

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

May 8, 2009 Vol. 36 No. 18

www.larouche.com \$10.00

A Curious Note: A Good Heart, But Bad History
The Genocide Policy Behind the Flu Pandemic
Exclusive Sudanese Report on Darfur Crisis

**LaRouche's April 28 Webcast:
The Other Shoe Will Now Drop**



No to the 'Clash of Civilizations'!


The Anglo-American financier oligarchy is trying to unleash a "Clash of Civilizations," to block the vast potential for Eurasian development. Instead, the Western powers should join in the great project of the new millennium, the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

The Eurasian Land-Bridge


The 'New Silk Road'—locomotive for
worldwide economic development

including studies of:

- High-technology infrastructure development corridors
- China and Europe as Eurasia's development poles
- Crucial infrastructure projects in China
- The Eurasian Land-Bridge and development around the great ocean basins
- Financing an economic miracle: Hamiltonian credit generation
- The Eurasian Land-Bridge and the economic reconstruction of the United States



EIRNS
Helga Zepp-LaRouche known as "the Silk Road Lady," has played a major role in organizing worldwide support for the Eurasian Land-Bridge. She is shown here at Lianyungang Port in China, October 1998.



A special report
from
Executive
Intelligence
Review

260 pages \$200

EIR News Service

P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390 Phone (toll-free): 1 800-278-3135
ORDER ONLINE at www.larouchepub.com

Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: *Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Antony*

Papert, Gerald Rose, Dennis Small, Edward Spannaus, Nancy Spannaus, Jeffrey Steinberg, William Wertz

Editor: *Nancy Spannaus*

Managing Editors: *Bonnie James, Susan Welsh*

Science Editor: *Marjorie Mazel Hecht*

Technology Editor: *Marsha Freeman*

Book Editor: *Katherine Notley*

Graphics Editor: *Alan Yue*

Photo Editor: *Stuart Lewis*

Circulation Manager: *Stanley Ezrol*

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Counterintelligence: *Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele Steinberg*

Economics: *John Hoefle, 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 Almarino*

Berlin: *Rainer Apel*

Copenhagen: *Tom Gillesberg*

Houston: *Harley Schlanger*

Lima: *Sara Madueño*

Melbourne: *Robert Barwick*

Mexico City: *Rubén Cota Meza*

New Delhi: *Ramtanu Maitra*

Paris: *Christine Bierre*

Stockholm: *Hussein Askary*

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*

Editor, Arabic-language edition: *Hussein Askary*

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 1611, D-65006 Wiesbaden, Germany; Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, 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 - Danmark, 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.

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

Copyright: ©2009 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

I think it's a fair statement, that very few people, if any, who watched Lyndon LaRouche's April 28 webcast left believing there was anywhere they could go and hide to escape the global crisis that is growing worse by the day. LaRouche laid it out: We are now in a deflationary process, leading to a general physical collapse of the world economy; the second "shoe to drop" will be the result of the bailouts adopted by the Bush and Obama Administrations: a hyperinflationary explosion, like that in Weimar Germany of 1923. As LaRouche emphasizes, and as some "mainstream" commentators are also recognizing, bailing out Wall Street is *not* a Franklin Roosevelt-style policy, despite President Obama's invocations of FDR.

Reading the questions that came in during the webcast from around the world, you will find a high level of serious reflection and deliberation over what LaRouche is saying, and what he is proposing as the solution. One questioner, for example (who is by no means a "conspiracy theorist" of the sort one finds on blogs-from-outer-space), wanted LaRouche's response to his own contention that "the current economic meltdown and everything that has followed it, particularly the bailout, represent the equivalent of a coup d'état," a power-grab that threatens to turn the government into "one giant Enron." LaRouche's reply takes the point one step further, in an unexpected direction.

Many people said they were "blown away" by what LaRouche said on environmentalism: windmills, "cap and trade," solar panels, and the rest of it. He pulled no punches, stating that such policies mean *genocide*, and are right in line with centuries of British imperial Malthusianism. Viewers were shocked, and many who had not understood the point before, began to "get it." For documentation, see the article on "cap and trade" in *Economics*.

Of course, the issue of the swine flu pandemic came up. Although there is a lot we don't know, it can definitely be said that the outbreak is a direct result of globalization, as our package in *Economics* reports. Standard public-health measures are definitely needed, but the fundamental solution is to reverse the 40-year economic policies that have relegated entire nations and population groups to the human scrap heap.



Cover This Week

President Obama with advisors, including economic behaviorists Larry Summers (left) and Peter Orszag (second from left).



White House/Peter Souza

4 **LaRouche's April 28 Webcast: The Other Shoe Will Now Drop**

In his webcast from Washington, with a satellite hookup to New York City, Lyndon LaRouche exposed the clinical insanity among various political circles, whose policies will rapidly lead to hyperinflation on the scale of 1923 Weimar Germany. In that case, LaRouche stated, "hyperinflation had blown out the very existence of a German economy." If the U.S. policy is not changed, from everything it has done since President Obama's trip to London, LaRouche said, the entire world economy will go, creating conditions for the population of the planet to fall from 6.7 billion people, to less than 2 billion. LaRouche's solution: Since the world depends on the credit potential of the dollar, the only way to prevent this collapse, is to retain the potential of the dollar for supporting *physical production*, and not supporting worthless financial paper, as is now being done.

Strategy

46 **A Curious Note: A Good Heart, But Bad History**

Lyndon LaRouche comments on a *Moscow Times* piece of April 24, "Anti-Nazi Bill Targets Ukraine, Baltic States." Author Natalya Krainova says the bill "would make the rehabilitation of Nazism a crime which could result in Moscow cutting diplomatic ties with other former Soviet republics." LaRouche cautions that the article misses the essential fact, and that one should first ask, "How and why did the British monarchy, first, create both Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler as British-sponsored dictators, and, later, turn against Hitler, but only when the Wehrmacht was overrunning France?"

Economics

- 52 The Genocide Policy Behind the Influenza Pandemic**
The new influenza virus advancing across the planet is bringing home to people, in a terrifying way, the reality that the human race and globalization cannot continue to co-exist. Either globalization is buried, or undertakers will be needed to bury upwards of 5 billion people. And that would *not* be good for “the environment.” The World Health Organization has declared a Level Five alert, signalling that “a pandemic is imminent.” Yet budget cuts and drug legalization threaten to spread the Type A(H1N1) virus even faster.
- 55 Crash Anti-Pandemic Program: Rebuild Nations, Public Health, Food Production**
- 59 LaRouche Was Right: Austerity Policies Will Cause Pandemics**
- 60 Cap and Trade Is Genocide**
- 63 The ‘Behavioral Economists’: Circle of Evil Around President Obama**
- 64 Why Larry Summers Should Be Immediately Unemployed**

International

- 66 Britain and France Lead the Attack Against Sudan**
President Obama’s Special Envoy to Sudan, Maj. Gen. Scott Gration (ret.), and Sen. John Kerry, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, have signaled a change in U.S. policy toward Sudan, away from confrontation, and toward bilateral diplomatic engagement. Yet, it seems that UN Ambassador Susan Rice didn’t get the memo.
- 67 We Fight for a Better Life for Our Entire Population**
Sudan’s Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Mutrif Siddiq, gave this briefing at the Sudan Foreign Ministry on April 6, to foreign delegates, including several *EIR* correspondents.
- 71 The Western Media Is Lying About Darfur**
An interview with Osman Yosuf Kibr, the governor of North Darfur State.

Interviews

- 71 Osman Yosuf Kibr**
The Wali (governor) of North Darfur State in Sudan, gave this interview to LaRouche Youth Movement leader Summer Shields on April 7. Wali Kibr presents a picture of Darfur which is at odds with the distorted image found in the Western media.

Editorial

- 72 Pakistan on the Brink**

LAROUCHE'S APRIL 28 WEBCAST

The Other Shoe Will Now Drop

Lyndon LaRouche gave a webcast address in Washington D.C. April 28, with a satellite link to a gathering in New York City. The webcast was co-hosted by LaRouche's national spokespersons, Harley Schlanger in Washington, and Debra Freeman in New York.

Harley Schlanger: Good afternoon. I'm Harley Schlanger, and on behalf of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, I would like to welcome you all to today's webcast.

Just over two weeks ago, on April 11, economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche delivered a shock, when he described the urgent crisis facing our nation and the world, due to what he developed as President Obama's "Narcissus Syndrome." Due to his obsessive desire to be popular, the President has been following the policy dictates of his chief economic advisor, Larry Summers, the kingpin of a nest of vipers in the Obama Administration, who call themselves "behavioral economists." In that webcast, and in the question-and-answer period which followed, Mr. LaRouche did what he is famous for: He told the truth, about Summers, Peter Orszag, and the whole group, in a relentless exposition of why, if Summers is not removed, and if the so-called free-market policies, including the bailout he is pushing on behalf of the criminal swindle run by the City of London and Wall Street, if they are not stopped, not only will

the Obama Presidency collapse, but the lives of billions of people on this planet will be endangered by a hyper-inflationary blowout collapse of the global financial system.

While many people responded initially with fear to what Mr. LaRouche said, I know that many of those who are fearful also know that he is right. Today, with human civilization hanging by a fraying thread, it is more necessary than ever, that Mr. LaRouche continue to speak truthfully about the crisis, and about the axiomatic flaws that cause many of you to shrink in fear, instead of taking up the clear solutions he has provided, to reverse this crisis.


For today's webcast, we are here in Washington, D.C., and we're linked, as well, to New York City through a satellite broadcast, where my colleague, LaRouche's national spokesman Debra Freeman, will participate in the question and answer.

It is now my great honor, to introduce Lyndon LaRouche.

Clinical Insanity Leading to Hyperinflation

Lyndon LaRouche: Thank you.

We just had another report from the conversations among various political circles on the world economic situation, and they're still all crazy. They are debating which of two scenarios might be the rescue of the world



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon LaRouche warned that unless the Obama Administration's policies change quickly, the current deflationary trend will accelerate to a physical collapse of the U.S. economy; at the same time, the bailouts are fueling a hyperinflationary process—the "other shoe" that will drop soon.

economy, or bringing some order into it. All of this is junk. It never would work. It's a complete failure.

We are now in the process—we are approaching, as in Germany, in 1923: In the immediate aftermath of the Versailles agreements, Germany went into a plunge, into a depression. And then, in order for Germany to pay its Versailles debts which had been ordered, it went into a hyperinflationary phase, in the Spring of 1923, and by November of 1923, the hyperinflation had blown out the very existence of a German economy.

We're now in a somewhat comparable situation today, in the United States, and in the world at large. We are now in what appears to be a deflationary process, where jobs are disappearing—something like 700,000 a month—in the United States. And that rate of job loss is going to accelerate, as the way it goes now. We're headed toward a general *physical collapse of the U.S. economy*, and that's in the short term.

Now, we're going to go to another phase with this bailout process, of attempting to manage an inflationary process, to try to keep the values of bank assets and so forth, up. Which will now do the same thing it did in

Germany, in the late Spring, Summer, and Autumn of 1923: The entire world system, not just the U.S. system, but the entire world system *will blow out*, in a financial breakdown crisis of a hyperinflationary type, such as that that hit Germany in the Autumn, November of 1923. That's what we face.

In response to this reality, everyone I hear, from every official quarter, is completely incompetent and insane, in terms of the effect. This is clinical insanity. And unless the present policies of the United States in particular, are reversed from what they've been since the President went to London, there is no chance for the United States. And if the United States goes, the entire world economy will go.

What we are faced with, is the potentiality, within a relatively short period of time, that a process will occur, *especially if the so-called environmentalist program is adopted*—if an environmentalist

policy is applied to the present situation—cap and trade: Cap and trade is Hitler policy. It's mass murder! If that policy were to be adopted under these conditions, these global conditions, then the population of the planet would fall rapidly, from 6.7 billion people *to less than 2*. And less than 2 billion people is the policy of the British monarchy, as stated repeatedly by Prince Philip. The policy is to reduce the world population to less than 2 billion people, by cap-and-trade methods.

So, as long as the U.S. government supports cap and trade, as long as the Obama Administration supports cap and trade, you're looking for a genocide globally, and in the United States, beyond belief.

Now, this coincides with a phenomenon of which there is some debate. But the debate is not about the danger of the present swine flu and related problems. What has happened, is, the breakdown—as always—the breakdown of a physical economy, particularly a global physical economy, as has been happening recently, always leads to the outbreak of conditions for mass pandemics. And we have a virtual explosion of a global, mass pandemic situation on our hands today. As

long as the present policies, the present economic policies of the present administration, the present Obama Administration, are continued, there is *nothing you can do*. You may inhibit the problem, but you can't stop it. We're now at a breakdown crisis: The preconditions for mass death throughout the planet are already there.

So, unless the Obama Administration is induced to change its policy—*radically*—from everything it has done, since the trip to London by President Obama—if that is not done, we're in a global catastrophe beyond belief. And no part of the world is exempt from that catastrophe. This is global.

For Example: China and Russia

There are other things.

You know, people don't think in terms of what a global system is. Take the case of China and Russia, as two primary cases. Russia, to a lesser degree, China to a greater degree: China was induced to reorient itself to become an export economy. We dumped, and closed down U.S. industries. We transported that production to China. And China's cheap labor replaced U.S. labor. We shut down our factories, we closed down our production capabilities, and we exported it to China. Why? Because China would work more cheaply than we would. So, now China is faced with a situation, where its whole economy is on the verge of a general collapse. Because not only is the collapse of the world market, through this financial collapse, collapsing the economy of China, but *China has no possibility, under the present system, of ever recovering from this collapse, which will only become worse*.

So, as long as the present world international monetary system and policies continue, China is condemned to vast rates of mass death. And other parts of the world as well.

Russia was not a production exporter; essentially, it was a petroleum and gas exporter. Russia depended upon this. Then Russia found out that contrary to the opinion of leading circles in Russia that this crash in the United States would not affect Russia, it would not affect all of Europe, that they would be exempt—they found very quickly that they're not exempt. And the Russian economy is now in a crisis, a deep crisis, where its present economic policies will not work, and will only lead to a perpetuation of this crisis.

Europe is crashing. Western and Central European economies are collapsing. The British economy is col-

lapsing. India is not yet collapsing, because India has a rather mild degree of export dependency for its economy. Europe is in a hopeless situation: Western and Central Europe are presently ungovernable, because they have no sovereignty. Globalization has eliminated the factor of sovereignty among the states of Western and Central Europe. The British are also part of this: They are in the dominant position, relatively, politically. But the British economy is a hopeless mess. It has no intrinsic, very little intrinsic, ability to ever recover, under its own power, even under the best policy.

So, in the center of all this, is that the world market, the world financial market, is based largely on dollar denominations. It's into a dollar market. Now, all the other markets are collapsing. The dollar market is collapsing. It's collapsing at an accelerating rate, which means, that unless you fix the United States, unless you fix U.S. policy, the whole world is going into a chain-reaction collapse, which can easily bring about, within a generation or two, the kind of rates of death, from starvation, disease and so forth, which will reduce the world's population to the goals of Prince Philip and the World Wildlife Fund, which is less than 2 billion people, from now, presently, 6.7 billion people.

I cite this fact at the opening, to indicate the *absolute insanity, of assuming there will ever be a recovery, under the present world system*, or assuming that there will ever be a survival of the United States, under the current Presidency's current policies. Therefore, from a world scale, since it's the dollar system which must be sustained, in order to maintain the world market for countries such as China, Russia, and so forth, therefore the U.S. economy must be fixed, now, *or else the world as a whole, goes to Hell!* That's the situation.

That's the reality. Anybody who argues against that, is contributing to insanity. They're contributing to the destruction of civilization. The Obama Administration *must now change its policy, and very damn soon!* Otherwise, the planet as a whole is going to Hell. Because of the dependency upon the essential credit potential, of the United States dollar—not the United States economy, the United States dollar; unless that potential remains, as a potential for supporting *physical production*—not supporting financial paper, supporting *physical production*.

In other words, we need long-term treaty agreements among nations, such as China, which will, in turn, provide the credit for *production* of food, infra-

A German magazine (1918) denounces the British: "The English Dentist and the Dutchman," with the caption: "I need your teeth to make myself new dentures."

structure, and industry. *Not finance! Don't bail out banks*, as such. What you do, is put banks through reorganization: You take all of the crap out of the banks, and you freeze it. You take the part of the banks that corresponds to real assets, production assets, and you support the banks, as under the U.S. system.


The World Monetary System Is the Disease

What you also have to do, is you have to, in this process, *eliminate* the present world monetary system! Because the present world monetary system is the disease which is killing the world. So therefore, forget the IMF! The IMF is a bankrupt, useless institution. It has no value, whatsoever. Get rid of it! It's a pestilence. You want to survive? Get rid of the IMF. But you have to replace it, not just get rid of it.

In order to replace it, what do you have to do? You have to go back to the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. Constitution provides the only basis for a system which leads to the recovery of the world's economy today. No nation of this planet can survive, without this action by the United States. Because otherwise, if the United States goes, every other part of the world will go into a Dark Age, as a chain-reaction effect.


Go back to the 14th Century: You had a similar situation in the 14th Century. Germany's situation is

Der englische Zahnarzt beim Holländer



Simplicissimus

Zeugereifahren an der Ruhr



Simplicissimus

FIGURE 1
Weimar Hyperinflation in 1923:
Wholesale Prices (1913 = 1)

(logarithmic scale)



French troops occupied Germany's Ruhr region in January 1923, when Germany was unable to meet reparations payments. *Headline: "Black Banners of Mourning in the Ruhr"; caption: "All for nothing. French capital prevailed."*

an example of what can happen. But Germany in 1923 was a special case, Weimar Germany. It was

operating under restrictions which were imposed by the Versailles conditionalities. And therefore, it was a frozen nation and could not operate on a world scale in any way. Therefore, as long as it was going to pay the conditionalities, specified by Versailles, it was going to go into hyperinflation, and collapse. It had no other alternative. And this was done directly by the British, with the support of Woodrow Wilson and company. That's how it happened; and by the French government

of that time, which acted like a bunch of pigs in that situation.

The British had started the war, but Germany was accused of having the sole war guilt. It was the British who organized World War I, or what's called World War I. They organized it by getting the Chancellor of Germany, Bismarck, fired. Then they killed the President of France, Sadi Carnot. Then they organized Japan to agree to go to permanent warfare against the United States, China, and Russia. And that policy, of going against the United States, an agreement between the British and Japan, reached in 1894, with the war launched in 1895, determined the general history of the world from 1890—the ouster of Bismarck—until the Summer of 1945, which was the official close of World War II.

And the British did it! The same British Empire which is steering policies today. The same British Empire which is controlling the policies of the President of the United States at this time, and has been controlling him ever since his visit to London, recently. The President of the United States currently has done nothing good, but only bad things, to the U. S. economy and to the world, since that trip to London, the trip he should never have made. And it was only his own ego that got in the way of seeing reality: He wanted to be embraced by the Queen, who is the center, practically, the female version of Satan, at this particular time.

She's the head of that! This little woman, who's shrinking and shrinking, and shrinking, as she gets older. This little woman, is officially the center of Satan's operations globally. She's evil! She's the world's biggest drug pusher, officially. You know anyone who died of drugs, anyone who suffered from drug addiction? Blame her! The British have been running the international drug trade since the 1790s, when they started the business. They conducted the Opium War against China. They're conducting an Opium War against all of the Americas, today, right now: Legalization of marijuana, legalization of other drugs, destroys nations and destroys people!

You look at the condition of China, in the latter part of the 19th Century, as a result of the Opium Wars: The destruction of the morality of the Chinese people, the ability to function, was crucially impaired, by the spread of drugs! This was an intentional policy of the British Empire against China. Which was then reinforced, by

the agreement of the British monarchy, the Prince of Wales, with the Mikado, to launch warfare—first, at that time, against China and Russia. Japan was organized to conduct war against China and Russia!

And later, in the early 1920s, the British conducted an agreement, which was aimed at *an attack on Pearl Harbor by Japan*. The Japan attack on Pearl Harbor, was based on an agreement which the British had reached with Japan, including the United States in the targets, together with Germany and Russia, of Japan at that time. The British Empire!

These are facts. This is the truth! The contrary is either foolishness or lies; or stupidity, ignorance, or lies. *The British Empire is the enemy of the United States and civilization!* Once you understand that—

Well, take the case of the Middle East, so-called: Why do Arabs and Israelis kill each other? Why is there a threat of an attack upon Iran? Why are these things occurring? The British Empire! The Queen, the good, old little Queen, the shrinking Queen. I don't recommend queens.

No, this is the purpose of the process.

What Is This Empire?

What's behind this? Why? What is this empire? What does it represent? Where the hell did it come from, and I do mean Hell.

Well, it's a long story: Empire is a fairly old story in known history, and in European history, it centers around a process which pivoted upon the Peloponnesian War. Greece, Athens, had become a great power, a maritime power, in that period, through the defeat of the Persian Empire. At that time, Athens turned evil, and started what became known as the Peloponnesian War. As a result of this process, Greek civilization went into a collapse phase. And despite the efforts of a group around Plato to reverse that process, the arrival of Aristotle as a replacement for Plato, ensured a certain degeneration of the entire culture of the Mediterranean from that time on.

From that point on, centered upon the cult of Delphi, the Apollo/Dionysian cult, which was also a big maritime financial cult, which was operating the predatory financial operations, and monetary operations, throughout the Mediterranean. You had the beginning of a process of empire.

Now, this process was somewhat screwed up by Alexander the Great. But with the death of Alexander the

Great, there was a continuing process of trying to form an empire based on the Mediterranean's maritime role, its financial-maritime role. This led to the efforts to unite the Middle East, to unite Egypt and Italy—Rome—as a maritime force to control the entire Mediterranean, with one big financial imperial order. And through an agreement with a cult from the Middle East, an agreement reached on the Isle of Capri, the agreement was struck to get rid of Cleopatra and others, and to establish a single empire for the entire region, based on the Mediterranean. This became known as the Roman Empire. It went through quite a process, but the so-called Caesar Augustus, or Augustus Caesar, actually established by agreement with a religious cult on the Isle of Capri, established a world empire, whose headquarters was nominally Rome, under which the Middle East, Egypt, and the power of Rome in the Mediterranean, dominated the world.

Now, this empire was essentially a financial empire, and when you look at it as a financial empire, you understand it. It had two principles, which you will see expressed in the Middle East today. The first principle is religious warfare. Now religious warfare has two forms. Religious warfare has, first of all, the form of explicit religious conflicts. You get a number of religions each to hate each other, and kill each other, because of religious hatred. But there's another form of religious hatred, which is not necessarily religious; it's called, cultural. So there's a relationship between religious warfare as such, and cultural warfare, which has the same form, as like race hatred, or national hatreds among peoples.

The way an empire operates, an empire has always been, in the history of Europe, all empires have been financial empires, essentially. They're not empires of nations, they're not sovereign systems of nations. The nations are ruled, the groups of nations, are ruled by a financial power, a monetary-financial power. That's the empire. And nations may exist under the empire, but they have no ultimate authority. The rule of law, of international law, is made by financial interests, not by national political interests: Nations are simply subsidiary captives of an international interest—like the British Empire today.

Look at the British people: They're fat and stupid. They're not really an empire. They have a very bad diet—intellectual diet as well as other diet. You think these poor slob are an empire? You think they con-

trol—the United Kingdom controls the world, these slob? They don't know which way to get up in the morning, poor fellows!

No, but Britain is the *seat of power*, of official power of the Queen, and the monarchy. And the monarchy is the agency of a Venetian-based, international financial-monetary system. It's an international financial-monetary system, that controls the empire.

The U.S. Credit System; Not a Monetary System

For example, today: We have an international monetary system; what is it? Let's look at the U.S. Constitution. What's the monetary system look like from the standpoint of the U.S. Constitution? Under our Constitution—it was a key point of the Constitution too, the way it was formed—after we had won the Revolutionary War, we had banks, which were banks which had been created by various colonies earlier, what had been colonies. And these banks were bankrupt because of the war debt. So, what happened as a result of that, was that Alexander Hamilton proposed measures of creating a national government, which would then take responsibility for dealing with the war debts of the local banks of the states. This led to the formation of the U.S. Federal Constitution.

In other words, the U.S. Federal Constitution was based on this idea, this principle; it's a central feature of it: The General Welfare is based on maintaining the security of the nation, economically and financially.

So we set up a system, which was intended to be a fixed-exchange-rate system, under which, money could not be uttered, by the United States, or within the United States, unless it was authorized by a vote of the Congress, and the consent and agreement of the President of the United States. So that we did not have a monetary system; we had a *credit system*: A vote, by the Congress and the President, to utter a certain amount of credit, as debt of the Federal government, is the basis for our currency.

In the case of Europe, or a monetary system, the monetary system is international, in which private interests generate credit, and the credit uttered by the private interests, is absorbed into the international system. Now, this system, in this present form, was established about 1000 A.D. It already existed in the form of the Roman Empire, but it was established in a new form, with the collapse of Byzantium as a power, and the rise

of Venice, as the center of the maritime financial power of the Mediterranean region and beyond, established a new kind of empire, between the crisis collapse of Byzantium in that period, and 1066, which was the Norman Conquest of England. During that period, there was a change, in which the Venetian interest took power over all the other interests in the European region.

To the present day, Europe is ruled *by a Venetian monetarist system*, which has undergone various kinds of technical modifications, but it still exists. The collapse in the 14th Century, into a Dark Age, was a temporary collapse of the Venetian system. The collapse we're going through today, is a collapse of the Venetian system. The British Empire, which was created by Paolo Sarpi's circles, is a special form of this process. It's the Venetian system. And the Venetian system operates on a monetary system, *first*, the monetary authority of this international consortium of monetary interests; and then on a lower level, subordinate to that, is the so-called banking interest. So, the banks don't create the monetary system, as such. It is the monetary system that consolidates the banks into a system, which, in turn, now governs the nations.

This is the so-called idea of "free economy," "free trade." Free trade means, that the governments do not exert any control over their economy. Because they consent to a *free* trade, which means that the international financier interest controls all the economies which accede toward free trade.

The most important development in the United States, in defeating the United States and destroying it, since Truman, who also started the process, occurred with the breakup of the fixed-exchange-rate system of the Bretton Woods system. Because, now, the pirates, the parasites, the gangsters, took over the world economy. And we got into a long-term inflationary process, under which the power of industry and agriculture, and infrastructure, which is the basis of national economy—that is, the improvement of basic physical-economic infrastructure, together with the agriculture and the manufacturing industry, is the basis for any healthy economy.

To have a healthy economy, you have to have a *protectionist system*, which protects the nation, against the inherently predatory role of international monetarist power! And the only way you can do that, which is the way Roosevelt specified, is with an international fixed-exchange-rate system. You bring the monetary systems under the control of the respective *sovereign governments*, using the model of the U.S. Constitution, that no

currency can be uttered, or the equivalent credit, can be uttered by any nation, except by the authority of its government. This is a regulated system. And the relation among the states in this system, the member-states, which are sovereign states, is sovereign agreements, treaty agreements, among nation-states.

The Case of China

For example, let's take the case of China: What're we going to do about China? Well, without the Obama Administration changing its character, there's no hope for China. Right, now, the administration, the present Obama Administration, is one of the *enemies* of China! It's the leading enemy of China. Not because Obama hates China, but because his policies hate China.

See, China made a mistake: It gambled on the assumption that by taking the production, which was done in Europe and the United States in particular, taking that production and those production facilities *away* from the United States, transporting them to the cheap-labor market of China, they would now supply the world with physical needs produced by China, at a low price, and we would tear down the high-cost, high-price industries of the United States and Western Europe—such as Germany in particular. So, that was insanity.

Now, China has created an over-dependency, like a new drug habit—not drugs, but dependency upon the world market for its cheap-labor goods. Now that the market has collapsed, and will collapse even more so, China has no hope for survival, for avoiding a *collapse into general chaos*. Because they never can build up again, the world market on which China has depended until the recent time, since the Nixon years. There's only one way that can be solved: If the United States takes the initiative, of creating and establishing a new international system, a new international credit system—a fixed-exchange-rate credit system, back to what Roosevelt intended—not what Truman intended, but what Roosevelt had intended in 1944, where he *opposed* the British system—go back to that kind of system, under our Constitution. Under those conditions we can organize international credit.

Now, China's requirement is not to produce cheap-labor goods. China's requirement is the development of its population and the conditions of production in its own country. This means a very large increase in infrastructure development. These involve investments which will have a life of investment of 25 to 50, to 100 years; like, for example, the Three Gorges Dam is that



Creative Commons ShareAlike/Christoph Finössl

China's Three Gorges Dam typifies the kind of long-term infrastructure project that is crucial for that nation, and the planet.

China gambled on building up exports to the United States and Europe, thereby creating an overdependency, like a drug habit. Here, the manufacture of electric meters in Wuzhong, in central China.



www.ningguang.com.cn

type, that long-term type. Generally, major water projects are 100-year projects, or longer. And they're *crucial* on the planet, now.

The planet also requires nuclear power. There is no possibility of civilization on this planet, today, without a massive increase in nuclear power. No other source of power is competent; every other source of power, every other project is totally incompetent! Only nuclear power can save civilization, provided we do the other things that go with that.

So therefore, China requires, in particular, like other countries, a large-scale investment, *not in export markets*; they require a large-scale investment in basic economic infrastructure, high-technology infrastructure,

large-scale water projects, area-territorial development projects, and major power projects, water projects. Because you have to build up the level of productivity of the Chinese people themselves, so they have an autonomous ability to survive. And this is going to take 50 to 100 years to do that.

Therefore, you have to have a credit system which provides for a 50- to 100-year credit system, for the development of the continent of Asia, because this problem is throughout virtually all of continental Asia; a system which builds up an economic basis, a physical-economic technological basis, under which these countries now become truly self-sufficient, in their ability to function as autonomous nations.

We're going to have to reorient the United States and Europe: Get rid of everything that smells green! Just get it outta here! Take the Queen of England and her crazy husband, her fascist husband, and put

them into retirement—and take their stupid son along with them! And take Al Gore. Let Al Gore be the lackey who opens the door for them—that's all he's good for. If he can get *in* the door, with his fat body, huh? I mean, say, "Hey, fatso!" And he's also a traitor to the United States, so we have no use for him.

So that's the direction we have to go in. If we go in that direction, that means we create long-term treaty agreements, in a manner which is consistent with the U.S. Constitution, with these countries, to provide the long-term credit agreements, which enable these long-term investments which are necessary to rebuild the world, to occur. *That's our only hope, to do that.*

And we have to eliminate everything that does two

things: We have to eliminate every arrangement which is globalization. The Tower of Babel was a bad idea! Eliminate it! That's crucial. And we also have to go to a high-technology project basis, a basis of scientific-driven technological and cultural progress for every culture on the planet. We have to raise the productive power, and the creative powers throughout this planet. That can only be done by sovereign nation-states. Why? Culture!

Man Did Not Come from Apes

Just take another subject here, which is very crucial at this point. If you go back in pre-history; go back up to about a million years, look back at archeological sites up to a million years ago. Now, you find little pieces of bone and similar kinds of things, which attest to something that looks like a human being, or maybe a monkey or an ape, and you find these samples as fossil samples. Archeology goes back about a million years, probably goes back 2 million years, but fossils are not too durable, really, most of the time.

So, how can you tell that a fossil which looks like a monkey, or something, has similar characteristics to an ape, how do you know whether that's an ape or a human being? Because apes and human beings are absolutely different. Man did not come from apes. The characteristic of human behavior is not something you find in any ape. The generation of creativity, which is *unique* to human beings!—does not exist among the apes. Don't marry an ape! It won't work. It won't work—it won't work biologically, and it won't work intellectually. Just try living with a couple of adult chimpanzees in your house for a couple of days, and you'll know what the story is. It doesn't work!

How do we know the difference? How does an archeologist tell you that this is definitely a human fossil? *Because of the signs of a campfire!* No ape uses fire for cooking. They may accidentally set fire to the joint, like Mrs. O'Leary's cow in Chicago! But that's about all they can do. So the very fact that you find an organized activity around fire sites, associated with things that look, in fossil form, like traces of humanoids or something similar, you have found a human culture. Only human beings make fire, and use it. And you try some of the cooking you get if you don't use a little bit of fire—you may find yourself in trouble.

So, therefore, the characteristic of humanity, and its history and development, *is the use of fire!* All human beings, who are qualified as human beings, use fire.

Human culture depends on fire. Fire takes many forms. And in order for culture to progress, fire has to increase, in a certain respect: Fire has to increase, in what we call, today, energy flux-density, and this is characterized by the relative temperature, the relative *physical* temperature, of the fire you're using. Man's progress depends upon the ability to increase the level, the equivalent of temperature, today.

To maintain a global civilization of the present population can not be done, unless you're using nuclear fission, or a higher degree of energy flux-density *of fire*.

What's wrong with this fire business? According to Aeschylus, who wrote his famous *Prometheus Trilogy*, and in the *Prometheus Bound*, in particular, fire is prohibited to mankind. Mankind must not use fire! So, this god, this Satan, who was called in that case Zeus, or similar things, says, you must not use fire. Mankind must not have access to fire: That's a secret thing that mankind must not have.

What does that do? If you abort the use of fire, as expressed by scientific and technological progress, then you are condemning man to a barbaric condition of life, a subhuman condition of life. Now, fire does not simply mean "fire," as such. But the principle of fire, we know as in the distinction of ape from man, takes many forms, and these forms go, for example, from the burning of rubbish, the burning of wood, the burning of charcoal, and going on to higher orders, like chemistry—oil, so forth—and up to a higher level of energy flux-density, which is many times the energy flux-density of anything else: nuclear fission. And then, there's still an orders-of-magnitude higher degree of temperature, called thermonuclear fusion; and then, there's so-called matter/antimatter reactions, which is several orders of magnitude greater than that, which we have not yet learned how to control.

So, man's *increase* of the fire, or the equivalent of fire, used by mankind, determines the conditions of life under which human beings can live. If you want to maintain a population of more than 2 billion people, you certainly do have to use nuclear power, today. Anyone who says you mustn't use nuclear power, is saying, you must reduce the world population to less than 2 billion people, from 6.5 or 6.7 billion today. *You must be a mass-murderer! To deny anybody, including your own country, the right to use nuclear power, is mass murder!* Because you will have to *reduce* the population to correspond to the level of energy flux-density you're employing.

Anybody who's a greenie, is an idiot! Or a criminal. Any President who proposes a green policy, is either an idiot or a criminal! And is a mass murderer beyond belief in these conditions. We now have a world population which is in the order of magnitude of 6.7 billion people: We have a *culture* on this planet, which at best is capable of supporting, sustaining support of, 5 billion people! The difference between those requirements and going to 10 billion people, is what? Nuclear power!

We Need Nuclear Power

Look, for example: We're drawing down fossil water resources. That is, the ability to get drinkable water, safe, drinkable water, despite the fact the oceans are full of water—saltwater—which requires a development beyond present freshwater resources.

For example, let's take India: India's living in a large part on drawing down fossil water. Some of this water was deposited in a glacial period, 1 million years ago. Now we're going to draw it down. We're already drawing down other resources.


Look at what's happening in the Western Plains of the United States: We're drawing down the water! The land level is sinking, because we're using up the water. The problem is a lack of freshwater resources throughout the world, and the present level of population can not be sustained under present water policies.

However: If we go to mass development of nuclear power, using both the uranium cycle and the thorium cycle of nuclear fission, *we can desalinate water, efficiently*; you can not desalinate water economically, except by very high energy flux-density.

So therefore, if we're going to survive, even maintain the present world population level, we have to go to nuclear power, as our *only* power. *Get those damned windmills down!* Don Quixote! Where are you?

We have to get rid of these solar reactors. Look,

FIGURE 2
A Diffusion-Driven Desalination Cycle



www.netl.doe.gov

Nuclear-powered desalination of seawater is the indispensable solution to the world's growing scarcity of potable water.

what do you want in your backyard—you want a solar reactor, or a tree? Which would you prefer? A solar reactor is a parasitical operation: It costs more in energy flux-density terms to use than it provides. After all, all it is, is the incidental sunlight which is hitting the surface of the Earth—what's that? That's a very poor source of power! And solar collectors will not help you! Actually, solar collectors cost more to build and operate, than they give you! They're a waste! They're insanity.

Windmills—my God! The President may be a windmill, but that's from his speeches. But that is not what we need for an energy source. Talking all day, he still won't supply much energy.

So, therefore, these are the kinds of questions that have to be faced, *real* questions: What does it take, to provide not only a larger population, which we're faced with, but what does it require to *raise the standard of living* of the existing population? When you consider the conditions of life of most of the population of this planet, it's extremely poor, for just this reason. There is no development. They're starving. China is in desperate straits, with its present population. Not because it's overpopulated, but because it's underpowered! China's population is not the problem,

it's the *lack of power!* It's a lot of very poor people! Who depend upon very poor standards of living and productivity.

Man Exists in the Noösphere

Therefore, when you look at these kinds of considerations, you say, what must be the policy of nations? And then you come to the next point: What is this difference between man and ape, which is associated with human productivity? It's called "creativity," which does not exist in any form of animal life. It's the difference between the Noösphere, and the Biosphere.

What is creativity? Well, it takes two forms: In the simplest form, when we're dealing with the abiotic, the so-called Lithosphere, the pre-living processes on this planet, and then dealing in the second, with the so-called Biosphere, which is the living processes, or things which exist only as products of living processes, or the acts of living processes, called the Biosphere. The planet is changing. Our planet is changing in its composition: We have a Lithosphere, which is the part of the planet which is still merely the byproduct of pre-human conditions, pre-living conditions; then we have a growing part of the planet, more and more, the Biosphere, living processes and products of living processes, are taking a larger percentile of the total mass of the planet.

But, then, look at the Noösphere! And look at the things that exist on this planet, and the mass of things that exist on this planet as the product of *human* activity. Human creative activity. Not animal activity, but *human* activity! That is increasing more rapidly than the Biosphere. That is creativity! Human creativity.

The human mind, the difference between the human being and the animal, and the ape, is creativity. And most people don't even know what creativity is! We're conducting educational programs, for example, in the Basement and so forth, where we're dealing *precisely* with the history of creativity, physical scientific creativity and cultural creativity. This is a very specific quality which the human mind has, which no animal existence has. And our ability, to



EIRNS/Susan Welsh

Every human being—and no ape—has the capacity for creativity. Above, a solar eclipse (May 1994) is projected through binoculars onto the table (lower left); the child is making his own eclipse, with a ball on a stick. Right: The orangutan has simpler aspirations.



clipart.com

change the universe—we're not part of the animal kingdom! We're on a qualitatively higher level than any animal kingdom.

We are in the Noösphere, not the Biosphere. We are changing the universe, as we find it, by the application of our creative powers, and their development, to the requirements of life on Earth. And if we survive this administration, this Obama Administration, we're

going to be dealing with the Solar System on that same basis: We are going to transform the Solar System, if we survive. That's our destiny! It's our nature! It's what makes us different from the ape. No monkey would ever think of going to Mars. Only a man is crazy enough to do it. And able to do it!

So, these are the problems. So what we have is, in the post-war period, this anti-progress tendency, the anti-science tendency. And what it really is, is a rejection of the difference between man and an ape: "We want to keep our neighbors as monkeys, pet monkeys, or pet baboons, or pet chimpanzees. We don't want to develop the people as people."

Now, how does this thing operate? Well, you have the three levels you have to deal with: You have the level of the Lithosphere, dealing with inanimate objects. Then you have the Biosphere, which consists of things which have come into existence only through the action of life, on the Lithosphere. Then you have a third one, which is the Noösphere: Things that come into existence, only as a result of human mental creative powers. That's what creativity represents. This is a power of the individual human mind. Ah, but it has a factor of immortality in it.

Because if you examine anything, there are two things you really examine: One area you examine from the standpoint of physical science. You're examining those powers of mankind, to change and improve the Biosphere and the Lithosphere, from the standpoint of preconditions of human existence, of increased amounts of human existence; of the ability of mankind to reach out and begin to control the Solar System, as well as this planet. That's one aspect of it.

Classical Culture: The Soul of Man

But then, you have this other aspect of creativity, which is called art. The first is called physical science. The second is called Classical art—and it's only *Classical* art, not any other kind of art. Daubings by chimpanzees on walls, is not art! Chimpanzees have no artistic creativity, and people who think they do, probably don't have artistic creativity either. Or, somebody who can do a chimpanzee-like painting, is not really a human being at that.

Human beings function in terms of what we call "Classical culture." Classical music, for example, the tradition of Bach, and the derivatives of Johann Sebastian Bach, is a measure of what is decent music. Anything else is not really decent music. It has not devel-

oped to the point of decent music by a modern standard of culture.

This is extremely important—also poetry, Classical poetry, or what we know as Classical poetry in the English language, or German language, or Italian. These forms of culture are *essential* to the human being. They're not "entertainment." They may be entertaining, but they are not entertainment. This comes to the *soul of man*: With Classical culture, you're dealing with mankind, as such, as what this is a power of mankind to develop. The power to think scientifically, physically and so forth, actually comes as a product of a function of Classical art, like Classical poetry or Classical music, which is *irony*: *Classical irony*.

And therefore, if you like Schiller, in German, or if you like Shelley, in English, and understand it; if you understand Beethoven and Mozart and so forth, as opposed to the junk you hear on the radios today, or similar sources today, then you begin to understand that it is the creative power, expressed by Classical artistic composition and its performance, as applied by man, to man, which mobilizes the creative powers of mind for doing the things which pertain to controlling and developing the Biosphere and the Lithosphere.

Now, this is associated largely with languages. Classical culture is always associated with a language, which means a culture, so that people communicate ideas, in terms of a *language-culture*. They develop the power of ideas through development of the language culture. This is why the Classical poetry of a people, of successful cultures, is so important to us. Because it's only through Classical culture, that people are able to transmit creative powers of thinking from one generation to another. And it is precisely those creative powers of thinking, associated with Classical music, Classical poetry, in the various language groups, which determine the ability of that language-group to develop in physical terms.

The idea of freedom in culture to do this, is the *essence of the meaning of human freedom*. It's not freedom to crap on any corner you wish to. Freedom is the ability to develop a Classical culture, to a higher level of realization, and in turn, through that realization, to take the Biosphere and the Noösphere as challenges, for human creativity.

For example: This is the essence of the meaning of the desire of human beings for immortality. Any creative discovery, of any principle, in art or physical science—how is it transmitted? How is it developed? Well,

it starts when somebody makes a contribution toward a creative discovery. That creative discovery is *reenacted* in the mind of somebody else, who then carries that discovery a further step. So that, essentially, when you go through successive generations within a culture, you find there's a process of a development, in which the core of creativity is a process of continuous development of ideas which are creative in their nature.

And therefore, to have a human race, you have to recognize that there are different cultures in this human race, and you have to give autonomy to each culture, for the sake of the creativity which is associated with the use of language—language and music. And therefore, you have to have sovereignty of peoples, based on their cultures, their choice of culture!

That doesn't mean they come to different thoughts than the other: It means that the process of development from infancy—and remember, the highest rate of development of the human being comes immediately after birth, and by the age of 3, you begin to slow down, in your creative powers. The human individual is learning to speak languages—use them! Make jokes! A baby that can make jokes is one which, you say, “This thing is intelligent, because it makes a joke!” No, it makes a joke on you. It plays a trick on you, right? Babies play tricks on their parents, and so forth. And the ability to play tricks increases. This ability to play tricks in a child, is a manifestation, precisely, of the potentiality for creativity.

Thus, we need *sovereign nation-states* which represented cultures, used as the medium of development of the individual human being. These experiences can be transmitted from one nation, one national culture to another, but they have to be respected in their origins. You have to replicate the continuity of this process, of this use of a language, for the development and self-development of a people.

Man's Immortal Destiny: To Change the Universe

That means that you have to have a society organized around the idea of creativity. And you have to think of man as in the image of the Creator, to do that. Because, you have a constant creative process, of the development of the universe, of the development of the Solar System, of its history; the development of mankind, the change in the character of the planet, the change in the improvement of the Biosphere, the development of the Noösphere. And going on, to take and

manage this Solar System—and then beyond that: *To change the universe!* More and more, in more and more degrees, at a higher rate. The role of man, man's destiny in the universe, is an immortal destiny, in which people who are dead *share* with those who are living.

And the sense of the value of the human being, in moral value of the human being in this sense, *is* the meaning of morality. All morality will go to that test. And that's precisely what we're destroying.

What is this Administration doing? It's bought into environmentalism, which is Satanic! In its effect. It will destroy the United States, and destroy its people. It's Satanic! That's the effect: *The United States will disappear, if we don't change this policy very soon!* If Obama continues this policy, for another couple years, *the United States is finished!* And maybe most of the planet is finished, too.

So, this is not a question of someone's “opinion”; this is a question of an obligation, *a moral obligation*, to have a policy of the United States which corresponds, not only to the requirements of *humanity* as a whole, but to the requirements of our *role*, within humanity as a whole. The world depends upon our getting out of this mess. Because without the contribution of the United States, as a nation, as a constitutional republic, it is nearly *impossible*, today, given the role of the dollar up to now, given the requirement for making the dollar viable, for the world as a whole, in order to ensure that China and other nations, have a right to continue to live.

Without that kind of system, there's no hope for humanity, except a Dark Age. And maybe we'll go back through the chimpanzee process of recovery, later on, a thousand years from now, or whatever.

So, we are dealing with a *moral issue*. The President's opinion is not worth anything if it's wrong! It has no authority if it's wrong! He's associating with people he shouldn't associate with, like these behavioral economist creeps. Like this chief advisor, who spends most of the face-time with him, in the White House. The President has no *right* to do this! He may be elected, and if the United States tolerates this thing to continue, the way he behaves, they're responsible: We bring the destruction upon ourselves, by allowing him to behave in this way! We have a moral responsibility as citizens to tell this guy: “Straighten up! Cut it out. Fire these guys! Fire the behavioral economists. The behaviorists. Fire Larry Summers. Get him out of there.” That's our job.



White House Photo/Peter Souza

President Obama, on Earth Day, April 22, 2009, visits a factory making wind turbines in Iowa. If the Administration doesn't drop its environmentalist nonsense, said LaRouche, "the United States is finished!"

This is a moral question! You want to oppose me on this, you're immoral! Because the *effect* of your opposing me, is immoral: It's destructive of humanity! We have to stand up on our hind legs.

Now, the resources on this. You've got a problem: You've got the upper 20% of family-income brackets; you got a problem there. They will say, "Look, we don't want to hurt anybody, but look, we have a certain standard of living. I gotta take care of my family. We got to take care of ourselves. We got to protect our interests. And look, we got to cut things, we have to have some austerity, right? Well, we really can not accept austerity for *us*. We've got to cut health care." That's what Obama is saying! To cut health care for the population in general, especially for the poorest; cut Social Security. That's what he's saying, under these influences. Is that moral?

Well, the Boomers, essentially, will say, "Well, I know, we don't like that. That's not nice. We would prefer that didn't happen. But, you know, we've got to do it. And sometimes, you have to go through suffering."

Yeah, but whose suffering? Yours, or theirs? The majority of the population, you want them to suffer? You've miseducated them, you've spread disease, you spread conditions of disease among them. You've done all these things, you had these two Presidencies under Bush—who wasn't even a bush, he was a twig. Look what was done under him, this creature! This guy—sometimes you wonder if he qualified for monkey

status. His behavior was such.

No: We have a moral responsibility, not only to ourselves, but to future generations to maintain the continuity of progress of the condition of life for human beings; and to protect human beings throughout the planet. And to protect human beings throughout the planet, with the assistance of protecting ourselves as a nation, protecting our culture and its development. That's the moral obligation. That's the *meaning* of the Preamble of the U.S. Constitution. And any President who violates that, ignores that, is not fit to be President. He should be impeached! Or induced to quit.

"Hey, you know, come on, why don't you just retire? It hasn't worked out too well. This marriage, this honeymoon is over! Look, you're the wrong species, this honeymoon is over. It didn't work out the way we intended. Our intention was sincere, but look, you're a different species than us, you have different species values than ours."

The True Meaning of Morality

So, the point is, when people say that I'm too critical of Obama: I'm not too critical of Obama. I'm wondering if I'm critical enough. One former President thinks I was probably slow on the uptake on this one; I should have acted sooner and harsher. I think he's right. But my responsibility is not to act beyond the authority of what I know to be true. And I've acted as soon as I realized a certain condition existed, and it was true. And then I responded. Other people criticized me—look, I'm qualified to be President, and they're not. That's why I'm in trouble, often. When somebody discovered I was qualified to be the President, they said, "Get rid of him! Get him outta here! We're happy with the chimpanzee we have in there."

So that's our problem. Our problem is, we lack a real sense of the practical meaning of the term "morality," as it applies to politics, and the application of physical science and economy. We come up with these "formulas," these lying, degenerate formulas. We are impressed and intimidated by what is prevalent opinion; we're intimidated by the press; we're intimidated

by the mass media; we're intimidated by adversary opinion. We destroy ourselves by that. That's our problem. And that's where we stand.

We can save this nation, we can save civilization. The power to do that exists in our hands, if enough of us are willing to do that. We don't have to do any bad things to anyone! That's not necessary. We simply have to say: Put this system into bankruptcy; go back to the U.S. Constitution, its principles, which are unique; go back to our history on the planet, what our history, our true destiny, our true role is, assert that on behalf of all humanity! Not just for us. What we have to do has to be done for all humanity. For all cultures on this planet, because we're all one people. We have different cultures, and *that's important to protect*. Because it's only through the culture that the creative potential of the individual is given its affirmation and development.

So therefore, we have to love all people, as if they were our own. But we have to recognize that their history is different, their cultural history is different. And therefore, we have to take that into account. We take that into account, through respecting national sovereignty. We take that into account through adopting the principle of Westphalia, that every people must put forward the interest of all other people, first, and then, their own interest will be taken care of. We have to have a society composed of sovereign nation-states, and sovereign peoples, and sovereign cultures. But these sovereign cultures must work together, to common ends, the common aims of humanity. And this is something that this President of the United States has yet to learn.

I think, however, that if we rid him of the behavioral economists, and rid him of Larry Summers, that those two remedial steps will cause him to tend to be confined in his behavior, to his association with his immediate peers in the cabinet, and in other institutions of the Federal government, and with some influence from the parties. In that case, I think he will be a manageable President. But he needs some management, because he doesn't know half the things he has to know, and he's making wild, arrogant judgments, on the basis of projects, where he doesn't know what the hell he's talking about. He's just babbling nonsense—he has no idea what he's talking about. He has no conception, often, of what the meaning is of the words that are coming out of his mouth. But he admires those words so much, for their own sake, that he doesn't seem to care about what they presumably mean.

Anyway, so we've got a lot of questions coming in here, and we can get at them.

Dialogue with LaRouche

Harley Schlanger: I'd like to start with the satellite broadcast of this webcast that we have, in New York City.

Debra Freeman: I'm going to start with a question that comes from our friends out on the West Coast, and the question is as follows:

“Mr. LaRouche, as you probably remember from the last webcast, some of us, who are working on policy for the administration were extremely frustrated, because we felt that the administration was directing itself toward fiscal bailouts and really not toward addressing the fundamental problems in the economy. But we decided to hang in there, because of assurances, number one, by the administration, that they would get around to the questions of economic infrastructure and related things. But also because we felt that it was necessary, that a portfolio of policies be in place.

“However, the problem that we are faced with now—and this has become really apparent with some of our reviews over the course of the last several weeks in particular—is this: The ongoing attempt, and it looks like an accelerating attempt, by the administration here, but also by the governments of Europe, to maintain what is essentially a bankrupt system, is right now, or at least it seems from what we are reviewing, seems to not be working. But in fact, the bailout itself, seems to be accelerating the collapse. And we say this, because what we are looking at, is, on the one hand, an increase of the bailout policy, and on the other hand, accelerating rates of unemployment, of shutdown of productive capacity, and other related aspects of the economy. So that, it would seem that it's not a question of the administration saying, ‘Well, we're going to deal with this fiscal problem here, and then we'll get around to dealing with the economy.’ It seems that their insistence on the bailout policy is actually creating a worse condition.


“Is this just coincidental, or does one feed the other, in your view? And we're asking this, particularly, in reference to your Triple Curve Function?”

LaRouche: Well, you've got to look at the behavioral economists and behavioral psychologists. What they're doing, is saying, “We're going to solve this problem by management. So give us time.” In other words, “what we're going to do, is brainwash the population, and give us time to brainwash the population into accepting the kinds of conditions that we intend to

FIGURE 3


Bailout Expands by Trillions, While U.S. Economy Collapses

Official Unemployment Rate, 2009




Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Home Foreclosure Filings,* 2009




Source: RealtyTrac.
* Includes initial notices, not the number of homes actually foreclosed.

Manufacturing Production Workers, 2009
(Millions)



Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Economic Decline in First Quarter 2009 from Last Quarter 2008



Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis.

create.” At the same time, they’re trying to save the afterbirth and kill the baby. That’s the effect of doing that.

But you have to see the element of malice, and when you think of the essential immorality of Larry Summers—this guy has a track record: The man is utterly immoral. He’s a predator. He belongs in the Adolf Hitler category, or similar categories. And the behavioral economists are the same thing: These people are *evil*. Nothing will come from them but evil. And they’re

saying, “Give Satan a chance.”

That’s exactly it: There is no sincerity of commitment to the benefit of humanity, in these policies! The President of the United States is *as if in the hand of Satan at this time*. And we have to think about freeing him from the grip of Satan. That’s what it amounts to.

Satan may not be here, but Larry Summers is a good approximation.

Roosevelt Opposed Keynes

Freeman: The next question is really something of a follow-up to the first one, from the same questioner. He says: “One of the things that we have recognized, in terms of looking at how to proceed, is that, we in the United States, have governing institutions that essentially allow unlimited lending power, a Federal government that can borrow and spend at will, and also a dollar as a global reserve currency. With that said, obviously, American institutions, although they’re not without flaws (and certainly we have made mistakes), do, in fact, serve us well. However, in looking at how to proceed, one of the things that we have recognized is that the rest of the world, in particular, Europe, lacks the mechanisms to take actions, as we can in America. The question of whether they have the inclination to do that, is a separate issue.

“But one of the things that we have been forced to grapple with, and the reason why we are grappling with it, is that we are told that the question of fiscal bailout is not a decision made simply with the interest of U.S. institutions, but that it is being demanded of us, internationally, and that therefore, if there’s going to be any cooperation internationally, the bailout has to proceed, because the rest of the world doesn’t have the mechanisms that we have. However, what we have argued here, is that the rest of the world might not cooperate in the same mechanisms of economic recovery that we can employ here in the U.S., but that if we started here,

Unemployment still rising...

February 2009
 • State 7 %
 • National 8.9%

Jobless rates reach highest mark since early 1990s recession

Page County
17.7 %

By Luther Johnson
 Staff Writer

It's been nearly 20 years since the numbers were this bad. The recent figures released by the Virginia Employment Commission show that Page County's unemployment rate for February was 17.7 percent. That's just over double what it was the same time last year at 8.5 percent. Page is not alone, 20 of Virginia's 95 counties have double digit unemployment rates. Two main reasons are pointed to for the rise of unemployment locally. The first is seasonal unemployment during winter months. There is a normal increase in unemployment that occurs in the winter months as seasonal work, such as the tourism industry and retail stores over the holidays, is cut. In November of 2007, the

See UNEMPLOYMENT Page A7

This chart shows annual averages for unemployment rates in Page County since the recession of the early 1990s. Source: Virginia Employment Commission

From Virginia's Page County News and Courier, April 16, 2009.

even if in the very first phase, credit, debt, and exchange-rate crises arise, that that in itself could be motivation for a restructuring of the global system, and that we should simply be prepared to deal with that. Certainly you've addressed it in your Four Power agreement.

"But I guess, what I'm really asking is, if you agree that it's true that the mechanisms we have here to effect economic recovery simply don't exist in the rest of the world?"

LaRouche: Well, that's irrelevant.

We have to recover. Our going down the tubes is not going to help the rest of the world. And the rest of the world is pretty much incompetent. And adapting our policies to the rest of the world, is just like an agreement to commit joint suicide.

The policies of Europe, for example: Every nation in Europe, Western and Central Europe in particular, is clinically insane! Their policies are clinically insane! We don't adapt to the policies of a madman, or a pack of madmen!

We have a system that works, and they don't! So we should give them the benefit of enforcing our system.

We should go back to what Franklin Roosevelt intended, still on April 12th of 1945, and forget what Truman did on the 13th of April, 1945: *Roosevelt opposed Keynes!* Up to the moment of his death! On the following morning, Truman brought Keynes in. And also, rejected the idea of eliminating colonialism. Roosevelt was anti-colonialist. Truman, under British influence, was pro-colonialist! I know: I know what happened on the 13th of April, I know what the effect was in various parts of the world!

The first thing that was done: The United States under Truman, kissed the ass of the British Empire, by turning the Japanese troops loose in Indo-China where they'd been captured by U.S. influence—the OSS and Ho Chi Minh—and we recaptured, for colonialism, Indo-China! With the effects which ultimately came out of that. That was done with the consent of Truman.

The postponement of the liberation of India, was done to kiss the butt of the British. What was done in Indonesia, was to kiss the butt of the British. Truman was not an honest person: Truman belonged to a group of fascist sympathizers, who were also in the Congress, in the Republican Party and also in the Democratic Party, when Roosevelt was elected. The American Enterprise Institute is a typification of that kind of fascist tendency which existed then, and exists today. Wall Street is controlled by organizations with the same policies as the pro-Hitler and pro-Mussolini organizations of Wall Street back in the 1920s and 1930s.

And we are submitting to a policy imposed upon us by Truman, which is to kiss the butt of the British Empire. Truman was part of a group, whose policy was to assimilate the United States back into the British Empire! And that's what you're getting here.

All we have to do, and I specified this on the 25th of July 2007, and supplemented that up through September, as to what we have to do. That is what we had to do!

Go Back to the Constitution

Now: What I also specified—Russia. Russia's crazy now, but so what? It's driven crazy by these policies. It has gone into the trap, the bear trap, of the British Empire. China is confused. India is somewhat confused, less so, but somewhat confused. Continental Europe, Western and Central continental Europe?—there is no sovereignty in Western and Central continental Europe: None!

So you want to adapt to their system? Bunk! They should change their system.

Our responsibility to the planet is to change and save the United States, according to its Constitution, and the economic policies which would have been agreed to by Franklin Roosevelt. Take that as a standard, which corresponds to our historical standard. *That's* the way we make policy! We do not make policy with the consent of the British Empire.

And the President should not have embraced the Queen. That was a terrible mistake: We have to check with the disease control people on that one, and see if we have to take remedial measures to protect him. He may have gotten some fatal infection from that.

No: We have a policy. *We're right!* The rest of the world has been *wrong*. The United States was created to free the people of this country, and hopefully the world, from the kind of system that existed in Europe, then; and the kind of system which still dominates Europe, today. Our policy on Russia, and China, and India is obvious: These are largely Asian nations, or Eurasian nations in the case of Russia, which have different interests, but they're compatible interests in terms of common features, mutually common features. If we agree, to put this thing through bankruptcy, shut down everything that has been done under Bush, and now, under the present President, since July of 2007—we shut that down. We go back to our Constitution, and say, "Sorry, buddies, you made a mistake. Our Constitution says, we don't do this, so we're going to cancel it. Call the game off for rain, or something; we're going to cancel this one."

We're going to go back to what we have to do, because what we're doing now, is insane. And the other authority you have on this, is the fact, that *if* there's an attempt to continue the present policies, the United States and other nations *will soon cease to exist*. I'm talking about the very short term. We're on the brink of something which is modelled by Germany, Weimar Germany, up to 1923: We have been going into a collapse of the economy, the physical economy, losing up to 700,000 jobs at a crack. We are now in the collapse phase, as Germany was, under the Weimar conditions. *Then*, in the Spring, and Summer, and Autumn of 1923, the very collapse of the German economy, *physically*, resulted, with the monetization of the crisis, in the hyperinflation. We are now in a *global system*, we have now reached the takeoff point of *hyperinflation!* *There*

is no solution for this system. Anybody who supports this system, is implicitly a criminal.

We have to put the world into bankruptcy reorganization and eliminate the present system. And we have to base that on the fact it's our dollars that are out there, that are floating out as the credit system; it's our nation we have to defend, and we defend our nation. And we extend the hand of cooperation, with an international credit system, consistent with our Constitution, with other nations, to assist them, through cooperation, in coming out of this mess alive.

If we create this kind of agreement, with Russia, China, and India—and other countries would automatically join in—I mean, for example, Japan would join in immediately; Korea would join in immediately; other countries would join in. Iran would join in, immediately! Khamenei would join! If Khamenei decides the wind is blowing in this direction, we're going to pull this off, he will put his foot on the side of pushing that kind of reform, and joining it, and cooperating with it. He may do it on his terms, but so what? That's the way life goes. Just do it.

So, no, there's no excuse for our condoning *in any way*, such a deal with European nations, and other nations. We should simply shut the whole damned thing down: Shut it down! It's bankrupt! We'll create a new system. Want to make me President? I'll do it tomorrow morning.

Prince Philip's Swinish WWF

Schlanger: In addition to the group that's viewing this in New York City, there are a number of other events, where the webcast is being shown: In the Universidad de America in Bogotá, Colombia; in the Universidad Bolivariana in El Alto de la Paz, Bolivia; and in Venezuela, at the Universidad Central de Venezuela, in Caracas.

Now, there's no showing of the webcast in Mexico City right now. They were all cancelled because of the swine flu problem. And so, Lyn, the next question—there are several people who asked this question, and so I'll put this together: "People have been following what you've warned about in terms of depopulation, and the collapse of living standards leading to the potential spread of epidemics and pandemic disease. Would you say that this is what we're seeing now, possibly with the swine flu? Or is this just an attempt to change the subject?"

LaRouche: Well, it has many features to it, some of

which are uncertain, but are big question marks which we have to answer. We don't have the full answers for it.

Here you have a policy, which is coming from the British monarchy, and from Prince Philip, whose policy has been to reduce the world's population to less than 2 billion people. That's the World Wildlife Fund policy; that's the green policy. Therefore, the green policy is to reduce the world's population. How do you reduce the world's population in large amounts so rapidly? Famine and epidemic disease. Lack of sanitation, famine, and epidemic disease.

Now, what you're getting is, you get the economic preconditions; the physical economic preconditions, for a global or a quasi-global pandemic conditions *exist*. They exist for reasons of *the economic policy, which the United States is still defending, under this President, today!* So, the guilt for this, is shared by the current U.S. government, because they bought into blame, because they did nothing to resist it!

When you take a population, like the world population now, you take the conditions of life in Mexico which were *imposed by the United States and Britain*, back in 1983—'82-'83, on López Portillo: That everything that's happened to promote these conditions in Mexico today, is a result of a continuation of what was done to President López Portillo of Mexico, and his Mexico, in 1982! There's the genesis of the conditions for genocide.

You look at the conditions today; they're much worse. The spread of the drug epidemic is also a factor, and the problem is, that, given these factors, the natural effect of these kinds of conditions we're creating economically, by current economic policy, creates the potential for a real global pandemic. Do not say that "Maybe it's only this." We don't say that. We say we have all the ignition material here for a global pandemic. Now, do we say it's going to be a global pandemic? No. Do we say it has the potential for becoming a global pandemic? Yes. Therefore, we *act* to prevent it from being a global pandemic. We assume the worst, and hope for the best; but we have to work for the best, not just hope for it.

So, there also is another aspect to this, which some people will bring up, for which there is presently no proof known to me. That is, from my experience with certain sections of the British government and the U.S. government from the past, there are people in powerful positions who would like to help Prince Philip out, as in



CDC/James Gathany

Swine flu: A microbiologist at the U.S. National Center for Infectious Diseases examines a re-created specimen of the 1918 Pandemic Influenza Virus (H1N1). Up to 50 million people were killed worldwide in that pandemic, which is believed to have originated from a mutated virus from a swine or avian host.

the way LSD was synthesized by the British, who have used chemical, physical chemical capabilities, biological capabilities, to help disease in the laboratory, by synthesizing types of viral and other diseases, or combinations of them, which will interact to reduce the world's population—which is the policy of the environmentalists. It's mass murder! And mass murder as Bertrand Russell prescribed, and as Prince Philip has prescribed with his World Wildlife Fund.

Their intention is to bring this about, and whether this is a by-product of their intention to be filthy on economic policy or social policy, or whether they're adding a little something to make it really happen, I don't know. But I'm going to operate on the assumption that, knowing them, since a crime has been committed in the neighborhood—there is evidence of the crime—I'm

going to assume they're doing it deliberately. And I'm going to act to defend the world's population on the assumption that they might be doing this deliberately. Even if I don't know they're doing it deliberately, I know they're doing it deliberately because their intention is that, of that nature. Their intention is to reduce the world population through a greenie policy, through an environmentalist policy advocated by Al Gore and Prince Philip, the British monarchy. Their intention is genocide, and they have the capability at their fingertips of the kinds of scientific technology capable of producing such genocide.

So, I'm going to act, since we're in a war against them. I don't know whether they're doing it or not, but I know they're determined to do it. It's like in wartime, so-called secret weapons, as in World War II. You're out to win a war. You have the capability of producing certain kinds of weapons, against the adversary or the target. You have the capability of doing it. If you're sufficiently evil and sufficiently eager, you will attempt to do it. And if you attempt to do it and you have the capability, you might succeed.

So, I think you have to treat this swine flu thing with that point of view. Don't panic! Don't panic! Do what ever you should do, and do it now; but keep your mind open, you might have a real something there that you have to deal with. You might have a synthetic disease, or a combination of diseases of a certain form, which will have a combined effect, because of the history of the populations, which will take certain selective effects. The tendency will be, in general, to go at susceptibilities of different kinds of populations, and use a weapon of that type against a population which is tailored for the type that's tailored for that population. But it could be more general.

And the swine flu threat is such, that what we're getting as these effects now—you mobilize for the contingency that the fire is going to spread. You don't wait until the fire spreads. You know there's a danger it could spread, and you mobilize now, to defend humanity against that danger. If it turns out to be it wasn't that bad; fine. But you wouldn't want to be in the position where you underestimated the threat, the consequences of which you wouldn't want to be responsible for. So I

Prince Philip's Genocide

In His Royal Highness's own words:

Address to Edinburgh University Union, Nov. 24 1969: We talk about over- and underdeveloped countries; I think a more exact division might be between underdeveloped and overpopulated. The more people there are, the more industry and more waste and the more sewage there is, and therefore the more pollution.

Address to Joint Meeting of the All-Party Group on Population and Development and the All-Party Conservation Committee, London, March 11, 1987: I do believe . . . that human population pressure—the sheer number of people on this planet—is the single most important cause of the degradation of the natural environment, of the progressive extinction of wild species of plants and animals, and of the destabilization of the world's climatic and atmospheric systems.



Photo EIRNS/Stuart Lews, design Alan Yue

The simple fact is that the human population of the world is consuming natural renewable resources faster than it can regenerate, and the process of exploitation is causing even further damage. . . . All this has been made possible by the industrial revolution and the scientific explosion and it is spread around the world by the new economic religion of development.

say, we mobilize! We mobilize rationally; we assume the possibility for the worst, and we fight it! We fight it because we should have a firefighting capability against this kind of thing anyway.

Why the U.S. Does Not Have Debtors' Prisons

Freeman: The next question is on banking policy and how to address it. And this comes from someone who is here with us in New York, but who also frequently works out of Washington, D.C., and generally represents policies related to the institution of the Presidency. And he says, that, in looking at the Obama Administration's approach to dealing with our current fiscal crisis, there are some aspects of it that really are—which I could only describe as perverse. The fact is, that what is implicit and perhaps explicit in the Geithner plan is that it allows guaranteeing bad assets at rates above their market value, and by so doing, it simply transfers the problem to those who hold the assets.

He says it would enable those individuals to convert those assets sooner or later to cash, and therefore, it preserves the wealth of the people who hold these assets that are valued above their market value. But at the same time, it fails to prevent the collapse of wealth of just about everybody else.

Now, what the questioner is getting at, is, as an interim step toward what is inevitable restructuring, would it not be better, rather than allowing the Geithner plan to proceed, to actually fix the value of those bad assets, not at rates that would float, but by essentially saying, "We will value these bad assets at some reasonable percentage, whether that be 15 cents on the dollar; 20 cents on the dollar; 25 cents on the dollar." The questioner says that if we do that, the fact is that many of the banks involved are still going to be declared insolvent, but then we can get around to the restructuring with some kind of rational basis. Do you think that this is workable? Or do you think it's just completely unnecessary, that there's no point in even attempting to do this at all?

LaRouche: No, I think it's plausible, but you have to define what you mean by it in the terms of law, because you're now getting into the area of a matter of Constitutional law, and it's extremely important to us that we preserve the intention of the U.S. Constitution in any proposal we make at this point. So, we have to think about Constitutional law in this.

Now, one of the features of the U.S. Constitution that our considerations take into account, pertains to the

question of bankruptcy, the law of bankruptcy. You used to have in England what were called "debtors' prisons." You still have, under German bankruptcy law, a debtors' prison provision, which is strange to us in the United States, because we're so used to ordinary bankruptcy. But a person who goes honestly bankrupt can be imprisoned in Germany for being bankrupt. And that's the debtors' prison law which has never been removed from German law.

Now, what we in the United States were formally against, in particular, was indentured servitude and our slavery—this idea. So our law of bankruptcy is to provide both the obligation *and* the opportunity for bankruptcy in a bankrupt situation. In other words, we reorganize in bankruptcy in the *public interest*, and in the interest of the freedom and human rights of individuals. We used to pronounce debtors' prisons to be immoral, which is not the case in Germany, for example. Debtors' imprisonment *is* an immoral act, and that law should be dealt with accordingly.

So therefore, yes, in this case, we go up to these guys and say, "Well, you guys are bankrupt. All you guys who are with this crap that you're trying to pass off, should be put into bankruptcy." The banks involved, the financial institutions, should be put into bankruptcy. At that point, when approaching this question of bankruptcy, we go back to Glass-Steagall, and [the repeal of] Glass-Steagall was rammed through by Larry Summers. And at that point, already under Greenspan, there were things in that direction, which were driving us into bankruptcy.

So, therefore, we go back to Glass-Steagall. We take those aspects of the banking system which have to be put through bankruptcy, and we put them through bankruptcy reorganization in accord with a Glass-Steagall standard. And we go at this historically. We go from the time of the repeal of Glass-Steagall, under Larry Summers' scheming. We go back to that point and take that as a point of reference. Now we say, "You got a lot of bankruptcies here." Now, we're going to look at the question of settling the bankruptcy at that point.

In other words, as you do with your computer: You go back and you reset to an earlier time, before you got things screwed up. We're going to reset the computer back to the time, 1999, when this bum began running loose while President Clinton was in trouble. And we say, okay, at that point we use a Glass-Steagall standard to determine what kind of transactions do qualify for bankruptcy protection. Now, we'll take what has been



William Hogarth, "The Rake in a Debtor's Prison" (1735). The United States was the first country to establish bankruptcy law that abolished debtors' prisons.

piled on since then in the role of phony values—"Sorry, buddy."

All right, now, how do we handle that? There are two ways to handle it. One way which is what I proposed back in 2007: freeze it and sort it out later. The alternative is, as indicated in the question: Okay, buddy, the United States government is going to use its big fist, and it's going to tell you bums, you'll settle for 15 cents on the dollar. In other words, take all your trash, and we'll put all this crap, we'll put it in a bucket, and we'll say "Okay, we'll give you 15 cents on the dollar for that, but not today. We'll agree to cover 15 cents on the dollar on that, and you can name that as an asset for the future in your accounting." Yes, we can do that. Some people might say 20% and so forth, but I say 15%. We'll fight about that, but that's the alternative.

The intention is to take the valid material, which meets Glass-Steagall standards of banking. Those kinds of things should receive full bankruptcy protection, maybe with some write-downs, because some of these mortgages were excessive; there were swindles already. But then we take the crap, everything that doesn't correspond to Glass-Steagall standards, and we say, "We lump this stuff, this crap, in one lump. We'll buy it from

you for 15 cents on the dollar, but not today. We'll agree to pay eventually 15 cents on the dollar. We'll sign that; you'll get that, that's going to be a value you'll get at some point. Now, take your money, and walk." That's it.

And that's the only sensible thing I can think of doing at this point. That's the alternative; either say we're going to freeze that until we can sort it out, or if they really want to get nasty, we'll say: "Okay, you want a definite price? Okay, we'll give you one. 15 cents on the dollar."

The People Are Suffering

Schlanger: There's a related question that was asked by a number of local elected officials that we spoke with at last weekend's California State Democratic Convention, officials who have been backing the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act, which you introduced back in August 2007. They are basically saying that many city and state governments have already passed resolutions supporting your Homeowners and Bank Protection Act, yet it seems that Speaker Pelosi won't allow the Congress to take this up, and foreclosures are now increasing again. More than 1.5 million families have already lost their homes due to forcible seizures. So, how can we reach the institution of the Presidency to get the HBPA enacted, since local governments can't do it, and it doesn't appear that Congress has the knowledge or the guts to do it?

LaRouche: Well, I think that citizens who are being destroyed by this process should act to let the President know, and Pelosi know, that this has to be done. And if she wants to object, tell her: "Well, let's go in and get another facelift there. Then you won't be able to speak, and that will permit us to do this." But that's the way it has to be done. We have to do it.

Look, the people are suffering; they're suffering as a result of bad policy. This bad policy is flagrant, and a flagrant bad policy borders on crime. And if they don't do something like this now, they're going to be called to account for committing a crime, because they knew

what was going to happen. It happened! They're criminals! They knew what was going to happen, and they did it, and the effects were injustice and injury to people. They go to jail!

FDR: State Power Over Finance

Freeman: This question is from an FDR historian, who is based out of Princeton. And, I'm putting together several questions here, because he's submitted a great deal for discussion. But his major point is the following: He says, "The Great Depression resulted from a collapse of the banking system and of asset values. We refer to that as the 'Great Crash.' The difference, however, was that the Roosevelt Administration, in understanding that that was at the heart of the Depression, approached it slightly differently. With the Pecora Commission, it became clear that what was at the heart of the problem was a culture of corruption, speculation, and self-dealing on Wall Street.

"So, when FDR embarked on his policies, when he permitted banks that had been closed down to be reopened, they were reopened under very specific conditions, and the American people understood that the banks that were re-opened could be relied upon. You've already referred to the Glass-Steagall Act. There also was the question of the creation of the SEC, and a variety of other measures. But, my essential point is, that what Roosevelt's actions constituted above all else, was a comprehensive assertion of state power over finance. And essentially, his New Deal represented a fundamental break with the previous role of the banks.

"In the Hoover Administration, which preceded FDR, you had a model that was followed which was much more of a British model. It was centered on the question of a financial policy designed to reassure the markets, and to essentially allow the banks to continue in their previous culture. The fact that that policy failed, it seems to me, is one of the first lessons of the Great Depression: That stuffing banks with money does not solve your economic problems, and in fact, it does not even solve a credit freeze.

"But what I would really like you to comment on, is your view as to this whole question of the assertion of state power, because it's my argument that this also was implicit in what FDR's concept was, although it was not exactly what was adopted, when he designed the Bretton Woods system."

LaRouche: Well, this goes into a question of history, so I'm glad I'm getting a question from an histo-

rian. We have to go deeply into history on this one, because the question of principle can only be understood by looking at history.

We had a development in Europe, coming out of the New Dark Age of the 14th Century, in which there was a launching of a new conception of the state. It was not entirely new, because Dante Alighieri, with his *De Monarchia*, had made a similar kind of proposal earlier, and was killed for that. On the question of language, where Dante defended the Italian language, which is the natural language of the Italian people—before Latin. Latin was a synthetic language imposed by a bunch of invaders, who went up the Tiber and raped some people, and made a population by rape, the Sabine women. So, this issue has an historical basis.

Now, when the Dark Age struck, in the 14th Century collapse of the banking system at that time, which was actually an extension of the Venetian monetary system, at that point, you had a Dark Age, where the population of Europe collapsed, conditions were horrible; mass death and so forth. But, out of this came what became known at the Renaissance, the 15th Century Renaissance. And this took the form of the great Renaissance in Florence, which established a form of nation-state which corresponded to Dante Alighieri's *De Monarchia*, but was more advanced. It was the *Concordantia Catholica* of our dear friend, Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa.

And it was the same Cusa who, a few years later, laid the basis for the establishment of modern physical science, with his *De Docta Ignorantia*. His work had been preceded somewhat by the work of Filippo Brunelleschi, the famous fellow who discovered the principle of the catenary, as a method of construction of the cupola of Santa Maria del Fiore. So, you had a scientific development.

Now, out of Cusa's work, out of his *De Monarchia* and his proposal in *De Docta Ignorantia*, you had the emergence of the first modern nation-state in Europe, around Louis XI. And then he was succeeded by an admirer of his, Henry VII, who established the second sovereign nation-state, in England, at that time, whose benefit was overturned by his son, Henry VIII, or Henry the Hateable. So, this corresponded with a plunge in Europe, from 1492 on, with the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, into a period of religious war and genocide which continued until 1648.

Now, this went through several phases of evolution. And in 1648, you had the first effort to restore a civi-

The New York Times

Copyright, 1933, by The New York Times Company.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 17, 1933.

TW

PRESIDENT STARTS RECOVERY PROGRAM, SIGNS BANK, RAIL AND INDUSTRY BILLS; WHEAT GROWERS WILL GET \$150,000,000

AIDS FARMERS THIS YEAR

Wheat Processing Tax,
30 Cents, to Take
Soon After July

ACREAGE CUTS IN

Payments to Growers
duction Allotments W
Include This Year's

WILL PROTECT CONS

Wallace Promises No
Price Rise—Will Ch
cision on Cotton To

Special to The New York

WASHINGTON, June
after July 1, Secretary W
announced today, the farm
under which wheat grow
ing to curtail their crop
ative approximately \$1

The acreage reduction a

ment provisions of the Pa
Act will be applied to li
crops of 1934 and 1935, and
of \$150,000,000 will be re
processing tax of seven ce
bushel levied against mil
Sept. 15 two-thirds of the
on, \$1,000,000, will have been d
among wheat growers w
complied with the gover
terme.

Eligibility to share in

tribution requires that
agree to reduce plantin
maximum of 20 per cent
The exact reduction calca
depend on the outcome o
tations at the economic
lary conference for joint
Global action to reduce world
production. It is possible that no

Powers Granted to the President

Special to The New York Times.
WASHINGTON, June 16.—Extraordinary powers granted
in the first session of the Seventy-third Congress to President

Text of President's statement on recovery policies, Page 2.

Special to The New York Times,
WASHINGTON, June 16.—Assum-
ing unprecedented peacetime con-
trol over the nation's economic life,
President Roosevelt placed in op-
eration today his sweeping program
for recovery from the depression.
Within two hours he signed acts
of Congress giving him control
over industry, power to coordinate
the railroads, and authority to start
work on a \$8,300,000,000 public
works program, and then began the
active administration of these and
other major measures.

In signing the National Industrial
Recovery Act the President declared
that it was "the most important
and far-reaching legislation ever
enacted by the American Congress,"
and said that it "represents a su-
preme effort to stabilize for all time
the many factors which make for
the prosperity of the nation and
the preservation of American stand-
ards."

The Glass-Steagall Banking Re-
form Act, which the President de-

ROOSEVELT HAILS GOAL

He Calls Recovery Act
Most Sweeping Law
in Nation's History.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATOR

Col. Sawyer Is Named to Direct
Public Works, Eastman as
Railway Coordinator."

'MILLION JOBS BY OCT. 1'

Employers Urged to Hire More
Men With Government Stop-
ping Unfair Competition.

Text of President's statement

Special to The New York Times.
WASHINGTON, June 16.—Assum-
ing unprecedented peacetime con-
trol over the nation's economic life,
President Roosevelt placed in op-
eration today his sweeping program
for recovery from the depression.
Within two hours he signed acts
of Congress giving him control
over industry, power to coordinate
the railroads, and authority to start
work on a \$8,300,000,000 public
works program, and then began the
active administration of these and
other major measures.

In signing the National Industrial
Recovery Act the President declared
that it was "the most important
and far-reaching legislation ever
enacted by the American Congress,"
and said that it "represents a su-
preme effort to stabilize for all time
the many factors which make for
the prosperity of the nation and
the preservation of American stand-
ards."

The Glass-Steagall Banking Re-
form Act which the President de-

ren, and then, by the Massachusetts Bay Colony, which established a system which is based on the influence of Columbus's intention in crossing the Atlantic waters to find, across the ocean, a place of refuge, in which the best of European civilization could be resuscitated free of the corruption inherent in Europe.

So, our foundations actually are traced in terms of law from the compact of the Plymouth brethren and the Massachusetts Bay Colony, which later suffered corruption, later in that same century.

But, American law was established at that time—the components of law, as opposed to European law. The conception that Europe was a place of corruption. There was a great culture in Europe, but it was corrupted. It was corrupted by the continuation of oligarchical influences. Therefore, our law has always been anti-oligarchical. And I can speak with authority, because my ancestors came over on the Mayflower, one of them at least. So, we were there; this is us! This is our law. It's anti-oligarchical law.

Now, the European systems, even though there were efforts to start republics in Europe—the British destroyed the possibility of a French Republic at that time, by the French Revolution, by the efforts of the British, who orchestrated that whole operation, and similar things, again and

again and again. Europe, to this day, has not freed itself from the corruption, the oligarchical corruption which was left over from that period.

The American Revolution

So, in the case of the United States, we have a conception of law, of natural law, which is different from any other part of the world as such, though there have been many imitations of U.S. law and experience, and some of them more or less good in various parts of the world. That is, the American Revolution was an inspiration to the world as a whole, of the possibility of taking the best of European civilization's culture, transporting it to a new part of the world, and making that available to the world as a whole, that precedent. Everything that's good that has happened in Europe since

President Roosevelt asserted the power of the state to deal with the Great Depression. Here, the New York Times of June 17, 1933 announces the passage of the Glass-Steagall Law, among other programs.

lized order in Europe, with the Westphalian principle. The outcome of this was through Cardinal Mazarin, who was also an author of the Treaty of Westphalia, and with his associates in France, who established France as new form of science-driven nation-state, which the British, and interests represented by the British, sought to destroy at that time. It was always actually the Dutch first, and then the British.

So, as a result of this, during the 17th Century, during the period of renewed religious warfare under the influence of Paolo Sarpi, continuing the religious warfare that the Hapsburgs had started earlier, there was a new phase of war involving the Hapsburgs, called the Thirty Years War. During this period, there was the first significant colonization in New England, what became known as New England, by the Plymouth brethren

that time, has been a product of the influence of this struggle inside North America; the American Revolution.

And so, our conception is based on that; and we have to look at this question in that way, as I referred to the question of the debtors' prison issue before. Our system of law is predicated on our history, when viewed from this standpoint. We represent in the United States the heir of the very best product of European civilization, a European civilization freed in our constitutional view of matters, from the evils inherent in the oligarchical traditions of Europe. We don't have *fondi*; we don't have an oligarchy.

But in this process, we never really rid ourselves of the influence of our opponents. The British East India Company's influence among us. An influence which we associate to the present day with Wall Street. With the British East India Company influence, with Wall Street, and with outright traitors inside our country. This problem exists.

So that on these questions, we go to our tradition, which is what we're defending, in the sense of the tradition of those who came here, as into Massachusetts, to establish the idea of the best of European culture, of science, of artistic culture, and the achievements of Europe and freedom from the legacy of the Dark Age. We represent that. Therefore, we insist on that, as a defense of civilization. Our principles are not just our principles; they're not the peculiarity of the United States. The United States was created by this peculiarity, of the intention of Nicholas of Cusa, for example, who was the one who said, at that time, that the corruption spreading in Europe meant that we had to defend the best of European civilization, by going across the oceans to other parts of the planet and building up an area where we could defend the best of European civilization.

Christopher Columbus, about 1480, when he became acquainted with this policy of Nicholas of Cusa, dedicated his life to that policy. And in 1492, he was able to cross the ocean—as he knew he could—to a place he knew existed, because he consulted people on that matter. And his arrival here was the intention to create a place of refuge, to find the people in the Americas and join with them in creating a refuge, bringing the best advantages of European culture into the Americas, South and Central and North America.

And, in the process, with all the fights on this issue, the United States emerged as the paragon, which was the concentration of this fight against the British Empire,

and the corruption that is inherent in the British Empire, through the present day. We have a system which is based on a credit system, under which we are sovereign. We don't have a funny system. We have a credit system according to our Constitution.


And what happened, of course, in the process, is, the British are still out to get us. Not only did they give us all the wars we had, but they also gave us the assassination of President McKinley. And the assassination of President McKinley brought a traitor into the Presidency, called Theodore Roosevelt, a distant cousin of Franklin Roosevelt. And Theodore Roosevelt brought us, with the British, a new kind of monetary system, introduced as the Federal Reserve System. And we had a guy who was a member of the Ku Klux Klan, Woodrow Wilson, who was another British scum and traitor, who was also of the legacy of the Confederacy, a British-created organization. And therefore, we had in New York and elsewhere, and in Boston, a center, a cesspool of British-style financier interests.

On the one hand, our policy was a credit, not a monetary policy. Whereas the British created a system, a monetary policy in which monetary power was superior to and independent of state power. A protectionist system like the Roosevelt system, was a protectionist system against monetary power, for domestic as well as foreign purposes. No private interest must be higher than the state, must be higher than the sovereign state. All financial interests must be subordinated to the authority of the state protection of the economy. And that's the issue here: We have to eliminate all traces of the evil which brought us to this point, especially under Alan Greenspan. And what was done was treasonous. It was treasonous in 1971. It was treasonous under poor Jimmy Carter. It was *treason*. The Trilateral Commission was an organization of treason, of British treason, foreign treason, foreign power. Alan Greenspan was a treasonous creature, as well as a despicable one, in general.


So these things we are fighting against represent an attack on everything that this United States represents, from its origins, especially from its European origins, from the origins of its founding in the 16th-17th Century. Therefore, our law is *clear*, and when we look at this law from the standpoint of history, its historical authority, it is what the world wants; it is what the world aspired to for so long—to have the freedom that we have in the United States. People didn't come here originally to settle this United States as refugees from Europe. They came here, like Columbus, to bring the best of Eu-



Nicholas of Cusa



Paolo dal Pozzo Toscanelli



Library of Congress

Christopher Columbus

From Cusa to Columbus

The Council of Florence, which began in 1439 and unified the Eastern and Western branches of Christianity, also came to fruition in Christopher Columbus's discovery of America. The key person was the Renaissance genius Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa (1401-64), through whose efforts the Council came about, and who was the founder of modern physical science. Cusa's close friend, the scientist Paolo dal Pozzo Toscanelli (1397-1482), encouraged Columbus to sail west to reach the Orient, and provided him with a map (now lost) that showed it could be done.

Columbus had been thinking about the plan for some time, but it was Toscanelli who convinced him that it was practical. Hearing of Toscanelli's investigation of the subject, Columbus wrote to ask for more information. Toscanelli sent him a copy of a letter he had written in 1474 to Fernão Martins, the canon of Lisbon, outlining such a project. His cover letter to Columbus noted, "I send thee another sea-chart like the one which I sent to him, wherewith thy demand may be satisfied." In a second letter, Toscanelli goaded Columbus on: "I am not surprised that thou, who are art of high courage, and the whole Portuguese nation who have always been noble men in all great enterprises, should be inflamed and desirous to prosecute the said voyage." (Toscanelli erred in supposing Columbus to be Portuguese; although living in Portugal at the time, he was, of course, Italian.)

ropean culture to a safe distance from European corruption.

And that's our law. If we understand the intent of our law—after all, what is law without intent? Law without intent is chaos. Law must be moral. A morality which is based on the conception of the nature of mankind, as a creative creature, unlike any animal on this planet. The sacredness of human beings, and the culture which corresponds to the sacredness of the creative powers unique to the human being, the promotion of those powers and their proliferation. This is our morality, and our law, as defined by our Federal Constitution, especially the preamble to the Federal Constitution, represents that. This is the highest law; this is the only law we consider respectable on this planet. That every people have a right to the same rights we claimed in our Declaration of Independence, and which we claimed as legal protection in the founding of our Constitution.

That's our law. The law lies in its intent, its moral intent, its purpose for humanity. And to the extent that we are committed to the purpose, we are committed to that principle on behalf of all humanity. We care as much for other people as we do for ourselves. Because we know that protecting other people according to this principle is the only security *we* have, and because we love human beings rather than baboons. Anybody who doesn't agree with me should marry a baboon, and find out what they're getting.

Empire: The Monster We Must Destroy

Freeman: Lyn, you've made our historian here very happy. What he says is, "You know, Mr. La-

Rouche, people here get frustrated with me because the point that I make over and over again is that the U.S. economy, from its inception, was based on a credit system as opposed to a European-style system. And I also have documented for people here, time and time again, that FDR's intention for Bretton Woods was a fixed-exchange-rate *credit* system, not a monetary system.

“Now, in fact, the Bretton Woods agreement, as it came into being, was itself not that, but was, in fact, a monetary system and became, pretty much, an unregulated monetary system after 1971. But it is my argument that the only way for us to proceed right now, is essentially, to apply the standard that Roosevelt had first intended, which is to adopt essentially a fixed exchange-rate credit system.

But, for the benefit of my colleagues gathered here, who seem to be incapable of comprehending the difference once we get down to brass tacks, could you define for them clearly the difference between a fixed-exchange-rate credit system and a monetary system?”

LaRouche: The credit on which a currency must be based is the interest and will of the sovereign nation. Now, people may compromise with other nations as *sovereigns*, to come up with a common system among *sovereigns*, but no third party can be introduced in between them. No third party can intrude on the sovereignty of any member or members of that association, or that association as a whole. A floating-exchange-rate system, an international monetary system, is a *Satanic* invention. It is a basis of empires.

The British Empire, in case of point: You look at these Brits, they're fat, sloppy, and dumb. Their dietary habits stink, their conditions of life stink, their opinions stink, in general. There are a few exceptions here and there, who say, “Well, you know, we're in this boat, you know, and some of the other passengers aren't exactly nice”—but the Brits are an imperial system and they're a parasitic nation, essentially. They suck the blood out of the rest of the world. Dracula was a story written by a Brit, remember. That's not coincidental.



National Archives

The “oil hoax” of 1973-74 drove U.S. gas stations and factories out of business, subjecting the developing sector to a horrendous debt burden. The photo is from 1974. Inset: Saudi King Feisal. The Saudis became an integral part of the British imperial system at this time.



So, they don't have a moral sense, the Brits. All they are, is a simple attachment to an international Venetian monetary system. That is, the monetary system is controlled by a Venetian principle, of an international agreement among bankers and similar kinds of financiers. They run the world, and they say, we have to have a *free-trade system*. You know, it's like an open marriage, a free-trade system. You don't know who the baby's father is. You can track the mother, but you can't track the father so easily. That's the British system, it's a free-trade system.

And therefore, the free-trade organization, the monetarists, control the world. That's the nature of the British Empire. The British Empire is an Anglo-Dutch-Saudi system. In 1973, it became also Saudi, because the Saudis actually ran the swindle, together with the Dutch and British, which created the new floating-exchange-rate system of the post-war system. And so, the Saudis actually became an integral part of the British Empire. Not merely member-subjects, but they actually became an integral part of the worst features of the British Empire. Some of the greatest crimes ever committed were committed by, essentially, the former ambassador to the United States from Saudi Arabia, Prince Bandar bin Sultan, who became a British agent at the

age of 16. And this crowd in Saudi Arabia, which has enemies inside Saudi Arabia, of course, naturally, this crowd is an integral part of the British Empire.

So you have an international system, which is above government, which demands—on a free-trade principle—that their system be higher in rank than government. That governments must submit to free-trade agreements. That is the name of Satan. That is the enemy. That is the Empire. It's not the British people, who are made stupid by living under such conditions, and they also have some filthy habits, as well as being stupid. But *they* are not the problem. It's not they or the Dutch that are the problem. It's this particular phenomenon. The *Empire!* This is the ancient concept of empire. The empire reposes in an individual who's selected by a committee, who is given the policy of making law. Nobody else can make law. Others can have statutes and agreements and policies, but they can't make law, in the sense of constitutional law. Only the caprice of the emperor can define law. And today that Emperor is the international financial-monetary system.

That is the monster we must destroy, and there is no solution to any of the problems the world faces today, unless we destroy that empire. And we can destroy the empire very simply. Make me President, I'll do it for you easily. I can explain it to another guy who's qualified to be President. I have the knowledge. I am willing to share that with anybody who is a qualified President of the United States. I'm getting old, I don't want to be running the Presidency myself. I know how to do it better than anyone else does, but that's not what I want to do now.

What we do, essentially, is, the United States conducts a treaty agreement with Russia, with China, with India. Why? Because you have two frontiers of the development of civilization today. One is in Asia, and Russia is a Eurasian nation. The other one is Africa. The first thing in Africa, you kick the British entirely out of Africa. Just kick them out. They're British: "Get out of here! Get the hell out of there! You don't belong here! You're a bunch of parasites; you're mass murderers; you've committed every crime imaginable. And we're going to free you, you Africans, you're going to be free, and kick the Brits out." Let's kick the Brits out, and let them have to live with themselves, and that will be punishment enough for them.

In that approach, we simply take the fact that we create a credit system. What do we do? How does the

United States make a treaty, and how does it utter money, legally, under our Constitution? You utter money by a vote of the Congress, primarily, the House of Representatives. It's a Presidential action, authorized by the consent of the Congress. Now, you do the same kind of thing you do for an international treaty. The United States explores a treaty agreement with other nations. The President endorses that. That is presented to the Congress, including the House of Representatives. The Congress must now approve that treaty before it can become law, before it can take effect. Money is uttered by the United States, legally, in the same way. When both are the form of credit. A treaty agreement is credit. It may not be monetary credit as such, but it's credit. A monetary agreement, financial agreement, is also credit.

We agree that the United States will create a debt. The debt will be used as a capital debt either to utter money for circulation in the United States, or for investment in some project, which the United States is going to fund, the Federal government's going to fund. We also do the same thing with friends abroad, with whom we have treaty agreements.

So, what I'm proposing is a general treaty agreement, made individually and collectively, between the United States, Russia, China, and India, and other countries, with emphasis upon our major targets, economic targets, which are Asia and Africa. Russia is a Eurasian nation whose territory and skills are crucial for the development of the mineral resources of northern Asia, mineral resources which China would know, but China wouldn't be able to develop. China does not have the technology and knowledge and experience to do that. Russians do. They know how to operate in tundra area, and a lot of this is in tundra area.

But, we need those raw materials developed in order to develop China, and other countries. So therefore, we have a treaty agreement. Now, China also, now recognizes that it's benefitting from this. We make a treaty agreement with China, and the Russians join into a treaty agreement with China, and with India, and also Japan will readily come in immediately. Korea will come in immediately. Nations of Southeast Asia will tend to join immediately. They want this.

So therefore, we now say we're going to make a treaty agreement with a 50- and a 100-year duration, because we know that what we're going to invest in has a 50- to 100-year cycle. Some of it is 25 years, some less. Now, we're going to give these countries credit

from the United States, for their development in certain projects, certain categories of projects, like mass transportation systems, water development systems, all the things that are necessary to develop a population and build up the physical capital investment, to enable that country to have a future.

In the meantime, the credit system will allow them to continue to live decently. They have protection against foreclosure, guaranteed by the United States and other nations. And therefore we say, China, you need this! Russia, you need this, and you have to do this for these other nations. India, you have to do this.

Credit for Development

For example, one measure. If we're going to have a war, a general war, it'll be a thermonuclear war, so if you want a war, you're going to get a thermonuclear war.

So don't worry about it! Because if they're foolish enough to have a war, you're going to have a thermonuclear war. If you don't intend to have a thermonuclear war, what are you going to do with all that plutonium, stored in weapons? Well, it has a very useful function. If you free it from this larder of plutonium, you're going to charge up nuclear uranium and thorium reactors. You're going to charge them up all over the planet. You're going to create this system of power, which enables you to use technologies of production which totally exist today.

The key one, the most important one, the most urgent one, is *water*. *Fresh drinkable water* for every people. Extremely important. Power in general, as a by-product of that. Well, it's going to be used for basic infrastructure.

Look at the map of Africa. Take a helicopter study of what the African terrain looks like. What do you see? How many roads do you see? How many railroads do you see? Look at the towns, look at where people live. What are the conditions of life in Africa? They're horrible! Totally undeveloped. What does



© WHO/P. Virost

Africa's most urgent need is for water—and that means both water infrastructure development and nuclear power for desalination. Here, a scene in Ethiopia.

Africa need? Does it need wise-guys coming in? No, it doesn't need wise-guys. It needs transportation systems, especially railways. It needs power systems, especially nuclear, which are being developed there. It needs various systems of infrastructure which are necessary to build up an economy in Africa, by the Africans. Get the British out, and it'll begin to happen immediately.

So, when we come into this kind of treaty agreement, a credit system, we extend it globally. Credit for Africa. We agree that Africa requires a mass transportation system, a railway—magnetic levitation. We agree they require water systems, with the aid of nuclear power. We agree that they require this. Okay, we and a group of nations are going to extend credit to them, to assist them in supplying themselves with these kinds of systems. If we

give them the infrastructure, and access to technology, they will do the rest for themselves. And it's better that they do it for themselves, because then it's theirs! And we want the private section of the economies of nations to be theirs, not ours. So we make credit agreements with them. Again, 50 years, a hundred years. We give this planet a hundred years to work its way out of the current mess. We emphasize scientific progress, technology, high energy flux-density, these kinds of things.

These are all things we can do. There are things we were on the verge of doing in the 1960s, before we shut down the space program. You know, in the early 1970s, we were getting a 10-cent return on every penny we spent on the space program. That is, the technologies we were getting from investment in the space program, were giving us a payback in technologies which were worth 10 cents for every cent we invested. If we return to that kind of policy, we have a multiplier capability, and if we extend, we share those technologies with the people in Africa, the people in China, in India, and so forth, for their development of their own economies, then we're going to have the kind of nation our great-

grandchildren will want to live in.

And that will be our mission in living today. It's what we're giving to the future of humanity. And it will work. You abandon selfishness, and think in terms of what does your life mean: Are you an animal? Is your personal physical pleasure everything to you? Or do you think of yourself as an immortal being, whose life is of significance for the future of humanity? Like the father, or grandfather used to take his grandchild out in the old days, and show them what he had participated in building, in some great project, like a great dam or some system. He'll tell his grandson, "I built this. I was part of building this." And that was his greatest pride in existence, in producing a generation of grandchildren to whom he could say that. And to inspire them to do likewise after him.

And that should be our policy. That's the meaning of a credit system. We have to be separate nations, as I said, because we're different cultures, and because the children have to develop their culture, their language culture, their traditions. But they have to develop to equality in equivalence of ability, and that should be our mission. Nations working to a common purpose. No more Tower of Babel. That sort of thing.

The problem is, as you see, when you think about this: We in the present generations have come to a time when governments and institutions have lost morality, true morality. When they talk about morality, you laugh with a sick laugh. These guys are talking about *morality!* The President is talking about morality, when he's doing what he's doing right now, since he went to London? That's not morality. Morality is the relationship of human beings to the future of the human race, through the medium of their nation, and cooperation among such nations. And that's the principle involved here. Nothing else is really that important.

What Is Immortality?

Schlanger: We have a question from a student of international law at Kazak State University in Almaty, Kazakhstan. And he's obviously someone who's studied your writings on FDR, and how FDR led the U.S. from the Great Depression in the first half of the 20th Century.

He asks: "In view of the overwhelming popularity of Franklin Roosevelt and his consistent criticism of the private banking cabal, what hindered Roosevelt from taking back the power of money printing from the bankers, to where it belonged, which is the U.S. government? Why did he not abolish the Federal Reserve?"

LaRouche: You know, why doesn't the general win the war all at once? Really, that's it. Not to be cryptic about it, but that's the way it is.

You have to think about human beings in terms of your immortality. Now, don't talk to most preachers about immortality. They don't know what it is. It's a rumor they spread to people who don't understand it, nor do they, and they've never been there; they'd never come back. They have no reports of immortality from the dead. But we have evidence of the immortality of the dead, from the living, in the terms of people who have made a contribution which is more than just an act, but who have contributed to the advancement of the ability of humanity to exist. Who have made peace when there was war. Who built construction and prosperity where there is poverty and destruction. Those are the evidences of immortality, because they involve the transmission of successive development of ideas and commitment, across successive generations.

It's a continuing process. There's no point at which a human being who thinks, is dead completely. Their body is dead, but they're not dead, because the ideas which other people are reliving, from them, as if they had the same ideas themselves, those relived ideas are living on as a continuing dialogue in development in generations to come.

Everything we've accomplished, has always referred to antecedents, human antecedents of accomplishment. To understand what the United States is, you have to understand the mind of Christopher Columbus in 1480 A.D., when he decided to commit himself to crossing the ocean for the mission specified by Nicholas of Cusa, earlier.

That's immortality. It's a commitment to the future of mankind, which is made actual through our reliving of the experience of discovery made by predecessors. So the process of discovery, as in physical science or as in great Classical art, is not something that just happens, like a dropping of a pigeon. What it is, is a process of development of an *idea, a creative idea*, across successive generations, and the dead live in those who come after them in this way. You cannot understand any discovery unless you relive it, and it's somebody else's discovery that you are reliving inside yourself.

What's wrong with education today, public education and university education above all: You go to school, today you get this lesson. At the end of the lesson, you get this test. You pass or you didn't pass. What a bunch of junk is that? Nobody ever becomes a

scientist in that way. They become an idiot who babbles what they've been able to memorize, but they don't know what they're talking about. And when you see some of our politicians, you recognize the effect of that. They talk a lot, but they don't say anything, because they don't have any ideas.

Ideas are always, in a sense, participation. For example, my own studies pertained to things that happened thousands of years ago. My understanding of history is re-living in my own mind the ideas that were developing in people up to thousands of years ago. Otherwise, they wouldn't be ideas. That's the difference between an opinion and an idea. The President has an opinion, this President, but he has very few ideas. He says words; that's his opinion. He backs up his words; that's his opinion. Where are the ideas? The ideas involve the antecedents and the consequences of the action which those ideas pertain to. That's our problem.

And so, this is the nature of the thing.

Our function in life is not to worry about merely what we accomplish physically in our lifetime. Our function in life is as FDR saw his own function in this respect, as President: to set into motion the process which is necessary as an idea to bring about a future benefit for mankind. The problem with Roosevelt's achievements is not in what he accomplished or didn't accomplish. He accomplished a great deal. He set the ideas in place, on which it is possible still today, by studying his state of mind, to proceed on what he intended to accomplish, if in a different form from then, but now. It's by re-living his intention as an idea, that we're able to accomplish what he intended, or had intended. And therefore, what Roosevelt accomplished, is making possible the consequences which I am proposing we establish, now.

The development of Kazakstan will depend, to some degree, on the continuation of those ideas in the environment in which Kazakstan lives today. It's those ideas which will inform the creative powers of the mind of the best young people in Kazakstan, in making their contribution to building what has not yet been built before.



NASA/Bill Ingalls

Addressing a question from Kazakstan, LaRouche said that great ideas, such as those that motivated FDR, “will inform the creative powers of the mind of the best young people in Kazakstan, in making their contribution to building what has not yet been built before.” An example: Kazakstan cosmonaut Talgat Musabayev (right) welcomes cosmonaut Nikolai Budarin (left) and astronaut Ken Bowersox to Kazakstan, May 2003. They had landed there after 161 days on the International Space Station.

The General Welfare: Social Security and Medicare

Freeman: This question comes from the Stanford group, and they say: “Mr. LaRouche, we participated in a seminar about two weeks ago with Professor Galbraith, and we came up with some proposals that we'd like to run by you. Some of them we all agree on, but there's one body of policy that is causing some controversy. As a group, we agree that there's really no alternative to putting the banks into receivership and restructuring them, and that really, from our standpoint, is a no-brainer. At the same time, what we've proposed is that while this is happening, that we establish what is essentially a publicly run bank to provide credit to businesses that is sufficient to keep them running through the crisis, and this institution obviously would be modelled on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Again, our memorandum of understanding is straightforward on these points, and we'd be happy to share it with you.

“Also, on the question of the long-term economic reconstruction: Again, we were pretty much in agree-

ment among ourselves, and I think that the proposals that we've come up with in our memorandum are things that you would more or less agree with.

"The point of controversy, however, came up when we began to address what we absolutely must address, which is the immediate emergency that the current slump is creating for our citizens. And, Professor Galbraith made some proposals, and some of us had some proposals, but this really is a point of great controversy, and we'd appreciate your comment on it. Professor Galbraith emphasized that one of the things that disturbed him, was the re-occurrence of the emphasis on the idea that Social Security and Medicare were causing problems. And he said that he thinks that the current preoccupation that's coming out of Washington with these two programs is extremely dangerous to the prospect for economic recovery, and we agree with him. But the proposals that we're playing with—many of them came from Dr. Galbraith, some of them came from others—but we just don't see any way around it. And we'd like you to comment on whether you think this is valid, whether you think it's inflationary, etc.

"First of all, given the situation that the elderly in this nation face, and they really do face a very difficult situation because they're being hit on a number of different fronts. Their home values and their stock values have declined radically. Whatever interest they were collecting on cash holdings, similarly, have declined. Therefore, the only viable solution that we were able to come up with, is that Social Security benefits should be increased, not cut. We also thought that, while overall health-care policy was being debated, that an emergency lowering of Medicare eligibility should be implemented, in which the age of eligibility would be brought down to 55.

"We also thought, and this obviously was a source of enormous controversy, but we thought that the payroll tax at least on lower-income people, should be placed on holiday. And particularly, in light of the fact, that President Obama's 90-day moratorium on foreclosures has now expired, we thought that measures to mitigate foreclosures, to keep people in their homes had to be taken immediately, and that the freeze should be extended.

"And then finally, we recommended that fiscal assistance to states and municipalities be made open-ended, so that we could put an end to job cuts in what are essentially vital public sections.

"Now, this has caused nothing short of hysteria from

our bosses in Washington, and even from some people who we work with. But we don't see any alternative to taking these measures. And since this Administration says it wants to take an FDR approach to the current crisis, it is also our assertion that this is how FDR would have dealt with it. Obviously, these measures are costly, but they are necessary. And it's our argument that however costly they may be, they probably are not nearly as costly as the amount of money the government is prepared to spend to bail out the banks. And, the difference here is that this actually could provide relief, whereas the bank bailout probably won't provide any, not even in the medium-term.

"But, we'd really like your comments on this, because again, it's a problem we have to deal with, and we want to deal with it responsibly."

LaRouche: Well, I think everything you first said you've proposed, which is considered controversial by some people, is valid. The problem here, I think, is, something has to be added to this. The measures are correct, but the question is, there are certain consequences of these measures which also have to be taken into account.

In general, first look at one aspect of this—the pensions and senior citizens. I don't feel like a senior citizen, but I see a lot of people in my age group or younger, who are considered senior citizens. And I see the plight that they go through. I'm just too stubborn to be a senior citizen. My stubborn youthfulness is hated in me by my enemies; I'm hated more for that reason than for anything else. I'm still alive—"What are you doing alive? We thought we'd be rid of you by now." But they're not rid of me yet. They may take drastic measures, you know; they always threaten that.

We have to look at two things. First of all, we have been operating with "promises, promises, and promises. That everything is going to be fine with your 401(k); that this is all going to work; that everything is guaranteed. Don't worry about it. Trust us. Trust us!"

Well, what happened? The pensions got wiped out! The guaranteed prosperity, the protection, got wiped out. The insurance companies got wiped out! Everything they depended upon; everything is being taken from them. When they're unable to defend themselves by their own means against what is being done to them by the present incumbents of the U.S. government, the Congress in particular, in general, and by the corporations. This was great thievery! What was done by Hank Paulson: They shouldn't have hung him, because that

would have stopped his suffering. Other remedies should be found, and we are going to provide some. The penalty of ridicule; he is going to be ridiculed by us in ways that will be infectious. He will be fleeing; changing his name; disguising himself; probably even growing hair on the top of his head, or such other desperate measures.

But the point is, we owe it to our citizens because they are citizens, because of their status, to provide them protection against the consequences of that bunch of idiots in the Presidency and the Congress who led this nation into these catastrophes. We are responsible. And who is most responsible? The super-rich! The super-rich, the useless ever-sucking super-rich! So therefore, the Federal government tax policy will reflect that. Why not?

First of all, we do have to take over the question of pensions and health care, but we have to do more than that. Look, the whole health-care racket in the United States is a great swindle which affects mostly people in senior years. It's a swindle! What happened to the general hospitals? What happened to the excellent system of hospitals in New York City, as a result of Felix Rohatyn's work? What happened to these things?

You know: You get sick; you go to the doctor. You have to go through this hurdle. You have this contact, this contact, that contact; go here this week, go there next week. You get an appointment for that three weeks from now. You get an operation two years after you're dead. There are certain faults in that system! So, simply putting money into them is not going to cure the fault.

What is happening is, the doctors themselves are being swindled. The system is swindling them, and doing even worse swindling against the patients, against the population. What we need to have is what we learned from World War II, medical experience in World War II. We consolidated a system of general hospitals. You got sick in a neighborhood, you could walk into one of the outpatient facilities of a general hospital system. You get into that through your physician and so forth, voluntarily. You don't have to go through an intermediary and this crap. And we were able to deliver better medicine, more cheaply under that system, than under the crazy system that's introduced now.

The way this system, the medical system was created, crafted, was to impoverish the physicians, to eliminate as many as possible through medical risk insurance, to increase the cost of everything. And the drug companies sat on top of it all. So, we've had a system

whose intention, in terms of its embodied function, was *criminal*. Our law says no law, no practice is condoned, which is contrary to the general interest, the general public interest. These were obviously against the public interest; they're against most *people* today. The policy now is to accelerate death. "You have a terminal illness? Come back two years from now; we might do something for you, if you're still alive; which we are confident you will not be."

So, in this case, in the medical area, we have to revamp the whole system. We have destroyed the excellent medical system we had in the aftermath of World War II. We've destroyed it. We have to put it back. We have to rebuild the same kind of capability, the same policies that we had then.

In the medical profession, who's making money? The drug companies! You compare what it costs to get certain prescription pharmaceuticals in the United States, with what they cost in various parts of the world, like Canada, various parts of Europe, and so forth. The pharmaceutical companies are the great swindlers, and part of the great swindle.

Get Rid of the 'Green'!

So therefore, you have two sides to the problem. First of all, you have the need to create the generation of income which will allow us to commit ourselves to make these payments which are necessary. That means we have to get rid of green. We're against pollution, but you get rid of green. We now go to a high-technology orientation, which is what we were based on. We go to high-technology industries, energy-dense industries, which means nuclear power today. You can't do it without nuclear power. Stop wasting money on solar cells, windmills. Windmills! What's your technology level in windmills? As a matter of fact, the windmill industry is subsidized. It's a fraud against the people. The reason it's able to operate is because it's protected and subsidized. Solar power? Subsidized. It's not efficient; it's useless. Get rid of this policy.

Now, go to high-technology industry. Rebuild—stop this highway policy. The whole highway system is crazy. You have people forced to spend as much—in this area—as two and a half hours a day each way, commuting from West Virginia or elsewhere to jobs around Washington. What the hell does that do to family life?


You say you care about family, like social welfare, general interest? What are you talking about? We used to have a system in the United States when you didn't

have giant corporations controlling everything. The basis for our economy was largely smaller firms, smaller enterprises located in various parts of the country, local agriculture and so forth. So you have economic distribution of productive activity in various parts of the country. And in general, most people, then, could get a job, a decent job, within 15 minutes, or 20 minutes, or half an hour of commuting time *at most* each way. People would move into areas where the job was there, where they commute within 15 to 20 minutes or half an hour at most to get to the job. What happens if you have two and a half hours commuting on each end of the job day? What happens to family life? Who cares?

So, the problem is, we have to restructure our economic policy in a way which is consistent with supplying these proposed remedies. The remedies are morally right; they're right economically. The question is, how do we pay for them? We pay for them by increasing the efficient productivity of the nation, per capita and per square kilometer. Restore American agriculture! Monsanto is not in charge of life. Monsanto never invented a living process. It never invented life, so why is it taxing it? Why has it got a monopoly on life? What's that? A new form of slavery? My vegetables are in slavery to some foreign corporation?

We've got to stop the idiocy, and go back to the idea—against Prince Philip, against the World Wildlife Fund—that fascist should not be running the world with his policy. And Al Gore should go there and be the house servant for this pig, and not bother us anymore. As a matter of fact, he's too big; he's too fat. Our doorways are not large enough to handle him in and out. We can't knock out and expand our doorways to let him in.

So therefore, we have to make revisions in our policy. We have to make sensible revisions that are consistent with our history as a progressive nation, with our best periods. We are going to be just, we're going to protect our citizens. The right to life is sacred, the right to a decent life, to protection, is sacred. We're going to provide the systems which are oriented to human beings. And these are proposals which are in dispute in this question, which are perfectly legitimate. They're necessary measures. The question is, how are you going to pay for them? Well, I've got some good ideas for what we don't pay for anymore, and what we pay less for. And for, in addition, the new industries, the new places of employment which are productive, which will enable our government *to afford* to make these adjustments.



Don Quixote tackles a windmill. Etching by Gustave Doré (1863).

So, you have to consider two things. The provisions are morally correct; they're necessary. How do we pay for them? We pay for them by not paying for such junk that we're paying for now, like high prescription drug prices, that sort of thing. We pay for them by eliminating junk. We pay for them by providing mass transit systems so people don't have to choke on highways for two and a half hours to get to and from work, and that sort of thing.

So, we build a more efficient, physically efficient economy, more powerful economy, with better technology. We don't have to have all these white-collar workers. We don't need it. White collars just get dirty quicker; we don't need that. What we need is high-technology emphasis on high degrees of productivity. We need capital-intensive, progressive investment. We need to decentralize much of our production, so we distribute our production across the countryside, as in agriculture and industry. So that in every part of the country, you have options for work, for employment, in communities, within a reasonable commuting time each day. You have all the necessities taken care of, like general hospitals in

every area that can be the matrix for dealing with the requirements of the health of the population. And we're going to have to socialize a lot of things, especially for the elderly, the ill, and for education. We're going to have to pay for it. So therefore, if you have to pay for it the old-fashioned way, go to work and earn it.

You Have To Be Right

Schlanger: Now we'll take a question from the floor.

Q: Good afternoon. I'm Doctor Hayes. I'm from Washington, D.C., I'm a Catholic, and I'm a Republican. . . . I've travelled overseas; I've been to Africa, I've been to the Middle East, I've been to Central Asia and Central Europe, Eastern Europe. I've been in all of the United States, and everyone asks the same question: "How are your policies going to help us have a better life?" And I just didn't get that with McCain or with Obama. So, I listened to your issues, and I say to myself, "How can you resonate your message to the American people, and foreign people, where they understand it? . . . Because they don't know what they need to know, and they don't understand what they need to understand.

LaRouche: Okay, partly, the secret in life is, you have to be immortal, not physically, but you have to be immortal in the way you think. And that is, you'll find in life, as I have, that most of your fellow citizens tend to be stupid. They tend to be morally stupid. They have the facts before them, but they don't draw the conclusions they should, because they have another agenda they're listening to. They say, "Well, I don't need what you're talking about. I'm fixed," or "I got a plan; something that's going to work for me. I don't want to jeopardize that, just because you come along with this idea."

And, as you're finding today around the country—for example, we get a lot of troubles inside the Democratic Party, but over 50% of the people at the recent California Democratic Convention, tended to agree with the fact of our agenda. They may not have fully agreed with it, but they agreed that this was one of the things that had to be discussed. And they were important issues, like the question of getting rid of Pelosi, for example. She needs a new facelift; maybe that'll shut her up for a while. I'm all for her getting a facelift. If it shuts her up, that's good. You know, with that initial surgery, she can't talk much.

So the point is, in life, when you talk to people, you have to take an immortal view. First of all, you have to

be right. And you have to be extremely self-critical to make sure you're right in your own mind, in what you do. You have to get to the point that you have enough knowledge to make that judgment. Then, you have to say it, *whatever* the reaction is you're getting. Because if ideas are valid, keep them alive, keep pushing them. And, now, people who are afraid of me, because I had too many enemies in politics, say, "Oh, how nice you are. Maybe we can do that."

So, in life, what you have to do, in dealing with your fellow citizens, you have to show patience. The so-called legendary patience of Job, because you have to wait for it to come to you. Your problem in life is not to submit guarantees of a certain time that this is going to happen. Sometimes, you can do that; sometimes I can because I'm a good forecaster, and generally I don't make the mistakes that most people make, so therefore, I'm right because I don't make those mistakes. But, in principle, being right now, does not mean you're going to get success now. The worst thing to do, is to find out what you can be successful at, whether it's right or wrong, and go with that. Our problem with the philosophical liberalism in the United States, which we got from the British, largely, is that people will say, "I gotta go with that, because that will be accepted, whether it's right or wrong."

So, what you have to build up in our citizens is a conception of what's right and what's wrong. And you've got make sure that you're right, and pay a lot of attention to being right, rather than simply opinionated. And if you're that, then you keep pushing. Keep pushing; because keeping ideas which are correct alive, is the very minimum of what you can do in life. Sometimes you can use judgment about where you push it. For example, you don't go to a Klan rally, nor do I go to a Klan rally, to express ideas. I just don't think that's a good idea. There are some parts of northern Alabama I visited, I wouldn't go out at night, where I'm known, because I might not come back.

So therefore, you don't do everything simply because it's right, but you try to select what you think you should be committed to, what you should be able to win people to eventually. And in the case of parents, what you do, is you select: This is a mission which you think you can succeed in, that you should be able to succeed in, and you try. And you may have some longer term ideas, too, which you also would express to people you think you might be able to influence or involve them in, call their attention to. What you're trying to do, con-

stantly, is plant the idea that is needed for the present and the future, and stick at it.

Because you have to think of your work as being immortal, not just you. Don't try to be immortal—you're not going to make that one. No one's ever figured that one out, so far. But you try to be immortal in terms of the values that you are providing for people around you. That's the only thing you can do. That's what I do. It's worked! I've had some big successes at times, and paid a big price to be successful, because my enemies were not pleased with that. I've had some big ones, so I can say that you can achieve big results. And I have. I've been more fortunate than most people, in that respect.

But, at the same time, if you think you want an absolute guarantee that you're going to get that result when you want it—that's selfishness. There's no guarantee in that. But doing the right thing, putting the right idea, putting the right devotion to a cause, into motion, that's valid, always.

The main thing is to be right, and to come to a deeper understanding at all times. That's what I try to do. I enjoy it.

A Coup d'État?

Freeman: This question comes from a journalist here, who writes on politics, and he says, "Mr. LaRouche, I think that it's time to address what nobody else here at this gathering has been prepared to talk about. Because we can talk about the right policies as much as we want, but I think it's time that we examined some of the politics behind what is going on. And I've said, time and time again, that people are pissed off about the financial crisis, about the bailout, but they're not nearly pissed off enough.

"It's my contention that the current economic meltdown and everything that has followed it, particularly the bailout, represent the equivalent of a coup d'état. That what has occurred basically is that a political trend that's been snowballing for decades, has essentially now been cemented, and that our government, in effect, has been taken over by a small class of connected insiders, who have repeatedly used money to control elections, to buy influence, and to systematically weaken financial regulations. And the fact of the matter is that Larry Summers is simply the leading and most disgusting example of this.

"The fact is, that the current crisis was essentially what these guys needed. They now, at this point, after

having been given free rein over the economy; after having literally wrecked the banking system and the financial world; what we're doing now is that we're giving the same people who created the problem, unlimited powers to clean up their own mess. And the fact of the matter is that, as a result, various of these individuals, like Larry Summers, like the gambling addicts who lead companies like AIG, are ending up not penniless, not in prison, but instead they've cemented their death grip on the Treasury and on the Fed.

"My contention is that the mistake that most people make in looking at the current crisis, is that they think about it in terms of money. But if you look at it in the terms that I look at it, and you can argue that they're Machiavellian terms—but I think they're accurate—is that I think that what we've experienced is a colossal power grab that threatens to turn the government into the equivalent of one giant Enron, which is essentially, an impenetrable fortress that's filled with self-dealing insiders, whose scheme is simply to steal as much individual profit as they can at the expense of an ocean of unwitting involuntary shareholders, who are actually known as U.S. taxpayers.

"Now, the reason that I'm going through this rant—and I admit that it is a rant—is that I think that unless we identify this pathology, then all of the great policies and reforms that we're discussing, will never be implemented. Because these individuals who, right now, for better or for worse, have a stranglehold on the policies of our government, are, as far as I can see, the enemy. And unless we identify someone like Larry Summers, and the general political tendency that he represents, as the enemy, I don't see anything good happening, with this administration or with any other. And nobody here wants to address that directly, I suppose because of where their salaries come from, but since I'm the irreverent member of the group, I wanted to put it on the table and I'd like your comments on it."

LaRouche: Okay, fine. Delighted to do so.

First of all, what you say in general is not inaccurate. It leaves something out.

Let's take 1789 in France. Let's take June-July 1789, in France, and what followed. The danger in this period is that, as you say, in the case of Lafayette, who made a critical mistake in that process: Lafayette's policy was that he still felt an obligation to his King, when the King had become a traitor to France. What had happened was, that it was a British operation—it would probably be interesting to go through this, because this is classic:



Jacobin mobs, like the one that stormed the Bastille in France (1789), are being created by Twitter today. “They’re a parody of the ancient cult of Dionysus,” LaRouche said.

The British had set up a Freemasonic operation in France which was again controlling the opposition to the King, and the Duc d’Orléans was a key part of it.

So what happened is, they set up this freemasonic organization, or network, on the European continent, which was a branch of British freemasonry, with a European accent. So, this crowd pulled a stunt. Up until that time, of this event—that is, the event three years earlier—the Emperor of Austria was very happy with Mozart. He was very happy with a number of things, including his sister, who was the Queen of France. And what happened was, the British, with this Freemasonic operation, pulled an operation under which the famous case of the Queen’s Necklace occurred. And this scandal enraged both the King, who was a little bit of a fool, but also enraged the Hapsburg Emperor, the Queen’s brother, who turned nasty. As a result of this process, the French monarchy turned nasty in general, along with her in-law, the Emperor of Austria. And they became hostile to the French people on this issue.

So, in 1789, in this context, the King had relied upon his brother-in-law to bring foreign troops into France, around Paris, to protect the French monarchy. In this same period, Lafayette and his friends had established a negotiation to create a republic, with the intent that the King should accept the position of constitutional monarch of a republic. But Lafayette and company did not follow through, at that time. So his enemy, the enemy of Benjamin Franklin and so forth, who was the

typical British agent in the situation, organized an event called the Siege of the Bastille, which had essentially a bunch of gibbering idiots in it, only, who were in there because they were waiting to be transported to an insane asylum. Nobody else was there, except the guards.

So the mob, which was armed by Louis Philippe, Philippe Égalité, besieged the Bastille and committed atrocities. When the guards surrendered, they decapitated them, put their heads on pikes, put the gibbering idiots on the shoulders of the mob, and the mob marched through with a triumphal procession. This, then, created a situation under which the King supported repressive measures against France. And this started this process of the French Revolution.

The ‘Twitters’: A Dionysian Nightmare

Now, what you’re looking at here, in the United States today, is a phenomenon typified by the Twitters. Now the Twitters are very seriously an operation of evil. They’re a parody of the ancient cult of Dionysus, of which we have examples: For example, the people at Columbia University, who in the second sit-in associated with Mark Rudd in 1968, were called “The Movement.” They were fascists. What’s the difference between the socialists and the fascists? They called themselves socialists, they called themselves the left. They were in a sense left-overs, who shouldn’t have been left loose. But they were fascists. What’s the difference? They called themselves socialists, but they were anti-labor—they hated blue-

collar labor—and they hated farmers, and they hated science. They were fascist.

Now, the Hitler movement back in the 1920s had the same characteristics. The environmentalist movement, as we call it today, was originally a keystone of the Nazi movement, in Germany in the 1920s. These guys, Mark Rudd and company, and that entire movement, were essentially pro-Nazi. They weren't Nazi, they didn't wear swastikas, but they had all the other relevant appurtenances, in terms of their behavior. They had become a dominant part in U.S. culture; they are a dominant force among the Baby Boomers. They are the peers of the Baby Boomers, and what's wrong with the Baby Boomers is that they are contaminated by their association with this generation of so-called 68ers, because the 68er generation was largely penetrated and polluted by things like Mark Rudd, and other fascist types.

So therefore, the danger here: This system is not going to last. What Obama represents today will not last. It's doomed, in any case. *The question is, what do you get in its place.* And the Twitters are the answer. The Twitters are devotedly brainless creatures. Twitter, twitter, tweet, tweet, tweet.

We had this experience in the Dark Age, the 14th Century. They were called the Flagellants. The Flagellants were not a social phenomenon. They were an orchestrated social phenomenon. In the period of fear, terror, the Dark Age, when society was disintegrating, you still had wars, but you didn't have well-organized armies, because the armies had broken down, because the financial system had broken down. So therefore, a new type of warfare was used. The warfare, just like the ancient cult of Dionysus, like the Nietzschean movement.

And what they would do, would be to call on these people—tweet, tweet, tweet, tweet, tweet—call them together, go to a certain place, and there's food there. You can steal it, you can loot that. And they would go there, beating themselves on the backs with sticks, or having other people beat them, for their great sins; going out and living by looting the countryside, thus starving the towns and cities, and then moving into the cities, and looting them. A Dionysian nightmare!

The danger here, in the United States—which is why your point is so well-taken—is that, unless we recognize that *that* is the alternative to what we must do, we won't be resolute in doing what we must do: We must not allow a Nazi-like nightmare, which the Twitters forebode, to be the movement that takes over the

United States when Obama, who will soon go down, if he continues on his present role—he'll be finished, his administration will collapse and disintegrate when the inflationary phase of this process hits, and it's about to hit now. The Obama Administration, under its present policy, is doomed, because the United States is on the verge of spiralling into a hyperinflationary process, like that that hit Germany in the Summer and Autumn of 1923. When that happens, Obama—if he continues his present policy—is finished. It may be weeks or months from now, but if he continues his policy, he's finished.

In what way will he be finished? Will he change, perhaps, and become human again? Or will he refuse to change, and be destroyed, along with his crowd? And what will we get, if he's destroyed in that way? Will we get Twitters, the brainless fascists who make the mating call to produce chaos as their children, like the Nazis of the 1920s, who were the predecessors of the Nazis of the 1930s, or what the Jacobin Terror was in France? That kind of thing? So this question has to be treated seriously.

We can not say that we can sit back and say we're right, just keep doing this. No, we have to say, we have to destroy the two threats to this civilization: first of all, the threat that Obama under his present policies, will bring the United States down, as the British desire. Or, that Obama will be destroyed, or his crowd will be destroyed, as a result of what he does, but then he will be succeeded by a fourth Terror.

Now, those who have studied history, in all parts of human culture, know this phenomenon: *If you do not provide a positive answer to an evil, you may get an even greater evil.* That's where we stand today in the world. Therefore, the problem here is a lack of guts to recognize that these are the alternatives, and the guts to act in a way to prevent these alternatives from coming true. You have to have the guts to fight this issue in the appropriate way. Obama is doomed if he continues this policy. He's doomed anyway. And he's doomed soon. What he's doing will not work, except to destroy him at the hands of his own friends. The danger is, when they destroy him, what are you going to get next? It could be something much worse.

Energy Flux-Density

Freeman: This question is part of about eight questions that have come from a small study group, that is trying to work through the comment that you recently issued on a paper by James Galbraith [*EIR*, April 24,

2009]. What they say is: “Mr. LaRouche, we have bravely embarked on the process of trying to work through your paper, and admittedly we really have just begun. We agree with you that it’s a barren and miserable approach to simply try to treat economics, and economic processes, through statistical analysis. However, at the same time, in going through your paper, what we are faced with is the task of actually trying to come up with a rigorous definition, an actual scientific definition, of what you identify as creativity, and human creativity, in physical terms.

“Now, one thing that has come out of the group is that perhaps the best way to approach it is to approach it from the standpoint of what you have put on the table as energy flux-density, or the measurement of the power to do work. We’re not sure that’s what you mean, and if it *is* what you mean, we have another problem, which is that—as I’m sure you know—the prevailing view is to try to figure out how to lower energy throughput, rather than to increase it, as a form of raising the efficiency of an economic process. You may want to go into different aspects of this, but it would be helpful to us, if you could put us in the right direction, and also identify whether you think it is actually possible to define this issue of creativity, obviously not in statistical terms, but in some rigorously measurable effect.”

LaRouche: This goes to a deeper question. It goes to a baseline question, a Basement question, as we call it. Because the idea of creativity does not exist in the cultural lexicon of any known existing university in the United States. No university in the United States is teaching anything about human beings, because human beings are different from animals because we have creativity. And that creativity is something which no university in the United States has properly defined.

We deal in physical science with the effects of creativity. Generally, that’s what physical science, insofar as it’s halfway competent, does, is consider the effects, the measurable effects of creativity, as they apply to physical scientific matters, or to cures of disease, which we make a good guess at. We call it a cure if it works.

Therefore, the idea of creativity, per se, is alien to liberal culture. Our culture, the culture we’re dealing with, is the culture established by Paolo Sarpi. The Catholic culture is mostly bankrupt. So therefore, the Protestant cultures have taken over, through England and the Netherlands, and the Protestant culture says that there is no such thing as creativity. Or they call anything creativity that they like, or don’t like, as the case

may be, and they don’t know what they’re talking about. They’re idiots. So they think of creativity in terms of mathematical formulas, and therefore they have not understood the ABC of physical science, as defined either by the ancient Greeks, the Classical Greeks, or as understood by the modern scientists, followers of people like Brunelleschi, and Nicholas of Cusa, and Kepler.

Because a principle is not something you can measure mathematically. That is, the mathematical expression does not describe the action of the principle. The mathematics describes the *effect* of the principle, not the causal feature of the principle.


Gravitation: What does Einstein say, for example? The universe is not bounded. It’s finite, but not bounded. Why is it finite? Well, Einstein says, look at Kepler. Because the universe is bounded by the principle of gravitation, as a general principle. Nothing exists outside gravitation. The universe is bounded by gravitation. The universe, physically, is bounded by universal principles, none of which is a mathematical formula as such. But the bounding, so far, describes the mathematical process. So Kepler defined a general theorem for gravitation, which is the only general theorem for gravitation known in the universe today, by him. And nobody ever invented a better definition of gravitation than he did—today, mathematically. Newton discovered nothing. He didn’t even discover himself, or what he was.

So, therefore, science is not limited to derivatives of statistical processes or mathematical processes. Rather, mathematics is a way of dealing with experimental evidence which pertains to the discovery of the hidden presence of a universal physical principle. Now, what we’re looking at in terms of universal physical principles involve—what? Abiotic domains. You know, everybody likes to start out with the hard, material stuff—the abiotic domain.

Then you get more sophisticated, and you leave the Department of Physics and you go over to the Department of Physical Chemistry. And when you’ve grown up, you stop being a physicist, and you become a physical chemist, because you can’t understand physical science without physical chemistry, as such, not just plain old physics. Physics is what you take when you’ve got constipation. Physical chemistry is what you take when you want to get scientific advancement. And then you go at the question of life, and you’re interested in the physical chemistry of life, and you can’t deal with the relationship between the physics, and life, without physical chemistry. Because the question of what part



"If you are not a Classical musician, or beloved of Classical music, you are not really a scientist." Shown: Albert Einstein.



EIRNS/Helene Möller

A LaRouche Youth Movement pedagogical workshop in Berlin, Feb. 1, 2009. The scientific work of the LYM's "Basement" team in Virginia radiates throughout the international youth movement, drawing more and more young people away from the Twitters, and into the process of creative discovery.

of the so-called abiotic domain is relevant, specifically, to the living processes.

Oh, now you think you've got a big success, right? You're a physical chemist who specializes in biochemistry, physical biochemistry. That's already a step up, but it's not good enough, buddy. You've got to go further, to a higher level. *Human* life. And human life is not understood from the standpoint of physical biochemistry. You can understand human life in its *effects* on physical biochemistry. For example, when a physicist goes in as a musician and also works in a laboratory, he will be doing something with physical chemistry. Biophysical chemistry. But biophysical chemistry does not explain what a human being is, because no ordinary form of life is capable of thinking like that: of being creative.

Now, where does creativity lie, then?

Creativity lies in Classical poetry and song. If you are not a Classical musician, or beloved of Classical music, you are not really a scientist. You're almost a guy who wishes he's a scientist, but hasn't made it yet. Because science pertains to man's relationship to the universe. Science exists only as an aspect of *human* behavior. Keep your monkeys out. And therefore, you cannot understand creativity unless you understand what science is, and science is *human* behavior.

So you go back to the study of mind. How does cre-

ativity work in the human mind? Interesting question, hmm? Because creativity does not exist as a conscious expression of behavior in anything but human beings. Art, as such, does not exist in anything but human behavior. So creativity as defined in art, is your key to understanding creativity. And all you have to do, once you've made that hypothesis, is, you have to prove it in physical terms. And this is the great challenge.

For example, mankind's potential population density is crucial. What determines that? How would we organize the planet, and *change* the characteristic of the physical chemistry and physical biochemistry of the planet, in order to increase the human population, to sustain a certain level of the human population and advance it? So therefore, we do know that you have to increase the energy flux-density. If you cannot increase the flux-density, you cannot sustain the population.

So, there's no economy which works on energy minimization. Reducing the energy throughput is the assurance of a Dark Age. There's no way that mankind can continue to exist and progress without increase of energy flux-density. Can't happen. Those who believe that, are being duped.

But then, you understand, as I've emphasized, unless people are educated, and emphasize, and have insight into Classical musical composition, especially *contrapuntal* Classical musical composition, they don't know

a damned thing. Therefore, it's only through this understanding, as applied to the question of physical biochemistry, that you really have touched upon, empirically, direct contact with the idea of what creativity is.

Read the Great Poets

If you want to know what creativity is, look at the greatest poets. Read Keats in English, or Shelley in English. Read Shelley's famous essay, *A Defence of Poetry*. Read particularly the last paragraph, the long paragraph from that essay: That's the key to creativity. When you are conscious, of your mind working in a way which corresponds to the activity of Classical poetic, or poetic musical expression, when you're able to think in terms of counterpoint, as a way of life, to recognize in yourself, those mental processes which you wish to encourage, which you find, in turn, are precisely the creative potential which leads to achievements in physical biochemistry, then you know what creativity is.

The problem is, in a liberal culture, philosophical liberal culture, based on the idiocy of William of Ockham, as revived by Paolo Sarpi—which is what Anglo-Dutch Liberalism is! The problem with the American people today, is, their education is in accord with Anglo-Dutch Liberalism! With this legacy of Paolo Sarpi. Earlier, you had a different form of impotence, called Aristotle. Aristotle destroys the mind, by denying the existence of creativity. You had a famous Jewish scholar, Philo of Alexandria, who denounced Aristotle's teaching on this ground: that it denies creation! And Aristotle *does* deny creation.

And so, for example, does Euclid. My break, was I hated Euclid: I recognized he was a fraud from the beginning, my first day in school, on geometry. He's a fraud. Euclid's a fake: He presumes that there are two self-evident qualities, particularly sight, and implicitly sound, which then comes up later—that these are self-evident. They don't have to be proven experimentally. You believe them, because your senses tell you that. You believe your senses!

Your senses are only sense-organs, they're not verities. And you have to adduce reality from understanding how these sense-organs interpret, or misinterpret reality, as Kepler did, in his discovery of gravitation.

But you find in the end, when you think about this, when you work in these media, of Classical artistic composition, which is man contemplating his own mind: man contemplating the mind of man. Then relat-

ing that to man's contemplation of man, himself, looking at what man does. Looking at the way nature responds, to what man attempts to do. Then you understand the connection between creativity, as you know it artistically, and creativity as it's manifested in physical effects.

And those of us who've been through that experience, and know what creativity is, know it very well. But, there's been a loss of creativity in the post-World War II period, which was deliberate. Which came together with the elimination of the influence of Franklin Roosevelt. We *destroyed* the American System, the American concept, in favor of British Liberalism. We set up a system of education. We increased the number of people educated, but we destroyed their minds, as the price of giving them an education.

You go into a classroom: You take a course, this course, this subject, today! You get a question, a quiz, on that course. Did you understand anything? No! Do you understand how to pass the examination? Yes! What's the examination worth, then? What do you actually know? You knew *nothing*! You knew how to behave, in order to get a passing grade. What does that do with the universe? What does that tell you about the Solar System? Nothing! It tells you how you behave in a classroom in order to get a higher grade; or bribe the professor some way or other, so you don't have to take the course, and get an A grade—that sort of thing.

So, the problem, the idea of actually having *proof* of principle, in respect to creativity, became essentially a lost art, especially in academia. If you're a fake, and you're a fake as a professor—you barely passed the course, by honors—and you go to David Rockefeller in Bellagio, Italy, where you are entertained by him, and he says, "Oh, gee, you ought to publish a book! You're a smart guy. Publish a book—I know a couple of guys who can fix it up for you." Then you go back, and you go to this university, where you're teaching as an almost thrown-out character—and suddenly you're promoted. You publish a book, two books, on various subjects; you fake it most of the way; But your books are celebrated. The *New York Times* covers them favorably, or the other review journals do it favorably, and you rise!

And then, you find all the top professors in the universities are the worst louts! The clumsiest, stupid jerks! And the honest ones, are plodders, who are sneaking around furtively, trying to get their ideas in, and nobody wants to talk to them, because they're spoiling the bullshit. You know? They're taking the



Rembrandt's self-portrait as Saint Paul: "man contemplating the mind of man."

pleasure out of the bullshit.

So therefore, you have a society which is organized from the top-down, by a bunch of fakers, who are the ideological leaders of culture in the United States today, mostly, as most of my friends from New York know this. That the best people, generally, are swarmed over by the fakers, who are the "luminaries"! And very rarely do they have a few kept people, who are competent, in key positions, just so somebody has a book index, as to where the ideas might be found!

But that's the nature of things. And what I laid out as creativity, *is* the understanding: It's the most important thing to understand, I think. The most important thing to understand, is man. And to understand man, you have to understand what the difference is between your neighbor the monkey, and your neighbor the man. And sometimes you find it difficult to distinguish between the two of them.

But, if you don't understand creativity, you don't

understand yourself as a human being. You may approximate, you may learn tricks, you may learn things that you're confident that work; but don't really believe in yourself, that you know them. You know that they work; you know if you put the right key in the front door, you can get in. But that's what you know. That doesn't mean you're a scientist.

That's the way it goes. And you have to think in these terms: That, one has to understand creativity, *per se*, and put that question, "Do you understand what creativity is?" Do you understand why Kepler, and how Kepler, was the only person, who *ever* discovered a general principle of gravitation? Until later, when his conception was enlarged by people like Einstein and Max Planck, for example, who had something to do on microspace; and the idea of how the universe is organized, was modified. But the essential discovery by Kepler, as presented in his *Harmonies of the World*, is the only discovery of gravitation that was ever made! No other original discovery of gravitation was ever made by anyone, except by Kepler. And if you work through that book, and the steps that he describes, as to how he came to that conclusion, you understand it.

But most people in university will tell you that, today, "Oh! Newton discovered gravitation!" Newton discovered nothing! He was a black magic specialist! He never made a discovery, of anything in science. A bunch of fakers made the whole story up. And they made it up in order to try to discredit Leibniz. It was part of the anti-Leibniz campaign that was run in England, in the first decade of the 18th Century. A complete fake! Everything that Newton is attributed to have discovered, proved to be a *fake*: Either he was a fake in the claim, or they were fakes in what they claimed.

And every important scientist, always knew, that Newton was a fake. Yet, just think how many places you hear that Newton is this great scientific discoverer. He discovered nothing... except how to be celebrated!

The only public speech that Isaac Newton ever made, was when he was a member of Parliament, and he suggested as his only statement on scientific questions, in the Parliament, *ever*—"Will somebody please open a window?"

A CURIOUS NOTE:

A Good Heart, But Bad History

By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

April 25, 2009

The Moscow Times of April 24, 2009 includes a piece, “Anti-Nazi Bill Targets Ukraine, Baltic States,” which author Natalya Krainova summarizes as, “would make the rehabilitation of Nazism a crime which could result in Moscow cutting diplomatic ties with other former Soviet republics.” The article’s argument may appear to be plausible, but absolutely misses the essential fact of the matter. Before speculating on the subject of Nazism, it is always the time to ask, “How and why did the British monarchy, first, create both Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler as British-sponsored dictators, and, later, turn against Hitler, but only when the Wehrmacht was overrunning France?”

The same strategic motive for British imperial policy then, is now the motive for Britain’s current aim to destroy the U.S.A., Germany, Russia, and China, and maintain a policy of genocide against Africa, today. Why the dumping of Germany’s Chancellor Bismarck, in 1890, which made possible Britain’s launching of what became known as a first “World War,” and also, why the related matter of British policy, still today, of the British monarchy’s launching of the 1895-1945 warfare of Japan against China, this time in the form of the pro-genocidal dogmas of Prince Philip’s World Wildlife Fund? See why Natalya Krainova had posed the wrong questions.

To correct the essential error in the *Moscow Times*

report by Natalya Krainova, begin with attention to the British empire’s steering of the continuing pattern of warfare since Prince Edward Albert’s role in the 1890 ousting of Germany’s Chancellor Bismarck and the Prince’s 1894 success in inducing the Emperor of Japan to unleash the war against China which was continued, in effect, until the Summer of 1945. The policy of the British empire then, is expressed presently with the same malice, as the “environmentalist” program, that of global genocide, of Prince Philip’s neo-malthusian World Wildlife Fund today.

This pattern of that drive toward that system of British world-empire which London has aimed since the decades leading into so-called “World War I,” was crafted by means including that assassination of France’s President (Marie François) Sadi Carnot (the grandson of that great Lazare Carnot known as “the author of victory”)¹

1. The great French scientist, Lazare Carnot, was otherwise celebrated as the commanding French general honored by his government as “The Author of Victory,” and later nominee for President of a post-1815 France. He then left the France which had fallen under the reign of the British-appointed Bourbon king, to live most of the remaining few years of his life in Magdeburg, Germany, where he bore his general officer’s rank, then, also as a Prussian officer and long-standing Ecole Polytechnique associate of Alexander von Humboldt. Under the reign of his grandson, the President of France, Carnot’s mortal remains were transported with great honors, with the highest German and French military honors, from Magdeburg, to its place in the Paris tomb of the immortals. The assassination of Lazare Carnot’s grandson, the President of France, in 1894, was com-



Count Otto von Bismarck

The orchestration, by the British Empire, of two world wars in the 20th Century, "could not have happened as it did," LaRouche writes, "but for the four crucial strategic factors:

1. the ouster of Bismarck in 1890;
2. the assassination of President Sadi Carnot in 1894;
3. the British launching of the Mikado into wars against both China (1895) and Russia; and,
4. the assassination of U.S. President William McKinley in 1901."




Marie François Sadi Carnot



Library of Congress

An artist's rendering of a naval battle in the 1895 Japan-China war.



Library of Congress

President William McKinley delivering his inaugural address, March 4, 1897.

which was followed by the Prince of Wales' seduction of the Mikado into what became a decades-long, 1895-1945 alliance against both China and Russia. It is a conflict which has been continued in sundry kaleidoscopic forms until the strategic crisis associated with the present role of British drug-running, since the 1790s, such as the role of Nazi-trained British agent George Soros, in controlling the relevant chunks of Afghanistan and Mexico, among many other nations of our planet, today.

bined with the 1890 ouster of Germany's Chancellor Bismarck and the launching, by Britain's Prince Edward Albert of Japan's 1895-1945 wars against China, Russia, and the U.S.A., policies which remain the keystone of Britain's still-continuing warfare against the U.S.-created geopolitical threat to the tyranny of the British Empire still today.

The British crown still runs the international drug-traffic of the world at large today, as it has since the 1790s, now with the notably prominent assistance, today, of British agent George Soros. This drug-trafficking remains a crucial component of British imperial interests and power at the present moment. All of these and other principal elements of Britain's role as the only actual world empire of today, are to be recognized as being the essential associated attributes of a form of world imperial power centered in a global form of a Venetian monetary interest which, in its sundry phases of metagenesis, has been a leading imperial power within Europe and beyond since the interval between the decline of Byzantium and the Norman conquest of A.D. 1066. Following the decline of the power

of the Habsburg family's imperialists, and rise of the followers of Paolo Sarpi during Europe's Seventeenth Century, the 1763 Peace of Paris established the maritime power of the Anglo-Dutch East India Company, and its Victorian successor as the world's leading imperial power.

Since that time, although there have been what were, in past times, self-avowed, essentially land-based "empires" on the continent of Eurasia and in Brazil, the only truly global empire in the Roman tradition has been that British, maritime-based, monetarist system which emerged from that February 1763 Peace of Paris concluding the so-called "Seven Years War," a British empire which is, in fact, the only empire still existing today.²

Since February 1763, even after the reign of Queen Victoria and her successors had taken over the British East India Company's operations, that Empire has continued to operate, as it rules presently over Southwest Asia on the basis of today's Sykes-Picot expression (e.g., religious and related warfare) of the original British imperialist Lord Shelburne's adopted model for world rule traced, by him, to the legacy of the Roman Emperor Julian the Apostate (A.D. 361-363). Just so, it was for a certain time, the British empire's principal asset-in-fact, the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte, whose actions worked to the same strategic effect as London's earlier orchestration of the Seven Years War, making the British empire of 1815 supreme in Europe and beyond. That continued so until the time of both U.S. President Abraham Lincoln's victory over the British puppets at Appomattox, and the subsequent crushing of Britain's Habsburg puppet Maximilian in Mexico.

Since 1890, most emphatically, the ultimate destruction of the United States has been never been far from the menu on the British imperial table, as being the principal long-term, imperial goal of the global financier empire centered politically in the United Kingdom. The betrayals of the U.S.A. from within, on this account, have been lodged, historically, in the British East India Company's agents, as typified by the long tradition traced from the cases of Judge Lowell and the treason of British agent Aaron Burr: a train of spill-overs in the U.S.A. by financier circles tied to that heritage. Since the British success expressed by the September

1901 assassination of the loyal U.S. President William McKinley, the relevant, most notable complicity in implicit betrayal of the republic, has been typified, still today, by the rotten, rabidly anglophile Presidents such as, most notably, Theodore Roosevelt, Ku-Klux-Klan backer Woodrow Wilson, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Harry Truman, Jimmy Carter, Richard Nixon, George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush, Jr. The implicitly treasonous U.S. submission to the British imperial frauds of the pseudo-scientific schemes of "globalization" and "global warming," are the relevant cases in policy-shaping currently.

One leading source of confusion on that matter, still today, is the widespread, childish notion, that the name "British Empire" connotes the misleading notion of a reign of the mere subjects of the current form of the rule by that "United Kingdom" of Ireland, Scotland, England, and Wales over some vast transoceanic territory. The childish assumption, that the British people themselves are the actual rulers, expresses the error of mistaking an empire's present choice of residence by a presently incumbent emperor, or empress, for the actual power which the empire exerts, dynamically, over nations and peoples spread through a large part, or even the entirety of the planet. In fact, the present British empire, now fairly termed, since the oil-price hoax of 1973, an "Anglo-Dutch-Saudi" empire of the Sykes-Picot system, is a global monetary-financier empire, to which the U.S. dollar-system became subordinated during the course of the 1968-1981 interval, under the delinquent U.S. Presidencies of those U.S. fiscal years.

Our Enemy, Britain

Since 1865, after three successive failures of the British East India Company's attempts to destroy the U.S. republic by direct military interventions (such as those of 1776-1782, 1812-1815, and 1861-1865), the example of the failures on this account by both the Foreign Office's Jeremy Bentham and his appointed successor, Lord Palmerston, led the British monarchy to relying upon concentration on a combination of treasonous roles by Wall Street for the launching of so-called "World Wars" centered on the Eurasian continent and its colonies. This *could not have happened as it did*, but for the four crucial strategic factors: 1.) the ouster of Bismarck in 1890, 2.) the assassination of President Sadi Carnot in 1894, 3.) the British launching of the Mikado into wars against both China (1895) and Russia, and, 4.) the assassination of U.S. President William

2. That some leading Russian spokesmen have described the U.S.A. of today as an empire, is not only incompetence in matters of strategic intelligence, but has deadly implications for the continued existence of Russia itself, unless corrected.

McKinley in 1901. A similar outcome might have been arranged by different factors than those; but, that is the real history of the origin of that general warfare from that time to the threat of even nuclear warfare embedded in British imperial schemes, still today, as affirmed by the proposal published by the British Empire's Bertrand Russell in September 1946.

Such were "World Wars I and II," and the "Cold War" launched by Winston Churchill, Bertrand Russell, Margaret Thatcher, and, then, Tony Blair. These were wars focused on the pivotal strategic implications of the Eurasian continent and of that continent's assets in Africa, Asia, and Ibero-America.

In other words, since 1876, the British Imperial strategy against the enemy it fears the most, the United States, has been "geopolitical." As Germany's Chancellor Bismarck stated, after his ouster on orders of Britain's Prince of Wales Edward Albert, the British empire's strategy was the application of the method of the earlier Seven Years War which the Anglo-Dutch heirs of Paolo Sarpi had introduced in his lifetime,³ to a new, post 1865-77 situation, in which the threat inherent in transcontinental railway systems had superseded maritime power technologically and as a strategic threat.

To the present day, it has been the intended destruction of the science-driven technological progress of the bellwether U.S.A., which has remained the most fundamental, long-term motive in both British imperial policy overall, and among those U.S. public figures, such as the implicitly treasonous and lying former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore, which have allied themselves with our nation's avowed enemy, Prince Philip's neo-fascist World Wildlife Fund, today.

Thus, there is a very specific, specifically imperial motive underlying the British empire's continuing, post-1876 "geopolitical" strategy against Britain's choice of its current principal strategic adversary, the continued existence of the U.S.A.⁴

3. The "Thirty Years War (1618-1648)."

4. The date 1876 signifies the combined effects of the combined U.S. transcontinental railway system and related impacts of the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial. For London, the spread of the policy of transcontinental railway systems throughout Eurasia, and the specific influence of U.S. economic successes in shaping the policies among governments of Eurasia was a potentially fatal blow against the continued existence of the global maritime power of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system's existence. All strategic conflicts which have arisen since that time have been aimed, first, at destroying the influence of the American System of po-

Today, one must ask oneself: "Why is this so?" The answer to that question is to be adduced from such truly Classical examples as Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*.

It must be essentially recognized, as a fact of paleontology, that *the crucial archeological test of the distinction between the active presence of the human species and some ape-like type of creature, is the evidence of the use of campfires at that relevant archeological site. No ape makes fire.* Then, one must ask oneself, why did the legendary Zeus of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, ban human use of fire? Nuclear fission, or, virtually any form of relative high energy-flux density, as by today's evil World Wildlife Fund, for example?

Aeschylus was pointing to the very essence of the actual forms of ancient imperialism: the banning of the use of technological progress by any of what have been deemed the "lower social classes," or "inferior people," of humanity as a whole. In European culture, this characteristic of actual imperialist or kindred forms of social oppression, is associated with the Delphic legacy of the Apollo-Dionysos cult, as by the modern, existentialist (e.g., fascist) prototype of both Friedrich Nietzsche and the fascists of the Mussolini and Hitler types, and by the followers of such as the sometime Nazi Martin Heidegger, and his friends Theodor Adorno and Hannah Arendt. All among those existentialist cults are nothing other than modern expressions of the ancient Delphic cult of Dionysos, modern cults which are either fascist, or shade into the irrationalism intrinsic to fascism and existentialism generally.

In the European cultural history of recent centuries, as in ancient and medieval history, these explicitly irrationalist cults, such as those of Nietzsche, Heidegger, Adorno, and Arendt, are always variants of what is called "fascism" otherwise. The essence of the "message" is the adoration of the hysterically irrational for its own sake. The anti-scientific cults of "environmentalism" and "globalization" are clinical forms of this form of violence-prone irrationalism.⁵

litical-economy in Eurasia, Africa, and Ibero-America, and, ultimately, as now, inside the U.S.A. itself. Apart from the U.S.A. itself, the principal targets chosen for destruction by the British Empire, still today, are Germany and Russia.

5. The systemic difference between pro-labor socialist movements and the fascists, as fascism was expressed among the accomplices of 68er Mark Rudd, or the neo-malthusian cults of today, is exemplary here. The traditional socialist movements of the Nineteenth and early Twentieth centuries were promoters of reason in the form of a search for the

Think back to cases such as the Roman Emperor Diocletian, in which the code was that the member of the lower social classes must follow the standards of practice of his father. As Shelburne's adoption of Gibbon's "Julian the Apostate" formulation indicates, the rule of an emperor over mere kings depends upon the use of maliciously crafted religious and cultural passions to divide an empire's subject population against itself, which, as in the Middle East or Southwest Asia today, prompts peoples to abandon their common interest in service to the pleasure of killing one another. It has always been pantheons, such as those of both the cult of Delphi and the Roman Empire, crafted according to that intention for a reign of divide and rule, which have been the most essential mechanism by means of which empires reign over the fools who are duped, into such violations, as by celebrated lies of that purely evil former Prime Minister Tony Blair, of the *De Pace Fidei* of Nicholas of Cusa, and the 1648 Peace of Westphalia crafted by the initiative of France's Cardinal Mazarin. It is in the reign of great empires crafted in the spirit of the Tower of Babel, as in "globalization" today, that fools enjoy the unity found, as in Southwest Asia today, in killing one another, that to the advantage of the imperial power seated in London.⁶

'Are You Really a Monkey's Uncle?'

As we should have been warned by the great Classical Tragedian Aeschylus, as in his *Prometheus Bound*, all known systems of imperial tyranny have depended upon a commitment Olympian Zeus expressed as the ban on human knowledge of "fire," such as the use of nuclear-fission power today.

benefits of physical-scientific progress, and increase of the means of improvement of the productive powers of labor, as in industry and agriculture. The existentialists, on the contrary, have been the hysterical adversaries of any presentation of such scientifically and culturally progressive goals. For example, I can attest first-hand, that the followers of Mark Rudd were a fascist movement based on wildly radical existentialist methods and guidelines of behavior.

6. The lunatic proposal for "a single world currency," is such a lunatic design crafted in the spirit of the Tower of Babel. Nothing could be a more efficient means for achieving the shared intention of both Britain's Prince Philip and his depraved lackey, former Vice-President Al Gore, of reducing the world's population levels quickly from over 6.5 billions persons, to a level of less than two billions, than the measures of "globalization" afoot among foolish leaders of nations today. (Gore should give up his grandiose, and disgusting intentions, and their dimensions, and lose weight, instead.)

In all practiced expressions of that ban by various societies, the discovery of actual universal physical principles is banned from the knowledge and practice permitted to the lower classes of the subjects of imperial, or would-be imperial and related forms of tyrannies. The British Empire today is a case in point. So are those in the U.S.A. itself which are "admirers" of the British Empire. Such is the root of the hatred expressed against Johannes Kepler, Gottfried Leibniz, Bernhard Riemann, and nuclear power by the lackeys of British Liberalism in American universities and other dupes of the British Empire today.

Today's ruling empire, the British Empire which is the leading adversary of the patriotic tradition which is represented by the U.S.A.'s President Franklin Roosevelt still today, expresses that imperialist view most nakedly in the explicitly genocidal economic and social policies of Britain's Prince Consort, Prince Philip, through his pro-genocidal World Wildlife Fund. His policy, in the true tradition of what Aeschylus' portrayed as the Olympian Zeus of *Prometheus Bound*, is his stated commitment, echoing the consummately evil Bertrand Russell, to reduce the world's population by such means as promotion of epidemic disease, from, presently, over 6.5 billions persons to less than two.

That is, for example, the entire basis for the spread of the lying propaganda behind the underlying fraudulent pro-genocidal proposal for "cap and trade."

The argument of Prince Philip and his depraved lackey, former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore, means forcing the reduction of the world's population to a "cap" of two billions, stupefied individuals from a presently estimated 6.7 billions by precisely those frankly Satanic methods expressed as "globalization" and "cap and trade."

Nor, relevant to the case of Russia, is there in any intention on the part of Prince Philip and his accomplices to allow the continued existence of any presently existing sovereign nation on this planet. "Globalization" means nothing other than a single world-empire, in which the world empire thus established will enforce a cap of two billions individuals on the living, chiefly brutishly stupefied population never in excess of two billions persons, even less than the equivalent of the 1.4 billions of China today.

The Olympian Zeus of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* would agree with such British (or, should we rather say, "brutish") objectives.

Keep Up with 21st CENTURY SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

Featured in Fall-Winter 2008

- A REPORT FROM THE 'BASEMENT TEAM'

Human Creative Reason As a Fundamental Principle in Physics

by Sky Shields

Bring back the concept of cognition as an independent organizing principle in the universe!

- On the 150th Birthday of Max Planck:

On Honesty Towards Nature

by Caroline Hartmann

Nature and the universe act according to lawfully knowable rules, not by the accidents of statistics and probability.

Special Report:

THE NUCLEAR POWER REVOLUTION

- Modular High-Temperature Reactors
Can Change the World

by Marjorie Mazel Hecht

- Interview with Linden Blue,
Vice Chairman, General Atomics

- Interview with Jaco Kriek,
CEO, PBMR

- Who's Trying to Strangle
the PBMR?



by Gregory Murphy

- Space Exploration
Momentum Moves East

by Marsha Freeman

- The Evidence for Gamma
Ray Photosynthesis

by T.D. Luckey



Subscribe!

Electronic subscriptions are

\$25 for 6 issues,

\$48 for 12 issues.

Single electronic copy is \$5.

Available at

www.21stcenturysciencetech.com
or send check/money order to

21st Century

P.O. Box 16285, Washington, D.C.
20041

The Genocide Policy Behind The Influenza Pandemic

by Dennis and Gretchen Small

May 1—The new influenza virus advancing across the planet is bringing home to people, in a terrifying way, the reality that the human race and globalization cannot continue to co-exist. Either globalization is buried, or undertakers will be needed to bury upwards of 5 billion people. And that would *not* be good for “the environment.”

The new Type A(H1N1) virus, a previously unknown and as yet not-fully-understood combination of swine, avian, and human virus types, was only identified on April 24 as a factor in an unusual flu outbreak in Mexico that was becoming increasingly deadly. Five days later, that flu strain had spread so rapidly and widely that the World Health Organization (WHO) declared an international Level Five (on a scale of 1 to 6) flu pandemic alert, signalling that “a pandemic is imminent.” As of today, one week after being first identified in Mexico—which remains the hardest hit country, with the highest number of fatalities—confirmed cases of H1N1 had been officially reported in 16 countries extending from North America to Europe, the Middle East, Asia, and New Zealand.

Besides the immediate threat posed by this strain of flu, virologists and other competent professionals are even more worried about what will happen if and when this strain mutates, and combines with far more virulent strains of avian flu and other animal and plant diseases, such as those prevalent in parts of Asia. Unless stopped, the world may be looking at a second wave to this

emerging pandemic, which will sweep humanity to the very doorstep of Hell.

The measures taken in Mexico and internationally, so far, have been appropriate, but insufficient. They are addressing the *effects*, but not the *cause*, of the problem. Nations are gearing up cooperation on stopping transmission, stepping up production of antivirals, identifying how the virus functions, producing a vaccine, etc. But the human race will not be secure until the economic preconditions which *created* this epidemic, and others building up behind and with it, are reversed. And that means that globalization must be uprooted and replaced with a new international system which develops the planet’s physical economy (see accompanying article).

While many questions about the origin and nature of this particular virus remain unanswered, there is no question that its actual cause is globalization, and the British Empire which created globalization with the deliberate intent of creating genocide, American physical economist Lyndon LaRouche emphasized from the outset.

In answering a question about the flu crisis in his April 28 international webcast (see *Feature*), LaRouche named Britain’s Prince Philip and his World Wildlife Fund (WWF) as directly responsible for spreading the “green” environmental policy which created the economic preconditions for mass death. Their stated policy



IFRC/José Manuel Jiménez

A patient is checked for possible swine flu, at a Mexican Red Cross hospital. As we go to press, 17 people have died in Mexico from infection with the H1N1 virus.

is to lower the world's population to under 2 billion people, LaRouche said. "How do you reduce the world's population in large amounts so rapidly? Famine and epidemic disease. Lack of sanitation, famine, and epidemic disease."

After all, Prince Philip is on the record as saying: "In the event that I am reincarnated, I would like to return as a deadly virus in order to contribute something to solve overpopulation."

In his webcast, LaRouche added: "Their intention is to bring this about, and whether this is a byproduct of their intention to be filthy on economic policy or social policy, or whether they're adding a little something to make it really happen, I don't know. But I'm going to operate on the assumption that, knowing them, since a crime has been committed in the neighborhood, there is evidence of the crime, I'm going to assume they're doing it deliberately."

A World Gone Mad

Probably the two most effective things you could possibly do, if you were intent on spreading an imminent global pandemic more rapidly and more virulently, would be to systematically cut available government budgets for health care; and to promote increased consumption of narcotic drugs, because of the well-known effect that drug consumption has on suppressing the body's immune system.

That is *exactly* what the British Empire and their puppets and dupes are now doing, on cue: They are throwing oil on fire.

President Barack Obama himself took to the airwaves this past week to justify the murderous policy of cutting health budgets, with arguments drilled into his head by behaviorist economist fruitcakes such as Office of Management and Budget head Peter Orszag and White House economics advisor Larry Summers. Eighty percent of all health costs come at the end of life, Obama parroted from his Nazi advisors, so that's where the cuts have to come from. He even presented the case of his own grandmother, to argue that hip replacement and other medical procedures may not be justifiable for the "terminally ill."

As LaRouche has warned you for decades: These followers of British Malthusianism are prepared to pull the plug on their own grandmothers!

As for drugs, the British and their foot soldiers such as George Soros are on an offensive to ram through legalization, and what they themselves admit will be increased drug consumption—in the middle of global influenza pandemic.

In a scene taken straight from Boccaccio's *Decameron* tales of the 14th-Century plague and collapse of society, on April 30 the Mexican Senate—isolated in their Senate chambers in a city with streets half-emptied by disease and the fear of disease—voted up, 87 in favor with 10 abstentions, the so-called "narco-retail" law which de facto legalizes "personal consumption" of seven different flavors of narcotics: opium (2 grams), heroin (50 milligrams), cocaine (500 mg), LSD (0.015 mg), marijuana (5 g), MDA crystal (40 mg), and methamphetamines (40 mg).

Have they gone mad? Did no one rise to point out that drug use suppresses the immune systems of users, as well as delivering millions more victims to the drug cartels already warring against the nation? And what about the advance of drug legalization initiatives in Oakland, California, and in Buenos Aires, Argentina?

Throw into this mix the fact that the Soros-run international "New Flagellant" operation known as Twitter, has now jumped into the middle of the flu crisis in Mexico, and you have all the elements of the New Dark Age that LaRouche has warned about. Twitter has deployed with an eye to creating maximum chaos and irrationality, launching a high-profile campaign telling people they can follow everything about the flu crisis on Twitter, find out what they should do, and see what's happening with their friends. According to an account in the Mexican daily *El Universal*, many *Twitteros*, as they are now called in "Spanish," are writing that the reports

of influenza are just paranoia and/or manipulation by the government. One person wrote: “The father of a co-worker got sick with influenza; I think I should blow his head off with a shotgun, before he infects us all.” A friend wrote back: “I already bought my bazooka; first cough, and I shoot.”

The Globalization Pandemic

Under the policies of globalization and free trade that have infected the world over the last 30 years, sovereign national economies and their protection of their populations have been eliminated. Mexico is an exemplary case of what happens when the battle to develop the national economy is defeated by the British Empire’s globalization.

Since 1982, when the City of London and Wall Street defeated Mexican President José López Portillo and his policies of fostering national sovereignty and economic development, food production and consumption have plummeted in Mexico. Poverty and unemployment have grown dramatically. The population’s nutritional and overall immunological levels are sinking rapidly, such that today, 21 million, out of the country’s 110 million inhabitants, endure “food poverty”—i.e., they don’t have enough to eat. Drug consumption among youth is rising dangerously. Over the last 25 years, 13 million Mexicans fled to the U.S. as economic refugees, in desperate search of sustenance, and now millions of them are being driven back to Mexico as the U.S. economy sinks into deep depression. They are returning to find no jobs, no health care, no infrastructure and, worst of all, no hope.

In comments April 26, LaRouche put Mexico’s own responsibility into sharp focus: “What is happening in Mexico is a result of the operation against José López Portillo,” Mexico’s nation-building President from 1976 to 1982, who allied with LaRouche to try to defend his country against financial warfare by the City of



IFRC/José Manuel Jiménez

At the Mexican Red Cross Headquarters in Mexico City, staff are mobilizing for the emergency. But the world’s governments are disregarding the deeper causes of the pandemic.

London and Wall Street. “Some people in Mexico today,” LaRouche explained, “will say: ‘Well, we couldn’t do this, we couldn’t do that...’ You couldn’t do this, because of what was done to López Portillo. You are paying the price for trying to destroy López Portillo. You try to destroy the President of Mexico, you demoralize the country, and now you wonder why you’ve got a problem? This is the time to revive the spirit of López Portillo, and unite all the patriots of Mexico in one bucket,” LaRouche said.

Mexico’s millions of economic refugees are only the tip of the iceberg of a world migration phenomenon. Globalization, by destroying national economies, has thrown huge masses of people marching across the globe, in desperate search of jobs, of survival.

There are tens and hundreds of millions of vulnerable migrants. Taken altogether, their number worldwide would constitute the fifth most populous country on the planet. The UN International Organization for Migration (IOM) estimates that there are more than 200 million migrants worldwide, roughly 20 to 30 million of whom are undocumented. Plus, there are 26 million internally displaced persons (IDPs). One third of the world’s migrant workers live in Europe, with slightly fewer living in Asia and North America.

Of particular concern, is what happens when the H1N1 virus explodes in Central America, as it surely will, and that shortly. Those countries have even less capability than Mexico to address the fundamentals of public health. And millions of Central Americans migrate north into Mexico, and from there, into the United States, also in desperate search of subsistence.

And when it hits Africa?

Can we be so stupid as to tolerate the “every-man-for-himself” ideology of globalization and free trade, and allow it to dominate under conditions of the planet-wide pandemic that is now emerging?

Crash Anti-Pandemic Program: Rebuild Nations, Public Health, Food Production

by Marcia Merr Baker

May 2—The fundamental requirements for public health—safe, plentiful water; decent nutrition; shelter; protection from pests; modern medical treatment; productive work—are lacking for billions of people internationally.

We here reiterate the emergency measures required, in three broad areas: public health and medical treatment; water, sanitation and power infrastructure; and, dismantling the globalized agriculture system of mega-production centers and worldwide food chains that fosters disease and hunger.

“Global sourcing” of food—as the World Trade Organization euphemistically terms it—must be stopped dead in its tracks. It has been a blueprint for the emergence and transmission of pathogens and food-borne illness, as well as heightening food scarcity. There are numerous instances of “free trade-era” diseases; for example, the 1980s BSE (bovine spongiform encephalopathy) outbreak under British Prime Minister Margaret “Mad Cow” Thatcher. Illness is today more frequent from dangerous strains of *E. coli*, salmonella, and other microbes. In plantlife, there is the case of the rapid spread of soybean rust, since its 2001 arrival in the vast soy monoculture regions of South America.

A hallmark of the past four decades of increasing globalization is the imposition of cartel livestock mega-farms, monoculture cropping, centralized food processing and worldwide foodchains. Monsanto, Cargill, DuPont/Pioneer, and a few others have wrongfully imposed patent-rights over foodseed stocks and genetic-improvement techniques, insisting on their “intellectual property rights,” over the means to life.

Smithfield Holdings, headquartered in the United States, now accounts for 20% of all the hogs grown in the U.S.—operating gigantic sow factories in North Carolina—and is the largest processor of pork worldwide. In Mexico, Smithfield has two partners in hog

mega-farms, Norson and Granjas Carroll, producing in the range of 1.5 million hogs a year.

In tandem with this kind of neo-British East India Company approach, high-tech, family-scale agriculture in many national farmbelts has been dismantled—from Argentina and Canada, to Europe and Australia. In Africa and most of Asia, productive nation-serving farming has been completely denied by the London-centered cartel powers. Billions of people are dependent on “world markets” to obtain or export food, which was undesirable even when markets “worked well.” But now, this means starvation.

There are particular disease dangers with concentrated animal feeding operations (“CAFOs”), as the World Health Organization (WHO) and other agencies politely call the giant cartel hog, chicken, and cattle operations. There is suspicion that there may be a connection between the early outbreak of the new A/H1N1 virus in the town of La Gloria in Vera Cruz, Mexico, and the Smithfield/Granjas Carroll hog CAFO in the same state, at Perote.

However, there is no question mark over the fact that huge meat-animal factories, when anything goes wrong, create automatic food shortages, and are set-ups for big disease outbreaks, when and if the right microbe mix occurs. In farm landscapes characterized by family-scale agriculture operations, there are natural distances between farms, and among towns, allowing for containment and treatment of zoonotic and botanical diseases, and lessening the hit to food output, and the likelihood of species jumps between humans and animals.

In particular, hog mega-farms are grounds for worry, because certain strains of influenza can be transmitted, either way, between hogs and humans. It is this connection that, for decades, has produced new flu strains in southern China, where animals and humans live in primitive, close-quarter conditions. Hog mega-facto-

ries in Mexico, the U.S., and elsewhere, have replicated this by having tens of thousands of animals closely confined, tended for long-hours by “cheap” labor gangs—tired, undernourished—creating favorable conditions for incubating new hybrids of flu between humans and swine.

In recent years, more frequent and more virulent strains of swine flu have been tracked. In 2003, *Science* magazine reviewed the danger, reporting that as of the late 1990s, “after years of stability, the North American swine flu virus has jumped onto an evolutionary fast track.” The new A/H1N1 is a triple-mix of viral material from human, swine, and bird sources.

The CAFOs and all forms of “global sourcing” must be dis-assembled as rapidly as possible. In the meantime, governments can intervene to save and expand family farming with floor-prices for hogs, and the outlawing of any kind of speculation in food and farm-input commodities, etc., in order to protect the food supply.

The Medical Defense System

Three sets of actions are imperative to give the maximum protection to populations: 1) vaccination capability and stand-by treatment infrastructure; 2) in-depth public health and hospital-centered systems of sanitation and medical care; 3) bio-science research and development.

Vaccines, anti-viral medications and stand-by treatment. On April 29, WHO director Dr. Margaret Chan issued an appeal to pharmaceutical companies to ramp up production of anti-viral medicine, and to donate stocks for coordinated use. The anti-virals Relenza (zanamivir) and Tamiflu (oseltamafu) are effective against the new A/H1N1. In 2005, Roche Holdings AG supplied 5 million doses of Tamiflu to the WHO, which is sending 2 million doses to developing nations, and reserving the rest for quick response. But this is puny relative to need, and for the contingency of dealing with “normal” flu and other infectious diseases that may hit at the same time. A “war mobilization”-type intervention is required to rapidly expand capacities to develop and produce anti-viral medications. The same goes for vaccines.

On May 1, Dr. Marie-Paule Kieny, director of the WHO Initiative for Vaccine Research, announced that a decision is near on whether to go for full-scale produc-

tion of an A/H1N1 vaccine globally. All the preliminaries are in place. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control (CDC) is providing the seed virus in two forms: the usual form for growth and reassortment in eggs, and the reverse genetics approach (which carries patent rights). By mid-May, the virus will be ready to transfer to manufacturers in many countries.

As in all questions of infrastructure, kept down during the past 40 years of globalization, there are great constraints in vaccine production capacity, and also in producing anti-viral medications. After the 2004 episode of botched production of vaccine for the flu season, at the facility in Liverpool, England, and the renewed outbreak of avian flu, new vaccine capacity was spurred by government and commercial action. “Pandemic production capacity has increased by 300% over the last two years,” according to the WHO and the New York City-based firm Oliver Wyman, in a February 2009 statement about their survey of some 44 vaccine firms worldwide. China and India have significantly expanded their capacity. India now has world-class facilities, and even has a cholera vaccine in production.

But still, for much of the world, especially the Americas and Africa, *the medications and capacity to produce them, do not exist* on the scale required. Capacity must be expanded for maximum deployment and to build stockpiles.

In addition to vaccines, other anti-disease products must be developed and mass-produced as required. There is an urgent need for virus test-kits. There are also new aids to retard the spread; for example, a special microbe-killing face mask has been devised.

Veterinary health requires a similar spectrum of medications and products for bio-security for livestock. The Paris-based World Organization of Animal Health, as well as leading agriculture universities in North America, are specifying guidelines.


Raise ratios of hospital beds, medical and public health staff.

The frontline defense against disease are ranks of public-health workers, and hospital-centered systems of treatment, sanitation, disease-monitoring, and education. Under globalization, the ratios of these staff and facilities per thousands of population have all been falling for decades.

Figure 1 gives a snapshot of the world picture where millions of people live in countries with a “critical

FIGURE 1

Countries with a Critical Shortage of Health Service Providers (Doctors, Nurses, Midwives)



World Health Organization, 2006 report.

shortage” of doctors, nurses, and midwives. The graphic is from the WHO’s *World Health Report, 2006*, “Global Distribution of Health Workers.” Moreover, even those countries listed as “without critical shortage” have ratios below what can and should be the modern standard of numbers of physicians, nurses, and others per 1,000 persons. For example, the United States, Australia, France, and Germany have 7-9 nurses per 1,000 persons, in contrast to Bangladesh, with 0.1.

Even this survey is out of date, and understates the decline. In the last two years, with the blowout of the financial system, many thousands of positions have been eliminated. The U.S. lost over 10,000 health-care workers in 2008, and is losing this year at the same rate.

This comes on an already shrunken base. In 2000, the total U.S. public-health workforce numbered 448,000, which was 50,000 fewer than in 1980. In 1980, there were 220 public-health workers per 100,000 U.S. residents; by 2000, this had fallen to 158 per 100,000.

Now it is worse. A paper released in December 2008, by the Association of Schools of Public Health (www.asph.org), “Confronting the Public Health Workforce Crisis,” points out that many of the remaining workers are at retirement age.

On April 27, Robert Petronk, executive director of the National Association of City and County Health Officials, told reporters that Federal funding has been cut 25% since 2005, for state and local preparedness for disasters such as a flu pandemic. Eleven states and the District of Columbia cut funding for public health services in FY 2008. In California, the Health Department is implementing a 10% budget cut, just as the governor has declared a state of emergency over the new flu. And the Obama Administration’s “American Recovery and Reinvestment Act” slashed \$700 million from public-health services.

Internationally, hospitals and facilities do not exist to cope with even seasonal flu, let alone a pandemic influenza. The number of community hospitals in the



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

During the flu epidemic of 2004, vaccinations were given at grocery stores throughout the United States. The WHO has now called for pharmaceutical companies to ramp up production of medicines to combat the A/H1N1 virus.

Water, Power, Sanitary Infrastructure

What is required is to mobilize interim water supply measures along military lines, to provide the chemicals, transportation, tanks, and equipment for temporary sources of potable water; and, at the same time, launch water infrastructure projects, postponed for decades, to increase the “natural” water resource base for present and future use.

An estimated 1 billion persons today lack safe drinking water, and 2.5 billion—a third of the planet’s population—lack water for sanitation. Considered on the crudest basis of volume of water available per capita, ratios in many parts of the world are below that needed for minimal personal use, and far below per-capita requirements that would reflect levels of water usage consistent with

U.S. fell from nearly 7,000 in the mid-1970s—built up under the 1946 Hospitals Survey and Construction Act (called “Hill-Burton”), down to under 5,000 today. This means fewer laboratories, diagnostic facilities, teaching positions, emergency departments, and so on.

During the first week of the new flu, U.S. emergency rooms were hit by a surge of visitors, often double their usual numbers. In San Bernardino, Calif., the Loma Linda University Hospital put a big tent up in their parking lot, to serve as the emergency room for the crowds.

The availability of hospital systems in poor countries is all but non-existent, but military-style logistics can provide interim anti-disease treatment while national infrastructure is built over time.

The third necessity for public health, is advanced medical R&D. What’s required is an Apollo Mission-style approach to the biophysics of infectious diseases, and other questions of health. Moreover, laboratory capacity for epidemiology work of all kinds, is shrinking. The U.S. Association of Public Health Laboratories in February said that 80% of the labs they surveyed have cut back their operations since January 2008, because of funding reductions.

modern economic activities of industry, agriculture, power production, and public health.

Under these conditions, no hygiene gimmick can curb the spread of today’s new influenza, or other infection.

The two modes of intervention for new infrastructure are large-scale desalination of saltwater, and large-scale diversion of water from bountiful areas, to water-scarce regions.

Large-volume water desalination and geo-engineering can solve all apparent water shortages. Cheap, plentiful electricity is the only precondition for high-tech desalination, and this requirement can easily be met through nuclear power.

In North America—the epicenter of the current flu pandemic threat—there were plans in the 1960s for continental-scale water diversion projects—the PHLINO/PHLIGON in Mexico to channel water to northern drylands; and the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA), to redirect water from Alaska/Yukon southward. Mexico had plans for 20 nuclear power stations; the United States had a full-scale nuclear commitment. The plans were dropped.

In this context of upgrading the conditions of life, sanitary measures to beat back disease vectors can

work: fighting water-borne diseases, parasites of all kinds, mosquitoes, ticks, and other insect transmitters, etc. Because of the decrease in concerted anti-disease action over the past 40 years, resulting from both the general economic decline, and the pseudo-environmentalist campaign against technology, there is today needless death and sickness from a range of bacteria, fungi, and parasites, as well as viruses. Pathogen threats (including HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, and dengue) that could be minimized, are nevertheless present and dangerous across wide regions of human, animal, and plantlife populations.

One policy shift of recent years that must now be reversed, is the reliance on selective, privately funded disease-fighting initiatives, away from the historical principle of favoring policies to support growing national economies that would be able to carry out public-health functions for their own populations. One of the most prominent of these private operations is the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, as the funder of first and last resort.

Instead, it's time to end globalization and build up national economies to restore life and health.

LaRouche Was Right: Austerity Policies Will Cause Pandemics

by Nancy Spannaus

The genocide policy which is now creating the threat of a new global flu pandemic, was first identified *35 years ago* by physical economist Lyndon LaRouche. Had his alternative policies been implemented then, we would not face the current threat.

LaRouche's argument, which has been articulated many times in this magazine, was succinctly summarized in a May 7, 1985 article in *EIR*, entitled "The Role of Economic Science in Projecting Pandemics."

"The conditions for economically determined pandemics," he wrote, "may be either the instance in which the average consumption is determined by a fall of potential relative population-density below the level of

requirements for the existing population, or the special case, that the differential rates of the households' goods 'market-basket' falls below the level of 'energy of the system' for a large part of the population. We are most concerned with the effects on health, as the nutritional throughput per-capita falls below some relative biological minimum, and also the effect of collapse of sanitation and other relevant aspects of basic economic infrastructure upon the conditions of an undernourished population.

"The first assumption, that the death rates would be increased by malnutrition, requires no special inquiry in the language of economic science as such. It is the second alternative, that the undernourished population might become a breeding-culture for eruption of epidemic and pandemic disease, which requires special attention. . . .

"It is merely necessary to estimate the rate of fall of population potential toward such threshold-levels, and to take into account the duration of such conditions historically indicated as consistent with brewing of a new upsurge of pandemics, to foresee when, how, and where a continuation of 1974 trends in monetary and economic policy would probably generate such eruptions."

The following chronology summarizes the LaRouche record. (Readers can find much of the documentation at www.larouche.com.)

September 1974: LaRouche sets up an interdisciplinary research team, called the Ecological Holocaust Taskforce, to explore the thesis that IMF and World Bank policies of slashing food and energy consumption, and denying health services in poor countries, would lead to biological holocaust, including pandemics.

November 1974: LaRouche testifies to the U.S. House Judiciary Committee in opposition to the nomination of Nelson Rockefeller for Vice President, and outlines his biological holocaust thesis.

January 1975: The results of the taskforce study are published in *New Solidarity*, the newspaper of the LaRouche political movement.

September 1983: The LaRouche movement identifies the outbreak of the AIDS crisis as "the harbinger of a series of holocaustal epidemics." The campaign is led by the Club of Life, an anti-Malthusian organization set up by Helga Zepp-LaRouche in 1982, as a counter to the genocidal Club of Rome.

April 1985: *EIR* publishes a Special Report entitled “The IMF’s Ecological Holocaust: More Deaths than Nuclear War,” warning of the consequences of devastating austerity policies in the world’s poor nations.

July 1985: LaRouche writes in *EIR*: “Unless there is, immediately, a sudden and rapid reversal in accelerating, 1967-1985 trends in nutrition, medical services, and sanitation, there will be an unstoppable eruption in both old and new varieties of bacterial and viral pandemics, from which no population of any part of the world will escape.”

October 1985: LaRouche announces his candidacy for the Democratic Presidential nomination, on a program which stresses the need to stop the threat of global pandemic disease like that of the Black Death, as foreshadowed by the AIDS pandemic.

February 1986: *EIR* publishes a special report with the title “An Emergency War Plan To Fight AIDS and Other Pandemics.”

1988-89: LaRouche escalates the political and scientific campaign against the emerging threat, in which he insists on an Apollo-style crash program on research, and massive construction of hospital bed capacity. This includes a ballot initiative in California, the publication of an *EIR* Special Report entitled “AIDS Global Showdown: Mankind’s Total Victory or Total Defeat,” and a half-hour national TV special on AIDS as part of LaRouche’s 1988 Presidential campaign.

January 2000: The CIA releases National Intelligence Estimate 99-17D, entitled “The Global Infectious Disease Threat and Its Implications for the United States.” The unclassified document admits that 20 well-known killer diseases, such as TB and cholera, have re-emerged since 1973, while 30 previously unknown disease agents have been identified, for which no cures are available. The document, in effect, substantiated the warning that LaRouche had put out 25 years before, and which had not been acted upon.

2001: LaRouche initiates a campaign for Hill-Burton public health standards, around the closure of D.C. General Hospital, and the scare of the Anthrax attacks.

2004: During the Avian flu outbreak, LaRouche carries out a sustained attack on the globalization of the world’s food supply, saying that it must end, and for the buildup of public health measures.

Cap and Trade Is Genocide

by Gregory Murphy

The author is the Associate Editor for 21st Century Science & Technology magazine (www.21stcenturysciencetech.com).

Financial interests centered in the City of London and on Wall Street are pushing for the United States to destroy itself by the adoption of a cap-and-trade scheme, based on the hoax of Al Gore’s global warming. Part of this policy of cap and trade calls for the deployment of low energy-density, intermittent, renewable energies, like wind and solar, to replace existing baseline sources like nuclear and coal.

The reality of this policy of cutting or capping carbon dioxide emissions is that there will be an explicit limit on the amount of energy produced, and there will be a limit as to what type of sources will be available to produce this limited amount of energy. By limiting the amount of energy available for medical purposes, heating of homes, cooking, and providing freshwater, cap and trade will set the stage for genocide.

The policy has its roots in the fascist ideas of British economist and Cambridge University professor Arthur Pigou, who worked closely with John Maynard Keynes during the 1930s. In a 1920 book entitled, *The Economics of Welfare*,¹ Pigou argues that the way to change a behavior, is to tax it out of existence. With cap and trade, you tax energy until it becomes too expensive, and this, in turn,



Arthur Cecil Pigou,

1. An online copy of *The Economics of Welfare* by Arthur Pigou can be found at <http://www.econlib.org/library/NPDBooks/Pigou/pgEW.html>

forces people to choose between using high-priced energy, and suffering the devastating health consequences of not using it. Essentially, all environmental taxes or policies are of Pigouvian influence. The trade part of the policy means creating a speculative market in carbon dioxide offsets, so that nations or producers whose output is less than the minimum standard, can sell their carbon offset to a producer who is exceeding the limit. As in the derivatives bubble, the speculators will act as middlemen for this exchange.


But, the basis of the whole scheme is a scientific fraud. When you hear the words “carbon dioxide emissions,” just think, “hot air.” In terms of atmospheric composition, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is a minor trace gas, less than 0.04% by volume. It is, however, the main input required for growth of plants. Life-scientists have always known it as the gas of life—and without it, the human body would fail to function. So, the idea that carbon dioxide is pollution, as Al Gore and Prince Charles have claimed recently, is just insane.

The computer models used to try to show the enhanced greenhouse effect of carbon dioxide are based on the false assumption that as carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere increase, temperature will increase at an increasing rate. Then, according to this pipedream, the increasing atmospheric temperature will create an increase in water vapor, which is the more significant greenhouse gas, causing a further increase in temperature.

Do You Believe in Perpetual Motion?

To believe such nonsense is like believing in a perpetual motion machine. It implies a major misunderstanding as to how carbon dioxide acts in the atmosphere. In reality, carbon dioxide is most effective as a greenhouse gas at concentrations of about 20 to 100 parts per million (ppm). As concentrations increase

FIGURE 1
More CO₂ Means Less Warming




David Archibald.info

This chart illustrates the exponential relationship of CO₂ to temperature. The first 20-100 ppm of CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere acts as an effective greenhouse gas, but as concentrations increase, its effectiveness as a greenhouse gas decreases exponentially.

beyond that level (today, it is over 300 ppm), the effectiveness of carbon dioxide as a greenhouse gas decreases exponentially (Figure 1). This exponential decline in the effectiveness of carbon dioxide as a greenhouse gas is not contested by the believers in global warming; they simply ignore it.

There is an experiment anyone can do to understand this principle: Take a sheet of paper, and place it over a window with sunlight coming through. You will notice that the intensity of the light, as it passes through the paper, decreases. Add another sheet of paper, and you see that more light is stopped. Keep adding paper, and you will notice that after a certain point, adding more paper has little or no effect in blocking the sunlight. The same is true as carbon dioxide concentrations increase beyond a certain level. The idea that there will be a runaway greenhouse effect, because of a doubling of carbon dioxide, is pure alarmism.

In a 1998 paper, in the journal *Climate Research*, Sherwood Idso, the director of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide, determined that the greatest temperature increase likely to result from a doubling of carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere,



UN World Food Program/Thierry Geenen

The result of the genocidal cap-and-trade policy will be to cut off economic development for billions of the world's people. Here, an Ethiopian woman feeds her starving child.

would only be 0.4°C (0.7°F).² Idso concluded that we have already seen most of the temperature rise that might come about from a doubling of carbon dioxide. But Idso also notes that the temperature increase may be far less than 0.4°C , because of the enhancing effect of carbon dioxide on growth of vegetation, which cools the Earth in various ways.

Depopulation Through Energy Starvation

Given that the greenhouse effect of carbon dioxide declines exponentially, as concentrations increase, and that it has been demonstrated, that we have already seen most of the warming from a doubling of carbon dioxide, there is no reason for a cap-and-trade policy—

2. S.B. Idso, "Carbon-Dioxide-Induced Global Warming: A Skeptic's View of Potential Climate Change," *Climate Research*, 1998. <http://www.int-res.com/articles/cr/10/c010p069.pdf>

unless it is to fulfill the expressed intentions of certain people to reduce the world population from the present 6.7 billion down to 2 billion, by the use of energy starvation.

According to the latest data from the Mauna Loa observatory in Hawaii (which is located on the mouth of an active volcano, calling into question the reliability of the data), the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is around 385 ppm. For the past ten years, atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration has increased at a rate of about 2.2 ppm per year. At this rate, it would take about 190 years to double the current concentration of carbon dioxide. In 190 years, can anybody say what the energy sources will be, or what new discoveries will be made that will change society for the better? Nuclear fission and fusion power produce no carbon dioxide.

In 1998, just one year after the Kyoto Protocol was signed, Dr. Tom Wigley, the former director of the Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia in the United Kingdom, and leader of the British climate mafia, argued in a paper, in *Geophysical Research Letters*, that even if there were full compliance with the Kyoto Protocol, there would only be a small savings on the temperature increase: 0.025°C .³ So for all of the needless death and the loss to the physical economy that policies like cap and trade would cause, there is no environmental benefit.

The fascist policy of cap and trade that the Obama Administration is promoting must be stopped. The policy is an attack on scientific progress, coming at a time when nuclear power is urgently needed to save civilization from two leading challenges: the deepening world economic breakdown crisis, and the progression of Earth's climate towards a new Ice Age.

As Richard Courtney, former lead material scientist at the British Coal Research Board, put it, "We have to stop this policy for our children and our children's children's sake. If not, then we won't have any children, or children's children, because they will have all starved to death."

The fight for civilization is on. It will be a tough war but with humor and creativity, the fight can and must be won.

3. T.M. Wigley et al., "The Kyoto Protocol: CO_2 , CH_4 , and Climate Implications," *Geophysical Research Letters*, No. 25, pp. 2285-88, 1998.


Circle of Evil Around President Obama

April 30—In his April 28 international webcast, Lyndon LaRouche said, “But you have to see the element of malice, and when you think of the essential immorality of Larry Summers—this guy has a track record: The man is utterly immoral. He’s a predator. He belongs in the Adolf Hitler category, or similar categories. And the behavioral economists are the same thing: These people are *evil*. Nothing will come from them but evil. And they’re saying, ‘Give Satan a chance!’”

But did LaRouche exaggerate? Are the behaviorists as evil, as thoroughly rotten, as he said they were? Let us examine the case of one of their top world leaders, Israeli-American Dan Ariely of Duke University. Ariely is a member of the Fabian Russell Sage Foundation’s prestigious 29-member “Roundtable of Behavioral Economics,” which had given frequent written instructions to the Obama campaign, and then to the Obama Presidency, since early 2008 at the latest, according to *Time* magazine of April 12. The magazine cited Ariely by name as a top behaviorist advisor to the President. British Conservative Party leader George Osborne also named Ariely as a top influence there in an April 8 speech.

In a videotaped memoir available on YouTube from FORA.tv, Ariely traces his interest in “behavioral economics” to a year-long hospitalization in Israel, following an explosion in which he suffered burns covering over 70% of his body. There are two ways to remove bandages, he said: either slowly, causing less intense pain for a longer period, or else rapidly, causing greater pain over a shorter period. His nurses believed in removing them rapidly, but since he was burned over most of his body, this caused him a full hour per day of intense pain. He urged the nurses to try another way, but they refused.

There *is* an experimental method to decide these questions, Ariely says. After he left the hospital, his first series of experiments was to place the fingers of



creativecommons/Bill Holsinger-Robinson

The behavioral economist Dan Ariely is obsessed with the application of pain to shape human behavior. He developed a “pain suit” for use on his experimental victims.

subjects in a vise, and to squeeze them more or less hard, with or without “time-out” breaks. “When I finished hurting the people,” he said, he asked them, “How painful was it?”

From putting people’s fingers in a vise, Ariely went on to using painful sounds and electric shocks. He even developed a “pain suit, through which,” he said “people can feel much more pain.” In a later study, which explored “The Effect of Past Injury on Pain Threshold and Tolerance,” the subjects were all injured Israeli Army veterans. They were divided into two groups: the more-seriously versus the less-seriously injured. Both groups were subjected to thermal pain; Ariely discovered that chronic pain patients have higher pain tolerance.

“Willingness to accept pain for payment” is one of Ariely’s frequent tools, among others, in these “studies.”

Ariely’s “research” showed that his hospital nurses had been wrong. The right way to remove his bandages would have been to remove them more slowly, starting at the face, the most painful part, and to give him rest-breaks during the process. But, when he went back to share these results with his favorite nurse, she

defended herself, among other reasons, on the grounds that she did not feel herself entitled to experiment on human beings!

Cheating and Masturbating

Another of Ariely's major lines of research over the years, has been to investigate what will persuade people to cheat, or else to steal, or more generally to do evil in various ways and degrees. He has administered mathematics tests in which subjects were paid a few dollars per correct answer, and then encouraged them to cheat by asking them to grade their own answers, for instance. He once planted Cokes throughout the student refrigerators at MIT, and noted the rate at which they were stolen over time. He then planted \$1 bills on plates in the same refrigerators, and compared the rate at which they were stolen.

It has been suggested that Larry Summers may have come over from nearby Harvard to steal all the Cokes, and then to take all the dollar-bills to autograph them! (Students used to ask then-Harvard president Summers to autograph their dollar bills, on which his signature appeared as Treasury Secretary.)

Among other findings, Ariely discovered that requiring subjects to try to recite the Ten Commandments from memory, was a greater disincentive to cheating, than requiring them to try to recite from memory the names of ten books they had read in high school.

With George Loewenstein, another top behaviorist, Ariely once compared the responses of male college students to sexually-oriented questions/suggestions first, before masturbating, and then, while they were masturbating. The experimenters noted with a smirk that their set-up allowed each student subject to use his "non-dominant hand" to answer their computerized questionnaire during the "study." They entitled their paper, "The Heat of the Moment."

Just at the moment when we have finally turned out the Dick Cheney Administration after eight terrible years, it can be very hard to face the fact that these sorts of influences are dominating our government once more. But facts are facts.

What is more, left to his own Nero-like tendencies, President Obama will purge all his moral and competent advisors in favor of deformed, Satanic creatures like Ariely and Summers, as he has already pretty much purged Paul Volcker. There goes his Presidency, then the country, then the world!

Why Summers Should Be Immediately Unemployed

by Nancy Spannaus

Given the abysmal performance of the Obama Administration on the question of life or death for most Americans—employment—it might not be surprising to learn that the President's chief economic advisor, Lawrence Summers, has a record of what is considered "expertise" in analyzing joblessness. His argument? Long-term unemployment is "caused" (his word), at least in part, by the existence of unemployment insurance, welfare payments, and unionization!

Could there be a better case for demanding that Summers himself be sent to the unemployment lines?

Summers, a Harvard PhD in what passes for economics these days, began specializing in the study of unemployment back in 1979, when he wrote a paper for the Brookings Institution with Kim B. Clark, entitled "Labor Market Dynamics and Unemployment: A Reconsideration." This study has formed the basis for a subsequent series of articles which have continued to the present day, the latest being a piece entitled, "Unemployment," written in 2008, for *The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics*.

In a tone of indifference, both to the condition of the unemployed and their families, as well as to the physical condition of an economy which does not utilize its labor force productively, Summers makes the case that long-term unemployment in the U.S. is more significant than many economists think. He then purports to explain the *causes* of such unemployment (leaving out, of course, as is traditional, those millions of unemployed who have left the workforce out of discouragement).

Summers' assertions are identical to those of the neocon, or, better-called fascist, economists who dominate the profession today. His conclusions are so contrary to traditional Democratic Party thinking, that they must be quoted, to be believed.

"Empirical evidence shows that two causes [of recorded long-term unemployment—ed.] are *welfare* payments and unemployment *insurance*," Summers begins (emphasis added). This is because those who sign up for such government assistance have to show they are actively looking for work, he says, even though

they may not be.

“The second way government assistance programs contribute to long-term unemployment is by providing an incentive, and the means, not to work. Each unemployed person has a ‘reservation wage’—the minimum wage he or she insists on getting before accepting a job. Unemployment insurance and other social assistance programs increase that reservation wage, causing an unemployed person to remain unemployed longer.” (Does he propose to starve them instead? Not outright.)

There follows an extensive “marginal utility” non-sense analysis about how workers may prefer to get unemployment rather than a job, because the person “may decide that an hour of leisure is worth more than the extra [money] the job would pay.” But, Summers argues, such a decision by the worker is an enormous cost, “in the billions,” to the taxpayer,

Not yet satisfied with this anti-labor drivel, Summers goes on to make two other outrageous assertions:

1. “Clark and I estimated that the existence of unemployment insurance almost doubles the number of unemployment spells lasting more than three months.”

2. “Another cause of long-term unemployment is unionization,” because “those who lost high-wage union jobs are often reluctant to accept alternative low-wage employment.”

A Step Back To See Reality

Summers is making the same argument advanced by the anti-labor neocons, who insist on removing as many restrictions on labor conditions, especially wages, as possible. The logic is that of a full-employment economy—with everyone working as virtual slave labor. And, in fact, Summers concludes his essay by noting that the mythical “natural rate of unemployment” (until recently) has been able to be reduced substantially by cutbacks in unemployment insurance, in unionization, and in outsourcing.

The only differentiation which Summers makes between his argument and that of the neocons, is his assertion that, since the Great Depression, “most economists have agreed that cyclical fluctuations in unemployment are caused by changes in the *demand* by employers for labor, not by changes in workers’ desires to work, and the unemployment in recessions is involuntary.” That’s a consensus—not a scientific argument—and does nothing to contradict Summers’ previous assertions of causality.

But the question remains: Can the average U.S. citi-

zen today understand what’s wrong, and evil, about Summers’ approach?

Keynes Was a Fascist

The crux of the matter can be spotlighted by reviewing a crucial debate that occurred on Dec. 2, 1971, between Lyndon LaRouche and a notable Keynesian economist, Abba Lerner, at Queens College in New York City. At issue was LaRouche’s assertion, that unless the economic and financial policies which had been adopted by the Nixon Administration on Aug. 15, 1971 were replaced by policies of directed credit toward high-wage employment, especially in economic infrastructure, at home and abroad, the world was headed toward a new fascism. Under LaRouche’s approach, which was coherent with that of Franklin Roosevelt, the Federal government would *create* the demand for a quality of labor, and physical production, required for improving living standards for future generations.

Lerner, while nominally a Social Democratic opponent of Nixon, strongly disagreed with LaRouche. He agreed that the only way to deal with the economic and financial crisis was to create mass employment, *but at whatever cost of labor the “market” would bear*. If labor were priced too high, he asserted, then the full employment goal could not be met. Labor costs had to be “competitive,” i.e., lower, as in the economies that he was advising, like Brazil.

When LaRouche charged Lerner with effectively adopting the policy of Hitler’s Economics Minister Hjalmar Schacht, Lerner sent shock waves through the room by stating that, if Schacht’s policies had been adopted before 1933, Hitler would not have been “necessary.”

The point should be obvious: Employment policy is a derivative question of government credit policy, and the value which that society’s government puts on the productive, creative capabilities of its citizens. From this standpoint, social safety nets like unemployment insurance and welfare are essential, as adjuncts to the forward-looking policies of investment in the progress of society. Fascists put no value on the working individual, except for what loot they can produce for a financial oligarchy, and therefore they insist on removing all protections for labor.

Is there a distinction between the way Larry Summers views the labor force, and the way the fascists do? I think not. He should be sent off to the unemployment lines, and out of any position of power over economic policy, as rapidly as possible.

Britain and France Lead The Attack Against Sudan

by Douglas DeGroot

April 30—President Barack Obama’s Special Envoy to Sudan, Air Force Maj. Gen. Scott Gration (ret.) and Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, have signaled a change in approach of U.S. policy toward Sudan, away from confrontation, and toward bilateral diplomatic engagement. After meeting officials at the Sudanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on April 2, Gration said: “The United States and Sudan want to be partners, and so we are looking for opportunities for us to build a stronger bilateral relationship.”

Later, after a three-day trip to Sudan, Kerry said on National Public Radio’s “All Things Considered” program on April 20: “I found a government that is far more prepared to move on other issues that are of importance to the United States, and I think it’s important for us to deal with those officials. And we’ll have to work around and deal with the complications of the ICC.” (The International Criminal Court is the privately established body, of which the United States is not a member, which issued an “arrest warrant” in 2008 for Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir.)

Given this shift, the head of the United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID), Rodolphe Adada, was apparently surprised when he was criticized by U.S. Ambassador Susan Rice at a closed session of the UN Security Council on April 27, according to the *Sudan Tribune*. Adada, a former foreign minister

of the Democratic Republic of Congo, told the UNSC, “Darfur today is a conflict of all against all. The armed movements fight amongst each other, or violently purge their own members.”

He countered the anti-Sudan media hype, saying that the situation in Darfur has now become a low-intensity conflict, and provided figures of 2,000 people who died from violence there since January 2008. Adada said that the ICC arrest warrant has complicated prospects for a political solution.

Rice, a dyed-in-the-wool anglophile, questioned his use of the phrase “low-intensity conflict.” She claimed he was not in agreement with his superior, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon. However, it is clear that Adada and the Secretary General are collaborating closely on operations in the region. Prior to Adada’s meeting with the UNSC, a UNAMID spokesperson said that Adada intended to review issues affecting the deployment of UNAMID, which “required key enablers to enhance the capacity of the Mission and enable it to carry out its mandate more effectively.” This refers specifically to helicopters, which are desperately needed by UNAMID, and is the precise terminology which has been used by Ban Ki-Moon.

Colonial Powers Push Regime Change

Despite the U.S. shift, the two primary former colonial powers in Africa, the U.K. and France, have re-


mained steadfast in their policy of regime change. On April 21, a high-level Sudanese delegation ended talks in Paris with French officials and Britain's Lord Mark Malloch-Brown, a Foreign Office Secretary, and a key figure in the founding of the ICC. The two ex-colonial powers refused to establish bilateral relations with Sudan, and "reiterated their commitment to international criminal justice and cooperation with the ICC," according to the *Sudan Tribune*. One of the Sudanese participants in the talks, Presidential Assistant Nafi Ali Nafi, called the ICC "a political tool used against African leaders who are viewed to be uncooperative with Western programs in Africa." While speaking at Khartoum University on April 28, Nafi revealed that the proposal put forward to Sudan at the Paris meeting, was for the formation of "a national interim government" headed by

al-Bashir. France would support suspending the ICC arrest warrant against him, if he withdrew as a candidate in the 2010 elections. U.S. anti-Sudan activist John Prendergast had offered Sudan the same deal earlier.

Nafi charged that those who are collaborating with foreign powers to accomplish regime change in Sudan were committing treason. He pointed out that the Darfur rebel group, Justice and Equality Movement (JEM), was not founded to better the lot of the Darfur population, but was merely an arm of the Popular Congress Party led by Hassan al-Turabi, in the latter's fight with the government. Turabi is a long-time member of the British-intelligence-connected Muslim Brotherhood. The JEM's mostly London-based leadership refuses to negotiate agreements with the government on Darfur issues.

Dr. Mutrif Siddiq

We Fight for a Better Life For Our Entire Population



Sudan's Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Mutrif Siddiq, gave this briefing at the Foreign Ministry on April 6, to the foreign delegates, including several EIR correspondents, who were attending a conference in Khartoum (see EIR, April 24, 2009).

Sudan is at a crossroads: Certain forces, through new means, are working to re-exert colonialism. To counteract that, we need a new approach. There are very sincere entities, there are very sincere persons, there are very sincere organizations, who share with us these ideas, who are working hard towards a just, international system. Unfortunately, we don't feel at all that the existing world order is a just one, including the United Nations itself. And the United Nations is represented as a supreme political body, that is, the Security Council, which was formed after the Second World War, and it was accepted and agreed to, based on certain attitudes prevailing at that time.

In light of developments concerning Sudan, reforms in the Security Council must be considered. And we think one of the unjust rules is that certain countries have special rights, where they are protected, and they can protect those whom they like, those whom they love, and the others are targeted for subjugation and intimidation and harassment, like the case of Sudan.

For example, in the year 2004, and the year 2005, most of the resolutions of the Security Council were directed towards the case of Sudan, and the case in Darfur.

This doesn't come out of the blue. This doesn't reflect the concern of the international community for the innocent people of Darfur who have been affected by civil wars. Because even the civil war in Sudan is not caused by the simple reasons that have been circulated in the media—that there is a fight between Arab and non-Arab tribes in Darfur—this is just a fallacy.

Problems in Darfur Are Not New

We think that the problems in Darfur are more complicated than that. We are afraid of the desertification that has affected the whole continent, and Sudan is severely affected. The biggest wave of displacement, the biggest wave of challenges that we have faced, was not in the years 2003 and 2004. It goes back in history. The most recent one, was the displacement and the resultant flow of refugees that took place in 1984, when we in Sudan received millions of refugees from the East and West. At that time, Ethiopia was united. We had received more than a million refugees from the eastern front; and we had received more than a million refugees from the neighbors in Chad. They had been forced into Sudan because of the drought that affected the wells in that year.

Despite the displacement, at that time, Sudan managed to absorb the serious shock, and to receive all these waves of refugees and IDPs [internally displaced persons], and feed them, alone first, and then with the help of the international community, at that time. And we do remember that President Bush, the father—at that time he was the Vice President of the United States—came to Sudan and he visited Kordofan and Darfur, and the United States offered some help to the Sudanese government to address the needs of the masses of refugees that came into Sudan from neighboring countries.

We are quite happy for that. We don't deny the favors; we recognize them, and thank those that helped us. But, any conditional assistance, or conditional help, which conceals agendas within that help, is not acceptable for us in Sudan. Because if you want to assist someone, you have to assist him in good faith. You have to assist to rectify that situation, and to get back to a normal situation. But if you utilize the problems to undermine the whole system, and to change the whole world, and use it as a means of manipulation, it is not going to help.

In Darfur, we have two major life styles: We have the nomads and the farmers. They always compete for their resources, and these resources are affected by the threat of desertification, and we have the advancement of the desert in Sudan. Every year it is said that the desert is advancing by more than 100 kilometers in Sudan. This is a shared responsibility. If we don't reverse the situation, it is now Sudan; but tomorrow it is going to be Niger, or Mali, or Algeria, or Senegal, or whatever. Or it might even go somewhere else.

The situation in Sudan is not even compared to the D.R.C. [Democratic Republic of Congo], where the D.R.C. problem is the typical regional and international conflict, because all the countries around the D.R.C. are involved. Some of the major powers are competing over the resources of the D.R.C.. What is the magnitude of displacement? What is the magnitude of killing? What is the magnitude of insecurity in the D.R.C.? But this is not mentioned.

Our internal conflict has been blown up and described as a threat to international security. This is why the series of resolutions—up to ten within less than two years in the UN Security Council—is a manifestation of the monopoly of the institution which shares the objectives of certain circles. That's why the Darfur problem was blown up as a humanitarian crisis, although it was an internal conflict that has flared up repeatedly. We had a conflict in 1986, but, at that time, the Cold War was still there, and no one was talking about internal conflicts. It passed, unnoticed, and the internal dynamics managed to absorb that conflict.

Rebels Are Run from London, Paris

The same could have been applied to the conflict in 2003, but because of the international dimensions, because of the regional hands that entered into the conflict in Darfur, these outside factors made the conflict something other than the internal conflict it actually was. The supposed internal conflict, as it is presented in the media, is not coherent with the actions of the rebel movements. Each anti-government movement wanted to appear as a separate entity, because it was supported by certain outside interests, and was so accepted in the media.

Where are the major rebel groups now? The U.K. is actually hosting the major leaders, with the exception of Khalil Ibrahim, of the JEM, that is the Justice and Equality Movement. Jibril Ibrahim, a brother of Khalil, is there in the U.K. Ahmed Tugod Lissan, chief negotiator at the Abuja talks, is there. The spokesman for JEM, Ahmed Hussein Adam, is there. And many others.

They are sponsored by the U.K. But what is the role of the U.K. in establishing this in Sudan? They reveal it themselves. They instruct us to make peace, but how can I make peace when they are holding the cards? When you are not encouraging those who are leading the rebellion to go and talk. The same applies to France, which is hosting Abdel Wahid Nur. If they want to tell



EIRNS/Douglas DeGroot

The AU-UN force in Darfur has not been able to receive desperately needed helicopters for transportation to trouble spots. Here, a UN helicopter at the El Fasher airport in North Darfur.

him to go and talk peace, he will definitely go and talk peace. But they say, “We are very democratic, we cannot force him to do so.”

Peace is not a choice, it is not optional. Our people are suffering inside Sudan, while he is sitting in Paris, and refuses to join the talks in Doha, or the talks elsewhere. This is their responsibility. But instead, they are working against the interests of Sudan. Although Sudan has made many attempts: We have declared a ceasefire, unilaterally, many times, with no results. This was repeated many times, and when we at last went to Doha, one of the major ideas that was put to us by the chief negotiator, was to conclude an agreement on two issues: One of them is to have a treaty, which we have accepted, and the other was a preliminary agreement that organizes a plan for successfully implementing peace in Sudan. We have accepted both, but the rebels have declined.

We did the same when we were invited in October 2007 to Sirte, Libya. We went there, with open mind and heart, we declared a unilateral ceasefire. But still, their chief claim was that the government of Sudan was the party that was reluctant to achieve peace, while they participated in the talks. What about Khalil Ibrahim, himself, and his forces? They attempted to broaden their role, were rebuffed, and went back to Chad. They attempted again to come to Nigeria, were rebuffed, and they are now in Chad. They are now deploying forces in Geneina, which is the capital of West Darfur, waiting for two things to happen.

The first one is American policy toward Sudan. It is up to you to restore the peace. The rebels are not

sure what the real American policy toward Sudan is. Either they will be granted permission to advance their hostilities, undermine security, and destabilize the city, or else they will be exposed for what they are. So you, our brothers, you have a role to play, here and there.

Second, they are waiting for the ICC [International Criminal Court]! And once the ICC had declared its decision, of the warrant of arrest of the President of the Republic, Khalil declared that he was not going to join peace efforts again. His path has shifted. He is going to continue fighting. He is going to be the arm of the ICC, to overthrow the government, arrest the President, and take him to The Hague.

Is that the intention of international justice? I think this is not the intention of international justice. But this is the intention of those who are behind using international justice as a tool of harassment, as a form of intimidation, against the regimes which they don't feel that they are on good terms with. They had been expecting that Sudan would collapse, that the Sudanese people would revolt against the leadership. That there would be rebel moves or advances toward the towns, and this was expected to be the end of the story. They were shocked [when this didn't happen].

The Threat Posed by the ICC Charges

And we were shocked too. Although we had received hints, to be frank, prior to the formation of the ICC justice caper, what the decision of the court was going to be: that they were going to drop the crime of genocide, and were going go with the other two crimes:

crimes against humanity and war crimes. I swear, this is what we knew prior to the announcement of the ICC arrest warrant. And unfortunately, and shockingly, this is what the decision of the ICC was. And they thought that we would accept this independent court as a legal court.

[ICC prosecutor Luis Moreno] Ocampo went to Yale University and was spreading lies about Sudan. And he was actually playing on people's emotions, using the supposed plight of the children of Sudan, and also claiming that about 5,000 people were dying per month in Darfur, without even cross-checking. This is the so-called evidence that is being used by the enemy. It is part of a conspiracy to prevent the rebels from coming to the table of peace, and to induce them, instead, to wait for the international community to agree to use "humanitarian" justifications to indict Sudan.

They want to use the right of military intervention, maybe through Chad, or by air, and so on. And we are always hearing about the extreme course of aid embargos and more sanctions to strangle the government of Sudan, and so on. But believe me, if we listen to those threats, and allow ourselves to be frightened by that course, we will never move a step forward. We have been facing this situation for almost the last 30 years. This is not new for us.

On the other hand, U.S. policy against Sudan has often been based on the idea of containment, the use of neighboring countries to undermine the system in Sudan, and to support their anti-Sudan goals. At that time, the United States said that it supported these neighboring countries with non-military supplies. But, in time of war, lethal and non-lethal forms of aid are equally important. Because if you give someone food, or you support him medically, at the time of fighting, this makes it easier for him to aid the anti-Sudan military effort. They can aid someone's medical corps. It is not fighting. But it is facilitating the welfare of the fighting groups of that country.

So I think our mission is to understand the plan, the scenarios, and to apply counter-scenarios, to defeat them. I think we are not alone in the world. First of all, we believe in God. God is great. Definitely.

The United States is not the only superpower. We are looking for the super-, super-, super-superpower. Once we have that conviction, the United States will be cut down to size. Once we are having noble objectives, while not deviating from those objectives—because for us killing is prevented by religion; rape is prevented by

religion; robbery is prevented by religion. All these types of activities which have been called tactics used by Sudan, are not in our nature. These are not our practice. This is why we feel harmed by these false allegations which the media has thrown against us, because it is contrary to our humanity, is contrary to our belief. It is contrary to our practice and conduct. So this is the biggest blow against us.

Why, in fighting a rebellion in my country, would I be labeled as exercising genocide? While these same forces are ostensibly exercising their right to defend their security, fighting from countries which are thousands of miles away, they are attacking those who are exercising their rights to protect their own people inside their country. What do you call it other than the worst hypocrisy?

This is why, our brothers, we think that this is our time to think in a new manner. We are happy with the call of President Obama for change. But we don't think that this task is an easy one, because there are many hawks who will not allow him to go onto that path, because it is contrary to the interest of many of them.

But let us have hope. This is why we have extended our hand to the new envoy of President Obama, who is still here with us in Sudan. We have been quite transparent, quite receptive, hoping that he will come with an open mind and an open heart, to work with us during the situation. We are true believers, and truth lovers. We want to live in peace with the whole world, including America, and the U.K., and France. And we never will stop our dialogue and our engagement, unless we are forced to do so. Because we think that we are equipped with the knowledge, we are equipped with the right thing, that will convince those who are sincere, those who are credible, those who are fair and neutral, to work hand in hand with us. So we really call for that sort of cooperation, that sort of engagement, that sort of understanding that will let us all live in peace.

Peace Through Developing the Entire Nation

So accept our apology for this lengthy talk, but believe me, no one can doubt our intention for treating our people in a different manner, to allow them to share power with us. The National Electoral Commission has declared a timetable for elections in Sudan. This is a very fundamental decision, that is going to broaden the base for peace, that is going to send a message to all. We have an opportunity to broaden the base of the govern-

ment. And anyone who has the ambition to govern this country through rule, and an agreed-upon program, will gain the support of the majority of the people, to have power, to have the opportunity, instead of taking up arms, to have a better life, an easier one. So we are after that change.

And we think that if we weaken any part of Sudan, if you continue this process of strengthening one part of the country against the other part of the country, or support this party against that one, the outcome is not going to be fair. It is not going to be acceptable. It will not create a lasting peace in Sudan. So we hope that we will all be here in a fair manner that will respect the choices of the Sudanese people themselves.

Interview: Osman Yosuf Kibr

The Western Media Is Lying About Darfur

Osman Yosuf Kibr, the Wali (Governor) of the State of Northern Darfur, Sudan, was interviewed by LaRouche Youth Movement leader Summer Shields, in the state capital Al-Fashir, on April 7, 2009. Shields was visiting Sudan as part of a four-person LaRouche delegation, April 4-10 (see EIR, April 24). The Wali's remarks were translated from Arabic.

EIR: What are the conditions like inside the IDP [internally displaced persons] camps?

Wali Kibr: The conditions are stable in the refugee camps, and the proof is that, one, there are no epidemics in the camps; and two, that the rate of mortality is declining, and that there is a steady improvement in the living conditions and a continuous decline in the rate of malnutrition. The level of nutrition in the camps is actually better than that in the cities. The humanitarian and security situation is stable.

EIR: There are accusations that the government of Sudan is committing atrocities, that there is a conflict between Arabs and blacks, and there are hundreds of thousands dead. What would you say?

Wali Kibr: This is absolutely not true. What we know about Darfur is that there are no whites or blacks at all. In Darfur all the people are a mixture, a cross-breeding of Arabs and Africans across the ages. And therefore, there is no pure African and there is no pure Arab here. Everyone here in Darfur is a Darfuri. Therefore, such a claim is unfounded.

EIR: Has there been an increase in the rate of deaths since the NGOs were kicked out of Darfur?

Wali Kibr: There has been no impact of these organizations. These organizations are intermediaries and not donor organizations. Their assignments were limited to conveying the aid. Some of them worked in marginal efforts, others in water, sanitation, and environmental improvement works. The truth is that the relevant ministries [of the government of Sudan], the national, and the other international organizations totally filled the gap that was left by the departure of these organizations. And thank God, the conditions are stable right now.

EIR: What message would you send to the people of the United States?

Wali Kibr: What I would like to convey to the people of the United States, is that the people of Sudan are not enemies of the people of the United States, and the people of Darfur are friends of the people of the United States. The issue of Darfur has to be seen with both eyes and listened to with both ears. There is a great deal of disinformation and distortion on the issue of Darfur. The issue is now limited to foreign interventions, personal and egotistic ambitions, and a distorting mass media.

We call on anybody who is physically capable to come over here to Darfur and witness for himself the reality. We assure you that the humanitarian and social conditions in Darfur are improving, and are not as bad as being transmitted through the media. That picture is very misleading. This does not mean that there is no problem in Darfur. There is a problem in Darfur. But it is not as dark as it is being portrayed to be.

The other issue is, that there is a great number of organizations that raise big sums of money from the American people, but none of that money is coming to Darfur. This money is never sent to Darfur, and the whole thing is becoming a business to get money from the donors to be spent somewhere else. And, I take full responsibility for what I am saying to you.

Pakistan on the Brink

On Aug. 18, 2008, Gen. Pervez Musharraf resigned as President of Pakistan. The previous November, four days after being certified as the elected President of Pakistan, he resigned as Chief of Staff of the Army. The decision to sever his ties to the Armed Forces was made under tremendous pressure from London, Riyadh, and the Bush Administration.

Lyndon LaRouche warned at the time, that this British-induced treachery by the Bush Administration would destroy Pakistan, and throw the entire region, stretching from the Indian subcontinent through Central Asia, the Caucasus, Russia, and China, into turmoil.

LaRouche argued that Musharraf's ouster would weaken the role of the Army as the principal institution holding Pakistan together. It was not just internal pressures for the breakup of Pakistan that LaRouche identified. First and foremost, the move to dump Musharraf was "Made in London." The British, dating back to their 19th-Century "Great Game," sought to create permanent religious and ethnic strife along the "Roof of the World," to ensure the defeat of American System efforts to unite all of Eurasia, Africa, and the Americas through high-speed railroads and development corridors.

The British orchestrated two world wars during the 20th Century to achieve this aim, which some have described as "permanent, managed chaos." At the end of World War II, even though Franklin Roosevelt had died and been replaced by British stooge Harry Truman, the British knew that they could not return to the imperial "mandate" system they had erected, along with French and other European colonial powers, in the aftermath of World War I.

Instead, the British opted for another variation

on their "Seven Years War" strategems: partition. Simultaneously, as British occupation was coming to an end in Palestine and India, London engineered the partitioning of both Palestine and India. From the outset, the split-up of India into India and Pakistan, was pure British chicanery, to assure ethnic, tribal, and religious (Hindu versus Muslim) conflict.

To his credit, after seizing power in a 1999 military coup, President Musharraf sought to solve the Kashmir dispute with India, and to place the military at the nation's service—above the party and feudal fault-lines that had kept Pakistan in turmoil since the Soviet war in Afghanistan (1979-90).

It was that Afghanistan War, and its aftermath, that produced the crisis we face today. It gave the world the Taliban and al-Qaeda, and it turned Afghanistan into a giant poppy field—currently providing up to 95% of the global heroin supply, and financing narco-terrorism worldwide.

Now, that disease has spilled fully into Pakistan, with all of the social and political disintegration that LaRouche warned of, when Musharraf was booted out.

There is no quick fix to the crisis in Pakistan today. It was the product of a 30-year process, led by London, with roots that go back a hundred years earlier. For the moment, the Pakistani Army remains the one institution capable of holding the country together. In a recent interview, Musharraf said that he is in agony over what has become of his country, since he was forced out of power. He offered to help in any way possible. Whether Pakistanis take up his offer and move to reverse his ouster, or whether they find another patriot-in-uniform to bring the nation back from the brink, Musharraf's assessment cannot be ignored, except at great peril.

See LaRouche on Cable TV

INTERNET

- BCAT.TV/BCAT Click BCAT-2 Mon: 10 am (Eastern Time)
- LAROUCHEPUB.COM Click *LaRouche's Writings*. (Avail. 24/7)
- MNN.ORG Click *Watch Ch.57* Fri: 2:30 a.m. (Eastern Time)
- QUOTE-UNQUOTE.COM Click on *Ch.27*. Tue. 6 pm (Mtn.)
- SCAN-TV.ORG Click *Scan on the Web (Pacific Time)*. Ch.23: Wed. 7 am Ch.77: Mon. 11 am
- WUWF.ORG Click *Watch WUWF-TV*. Last Mon 4:30-5 pm (Eastern)

INTERNATIONAL

THE PHILIPPINES

- MANILA Ch.3: Tue 9:30 pm

ALABAMA

- UNIONTOWN GY Ch.2: Mon-Fri every 4 hours; Sun Afternoons

ALASKA

- ANCHORAGE GCI Ch.9: Thu 10 pm

CALIFORNIA

- CONTRA COSTA CC Ch.26: 2nd Tue 7 pm
- COSTA MESA TW Ch.35: Thu 5:30 pm
- LANCASTER/PALMDALE TW Ch.36: Sun 1 pm
- LONG BEACH CH Analog Ch.65/69 & Digital Ch.95: 4th Tue 1-1:30 pm
- ORANGE COUNTY (N) TW Ch.95/97/98: Fri 4 pm

COLORADO

- DENVER CC Ch.56 Sun 10 am

CONNECTICUT

- GROTON CC Ch.12: Mon 5 pm
- NEW HAVEN CC Ch.23: Sat 6 pm
- NEWTOWN CH Ch.21: Mon 12:30 pm; Fri 7 pm
- NORWICH CC Ch.14: Thu 7:30 pm
- SEYMOUR CC Ch.10: Tue 10 pm

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- WASHINGTON CC Ch.95 & RCN Ch.10: Irregular

FLORIDA

- ESCAMBIA COUNTY CX Ch.4: Last Sat 4:30 pm

ILLINOIS

- CHICAGO CC./RCN/WOW Ch.21: Irregular
- PEORIA COUNTY IN Ch.22: Sun 7:30 pm
- QUAD CITIES MC Ch.19: Thu 11 pm
- ROCKFORD CC Ch.17 Wed 9 pm

IOWA

- QUAD CITIES MC Ch.19: Thu 11 pm

KENTUCKY

- BOONE/KENTON COUNTIES IN Ch.21: Sun 1 am; Fri Midnight
- JEFFERSON COUNTY IN Ch.98: Fri 2-2:30 pm

LOUISIANA

- ORLEANS PARISH CX Ch.78: Tue 4 am & 4 pm

MAINE

- PORTLAND TW Ch.2: Mon 1 & 11 am; 5 pm

MARYLAND

- ANN ARUNDEL CC Ch.99; FIOS Ch.42: Tue & Thu: 10 am; Fri & Sat: midnight
- P.G. COUNTY CC Ch.76 & FIOS Ch.42: Wed & Fri: 6 pm
- MONTGOMERY COUNTY CC/RCN/FIOS Ch.21: Tue 2 pm

MASSACHUSETTS

- BROOKLINE CV & RCN Ch.3: Mon 3:30 pm; Tue 3:30 am; Wed 9 am & 9 pm;
- CAMBRIDGE CC Ch.10: Tue 2:30 pm; Fri 10:30 am
- FRANKLIN COUNTY (NE) CC Ch.17: Sun 8 pm; Wed 9 pm; Sat 4 pm
- QUINCY CC Ch.8: Pop-ins.
- WALPOLE CC Ch.8: Tue 1 pm

MICHIGAN

- BYRON CENTER CC Ch.25: Mon 2 & 7 pm
- DETROIT CC Ch.68: Irregular
- GRAND RAPIDS CC Ch.25: Irreg.
- KALAMAZOO CH Ch.20: Tue 11 pm; Sat 10 am
- KENT COUNTY (North) CH Ch.22: Wed 3:30 & 11 pm
- KENT COUNTY (South) CC Ch.25: Wed 9:30 am
- LAKE ORION CC Ch.10: Mon/Tue 2 & 9 pm
- LANSING CC Ch.16: Fri Noon
- LIVONIA BH Ch.12: Thu 3 pm
- MT. PLEASANT CH Ch.3: Tue 5:30 pm; Wed 7 am
- SHELBY TOWNSHIP CC Ch.20 & WOW Ch.18: Mon/Wed 6:30 pm
- WAYNE COUNTY CC Ch.16/18: Mon 6-8 pm

MINNESOTA

- ALBANY AMTC Ch.13: Tue & Thu: 7:30 pm
- CAMBRIDGE US Ch.10: Wed 6 pm
- COLD SPRING US Ch. 10: Wed 6 pm
- COLUMBIA HEIGHTS CC Ch.15: Tue 9 pm
- DULUTH CH Ch.20: Mon 9 pm; Wed 12 pm, Fri 1 pm
- MARSHALL Prairie Wave & CH Ch.35/8: Sat. 9 am
- MINNEAPOLIS TW Ch.16: Tue 11 pm
- MINNEAPOLIS (N. Burbs) CC Ch.15: Thu 3 & 9 pm
- NEW ULM TW Ch. 14: Fri 5 pm
- PROCTOR MC Ch. 12: Tue 5 pm to 1 am
- ST. CLOUD CH Ch.12: Mon 6 pm
- ST. CROIX VALLEY CC Ch.14: Thu 1 & 7 pm; Fri 9 am
- ST. LOUIS PARK CC Ch.15: Sat/Sun Midnite, 8 am, 4 pm
- ST. PAUL CC Ch.15: Wed 9:30 pm
- ST. PAUL (S&W Burbs) CC Ch.15: Wed 10:30 am; Fri 7:30 pm
- SAULK CENTRE SCTV Ch.19: Sat 5 pm
- WASHINGTON COUNTY (South) CC Ch.14: Thu 8 pm

- WASHINGTON COUNTY (South) CC Ch.14: Thu 8 pm

NEVADA

- BOULDER CITY CH Ch.2: 2x/day: am & pm
- WASHOE COUNTY CH Ch.16: Thu 9 pm

NEW HAMPSHIRE

- CHESTERFIELD CC Ch.8: Wed 8 pm
- MANCHESTER CC Ch.23: Thu 4:30 pm

NEW JERSEY

- BERGEN CTY TW Ch.572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- MERCER COUNTY CC Trenton Ch.26: 3rd & 4th Fri 6 pm Windsors Ch.27: Mon 5:30 pm
- MONTVALE/MAHWAH CV Ch.76: Mon 5 pm
- PISCATAWAY CV Ch.15: Thu 11:30 pm
- UNION CC Ch.26: Irregular

NEW MEXICO

- BERNALILLO COUNTY CC Ch.27: Tue 2 pm
- LOS ALAMOS CC Ch.8: Wed 10 pm
- SANTA FE CC Ch.16: Thu 9 pm; Sat 6:30 pm
- SILVER CITY CC Ch.17: Wed 8-10 pm
- TAOS CC Ch.2: Thu 7 pm

NEW YORK


- ALBANY TW Ch.18: Wed 5 pm.
- BETHLEHEM TW Ch.18: Thu 9:30 pm
- BRONX CV Ch.70: Wed 7:30 am
- BROOKLYN CV Ch.68: Mon 10 am TW Ch.35: Mon 10 am RCN Ch.83: Mon 10 am FIOS Ch.43: Mon 10 am
- BUFFALO TW Ch.20: Wed & Fri 10:30-11pm
- CHEMUNG/STUEBEN TW Ch.1/99: Tue 7:30 pm
- ERIE COUNTY TW Ch.20: Thu 10:35 pm
- IRONDEQUOIT TW Ch.15: Mon/Thu 7 pm
- JEFFERSON/LEWIS COUNTIES TW Ch.99: Irregular
- MANHATTAN TW & RCN Ch.57/85 Fri 2:30 am
- ONEIDA COUNTY TW Ch.99: Thu 8 or 9 pm
- PENFIELD TW Ch.15: Irregular
- QUEENS TW Ch.56: 4th Sat 2 pm RCN Ch.85: 4th Sat 2 pm
- QUEENSBURY TW Ch.71: Mon 7 pm
- ROCHESTER TW Ch.15: Sun 9 pm; Thu 8 pm
- ROCKLAND CV Ch.76: Tue 5 pm
- SCHENECTADY TW Ch.16: Fri 1 pm; Sat 1:30 am
- STATEN ISLAND TW Ch.35: Mon & Thu Midnite. TW Ch.34: Sat 8 am
- TOMPKINS COUNTY TW Ch.13: Sun 12:30 pm; Sat 6 pm
- TRI-LAKES TW Ch.2: Sun 7 am, 1 pm, 8 pm
- WEBSTER TW Ch.12: Wed 9 pm
- WEST SENECA TW Ch.20: Thu 10:35 pm
- HICKORY CH Ch.6: Tue 10 pm
- MECKLENBURG COUNTY TW Ch.22: Sat/Sun 11 pm
- AMHERST TW Ch.95: 3X Daily
- CUYAHOGA COUNTY TW Ch.21: Wed 3:30 pm
- OBERLIN Cable Co-Op Ch.9: Thu 8 pm
- NORMAN CX Ch.20: Wed 9 pm
- BRISTOL, BARRINGTON, WARREN Full Channel Ch.49: Tue: 10 am
- EAST PROVIDENCE CX Ch.18; FIOS Ch.25: Tue: 6 pm
- STATEWIDE RI INTERCONNECT CX Ch.13; FIOS Ch.32 Tue 10 am
- HOUSTON CC Ch.17 & TV Max Ch.95: Wed 5:30 pm; Sat 9 am
- KINGWOOD CB Ch.98: Wed 5:30 pm; Sat 9 am
- BRATTLEBORO CC Ch.8: Mon 6 pm, Tue 4:30 pm, Wed 8 pm
- GREATER FALLS CC Ch.10: Mon/Wed/Fri 1 pm
- MONTPELIER CC Ch.15: Tue 10 pm; Wed 3 am & 4 pm
- ALBEMARLE COUNTY CC Ch.13: Sun 4 am; Fri 3 pm
- ARLINGTON CC Ch.69 & FIOS Ch.38: Tue 9 am
- CHESTERFIELD COUNTY CC Ch.17; FIOS Ch.28: Mon 1 pm
- FAIRFAX CX & FIOS Ch.10: 1st & 2nd Wed 1 pm; Sun 4 am. FIOS Ch.41: Wed 6 pm
- LOUDOUN COUNTY CC Ch.98 & FIOS Ch.41: Wed 6 pm
- ROANOKE COUNTY CX Ch.78: Tue 7 pm; Thu 2 pm
- KING COUNTY CC Ch.77: Mon 11 am, Wed 7 am BS Ch.23: Mon 11 am, Wed 7 am
- TRI CITIES CH Ch.13/99: Mon 7 pm; Thu 9 pm
- MARATHON CH Ch.10: Thu 9:30 pm; Fri 12 Noon
- MUSKEGO TW Ch.14: Sat 4 pm; Sun 7 am
- GILLETTE BR Ch.31: Tue 7

MSO Codes: AS=Astound; BD=Beld; BR=Bresnan; BH=BrightHouse; BS = Broadstripe; CV=Cablevision; CB=Cebridge; CH=Charter; CC=Comcast; CX=Cox; GY=Galaxy; IN=Insight; MC=MediaCom; TW=TimeWarner; US=US Cable. FIOS=Verizon FIOS-TV.
Get The LaRouche Connection on your local cable TV system! Call Charles Notley 703-777-9451, Ext. 322. Visit our Website: www.larouchepub.com/tv.
[updated Mar. 2, 2009]

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 _____