouche said. “And that’s what has to be emphasized. The Kennedy family has to clean up its act. That is the problem we’re dealing with.

“Everyone in the Congress, everyone in the campaigns, knows this,” LaRouche continued. “The campaign is to get a Republican such as Giuliani into the Presidency. And how to do that—that can be done only by keeping Pelosi in the position she’s occupying now! She actually should be retired. And any Democratic Presidential campaign, should say, ‘retire Pelosi now, before she does more damage!’

“But, that’s the game. And the game is, the Kenne-

dys have agreed, or at least the majority—some of the members have not agreed to that—but the majority have implicitly agreed to having a fascist regime in the United States, in the next election. A role which Giuliani would be a suitable agent for, if people actually know what his real background is.”

But there’s an even more immediate problem created by Pelosi’s control—as indicated by Kucinich’s decision to bypass traditional procedures to take his impeachment resolution to the floor. The smell of war is in the air.

It would be hard to find a more striking indication of how close a Cheney-determined war against Iran would be, than the statements made by Russian President Vladimir Putin in Lisbon, Portugal on Oct. 26. Putin, who has personally been on a non-stop diplomatic effort to prevent a new war in Southwest Asia, first declared his commitment to enforcing the Non-Proliferation Treaty, with respect to Iran and other nations. He then turned his attention to the U.S. government, which had just declared unilateral sanctions against Iran:

“Why exacerbate the situation now, pushing it towards deadlock and threatening sanctions and military action? Only a short time ago it seemed as though it would be impossible to resolve the North Korean nuclear issue, but peaceful means were found nonetheless, and we are now well on the road towards settling this problem. I do not think that running around like a madman with a razor, brandishing it in all directions, is the best way to resolve problems of this kind.”

When the second major nuclear power in the world calls the U.S. Vice President a “madman with a razor,” even if not by name, can there be any doubt that the situation is on the edge of going out of control?

We as a nation face a deadly peril, not just because Cheney is a war-mongering sociopath, and Kennedy-Rohatyn asset Nancy Pelosi has determined to submit to his madness. The fundamental problem we face is a failure in our own citizens’ willingness to take responsibility for our nation’s future, rather than try to wish the danger away. Listen to LaRouche, and deal with the Cheney and Pelosi problems, once and for all.

ΔYNAMIS

THE JOURNAL OF THE LAROUCHE-RIEMANN METHOD OF PHYSICAL ECONOMICS

THE LAROUCHE YOUTH MOVEMENT:
REBUILDING SCIENCE, WITHOUT THE HIGH PRIESTS.


JUNE 2007 EDITION

THE TRAGEDY OF LEONHARD EULER
by LYNDON H. LAROUCHE JR.

A SCIENTIFIC PROBLEM: RECLAIMING
THE SOUL OF GAUSS
by MICHAEL KIRSCH

TRANSLATION: SOME GEOMETRICAL
WRITINGS OF NICHOLAS of CUSA
by ABRAHAM KÄSTNER.

TRANSLATION: CARDINAL CUSA'S DIA-
LOGUE ON STATIC EXPERIMENTS
by ABRAHAM KÄSTNER.



DOWNLOAD IN PDF FORMAT on WWW.WLYM.COM

See LaRouche on Cable TV

* Call station for times.

INTERNET

LAROCHEPUB.COM Click
LaRouche Writings (Available 24/7)
SCANTV.ORG Click Scan on the Web
Sat: 2 pm (Pacific Time only)
• WUWF.ORG Click *Watch WUWF-TV*
Last Mon: 4:30-5 pm (Eastern Time only)

ALABAMA

• BIRMINGHAM Ch.4 Wed: 11-11:30 pm
• UNIONTOWN Ch.2 Mon-Fri: every 4 hrs.; Sun: Afternoons

ALASKA

• ANCHORAGE Ch.9 Thu: 10 pm

CALIFORNIA

• BEVERLY HILLS T/W Ch.43 Wed: 4 pm
• CLAY/CONCORD Comcast Ch.26
2nd Tue: 7 pm; Astound Ch.31 Tue: 7:30 pm
• CONTRA COSTA Comcast Ch.26
2nd Tue: 7 pm
• COSTA MESA TimeWarner Ch.35;
Thu: 5:30 pm
• E.LOS ANGELES T/W Ch.98 Mon: 2 pm
• HOLLYWOOD T/W Ch.24 Tue: 4:30-5 pm
• LANCASTER • PALMDALE T/W
Ch.36 Sun: 1 pm
• LONG BEACH Analog Ch.65/69;
Digital Ch.95; 4th Tue: 1-1:30 pm
• LOS ANGELES T/W Ch. 98 Wed: 3-3:30 pm
• MARINA DEL REY T/W Ch.98 Wed:
3-3:30 pm; T/W Ch.24; Thu & Fri: 4 pm
• MIDWILSHIRE T/W Ch.24 Tue: 4:30-5 pm
• NE SAN FDO. VLY. Comcast Ch.20
Wed: 4 pm
• N.ORANGE COUNTY T/W
Ch.95/97/98 Fri: 4-4:30 pm
• SANTA MONICA T/W Ch.77 Wed: 3-3:30 pm
• WALNUT CREEK Comcast Ch.6 2nd
Tue: 7 pm; Astound Ch.31 Tue: 7:30 pm
• VAN NUYS TimeWarner Ch.25 Sun:
5:30 pm
• W. SAN FDO. VLY. TimeWarner
Ch.34 Wed: 5:30 pm

CONNECTICUT

• GROTON--Ch.12 Mon: 5 pm
• NEW HAVEN Ch.23 Sat: 6 pm

DISTRICT

• WASHINGTON Comcast Ch.95; RCN
Ch.10 Irregular Days/Times

FLORIDA

• ESCAMBIA Cox Ch.4 Last Sat: 4:30 pm

ILLINOIS

• CHICAGO Ch.21
Comcast/RCN/WOW*
• PEORIA COUNTY Insight Ch.22 Sun:
7:30 pm
• QUAD CITIES Mediacom Ch.19 Thu:
11 pm

IOWA

• QUAD CITIES Mediacom Ch.19 Thu:
11 pm

KENTUCKY

• BOONE/KENTON Insight Ch.21 Sun:
1 am; Fri: Midnight
• JEFFERSON Insight Ch.98 Fri: 2-2:30 pm

LOUISIANA

• ORLEANS PARISH Cox Ch.78 Tue: 4 am & 4 pm

MAINE

• PORTLAND TimeWarner Ch.2 Mon:
1&11 am,5 pm

MARYLAND

• ANNE ARUNDEL Annapolis Ch.76
Milleneum Ch.99; Sat: 12:30 am;
Sun: 12:30 am; Tue: 6:30 pm
• P.G.COUNTY Comcast Ch.76
Tue/Thu: 11:30 am

MASSACHUSETTS

• BRAINTREE Comcast Ch.31; BELD
Ch.16 Tue: 8 pm
• CAMBRIDGE Comcast Ch. 10 Tue:
2:30 pm; Fri: 10:30 am
• WALPOLE Comcast Ch.8 Tue: 1-1:30 pm

MICHIGAN

• BYRON CENTER Comcast Ch.25
Mon: 2 & 7 pm
• DETROIT Comcast Ch.68
Unscheduled pop-ins
• KALAMAZOO Charter Ch. 20 Thu: 11 am;
Sat: 10 am
• KENT COUNTY Comcast Ch.25 Fri:
1:30 pm
• N.KENT COUNTY Charter Ch.22
Wed: 3:30 & 11 pm
• LAKE ORION Comcast Ch.10
Mon/Tue: 2 & 9 pm
• LIVONIA Bighthouse Ch.12 Thu: 3 pm
• MT.PLEASANT Charter Ch. 3 Tue:
5:30 pm; Wed: 7 am
• PORTAGE Charter Ch.20 Tue/Wed:
8:30 am; Thu: 1:30 pm
• SHELBY TWP. Comcast Ch.20 WOW
Ch.18; Mon/Wed: 6:30 pm
• WAYNE COUNTY Comcast Ch.16/18
Mon: 6-8 pm
• WYOMING Comcast Ch 25 Wed:
9:30 am

MINNESOTA

• BURNSVILLE • EGAN Comcast
Ch.14 Sun, Tue, Thur, Sat: 4:30 pm;
Mon, Wed, Fri.: 4:30 am
• CAMBRIDGE US Cable Ch.10 Wed:
6 pm
• COLD SPRING US Cable Ch.10
Wed: 6 pm
• COLUMBIA HTS. Comcast Ch.15
Wed: 8 pm
• DULUTH Charter Ch.20 Mon: 9 pm;
Wed: 12 pm; Fri: 1 pm
• MINNEAPOLIS TimeWarner Ch.16
Tue: 11 pm
• MINNEAPOLIS (Northern Burbs)
Comcast Ch.15 Thu: 3 & 9 pm
• NEW ULM Ch.14 Fri: 5 pm
• PROCTOR Ch.12 Tue: 5 pm to 1 am
• ST.CLOUD AREA Charter Ch.12
Mon: 9:30 pm

• ST.CROIX VLY. Comcast Ch.14 Thu:
1 & 7 pm; Fridays--9 am
• ST.LOUIS PARK Comcast Ch.15
Sat/Sun/Mon/Tue Midnite, 8 am, 4 pm
• St.PAUL (S&W suburbs) Comcast
Ch.15 Wed: 10:30 am; Fri: 7:30 pm
• S.WASHINGTON Comcast Ch.14
Thu: 8 pm

MISSOURI

• ST.LOUIS Charter Ch.22 Wed: 5 pm;
Thu: 12 Noon

NEVADA

• WASHOE CTY Charter Ch.16 Thu: 2 pm

NEW HAMPSHIRE

• MANCHESTER Comcast Ch.23 Thu:
4:30 pm

NEW JERSEY

• HADDEN TWP Comcast Ch.19 Sun:
10 am
• MERCER CTY Comcast*
• TRENTON Ch.26 3,4 Fri: 6-6:30 pm
• WINDSORS Ch.27 Mon: 5:30-6 pm
• MONTVALE/MAHWAH Cablevision
Ch.76 Mon: 5 pm
• PISCATAWAY Cablevision Ch.22
Thu: 11:30 pm
• UNION Comcast Ch.26 Unshed.
Fillers

NEW MEXICO

• ALBUQUERQUE Comcast Ch.27
Thu: 4 pm
• LOS ALAMOS Comcast Ch.8 Wed:
10 pm
• SANTA FE Comcast--Ch.8 Thu: 9 pm
Sat: 6:30 pm
• SILVER CITY{Conley Productions}
Daily: 8-10 pm
• TAOS Ch.2 Thu: 7 pm

NEW YORK

• ALBANY T/W Ch.18 Wed: 5 pm
• BETHLEHEM TimeWarner Ch.18
Thu: 9:30 pm
• BRONX Cablevision Ch.70 Wed: 7:30 am
• BROOKLYN T/W Ch.35; Cablevision
Ch.68 Mon: 10 am
• CHEMUNG T/W Ch.1/99 Tue: 7:30 pm
• ERIE COUNTY Adelphia Ch.20 Thu
10:35 pm
• IRONDEQUOIT T/W Ch.15; Mon/Thu:
7 pm
• JEFFERSON • LEWIS T/W Ch.99
Unscheduled pop-ins
• NIAGARA/ERIE T/W Ch.20 Thu:
10:35 pm
• ONEIDA T/W Ch.99 Thu: 8 or 9 pm
• PENFIELD Ch.15 Penfield Comm.
TV*
• QUEENS T/W Ch.35; Tue: 10:30 am
• QUEENSBURY T/W Ch.71; Mon: 7 pm
• ROCHESTER T/W Ch.15, Sun:9 pm;
Thu:8 pm
• ROCKLAND Cablevision Ch.76 Mon:
5 pm
• SCHENECTADY T/W Ch.16; Fri: 1 p.m.
Sat: 1:30 am
• STATEN ISL. TimeWarner Thu:
Midnite (Ch.35); Sat: 8 am (Ch.34)
• TOMKINS CTY Sun: 12:30 pm; Sat: 6 pm

• TRI-LAKES Adelphia Ch.2 Sun:7 am,
1 pm, 8 pm
• WEBSTER Ch.12 Wed: 9 pm

NORTH CAROLINA

• HICKORY Charter Ch.3 Tue: 10 pm

OHIO

• AMHERST T/W Ch.95 Daily 12 Noon & 10 pm
• CUYAHOGA T/W Ch.21 Wed: 3:30 pm
• OBERLIN Cable Co-Op Ch.9 The: 8 pm

OKLAHOMA

• NORMAN Cox Ch.20 Wed: 9 pm

OREGON

• LINN/BENTON Comcast Ch.29 Tue:
1 pm; Thu: 9 pm
• PORTLAND Tue:6 pm (Ch.22); Thu:3 pm (Ch.23)

RHODE ISLAND

• E.PROVIDENCE Cox Ch.18 Tue:
6:30 pm
• STATEWIDE RI Interconnect Cox
Ch.13
Tue:10-10:30 am

TEXAS

• DALLAS Comcast Ch.13-B Tue:
10:30 pm
• HOUSTON T/W Ch.17 TV Max
Ch.95; Wed: 5:30 pm; Sat: 9 am
• KINGWOOD Cebridge Ch.98 Wed:
5:30 pm; Sat: 9 am

VERMONT

• GREATER FALLS Adelphia Ch.10
Mon,Wed,Fri: 1 pm
• MONTPELIER Adelphia Ch.15 Tue: 9 pm;
Wed: 3 pm

VIRGINIA

• ALBERMARLE Comcast Ch.13 Sun:
4 am; Fri: 3 pm
• ARLINGTON Comcast Ch.33 Mon: 1 pm;
Tue: 9 am
• CHESTERFIELD Comcast Ch.6 Tue:
5 pm
• FAIRFAX Ch.10 1st & 2nd Wed: 1 pm
• LOUDOUN Comcast Ch.23 Wed: 6 pm
• ROANOKE Ch.78 Tue: 7 pm; Thu: 2 pm

WASHINGTON

• KING COUNTY Comcast Ch.29/77
Sat: 2 pm
• TRI CITIES Charter Ch.13/99 Mon: 7 pm
Thu: 9 pm
• WENATCHEE Charter Ch.98 Thu: 1 pm

WISCONSIN

• MARATHON Charter Ch.10 Thu: 9:30 pm;
Fri: 12 noon
• MUSKEGO TimeWarner Ch.14 Sat: 4 pm;
Sun: 7 am

WYOMING


• GILLETTE Bresnan Ch.31 Tue: 7 pm

If you would like to get The **LaRouche Connection** on your local cable TV system, please call Charles Notley at 703-777-9451, Ext. 322. For more information, visit our Website at <http://www.larouche.pub.com/tv>

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online



EIR Online gives subscribers one of the most valuable publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today. Through this publication and the sharp interventions of the LaRouche Youth Movement, we are changing politics in Washington, day by day.

EIR Online

Issued every Tuesday, EIR Online includes the entire magazine in PDF form, plus up-to-the-minute world news.



I would like to subscribe to **EIR Online**

(e-mail address must be provided.)

- \$360 for one year
 - \$180 for six months
 - \$120 for four months
 - \$90 for three months
 - \$60 for two months
- Send information on receiving **EIR** by mail.

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

e-mail: **fulfillment@larouchepub.com**

Call **1-800-278-3135** (toll-free)

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail address _____

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to
EIR News Service Inc.
 P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Please charge my MasterCard Visa

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____