

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

June 12, 2009 Vol. 36 No. 23

www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

Exclusive: Obama's Advisors Push Health Cuts
An Unavoidable Duty: On Ricci vs. DeStefano
Globalization and the 'Auto' Bailout

Evidence for a New Nuremberg: Obama's Nazi Health Plan



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

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

Behind the so-called “health-care” plan that President Obama and his crew of Nazi doctors are attempting to fast-track into law by the end of this Summer, is the human-hating ideology of the British oligarchy, personified by Lord Bertrand Russell and His Royal Virus Prince Philip. These two creatures, who should be consigned to the lowest rung of Dante’s Hell, with Satan himself, offer their personal views on why the human population must be “culled,” as reported in this week’s *Feature*. I recommend reading this first, before moving on to our coverage of the Obama Administration’s first public airing of its plan to bring British-style denial of medical care to Americans, under the cover of euphemisms such as “sustainability,” “cost effectiveness,” “a shift to quality, not quantity and volume,” “overutilization,” and so forth. Behind the polite sophistry, lurk the twisted smiles of Philip, et al. But don’t be fooled! As *EIR*’s Paul Gallagher charged, in confronting the Obama team, without eliminating the murderous HMOs, you’re talking about defining “lives unworthy to be lived,” as promulgated by Hitler himself, in his 1939 “Top-Secret Euthanasia Decree.” We publish here the exclusive, full transcript of that meeting, in which Obama’s Council of Economic Advisors presented its report, “The Economic Impact of Health Care Reform.”

Meanwhile, as the Administration continued its policy of bailing out the Wall Street and London financial elites, to be paid for by slashing health care and living standards, the once-mighty automaker General Motors was forced to declare bankruptcy, while Chrysler cut plants and dealerships to satisfy the financial predators, and the official jobless rate climbed to nearly 10%. This week’s *International* lead reviews how GM, the company that once symbolized America’s post-war industrial might, became the poster-child for today’s post-industrial junkheap.

In “An Unavoidable Duty: On Ricci vs. DeStefano,” Lyndon LaRouche moots the possible impeachment of President Barack Obama, in the context of a civil rights case, now before the Supreme Court (*National*). Prince Philip’s WWF is moving to destroy South Africa, as it continues its imperial policy to rid the continent of all impediments to its looting rights (*International*); and, an interview with Lord Christopher Monckton shows how the real intent of the “global warming” cabal is to impose world government.



Cover This Week

Dr. Karl Brandt (standing, center) on trial at Nuremberg, 1947. He oversaw the Nazi "euthanasia" program: mass killing.



4 Evidence for a New Nuremberg: Obama's Nazi Health Plan

By Nancy Spannaus. The President is determined to get the Nazi-style health policy of his advisors through in a matter of months. His "behavioral economist" advisors, denying that the health-care cuts are to pay for Wall Street bailouts, are using euphemisms as did the Nazis when they sent hundreds of thousands of Germans to their deaths: "action" for a "merciful death" for those for whom treatment would be "ineffective" or "futile."

6 Obama's Nazi Doctor Recasts Hippocratic Oath

From Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel.

9 A Preview of Obama's 'Reform': Oregon's Health Plan Will Pay for Euthanasia, Not Cancer Care

12 EIR Confronts Obama's Nazi Doctors: Economic Advisors Admit: Obama Will Cut Social Security, Medicare

A full transcript of a June 2 event in Washington, D.C., where Council of Economic Advisors chair Christina Romer presented a report on "The Economic Impact of Health Care Reform."

24 A Formulary of U.S. Nazi-Medicine Terms

26 Documentation: The British Nazis in Their Own Words

National

28 An Unavoidable Duty: On Ricci vs. DeStefano

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. comments on the case of a New Haven, Conn. firefighter who sued the city, when his promotion was blocked on the grounds that no minority candidates passed the qualifying test. Plaintiff Frank Ricci, who is white, passed; the city threw out the test. LaRouche draws the implications, concluding: "Unless the so-called health-care reforms presently proposed by President Obama are prevented, all talk of civil rights were an ugly farce in the tradition of Adolf Hitler's Tiergarten-4."

30 Ricci v. DeStefano: Facts of the Case

31 'Day of Reckoning': Schwarzenegger Goes in for the Kill

33 Soros Crowd Behind Smears Against Murtha

36 National News

International

38 Globalization and the 'Auto' Bailout

U.S. taxpayers got very little for the \$70 billion they paid for GM. But the "bailout" of the auto sector was never about saving auto production and jobs, but was part of the bailout of the bankrupt financial sector.

41 The Auto Bankruptcies: LaRouche Told You So

43 Oligarchy's WWF Goal: Destroy South Africa

47 Destroying National Sovereignty: The Real Face of 'Global Warming'

An interview with Lord Christopher Monckton.

51 South Korea Convinces Malaysia's Prime Minister To Go Nuclear

53 North Korea: LaRouche Calls for U.S. Direct Dialogue

54 LaRouche in Ukraine: Vitrenko Presents LaRouche's Record

55 International Intelligence

Interviews

47 Lord Christopher Monckton

Lord Monckton, former science advisor to British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, is a leading spokesman against the global warming swindle, and has testified that the effects of passing any climate change legislation that includes a cap-and-trade scheme for carbon emissions would be genocidal for the poor.

Editorial

56 A Scary Strategic Assessment

Evidence for a New Nuremberg: Obama's Nazi Health Plan

by Nancy Spannaus

June 4—When the Obama economic team, dominated by the larcenous economics advisor Larry Summers, and murderous accountant and Budget Director Peter Orszag, launched their offensive to ram through the Administration's Nazi health "reform" June 2, they thought they would have their day. Instead, they found themselves confronted and exposed as the purveyors of a Hitler genocide plan, that would condemn millions of Americans to death, as having what Hitler called "lives not worthy to be lived."

The Obama team showed no shame. Again and again, burnished under a patina of bureaucratic jargon, they demanded hundreds of millions of dollars in cuts for the most vulnerable of American citizens, insisted upon stopping so-called unnecessary medical care for as much as a third of the American population, and put their version of fiscal health before the lives of people. While they brazenly pour trillions of dollars of Federal monies into the very banking institutions which have brought the world economy to its knees, they tell American citizens, particularly those on Medicare and Medicaid, that they are "overconsuming" health care, and



Figure 1. "Exhibit A": *The Council of Economic Advisers' report on the economic effects of the health reform, presented at the Old Executive Office Building June 2.*

have to be stopped, "for their own good."

"Exhibit A" (Figure 1) is the presentation of the Council of Economic Advisers' report on the economic effects of the health reform, which occurred at the Old Executive Office Building in Washington, D.C. the morning of June 2, the transcript of which event we present in full below, as an exclusive. In it, you will read not only the Hitlerian intent of these "reformers," but see them exposed by *EIR's* correspondent for their criminal intent.

In commissioning the full publication of this transcript, which has otherwise been suppressed by the White House and major news media, Lyndon LaRouche put the issue squarely before the American people,

and the Congress:

"If we don't defeat these bastards, there will be no humanity left. We have to clobber these murderers.

"How would you treat Hitler if he were standing before you? The Obama team is standing before you. Do you want to hit the Hitler of the past, or the new Hitlers who are threatening humanity today? They are your target.



Like the Obama team, the Nazis used euphemisms in their infamous T4 program of “euthanasia,” which sent hundreds of thousands of German ill and aged to their deaths, under the rubric of a “merciful death” for those for whom treatment would be “ineffective” or “futile.” Shown: Jewish handicapped, victims of Nazi euthanasia.

“This transcript is evidence to present to a new Nuremberg Tribunal, should they succeed in carrying out their crimes against humanity. Here the criminals indict themselves, as if they were carrying out a secret conference of the inner cabal of the new Nazi regime. Now is when we must stop them, before the mass murderous ‘reform’ is put into place.”

The Outlines of the Nazi Plan

Don’t be confused by the Orwellian gobble-dygook, uttered by the promoters of Obama’s health plan, that you will find in the transcript of the June 2 event. Look into their minds. The Nazis used euphemisms as well, when they set up the infamous T4 program of “euthanasia,” which sent hundreds of thousands of German ill and aged to their deaths. They referred to the process as the “Action,” which would provide a “merciful death” to those for whom treatment would be “ineffective” or “futile.”

The Nazis were also not loathe to point out the economic “benefits” of their program, which would allegedly permit money to be spent on

healthy citizens instead. The fact that the monies were actually going into armaments and financial cartels, didn’t stop them from peddling their lies.

From beginning to end, the presentation of the Obama Hitler health plan hinges on *cutting* health care, starting with \$309 billion from Medicare over the next ten years. The HMO system is defended. Current health-care practices in the United States are treated as if they are overabundant, even as the American people have been facing massive shortages of hospitals and medical personnel, and have been forced to forego necessary care because of costs, HMO restrictions, or lack of facilities. The genocidal consequences of these cuts are obvious, even to a child. Can we not say that the perpetrators met the standards

of the Nuremberg Tribunal: that they knew, or should have known?

But, after being confronted by *EIR*’s Paul Gallagher, the Obama team continued to simply repeat the same mantra about keeping the murderous HMO system, and cutting back on health care. At a Brookings Institution event, and then a National Press Club

Adolf Hilter’s Top-Secret Euthanasia Decree of October 1939 (backdated to Sept. 1), was handed to his doctor Karl Brandt, under the title, “The Destruction of Lives Unworthy of Life.” It read:

“Reichsleiter Bouhler and Dr. Brandt are charged with the responsibility for expanding the authority of physicians, to be designated by name, to the end that patients considered incurable according to the best available human judgment of their state of health, can be accorded a mercy death.”

Obama's Nazi Doctor Recasts Hippocratic Oath

May 31—Ezekiel Emanuel, M.D., called for a reinterpretation of the physician's Hippocratic Oath to take account of "costs" and "effect on others" (like HMOs), in an article in the June 18, 2008 *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)*, titled, "The Perfect Storm of Overutilization." The brother of Obama's chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, Ezekiel is a top designer of Obama's Hitlerian medical-care "reform," as health-care advisor to Peter Orszag's OMB and a member of the Federal Council on Comparative Effectiveness Research. He wrote:

"At least 7 factors drive overuse [of medical care], 4 related to physicians and 3 related to patients. First, there is the matter of physician culture. Medical school education and postgraduate training emphasize thoroughness. When evaluating a patient, students, interns, and residents are trained to identify and praised for and graded on enumerating all possible diagnoses and tests that would confirm or exclude them. The thought is that the more thorough the eval-



National Institutes of Health
Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel

uation, the more intelligent the student or house officer. Trainees who ignore the improbable 'zebra' diagnoses are not deemed insightful. In medical training, meticulousness, not effectiveness, is rewarded.

"This mentality carries over into practice. Peer recognition goes to the most thorough and aggressive physicians. The prudent physician is not deemed particularly competent, but rather inadequate. This culture is further reinforced by a unique understanding of professional obligations, specifically, the Hippocratic Oath's admonition to 'use my power to help the sick to the best of my ability and judgment' as an imperative to do everything for the patient regardless of cost or effect on others" (emphasis added).

Compare the account in Robert Jay Lifton's book, *The Nazi Doctors*.

The anti-Nazi physician Ella Lingen-Reiner pointed to the chimneys in the distance, and asked Nazi doctor Fritz Klein, "How can you reconcile that with your [Hippocratic] oath as a doctor?" His answer was, "Of course I am a doctor and I want to preserve life. And out of respect for human life, I would remove a gangrenous appendix from a diseased body. The Jew is the gangrenous appendix in the body of mankind."

—Tony Papert

event later the same day, Administration spokesmen kept up the pep talk. The next day, Administration official Nancy-Ann DeParle felt compelled to reference the fact that what she called "scary rumors" were being circulated about the Obama plan, but claimed that the Administration was not going to be forced to "react."

DeParle, however, effusively endorsed the genocidal cuts put together by the private "health-care industry" which the Administration proposes to keep in charge of the system. Typical of the proposals these "stakeholders" put together to cut \$2 trillion in health-care costs, are those of the American Medical Association, under a section called "Efforts To Reduce Unnecessary Utilization." These include reducing "overuse" of surgical and non-surgical management of back pain,

angioplasty, treating sinusitis with antibiotics and sinus radiography, and diagnostic imaging.

In fact, President Obama's own actions June 2 compounded the evidence of genocidal intent. Following a meeting with 24 Democratic Senators on the plan, the President gave a five-minute presentation, during which he stressed that it is not sufficient to add people to the Medicare and Medicaid rolls, "in the absence of cost controls and reforms." He then sent a letter to Sens. Max Baucus (D-Mont.) and Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.), heads of the committees in charge of ramming through the plans, proposing *more* cutbacks in Medicare and Medicaid than are in his budget—\$200-300 billion more, to be precise.

As LaRouche put it, "The President is fully guilty of a policy of genocide."



Creative Commons

A bill introduced by Sen. Jay Rockefeller, chairman of the Finance Subcommittee on Health Care, seeks a procedure to cut health costs, “insulated from political pressure,” as the Base Realignment and Closing Commission (BRAC) did in the case of military base closures.



Creative Commons

Tom Daschle seeks to set up the equivalent of a Federal Reserve Board for health care, protected from political pressure, and able to set up such genocidal rules as demanding that everyone signing up for Medicare sign a document outlining their “end of life” directive.

Letting the ‘Experts’ Decide

As we stressed in last week’s issue, the preferred *modus operandi* of the President’s Nazi health-care advisors, is to set up a “non-political” structure which would have the responsibility of deciding the parameters on who should live, and who should die. This is in line with the procedures adopted by the Hitler regime, and by its most faithful model today, the British National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE).

The leading proposals for such a structure have come from former Sen. Tom Daschle, whom Obama had intended to bring on as a health czar; from Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel, a health-care advisor to Office of Management and Budget director Orszag; and from Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-W.Va.), who has legislation before the Congress which would turn the Medicare Payment Advisory Council (MedPAC) into an agency able to dictate what will be paid for.

The latest statement in favor of this approach came from DeParle, counselor to the President and director of the White House Office of Health Reform. Speaking to the Congressional Quarterly Healthbeat conference in Washington June 3, DeParle stated that the President is open to giving special consideration to recommendations coming from MedPAC, for dealing with rising health-care costs. These recommendations involve making MedPAC decisions mandatory, concerning which medications and procedures will be reimbursed,

unless they are opposed by a joint resolution of the Congress. This mirrors a bill introduced by Senator Rockefeller, which seeks a procedure to cut health costs, “insulated from political pressure,” as in the Base Realignment and Closing Commission (BRAC), which shut down military bases across the country. That “political” debate and “pressure,” of course, is otherwise known as the constitutional authority of the Legislative branch of government.

A more-elaborated policy to the same effect, has been in circulation since 2008 from Dr. Emanuel. In his book, *Healthcare, Guaranteed*, Emanuel calls for phasing out Medicare, Medicaid, and the children’s health program SCHIP, and replacing it with government-paid private insurance. He also calls for the institution of a value-added tax (VAT), one of the most regressive taxes in existence. But the oversight on the health-care payments, procedures approved, and the like, will be made by an “independent” National Health Board. “To reduce political interference and allow the necessary tough choices to be made,” Emanuel says, this board will be nominated by the President, and confirmed by Congress, but otherwise be insulated, *even getting its funding independently of Congressional appropriations.*

Emanuel’s plan is a virtual carbon copy of that put forward in another 2008 book, *Critical: What We Can*

Do About the Health-Care Crisis, by Daschle, who was also on the hustings this past week in Washington. Daschle seeks to set up the equivalent of a Federal Reserve Board for health care, insulated from political pressure, and able to set up such genocidal rules as demanding that everyone registering for Medicare sign a document outlining their “end of life” directive.

Challenged by William Jones of *EIR* at the June 2 National Press Club event on health care, to explain how his and Obama’s health-care cuts, to pay for Wall Street bailouts, differ from the thinking behind Hitler’s 1939 order to eliminate useless eaters by withdrawing their medical care, Daschle just lied: “We’re not cutting. We’re slowing growth.” He then proved *EIR*’s point by claiming that there is “a growing awareness among Americans, of the large amount of *unnecessary* medical care being delivered” (emphasis added).

A later challenge from *EIR*’s Paul Gallagher, who asked how Daschle could deny that the “reform” would deny care and cut off “lives unworthy to be lived, like the Nazi doctors did,” was met with a similar denial. But, while claiming that he and Obama didn’t want to ration care, Daschle showed that, in fact, he did, by saying, “We’re just trying to allocate resources so that everyone can get necessary care, although some will get less elective care.”

Stopping Fascism

There is no question but that the President, who is fully embracing the policies of his Nazi economic advisors, is determined to get this Hitler health policy through in a matter of months. Senator Baucus and others have laid out a schedule that calls for getting a bill approved before the August Congressional recess, and insiders, such as Daschle, have declared that the Administration intends to maneuver (criminally) so that the bill can be passed with only a simple majority of 51 in the Senate, rather than go through a process which would be subject to potential filibuster.

While there is substantial disagreement with the plan from medical professionals, and supporters of the single-payer proposal of Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich.) and Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), the LaRouche Political Action Committee is the only force prepared to confront the Administration’s fascist character—and to



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

LaRouche PAC organizers have been going into the streets with a poster of President Obama sporting a Hitler-style mustache, with the caption “Is this your President?” On June 4, in Detroit, Mich., Alan Egre (shown here) was arrested for organizing with this poster. LaRouche responded: “This is a real civil rights case . . . a violation of the Constitution.”

present a workable solution in the context of a *total* change in economic policy.

LaRouche PAC has been underscoring its point by going onto the streets with a poster of President Obama sporting a Hitler moustache, with the caption, “Is this your President?” Many have been provoked to think, but in Detroit, Mich., on June 4, LaRouche Youth Movement organizer Alan Egre was arrested for organizing with this poster.

LaRouche responded: This is a real civil rights case. The President of the United States is recommending the same policy as Hitler on health care, and the Detroit police are trying to prevent the truth from being told. This is a violation of the U.S. Constitution. Are the police acting on the orders of the Obama Administration? Why is a Michigan law enforcement official supporting fascism?

Egre was released after two hours, without any charges being brought against him, but the question remains: Can Obama be stopped from putting through his fascist policies? Will the American people follow LaRouche’s lead, and defeat the new Hitler to save our republic?

Oregon's Health Plan Will Pay For Euthanasia, Not Cancer Care

by Nancy Spannaus

June 6—Hitler's Nazi doctors had two vital roles to play in the T-4 program which the Führer launched against those lives he considered "not worthy to be lived," during his 1939-41 "euthanasia" program. First was their crucial participation in setting the so-called medical "standard" for who would live, and who would die; the second was to provide a figleaf of medical cover for why people had died.

Both of these jobs have been carried out in Oregon, since 1994, the fateful year when that state adopted two Nazi programs—first, the Oregon Health Program, which set up a system for *denying* "expensive," "futile" medical care to large categories of poor people (whom Dr. Leo Alexander, the medical advisor to the Nuremberg Tribunals, would call the "non-rehabitable sick") enrolled in the state's Medicaid program; and second, the Physician-Assisted Suicide Law, which permits physicians to provide lethal drugs to patients who allegedly voluntarily decide to terminate their lives.

We review this process here as a precautionary tale: The thinking behind the Oregon Plan mirrors that of both Hitler, and Obama's health planners—and it leads to genocide. Will you let this happen in the United States?

Setting Up the 'Choices'

The Oregon Health Plan is generally considered to be the brainchild of Dr. John Kitzhaber, a medical doctor who spent years in the Oregon Senate, before becoming governor during 1995-2003. Kitzhaber, who remains politically active, and was reportedly considered as a candidate for Secretary of Health and Human Services in the Obama Administration, projects the New Age aura, concerned with reforming our health-care system to foster "wellness," instead of dealing with people needing health care. Like the Nazi doctors, who were concerned with preserving the "wellness" of the

race, Kitzhaber has the mind of a killer. All for the greater good, mind you.

In putting through the program, Kitzhaber worked closely with Barbara Coombs Lee, a nurse who became counsel to the Oregon Senate's Committee on Health Care and Bioethics, and was the chief petitioner for Oregon's assisted suicide law. Lee is currently the head of Compassion & Choices, an organization derived from the Hemlock Society and other pro-death groups.

The Oregon Health Plan, which was first passed in the Summer of 1991, was touted widely as a boon to the poor, as it was intended to provide medical coverage to all Oregonians below the poverty line, either through Medicaid or other plans. As with Hitler, and the Obama plan, it began with establishing a commission of "experts."

An 11-member commission resulted in the creation of a mathematical calculus, which allegedly measured the net benefit value (to society) of treating a sick person, by contrasting the net benefit of treatment against net costs. The calculus comes from multiplying the cost of a treatment, by the number of years the patient might live as a result, and dividing by the number of the illness on the "Quality of Well-Being" index, an index developed by Dr. Robert Kaplan of the University of San Diego. The index effectively parallels the Quality of Adjusted Life Years (QALY) measurement, which is touted by Obama's Budget Director Peter Orszag as an excuse for killing people in the Obama "reform."

As a result of this effort, the doctors devised a list of 709 diagnoses and treatments, which, when calculated along with the cost of treatment, and the "value" given to treatment by certain limited popular surveys, were ranked from 1—the most favored—to 709—the least favored. The use of popular surveys, carried out through meetings and phone calls, is eerily reminiscent of Nazi

school propaganda under Hitler, which asked children to compare the costs of paying for the handicapped, against paying for able-bodied families. Propaganda for the plan from leading advocates, like Barbara Coombs Lee, has a similar taint, in its emphasis on sacrificing for the good of the “community.” (Might we say “the Volk?”)

Once the calculus was done, the state would consult these ratings when deciding if it could/would pay for care. Note, however, that from the start, over 100 of these conditions were ruled out because of their “low value,” and every two years, a new line would be drawn, under which reimbursement would be denied. The cutoffs were due to the fact that the legislature each year capped the amount to be spent on the health program. When there were budget cuts, more treatments had to go.

Reports of what conditions would not be covered vary, but, at one point, they included such common conditions as chronic bronchitis and asthma. In 1993, when the program finally went into effect, 120 procedures on the list were ruled out, including treatments for liver cancer, phlebitis, and acute viral hepatitis. This model should be kept in mind, as we hear representatives of the “health-care industry” coming out with their cost-savings plans, which list some of these same conditions as targets for cutting health-care costs.

Ironically, the Oregon Plan could not get the waivers from the generally sympathetic Bush I Administration, which would have allowed it to codify this Nazi denial of care for Medicaid recipients, and put the plan into effect. Thus the program was only approved in March 1993, by President Clinton’s Health and Human Services head Donna Shalala, and went into effect in 1994.

From Rationing to Euthanasia

Lawfully, 1994 saw the Nazi doctors of the state, led by soon-to-be-governor Dr. John Kitzhaber, and supported by the international genocide lobby of the euthanasia movement, ram through the next phase of the program: the Physician-Assisted Suicide law. A



Barbara Coombs Lee, counsel to the Oregon Senate’s Committee on Health Care and Bioethics, was the chief petitioner for Oregon’s assisted suicide law. Lee is currently the head of Compassion & Choices, an organization derived from the Hemlock Society and other pro-death groups.

referendum authorizing this practice passed in November 1994, under the typically sophisticated title “Death with Dignity.”

Again, there were legal complications, as lawsuits held up open implementation until 1997, when the U.S. Supreme Court permitted the states to do as they would. At that time, records show that physician-assisted murders began.

Allegedly the law was implemented with a set of safeguards. These included having two physicians certify that the person had less than six months to live; that the patient request the deadly drugs at least three times (two in writing); that there be a 15-day waiting period after the request before the action; and that the patient “self-administer” the dose.

However, as representatives of anti-euthanasia groups with experience in the state point out, “self-administer” only means that the patients can ingest the poison—and that does not prevent someone else from putting it in their mouths, or feeding tubes. In addition, there is no requirement for patients to reiterate their desire to die at the time of the action, nor is there any requirement for a witness, to ensure that the regulations are followed. Not to mention the fact that projections of someone having “only six months to live” are notoriously unreliable.

In fact, the numbers of deaths under the law cannot actually be verified, because the Oregon law does not require any accountability. (Numbers available suggests there have been at least 600 to 800, and they are on the rise.) In addition, the doctors providing the lethal dosages are mandated to *falsify the death certificates*, to say the deceased died a “natural death” (**Figure 1**). This is *exactly* the same practice carried out by Hitler’s Nazi doctors.

As with the medical rationing plan, the euthanasia program ran into legal problems with the Federal government, in this case with Attorney General John Ashcroft, who argued that the dispensing of lethal drugs violated the Controlled Substances Act. This ruling hampered the program between 2001 and January 2006,



Instructions for Medical Examiners, Coroners, and Prosecuting Attorneys: Compliance with the Death with Dignity Act

Washington's Death with Dignity Act (RCW 70.245) states that "...the patient's death certificate...shall list the underlying terminal disease as the cause of death." The act also states that, "Actions taken in accordance with this chapter do not, for any purpose, constitute suicide, assisted suicide, mercy killing, or homicide, under the law."

If you know the decedent used the Death with Dignity Act, you must comply with the strict requirements of the law when completing the death record:

1. The underlying terminal disease must be listed as the cause of death.
2. The manner of death must be marked as "Natural."
3. The cause of death section may not contain any language that indicates that the Death with Dignity Act was used, such as:
 - a. Suicide
 - b. Assisted suicide
 - c. Physician-assisted suicide
 - d. Death with Dignity
 - e. I-1000
 - f. Mercy killing
 - g. Euthanasia
 - h. Secobarbital or Seconal
 - i. Pentobarbital or Nembutal

Figure 1. Oregon doctors who provide the lethal dosages to those they assist in killing themselves, are ordered to falsify the death certificates, to say the deceased died a "natural death." This is exactly the same practice carried out by Hitler's Nazi doctors.

when the U.S. Supreme Court, once again, in a clear violation of the Declaration of Independence's commitment to the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, upheld the constitutionality of Oregon's assisted suicide law.

The State Pays for Murder

The two elements of the Hitler health system came together in 2008, when Oregon resident Barbara Wagner petitioned the Health Plan for permission to get a special cancer drug, to deal with the recurrence of her disease. Wagner, a 64-year-old with end-stage lung cancer, had previously received extensive treatment. She learned about the recurrence in May, and sought a new therapy which her doctor informed her of. But the representative of the state plan sent Wagner a form letter by which she was informed that it would *not* pay for the drug, but would pay for "palliative or comfort care," under which category falls "physician aid in dying"! Treating her was considered "futile," which is defined as any treatment without at least a 5% chance of giving

the patient five more years of life.

Pressed to explain the decision, the medical director of the Oregon Health Plan said, "We can't cover everything for everyone. We try to come up with policies that provide the most good for the most people."

As one commentator pointed out, the state's action was only natural, by Hitlerian logic. The anti-cancer drug cost \$4,000—the drugs to kill yourself less than \$100. And Barbara Wagner, with the drug, would never be "cured," only allowed to live.

This, again, is exactly the kind of thinking identified by Dr. Alexander, as the "small beginnings" of the Nazi euthanasia program, the adoption of a utilitarian attitude toward the value of human life. The very same thinking can easily be discerned in the thinking of Obama's Nazi doctors, who speak of cutting costs by eliminating "ineffective" treatments—those that won't bring people back into playing a "useful" role in society.

The decision to put the drugs for killing people on Oregon's list of approved "treatments" was made in March 1998, under the administration of Governor Kitzhaber, an avid supporter of Nazi health. He doesn't call himself a Nazi, but he's still extremely active, along with his cohort Lee, in demanding this Hitlerian policy. The Health Services Commission ruled 10 to 1 to include the lethal drugs, which became number 260 on the list of 709 conditions and "treatments."

The Wagner case caused a flurry of protest, but Oregon officials did not back down. Instead, the scandal led the manufacturer of the cancer drug to offer it to her for free. She had a few more months of life, dying in October 2008.

As Lyndon LaRouche put it today, we're going to track these Hitler-lovers of Oregon. "You're in Oregon? Duck! These guys are out to kill you. And they are considered respectable people. They are respectable Hitler-lovers. They may not like *him*, but they certainly do like his policies!

"We don't need them in Oregon or any place else on this planet! We're out to destroy them!"

Economic Advisors Admit: Obama Will Cut Social Security, Medicare

The following is a full transcript of a June 2 event at the Old Executive Office Building in Washington, D.C., where Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) chairman Christina Romer presented the latest CEA report on "The Economic Impact of Health Care Reform." Also speaking were Sens. Max Baucus (D-Mont.) and Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.); other participants were Obama's top economic advisor Larry Summers, Budget Director Peter Orszag, White House Director of Health Care Reform Nancy-Anne DeParle, and Obama spokeswoman Linda Douglass.

Despite the fact that the event was an open press conference, it has been treated by the White House as if it were a secret hearing, as no professional video or transcript of the event has been made public. We are thus providing an admittedly imperfect transcript, based on non-professional equipment, as an exclusive. This transcript of the hearing on the genocide being prepared by the Obama Administration, which has otherwise been suppressed, speaks for itself. Subheads have been added.

Christina Romer: Good morning. It is lovely to be with you today to unveil or introduce a new report that the Council of Economic Advisors has just written, called "An Economic Case for Health Care Reform." I'm Christina Romer. I'm chair of the Council of Economic Advisors, and I am delighted to be joined this morning with a number of distinguished guests. We have two distinguished Senators—Sen. Max Baucus, chair of the Committee on Finance, and Sen. Chris Dodd, chair of the Senate Banking Committee, but of course, also a key member of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, where he serves as the chair of the Subcommittee on Children and Families.

I'm also glad to be joined by two of my White House colleagues, Peter Orszag, director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Nancy-Ann DeParle, director

of the White House Office on Health Reform. Larry Summers is in briefing the President, but if he lets him go, he's going to come and join us, as well.


To give you just a little sense of how the morning is going to go, I'm going to take a few minutes to talk about what's in the report, and then I will turn it over to Senators Baucus and Dodd to give some remarks, and then we'll open it up to questions and give you some answers.

The Objective: Restrain Health-Care Costs

All right. So, my job is to introduce the report briefly, and I'm delighted to be here. As I said, the report is on "An Economic Case for Health Care Reform." The key contribution of the report is to show that, if we do health reform well, the benefits to the economy would be enormous. If we can genuinely restrain the growth rate of health-care costs significantly, while assuring quality, affordable health care for all Americans, living standards would rise, the budget deficit would be much smaller, unemployment could fall, and labor markets would likely function much more efficiently.

Because the economic benefits that we identified depend crucially on not just doing health-care reform, but doing it well, I am particularly honored to be joined by these two distinguished Senators who will be so central in formulating the legislation. And I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the dedicated members of the House of Representatives, who are very sorry they couldn't be with us this morning, but will obviously also be central to the reform effort.

All right. Well, the report has four key sections. The first discusses some of the key projections of what's likely to happen in the health-care sector without successful reform. If you want, it shows the cost of doing nothing. And one fact that is well known, is that health-care expenditures in the United States are currently about 18% of GDP, by far the highest of any country,



J. Scott Willey

In her opening remarks to the meeting, Christina Romer (center) set the tone, with happy talk about the plan to “reform” health care by “eliminating waste and inefficiencies,” and other euphemisms for letting people die without medical treatment. Sen. Chris Dodd (left) is a leading spokesman in the Senate for the Obama Nazi health plan; Budget Director Peter Orszag (right) is the leader of the White House “behavioral economists,” who have formulated the policy.

projections suggest that these expenditures, which are currently about 6% of GDP, will rise to 15% of GDP by 2040. In the absence of tremendous increases in taxes or reductions in other types of government spending, the trend implies a devastating, and frankly, unsustainable rise in the federal budget deficit.

Another trend that’s well known, but too crucial to be ignored, is the rise in the number of Americans without health insurance. Currently 46 million people in the United States are uninsured. In the absence of reform, this number is projected to rise to about 72 million by 2040. All right. Well, let’s say, that’s what will happen if we

and these expenditures are projected to rise sharply. By 2040, health expenditures could be roughly one-third of the total output of the U.S. economy.


For households, rising health-care expenditures will likely show up in rising insurance premiums. Even if employers continue to pay the lion’s share of premiums, both economic theory and empirical evidence suggest that this trend will show up in stagnating take-home wages.

Let’s see. This is **Figure 3** over there, a figure from the report, that shows our projection of total compensation, and below the line, compensation less insurance premiums. And what you’re supposed to see is that we project, without reform, that, bottom line, basically workers’ take-home pay, will likely stagnate, probably even fall eventually, as insurance premiums, that wedge between those two lines, rise sharply over time.

Now, rising health-care expenditures also mean that government spending on Medicare and Medicaid will rise sharply over time. Our

don’t do anything.

The second key part of our study looks at inefficiencies in the current system and the market failures that lead to a lack of insurance. This part of the report also discusses the key goals the President has laid out for reform. One is to genuinely slow the growth rate of health-care costs, while maintaining quality in choice



of doctors and plans. And another is to expand health-care coverage to all Americans.

Now, since reform plans are very much in the process of being developed cooperatively with the Congress, we don't describe in detail the reforms that will enable us to achieve these goals, but to make the analysis credible, we give a sense of the kind of changes that might be implemented. We also surveyed the evidence, much of it from international comparisons, and comparisons of cost in different parts of the United States, that there's substantial inefficiencies in the current system. It's important in making the case, that slowing the growth rate of health-care costs by improving efficiencies is absolutely possible.

For example, our estimate suggests that we can slow cost growth by 1.5 percentage points per year for almost a quarter of a century, before we have exhausted the existing inefficiencies.

However, I don't want to sugarcoat the situation. Slowing cost growth by 1.5 percentage points per year may sound small, but my staff has told me, many times, it's likely to be very challenging. It will take an incredible degree of resolve and cooperation among policy-makers, consumers, and providers to bring this about. But, what our study shows is that it should be possible.

Health Care or Fiscal Health?


Most fundamentally, what our study shows is that the economic benefits of slowing cost growth would be enormous. This is, in fact, the conclusion of the third key part of our study, which looks at the economic effects of successful reform. In our study, we considered the effects of cost containment and coverage expansion separately, but of course, the two are related. For example, expanding coverage is likely to make certain types of cost containment easier to achieve.

In our analysis of cost containment, we focus on slowing the growth rate of costs. This is the so-called curve bending that can last for decades. The fundamental thing that slowing cost growth does is to free up resources. If we

restrain costs by eliminating waste and inefficiencies, we can add the same real amount of health care with resources left over to produce the other things that we value. We analyze the effects of freeing up resources in the standard growth accounting framework. For those of you who like equations, the framework is spelled out in the appendix of the report. The crucial finding of our analysis is that living standards can be substantially higher if we slow the growth rate of health-care costs.

We then expand our framework to analyze what slowing cost growth would do for the deficit and capital formation, or investment. Slowing the growth rate of health-care costs would lower the deficit and raise public savings. And efficiency gains that then come with these lead to additional private savings. All of this increased saving would tend to lower interest rates and encourage investment. And extra investment increases output even more.

Our estimates suggest that the combined impact of greater efficiency in health care and greater investment is very large. To make the effect on output more concrete, we translate that into the effect on the income for a typical family of four in constant dollars, and these effects are shown in this **Figure 15**, which shows "Estimated Family Income With and Without Health Care Reform." The bottom line shows you without reform. The various other lines show you, with different degrees of cost containment, what you could expect. Our



numbers suggested if we slow cost growth by one-and-a-half percentage points per year, family incomes will be about \$2,600 higher in 2020, than it otherwise would have been. By 2030, it will be nearly \$10,000 higher.

I also want to show you what our analysis found about the effect of health-care cost containment on the Federal budget deficit. And I need to be very clear that our estimates are not Peter [Orszag]'s kind of estimates, not the official budget projections. They're more of a back-of-the-envelope calculation. And they do not include the cost of coverage expansion, because most of those costs will be covered by the spending cuts and revenue increases that are currently under discussion.

What we find is that the effects on the budget deficit are very large, and the last figure, the one Peter appropriately is standing in front of, is the reduction in the Federal budget deficit due to health-care reform. If, again, if we can slow health-care cost growth by 1.5 percentage points per year, we estimate that the deficit in 2030 will be 3% of GDP smaller than it otherwise would have been. In 2040, it would be 6% smaller. These numbers illustrate the crucial truth that serious health-care cost containment is the number one thing we can do to insure our long-run fiscal health. Health reform is central to long-run fiscal stability.

Another possible macroeconomic effect of cost growth containment is the short-run impact on unemployment and employment. When health care costs are growing more slowly, wages can grow without firms' costs rising, so firms may not raise prices as much. This allows monetary policy to lower the unemployment rate while keeping inflation steady. Our estimates suggest that slowing cost growth, again by the 1.5 percentage points per year, would lower normal unemployment by about a quarter of a percentage point. This translates into an increase of employment of about 500,000 jobs. While this is almost surely not a permanent effect, it could last for a number of years.

Finally, the report, in the last section, discusses the benefits of coverage expansion. The most important of these involves the economic well-being of the uninsured. We used the best available estimates to try to quantify the costs and benefits of expanding coverage to all Americans. Among the benefits that we attempt to put a dollar value on, are the increase in life expectancy and the decreased chance of financial ruin from high medical bills. Not surprisingly, we find that the benefits

of coverage to the uninsured are very large. But, crucially, we find that the net benefits, that is, the benefits minus the cost, are also very large, roughly \$100 billion a year, or about two-thirds of a percent of GDP.

Another effect of expanding coverage that we considered is expanded labor supply. With full health insurance coverage, some people who would not be able to work because of disability, would be able to get health care that prevents disability, and therefore, be able to stay in the labor force longer. How large these effects might be is hard to predict, but we believe that the net impact on effective labor supply will be positive, and will further increase GDP.

The final impact that we identified is that of expanding coverage on the efficiency of the labor market. Expanding coverage and eliminating restrictions on pre-existing conditions would end the phenomenon of job lock, where worries about health insurance cause workers to stay in their jobs, even when ones that pay better or are better matched are available. Similarly, we examined the fact that small businesses are currently disadvantaged in the labor market, because employer-sponsored insurance is so expensive for them. Moving to an insurance system that removes the disadvantage should be beneficial to the competitiveness of the crucial small business sector of the economy.

Well, the bottom line of our report is that doing health-care reform right is incredibly important. If we can put in place reforms that slow cost growth significantly and expand coverage, the benefits to American families, firms, and the government budget, would be enormous. To put it simply, good health-care reform is good economic policy. Thank you, and now let me turn it over to Senator Baucus.

Baucus: We Must Cut Health Care—Now!

Thank you very much, Dr. Romer. The key point of this report is that it demonstrates an underlying imperative of doing health-care reform now. It shows so clearly that announcing health-care reform now means that we're on a stronger path to economic recovery. We can address the budget deficit. We can begin to cut back on the cost that families pay for health insurance premiums, out-of-pocket costs. We can also provide more coverage hopefully, universal coverage for all Americans.... [inaud]

Number one is the cost of health care, today, in America is just too much for Americans to bear. We

spend twice as much per capita on health care, than the next most expensive country, and we're not twice as healthy. All international indicators show, that we show up 18th in terms of health-care outcomes, and yet we spend so much more per person on health care than other countries.

And if this path continues, if this path of rate of increase in health-care costs continues, an average family

The main point here, which is so critical, is that this report just underlines, demonstrates, and shows that we have an obligation and opportunity to have health-care reform now, and the key, underlying part of it is getting control over the increase in health-care costs. —Sen. Max Baucus



baucus.senate.gov

will pay half its health insurance premiums, excuse me, [half] an average family's budget will be in health insurance premiums. We'll easily spend about \$2.45 trillion a year in health care, over ten years, about \$4.23 trillion a year in health care in America. It means that American companies are going to be much less competitive, in the future, even as they are today, compared with other countries' companies. It means that the number of current bankruptcies due to health care—about 1.1 million a year—will perhaps double. We have to cut health-care costs.

Now health-care reform has several components. One is to make sure that all Americans have health insurance—that's critical. That will also help reduce health-care costs. Certainly, uncompensated care costs at hospitals are quite something [inaud]. The other major goal of health-care reform is health insurance market reform, so Americans are not denied health insurance coverage based upon pre-existing conditions and health-care status. And the rating bands are narrow enough so all Americans can have access to good quality of health insurance, and that too will begin to

reduce health-care costs.

A huge, big part of health-care reform is doing system reform, so we begin to align payment more with quality, than quantity and volume. The main point here, which is so critical, is that this report just underlines, demonstrates, and shows that we have an obligation and opportunity to have health-care reform now, and the key, underlying part of it is getting control over the increase in health-care costs. We want all Americans to be covered. We want health insurance reform. It's critically important to get a hold of health-care costs, and this report shows why that's so very, very important.

And the next job, obviously, is to do it. It's to find ways to control health-care costs, and that's the job of us in the Congress, to work through the President. And I've got lots of ideas of how we can do that, but I'm committed, as the chairman of the Finance Committee, to do everything that we possibly can, to bend the cost curve, to get the rate of increase of health-care costs *down* to an acceptable level, so that budgets, state budgets, family budgets, health budgets, and so forth, [are] in control. And that's what this report again shows why it is so vitally important that the Congress find ways to get a hold of that increase in the growth of health-care costs.

Now, I'm honored to introduce Chris Dodd, who's working on health issues. There are two major committees in the Senate working on health-care reform, the Finance Committee and the health committees [inaud] . . . doctors and health meetings.

Dodd: No Choice But To Get This Done

Thank you very, very much. First, let me begin by thanking Dr. Romer, Dr. Orszag, and Nancy-Ann DeParle, and Mr. Summers as well. This is a major report. Obviously, it [inaud] the ability to argue that the importance of this issue. And, for course, Max [Baucus], the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, has outlined the importance of the issues that'll be debated. I think if I had to synthesize everything Dr. Romer said, in a sentence or two, it would come down to the following: that health-care costs are rising faster than our economy is growing. And that's not only unacceptable, but it's unsustainable for a country. We have no other choice, in my view, but to get this done.

I'm here this morning, replacing someone who's irreplaceable on this issue, and I hope he'll be back in the coming days—Senator Kennedy, obviously the

chair of the Labor Committee. I talked to him this morning. I talk to him almost on a daily basis, and my hope is he'll be back, as the chair of our committee. But Barbara Mikulski, Senator Mikulski, Sen. Tom Harkin, Sen. Jeff Bingaman, as members of our committee, have already been doing extensive work on coverage, and quality, on prevention issues. We've been working closely, obviously, with Senator Baucus, Senator Enzi, other members and staffs, over the last number of weeks and months, to bring us to this point, on the cusp, on the brink, and now we're deploying in the coming 8 or 10 weeks, we can see if we cannot package this proposal together, to make a difference on expanding coverage and reducing the cost of health care.

These numbers, obviously, these large numbers, although Dr. Romer certainly got into the details, need to be brought down in a way so that average families can understand what's at stake in all of this. And there are some very compelling numbers. The 46 million who have no coverage, 1 in 6 Americans. There's another number in all of this, however, that ought to be disturbing to people, and that is, just between 2007 and 2008, 87 million Americans at one point or another, had no health-care coverage at all—that's 1 in 3 Americans under the age of 65. The premium costs, that have gone up over the last ten years or so: an 85% increase. For a family of four, roughly over \$6,000 to around \$12,000, in premium costs. Over \$1,100 of that cost, is coverage for the uninsured, of that figure.

So, when you see the importance of these issues, beyond the human element, which is compelling enough, but obviously the economic issues.

I was here 15 years ago, with a lot more black hair than gray hair, when this last battle was waged. And there was a tremendous effort on the part of the Clinton Administration to move forward on this issue. We did not succeed in those days. What you just heard this morning, is a new, compelling element that was missing, frankly, back in the early 1990s. It was there, but the case was not made as strongly as it has been made this morning, and that is the economic advantage to this, that Max has talked about, and Dr. Romer has laid out in rather a good detail this morning. It's going to be critically important that we bring together those elements that are going to be so adversely affected by all of this, if we don't make the kind of change that the proposals that are on the table, will achieve.

So, on behalf of Senator Kennedy, and the Labor Committee, we look forward to these coming days, to work closely with the President, who's made this a priority of his domestic agenda. He talked about it extensively in the campaign, and he's fulfilling that promise, as early as he has, to see us move forward on this issue. We'll be going to work with Mike Enzi, the Republican ranking member of the Labor Committee, along, of

Health-care costs are rising faster than our economy is growing. And that's not only unacceptable, but it's unsustainable for a country. We have no other choice, in my view, but to get this done.—Sen. Chris Dodd

course, with Max, with Senator Grassley, and others, as we pull this front matter together here, on behalf of the people who, as I said a moment ago—this is not just an issue that is unacceptable—it is unsustainable. We cannot sustain this, if we don't make the change that's being laid out by the administration.

Linda Douglass: After that, we will take some of your questions. I know the Senators are going to have to leave fairly soon, because they've got a vote. And I'll stand here.

New York Times: Senator Baucus, you said you have a lot of ideas. I wonder if you might share with us two or three of your top ideas for bringing costs down. And you're going to see the President later, I hope you'll be sharing these ideas with him, but maybe you could—

'Overutilization': Patients Using Too Much Medical Care

Baucus: Yeah, sure. First of all, just, we *will* find ways to make this happen. I've encouraged my office to find a green book of credible ways to get health-care growth down below the rate of the medical index—if we could get close to the CPI [consumer price index], that'd be great. Whatever it is, whatever it takes to get the rate of growth down, over ten years, down to that, coming close to the CPI.

Yeah, first of all, it takes time for this to take hold. It's all the delivery system reforms. When we start re-

imbursing based on quality, rather than quantity, or volume, we're going to start to get rid of all the *waste* that occurs in the current system. The estimates are that about a third of the American health-care system is waste. It's waste due to different practice patterns, in different parts of the country, geographic variation. It's waste because we reimburse based on quantity, and volume, not on quality. It's waste because doctors don't have the correct—information available to health IT, to comparative effectiveness, to practice more evidence-based medicine. So, a large component of this—it takes time to kick in—will be delivery system reform, where we're reimbursing based on quality, not quantity and volume.

That quantity and volume also lets the fraud, waste, and abuse in the American system. The significant savings there. We're going to be very, very tough on fraud, waste, and abuse.

After that, we're going to implement the best we can, the provisions recommended by the various industry Presidents. A couple weeks ago, we asked them to come up with \$1.7 trillion in savings. And a lot of them will agree. And we're going to implement a lot of those, through Medicare, and working with the private sector as well.

A lot of it's going to come through identification in the health insurance applications and delivery, and the wording, and a very, very simplified process, when a person applies for health insurance—insurance, and also claims for health insurance [inaud]. In exchange, we're going to dramatically reduce the number of options the insurance companies will have—let alone address all the problems, that is, prohibit denial based on pre-existing conditions, health-care status, and so forth, which in itself must [inaud], because in many ways it starts with savings in the health-care industry.

There are other ways we could attack [the overuse]. One way, we'll have to work our way through. We have to identify solutions. I personally believe that [setting] an appropriate limit on benefits would begin to reduce overutilization in health care. Overutilization's a big problem in America. I know that's an issue we have to work out with the President, because I think initially we will work it out because *all* experts believe that we have overutilization in America, probably because there's no limits on the benefit package, that an employer can provide to his or her employees. And I think we have to look at that very closely, and working with the President, and see if there's a way to address that too.

Those are several ways, but there are a lot of others, and believe me, action is vital because we have *no choice*. We have no choice. We've got to figure out how to put a provision in the *law*, not just voluntary, but in the law, which will get that cost curve of growth down to acceptable levels, and to me, acceptable means getting pretty close to CPI.

'What's the Stick?'

Modern Health Care: Yesterday, the Administration, and people from the care and provider community, outlined a number of different ways that they planned to help, in order to [inaud] to achieve this. Could you talk a little bit about how this report dovetails with the initiative that the care and the providers outlined? And also, what's the stick? How do you make sure that that community that's so vital to reform, actually carries through on what it pledges?

DeParle: Well, first, I give the group of providers a lot of praise. They came forward a month ago, to the President, and pledged to do their part to bring health-care costs down. And they acknowledged the very things that we've talked about this morning, [inaud] and that they can do better in providing high-quality care, and that they want to do that. I challenge anyone in this room to go back to your organization and try to do the same things; that's a very hard exercise. They then met with the President, and he told them he appreciated their offer, and he wanted to work with them. They've spent tens of hours together, working on what they submitted yesterday [inaud].

And I think we should follow this—and I agree with Chairman Baucus, that they have some very solid ideas and proposals, that we'll want to work closely with them on this. And they'll produce savings for the American people that will reduce health-care costs, and that will have some tangible benefits, although in the short term—

Baucus: On that point, let me just say, I've met with the same group, and they were quite honest, a couple days later. My goal is to help the President to keep their feet to the fire. Okay, everybody, where's the beef? You promised this, but where is it? According to us, they honestly couldn't tell me at that moment, but I said, "Okay, I want to know myself. And at the White House, the President wants to know, say in a week." And I called a couple of CEOs later, and extracted promises out of them to get their recommendations up. One, the Hospital Association, last Friday, and others, at later

dates. We meet with the pharmaceutical industry today. And one main goal is to ask them, “Where’s the beef? Where is it, here?” A number of them figure out ways to implement that, in the legislation.

The key here is, working through Medicare, and developing metrics and quality measures and so forth, that are also applied to the private sector. And developing the metrics with the private sector. Because we can get some, we could learn a little bit about how the private

If you're just looking at this and that, you may be underestimating the amount of work that's going on behind the scenes. I'm assuming we're going to harmonize the approaches. There's been a tremendous amount, tens of hours a day, and hundreds of hours being spent, on staff both in the House and the Senate working on this....

—Nancy-Ann DeParle



White House/Pete Souza

sector could develop these metrics. So, it’s working together to get these metrics, quality measures, so that we can begin to reimburse—well, that’s just one. Also, developing comparative effectiveness, quality measures, you know, for procedures, for medical equipment, for the drugs, and also, make sure health IT really works in a good way.

The real key to all this is integrated systems. It’s integrated systems. If you look at integrated systems around the country, they’re doing it right. Geisinger Health Systems, Integrated Healthcare, Kaiser, Mayo, Denver Healthcare—there are a lot of them. Pick their brains, how they do it. The key is to try to figure out how we transfer that over to the country as a whole. That’s going to, itself, realize real savings for this country, and take advantage too, in the *companies* that are doing it—GE, Safeway, Wal-Mart, Pitney Bowes—they’re doing it themselves, and they’re realizing it’s in their interest, too. And a lot of that is wellness, prevention. They’re

able to get their health-care costs down with wellness, prevention, and we’re going to do the same.

Bloomberg News: First, to the Senators: Both of you talked about what needs to happen [interruption—laughter]. . .

Dodd: Well, we’re doing it. There have been a lot of the meetings that have not been on the radar screen, between the staffs and others for the last number of weeks and months, to try and work towards a common bill, and goal. I think the goal is—and Max will correct me if I’m wrong on all of this—certainly Harry Reid’s goal is, to have a single bill before the Senate, not disparate bills in the Finance Committee, the Labor Committee, but rather to meld these bills together so we’re giving our colleagues a comprehensive approach.

I think the leadership has decided—in fact, I’m going to spend some time this evening with Mike Enzi, to talk about where we can come together on these issues, where the differences may be; to see how we can achieve those goals. I would love to see—I know Max as well, has spoken about this—the goal is to have a broad comprehensive support for a health-care reform bill. That’s our ultimate goal. If we could achieve that goal, that would be important. Not only in terms of passing the bill, but sustaining the efforts. This is more than just a one-year effort. We’re going to have to sustain that for more than a decade, to get this done.

So, starting out with the kind of broad support that will be necessary, is critical. And I feel pretty good about where things are today. I’ve been meeting with my Democratic colleagues in the Labor Committee on the work that’s been done already. Eleven hearings we’ve had on the Labor Committee, on prevention, coverage, and quality, that my three colleagues that I’ve mentioned have held already. And again, a lot of cooperation, particularly in the prevention areas, for instance. It’s almost unanimous in meetings, that here’s a real cost savings, in prevention, in what we need to do in that area.

So I begin the process; and as I said before, having been through this 15 years ago, we’re in so much better shape today, for the reasons, frankly, that people are aware of. If there’s any silver lining in the economic crisis we’re going through, it is, this has brought home the reality of dealing with these economic issues. And you can’t deal with our economic issues, without deal-

ing with health care. It's not sustainable. And that, I think, is going to do an awful lot to drive this process politically, within the Senate of the United States, to achieve the kind of compromise that we're going to have to achieve for this to succeed.

The Train Is Running on Time

Baucus: We *will* pass a comprehensive, meaningful health-care reform bill this year. It's going to happen. The train's leaving the station. And all groups know it. They know they'd better be on the train. They know they'd better offer a constructive solution, or they're off the train, and will be left out. There will be meaningful, comprehensive health care reform legislation passed, this year. Mark my word. I'll bet my bottom dollar on it. *It will happen this year.*

And why is it going to happen? It's going to happen because Congress wants it, the President wants it, the people in the country want it. Groups are working together for the first time. It's *amazing*. It's a lot of fun working all this. If you talk to all these groups, man, they want to be part of the solution! They don't want to be part of the problem, they want to be part of the solution. And Senators want it, Republicans and Democrats together. Now, of course, we haven't written all the details as yet—dot the i's and cross the t's. But it will pass this year, because there's such enthusiasm for passing health care this year. We will get it passed this year, there's no doubt about it. I'm positive, because also, it's such an inclusive process.

Recall that in '93, the President submitted health-care reform, and laid it on the Congress. This time, it's just the opposite. We say to the President, look, here's eight principles. Okay, well, we're doing principles. It's totally inclusive. The [inaud] we've got umpteen, cajillion millions. [laughter] And on the roundtables, the walkthroughs, all the subjects, and all the meetings—you won't believe the meetings we've had on health-care reform. And it is needed, because the learning curve on a lot of this, is pretty steep. This is complicated stuff. And so we've had all these meetings, which have made it more likely to learn the health-care process people wanted, with all the meetings, we've started to understand how part A fits into part B.

National Public Radio: Nancy-Ann DeParle, you've all been up on the Hill, dealing with the committees in the Senate and the House, and we're starting to

hear some of the details. Obviously, these committees have a little bit different idea of how to put these things together, and we're starting to see some details emerge, and most of it fits within the guidelines that you put out. But there are a bit different approaches. Are we going to start to see published, soon, published from the Administration, about which of these approaches you prefer, or are you going to let a [thousand?] flowers bloom, and see what comes out of the Congress?

DeParle: Well, first, you may be, if you're just looking at this and that, you may be underestimating the amount of work that's going on behind the scenes. I'm assuming we're going to harmonize the approaches. There's been a tremendous amount, tens of hours a day, and hundreds of hours being spent, on staff both in the House and the Senate working on this, and together [inaud]. And actually, quite a bit's [been done]. So actually, I think you're going to see that there's far more agreement than disagreement. There's very much agreement on the basic principles, very much the same outline, the same basic elements, 95% of it very friendly. And then, I think the President today will be working through our two leaders here, and they're going to go talk about their approaches to this, and we'll be [inaud].

NPR: Will you be expressing a preference for how it should be?

DeParle: We'll be working closely with the Congress, as we have been all the way through.

Staff: I think the Senators have to leave. Before they do, I would just note that Max Baucus is a depiction of [the kind of] a man who runs ultramarathons. [laughter]

Staff: Exactly.

Baucus: Thank you. I also want to say, Nancy and I meet constantly. Peter and I meet constantly. Larry [Summers] and I meet constantly. There's an awful lot of meetings going on. We'll be meeting with the President this afternoon, Chris and I, and the Democrats on the Health Committee, Democrats on the Finance Committee. Just another example that we'll compare notes, and put this together. It's going to happen.

'Hard, Scoreable Savings'

Question: Peter, I was going to ask this of Senator Baucus, but I think you can answer this: When we get on the cost discussion, do we have an estimate yet of how much cost savings can we squeeze out of the

system, to help finance the insurance for those uninsured?

Orszag: I think it's a very significant share. I can't give you a specific estimate right now, but a very substantial share of the overall upfront cost of this reform effort will come from savings within the health-care system.

And I want to actually just pause here; I think there's

You've heard about comparative shopping as changes in financial incentives towards quality, bundled payments, all the other stuff that the Institute of Medicine and others have been highlighting as crucial to a more efficient health-care system, and then backstopping it with hard, scoreable savings over the next decade, so that the program overall is deficit neutral.

—Peter Orszag

been a lot of confusion about this. And be very clear, about two different types of cost containment measures. One is the type that will be necessary to reach the deficit neutrality test that we are applying to health-care reform, and to get the bill passed. The other step will be necessary to make the reform successful over time. Ironically, most of the things that are going to prove to be most important to a sustainable health-care system over time, do not score, to any significant degree, they're not going to chill out, as an offset, to any significant degree, over a 5- or 10-year window, but nonetheless, are absolutely essential for the kinds of things that Christie Romer has been highlighting, in terms of making our health-care system more efficient in capturing these potential economic benefits.

I do not think you can read that Atul Gawande piece in *The New Yorker*, highlighting the dramatic variation in our health-care system, without concluding that there are very significant opportunities for efficiencies in treatment. And if that's all we were doing, we could say we're spending more now to save money in the future. But that is *not* what we're doing. We're doing a belt-and-suspenders approach, where we're doing those

steps—you've heard about comparative shopping as changes in financial incentives towards quality, bundled payments, all the other stuff that the Institute of Medicine and others have been highlighting as crucial to a more efficient health-care system, and then backstopping it with hard, scoreable savings over the next decade, so that the program overall is deficit neutral.

So, another way of putting it is, at worst—and this is, I think, very much at worst—it's a net neutral fiscal change. And if you believe all of the health-care policy analysts who put forward proposals, and I think we're doing as much as can possibly be done—if other people have ideas, for that second category of game changers, which might not score, but which are crucial to the feasibility requirement—we would welcome it. We think we're dialing that up as much as possible, and to the extent that that pays off, we will see the kinds of effects that the report this morning highlights.

Question: Well, can you give me an example of the “hard, scoreable savings?”

Orszag: We've already put \$300 billion in Medicare and Medicaid savings on the table. There will be more to come. Of that \$300 billion, roughly a little over half comes from reducing overpayments to Medicare Advantage plans, and there are a whole variety of other changes that we have put forward in our budget document. There will be more to come, in terms of Medicare and Medicaid payments, and you will see the committees also coming forward with specific, scoreable savings that will be scored by the Congressional Budget Office. And the package as a whole, will be deficit neutral, by that score.

Why Not Get Rid of HMOs?

Moderator: We'll take a couple more questions.

EIR: Paul Gallagher with Executive Intelligence Review News Service. You've said “cuts” and “savings” innumerable times. You've even said that as much as a third of the total spending on health is essentially wasted and cuttable, but you're not talking about cutting. You're leaving the HMOs in charge of the process, which are the source of the great volume of overhead and waste in the system. So, how do you deny that you're talking about rationing care, you're talking about denying care the way the British health system does with the NICE [National Institute for Clinical Excel-



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Paul Gallagher of EIR challenged the speakers to explain why they weren't talking about shutting down the HMOs, instead of rationing care. "You're talking about, in effect, defining lives that are 'unworthy to be lived,'" he charged.

lence] organization, you're talking about, in effect, defining lives that are "unworthy to be lived," because the procedures that they need are not cost effective? Why not get rid of the HMOs?

Orszag: The President has said that we have a system that is based in part on private insurance through employers, and we are going to retain that.

But let me go directly to the heart of your question, because no one here is talking about rationing. What we are talking about, and I'm going to come back again: Look at the source of that—most of that 30% or so in potential efficiency gained in the health-care system, are from unnecessary procedures, unnecessary days in the hospital, unnecessary applications of technology, and what have you. I'm going to again refer you both to the evidence from the Dartmouth Atlas, and from, on a micro basis, stories like the one Atul Gawande told. We have very dramatic variations in the way health care is practiced across the United States, in which the more efficient providers do not seem to generate worse outcomes than the less efficient providers. In other words, cost and quality don't go in the normal correlation.

And to get directly to your point, we are not talking about eliminating tests and procedures that are helping people. We are talking about not knowing, and often

doing things that actually don't help people, paying for them—we have a payment system that facilitates more of such procedures and tests. And frankly we're then also, even apart from the financial impact, who wants to be exposed to unnecessary days in the hospital and unnecessary procedures—because those do pose health threats—which is one hypothesis for why the correlation actually goes in the opposite direction.

So, I guess I would put back to you, that after spending years and years at the Institute of Medicine and the Congressional Budget Office and other analyses, and looking at the evidence on this dramatic variation within the United States—we're not talking about other countries—within the United States, that there do appear these very significant efficiency improvements within the health system,

so that we could have either the same or better outcomes at lower cost in the future, and that is what we're talking about.

Gallagher: So—on followup—so the main source of savings is from tests and procedures?

Orszag: The main source of savings is, as Senator Baucus said, is through delivery-system reform. Most of the—if you look across a variety of studies, whether it's the Kinsey Global Institute study, or the Dartmouth study, or others, cost differentials are rising from a variety of sources, but the most important driver in the variation, across the United States, for example, is the intensity of services provided for the same kind of patient. So, if you have a given condition, and you get set in one county of Texas, versus another county in Texas, as the *New Yorker* article highlights—very much different things happen to you. In one setting, you have a lot more tests applied, you're much more likely to be hospitalized, you're much more likely to undergo surgery, and that would all be very much worth it, if we got better outcomes, but that is not what the evidence suggests.

Question: May I ask a followup on the question about the payment for the uninsured? That would pre-

sumably have quite a large part of that—we don't know exactly what it would be—but wouldn't that undermine fairly dramatically, some of the savings from a federal budget perspective?

Romer: One of the things that Peter has so very well described, in the plan that we'll be putting forward out of the Congress, and what the President has dedicated himself to, is paying for things with hard, scoreable savings, and revenue increases, in that ten-year budget window. So I think that's a crucial point to make. The other thing, if you kind of do a little bit of a back-of-the-envelope calculation, we've talked about how much waste there is. Another thing people throw around, either from your international comparisons, or from comparisons across states in the United States, it's about 5% of GDP. And that is a huge amount of money. If you think of any of the numbers, and we don't have a plan yet that has a number, but the numbers out there in the literature are all well less than 1% of GDP, for what it would cost to expand coverage. That gives you a little bit of a sense of the amount that you're talking about.

And one other thing that I do want to emphasize again, as Peter points out, the things that don't score, the so-called game changers that are really what's lying behind our study, those things that would genuinely slow the growth rate of health-care costs, those are so unbelievably crucial. That's why I practically cheer every time Max Baucus opens his mouth, precisely because those are the kinds of things, when you look 20, 30 years in the future, that are going to be utterly crucial.

Getting Out the Inefficiencies

Question: I just want to [clarify] again, that this analysis on this chart [Figure 3] does not account for the net, for the costs associated with any Federal outlays for helping to close the uninsured gap.

Romer: It does not. This is just the effect of slowing the growth rate, that long-term curve.

Orszag: One way of thinking about this is, we are committed to, and I want to again emphasize, deficit neutrality, hard, scoreable savings, so that the net impact is, at worst, near zero. And then in addition to that, we have a variety of changes aimed at getting out the inefficiencies in the health-care system, which could help to reduce the growth rate. So, this does not include the first set of things, because they are deficit neutral. It focused on the potential impact from slowing the growth rate,

by, I don't know, half a percentage point per year, or 1.5 percentage points per year, from the changes in the structure of the health-care system, that will lead to even improved efficiencies.

Question: Okay, that question to Mr. Orszag—

Summers: Can I just...? I think this is a crucial point, so I want to just emphasize this one more time.

The greater permeation through the system of the results of cost effectiveness research, and effectiveness-based medicine; the benefits and economies that come from the improvements in the quality of care promoted by health information technology; the greater knowledge of the differentials that Peter and Christine have stressed, that will come from the benefits of promoting information technology.

—Larry Summers



swiss-image.ch/Remy

The coverage savings that the Administration anticipates [gaining back] coverage increase, are being paid for, in large part, by direct changes in identified costs paid to providers: measures such as the Medicare Advantage reform. Those measures will, along with the whole program, provide for a balanced-budget approach. Entirely separate from that effort, are a set of major goals for promotion of preventive care, which ultimately will reduce costs. The greater permeation through the system of the results of cost effectiveness research, and effectiveness-based medicine; the benefits and economies that come from the improvements in the quality of care promoted by health information technology; the greater knowledge of the differentials that Peter and Christine have stressed, that will come from the

benefits of promoting information technology.

All of those things, which have the potential to bring about broad cultural change, are *not* being relied on to finance increased coverage. They are a separate component. They are a separate component, but, given the estimates suggesting that a third of the system is waste; given the evidence that health-care inflation in excess of regular inflation is not constant, but something that varies over time, and varies over time in ways that can be related to the degree of government concern with respect to health-care costs, these costs are the source, potential source, of the 1.5% savings; and that 1.5% savings brings the very powerful benefits that Professor Romer's study discussed.

So it's very important, in looking at our bill, to draw—our approach—to draw that distinction between the components of hard, scoreable savings, and the broader effort at system transformation, which is what this study is about.

AP: Could you provide any estimate as to how much in new revenue taxes will be required? And since Senator Baucus mentioned that he is going to bring up with the President the tax exclusion, what is the White House posture currently on that?

Orszag: Well, first, in regard to that amount of revenue that may be necessary in the short run, as we were just discussing in that first, brief [inaud] to ensure deficit neutrality, the Congress requested that earlier about Medicare and Medicaid savings, so again, I will just give the same answer: The bulk, or a significant share, of short-term costs will come from savings within Medicare and Medicaid. There will temporarily need to be some additional revenue also.

Question: How much?

Orszag: I'm not going to give you the exact [inaud] right now. It will depend on—you have the multiple pieces of legislation that I'm moving, they have slightly different price tags, the shares are going to depend on where all of that lines up. With regard to the health exclusion, I think we have been clear that it is not in the President's plan. It was not in our budget. You heard today from Senator Baucus that he and others have been putting that idea forward, and I think we need to stay where we are. It is not in our plan, and it's not in our budget. We are saying that we want the legislative process to play out, and that's all we have to say on that. . . .

A Formulary of U.S. Nazi-Medicine Terms

by Marcia Merry Baker

June 6—The bum's rush called the White House/Congressional "health-care reform" process, bent on producing "comprehensive" reform legislation this Summer, is intended by the genocide lobby orchestrating it, to drastically cut care and reduce the population, while also continuing infusions of funds into the HMO insurance privateers. Since using such straight language would halt the game, a special lexicon of euphemisms has been formulated and put into wide circulation.

The following are definitions of some of the most-used Nazi-medicine expressions, defined from the vantage point of those who originated the cant. The "strength-through-joy" terms are presented in two categories: overview lies and specific falsehoods.

Overview Lies

Term: *The U.S. health-care system today is unsustainable.*

Meaning: For the HMO/international finance circles, the U.S. government and citizenry must be stampered into accepting that their care will be drastically cut, sickness and death rates will rise, in order for payments to HMOs to continue and increase, despite the effects of the crash that is ruining households, states, and localities. How do you make continued HMO payments and loss of life sound acceptable?

Appeal to popular ignorance and demoralization. Cast blame at chosen targets, to account for the asserted "unsustainability" of today's high-cost, bad health care: Blame "greedy, mistake-prone doctors and hospitals." Blame old people for wasting so much expensive care by "unnecessary end-of-life" treatment. Blame high-technology equipment for excessive expense. Blame money going to nursing homes to care for Medicaid patients, instead of in-home care. Blame the obese, disease-prone, immigrant, and other groups for using up care, and "driving up costs." Blame the disabled and mentally ill for wanting to

live. Blame those who refuse to provide assistance to “willing” suicide candidates.

All the while, be careful to black out the fact that there is an acute national shortage of medical personnel and facilities, and that hospitals are going broke.

(The five largest managed care corporations and their annual revenue: UnitedHealth Group [\$81 billion]; WellPoint [\$61 billion]; Aetna [\$31 billion]; Humana [\$29 billion]; and Cigna [\$19 billion].)

In reality, it is true that the once-working U.S. health-care system is no longer being sustained, nor is anything else in the economy “sustainable” under today’s crash process. But taking the right economy-building emergency measures, and eliminating the HMO system, can restore medical treatment infrastructure to serve the public good as it should.

Term: *We must bend the curve on health-care costs.*

Meaning: We are committed to deep cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and other programs in the short term, and even more over ten years, so that we can assert and “show” that we are retarding the growth in the otherwise rising curve of health-care expenditures, while we keep the payments flowing to the HMOs, and kill people.

We are issuing all kinds of quantifications, graphs, and charts, to proclaim that many benefits to the economy will ensue from our cuts in health care. At the same time as we are protecting the flow of funds into HMOs, we are thanking them for their collaborative expertise in cutting health care.

Some of the cost-cutting measures that we often cite are: ending care during the last six months of someone’s life (yes, we know that you cannot determine that period, but, so what?); reducing hospital re-admissions (if someone tries for re-admission, threaten the hospital with negligence and non-payment); reduce radiology imaging—MRIs, CAT, PET scans, and others (yes, we know that mammograms have dropped 16% in the last eight years, but so what?)—and many other cuts, that, together, we like to refer to as, “reducing inefficiencies.”

Term: *There must be a shift to quality and value in medical care, away from quantity and volume.*

Meaning: Too many Americans are getting too much medical treatment. We must create top-down au-

thority to set limits on what procedures will be allowed to be performed by doctors, hospitals, laboratories, etc. The model for this is NICE (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence), set up in Britain in 1999, which disallows all kinds of medications, surgeries, and other treatments, on the basis of cost.

At the same time, we will gush over “wellness” management and “integrated” care, in which the patient is expected to comply with weight loss or other behavioral change—or else. Treatment will be contingent on lifestyle, determined by “experts.” We want ACOs—Accountable Care Organizations—with teeth. These restrictions will be praised as “value”-based, “quality” care. We praise corporations for doing this today, e.g., Wal-Mart.

Life-prolonging procedures such as kidney dialysis are to become only selectively available, as in Britain. Therefore, the death rate will rise.

However, we will *not* use the term, “rationing” of care. We will create lists of disallowed treatments, under the rubric of “comparative effectiveness,” to assert that costly treatments are ineffective, and too frequent. Doctors will be restricted to lists of “evidence-based” treatments.

Term: *Universal coverage.*

Meaning: Sure, we support the charade of giving everyone health-care coverage—they can all carry an insurance card—but we will cut the medical treatment they will get. That will be the principle, whatever type of plan we can ram through. It might be to mandate that all Americans must sign up for a policy with one of the private insurers on the “market”; plus, there might be the option of a government plan or two, with government supplements going to HMOs that take poor enrollees. Or some other variation. We could even make Medicare open for those 55 or younger. But when all are signed up, whole categories will be denied care, in order to “bend the curve” of rising health costs, and keep the system “sustainable,” which is, after all, the intended outcome of the May 11 “breakthrough moment” between Obama and the HMOs, which are all committed to “value” care, not “volume” care.

Specific Falsehoods

Term: *Medicare is running out of money, and, anyway, “it’s old-fashioned, fee-for-service, à la carte, atavistic, out-of-date”* (from a Baucus Roundtable par-

ticipant in May 2009).

Meaning: This means just what is implied: Medicare should be smashed. The reality is that if we rebuilt the economy with high-paying jobs, and went nuclear, we could easily generate the funds to support adequate health care for all.

Term: *There is “overutilization” of health care.*

Meaning: This term is contrived to debase popular opinion to fall for the lie that the U.S. physical infrastructure for health-care delivery is fine, if only certain over-insured louts and hypochondriacs would stop overusing the system. In fact, the physical infrastructure base of the nation is way below ratios required to provide decent care, and especially flu pandemic care, in terms of hospital beds per 1,000 persons, numbers of physicians, nurses, technicians, and public-health workers per 100,000, and other standard public-health parameters.

Moreover, there is a special HMO-serving propaganda tool, *The Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care*, which makes the specious case that, because there are geographic disparities in U.S. medical costs, treatments, and results, therefore, all should be degraded to the lowest possible levels, in order to be “fair” and “efficient.”

Term: *Today is a breakthrough moment for reforming health care.*

Meaning: In 1993, private financial interests represented by the HMOs and other insurer/investors opposed any White House initiative that might expand health-care coverage, and impede their looting of the medical system.

Today, those same financial interests *want* government intervention to guarantee their revenue stream, by implementing top-down, drastic cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, Veterans Administration, and all other care systems. On May 11, Obama had his “breakthrough moment” in a White House meeting with the HMO insurance corporate executives and Service Employees International Union (SEIU) flunkey Dennis Rivera.

Term: *“Transformation” of the health-care system.*

Meaning: This is the favored description by Obama economic advisor Lawrence Summers, as well as Newt Gingrich and others, for the forced takedown of the U.S. health-care system into a Nazi-medicine horror, by all of the measures described above.

Documentation

The British Nazis In Their Own Words

Here, speaking for themselves, are Lord Bertrand Russell and Prince Philip, the unacknowledged éminences grises behind the architects of the Obama Nazi health plan.

Lord Bertrand Russell

But bad times, you may say, are exceptional, and can be dealt with by exceptional methods. This has been more or less true during the honeymoon period of industrialism, but it will not remain true unless the increase of population can be enormously diminished. At present the population of the world



is increasing at about 58,000 per diem. War, so far, has had no very great effect on this increase, which continued through each of the world wars. . . . War . . . has hitherto been disappointing in this respect . . . but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could spread throughout the world once in every generation, survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. . . . The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of it? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other people's.

—*The Impact of Science on Society* (1953)

The white population of the world will soon cease to increase. The Asiatic races will be longer, and the negroes still longer, before their birth rate falls sufficiently to make their numbers stable without help of war and pestilence. . . . Until that happens, the benefits aimed at by socialism can only be partially realized, and the less

prolific races will have to defend themselves against the more prolific by methods which are disgusting even if they are necessary.

—*The Prospects of Industrial Civilization* (1923)

Prince Philip

In the event that I am reincarnated, I would like to return as a deadly virus, in order to contribute something to solve overpopulation.

—Reported by Deutsche Press Agentur (August 1988)

I just wonder what it would be like to be reincarnated in an animal whose species had been so reduced in numbers that it was in danger of extinction. What would be its feelings toward the human species whose population explosion had denied it somewhere to exist. . . . I must confess that I am tempted to ask for reincarnation as a particularly deadly virus.

—Foreword to Fleur Cowles, *If I Were an Animal* (1987)

I don't claim to have any special interest in natural history, but as a boy I was made aware of the annual fluctuations in the number of game animals and the need to adjust the "cull" to the size of the surplus population.

—*Down to Earth* (1988)

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 Edinburgh University Union (1969)

I realize that there are vital causes to be fought for, and I sympathize with people who work up a passionate concern about the all too many examples of inhumanity, injustice, and unfairness; but behind all this hangs a deadly cloud. Still largely unnoticed and unrecognized, the process of destroying our natural environment is gathering speed and momentum. If we fail to cope with

the challenge, the other problems will pale into insignificance.

—Fairfield Osborne Lecture, New York City (1980)

Human population growth is probably the single most serious long-term threat to survival. We're in for a major disaster if it isn't curbed—not just for the natural world, but for the human world. The more people there are, the more resources they'll consume, the more pollution they'll create, the more fighting they will do. We have no option. If it isn't controlled voluntarily, it will be controlled involuntarily by an increase in disease, starvation and war.

—*People* magazine (1981)

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.

—Address to the Joint Meeting of the All-Party Group on Population and Development and the All-Party Conservation Committee in London (1987)

What has been described as the "balance of nature" is simply nature's system of self-limitation. Fertility and breeding success create the surpluses after allowing for the replacement of the losses. Predation, climatic variation, disease, starvation—and in the case of the inappropriately named *Homo sapiens*, wars and terrorism—are the principal means by which population numbers are kept under some sort of control.

Viewed dispassionately, it must be obvious that the world's human population has grown to such a size that it is threatening its own habitat; and it has already succeeded in causing the extinction of large numbers of wild plant and animal species.

—*Down to Earth* (1988)

There may be disagreements about the time scale, but in principle there can be little doubt that the population cannot go on increasing indefinitely. Resources presently being used will not last for ever and pollution in its broadest sense, unless severely checked, is bound to increase with population and industrial activity.

—Address, Salford University Degree Ceremony (1973)



NASA

AN UNAVOIDABLE DUTY:

On Ricci vs. DeStefano

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

May 31, 2009

Since I am, implicitly, posing the possible need to bring about the impeachment of a recently elected President of the United States, President Barack Obama, I must present a certain comment on the account of the case of Ricci vs. DeStefano as presented, admittedly, by today's issue of the Washington Post, a journal which I must admit does not command awesome credibility.

If there is no fatal error of fact in the *Washington Post's* account in the edition of Sunday, May 31st, and if the examination was competent and fairly conducted and scored, slippery avoidance of this fact can not be fairly used to exclude Mr. Ricci's certification as a candidate to be considered for appointment, on the grounds that no African American passing the examination was available to be certified.

I take up Ricci vs. DeStefano here, because there is a significant suggestion of a much deeper, more urgent and ugly issue lurking behind the curtains of justice, to be seen from reading the *Post's* version of the case.

Racial discrimination has been an evil since the Anglo-Dutch Liberal, and, later, the Spanish monarchy, had introduced the extensive marketing of captured Africans as slaves into what became the territory of the

U.S.A. As we have seen since the conclusion of the U.S. Civil War, merely removing the shackles of slavery was not sufficient means for meeting those objectives of our Declaration of Independence from Britain respecting the despicable and deleterious effects of its slave-trafficking on our economy and on our public conscience respecting matters of domestic and foreign affairs.

It is admittedly difficult, today, to provide the right of suitable opportunities of education and employment under the present, post-1968, downwards drift in the available quality of education, employment, and social security, when a murderous cut-back in the right to life of citizens is being taken away systemically under the implications of the present, intrinsically predatory HMO legislation introduced by the Nixon Administration. However the remedies for the problem of civil rights could be available, if we are willing to reverse the policies which are responsible for the decline in the conditions of life of our citizenry as a whole under the regime of de-industrialization that has reigned since the election of that same President Richard Nixon under whose administration the predatory HMO law was enacted, and implemented.

If we really cared about civil rights in practice, we would have, and could have reversed the policies re-



Ricci v. DeStefano was argued before the Supreme Court on April 22; a decision is expected later this Summer.

sponsible for the decadence of our national economy over the course of the 1969-2009 interval to date.

My Argument

I do not foresee the necessary ultimate outcome of the plea on Mr. Ricci's behalf, nor do I pretend to know all of the possibly relevant facts to be taken into account, or of the particular statutes and precedents which might be relevant. I am, however, deeply concerned with any appearance of a threat to a decent standard of practice in writing or enforcing of law by our Federal government. *Ricci vs. DeStefano* concerns me, not only as a matter affecting an individual, but in my sensed responsibility as one among notable public figures who knows the importance and the present difficulties in securing an honest judgment in certain areas of the practice of law under recent U.S. Federal administrations and the courts associated with them.

Whether Mr. Ricci's reported dyslexia should have been considered as a physical disqualification for the duties to be performed, is a different matter. If Mr. Ricci were qualified as having passed the examination, that remains a true fact in the judgment of any fair and intelligent citizen. The absence of a qualified African American for the award on that occasion, should have no bearing on the qualification of Mr. Ricci himself. There are other routes by which the intent of the fairness statute could have been served.

Our Constitutional system should never have pre-

tended to treat persons of different human ancestry as if they were representatives of a different race than any other member of the human race. No law should be allowed to stand if such a distinction is made, except in the case of preventing racial discrimination against a human individual. The appropriate legislation required was always available, but the intent to bring it actually into play was at fault.

What Legislation Is Needed?

The problems and failures of the implementation of the objectives of anti-discrimination measures must be addressed from the following

standpoint, or they will never be realized at all.

Admittedly, denying Mr. Ricci the right to claim the degree of qualification he had earned, is not to be compared, in itself, as comparable to the Nazi-like euthanasia practices of the Adolf Hitler regime. Nonetheless, the case of *Ricci vs. DeStefano* suggests the same kind of systemic error of intent in application of statutes and precedents which, carried into the domain of the citizen's right to life itself, has already resulted in the notorious crimes against humanity by the Hitler regime, and which is also the clearly fatal implications of any toleration for the current health-care proposals of the Obama Administration. It is the system of law which is in need of defense, even without considering the relative magnitude in the effect of a possible injustice, defense against the assault by the Obama Administration, presently, against a decent consideration of the individual's sacred right to life.

The Remedy In Ricci

If the account presented by the *Washington Post* were not in error, then the only reason for withholding Mr. Ricci's prospect for appointment would bear upon his capability of performing the duties for which he would have been fairly designated as a suitable candidate for a relevant appointment to some available position.

The most urgent issue of civil rights is posed by the declared intent of the Obama Administration itself. We are currently presented with a proposition uttered

by the incumbent President of the United States, who has presented himself, repeatedly, as committed to establishing the adoption and hotly pressed implementation of a particular evil, proposed body of law which would introduce the methods of discrimination against the very right to life of the category of persons who are given an accelerated ride to death on grounds of their

age or by the use of comparable, evil standards of practice under the currently proposed U.S. law, presented by the Obama Administration.

Unless the so-called health-care reforms presently proposed by President Obama are prevented, all talk of civil rights were an ugly farce in the tradition of Adolf Hitler's *Tiergarten-4*.

Ricci v. DeStefano: Facts of the Case

May 31—The subject case of Lyndon LaRouche's May 31 comment "On Ricci vs. DeStefano," involves a promotion test administered to firefighters by the city of New Haven, Conn. After reviewing the results, the city decided to throw out the test, on the ground that no African-Americans, and only two Hispanic-Americans advanced, but cited no particular flaws in the test itself. The white firefighters who passed the test sued, essentially arguing that they were denied the promotion they had earned, because of the color of their skin.

The Federal district judge dismissed the suit without even taking it to trial, ruling that the city was justified, under the law, in junking the test even if it could not explain what was wrong with it. The white firefighters appealed to a three-judge panel of the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals, a panel that included Supreme Court nominee Judge Sonia Sotomayor. That panel affirmed the lower court ruling in a 134-word summary order that explained that although Frank Ricci (the plaintiff) appeared to have scored highly on the test, despite having dyslexia, the results were invalidated for reasons having nothing to do with his qualification for the position he was applying for.

The Court's ruling stated, "it simply does not follow that he has a viable claim" under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The panel ruled that, by refusing to validate the test, since the city "was simply trying to fulfill its obligations under Title VII when confronted with the test results that had a disproportional



New Haven, Conn. firefighter Frank Ricci was denied a promotion based on a faulty application of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

tionate racial impact, its actions were protected."

The appellate court ruling was roundly criticized for its lack of reasoning, by none other than Sotomayor's mentor on the court, Judge José A. Cabranes. Cabranes wrote, on behalf of the Republican-appointed judges on the court, that, "The opinion contains no reference whatsoever to the constitutional claims at the core of this case. This perfunctory disposition rests uneasily with the weighty issues presented by this appeal."

The case is now before the U.S. Supreme Court, which could rule on it as early as the end of June.

—Carl Osgood

Schwarzenegger Goes in for the Kill

by Harley Schlanger

June 5—California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, after voters decisively rejected his plans to assume dictatorial budgetary powers through ballot initiatives—for the second time in four years—told a special joint session of the legislature on June 3 that they now have no alternative, but to impose budget cuts which will kill poor children, the elderly, and the disabled. In his speech, he made it clear that he knows full well the murderous implications of what he is proposing.

"I know the consequences of these cuts are not just dollars. I see the faces behind these dollars. I see the children whose teacher will be laid off. I see the Alzheimer's patients losing some of their In-Home Support Services. I see the firefighters and police officers who will lose their jobs.

"People come up to me all the time," he continued, "pleading, 'Governor, please don't cut my program.' They tell me how the cuts will affect them and their loved ones. I see the pain in their eyes and hear the fear in their voice.

"It's an awful feeling. But we have no choice. Our wallet is empty. Our bank is closed. Our credit is dried up."

Therefore, he concluded, all we can do is cut and slash, no matter what horrors this will perpetrate upon millions of Californians. After presiding for nearly six years over a government which he has made increasingly dysfunctional, in an economy devastated by the unregulated free-market policies he champions, the only consolation he could offer those targeted for the human scrap heap is that he will pay back the principal and interest on the debt he incurred, to cover his past borrowing!

And even with the cuts, to maintain payments of interest on the debt, the Fitch ratings agency just downgraded the state's debt from stable to negative.

Deregulation and Deindustrialization

Beyond the \$24.3 billion deficit currently projected by the end of the next fiscal year, in June 2010, which forced Schwarzenegger to make what he called his "May revision," the most striking figure he presented is the drop in revenues collected by the state. These have fallen from \$92 billion last year, to \$68 billion this year, a whopping 27% drop. That is why, after a previous reduction of \$16 billion from the deficit—mostly through cuts in education, health care, and pay to state employees, and an incremental increase in some taxes—the deficit has ballooned yet again, to \$24.3 billion. This is a slap of reality in the face of the Governor, who is fond of saying, repeatedly and buffoonishly, that the state does not have a "revenue problem," but a "spending problem."

The dramatic collapse in revenue is only partially explained by the so-called subprime crisis. Though California is one of the leading states in home foreclosures, following years of unrestrained housing price increases, which some economists foolishly declared a sign of economic strength, its economy has been on a downward arc for the last two decades. As economist Lyndon LaRouche forecast in the early 1980s, it would be the combined effects of the deregulation of banking and financial services, with the adoption of "post-industrial" economic policies, which would threaten the economic health of California, and the formerly industrial states of the Midwestern United States. This process went into an even higher gear, when that Ayn Rand-loving, free-market fanatic, Alan Greenspan, took over as chairman of the Federal Reserve in August 1987.

In the short run, many economists marveled at the apparent growth of the California economy, which they attributed to deregulation and free-market policies. The state's economy, which had been growing from World War II into the mid-1980s, based on technologically advanced manufacturing, which offered high wages and benefits to skilled workers and engineers, massive investment in infrastructure, and advanced agriculture, seemed to flourish, even as those industries were shut down, and hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs fled the state; as money was saved by *not* building new infrastructure, nor upgrading old projects; and, as the implementation of NAFTA meant that food could now be imported cheaply from around the world, leading to cutbacks in investment in farm production in California.



White House/Pete Souza

Is California “too big to fail”? When Arnie asked President Obama for special Federal aid for California, Obama refused, saying that, “We have got to make some very difficult choices.” Perhaps the President was egging on the son-of-a-Nazi Schwarzenegger, using California as a test case for ramming through murderous fascist policies. Shown, Obama and Schwarzenegger in Los Angeles, in March.

Replacing these wealth-producing enterprises were money-making ventures in entertainment and sports, computers (remember the dot-com bubble?), tourism, lotteries, Native American gambling casinos, retail sales (selling cheap goods imported from overseas), and, finally, the housing bubble, created by unregulated banks and mortgage companies. To economic fakers like the fascist George Shultz, who was the key promoter of Schwarzenegger for Governor, turning California into a post-industrial economy was a necessary part of selling globalization. For Shultz and his ilk, the short-term financial profits generated by the bubble economy were hailed as proof of the wisdom of tearing down the “old economy.”

For them, the final impediment to full globalization is the belief, which still remained from the era of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s administration, that government, including state and local governments, plays an important

role in promoting and facilitating scientific and technological progress.

Enter the Governor

Destroying that belief, by turning governments into dysfunctional bureaucracies reduced largely to accounting agencies, has been central to Shultz’s “grand plan” for destroying our national economic sovereignty. After imposing the Bush-Cheney regime on the United States, to undermine Constitutional rule, Shultz turned his attention to California, using the havoc wreaked by electricity deregulation in 2001-02—which nearly bankrupted the state—to bring Schwarzenegger in, through the referendum to recall Gov. Gray Davis in 2003. There was never any Schwarzenegger master plan to reform state government, to make it more efficient. His erratic behavior—part clown, part bully-boy—might have been entertaining at times, but it diverted attention from the reality, that the state’s productive economic capability was being driven far below breakeven.

It was only a matter of time before the revenues collected by the state collapsed. As that has occurred, Schwarzenegger has gone on a rampage, attacking “big spenders” for letting government grow out of control. When challenged on this, he adopts the role of demagogue, using ballot initiatives to demand that voters give him the personal power to make cuts without being constrained by legislative oversight, conducted by elected representatives.

When this course failed at the polls, again, last month, Schwarzenegger claimed voters were actually backing him, demanding that he force deadly cuts, despite the reluctance of most legislators. His speech on June 2, in which he spoke of how difficult it is to face the “Day of Reckoning,” was the one Shultz and others had been waiting for him to give since he became Governor. After all, it had been Shultz ally Pete Wilson, the former Governor, who said that these power-brokers were supporting Arnie because he “had the stomach” to push through killer cuts.

Killer Cuts

Let there be no mistake: These are killer cuts. For example, Schwarzenegger is demanding an end to CalWORKS, the state welfare agency that maintains families while providing job training, to move them off welfare. CalWORKS, which has been praised for its success, presently serves some 525,000 families per month, providing around \$650/month to each family. According to the County Welfare Directors Association, eliminating CalWORKS will force thousands of families into homelessness. If Schwarzenegger gets his way, California will be the only state which will have eliminated *all aid to dependent children*. Its executive director, Frank Mecca, told the *Sacramento Bee* that this would eliminate the safety net for poor families. “There really is no fallback, especially given the financial condition that most counties are in.”

Schwarzenegger has also demanded an end to the state’s main health insurance plan for poor children, threatening to *leave nearly 1 million children with no health care*, at a time when emergency rooms in public hospitals are being closed. Supplemental funds paid to the disabled, poor, and elderly will also be eliminated. Cuts in home health-care spending will condemn more than 395,000 elderly and/or disabled to shortened lives, including those with Alzheimer’s disease, people who are paralyzed, or are simply too weak to care for themselves.

Karen Bass, the Democratic Speaker of the Assembly, in reviewing the coming devastation if these cuts go through, said, in a characteristic understatement, “Some of these cuts could result in people losing their lives.”

That peoples’ lives are at stake means little to Arnie, whose statement about his concern over the pain inflicted by his actions is little more than a throw-away line of a script from one of his bad movies. More in character with the tough guys he played was his conclusion, in which he told legislators that this crisis “will test our will, our resolve and our leadership. . . . In the coming days and weeks, the entire nation will be watching how we react and respond.”

It is likely, as one veteran California Democrat told *EIR*, that the Obama Administration refused any bailout funds to the state, to see if its citizens would revolt against the fascist austerity demanded by the Governor. For the sake of the future of our nation, the source said, “I hope the people of California won’t take it lying down.”

harleysch@gmail.com

Soros Crowd Behind Smears Against Murtha


by Anita Gallagher and Jeffrey Steinberg

June 6—The *Washington Post*, the *New York Times* and the Capitol Hill leak-sheet *Politico* all used the occasion of the 19th annual “Showcase for Commerce” in Johnstown, Pa. as the occasion to escalate their slander campaign against leading House Democrat, and longtime New Deal advocate, Rep. John Murtha (Pa.). While the mainstream media paid no attention for 18 years to the annual Johnstown industrial exposition, which highlights defense, machine-tool, and biotech companies that have led a remarkable industrial recovery in the central Pennsylvania district, following the collapse of the steel and coal industries in the 1970s and ’80s, this year’s event saw *Washington Post* and other reporters literally stalking Representative Murtha, as he toured the hundreds of expo booths on the floor of the Johnstown hockey stadium. And not one word of Murtha’s stunning call for a Federal government-led industrial revival, in the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal, made it onto the pages of the *Washington Post*.

Instead, the *Post* and the other newspapers spewed out a tirade of unfounded charges of kickbacks and corruption, almost all based on the work of a George Soros front group that was created specifically to target FDR advocates on Capitol Hill, and make Congress safe for proponents of dope legalization, offshore unregulated speculation, and euthanasia—all favorite Soros policies.

Obama and Pelosi

Sources close to the Obama Administration have told *EIR* that Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) has made a backroom deal to save her job, following her recent confrontation with the CIA over briefings its officials had delivered to her and her top staff, on the Bush-Cheney torture policies—policies she claims she knew nothing about, and never endorsed. Pelosi was caught lying in public; her job was on the line, and she reportedly went to the White House to save her hide. According to the sources, one



Creative Commons/KClvey

Rep. John Murtha is being skewered by “corruption” scandals—but don’t believe what you hear from the Soros press sewer. His “crime” is to be a Democrat in the FDR tradition, and a defender of his district’s industrial base.

of the demands imposed by Team Obama was that she turn her back on her longtime ally, as the “Get Murtha” campaign, part of a broader targeting of traditional constituency-based Congressmen and Senators, moved in for the kill.

The recent decision by Attorney General Eric Holder to drop the case against former Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Ak.), because of massive prosecutorial misconduct, originally seemed to signal a broader crackdown against this kind of Department of Justice and FBI corruption. But the Attorney General, as the result of President Obama’s decision to shut down the holding facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, has been forced to devote a great deal of his time to developing a game-plan for dealing with those prisoners, and this has stymied more concentrated effort on shutting down the Federal gestapo.

That gestapo apparatus has had it out for John Murtha for a decade, because of his co-sponsorship, with former Rep. Joseph McDade (R-Pa.), of the 1998 McDade-Murtha Bill, which imposed criminal penalties on prosecutors and FBI agents who engaged in judicial frameups.

According to well-placed sources in the Democratic Party, the White House has its own reasons for wanting

to dump Murtha, the Defense Appropriations chairman from the House leadership—which can only be done through scandal-mongering and media slanders, and, ultimately, a bogus criminal indictment.

“The Obama team wants to consolidate absolute power over the party, especially on Capitol Hill,” one source candidly explained. “They don’t want any more powerful families and elder statesmen standing in the way of their policy agenda. No more Rockefellers, or Kennedys, or Cuomos. John Murtha has a powerful base of support within the military industries, and that translates into significant financial support for Democratic candidates. The White House wants their people to control all the money.”

That report conforms to *EIR*’s own investigation into the apparatus behind the attacks on Murtha, as well as on other powerful Congressional leaders.

Ultimately, all roads lead back to the hedge fund manager and self-confessed wartime Nazi collaborator, George Soros—a major early backer of the President’s electoral campaigns.

The Soros CREW

It is George Soros, through the Open Society Institute and the Democracy Alliance, who is funding CREW (Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington), which has made ousting Murtha one of its ten top projects since 2005, and has recently gone into high gear.

Having had no success in defeating Murtha in dirty campaigns financed by national “Swift Boat” supporters outside his central Pennsylvania district, the same media that never note that George Soros’s conviction on insider trading has been affirmed after two appeals by the highest court in France, spread new dirt on Murtha every day.

CREW cites campaign contributions to Murtha by companies and their employees who get work, as proof that “Representative Murtha has rewarded his campaign donors with earmarks.” The reality is much simpler—Murtha supports industry, defense, and industrial jobs.

CREW's 15-page report on campaign contributions to Murtha is full of items such as: "Since 2000, Windber Research Institute and their families have donated \$21,250 in donations to Murtha." This is not a large amount, nor is it surprising that Northrop Grumman's PAC has donated \$34,500 to Murtha since 2000.

Who's Funding CREW?

What is stunning is who is funding CREW. On July 17, 2006, *Washington Post* reporters Jim VandeHei and Chris Cillizza wrote that a new Democracy Alliance of nearly 100 of the nation's wealthiest donors, had directed more than \$50 million from October 2005 through July 2006 to liberal think tanks and advocacy groups. The Democracy Alliance, they wrote, has decades-long transformational goals for the United States, not merely short-term objectives. "It has lavished millions on groups that have been willing to submit to its extensive screening process and its demands for secrecy." And, further, "The Alliance has required organizations that receive its endorsement to sign agreements shielding the identity of donors. Public interest groups said the Alliance represents a large source of undisclosed and unaccountable political influence."

The same article reports that "a Democracy Alliance blessing effectively jump-started Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington. It bills itself as a non-partisan watchdog group. . . ." CREW was among 600 liberal Democratic groups screened by a panel of members, donors, and outside experts. Only 40 of these were invited to apply for an endorsement, and CREW, with its targeting of those who practice constituency politics in Congress, was among the 25 groups ultimately chosen. One of CREW's other early targets was Senator Stevens.

Democracy Alliance was formed in 2005 by billionaire George Soros, his son Jonathan, and former Rockefeller Family Fund president Anne Bartley. On May 5, 2009, Soros, David Rockefeller, and Warren Buffett convened a secret meeting of billionaires at Rockefeller University in New York, in which the consensus was the best way to use their wealth in the current financial collapse, would be in efforts to reduce the world's population, according to John Harlow of the *Los Angeles Times*.

As to the Alliance, "Like a lot of elite groups, we fly beneath the radar," said Guy Saperstein, an Oakland lawyer and Alliance donor. To become an Alliance

"partner," as the members call each other, requires a \$25,000 entry fee, plus annual dues of \$30,000 to cover Alliance operations, and some of its contributions to start up liberal groups. Partners also agree to spend at least \$200,000 annually on organizations that have been endorsed by the Alliance. Essentially, the Alliance serves as an accreditation agency for political advocacy groups, the *Post* reported. Many of the "partners" give away "far more than the \$200,000 requirement. Soros and insurance magnate Peter Lewis are among the biggest contributors, but 45% of the 95 partners gave \$300,000 or more in the initial round of grants last October [2005], according to a source familiar with the organization," according to the *Post*. There are also institutional investors like the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), which pay a \$50,000 annual fee, and agree to spend \$1 million of their members' money on Alliance-backed efforts.

So, while CREW points to a level of contributions to Murtha which is ordinary, which cannot exceed \$2,300 per individual, and which are all detailed in public Federal Election Commission (FEC) records, CREW itself is one of the 25 groups which received money it is obligated not to disclose, from the British-empire frontman George Soros's Democracy Alliance.

Even the *Washington Post* admitted, "Unlike election campaigns, which must detail contributions and spending, most of the think tanks and not-for-profit groups funded by the Alliance are exempt from public disclosure laws. 'It is a huge problem,' said Sheila Krumholz, the acting executive director of the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics," which tracks contributions.

In 2008, CREW received \$75,000 from the Arca Foundation, founded by the Reynolds-Bagley family. In January 2006, it also received \$100,000 from Soros, to purge pro-FDR Congressmen, by scandal.

HOTLINE

**LaRouche and EIR Staff
Recorded Briefings
—24 Hours Daily
916-233-0630, Box 595**

National News

'Bailout Ben' Demands Fiscal Restraint, Now

June 3—Sometimes you don't know whether to laugh or cry. Such a moment occurred today when Federal Reserve chairman Ben Bernanke addressed the House Budget Committee, and urged fiscal restraint. Imagine that! Bail-out Ben, whose Fed has spent, lent, and guaranteed trillions of dollars to zombie banks to delay them from suffering the inevitable consequences of the most monumental financial stupidity in history, actually has the nerve to lecture others on fiscal responsibility!

"Either cuts in spending or increases in taxes will be necessary to stabilize the fiscal situation," Bernanke said. "The Federal Reserve will not monetize the debt."

Too bad he doesn't have the same position on the bailouts of Wall Street, the City of London, and other parasites!

Bernanke also thoroughly debunked his own claim that "green shoots" of recovery had begun to appear. "The pace of economic contraction may be slowing" and the housing market has "shown some signs of bottoming," he said, while adding that businesses "continue to reduce their workforces and capital investments," and that consumer spending, after plunging last year, "has been roughly flat since the turn of the year." In other words, the economy is still falling. Perhaps you have to be an "economist" to see the "growth."

Obama Administration Is Fascist, Says Nader

June 2—In an interview with Amy Goodman of Democracy Now! today, consumer activist Ralph Nader called the Obama Administration fascist. Nader was being interviewed on the GM bankruptcy, along with University of California at Berkeley "labor" professor Harley Shaiken. Nader repeatedly said that the bankruptcy judge is a "tool" of the Obama Administration, and that the court is a means to scapegoat a policy of

sending of jobs overseas (not the strongest of objections). He then mentioned Felix Rohatyn's protégé Steve Rattner, the top advisor to the Administration on the auto industry, who refused to answer a question from Nader on the fate of assets of GM in China, something to which Nader said Rattner certainly knew the answer.

"We're dealing here with a corporate state," Nader continued, "the kind of corporate state that Franklin Delano Roosevelt called fascist, in a statement to Congress in 1938—that is, when government is controlled by private economic powers, that's fascism." Host Goodman quickly changed the subject.

Fascist Infrastructure Bank Bill Introduced

June 5—A major step was taken May 20 toward the creation of a National Infrastructure Bank (NIB) as proposed by Felix Rohatyn, when Rep. Rosa DeLauro (D-Conn.) introduced a bill in the House, which would authorize the creation of a privatized NIB. Fascist Felix was there at the press conference announcing the scheme. Rohatyn's bill has three Democratic co-sponsors: Keith Ellison of Minnesota, and New Yorkers Tony Weiner and Steve Israel. The bill has not-unexpected, short-sighted support from the construction unions' National Construction Alliance, the Building and Construction Trades Department, the American Society of Civil Engineers, and the AFL-CIO. But more telling was the presence at the press conference of Lazard fascist Rohatyn, industrialist-turned-speculator Bernard Schwartz, and Anna Burger of the Service Employees International Union.

That some who advocate necessary physical development of the economy could be hoodwinked into supporting the fascist legislation is explainable only by the lack of a real national development plan by the Obama Administration, which, under the control of top economic advisor Larry Summers, could care less about the physical economy. For his part, Rohatyn

called the NIB an "essential," and "transparent" institution, "modelled on the European Investment Bank," which "can leverage significant private capital for infrastructure projects."

Private capital? From where?

Is Summers About To Get Caught Taking Kickbacks?

May 29—AlterNet.com today raised the question: "Is Larry Summers taking kickbacks from the banks he's bailing out?"

When he was forced to step down as president of Harvard University, Summers joined the board of a company called Revolution Money in 2006 (when it was called GratisCard), which was set up by former AOL chief Steve Case, to rival PayPal, an online payment company. Summers' longtime chief of staff, Marne Levine, joined Summers at Revolution, where she served as director of product management.

In September 2007, Revolution Money announced that it had raised \$50 million from Citigroup, Morgan Stanley, and Deutsche Bank. Revolution's ability to raise this amount was based on the political connections of Summers and another board member, Frank Raines, the former CEO of Fannie Mae, who is still on the board.


When he joined the Obama Administration in January 2009, Summers resigned from the Revolution Money board. However, just three months later, on April 6, Revolution Money announced that it had just raised another \$42 million from Goldman Sachs, Citigroup, and Morgan Stanley, all of which had been bailed out by Summers.

Ames concludes: "Everything about Summers, from his horrible track record in the developing world in the 1990s, to the sleaze and plunder he's overseeing in the White House should make us terrified.... Summers ... has seen his gelatinous layers of neck-fat swell up like an amphibian guarding its eggs ever since he took control of the economy. Get this monster out of the White House now, before he devours us all."

EXPOSED!

DERIVATIVES
SPECULATOR
CURRENCY-
WRECKER
WORLD-CLASS
LOOTER

SOROS THE GOLEM



An EIR
Special
Report

'The True Story of
SOROS THE GOLEM:
A Profile of Megaspeculator
George Soros'

INCLUDES:

- Soros promotes drug legalization
- Soros, the drug cartels, and narcoterrorism
- The secret of the Quantum Fund
- Union Bancaire Privée and the 'Swiss connection'
- The Rothschild connection
- Marc Rich, Reichmann, and Israeli links
- Savaging Eastern Europe

\$50

This 1997 report may be ordered from
Executive Intelligence Review at P.O. Box 17390,
Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.
1-800-278-3135 (toll-free)

Order # EIR 97-001

Globalization and The 'Auto' Bailout

by John Hoefle

June 5—The bankruptcy of General Motors, once one of the world's industrial giants, is the result of a policy shift which began the day President Franklin Roosevelt died. Though it officially filed for bankruptcy on June 1, 2009, GM has been bankrupt for years, hemorrhaging money at an accelerating rate. At the time of its bankruptcy filing, the company had a net worth of negative \$90 billion.

The U.S. government has now pumped over \$70 billion into GM and Chrysler, their suppliers, and GMAC, the former finance arm of GM—which is now a bank holding company. Our government could have bought the lot of them outright far cheaper: GM had a market capitalization of less than \$1 billion when it failed, and, at about \$1 a share, was still overpriced.

Chrysler is being taken over by Italian automaker Fiat, and the “new” GM has said it will reduce its dependence upon its domestic manufacturing capability by importing cars it makes overseas. GM will shed several of its brands, reduce its workforce by some 21,000 union workers (from about 125,000 U.S. employees prior to the bankruptcy), and close 14 plants and three parts-distribution centers. By 2012, it expects to have just 33 plants in the United States, down from 47 just last year. In the early 1980s, it had 150 U.S. assembly plants and employed some 349,000 workers.

It would appear that we taxpayers got very little for our \$70 billion, and that is true—but this so-called “bailout” of the auto sector never has been about saving

auto production and auto jobs. What it is, is part of the bailout of the *financial* sector.

Industrial Takedown

Coming out of World War II, the United States was the most powerful industrial power the world had ever seen, and under President Roosevelt, was committed to leading the world forward into new prosperity. One element of that prosperity was the elimination of the colonialism of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system. Naturally, the oligarchs did not like that. And as soon as FDR died, on April 12, 1945, they set about dismantling the U.S. from within.

This was the origin of the policy of post-industrialism, which was based upon the phony theory that services, information, and finance were the natural successors to industry. Under the sway of this false ideology, we began to shift our attention from the development of our physical economy, towards pushing papers and manipulating money. It took a while to overcome America's can-do disposition, but we eventually turned our back on nuclear power, thus cutting off the leap into a new era of scientific and technological progress. As we lost contact with our heritage, we began to turn “green,” adopting an anti-science outlook and viewing the world in terms of money and profit. It is that shift which has destroyed our productive base, and allowed the financial parasites to take over.

Under the control of the financier class and its ex-



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

“TOTAL INVENTORY LIQUIDATION” at a Chrysler dealership in Leesburg, Va., June 3, 2009. The dealers helped the company out by loading up on inventory, and many have now been cut loose.

panding system of corporate cartels, we began to move our production of goods overseas, to places where labor was cheaper. We were told this would make us more competitive—and more profitable—but it was a lie. What happened is that we systematically dismantled our manufacturing base, eliminating skilled and decent-paying jobs by the millions, until our former industrial heartland became a disaster area. The parasites of Wall Street and the City of London did indeed get richer, some of them obscenely rich, but the American people, the working people who are the foundation of our nation, did not. Instead, they found themselves with ever declining standards of living, working in lower-paying jobs, with growing debts, and despair.

Today, we see the last vestiges of our former indus-

trial might withering on the vine. What remains of our productive base largely revolves around that which President Dwight Eisenhower warned us about, the military-industrial complex. We still produce weaponry and war materiel, ever-intrusive police-state products, and related items, though even there, we buy much from overseas.

Auto-Destruct

What we are witnessing in the auto sector is not a “rescue,” but continued destruction, another looting operation by the global financier parasites. The so-called auto bailout is nothing but an attempt to control the damage to the financial sector caused by the collapse of the auto companies. What is being protected is not production, but the valuations of the debt and other financial obligations of the auto sector, and the derivatives bets piled atop those obligations. That is why the government bailed out GMAC, why it poured \$5 billion into Chrysler and \$50 billion into GM. It was yet another backdoor bailout of banks like JP Morgan Chase and Citigroup, of the hedge and private equity funds, and others. Auto production was not saved—it will continue to decline and be globalized.

The unions are not being saved, far from it. Chrysler’s union retiree health fund will own 55% of the post-bankruptcy, Fiat-run Chrysler, but in return gave up claims to much of the \$10 billion Chrysler owed it. The union members may have believed it was the best deal they could get, but they are being taken for a ride. The Chrysler dealers are also getting the shaft. After helping the company by loading up on inventory, many of them were cut loose, given a month to liquidate their stocks of cars and trucks. Money talks, everyone else walks.

The GM case is not much different. In its bankruptcy filing, it listed \$173 billion in debts, against assets of \$82 billion. Under its bankruptcy plan, the U.S. government would own 60% of the “new” GM, while the governments of Canada and Ontario would own a combined 12%. The union health trust would own 17.5%, and the company’s pre-bankruptcy bondholders would own 10%. In return for its 60% share of a company with a net worth of minus \$90 billion, the U.S. government will pay \$30 billion. The United Autoworkers’ retiree health fund will exchange the \$20 billion it is owed by GM for that 17.5% stake, plus \$9 billion in notes and preferred stock. That may seem reasonable, until you consider what such a stake in a dying company is really worth.



UAW Local 730

In Grand Rapids, Mich., UAW members from Local 730, workers at the GM Metal Fabrication Plant, rallied in an effort to defend their jobs and health care, May 12, 2009. Above, the same plant on Feb. 11, 1943, producing materiel for World War II. The auto plants were converted quickly under FDR's war mobilization to produce what was needed for the war effort; they could be converted today to build nuclear power plants, high-speed (maglev) rail, and other vitally needed infrastructure.



UAW Local 730

Death of a Nation

To understand what *is* happening here, and to effectively fight it, one must step back and view the matter in a larger perspective. The issue is not GM or Chrysler, or even auto production, but the collapse of the U.S. economy, and its looting by the global financial oligarchy. The auto sector is not in trouble because its executives made poor decisions—though they did. The auto sector is in trouble because a decision was made by the financiers to collapse the core of the U.S. machine-tool capability, which is crucial for new leaps of productivity in the United States and the world. It is the nation which is dying, and taking the auto sector with it.

Rather than deal with that crucial problem, the Obama Administration, like the Bush Administration before it, has decided to save the fictitious paper values

of Wall Street, the trillions of dollars of unpayable debts and quadrillions of dollars of derivatives bets. To do so, it must mercilessly impose austerity upon the American people, raising taxes, cutting services, dismantling the social safety net at a time when our citizens need it more than ever.

The purpose of all of this is not really to save the financial system, which is already dead. The purpose is to complete the destruction of the United States, as a necessity for destroying the nation-state system as a rival to imperial rule. The United States, which was committed under FDR to ending the colonial system, is instead being reabsorbed into the Anglo-Dutch Liberal empire, under the guise of “saving our economy.”

We are killing ourselves, destroying our economy

and our people, and for what? The perpetuation of some medieval system which should have died last century, and would have, had FDR lived, and we not been so damned stupid.

johnhoeft@larouchepub.com

The Auto Bankruptcies: LaRouche Told You So

Although Lyndon LaRouche repeatedly warned Congress in 2005 to take emergency action to save the auto sector, as a crucial component of U.S. strategic machine-tool capability, Congressional leaders blocked his proposed solutions. These key statements by LaRouche make the record clear:

2005

February: LaRouche forecasts a debt blowout of the American auto sector, referring to international press coverage, largely blacked out of the U.S. media, that General Motors, GMAC, and Ford are going to be downgraded by bond-rating agencies. *EIR* begins intensive coverage of the auto crisis.

March 10: *EIR* Strategic Alert publishes an item entitled “GM Heading for Junk-Bond Status?” on impending U.S. auto sector collapse, citing Feb. 26 editorial in the Swiss daily *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, “Thunderstorm over Detroit.”

March 23: At a LaRouche PAC town meeting in Detroit, LaRouche calls for a “reconstruction agenda” to save the nation’s industrial capacity, in the face of the threatened collapse of GM.

April 7: At an international webcast from Washington, D.C.,

calling for a New Bretton Woods financial/monetary system to revive national economies, LaRouche speaks at length on the GM crisis, and the way to reorganize the entire auto/machine-tool sector to save and expand industrial output capacity.



April 9: In a meeting with labor leaders and elected officials, called to discuss a solution to the crisis, LaRouche calls for saving the auto industry as a crucial aspect for U.S. economic recovery. He proposes that the government intervene by placing the productive capacity of the industry into government-supervised receivership, and then funding the retooling and expansion of that capacity, to supply the components of national infrastructure projects.

April 13: LaRouche issues memorandum to the U.S. Senate, “Emergency Action by the Senate,” which provides a summary statement of the crisis and guidelines for what must be done, emphasizing “The Emergency Measures for the GM Case,” and the need for an “Urgent Return to the American System.” It is published in *EIR* on April 22 and then as a LaRouche PAC pamphlet. The only solution, LaRouche shows, is to move immediately to save vital productive capacities, such as GM, and then move to reorganize the bankrupt global financial-monetary system.

May 10: LaRouche issues a mass leaflet, “Guts and Government,” calling for Congress and other leaders to stop vacillating on the GM crisis.

May 14: LaRouche issues a memorandum to Congress, published in *EIR* May 27, “Congress Faces New Turn: On the Subject of Strategic Bankruptcy.” Highlighting the collapse of the airline industry, the efforts of GM/GMAC to dump auto workers’ pensions, and the threatened collapse of GM, Ford, and others, he lays out the parameters for a stra-





tegic bankruptcy, in the interest of the general welfare.


June 16: At a webcast from Washington, D.C., LaRouche stresses that “the automobile industry is a strategically crucial part of the U.S. economy,” and outlines how to save the people employed there, and all the industrial capacity associated with it—“the core of the machine-tool capacity of the United States.”

June 21: Answering questions e-mailed to the June 16 webcast, from Senate sources, LaRouche emphasizes that “If GM and Ford go down, the United States loses a vital part of our machine-tool capability, in which case we’re no longer a serious nation, economically”—and urges immediate action so that “we maintain this labor force *in production*...”

Oct. 12: Responding to a question at a Washington webcast from the Senate Manufacturing Caucus, asking about the recent bankruptcy filing of Delphi, LaRouche calls for putting the auto industry under Federal protection.

2006

Feb. 28: LaRouche in a press release warns the U.S. Senate to “stop flim-flamming, and save the auto



Rebuild the Nation.” Within six weeks, 10,000 copies are in circulation.

April 27: At a Washington webcast, “Americans Must Act Now To Stop Greatest Economic Crisis,” LaRouche again stresses the importance of Senate action on the auto situation, and meets with Midwest and other auto, industrial, state legislative, and community leaders.

May 2: LaRouche issues a 12-page pamphlet addressed to “Economists, Legislators, and Labor,” titled “Emergency Legislation, Now!” The purpose is “to prompt the immediate crafting of urgently needed emer-

sector.” The Senate has to act now, LaRouche says. “If it does not, it may be too late to stop an irreversible and chaotic collapse of the industry.”

March 9: LaRouche elaborates his proposal for the Federal government to take the automobile-manufacturing industry under “temporary protection” as a measure essential for the general welfare.

March 31: Upon hearing of the action by Delphi Corp. to rip up its contracts and productive capability, and Congressional inaction, LaRouche issues a statement, “If Congress doesn’t Act To Stop the Destruction of the Auto Industry, They Don’t Give a Damn About the U.S.” He writes: “Congress should examine its conscience. The Delphi action, and the overall auto collapse, is not just about the employees and their conditions, but about the structure of the U.S. economy. Anyone who doesn’t act now, doesn’t give a damn about the United States.”

April 14: LaRouche PAC issues an hour-long DVD, “Re-

gency Federal legislation” to prevent the collapse of the auto industry from triggering the destruction of the U.S. physical economy, and mobilize the constituency demand to push Congress to intervene.

May 14: LaRouche proposes the “U.S. Economic Recovery Act of 2006” in a pamphlet that elaborates the crisis in the auto sector and the need to “retool” the unused capacity of the auto industry to produce new national infrastructure. The pamphlet includes a resolution to save the auto industry, variations on which were passed by several city councils and state legislatures.

June 5-9: A Week of Action in Washington, D.C. focusses on the need for emergency Federal intervention for the auto sector and economy. LaRouche Youth Movement activists are joined by labor and state leaders to lobby Congress, capped by a June 9 LaRouche PAC webcast.

June 7-8: LaRouche PAC places paid ads in two widely circulated Capitol Hill weeklies, *The Hill* and *Roll Call*, signed by scores of labor leaders and elected officials, urging Congress to enact the emergency Federal legislation called for by LaRouche.

July: LaRouche PAC issues a White Paper, “Time Is Running Out for the U.S.A.,” which targets Lazard Frères banker Felix Rohatyn for his personal role in sabotaging a LaRouche solution to the crisis in the U.S. auto industry. It was he, representing Rohatyn Associates LLC, who signed Delphi Corp.’s May 1, 2005 pre-bankruptcy letter of agreement. A Synarchist by tradition, Rohatyn is also one of the money-bags for the faction of the Democratic Party that opposed LaRouche’s initiatives.

2008

Sept. 12: *EIR* reports that the LaRouche PAC has relaunched its mobilization for the Economic Recovery Act (ERA) of 2006. In contrast to the “save auto jobs” approach now being taken by those in Congress who sabotaged LaRouche’s 2005 initiative, LaRouche’s approach demands the establishment of a new Federal corporation which will salvage the remaining labor and plant capacity, to turn out the machine-tool products required to rebuild the nation’s infrastructure. The auto industry cannot and should not be saved, LaRouche has emphasized. Through Congressional inaction and Administration incompetence in the face of a global financial crash, the U.S. physical economy’s condition is significantly worse than in the Spring of 2005, when LaRouche’s ERA was already urgent.

Oligarchy’s WWF Goal: Destroy South Africa

by Douglas DeGroot

June 4—Prince Philip’s World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) is going on the offensive against South Africa, dictating that the WWF’s depopulation policies be implemented in South Africa. The anti-South African offensive was signaled by the June 1 announcement of a campaign against industry by the South African branch of the WWF, using the fraudulent pretext of the danger of a carbon dioxide buildup.

The goal of the WWF and the British Imperial financial cartel, is to use the anti-scientific CO₂ ruse to force South Africa to dump its goal of developing advanced-technology power generation as a means of industrialization. The alternative being offered, is to reduce energy consumption, and use inadequate “renewable energies.” Prince Philip and his cohorts in the London-based imperial financial cartel are the top culprits who are pushing these racist, Nazi-style policies to depopulate the globe.

The implicit target of the WWF is the South African Pebble Bed Modular Reactor (PBMR) project, which is a world leader in developing a fourth-generation, high-temperature, gas-cooled, pebble bed reactor. Successful development of the PBMR project would defeat Philip and his like-minded Neanderthals who are intent on preserving their old order by imposing a policy of technological apartheid on Africa and the rest of the yet-to-be developed nations of the world. The defeat of these fanatics would destroy all the scenarios now being cooked up to eliminate South Africa as the continent’s leading industrial nation.

Crucial to that defeat is a shift of policy in the United States. The British population-reduction policy was brought to the United States by Henry A. Kissinger in 1974, when he initiated the process that made genocidal population reduction a required tenet of U.S. policy-making.¹ The U.S. thus joined the British in seeking to

1. On Dec. 10, 1974, National Security Advisor Henry A. Kissinger issued National Security Study Memorandum 200 (NSSM 200), which linked what it termed “overpopulation” to U.S. national security inter-



The South African affiliate of Prince Philip's global WWF network has announced an anti-industrialization drive against advanced-technology industry in South Africa. Here, on the website of Engineering News, the WWF's Saliem Fakir is being interviewed in South Africa by Creamer Media.

prevent the ex-colonial sectors from using their resources, considered "strategic" by the policy's promoters, to encourage population growth by modernization and industrialization. The time is more than ripe for the U.S. to break from British imperial policy.

WWF Calls for War

The call for green fascism in South Africa was announced in a June 1 interview with Saliem Fakir, the head of WWF's Living Planet unit. He called for lowering carbon dioxide emissions, and developing solar power technology in South Africa, and said that the WWF will target ten companies over the next five years to be involved in the Fund's "Climate Savers" initiative. (See the fraudulent carbon dioxide argument against development exposed as a hoax in the interview with Lord Christopher Monckton on p. 47.)

As a result of the bankruptcy of the globalized monetarist system, South Africa is in the throes of its worst economic crisis since 1992. The WWF picked this moment of vulnerability to launch its offensive, less than a month after Jacob Zuma was inaugurated as President of South Africa, on May 9.

Zuma, as the African National Congress (ANC) candidate, ran a populist campaign, promising to

ests. After Kissinger became Secretary of State, his NSC successor, Brent Scowcroft, issued National Security Decision Memorandum 314, which adopted NSSM 200 as official (covert) U.S. policy on population matters. See *EIR* April 18, 2008, for excerpts of NSSM 200.

reduce poverty, and he continues to pledge more jobs. However, in the first quarter of this year, mining production has dropped by 32.8%, and manufacturing output plunged 22.1%, the biggest fall in these two sectors since records began to be kept in 1960. Zuma is now trapped. He cannot deliver on his promises.

British Fabian Society Assets

The core of Zuma's support is the Cosatu trade union federation and its close ally, the South African Communist Party (SACP), an alliance going back to the fight against apartheid. The leaders of

this alliance are assets of the British Fabian Society. Cosatu has 21 affiliated unions, and a combined membership of over 1.9 million. The SACP has 37 of the 400 seats in the National Assembly.

Cosatu is demanding protection from the economic crisis by means of more social spending and protectionism, but the globalized business sector isn't going to see South Africa as "business friendly" if it turns to protectionism. South Africa risks being destroyed by the conflict between these two opposing forces.

Trying to buy some maneuvering room, Zuma said in his inaugural State of the Nation speech yesterday, that job creation and fighting poverty will be his main focus. He announced that the South African Industrial Development Corporation (IDC) has developed a program to fund South African companies that are in trouble because of the global collapse, to protect jobs. He vowed to create 500,000 job opportunities by the end of the year, and 4 million jobs by 2014. South Africa's unemployment rate has climbed to 23.5% in the first quarter this year, from 21.9% in the last quarter of 2008.

But, indicative of the trap he is caught in, Zuma also sought to dampen expectations of what his government could do to alleviate poverty and create more jobs: he said that the economic crisis calls for prudent spending.

On June 1, two days before Zuma's State of the Nation speech, Irvin Jim, the general-secretary of the National Union of Metalworkers, one of the three big-

gest trade unions, threatened mass strikes to force interest rate cuts by the Reserve Bank (the central bank): “If matters are not resolved, we will have mass rolling action.” In response, Jessie Stuart, spokesperson for the ANC, urged caution: “What will have to happen,” she said, “is an understanding that during a recessionary time there is a slight difference, that we might as a ruling party have to mediate and talk about all of us taking responsibility that the recession doesn’t deepen.”

Cosatu leaders approved of Zuma’s speech yesterday, but the honeymoon didn’t last long. Today, Cosatu backed the metalworkers’ call for strikes to demand deeper interest rate cuts, as a way of fostering economic growth, and thus save jobs. Cosatu general-secretary Zwelinzima Vavi said: “We fully endorse that we must engage in mass action.” Cosatu also said today that it would not support the renewal of Reserve Bank governor Tito Mboweni’s contract, which expires in August.

The Cosatu-SACP alliance played a key role in dumping former South African President Thabo Mbeki, who was forced to resign last Sept. 20. This opened the way for the election of Zuma. It was the legwork carried out by Cosatu which ousted Mbeki and gave Zuma his April electoral victory, setting him up for his no-win trap. Now, the Cosatu-SACP alliance, not comprehending the nature of the crisis, is being played against Zuma. It is telling the Cosatu membership that it is pay-back time for them, for having ousted Mbeki and his backers. The Fabian Society-manipulated Cosatu-SACP alliance is now in a position to destroy the nationalist institutions of the ANC.

The British imperial Fabian Society will use its assets to pressure the South African government to dump the PBMR project, or cut it way back, and instead use the financial resources for programs to alleviate the immediate effects of the economic crisis.

The WWF and South Africa

There is a long, deep, and intimate connection between the WWF and South Africa. The British imperial elites and like-minded elements amongst the South African elites of British and Afrikaaner extraction were, and still are, intent on stopping human development and progress, and greatly reducing the world’s population. If they don’t succeed, they will not be able to maintain their control in the world.

The WWF was founded in 1961, at the time many former European colonies in Africa were gaining nominal independence; it was an initiative of Julian Huxley and Edward Nicholson, and was dedicated to preserving a “natural order” undisturbed by humans. Huxley approvingly reported, for example, his discovery on a trip to British colonial Tanganyika, that the wildlife on the Serengeti plain was almost undisturbed, because the tsetse fly (the vector for the trypanosome parasite which causes sleeping sickness in humans) prevented human settlement there.

Nicholson was a longtime intimate of the British imperial order. He accompanied Winston Churchill to the Yalta summit, before the end of World War II, and also accompanied him to the post-war meeting with Josef Stalin and Harry Truman in Potsdam, among his other services to the British imperialist cartel.

Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands was WWF president from 1962 to 1976, when his involvement in the Lockheed scandal became public. Prince Philip was president 1981-96. Both princes were from not very distinguished European royal families, and only acquired their more elevated status when they married their respective spouses, both of whom later became queens.

Although the WWF was set up to raise money to preserve the old order in South Africa by pushing population-reduction policies, it reportedly was not very successful until South African businessman Anton Rupert joined the board. Rupert was one of the richest men in South Africa, rivaled only by Harry Oppenheimer, the gold and diamond magnate. Rupert made his initial fortune in tobacco and alcohol. According to reports, Rupert came to the rescue of the WWF by coming up with the idea of the 1001 Club, which gathered together wealthy individuals who were expected to give substantive contributions.

An inordinately large proportion of the 1001 were South Africans. The percentage of South Africans, relative to its total white population, was higher than the percentage of any other country in the WWF. Of course, black Africans were not counted. The imperial cabal only counted them as an indicator for determining where populations were getting too large.

Rupert appointed an employee of his, Charles de Haes, as a personal assistant to Prince Bernhard, for WWF fundraising. After two years, de Haes was put in charge of the WWF, paid by Rupert.

The South African group in the WWF saw eye-to-eye with Princes Bernhard and Philip, agreeing that the “natives” should not be allowed to disturb the natural order by becoming “uppity” and thinking that they should have the right to industrialize their countries to provide for, and benefit from the growing population. Hence, the fixation of Prince Philip et al, on depopulation (see “In Their Own Words,” p.27).

PBMR Is the Only Option for a Future


South Africa is at the forefront of developing fourth-generation nuclear power plants for the 21st Century. With a 700-member team, PBMR has one of the largest nuclear reactor design teams in the world. This is a notable accomplishment, because the ability to design civil nuclear power reactors is not widespread.

Successful development of this technology has enormous implications for Africa and the rest of the world. Africa has about 15% of the world’s population, but only generates 4% of the world’s electricity. South Africa is about 75% electrified, but only 10% of the 700 million people on the continent have access to regular electricity. Presently, 90% of South Africa’s power is produced in coal burning plants.

The high energy flux-density of power that would be produced by the direct cycle gas-cooled PBMR reactors could provide the cheap power needed to develop South Africa and the rest of Africa.

It is critical to keep this project going. South Africa’s electrical power generation parastatal, Eskom, owns 41% of the project, the IDC owns 14%, and the South African government holds a 30% direct interest in the project. U.S.-based Westinghouse also has a 15% stake.

The PBMR project will run out of money next March. Therefore, PBMR is currently shifting the reactor design from a direct cycle, helium gas-turbine concept for direct production of electricity, to the more quickly marketable indirect, steam-turbine concept that



PBMR

Implementation of the cutting-edge technology represented by South Africa’s Pebble Bed Modular Reactor project (PBMR) would render unnecessary Prince Philip’s demand to cull what he calls “the human herd.” Shown here, a diagram of the fourth-generation South African PBMR reactor.

can generate electricity or be used for process-heat applications. This application would involve using the helium coolant gas that becomes super-heated, to create high temperature steam.

Because of rapidly growing interest from petrochemical groups and tar sands companies in applying the PBMR to activities requiring process heat, the pebble bed project is now busy modifying the PBMR design. PBMR’s Tom Ferreira said that “given the limited funding available, we are considering whether we could build a more versatile reactor that could do both electricity and process heat. The same basic machine for both applications.”

In this variation of the project, the gas is used to generate steam, which can be used for heavy oil recovery in oil sands; for reforming methane to produce hydrogen, ammonia, and methanol; water splitting; coal to liquids and coal to methane; and desalination. As a result, there are more commercial applications with this approach, rather than limiting it to direct production of electrical power. The PBMR project team hopes this will keep the project alive, despite the global financial collapse.

Destroying National Sovereignty: The Real Face of ‘Global Warming’

Lord Christopher Monckton, former science advisor to British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, was interviewed by Gregory Murphy, Associate Editor of 21st Century Science & Technology, on June 2, at the Heartland Institute’s Third International Conference on Climate Change in Washington, D.C.

Monckton is recognized as a leading spokesman against the global warming swindle as “genocidal.” He has special authority in stating this. His grandfather played a key role in arranging the 1936 abdication of that chief symbol of Britain’s Nazi-loving aristocracy, King Edward VIII, as part of the effort by anti-fascists to crush the Hitler project in Britain.

In March of this year, Monckton testified at two hearings on Capitol Hill, just days after the global warming lovefest organized by former British Prime Minister Tony Blair and Lord Nicholas Stern. At these hearings, Monckton presented testimony demonstrating that the effects of passing any climate change legislation that includes a cap-and-trade scheme for carbon emissions would be genocidal for the poor.

In the interview, one sees that, Monckton’s view of the “cabal,” as he calls the people behind the fascist global warming swindle, is limited. The interviewer’s view of this cabal is broader, which includes the financial oligarchy centered in the City of London and the self-confessed genocidalists Prince Philip and Prince Charles, along with their lap dog Al Gore.

Murphy: In the Senate and the House and on Capitol Hill, there’s a debate on the Cap and Trade Bill, known as the Waxman-Markey bill, which has devastating effects on rationing energy. What other effects will the bill have?

Monckton: The first effect is that this is the largest tax increase ever to be inflicted on a population in the history of the world. And it is also the most pointless and unnecessary tax increase. Winston Churchill used

to say that the only legitimate purpose of taxation is to raise revenue. But what has happened on the left in politics is that the left are now using taxation not only as an instrument of raising revenue, but as an instrument of policy, to try to make people behave in a way which the left thinks is desirable.

So they have decided that “global warming” as they used to call it, “climate change” as they began to call it, and “energy security” as the bill now calls it—and “absolute rubbish,” as I call it—is a problem that needs to be addressed by inflicting taxation on the entire population. However, it occurred to them, after I testified in front of them and told them so, that if they were to put up the cost of energy, then that cost would fall disproportionately on the very poorest taxpayers. Or even if they weren’t taxpayers, it would fall disproportionately on them, because energy costs form a far larger proportion of the household budget of poor people than of wealthier people.

And the first response I got when I said this to the committee was, “Why are you calling them ‘poor people’? We call them ‘low income families.’” And I said, “That means that they are poor, and if they are poor, we should say that they are poor, and we should do something about it, rather than making them poorer still. And I’m not here,” I said, “to bandy words about what is the politically correct phrase about somebody who is poor. Somebody who is poor is disadvantaged by not having enough money to live on.”

“And so, let’s call a spade a spade. This bill will in particular needlessly, pointlessly, extravagantly, hurt the poor.”

Now, of course, the Democrats eventually realized this. So they decided that they would use some of the revenue from taxing the richer purchasers to subsidize the poorer purchasers so that they can go on using energy. But of course, the moment that you do that, you undermine the purpose of the bill, which is to stop people from using lots of energy.



Lord Christopher Monckton

Raise the Standard of Living!

Murphy: In the past you've described the global warming scare, fraud, hoax—you've used numerous words to describe this—as a “genocidal” policy, similar to the policy of how AIDS was handled, or to the ban on DDT. Is that still your view?

Monckton: What we have here, is a faction in politics, and it's a worldwide faction, that really came out of the Marxist extreme left when the Berlin Wall collapsed, and found its new home in the environmental movement. And it got into the environmental movement and took it over. A friend of mine is one of the founders of Greenpeace, and he said, “All of us who are genuine environmentalists left after a year, because the Marxists moved in and took it over.”

So, what we have, is what I call the traffic light faction: the greens too yellow to admit that they're really red. And it's they who are trying to say to us that this climate scare is real, so that they can impose upon us measures that would drastically reduce the human population by direct intervention, if necessary.

But why does this fail, even if they are eventually granted the authoritarian powers that would be necessary to enforce the sterilization of the male population, or to enforce a one-child policy? These were policies that were tried, respectively, in India and China, and both have abjectly failed. The only way to prevent the population in the poorer countries (or the “lower-income countries”) from rising rapidly beyond the resources of that country being able to cope with them is

to raise the standard of living of the general population of these countries. Nothing else works.

This is perhaps the fundamental fact of demographics: that if you want to stabilize populations in poorer countries, you must raise their standard of living. Nothing else works whatsoever.

So, we come along and we say, even to China and India, and this is what the Democrats have been saying, “Either you agree that you will not ever burn CO₂ into the atmosphere at the rate we did, that you will keep yourselves poor, or we will impose protectionist trade sanctions upon you.” I heard the Democrats arguing this when I was testifying in front of them, and I told them what an extremely bad idea that was. And why it's a bad idea, is because even if protectionism worked—and, of course, it always, in fact, backfires on the person who tries to impose it—all it would do is to keep China, India, Russia, Indonesia, Brazil, and other large countries, poor. If it keeps them poor, their populations will continue to increase rapidly. If their populations continue to increase rapidly, their carbon footprints will increase rapidly in the long run, if not in the short, and probably even in the short.

So you will have achieved the precise opposite of what you say you're intending to do, and you will have a growing population, when the left's real aim is to reduce population. So what they are advocating at the economic and political level, simply doesn't work. And it works no better than their attempts to ban DDT, which led to the deaths of 40 million children in the poorer countries. A totally unnecessary ban. DDT is not dangerous! You can eat it by the tablespoonful—do you no harm at all. But they invented a scare that it causes cancer, which it does not. They invented a scare that it might thin the eggshells, which it does not—unless you happen to deprive the birds of calcium in their diet, before you do the measurement, which is how they got the bogus result they based it on.

So, we've seen these lies and manufacturing of data before. Same with HIV, where, as with any other fatal, incurable infection, it should have been treated as what's called a notifiable disease, carriers isolated immediately to protect the rest of the population. This was not done. The result? Twenty-five million dead, 40 million infected and going to die, and heaven knows how far the epidemic will continue to spread. In Washington, D.C., here, where we're speaking from, 3% of the population is now infected with HIV, and that means

Figure 1



Source: Science and Public Policy Institute's monthly CO₂ report for March 2009.

The arithmetic mean of the Hadley and NCDC (terrestrial surface) and RSS and UAH (satellite lower-troposphere) temperature anomalies shows global temperature falling at a rate equivalent to 2 C°/century for more than seven years. The IPCC's predicated path for global temperatures is shown by way of comparison.

that there's a good chance that Congressmen and Senators rubbing shoulders with cleaners and other basic labor inside Congress, some of them are going to get infected before very long, because the correct public health measure wasn't taken, because yet again, the left had a policy on this and the policy did not accord with scientific reality at any point.

So we've seen it with DDT—they acted against the science: 40 million killed. We've seen it with AIDS—they acted against the science: 25 million killed, 40 million infected and going to die. And already people are now dying, all over the world, of starvation, as a result of the biofuels scam which came out of the global warming scare and has taken, for instance, one third of all the agricultural land of the United States out of producing food, for people who need it. Now it's producing fuel for automobiles that don't.

In any view, whichever aspect of this scare you look at, the policies of the left are not just heroically stupid, but deeply damaging for the future of humankind, and particularly damaging for the very poorest.

The Goal Is World Government

Murphy: That is very true. What is coming out—you've identified the biofuels scam as hurting the poor with food starvation, which is listed as one of WHO's

top causes of death. Now, [UN Secretary-General] Kofi Annan has just issued a bizarre, bogus report stating that 300,000 people have died already as a result of global warming or climate change per year, and more deaths are possible. But the policies that he's advocating to solve this will kill *billions* of people, and will eclipse that, even if it were true.

Monckton: Let's look at this report. It's produced by the usual crowd of rent-seekers wanting to enhance the role of the UN as a world government. That's what is really behind this: It's world government that the left are after. And world government, of course, does not mean democratic government. It means autocratic government, rather like the EU writ large.

And this report they produced is plainly nonsense, and you can just look at one simple fact, and that is that for the last 15 years, as [MIT climatologist] Dick Lindzen is about to tell us, there has been no statistically significant global warming. For the last eight and a half years, there has actually been a trend of global cooling, and quite a rapid one. So, why is Kofi Annan coming along now, 15 years after the warming stopped—and, of course, the warming was pretty unremarkable even while it was happening; it was entirely within natural variability—but the warming stopped 15 years ago, and only now do they tell us that this warming was killing

people. It certainly can't have been killing people recently, because we've been having global cooling. And that one fact is enough to establish what complete nonsense this UN report is.

All it is, is another way of keeping this flagging, failing scare in the headlines between now and the Copenhagen Climate Summit organized by the UN for December 2009. And at that summit, they are hoping the first steps to turn the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change into a world government will be taken. They are not frankly particularly worried about whether they get a deal on who should cut global emissions by how much. It is not, and never was, about that. It is not and never was about the climate. As Vaclav Klaus, the president of the European Union at the moment, has rightly said, "It's not about climatology; it's about freedom."

They want to take our freedom away. They want to set up a world government which will tell the rest of us how to behave, and which will certainly not be subject to any democratic recall or accountability or constraint. And they will do this by saying that, of course, the peoples of the world if left to their own devices, would screw up the planet, because of the emissions of carbon dioxide. Therefore, to save you from yourselves, we are going to ask your government to hand over their sovereignty and their powers—of course in our democratic countries, their powers are peoples' powers—to unelected bureaucrats, technocrats, and dictators, so that they will govern us in the future.

That is what this is all about, and they have to be stopped, which is why I am here.

The Climate Can Look After Itself

Murphy: There was an interesting report that didn't get much play, that came from the Center for International Cooperation at New York University. This had different scenarios—in the one they were promoting, there would be no deal at Copenhagen; everything falls apart. And in another scenario, there *is* a deal at Copenhagen, but it falls apart. And then there's one where you agree over time to make emission cuts. But the key to the one they are pushing is that they want two things: One, to set up an IAEA-type of agency to govern all nations, willing or unwilling, on the carbon emissions, so your world government question is there. And, two, they want to use carbon credits as—and this is really wild and outlandish, but based on the credit crisis we're having right now, the eco-

nomie downturn, the breakdown crisis—they want to use carbon credits as the new currency, with the IMF as the clearing house, central bank for the world. This is just ridiculous.

Monckton: Well, no, it isn't ridiculous, you see. It's *dangerous*. That's what it really is. This is exactly the type of mechanism which those who are in the small cabal that is plotting all this are working on in order to bring about world government before anyone notices. That is why they're so very angry with us. Because what we're saying is that as far as the science is concerned, there is no basis for doing anything whatsoever about the climate, which has looked after itself for four and a half billion years and will continue to do so. Our perturbations of it are so small as to be entirely insignificant, so insignificant that they cannot hope to be distinguished from natural climate variability, as even NASA itself said the other day.

There is no basis scientifically for doing anything. *The correct policy to address a non-problem is to have the courage to do nothing.* However, they are not concerned with whether there is a problem or not. They merely wish to pretend that there is a problem, and try to do so with a straight face, for long enough to persuade, not the population, because we have no say in this, but the governing class in the various member-states of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change: That they should hand over their powers as government to the United Nations or to a new agency, or possibly just to the existing climate panel, merely restructured a bit. So that we would no longer be free to decide what our currency would be, or how much of it there should be, or what we could burn, or what we could do. These things would be dictated to us by the dictators at the center.

And this is an extremely dangerous moment, because it repudiates freedom, it repudiates democracy, it denies us both of those. It repudiates any form of justice. It is a kick in the teeth for the poor. It has no merit whatsoever except to enhance the wealth and the power of the governing elite, and that really what we're seeing here is a conspiracy of the governing class against the governed. And if the governed continues to be as passive, and acquiescent, and as unquestioning as too many of them are being in Europe (it's a little better in the States), then this faction is going to get its way, and when it gets its way, we shall realize that it's far too late for us to do anything to throw it into reverse.

South Korea Convinces Malaysia's Prime Minister To Go Nuclear

by Michael Billington

June 6—Malaysian Prime Minister Najib Tun Razak, who came into office only two months ago, has dropped a bombshell into the intense Malaysian political and economic debate over how to respond to the global economic breakdown. Following Najib's participation in the ASEAN-South Korea CEO Summit in South Korea May 31-June 1, and after private discussions with South Korean President Lee Myung-bak, Najib released a statement saying he was convinced that small nuclear reactors, generating 200-300,000 KW of power, should be part of Malaysia's energy policy. "Such a reactor is safe and can be set up near a municipality. Forty percent of the power in South Korea is generated by these reactors," he said, noting that they cost only one-third as much as a coal-powered station.

As is customary these days, although no less absurd therefore, the Prime Minister's call for Malaysia to go nuclear was dressed in the garb of green technology, noting that there is no carbon emission from nuclear plants. Although true, it feeds into the scientific fraud that CO₂ is a pollutant, causing a (non-existent) rise in global temperatures. As part of the Summit, the Seoul government hosted a "Green Growth, Green Asia" exhibition, promoting so-called green technologies, including solar panels and giant windmills, which consume more energy to mine, manufacture, maintain, and dispose of than they produce in their short lifetimes.

But the Koreans have attempted to judo the green technology hype by focusing on nuclear power as the best green energy source, countering the hysterical anti-nuclear prejudices of most advocates of the climate change hoax. Not only does South Korea produce over 40% of its electricity with nuclear power, but it is rightfully proud of the fact that its early decision to use nuclear energy was the key to its development as a modern industrial nation, with one of the highest standards of living in Asia.

An official from the Blue House (residence of the President) in Seoul, who helped escort the ten heads of state of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) through the exhibition, reported that nearly every leader was fascinated by the small nuclear reactors. Other Korean technological innovations which were of great interest included a membrane used for water purification and desalination.

President Lee, the former CEO of Hyundai Engineering and Construction, has, over many decades, established close relations with leaders in Southeast Asia as an advisor on infrastructure development. He oversaw the construction of the Penang Bridge in Malaysia in the 1980s, and has been a close associate of Malaysia's then-Prime Minister, Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, ever since. In Cambodia, Lee has been an advisor to Prime Minister Hun Sen for ten years, and Korea has been the leading investor in Cambodia's reconstruction.

A Raging Debate

Prime Minister Najib's surprise declaration for nuclear power intersected a raging debate within Malaysia on this issue, spurred to a great extent by friends of Lyndon LaRouche, in collaboration with the nuclear scientist community in Malaysia, trained several decades ago during the U.S. Atoms for Peace era. Mohd Peter Davis, a scientist at Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), who also represents the LaRouche movement in that country, has been a persistent advocate of Malaysia's taking the lead in nuclear power development and other new technologies, among developing nations.

Over the last year, as Najib prepared to take over as Prime Minister in April 2009, there was a noticeable shift in the coverage of the nuclear issue in the nation's press. For the first time, letters from Davis regarding nuclear power and other issues were printed in the leading papers, and he was interviewed as a nuclear advo-



U.S. Department of Defense/Helene C. Stikkel
Malaysian Prime Minister Najib Tun Razak's surprise declaration of support for nuclear power intersected a raging national debate on this issue.



Creative Commons/Henrik Hansson
South Korean President Lee Myung-bak met privately with the Malaysian Prime Minister in Seoul, and played a key role in convincing the latter to "go nuclear."

cate, answering the lies and confusion peddled by the dupes of the British anti-science campaigns led by Prince Philip's Worldwide Fund for Nature, whose colonial intention is to collapse world population under the forced-backwardness policies of the British Empire. Davis also collaborated with the Malaysia Nuclear Society in sponsoring events and rallying experts to engage the public in a dialogue aimed at refuting the lies about nuclear power.

Dr. Kim in Kuala Lumpur

Then, last month, a visitor from South Korea arrived in Kuala Lumpur for a series of lectures on college campuses. Dr. Jong H. Kim, from the Korean Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST), explained the crucial role of nuclear power in the transformation of South Korea after the devastation of the Korean War. Mohd Peter Davis's son Danny, a first-year physics student at UPM, attended the event and was inspired by the clear evidence that nuclear power was not only safe, but essential to meet the needs of current and future generations. He wrote a report on the event to submit to the newspapers.

Unfortunately, Dr. Mahathir, who, as Prime Minister, stood up against the financial imperial powers on behalf of his country, and the developing nations generally, during the 1997-98 speculative assault on the Asian economies, posted an anti-nuclear declaration on his

blog, the most widely read blog in the country. Danny Davis decided to use his report as a response to Mahathir; it read in part: "As a student studying physics at UPM who grew up to admire your Vision 2020 [a plan for Malaysia to be a modern industrial nation by 2020], I am very disappointed that such a good leader for Malaysia and developing countries has swallowed the unscientific anti-nuclear propaganda pushed by the green environmental movement. I have become convinced for some time that a Nuclear Malaysia is the way to achieve Vision 2020 and beyond."

He detailed Dr. Kim's story about South Korea's nuclear-driven rise from backwardness, adding: "I came away from the talk convinced that South Korea's 50-year peaceful nuclear program is the very best example for Malaysia to follow. If South Korea can be recognized not only as a major economic power, but a major nuclear power producer, isn't it time we make more of a name for ourselves than merely rubber, palm oil, and the Petronas Twin Towers? Our Asian neighbors have done it. Vision 2020 is only 11 years away. What are we waiting for?"

—Muhammed Daniel"

Apparently, Najib came away from his Korean trip with the same inspired vision, which the nation is now primed to implement. Najib also discussed with President Lee the potential for sending Malaysian youth to Korea to be trained in the necessary technologies.

Meanwhile, Dr. Nahrul Khair Alang Md Rashid, the head of the Malaysia Nuclear Society, is sponsoring a debate on Aug. 6 between nuclear scientists and the anti-nuke fringe, and has agreed to include students as participants on both sides. Danny Davis has been invited.

With Malaysia again asserting international leadership for a defense of the sovereign nation-state against the Empire, the other nations of Southeast Asia which are seriously considering nuclear power, as well as other developing nations, will have a model and a supporter in their efforts to achieve sovereignty and energy independence through nuclear power. While this will not solve the global economic crisis, without a global nuclear renaissance, escape from the impending new dark age will be impossible.

mobeir@aol.com

LaRouche Calls for U.S. Direct Dialogue

June 6—Lyndon LaRouche called this week for the Obama Administration to engage in direct diplomacy with North Korea, to avoid a needless confrontation. He observed that it is known that North Korea is in some phase of a leadership succession process, and is also facing famine and other forms of economic catastrophe.

“The challenge is to get them to open up, and for the U.S. to find out what the story is. A high-level Presidential emissary should go to Pyongyang and meet with their top leadership. Ask them: ‘What is your problem? Maybe we can help.’ In short, we need to engage in actual diplomacy,” LaRouche explained.

“Diplomacy is all about getting the other side to tell you what they want. This is especially important, when you have a relationship between a great power and a lesser power. Very often, aggressive behavior by a lesser power is aimed at getting help in solving a problem. So, the key to good diplomacy, under such circumstances, is to be generous. This will help you in the long run.”

The second nuclear bomb test carried out by North Korea on May 24 has provoked a quandary among the other members of the Six-Party Talks—the U.S., Japan, China, Russia and South Korea. While the Obama Administration is calling for a strong response, there is wide recognition that new sanctions will have no more effect than past sanctions in convincing Pyongyang to give up its nuclear weapons program. China and Russia, although they agree that the Korean Peninsula should be free of nuclear weapons, consider sanctions a fruitless and provocative exercise, especially as long as North Korea has legitimate security concerns. Negotiations in New York for a UN resolution are stalled, while a high-level U.S. team is touring Japan, South Korea, China, and Russia in an attempt to win agreement on sanctions, and lay plans for longer term contingencies.

North Korean strongman Kim Jong-il, who has been in failing health since his stroke in August, is thought by South Korean intelligence to have turned to the hard-

liners in the defense establishment, needing their support to assure his choice of a successor, and to deal with the economic crisis. Several top officials were purged who had been responsible for the growing collaboration with the South during the last two South Korean administrations; and in May, Pyongyang cancelled the contracts with the 100 South Korean firms with factories in the North Korean town of Kaesong, demanding higher pay and other concessions for the 38,000 North Koreans who work there.

Pyongyang also accused the South Korean government of President Lee Myung-bak of declaring war on the North by joining the Proliferation Security Initiative, in reaction to the second nuclear test. The PSI, a creation of neocon John Bolton during his days as U.S. ambassador to the UN, was designed to justify searching North Korean ships suspected of transporting nuclear weapons. Seoul refused to join at the time, but has now reversed that decision, reportedly under U.S. pressure.

The Problem Is Globalization

This is the environment of heightened danger of confrontation in which LaRouche has issued his call for direct dialogue. He elaborated on his call, in order to place the issue in the context of the global crisis, citing the problem that has become more pronounced, globally, in the post-Soviet era. “Under the globalization system,” he said, “most governments around the world, including that of Russia today, have gotten so obsessed with moneymaking, that they fail to implement policies that actually improve the productivity of their economies, that ensure actual economic development. In Russia, just to cite that as an example, you have a priority on raw material extraction, especially oil and gas, for monetary gain. There is no real investment in infrastructure, in high-technology industry, in scientific education. The world is gripped by Adam Smith British ideology. That is the sin of globalization. Either you destroy globalization, and put productivity and development over quick-fix monetary profit, or global civilization is going to be destroyed—very soon.”

LaRouche concluded, “Most conflicts in the world today stem from this disease. Everybody is behaving idiotically. Why not focus on the real enemy: unemployment and hunger? With that as a starting point, and with patient American diplomacy, we can solve this North Korea situation, relatively easily.”

Vitrenko Presents LaRouche's Record

by Rachel Douglas

May 28—Speaking at an April 24-25 conference in Kiev, titled “The Council of Slavic Peoples of Belarus, Russia and Ukraine,” Progressive Socialist Party of Ukraine leader Natalia Vitrenko made her latest presentation featuring Lyndon LaRouche. Vitrenko, a doctor of economics, was co-initiator with Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche, in 1997, of the international movement for a New Bretton Woods conference. She campaigned for the Ukrainian Presidency in 2000 under a poster showing herself explaining the Triple Curve, LaRouche’s pedagogical demonstration of the systemic crisis. She has continued to brief people throughout Ukraine, as well as in Russia and Belarus, on how LaRouche’s forecast came true. Such a briefing was included in her recent DVD, “Save Ukraine and Rebuild the World.”

At the Kiev conference, Vitrenko said: “Let’s get back to economics. The whole point is that cranking up financial speculation, through the liberal economic model, lawfully led to its complete and fundamental collapse. The well-known American economic scientist Lyndon LaRouche warned about this, very convincingly, already 15 years ago. And the crisis arrived, in June 2007! Under economic and financial globalization, with the U.S. dollar functioning as the world reserve currency, naturally the crisis became global. If we look at the monstrous dimensions of the currency bubbles, the so-called derivatives, i.e., the volume of financial speculation in the world (and it’s estimated at \$1.4 quadrillion!), it is absolutely clear that mankind will not survive, without radical surgery.”

Vitrenko paid lip service to Joseph Stiglitz’s heavily publicized UN Commission on the Global Crisis, but then she returned to LaRouche: “LaRouche poses the objective in a tougher form: not to reform the institu-

tions of an already bankrupt international financial system (the IMF and others), but to get rid of them. In a March 16, 2009 statement [“It Should Be G20 Minus 1—Without the British Empire!”], LaRouche said: ‘Any reforms based on looking for agreement with the existing institutions, with the British Empire’s monetarist system, will be a disaster. Eliminate the monetary system. Go with a credit system, for long-term investment projects in infrastructure. Eliminate the monetarist characteristics of the world system.’

“LaRouche insists that an emergency has to be declared in the U.S.A., that the Federal Reserve System has to be declared bankrupt, and that President Obama should take control of the banking system, force the banks through bankruptcy, and direct the credit resources of the Federal government only into the traditional types of commercial banks, in order to build industrial and public infrastructure.”

While many figures in Eurasia have embraced the George Soros agenda of “reforming” the IMF and using its special drawing rights as a stepping stone to a supranational currency, Vitrenko went after the failure of the G20 London summit in April: “It is not only a U.S. problem,” she said, “it is a problem for all mankind. But, alas, the G20 summit which took place in London in April 2009 did not identify these problems and did not solve them. On the contrary, it was decided there to reinforce the IMF and increase its resources by \$500 billion.”

The conference where Vitrenko made this presentation was attended by leading Russian figures such as Academician Sergei Glazyev, now secretary of the Customs Union of the Eurasian Economic Community (EurAsEC), and Gen. Leonid Ivashov (ret.), formerly head of the foreign relations department of the Russian Ministry of Defense.

High-profile coverage of LaRouche’s strategic initiatives continues through other sources in Ukraine, as well, in the wake of his representatives speaking at a conference on “Physical Economy” at the Kyiv National Economic University (KNEU) on April 9. In the May issue of the KNEU newspaper *Ekonomist*, economist Lyudmila Vorobyova reported on that conference. Included in her article was a full Ukrainian translation of LaRouche’s message of greeting to the conference, titled “Science and Society Now.” (See *EIR*, May 1, 2009.)



Natalia Vitrenko

International Intelligence

Pasteur Institute: Universal Vaccination Needed vs. H1N1

June 5—Interviewed by *Le Figaro* yesterday, Prof. Sylvie Van der Werf, who heads a research unit of the French Pasteur Institute, confirmed that France is preparing to vaccinate its entire population against the (A)H1N1 flu. Van der Werf stresses the unconventional behavior of the new influenza virus, which usually spreads in Fall and Winter. The current virus is spreading in the United States and Canada, while these countries are in Spring and early Summer. We're not in normal conditions of virus transmission, she says.

Another anomaly: Normally a new influenza virus substitutes itself for the virus of the seasonal flu. This is not taking place now. We're in an entirely new situation. It cannot be excluded that the virus will start circulating at an unusual time period.

Therefore, vaccination of everyone has to be undertaken—the sooner the better.

Was Air France 447 Crash Caused by an Explosion?

June 6—After having consulted a number of airline pilots and other competent sources, the LaRouche-affiliated political party in France, Solidarity and Progress, has come to the conclusion that only an explosion could be responsible for the destruction of Air France Flight 447, traveling from Rio de Janeiro to Paris, overnight May 31-June 1.

All other hypotheses raised to account for the crash have been eliminated at this point:

1. Air France's first hypothesis, that the airplane was struck by lightning, is the weakest, since airlines and pilots are prepared to deal with this eventuality, as a matter of routine;

2. The hypothesis of exceptionally bad meteorological conditions is also to

be discarded. Three Lufthansa pilots travelling from São Paulo to Frankfurt, who crossed the same area half an hour before, declared that there was nothing special about the meteorological conditions in the area.

3. The hypothesis that a large hail stone destroyed the windshield of the cockpit is virtually impossible at an altitude of 11,000 meters.

4. The hypothesis of a computer bug in the automatic pilot system and other such key functions was also raised. Such malfunctions, however, could not have kept the pilots or assistants from communicating in some way.

Having eliminated all other hypotheses, only that of an explosion remains. According to most pilots consulted and other competent sources, "nothing, except an explosion, explains the fact that the pilots or assistants were not able to say anything." "A small package of explosives placed under the cockpit could have done the job," stated one of those sources.

The Tragedy of MacBroom Now in Its Final Act

June 5—The "tragedy of MacBroom" is entering its final act, and the British population does not know whether to laugh or cry, states the leading commentary in the London *Daily Telegraph* today. ("Broom" is the Scottish pronunciation of Brown.) British Prime Minister Gordon Brown, who is refusing to yield power, has fallen out with his former friend "Banquo" (Treasury Minister Alastair Darling), who is refusing to leave the stage; former Home Secretary Jacqui Smith is wandering about lamenting expense claims which cannot be undone; and even the supernatural powers of the "three witches"—Lord Mandelson, Alastair Campbell, and his (ousted) aide Damian MacBride—can do nothing to avert disaster.

But the tragedy goes way beyond the fate of Gordon Brown, whose Labour Party suffered nasty losses in yesterday's local elections. Labour came in in third

place, just managing to stay ahead of the smaller parties. However, the Tories' 38% share of the vote was "not as high as expected," even the pro-Tory *Telegraph* had to admit. Labour got just 23%, a historic low, below the Liberal Democrats 28%, and has lost about as many local council seats as the Tories won.

As Birnam Wood approaches, more ministers are fleeing. Brown announced his planned cabinet reshuffle today, not even waiting for the results of the European Parliament elections, which will be announced June 8.

Putin Orders Back Pay for Russia's Desperate Workers

June 4—Dramatic protests by hundreds of unpaid industrial workers in the northwest Russian town of Pikalevo, brought Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin there today, where he asserted that the workers' back wages of 41,240,000 rubles (\$1.3 million) had to be paid immediately, Novosti reported. On June 2, up to 500 workers began blocking the highway near the town, some 200 km from St. Petersburg—where the "Russian Davos" on world financial policy began today—and caused a 300 km traffic jam. On May 22, hundreds of workers, many of whom cannot afford food, had stormed into the emergency meeting at a local administration building to demand payment.

Pikalevo, which has 22,000 residents, is a "monogorod," a Soviet-era city dependent upon one industry—a plant which produced alumina, a compound used both to smelt aluminum and to produce ceramics. This plant used to be an industrial leader in all of Russia. The price for alumina has crashed, and this factory, and the adjoining cement and potash plants, shut down late last year. Since then, workers have received nothing, and have been reduced to living on nettle soup and dandelion leaves, *Russia Today* reported.

Putin announced that the plants will resume operations, whether or not their owners agree.

A Scary Strategic Assessment

As we were finishing this magazine, on June 6, Lyndon LaRouche issued a breaking strategic assessment, which we summarize here. (The full statement can be found at www.larouchepac.com.)

First, he reported that “the information from Europe, from experts ... is that what happened with the Air France Flight 447, as far as anyone can tell now, ... is that one of two things could have brought down the plane, in a pattern of the type which has been presented to us. Both involve an explosion underneath the cockpit, in the nose of the aircraft. Such an explosion would have neutralized all control of the electronics for the pilot, and the plane would have gone out of control....

“That is what the best guess of the experts is, and there’s no information available which points in any contrary direction....

“The problem is now, apparently, that this is a hot potato, and we’re in a period in which no government in any part of the world is presently prepared to face reality. And among those who are least prepared to face reality, is the present government of the United States, because we have a lunatic in the cockpit of the U.S. Presidency. And that’s the other problem.

“Now, the other side of this case is, we’re talking about the incompetence of various economists, groups of economists, and the incompetence of governments, to deal with the present world, on-rushing general breakdown crisis, of both the present monetary system of the world, but also a breakdown of the physical economic systems of the world, as a by-product of the breakdown of the monetary system.

“Now, if something happened, such as Russia pressuring China to break with the dollar, and if China agreed, *you would have an immediate breakdown of the functioning of the U.S. Federal and state governments!* And, of course, a catas-

trophe throughout Europe....

“Now, let’s assume the case, that China ... were to agree, under the strain of U.S. current pressure, and European pressure at the same time, to cancel its relationship to the dollar, ... you would have an instant disintegration of the U.S. government, and the entire system of government.

“Now: This comes into the next point. There is no one in a position now, to deal with this problem, unless I’m on deck and directing it. *I know how to deal with this problem, as I’ve specified.* None of the current actors, controlling the U.S. financial-economic management policy, is competent. There are competent people in the wings in the U.S. government. But they’re not in charge, they’re not shaping policy. We have a similar situation, even worse in some respects, in Western and Central Europe. Western and Central Europe is in a process of *self-inflicted disintegration*, under the present euro system....

“If the China break occurs, then the whole world system is going down, and it comes down to who’s sitting on top of the policy-shaping under emergency conditions in Washington. And I’m afraid, that without my being in a kind of super-cargo position, to steer these guys *through what they don’t know how to do*, I don’t think the United States will survive.

So, while people are worried about a lot of things, ... we’re the only ones on the scene, with my know-how, who know how to steer, advise and steer leading circles in the United States to deal successfully with this crisis. And of course, the first thing would be, to *scrap the whole Obama health-care program: scrap it, entirely!* No Hitler policies in the United States!”

Then, we must put through the Four Power agreement for a new credit system—under LaRouche’s direction.

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

NORTH CAROLINA

- HICKORY CH Ch.6: Tue 10 pm
- MECKLENBURG COUNTY TW Ch.22: Sat/Sun 11 pm

OHIO

- AMHERST TW Ch.95: 3X Daily
- CUYAHOGA COUNTY TW Ch.21: Wed 3:30 pm
- OBERLIN Cable Co-Op Ch.9: Thu 8 pm

OKLAHOMA

- NORMAN CX Ch.20: Wed 9 pm

PENNSYLVANIA

- PITTSBURGH CC Ch.21: Thu 6 am

RHODE ISLAND

- 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

TEXAS

- 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

VERMONT

- 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

VIRGINIA

- 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

WASHINGTON

- 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

WISCONSIN

- MARATHON CH Ch.10: Thu 9:30 pm; Fri 12 Noon
- MUSKEGO TW Ch.14: Sat 4 pm; Sun 7 am

WYOMING

- 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 _____