

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

July 29, 2011 Vol. 38, No. 29

www.larouche.com \$10.00

LaRouche Warns of New Drive for Dictatorship
Banks Dictate Bailout Policy to EU Summit
Terrorists, Bankers Keep Asia Drug Boom Going

**LaRouche Webcast: Obama
Goes or the U.S.A. Goes!**



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: *Gerardo Castilleja Chávez*

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: eirns@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., 709-A 8th St. SE, Washington, D.C. 20003. (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: 514-461-1557

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 City: EIR, Ave Morelos #60-A, Col Barrio de San Andres, Del. Azcapotzalco, CP 02240, Mexico, DF. Tel: 5318-2301, 1163-9734, 1163-9735.

Copyright: ©2011 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

As we finish this week's issue, everyone seems fixated on the Great Debt Ceiling Debate. Will they or won't they reach a deal by the Aug. 2 deadline? Will the Democrats or the Republicans look better? What happens if the United States defaults on its debt? What will happen to *my money*?!

Lyndon LaRouche's webcast, which we publish in full (watch it at <http://www.larouchepac.com>), makes mincemeat out of all that, along with not a few other stupid fixations. What is all this debt, really? "Gambling debts!" he said. "There's no value in this stuff! . . . When we do what I want to do, cancel that crap!—we'll bankrupt the whole system, and we get back to an even deal. Because we then base everything on a credit system. We cancel everything that way. How do we do it? Glass-Steagall! Glass-Steagall, which says, only the commercial debts and equivalent debts, are guaranteed by the Federal Treasury, under law. The other stuff, the crap, goes to the gambling institution which is called Wall Street."

The whole idea of a "debt ceiling" is a fraud in the first place. Does the Constitution say there should be a debt ceiling? Did Alexander Hamilton construct the first government of the United States with a debt ceiling? No! He built a credit system, which is what the Constitution allows and what LaRouche wants to reinstate. It will work, and it's the only thing that will work.

LaRouche surprised quite a few people when he said, before the webcast, that it was going to be on the Second Law of Thermodynamics. "Are people going to understand it?" Well, if they didn't understand it at the beginning of the presentation, they did by the end. LaRouche tied it all up in a package with the genocidal green movement, Prince Philip, and the crew that runs Wall Street and the City of London. "People who believe in windmills are stupid or liars!" If you believe in *entropy*, you're insane!


LaRouche was uncompromising in his insistence that the whole bankrupt system is coming down, and that Barack Obama must be impeached, or else the nation has no future. There is no "Plan B."

Elsewhere in this issue, Helga Zepp-LaRouche brings us up to date on the financial crisis, from her vantage point in Europe, and Jeffrey Steinberg reports LaRouche's analysis of the recent terrorist outbreaks: a new "Reichstag Fire," like 9/11.



Cover This Week

Lyndon LaRouche addresses a webcast audience on July 21.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

4 LaRouche Webcast: Either Obama Goes or the U.S.A. Goes!

In his July 21 webcast, Lyndon LaRouche presented a clear set of marching orders for the immediate days ahead: Number one, Obama must go, by impeachment or other constitutional means; number two, the “Second Law of Thermodynamics” is a fraud, and must be abolished, if humanity is to survive this crisis; number three, the so-called “environmentalist” movement is a scientific hoax, promoted by the British Empire. The “Green” ideology must be replaced with a commitment to vastly increase the energy flux-density of the physical economy; number four, the casino economy must go, and Glass-Steagall be reinstated.

15 Dialogue with LaRouche

During the discussion period, LaRouche addressed a wide range of questions, from the marriage of science and art in the Pazzi Chapel in Florence, to the courage of the World War II generation. We print the full transcript.

National

35 LaRouche Warns of ‘Reichstag Fire’ Drive for Dictatorship

As he had in January 2001, presaging the 9/11 events, Lyndon LaRouche, on July 23, issued a warning about a new drive for dictatorship, emanating from the London-Wall Street financial oligarchy, which now faces imminent doom. Today, President Obama’s London controllers are far more desperate, and are moving for dictatorship in the United States and Europe.

37 Glass-Steagall Juggernaut Becoming Unstoppable

International

40 Banks Dictate Bailout Policy to EU Summit

By Helga Zepp-LaRouche.
Agreements reached at the July 21 EU Summit are a threat to Germany's fundamental character as a democratic and social state, as defined in its Basic Law. Should the Bundestag approve the EU decisions, as expected, then all Germans have the constitutional right to resist, because no other remedy remains.

43 1 Million Afghan Addicts: Cash-Starved Bankers and Terrorists Keep Asia Narcotics Boom Going

Our New Delhi correspondent Ramtanu Maitra reviews the latest UN Office on Drugs and Crime report, which concludes that worldwide drug production and consumption have stabilized. Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth, as globalization and hot-money flows are opening up new consumer markets among the producer countries.

49 In Memoriam: Tibor Kovats—Patriot and World Citizen

Helga Zepp-LaRouche remembers this great soul and friend of the LaRouche movement.

Editorial

50 The Courage Deficit

LAROUCHE WEBCAST

Either Obama Goes Or the U.S.A. Goes!

Lyndon LaRouche delivered this webcast address from Northern Virginia on July 21, 2011. LaRouche's national spokeswoman Debra Freeman was the moderator. (The entire [webcast](http://www.larouchepac.com/webcasts/20110721.html) is archived at <http://www.larouchepac.com/webcasts/20110721.html>.)

Debra Freeman: Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'd like to welcome you to today's webcast on behalf of LaRouchePAC. My name is Debra Freeman and I'm Mr. LaRouche's national spokeswoman. In beginning today's event, I think that it would be irresponsible not to take note of the fact that this is a sad day for the United States. At approximately 5:57 this morning, the Space Shuttle *Atlantis* landed at Cape Kennedy, and although it was a safe, and in fact, perfect landing, and that's something that we are grateful for—we're happy that the astronauts came back safely—it is also the case that that landing had, really, the nature of a funeral, because it was the end of not only the 30-year mission of the Space Shuttle itself, but thanks to Barack Obama, if he were to have his way, it would mean the end of manned spaceflights on the part of the United States.

Now, if you don't like that—I know I don't like it—if you don't like that, then I suggest you listen very carefully to what Mr. LaRouche has to say today. Because, what I know he will do, is give you a *very clear* road map, as to what you can do about it. Because, while it's appropriate to be momentarily sad at this event, the fact is, that there is a solution to it. And the solution lies


in removing Barack Obama from the Presidency, and beginning to impose the kinds of solutions that can restore our nation, and in fact, restore our species to its rightful mission on this planet.

So, without further ado, Ladies and Gentlemen, I bring you Lyndon LaRouche.

Lyndon LaRouche: Thank you.

We are now, as we have been doing in the previous two days—we're going to take on the essential fraud of a President who is not a President, who is some kind of freak: Barack Obama. If we don't get Barack Obama out of office very soon—and there are three ways to get him out: One, he runs scared, in order not to go to prison, like Nixon did. Number two, he's kicked out of office by Section 4, of the 25th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. And in that case, he goes that way. The other way is a straight impeachment.

If this bum is not out of office, you're not going to have a United States. So there is no basis for tolerating this President in the office of President now! The problem is, the issue is not made clear because we have a bunch of cowardly generations. Not my generation; my generation is World War II. I'm one of the last survivors, or active survivors of that period. And other generations, generally, are cowards: They will never tell the truth. They will always mix things up and say, "Well, maybe it could be this," or that sort of talk. As a result of that kind of talk, if no decision is made, which would



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

“The elimination of Obama from the Presidency is the absolute precondition for the survival of the United States, and generally for the human race,” LaRouche declared.

save this nation from extinction, *we’re close to the end, now!* You’re talking about September-October; you’re talking about an already dead nation if no change of this type is made.

So what we are going to do today, as we’ve been doing in sessions earlier this week, on Tuesday evening—and that’s recorded in an audio version; what we said yesterday, on the Wednesday program which we ran, which was a scientific presentation, with some special features included; what we’re going to say today, is recast that whole picture in essentials [[June 20 LPAC-TV Weekly Report](http://www.larouchepac.com/node/18831) (<http://www.larouchepac.com/node/18831>)]. The elimination of Obama from the Presidency, is the absolute precondition for the survival of the United States and generally for the human race.

Because if he is allowed to remain in office, the chain-reaction effect throughout the world will mean the greatest kill of human beings in all known history today. If you want to be exterminated, keep him in office, permit him to remain in office. The man is purely evil. Everything he represents is a *lie!*

The problem is, there are many other liars. They call themselves “scientists.” They specialize in *lies*. I shall deal with that.


The Oligarchical Principle: the Second Law of Thermodynamics

Okay, the key issue here is that people have adopted a policy called a Second Law of Thermodynamics. The Second Law of Thermodynamics is a complete fraud. There is absolutely no truth to it. Now, this is easily demonstrated, actually, scientifically. There’s no doubt. Anybody who believes in the Second Law of Thermodynamics is mentally ill, whether they know it or not, whether they did it deliberately or not. Because the known organization of the universe is against that assumption for a Second Law of Thermodynamics. But this is used as a way of destroying humanity.

I’ll get to exactly what that means, but first of all, let’s take the issue itself. The Second Law of Thermodynamics presumes, that there’s a barrier in the universe, such that there’s always a deterioration in terms of the potential population-density of the people of the planet. That is an absolute lie! Anybody who believes in the Second Law of Thermodynamics: They flunk science—or science flunked them—one of the two.

There is no basis for tolerating, or proving, or permitting the fraudulent Second Law of Thermodynamics being introduced as a policy-maker inside the United States or Europe, or elsewhere, but the United States, in particular. But that is the argument which is used for the so-called—what do you call it? You call it anything dirty—that’s what it is. But it’s the so-called Second Law of Thermodynamics which is behind the so-called Green movement.

The Green movement is designed by certain people, and has been designed over many centuries, millennia even, *to kill people*. The motive for the killing is called the oligarchical principle. The key example of that officially in European history, is located in the period of



There is no Second law of Thermodynamics! LaRouche emphasized: Over the course of the evolution of life on Earth—the past billion years, or so—there have been periodic mass-kills of plant and animal life, in which some species are eliminated, but others emerge which are of a **higher order**. “This is the principle. The universe is **anti-entropic**.” Shown: Sky Shields and Alicia Cerretani, in the LPAC-TV video, “[Evolutionary Potential](http://www.larouchepac.com/node/17607).” www.larouchepac.com/node/17607

LPAC-TV

the reign of King Philip of Macedon. Philip, during his reign, made an agreement with the Persian Empire. That agreement was the agreement to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, in effect: It’s called the oligarchical principle. The argument was that the oligarchical class must rule the world, and that the people who are not in the oligarchical class will be classed as cattle, or some kind of animal. They will be reduced in numbers, they will be kept stupid, they will be prohibited from having access to scientific and related knowledge. The population will be regulated, accordingly, to fit what you can accommodate with a certain low level of technology, how large a population of the slaves can you maintain.

The point is, if you increase the productivity of the slaves, through scientific or similar kinds of progress, then they will take over! If they’re numerous and skilled, they will take over. Then what happens to the oligarchy?

It was this agreement, that’s called the oligarchical principle. And the history of European civilization since that time, actually, also since earlier times, had been based on that concept of the oligarchical principle.

The typical example of this, is the monetary system: If you believe in monetarism, you are believing in that principle, the oligarchical principle. It’s a lie! The lie is the Second Law of Thermodynamics in modern times. Anybody who believes in an attritional principle is actually stupid in science. Any scientist who approves it is either a liar, or just plain ignorant, or stupid.

Because, the evidence before us demonstrates that that is a *lie!* The policy that is driving the Obama Administration is a mass-murderous policy which is a *lie!* Everything in the policy is a lie. Anybody who recites it, with a university education, they’re a liar! Maybe they’re stupid—that’s probably their escape clause.

That’s what the danger is. You have it now—it’s clear. Prince Philip of England said 2 billion people is the maximum allowed, before! Now, they’ve reduced it to *1 billion people* that are allowed to live. The rest of you are going to be killed, because you’ve got to fit a policy of world population of 1 billion people or less.

The British Empire Is the Enemy of Humanity

You are supporting Obama? Who are you going to eat? Who are you going to kill? What about the people called professors, scientists, experts, who support this policy? They’re worse than Hitler, far worse than Hitler. Hitler was a junior league type, with this crowd.

Who is this? Who’s behind it? The British Empire, the Queen of England! The President of the United States, right now, is an enemy of all humanity. He’s a bigger enemy of humanity than Adolf Hitler was. If you support his policy, the Green policy, you are supporting a Hitler policy against yourself.

Now, this has been going on for a long time. Look at Africa: Africa is an area of *permanent cannibalism by the British* and others. And you support this policy? You tolerate this policy? You support a member of the Senate, or a member of the House of Representatives,

who supports this policy? Aren't you a mass-murderer, an accomplice in mass-murder against probably yourself and your neighbors.

This is a lie! There's no truth to it! What's the truth? Well, it happens, for the past, approaching a billion years or so, there has been a study of life on Earth, all kinds of life; the evolution of life, development of life-forms, so forth. And this process, of change in the nature of species existing on the planet, the change in the size of the population of animals, various kinds of vegetation and so forth, and human beings—and human beings have only been around for a few million years of all this period.

But throughout this period, there have been periodic mass-kills, of species of society, or plant life, animal life, and so forth—mass kills. But, every mass kill is associated with the elimination of some species, but the emergence of species which are of a *higher order* than those which are killed. This is the principle. The universe is *anti-entropic*. There is no Second Law of Thermodynamics. There's only an *evil lie*.

That's the record.

For example, we have the delightful myth about the people living in the so-called Stone Age, or the ancient Stone Age, the great kills. But when they were killed, these animals which were killed were very inefficient animals relative to what replaced them later on. It wasn't one species for another, that replaced the other. It was a general increase in what we call the energy-flux density of the human and other species, plant species, other things, a constant increase of progress to higher forms of life, with greater power than the species that had died out.

Now, in all these cases, the changeover, from a lower level of life existence, to a higher form, has usually depended upon a change in species. The inferior species died out, but they were replaced, not one for one, but in terms of total variety, they were replaced by higher orders of species, more developed, more productive. A



EIRNS/James Rea

“The Green movement, if allowed to exist, will destroy much of the human race, and send it backward,” LaRouche stated. “Anybody who supports the Green movement, is, in effect, either clinically insane or a criminal.” Shown: Greenie demo against nuclear power in Berlin, Germany, May 2011. The sign says “F—k the Nuclear Companies.”

general increase in the energy-flux density of living processes on this planet! Not only are the species improved, in net effect, but the energy-flux density represented by this change is always continued. There has never been a period, that corresponds to the idea of environmentalism.

All environmentalism is a lie! It's a vicious lie whose consequence, when applied, is genocide.

Now, Africa is typically an area of genocide. Who practices genocide in Africa? Well, first of all the British. They are the principal means there of genocide. Who else does it? Well, others do it, the people who own Africa, who control the population, who control their conditions of life; who prevent the development of water systems, all of these kinds of things. *There is deliberate genocide against Africa!*

The Green Movement Is a Crime of the Monetarist System

And the particular significance of this, is the fact that they are now bringing it to you, in Europe, and in the United States. *Genocide is being brought against you.* And you vote for a Greenie? You tolerate a Green policy? The fact of the matter—that the characteristics of living processes on this planet, and in this system, otherwise, as we know the system as a whole, the Solar

System and what we know of the processes in the galactic system, in the galaxy of which we're a part—these processes are always anti-entropic. That is, the energy-flux density, represented by each type of species, is increased to a higher level—the direct opposite of the argument of the Green movement. The Green movement, if allowed to exist, will destroy much of the human race, and send it backward. Anybody who supports the Green movement, is, in effect, either clinically insane or a criminal. The Green movement is a *crime*; it is not a political movement.

The basis is the oligarchical principle. The argument was, as in the case of King Philip of Macedon and the Persian Empire, which made the agreement with him, was that the areas around the Mediterranean at that time would be under the rule of the oligarchical principle; which means that the ordinary folk are going to be kept not too numerous, and cheap, and living miserable, and frequently culled in their numbers! So, there will be just enough people, among the human beings as opposed to the oligarchs, to be convenient for the oligarchs. And the rest of them were superfluous. Kill 'em!

Wars were organized, as an aid to decimations of populations, for the *Green movement* of the past. Cultures were destroyed, for the same purpose. And this is what is running the United States, right now, under Barack Obama.

Barack Obama is a stooge for the British Empire. The British Empire is a continuation of the original Roman Empire, a continuation of the Byzantine Empire, of the Crusader system. The British Empire is not something that comes out of the Queen: The British Empire is a system, a *monetarist* system. The world is dominated by a monetarist system!

Now, what's the meaning of a monetarist system? Well, a monetary unit has no intrinsic value, no intrinsic physical value. No value for humanity. It's simply an arbitrary instrument, which came into existence as the product of a cult which is called the oligarchical system. Prince Philip: No more than 2 billion people on the planet; kill the rest of them. Keep bats in your belfry, what the British modern family does. Same thing all the way through, same kind of thing. This is what our problem is.

The problem is, the suckers believe the stuff. Members of Congress, members of the Senate, other members of government, *universities! Science departments of universities believe in this crap!* You get degrees for

believing in this. Not much of a future, but degrees, you get. You're buried, wrapped in some kind of a symbol of the universe degree—the parchment—you get a piece of parchment, and they wrap your corpse, after it's dried, in parchment, in order to regulate the size of the population.

And you suckers believe it? You think this is science? You think because the guy's some professor at some university that he's a scientist? It's a freak show! He's a freak! He's out there in costume in various senses and ways. And you look at him, "Oh!! There is a Professor! They're all geniuses, aren't they? They know the *secrets* of the universe! They know things you don't know, *they know!*" In order to be able to know what they know, you have to become a professor, in a certain university, and emblazoned with all kinds of decorations and instruments and so forth. And you are now admired: "He's a Professor! *He knows!*" And that's the farce. So, we believe in this.

Obama Is Putting Your Life in Danger!

Now, what we've done, and as I say, there were two previous sessions of our organization which dealt with this problem. One, we had a meeting of the National Executive Committee, on Tuesday this week, and the record of that discussion exists as an audio production, available to you. We did a second piece yesterday, in a video type of production of one hour and two minutes [LPAC-TV Weekly Report: <http://larouchepac.com/node/18831>], which presents the argument for the case, and also amplifies that. Sky [Shields] did one part of the thing; I did another part; and this young lady, Alicia [Cerretani] did the other part.

And we presented four points, four different points on this. It's available to you. Use it. It's there. Sky did a brilliant job in his part on this one, just a very concise, effective presentation of a scientific argument on this question. I'm trying not to tread on the area they covered, because you'll have these things as a permanent record for you to consult as to what's going on here.

So therefore, we have to, in a sense, destroy everything that's tied to the Obama Administration. The Obama Administration is simply an agent of the British Empire. He's a British stooge; the corrupt money which brought him into office was provided largely by people from Britain. And they violated the law, up and down, in the way they financed Obama's election. He shouldn't be President. He should have been sort of impeached before coming into office. You know, a pre-impeach-



White House/Pete Souza

“You’ve got a bunch of cowards called ‘Members of Congress,’ who won’t fight Obama, who won’t throw him out!” LaRouche charged. “And every day you don’t throw him out, you’re putting your life and your whole family’s life in danger!” Here, Obama meets with members of the Congressional Black Caucus Executive Committee in the Oval Office, March 30, 2011.

ment would be appropriate for his case.

But the point is, that we are imprisoned, by people who control our destiny, on the basis of what is called now a Green policy. Germany, other countries of Europe, are imprisoned by that. Mass genocide in parts of Africa, spreading genocide, intended for other parts of the world: genocide. You vote for President Obama, support him, you’re a promoter of genocide. You have no moral right to avoid impeaching this clown. Because if you don’t impeach him and throw him out, you’re going to have the worst dark age that mankind has ever experienced, and it’s coming on *right now*, under his present term, as President.

And you’ve got a bunch of cowards called “Members of Congress,” and leading politicians, *who won’t fight him, who won’t oppose him, who won’t thrown him out!* And every day you don’t throw him out, you’re putting your life and your whole family’s life in danger! You’re putting everything you know in danger! Every day he’s there, more will unnecessarily *die!* *Murdered by the Green policy.* Because there won’t be enough to eat.

Already, in the United States today, we are not producing enough for Americans to eat! Can you imagine what that’s going to look like next January and so forth, by that time? How many of you will be dead of starvation because there’s a vast gap in what’s needed for human consumption of what’s going to be available.

Look what’s happening in Africa now, the genocide

in that corner of Africa. You tolerate this present President, you’re guilty of supporting and tolerating genocide. Not only genocide against other nations, but against yourself.

So we come into a situation in which the welfare of the future of mankind depends upon people who have the guts to take this on, and fail to compromise with *anything* resembling the Green policy. It’s important to know that this is a fraud. It’s important to say that this is a fraud. People will attack the policy, they will say, “Well, it’s not fair. It doesn’t do something for us. We need

this, not that.” All these petty, silly little arguments about minor things that don’t mean anything, in place of the fundamental question: As long as this President *is* President, *you don’t have a chance.*

Not chasing this President *out* of the Presidency is an act of suicide. And that’s what this proves. If we look at what we call the energy-flux density of the various forms of life in the Solar System, and we study that, we see that there is always this rise in energy-flux density, that is, the amount and concentration of power, in the form of energy-flux density. That’s what it’s based on: higher energy-flux density.

The Issue Is Energy-Flux Density

Green is dead. Solar power is murder. Because, take the case: Look at a little thing like solar power, sunbeams. Now, you are familiar with them, largely, well, if you’ve got a sunburn or something like that, that’s one way. But you’re also familiar with them as something else. You’re familiar with them as green. You’re familiar with them, in our time, as the solar radiation which, applied to plant growth on Earth, increases the net effect of energy-flux density.

If you take the solar power, solar radiation, and you *consume it* as a power source, what’s the effect? You do not get chlorophyll. And the generation, for our time, for the human race’s time, the generation on which progress depends, is chlorophyll. The capture of solar

radiation into the form of the magical little creature called chlorophyll. And this little creature gives you, not just something, it gives you plants—otherwise, you wouldn't have them. It gives you trees, a special kind of plant. It gives you weather systems, on which you depend. It's all done for free, by the solar radiation process, and anti-environmentalist, shall we say, system.

If you're an environmentalist, you're asking to be killed. Solar radiation will kill you; it won't feed you, it'll kill you. Solar radiation impinging upon plant life, the *real* green, gives you the basis for much of the entirety of the possibility of human life on this planet. If you convert solar radiation into solar cell-power, instead of into the benefits of green, then you're killing the human race.

If we look at it from another standpoint: Let's take the total amount of calories, as measured in energy-flux density, from solar radiation and similar kinds of radiation. What is the effect of that? How does that work? And you look, then, at living processes generally, over the period that we know, say, approximately about a billion years or so, something like that. What happens? The planet Earth and the Solar System increases its potential productivity for human life, in direct and indirect ways. If you convert it to the raw consumption of the direct solar radiation, it will kill you. Solar radiation, used as it should be used, increases the power of the human species.

What we're doing now is killing the human species: Every windmill you see is killing people, not just birds. Every solar collector you see is killing people. When the measure of the potentiality of the human species, is actually the increase of the power, by the use of solar radiation and other forms of radiation to increase the power of mankind and the power of life.

So, when they talk about a Second Law of Thermodynamics, they're lying! There's no truth to it. The truth of the matter is, the possibility of the increased conditions of human life, or any other kind of life, the *whole history* that we know of *life in this Solar System*, is based on that principle! Take down the windmills. Destroy the solar cells. We may keep a few for exhibits. For helping to cook people! Hmm? But that's what we're up against. And it's the failure of lying scientists, who tell you, that these instruments are good—they're liars! If they're not simply stupid. The same thing is true with the windmills. People who believe in windmills are stupid or liars!

There *is* no such thing as a tendency toward a deple-

tion of power, what some of you call energy-flux density, on this planet. The history of living processes, the history of the Solar System, says that the logical, natural tendency which *rules the universe* and rules our Solar System in particular, is a constant rise, through the action especially of life, the rise in what's called energy-flux density.

So there is no such thing, as an attritional factor, in human life on Earth. Mankind dominates this planet in a way it was never true before. Mankind is an active part—in other words, you don't have a universe, or a Solar System, or an Earth, which is using up something. Actually, human life in this system increases the productivity of the system.

We are not a waste product—unless we eat too much, which will have certain effects. We're not a waste product. We are an *active, leading part* of the universe, in the part we live in! Mankind is a *leading contributor* to the conditions of life, of *all* kinds of life, not every particular species, but all kinds of life.

We Are an Essential Part of the Universe

Now, this comes to the big question: What does this all mean? What it means is elementary. It means that we are an essential part of the universe. We are a leading part of the universe, in the part we occupy. We are exemplary of processes, which approach those of human species. We are a creative force. We're not something on the sidelines; we're integral to the creative forces of development within our part of the universe. We exemplify, in what we're able to contribute, those processes, which *dominate and run the universe!*

The universe is like that! So science should mean this. Everything else is a lie.

But the lie has a function, an evil function. And the lie is to reduce the human population. Why? Because mankind's natural tendency is to make what we call discoveries in universal physical principle, or things equivalent to that. This is not something man may or may not do. The very existence of mankind introduces this factor. We are the most important positive factor in the universe, at least as far as we know, in the territories we know.

Human beings are the *driver of progress* on this planet. The increase of energy-flux density by the action of human beings is the leading force and factor in developing life on this planet.

Why do we have to believe this crap? Because the enemy of mankind, the oligarchs, believe that they, as

oligarchs, a tiny part of the whole population, have the right to control and exploit people. They believe that people are cattle, whose only function is to be sufficient in their labor and numbers to provide the oligarchs with sustenance, as oligarchs. And anything that gets in excess of that, they have to periodically clean out! Every mass-base of genocide on this planet, of true genocide, that is, the willful practice of genocide by nations and by cultures, is based on the iron Green principle! On the principle of so-called environmentalism. Environmentalism is the greatest evil that we know on this planet. We give into it, we're either stupid, or evil, ourselves.

Then, why would you support a politician, who would vote the Green ticket? Your voting for genocide. You're making Hitler look like a small-time piker compared to *you*. That's the case.

Now, you know what people are saying out there, you know what you see in the press, you know what you see in the magazines, you know what comes out of the universities, and out of the mouths, or some other part of professors—you know this thing. And yet, you consent to it! You consent to it either by supporting it, you consent to it by condoning it, you concede to it by saying, "Well, uh, they made the laws."

What is law then? Is it lawful to practice genocide against human beings? To practice genocide *willfully* against human beings? Is that lawful! What do you do with such a law? What do you do with such a lawyer? You hang him! As a criminal! He's no good. What do you do with a politician, who supports Green policies?

This is reality! We face the fact that the human species is being destroyed, now, by the Green movement. That the Green movement is a fraud; every argument for the Green movement is a fraud! It's a lie, and it's a murderous *lie, a mass-murderous lie!*

Why do you vote for a politician who supports that policy? *Why do you tolerate* a politician who supports that policy? You say you would like to get hands on



The movement of the Solar System through the galaxy in its 62-million-year cycle results in mass kills of species, as occurred with the dinosaurs. "But then, the universe, especially our galaxy, has a marvelous thing: It, too, increases the energy-flux density embodied in it. It grows! It grows like a living thing." Image from the LPAC video, "[Our Extraterrestrial Imperative](http://www.larouchepac.com/eti2)," part 2. <http://www.larouchepac.com/eti2>

Hitler, who's already dead, and kill him? What you've got is something worse: It's called the President of the United States! He's worse than Hitler! And people say, "You can't say that about our President!" Why not? He's a criminal. His actions are a crime! He's a threat to humanity! Why do you apologize for him? Why do you apologize for the politician? Why do you apologize for the press? Why do you apologize for people who spread this crap? *Which is killing our people! Killing civilization! And you are willing to accept the authority of a Congress which votes for this crap?* How are you going to free yourself of death, mass death, if you don't stop supporting the so-called Green movement. You have not got a chance and the human race doesn't have a chance.

So where's your morality? You say you have morals? What's your morality and its effect on humanity? What's your morality if you believe in the Green movement? It's killing people already; it's killing them *en masse* already! I mean, most of the people in this room would be dead, in short order, unless this movement is stopped, the Green movement.

What's lacking? Honesty and courage. Honesty and courage. That's the problem before us, that simple. Anything contrary to that, is a lie.

Mankind Is Immortal

Well, that's not the limit of the problem. Let's take the case of the Solar System and our galaxy. The Solar

System is a part of the galaxy; it's a wandering part inside the galaxy; it goes up and down, and so forth. And the movement of these parts of the galaxy back and forth results in things called mass kills, great kills. The dinosaurs were killed off by such an operation, the only way they were killed.

But then, the universe, especially our galaxy, has a marvelous thing: It, too, increases the energy-flux density embodied in it. It grows! It grows like a living thing.

The human species is the miracle species. Every form of life, other than mankind, is doomed to extinction in the cyclical process of development of evolution of the universe. . . . Mankind is the only species which can continue to live, among all the living species we know.

Well, what's the difference between an animal then, and a man? Mankind makes the decision willfully. We are capable of increasing the energy-flux density in the universe, willfully.

Now, the universe does this anyway. The universe is always productive. The difference is that mankind is *consciously* productive. Mankind's discovery and knowledge of science is *conscious* action, and the rate of increase of productivity of mankind, and productivity of everything in the system, depends upon the creative powers which are uniquely specific to living human beings; properly educated living human beings of course.

That is the secret of life. That's the secret of the universe: That we, as mankind, are a greater force for improvement of the universe *than any other form of existence*. We, as human beings, are the greatest force for good known to us today. There are lots of parts of the universe we don't know, but just to stick to what we do know, the neighborhood we know: Mankind is the greatest creative force within the universe, as far as we know it.

It's the creative powers of mankind, because all forms of life, all forms of existence, are creative! They all, in the process—when they die, for example, they will die out, and they die out, as being replaced by a higher form of living process, or higher form of exist-

tence generally, than what they replace. It's not a one-for-one replacement, but in general, the whole system is of that nature. The one thing that's great is the human species: Why? The human species is the miracle species. Every form of life, other than mankind, for example—there are other considerations—but every form of life other than mankind is doomed to extinction in the cyclical process of development of evolution of the universe. That's what we know. We know it immediately, and we adduce that for this system at large—every form!

Mankind is not only the most productive form, in terms of rate of increase of productivity, in the universe as we know it, but mankind is the only species which can continue to live, among all the living species we know. In most cases, you look at the history, close to 98% of what we know of having been living species are extinct! And yet, in the process of extinction the universe improves. Because each generation of creature, does its job, and dies, and passes the torch on to the next species, or the next series of species. That's the way it works.

And mankind does not only do that, with the greatest efficiency in potential of all known living species, but *mankind is the only species which is potentially capable of being an immortal species*. That is, a species which *never dies*. Now, this is conditional: In principle that's true. Mankind in principle is an immortal species. That doesn't mean we're going to live forever as individuals. It means the human *species* is capable of living *forever*! If we do the right thing, and don't do the wrong thing. Whereas, there's no other living species, which has a built-in capability, as a species, of surviving the upward evolution of the varieties of existence within the universe as we know it. *We are the only immortal species*.

Now, that's on the condition that we live up to that challenge. It means scientific progress; it means increase in the energy-flux density of great orders of magnitude; it means an explosion of achievement, whereby we're able to protect human life within this galaxy, within this region of the universe. We're capable of doing that, if we *do it*, and if we commit ourselves to it appropriately, we are the kings and queens of the universe, apparently. Or, maybe there's some other species we don't know of up there, that shares that dignity. But that's what we are.

Now, this is the meaning of immortality, which is the proper principle for looking at this whole process.

We are all going to die, probably. Maybe somebody comes up with an invention and changes that rule. But in the history of mankind, so far—oh, a few million years, that's all mankind has lived in this planet; but in this process, we become more powerful as a species. We become more creative. In being creative, we develop the means to ensure that we can survive the next great kill change, that we could have survived, for example, the dinosaurs, who were wiped out in one big mass kill. We have the potentiality, in what we call scientific and related progress, to build a condition under which we are able to develop a system to protect and maintain human life in continuity, under conditions which, for an animal species, otherwise, would be dead!

Now, how does this occur? This occurs by discoveries, like physical scientific discoveries of mankind. That's how this occurs. Therefore, we develop means, we might call them scientific instruments, other, similar kinds of means, by which we're able to build *protection* for the human species. This power of protection comes from the inventions and similar kinds of progress in the condition of the existence of the human species. We can protect ourselves. We are more powerful, we have means that are more powerful! We can protect ourselves. And by building protection for ourselves, we can endure and tolerate conditions that mankind otherwise would never be able to tolerate.

We are, thus, immortal, through scientific exploration, through scientific migrations, and similar kinds of things, we are capable of expanding the role of mankind more broadly in the galaxy and in the system. Mankind is an immortal species, which the discoveries of new great principles, like scientific principles, means that mankind is enabled to protect itself, against conditions which would otherwise be the kind of great kills, which wipe out entire species. That's us!

But that's not for the oligarchs. The oligarchs say, if we can do that, we human beings can do that, we don't need the oligarchs, any more. And we never did! It's the overcoming a destruction of the system of oligarchism, which is typified by the Queen of England, typified by the piece of trash called Obama! *That* is the issue.

Not merely to save mankind, to protect mankind, to improve the conditions of life. But on the conception that mankind has some kind of a special gift from the universe, that mankind as a species has a higher destiny than any other known living species to us today. That destiny is *ours*! It belongs to *us*, providing we live up to

what we are, human creative beings. It belongs to us.

Somewhere in this process, in our development of discoveries of great scientific principle, we developed the means by which not only to preserve the human species, where no other known species to us could be preserved. But we have a mission, a divine mission in the universe to be the power, the growing power within the universe, which is capable of doing other great things for the improvement of the universe, as such.

That should be our self-conception. That's the immortality of the person. Think of a scientist, who makes a great discovery. He dies. The great discovery lives on as a permanent benefit built into the system. It leads as a foundation, for the development of still-higher states of development of humanity. So mankind is of a type of species, which is, in principle, immortal in potential. We live in the service of the universe, as a willful, creative force, within the service of the universe: That's us.

We Are a Sacred Species

Therefore, we are immortal, not because we might live forever, but because the effect of what we do as human beings will live forever: We are among the assigned authors of the improvement of the universe, to whatever purpose we find landing in our laps. We are a sacred species, because we have the power of immortality, made available to us, and into our hands, by these means.

Now, that was the tendency, when people left Europe, and came to New England. That was the intention: to take the natural potential of mankind as already developed and transport it away from a place where it would be crushed, into a place where it was intended to be expressed.

The Massachusetts Bay Colony became the symbol of that. Then, with William of Orange's ascension to power, which was the beginning of the British Empire, we were crushed in Massachusetts. But the principle was maintained, and was expressed then in our Constitution, if you understand our Constitution. That's what was expressed there: the sense of humanity, a moral sense of an immortal species. Not immortal because it's sitting being immortal, but because its *activity*, its *contribution* to the condition of mankind, is of the quality of willful immortality: a purpose for mankind, a destiny for mankind, which is conditional on the willingness of mankind, to adopt that destiny and practice it.

Can you think of yourself as being a part of a species



LPAC-TV

“Do you not recognize that we, as human beings, have the power of creativity, as no other known species, known to us presently, has? . . . It’s that conviction that gives us the power, the will, and the joy, to be a human being!” Shown: The Schiller Institute chorus performing Beethoven’s “Choral Fantasy,” July 2, Rüsselsheim, Germany. (<http://www.larouhepac.com/node/18733>)

that just plain dies, without any change in improvement in what you are able to do? Can you be satisfied and pleased with that? Can you be pleased with the idea that the species you represent is suddenly going to become extinct? Can you like that? Can you work to that end? Or would you be despairing?

But the fact is, as scientific progress has enabled us to demonstrate this, in an exemplary way, at least, if not a perfect way, we have a divine intention for our existence, which is the maintenance and improvement of the universe. We’re now modest in our skills, but the principle is there. The principle of those who have gone before us in the great achievements of mankind, have done the same thing, served that same principle.

So it’s not merely a matter of avoiding “bad things,” which the Obama Administration is—*very bad*—which ought to be eliminated immediately! We have various instruments to do it, as I said. There are three ways we can get rid of him—and quickly. And it must be done—quickly. How will we do it? We crush his power. We take the instruments of power out of his hands! By getting our citizens to take their legal right to create laws which take the power *out of the hands of these pigs!* That’s what we must do.

We must do it with a sense of a divine mission, that we are a unique species, insofar as we know what we are. We are an immortal species of mortal people. Our

immortality lies in what we discover and contribute to the future of mankind. That is made evident to us, just by what we experience. It’s made evident to us; that’s our assigned mission because that’s the possibility before us. That’s the challenge before us.

We’re all going to die, so what’s the purpose in our living? Are you just something like a bug that just happens to live and then dies? Is that what you are? Is that what you wish to be?

Or, do you not recognize that we, as human beings, have the power of creativity, as no other known species, known to us presently, has.

And any species that has the same power, anywhere in the universe that we discover, has implicitly the same divine mission that we as human beings have. We never die. The effect of our living lives on, if we live that way.

It’s that conviction that gives us the power, the will, and the joy, to be a human being! That’s the basis for the true sense of citizenship of a person in our nation: *This is us!* This is the meaning of our existence. This is our purpose for existing! This is our rejoicing in the fact that we exist, that we make children, we make other human beings, to continue and to improve in this same direction.

That’s what we must fight for! Not bickering about this point, and that law, and that law. But a matter of principle: Are we realizing the divinity, inherent in a special quality of mankind, as not known to us, presently, in any other species. That’s our intention. That’s the meaning of life: If you’re going to die, and we all must expect to die, now, then what do you have? You have the intention of your *effect* in the universe. You are creating an *effect* which is immortal. And therefore, you *are* immortal. You are a member of an immortal species.

And you have the power and authority which goes with that, implicitly. The universe has pointed it out to you. Experience has pointed it out to you: That’s your

power, that's your authority. That's your joy! That's your pleasure in being human, and being alive, and having a special kind of immortality, that *your life will always mean something to humanity*, in practice, if not in knowledge. But you will be able to know that *your life has an immortal meaning*.

That's the basis for our republic. That's the basis for our proper policy. That's the basis for our proper law. This other stuff is crap! It's a great lie, put upon us by evil, evil called the oligarchical principle; the oligarchical principle embodied in the British monarchy; the oligarchical principle embodied in Barack Obama!

Are you going to fight for humanity? Are you going to defend humanity? Are you going to defend the idea of an immortal species, as mankind? (Not excluding the fact there may be other immortal species somewhere in this universe.) That's the challenge.

And I think, without that concept, and without that challenge, I don't believe there is any possibility of true morality. That's what has not been said. Only saying that, and understand that, and adhering to that, acquiring the confidence that that represents, acquiring the intention that that implies: *That* is what it is to be a human being! And by asserting that law, we are asserting the role of humanity as qualifying *itself* as an immortal species. *That's* what you have to counter to this crime called Obama.

Thank you.

Dialogue

Freeman: ...I should mention, that this webcast was featured as the lead item on a very important website in Spain, complete with the Obama moustache picture. And it included a direct link to the live Spanish translation of the webcast. Very interestingly, the posting provoked dozens of commentaries from readers in Spain, and it really does lead someone to the conclusion that Lyn is becoming something of a folk hero in Spain, as well as the United States!



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Members of the audience listen to LaRouche during the webcast. "My job is to make things happen," LaRouche told them.

One professor writes, "I'm not going to miss it. I'm also sending an e-mail to all my students and have them write an essay on this subject in September. This is what ought to be taught in all economics classes worldwide, the ideas of Lyndon LaRouche. To Hell with Adam Smith and Paolo Sarpi!"

There are a lot of things like that, but one of the last comments that was transmitted, was, "Lyndon, hit Obama hard, the way you know how to do it." And I think Lyn satisfied that request.

We also have a message that I will read. It's greetings from the Free Dutch, and it says:

"Dear Mr. LaRouche,

"Greetings from deep inside the Anglo-Dutch Empire, where this Dutch group has organized a webcast showing. As a modest representation of the Free Dutch, we want everyone to know, that we support your campaign to promote Glass-Steagall legislation in the United States and around the world.

"No matter how thorough the corruption by Sarpi, Adam Smith, and Bertrand Russell among the people of the Netherlands, let it be known, that deep inside the Netherlands, lives the eternal spark of a Rembrandt, Erasmus, Anne Frank, and Christiaan Huygens. "

—The Free Dutch."

And we welcome you to the webcast.

What Is 'America,' Really?

Really? Lyn, the first question comes from one of the editors of the Russian weekly *Zavtra*, and he asks

for your comments on an article that they just published, called, “Default, the United States on the Brink of Bankruptcy.” He says, “Lyn, the article says, that whether or not the Federal debt ceiling is raised before the August deadline, a default by the United States is inevitable, and is only a matter of time. And that what is happening now, is the ultimate outcome of 40 years of massive dollar paper-printing operations that began in 1971.

“Our article goes on to say that Germany will be unable to cope with a repeat of the Greek debt crisis in Italy and Spain, that soon the EU will have to appeal to China for financial aid, and that China would provide the aid, in the form of U.S. Treasuries. But since the creditors for the European debts are companies like Goldman Sachs and JP Morgan Chase, which not only own the U.S. government but *are* the U.S. government,” [Freeman: I beg your pardon!] “the result would be a bankrupt debtor paying a bankrupt creditor with the worthless paper of the bankrupt creditor, i.e., a snake eating its own tail.

“Our authors go on to suggest that such a development will drive U.S. interests to attempt to export chaos and promote destabilization and wars, throughout Southwest Asia, while trying to take over Russia, by promoting U.S. agents of influence, through next year’s Russian Presidential elections. “Would you please comment on this?”

LaRouche: That’s a rather large challenge, not as such, but it’s a large challenge, because I don’t agree with the point of view! There is a descriptive aspect to it, which obviously does correspond to an apparent reality. But I don’t like to deal with apparent realities, I like to deal with the causal factors which determine these realities.

Now, first of all, yes: The entire system is coming down, not one causing the other. *The entire damned system is coming down!* And it’s not because something is causing something, which is causing something, which is causing something. Just, forget it! That’s the monetarist way of thinking, and trying to explain things in monetarist terms, and hoping that they’ll get attention from people by giving the monetarist feedback, in terms of it.

The whole world system is now doomed in its present form. There is no way, under the present system, that during even as short a term as the months ahead, world civilization could survive the present policy-structures of the world; no possibility at all. So you

don’t need to factor, to factor, to factor, to factor—forget it! The system is now, in its present form, doomed to extinction, unless it is replaced! It will never survive! It *can not* survive!

What you have out there, you have lollapalooza money, all over the place. It’s not real value. Money itself has no value! It has no physical value! It’s a swindle! The idea that money has value, is a swindle! Don’t we see that the use of money, called money, the same denominations, can be spent on prostitution in New York City? Particularly with some visiting Frenchmen? And then it can also buy bread, or something else. So there is no intrinsic value to money!

The United States’ system was never a monetary system, not as the United States. Because the Constitution of the United States, which provided for the definition of *the* United States, was always based on a credit system. Just like the Massachusetts Bay Colony, until it was crushed by William of Orange, was based on a credit system. You assign credit to things which are designated as physically useful to humanity. These things then become of value, not because they have any *inherent value*—*they have no inherent value*. They are simply tokens.

Now, if you attach the token to a condition, like Alexander Hamilton did, you don’t have a problem, because you give credit and utter credit only for things that are physically useful to mankind. And therefore, you may make mistakes in the estimate of the value, but there’s value there, nonetheless. In general, among intelligent people who know how to manufacture things, and things like that, generally, if they’ve got any experience, the credit they utter for a result, will be in some general correspondence to that result.

So, forget this whole monetarist system, about money causing money. Money causing money is called hyperinflation. Period.

Now, this points out the fact, that the entire debt of the United States ain’t worth a penny! It’s worth nothing! All Wall Street’s money is worthless. It can never be repaid, it never had any value. It’s gambling money, gambling debts. Now, I never saw a gambler actually produce anything, except debt—and swindles. Or houses of prostitution—that they produce. So therefore, forget that stuff!

The planet at present is not going to survive unless a certain very specific kind of reform is made. Period. Make that reform, or die! That’s the order. If you don’t obey that, you’re wasting your life. There’s no redeem-



USDA/Bruce Fritz

“The entire debt of the United States ain’t worth a penny!,” LaRouche exclaimed. “All Wall Street’s money is worthless. It can never be repaid, it never had any value. It’s gambling money, gambling debts.” What’s needed is physical-economic production. Shown: an Atlantic City, N.J. gambling casino; a modern combine with a GPS system.

ing. It’s not that some nation’s going to make a mistake and this guy’s going to do this, and that guy’s going to—*forget it!!*

I’ve been forecasting since, when? Guess when? My first forecast was in 1956, and I forecast toward the end of August, that under the present system it was virtually certain, that by February or very early March of 1957, the United States would plunge, at that instant, into the deepest depression of the postwar period. And it did!

Every other forecast I made was successful, in the same way. Everyone who forecast differently, except for people who made a different kind of forecast, not for a national forecast, but for a particular kind of production, or something of that sort; or for the harvesting of a crop you planted the seeds for. That is somewhat predictable; you can forecast that. What happens to money, especially my first forecast, in 1956, no, you can not forecast. You can only forecast the way I did. Not as

prediction by monetary statistics. Everyone who does statistical method of forecasting is intrinsically incompetent in economics.

I’ve never failed, why? Because the competition was so poor. It’s like the guy, you know the one-legged man who ran a race among zero-legged people. You can pretty much predict the result beforehand, unless he’s very good at crawling on his hands. So the nature of things lies in the issue of *value*: Value is intrinsically physical in nature. It’s useful to human beings, as changes which are introduced, as replenishment, or repair, or augmentation, of the physical conditions of human life. Therefore, there’s always a physical value. And you define the value in terms of what experience shows you are the normal relations of reproduction, that is, of economic reproduction, physical-economic reproduction. And that’s what you can do. And I’ve never made a mistake in that, but that’s only because I had lousy competition; I wasn’t that good. I’m pretty good

right now, but I wasn't that good back then. I just happened to know all the facts. And I was right, and they were always wrong. And they never improved, so I'm the champion, because they never improved! If the other guy fails all the time, you can win! That's the kind of thing that happened to me.

No, what we have to do, is first of all, *eliminate the idea of money as value*. Money is value, only as it functions as credit, as valid credit, in a credit system, which is what the United States is, under its original Constitution. *Ours is a credit system, not a monetarist system*. Money has no intrinsic value; money has only the estimated value as credit, of what it's capable of producing, as a physical result. How many people are you keeping alive by feeding them? How many people are being cured of disease? These are the kinds of questions that measure value. And the ultimate measure of value is, what is the *productivity*, the power of creation, we call productivity, by the human species? *That's value!* Machine-tool design is value. Growing crops that feed people—value. Educating young people to go beyond, way beyond what their parents and grandparents were capable of— that's value. Changing the character of transportation systems, changing the conditions of life throughout the universe—that's value!

That's the American System. It's in our Constitution! It's the intention of the Hamilton influence on the Constitution; it's our system. And the problem with the Europeans, and beyond, is the fact, they are suckers for monetarism. They believe in money. They try to estimate value, in terms of money.

Now, money can be used, very usefully, as a credit system, but that's because you have predetermined *the value of the product*. If you hit the target, on the value of the product, then you have succeeded. That's a good estimate. It doesn't mean it's determined as a monetary thing; it means that your monetary estimates, which you're using for a credit system, are valid. And it depends upon the *performance* of the economy, as to what the value is. It depends upon what you get out of it: In other words, you produce something, like a machine tool. Now, what's the value of a machine tool? Can you eat it? Or, can you use it as a tool, which results in production, down the line, as a part of the process of production, which improves the conditions of life of human beings—*as value*, producing human beings is value! Don't expect two-year-olds to do it, but this is value.

And therefore, the problem here, that's posed by the question, is the reliance upon notions of monetarism.

What is monetarism? It's a product of the oligarchical system. It always was. It's a slave system!

So the Europeans think they've got a money system—they're nuts! That's why we came over here, to get the hell away from them, and their nutty ideas. And, except for when we were chased by the British, we did pretty well, despite a lot of mistakes that were made in the process; in principle, we were right. A credit system!

A credit system means, what is the physical value, or physical effect as value, which is represented as an *increase* in the value for society? Period, that's value. Now, you want a money system, which is really a credit system, which is based on those relations. And what the Russia paper missed, is that.

They all, Europeans, still are slaves, in one degree or another, to the idea of a money system. They interpret everything causally, in terms of a money system. And a money system is not worth anything, intrinsically. And it's been demonstrated by hyperinflation. What do people in Europe invest in? What do people in Wall Street invest in? What do stockbrokers invest in? Gambling debts! There's no value in this stuff! It's gambling debts! The amount of money indicated, in value, as gambling debts, is the great amount of value in the world!

When we do what I want to do, cancel that crap!—we'll bankrupt the whole system, and we get back to an even deal. Because we then base everything on a credit system. We cancel everything that way. How do we do it? Glass-Steagall! Glass-Steagall, which says, only the commercial debts and equivalent debts, are guaranteed by the Federal Treasury, under law. The other stuff, the crap, goes to the gambling institution which is called Wall Street.

The United States has no obligation to pay the debts of Wall Street, not under our Constitution. We just take them—"sorry, buddy." "But it's my money!" "Sorry, buddy, it just got cancelled. We found it was worthless." "Well, it's my money!" "Well, I'm sorry, buddy, but you made a bad investment! Now, we'll probably try to find some home relief or something for you, to get through. That little mansion you're occupying in the Wall Street area, or up on the West Side of Manhattan or East Side of Manhattan, buddy, I think you're going to have to sell that. But don't worry, we'll be kind to you. We'll be generous, we'll give you a chance. We'll get you some sewers to dig out there, give you a job, useful work. Clean things up! And sewer work means that you

really are getting down to the business of *cleaning* things up!”

So that’s the point.

Our problem is, the world in general, and economists in general, and systems economics in general, are perfectly *incompetent!* Because they presume that something that has no intrinsic value, is the denomination of value. When in fact, we can know, very easily, that food, which is edible, is value. We know that other kinds of things, are value. If we denote these in relative values for a credit system, fine! As long as your estimates are reasonable, the system will work, as long as you’re productive.

So, let’s get away from all this idea of *monetarism* as determining the economy. Monetarism is the *death* of economy, not the birth of it.

Confusion in Russia

Freeman: The next question is also from Russia. This is from the Moscow State Institute of International Relations, which is the university of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Now, this certainly expresses a different view, than *Zavtra*:

“Mr. LaRouche, most financial experts in Russia do not believe that the international financial system will crash any time soon.” [**Freeman:** I don’t think they read *Zavtra!*] “They think that such a forecast is either unfounded panic, or maybe something for the long term. They don’t believe that the U.S. could really default—after all, the American economy is so big. They think that in Europe, some countries, like Greece, might default, but certainly not Germany. They don’t want to see the signs of the crash, believing that this is invented by panic-mongers. This attitude is typical of the current leadership of Russia, as you could well see from the Russian President’s remarks in Germany this week, about how the euro is a strong currency, that just happens to have been dragged down by some weaker countries.

“In that vein, we have two very specific questions: Number 1, can you list the particular signs that a full-scale crash is here.” [**Freeman:** They should come to the United States!] Two, what will the impact be on other countries, in particular on Russia, China, and India, from the crash of the current financial system, and how long will the crisis continue—a year or two, or will it last for decades?”

LaRouche: Well, I must say that the description of economy in the latter cases is a disaster. Russia will not

be able to survive the present crisis, as long as that belief is maintained. It’s the end of Russia. So I would recommend, strongly, a change in thinking on the part of those folks.

The system will not work. It’s a catastrophe in conception. It has no correspondence with reality. It sounds like the old time of the kulaks, in Russia, the so-called “kulak,” the fist, the fist that’s grabbing something it calls “money,” and says, “*This is my money!*” And it’s something left over from the worst aspects of the system of Russia, which is known as the kulak system, and so forth.

What we’re facing now, contrary to what these fellows are deluded into believing, is an immediate, general, chain-reaction collapse, of the entire world system. *No money system* of the world will independently survive the crash which is now scheduled for this year. None! So such thoughts as those expressed by the authors of the question, they should *get rid* of those thoughts immediately, if they wish to survive.

Russia has a great potential.

Let me go back to something, just to emphasize something, and how this thing worked. During the year 1977, I developed a scheme, which was based on my study of certain things, including U.S. military systems, and Russian and other systems. This became known later, as the basis for what was called the Strategic Defense Initiative. My proposal.

I was the origin for that proposal. I acquired support in about ‘78, ‘79, from people who had been key parts of the intelligence service called the OSS during World War II. They just came knocking at my door, and said, “Well, we’d like to support some of the things you’re doing.” And so, it spread there.


I moved into an area during this period, especially the beginning of the 1980s, where I approached the Soviet Union. And I proposed to the Soviet Union that the United States and Soviet Union—this was done with the cognizance of key elements of the U.S. intelligence service. So, I was the author of a scheme which first became part of the U.S. intelligence service, became part of the policy of the National Security Council under Reagan, in which I was a key author of the whole project. I, at the same time, negotiated with the Soviet Union, for what became known as the SDI. This system would have worked. Many Russians, many Russian officials were negotiating with me, many Russian scientists were working with me, on the implementation of this project.

The immediate motive for this project by me, was to prevent a world war between the Soviet Union and the United States, because such a war would have been so destructive, that civilization would not have survived it. Therefore, we reached a lot of agreement with the Russians on this project. The question was, whether the United States would support it. So, the British factor, the Wall Street factor in the United States, including the leadership of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, both voted not to support the President of the United States at that time, who proposed the support over the policy I had introduced as the SDI. Reagan and the Reagan Administration named it the SDI; it was my policy.

This policy was not merely a U.S.-Russian relationship. You would find in the ranks of the people with whom I was associated, the leading general officers in Germany, the leading general officers in France, leading general officers in Italy and elsewhere. This was my baby. The result of the failure to support it, by first of all this British agent Gorbachov, and Andropov before him, these British agents created a situation which led to the destruction of the Soviet Union. Not merely of the Soviet Union, but the destruction of whole sections of Russia as such, and beyond. It led to the general collapse of the European system in 1989-90, because the damn fools thought they were smarter than I was. It's that simple.

What happened to Russia? Well, the British took Russia apart; they destroyed it. The British did. Well, you had British agents like Andropov and Gorbachov, what do you expect? What do British agents do when they're working in leading positions in Russia, or the Soviet Union earlier? They do what British agents do. Andropov was a British agent. Gorbachov is still a British agent, even today, and so forth and so on.

So, my purpose was to save civilization from this



Russia will not survive the present crisis unless it breaks from belief in the "kulak" system, and realizes its potential as a scientific and industrial power. Russia's problem is expressed by the rejection, under British agent Andropov, of the LaRouche-Reagan proposal for the SDI. This pamphlet was issued by LaRouche's Presidential campaign in 1983.

kind of war. The damn British screwed this thing up with their agents in Russian guise, and the result was the destruction of the Soviet Union and of Russia itself. You take the destruction of the current Russia, under the post-Soviet system; one of the greatest destructions of one of the most powerful nations in the world. It was almost like turning Russia into another African state, in effect. *Damned fools!* And it was these kind of damned fool ideas, used by the British through agencies such as the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, based in Austria—but it's a British institution. British institutions have been running Russia. There are some people in Russia who are patriots, but on this question, their understanding of economy is highly deficient. Their belief in monetarist systems is the root of the problem, but there are compli-

cations—really kookish kinds of complications. You might say kulak thinking.

My determination today is *still* to save Russia, but I can't save Russia if they insist on foolish ideas. My intentions are friendly; very amiable. I'm concerned about the injustice done to Russians in general. I'm also concerned about the injustice done to Europe as a result of the collapse of Russia as a power against the British. Unfortunately, the Russians have made so many accommodations to the British, it seems almost impossible to save them. I think the only way Russia can be saved, really, from the destruction which is ongoing—. And it's physical destruction; the productive powers of labor in Russia are being destroyed! And they're being destroyed by British-influenced policy. In other words, the best way to kill somebody is to get them to commit suicide. And a lot of the Russian economics policy is exactly that.

We have to save nations. There's no more need for war, as wars have been fought before. The time for that is past. War has an inherently destructive character, and

long wars are totally destructive, like the war in Vietnam, which destroyed the United States. Because somebody in the United States killed President Kennedy, who was against the Indo-China War, and that destroyed the United States. And just to make sure that Kennedy's death was secured, they killed his brother, who was about to become nominated as the Presidential candidate of the Democratic Party of the United States.


I'm dealing with a bunch of damn fools, most of the time; I've been living with damn fools for a long time. I know what a damn fool really is. I've shaken hands with some of the best of them; the most high-ranking—that's what I've been doing. These guys have got to finally wake up, on the government level. They didn't recognize that I was right, they were wrong. I tried to save them, and they let themselves be run around by the ring in the nose by the British, through people like Andropov and Gorbachov—I say Garbage-off, because the garbage must be removed.

Architecture and Classical Culture

Freeman: A couple of months ago, with some of the work that we were participating in with the Stanford Group, there was also the participation of a significant group from Northern Ireland. It was at a real crisis point for Ireland, that was reflected, I think, in the good news and the very big win for Gerry Adams and Sinn Fein. Now we have a question from there.

And it says, "Mr. LaRouche, first and foremost, hello from Belfast! We bring you greetings, and I choose to ask my question with the assumption that, in short order, we will bring an end to this blasted British system. But then we have the task of building nations and undoing the destruction that was done to our planet. I've been studying, since I've gotten back home, and I, for one, am fascinated and inspired by many of the ideas so vividly presented on your website. As a currently under-employed architect, I fully expect that one day very soon, I will be able to participate in the kind of world-changing infrastructure projects that you champion.

But I have a question regarding your view of Classical composition in the arts, relating to the field of architecture and the "built" environment. And I should tell



CC/Gryffindor

A questioner from Belfast wanted to know if it were important to consider beauty as well as function, for example in architecture, in rebuilding the nation. Absolutely, said LaRouche, who recalled a visit to the Pazzi Chapel in Florence (interior, shown here), designed by Filippo Brunelleschi. "It's a wonderful instrument; it's a tuned chapel. Absolutely tuned. If you sing in there, it will sing back to you. It's a beautiful piece of work." There is no difference in principle between science and art, he concluded.

you that this has led to a great deal of controversy here, with some people saying, 'Look, let's just worry about how to rebuild the nation, and not worry about whether it's beautiful.' I'm sure that the subject of architecture has crossed your ever-inquiring mind, and I was wondering if, to your mind, Classical composition in architecture is fully compatible with the technological approach? Would they be separate motives at times? How do you see the built environment of the future? I personally believe, that in fact, the two are compatible; but I don't think this is a minor question, because we really are talking about building nations, and it's a time at which these questions are really quite urgent and quite compelling."

LaRouche: Well, you happen to be absolutely correct! And I'm standing here to prove it to you. I thought you'd like the proof. You deserve it. Being Irish, you

deserve a lot of things, because, you know, you have the British around your neck, and that's a terrible thing to put up with. Ever since William of Orange in particular, a very nasty bastard, you know what I mean?

Anyway, the basis for this, the simplest illustration for this, is, you had a fellow called Brunelleschi, in the early to middle part of the [15th] century. He was a participant in the construction of the great cathedral of Florence, Santa Maria del Fiore. Just one part; but also, he was a discoverer in many other respects. Now, the principle of Santa Maria del Fiore, of the cupola, is very interesting in this respect, and goes directly to the point of the question, which I'm delighted to answer. Because it deserves it. The Irish deserve something *good* after all this stuff. Oh, their being so close to those beastly Brits, you know? They deserve something nice.

But what was the principle that Brunelleschi discovered? The principle which is called—well, it's famous in Italy—the funicular; that principle. The funicular principle, which applies to taking a rope and dropping it across a crevasse. And you put pins on either side of the crevasse, and you build a rope bridge. And when you're walking across it, you dance wonderfully, because the very nature of system does it for you! And he understood that this was not merely a clever trick, but this was a *universal physical principle*, which superseded the notion of the sphere and circle. Now, he's also known for a chapel, the Pazzi Chapel in Florence. It's a wonderful instrument; it's a *tuned* chapel. Absolutely tuned. If you sing in there, it'll sing back to you. It's a beautiful piece of work. It's the same principle of Brunelleschi. Now, this was also the kind of thinking which characterized the achievements of the founder of modern science—also a Florentine gentleman for a decent part of his career—Nicholas of Cusa. My favorite scientist; one of my favorite theologians at the same time. And this concept is exhibited in the Pazzi Chapel, or the Santa Maria del Fiore, in the cupola. It demonstrates that what we call art and science coincide in principle.

That's the virtue of the argument made by the questioner, precisely that. There is no difference. In point of fact, much more important to say about it, is that this kind of development shows a connection between science and art, Classical art, in principle. What's that connection between these two phenomena—Classical art, and Classical science? Well, the principle is simple:

that all creativity, human creativity, is based on this principle. The art of science depends upon the art of creativity, human creativity. Human creativity is explicitly artistic, not physical. It belongs to the department of physics, yes, but it's in the imagination; it's in the principle of metaphor, as typical of the whole principle. The human powers of creativity, which we know as science, are born in art, and in great principles of art, as exhibited by the case of the Pazzi Chapel, which is a miracle in itself, and by Brunelleschi's development of the Cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiore.

So therefore, there is no difference between science and art. Science is a product of Classical art. So therefore, my dear questioner, you are absolutely right.

'Natural Disasters' in Africa

Freeman: The next question comes from an American foundation, and the person who's submitting the question just came back from a trip to Africa. He's an American, though. He says, "Mr. LaRouche, as I'm sure you're aware, right now there is a severe drought in East Africa. And this has caused, among other things, the greatest food shortage that I believe the continent has ever faced. I think that the most modest estimates that approximately 12 million East Africans could now be classified as being at risk. I do appreciate, and I agree with, your call for the imposition of food price controls, and for the end of the current use of food for fuel, which over the course of the last five years, has eaten up over 40% of the U.S. corn crop. Obviously, this poses an even more critical question now, as the U.S. itself has been hit with aberrant weather, and the size of the crops are themselves in doubt.

"However, I have another question really, because as we debate what policy should be for the United States, as the Europeans talk about whether or not the European monetary system and the EU will continue to live, or will be replaced by another system, the fact of the matter is, that this seems to keep on happening in Africa. And, what some would argue is that there is just absolutely nothing you could do about these kinds of things; it's the nature of the geography; droughts; this, that, etc., that these represent the equivalent of natural disasters. And really, the only question is, how quickly the rest of the world responds with relief. However, I just find it very hard to accept that overall view, and I don't think that it's reasonable to tell this large continent that they just have to sit around and wait until the advanced sector gets around to solving its problems. I

think that my question really goes to the heart of some of what you had discussed last year, regarding NAWAPA [the proposed North American Water and Power Alliance] and other such great projects. But I think to simplify things, I would just ask you, do you think that these kinds of catastrophes are simply natural disasters that we have to put up with, or things that we can change in shaping the general terrain of this planet that we inhabit?"

LaRouche: I think you missed the point. Your argument is irrelevant to the point! *The point is, we're dealing with genocide on a global scale*, as I've addressed this over this evening. And don't play with it! Don't do goody-goody shoes. It's nonsense, don't do this. We have a policy of genocide against Africa, which is not something that came recently; it's been going on for a very long time. And the policy of genocide is now going on in Europe. The policy of genocide has now come to the United States, when you're going to see your food supply next January and February. So, let's not talk around the issue. Let's not talk about petty little things. "I've got a little suggestion to fix something." *Crap!* Forget it. You're changing the subject from the real subject to a subject that's absolutely irrelevant!

The problem is there, no question about it. Anybody can comment on it, it's true. But it doesn't address the problem; it doesn't address the solution. You're not going to save Africa unless you get Obama out of the Presidency; you're not going to do a damn thing for it. You can prate all you want to about suggestions for this or that. It's not going to happen! And your suggesting it might happen is no good, because *it's not going to happen!* You have to make suggestions, and raise issues, which go practically to the issue, in fact—how you get the damn change made.

There's too much of this smarty stuff. Oh, you've got a suggestion as to how that might be considered, or ask a question how we might improve something. Forget it! Stop it! You're wasting time. You're substituting a posture for reality. You're saying we've got to



AU-UN IST/Stuart Price

We're dealing with genocide on a global scale. We have a policy of genocide against Africa. "You're not going to save Africa unless you get Obama out of the Presidency," LaRouche insisted. Shown: Starving women and children rush to a feeding center in Mogadishu, July 20, 2011.

pose this proposal; we're going to propose this improvement. That's not going to do a damn bit of good. You've got to force the issue on a global scale. *There is no African solution for Africa; there's only a global one.* It means getting rid of the beast in the White House, among other things. You don't include the beast in the White House; why do you put all these other details in there, which are irrelevant? It's the beast in the White House that's your main problem, or the bitch in Buckingham Palace. That's your problem. It *always has been* the problem. Africa's been subjected to generations of genocide. It's a target of a system of genocide. You want to come along with some suggestion? You want to duck the issues? You want to raise the issues that are important? That will decide the question? We shouldn't play, we shouldn't masturbate with history! That's what it amounts to—coming up with cute suggestions, cute questions. Cut it out! It's childish!

If you want to do something, don't worry about Africa. Get your nose out of Africa. Stick it right up the you-know-what of the United States and Britain, because that's where you'll do some good. Otherwise, you're just babbling, wasting time on something that's not going to work. And that kills us! That's the kind of thing I was addressing from the beginning of the re-

marks tonight. Stop it! Stop this nonsense! Stop playing games! Stop trying to make yourself look pretty, instead of doing what has to be done.

You have to get rid of this President! Don't talk about Africa, until you get this guy kicked out of there first, because you don't have a chance if you don't kick him out of there. Your talk about Africa is self-deluding, and it's actually disgusting! Because you're talking about how we're going to do something about Africa, we must do something about Africa? You're not going to do a damn thing for Africa, unless you clean out the White House. *Face truth!* Don't posture. I intend to solve the problem. How? Get the bum out of the White House! That's the first step. If you're not going first to the question of the White House, you're kidding yourself. That's what we're dealing with here in the United States. We're dealing with the gut issue. Don't run away to Africa, and talk about issues in Africa, when you're running away from the problem in the United States, because the solution lies within the United States. And Africa's going to die from it. No scheme proposed by anybody for Africa is going to be a damn bit of good unless it's premised on getting this bum out of the White House, and the other bum, the Bitch of London, out of Buckingham Palace.

That's the way to look at this thing. We have the concept of what to do. I know what to do, I don't have to be told to know what to do. I know what the solution is, and I've got the Africans and others available to us, who know how to implement the solution. We've got to clear the way to actually make the solution *possible*. Masturbation is not pregnancy!

On Dams and Earthquakes

Freeman: I'm going to have an interesting weekend!

Let me just preface the next question by saying that these guys have submitted about eight questions, and we're not going to be able to take them up in this forum. There are some discussions planned over the next couple of weeks, where I think they can be examined in detail, and I know Lyn will make himself available to do that. The questions come from a group of Russian and American geologists, scientists in economics, who have been doing some work in the wake of Lyn's proposals on NAWAPA, and in the course of that, they also got involved in a certain number of studies since the Japanese earthquake and tsunami, and on this whole question of whether or not earth-

quakes can be predicted and other such things.

The question that they're posing, was provoked by a study that was released in late June, done by a combination of the Scripps Institute of Oceanography, of UC San Diego, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the University of Nevada. They were looking at the question of predicting earthquakes, and apparently what their study was examining was the theory that the Hoover Dam had inadvertently tamed the San Andreas Fault. What they said in the study was that until the late 1800s, the San Andreas Fault jolted southern California with very large quakes about once every 180 years. But that now, it's been three centuries since the last really major earthquake, and what the study said was, that they were baffled by this. They looked at certain sonar readings and other things beneath the surface of the Great Salton Sea, and examined the fact that there hasn't been a quake in that area. There's been underground turbulence, but there hasn't been a major quake. And they say that they believe that this has occurred since the Federal government built dams that controlled flooding on the Colorado River.

Now, what our friends are saying, and I mean there's a lot more detail in this that we could examine, but what our friends are saying, is that the people who did the study are saying well, you could look at this one of two ways: Either water management did inadvertently tame the San Andreas Fault, which has very interesting implications vis à vis NAWAPA and other large-scale water management programs, but it could also mean something else. It could mean that this is paving the way, by containing this—one of the people in the study compared it to a woman who was 15 months pregnant—saying that this may in fact be paving the way for an even bigger megaquake. And therefore, they're arguing that these kinds of water management projects may be a problem; that they're not looking at all the factors involved.

Now what our friends say, is that they'd really like you to comment on this overall, because obviously there are big implications here in terms of water management in general; but they also pose the question as to whether examining precursor indicators by simply looking at questions like flooding and things like that, might actually be scientifically faulty, and that really the causes of quakes are coming from other issues. As I said, there are a lot of questions here, but I think you get the gist.

LaRouche: I don't like the whole discussion. A

friend of ours, a Russian specialist¹ in this, at a recent conference we had in Germany, emphasized this in answer to a question from Sky Shields and others. His statement, the Russian's statement, is that we are not capable of predicting, because we're not doing enough work in the area. Therefore, there's a fallacy in all these discussions; that people are adapting to the incompetence of the practice of governments and economies today, because they don't have the means to make a decent forecast. Now, we do know, from scientific work by people who *are* responsible, and it's one of my specialties in on this thing in terms of physics.

What we're dealing with here—and it's an important question; if others don't make it, this is probably more important, because it's more general. First of all, the general conceptions that you get in most institutions today, academic and otherwise, are fraudulent. Why are they fraudulent? Because you have a policy group inside the British system and the United States and elsewhere—but especially the British and the United States—where the actual, competent scientific work, of which some people and professors and so forth are capable, refuse to do the job. Why? Because they would lose their job and their subsidies if they did. So, we live in a nation of vicious scientific incompetence among the very layers which, in the main, would be considered competent. Their hides depend upon being incompetent. And because they need money, they need careers, they need access to resources, university-established things, *they lie like Hell!* And they produce frauds to say, “Well, we can go along with you, Mr. Obama, because we're obedient Obama-kissers.” And this whole thing becomes a hoax!

Now, the point here, the most crucial thing, which is what my specialty is, on this scientific work, is, the human mind is not located in the simple functions of the brain. Now, this is a point which was made very clearly by my dear friend in this area. The issue here is that *we don't know*; we're not looking at the thing from a com-



CNES/D. Ducros

If we are to forecast earthquakes and other severe weather phenomena, we have to supersede our five senses by developing and deploying the appropriate scientific instrumentation. But, “the lid is on it,” LaRouche stated, imposed by Obama’s budget cuts. Shown: an artist’s depiction of the Demeter satellite above Greece.

petent physical standpoint. The human mind, the human brain, does not represent the principles of nature. The human brain had five categories [senses] in it originally. It was capable of only a very limited, cheap approximation of knowing anything about the universe in which we live. Therefore, what we have done, we no longer talk about the five senses, unless we're idiots or poor, ignorant people who don't know any better.

What you have now, what's happened is that mankind has discovered supplements to the five senses. This point was made clear by Bernhard Riemann in the concluding, third section of his habilitation dissertation. So therefore, the problem is that we are teaching people to believe in sense certainty, and sense certainty does not exist. The best kind of sense certainty you can get is in Bach, because in Bach you have the implicit principle, which governs these types of things about the relationship of the mind to sense perception. Crucial, hmm? So therefore, what we do have, we are able to develop, as Riemann defined the problem in that third section. We are able to develop approaches to the uni-

1. See Sergey Pulinet, “Are Earthquakes Foreseeable? Overview of the Current State of Research,” http://schillerinstitute.org/conf-iclc/2011/ruesselsheim/vid_eos2.html#pulinet. Synopsis in *EIR*, July 15, 2011.

verse, to replace and supersede sense perception, by instruments, by scientific instruments. And we can use the standard of the discovery of gravitation by Kepler, and the way he defined gravitation. We can use these methods of sense-perception-like instruments; we can use them in contrast, exactly as Kepler proved and demonstrated the principle of gravitation, in which he defined a principle which is not located in any of the instruments, but it was located in a paradoxical conjunction of elements of the instruments.

Now, what happens now? We come along, and we take our five miserable senses, if they're still there, and we now use these sense organs, the five senses, to enable us to use instruments that we create. We develop complexes among instruments we create, and these complexes now serve as new instruments, which correspond, in the same way that Kepler defined gravitation, to some other principle of the universe. These discoveries then, are adopted by the human mind as extended principles that supersede sense perception. That opens up the gates for an expanding amount of instruments that humanity defines. Not only instruments as such, but combinations of instruments, which have the same effect as defining a universal physical principle. It's never a perfect universal principle; it's an approximation of one.

Now, to correct your view of the universe, you have to discover new, additional physical principles. And on top of this, then, you get to a state where the idea that you're going to be able to determine, by instruments of the type we are using, what the universe is like, is nonsense. And as our Russian friend said, you have to develop and deploy the set of instrumentation which gives you access to this knowledge. So, we don't know, because we're not doing the kind of work with instruments in space, which enables us to explore this process and to understand the universe in a larger scale than we can now. It's that simple. So therefore, what you get is, people are trying to make a career in science, and they're prohibited from having access to an approach which is



EIRNS

Forget the debt ceiling debate! LaRouche advised. It's a fraud. "We have to crack down with a Glass-Steagall law." Shown: LPAC organizers in Columbus, Ohio, fight for Glass-Steagall, and dumping Obama.

correct, because the President of the United States outlaws it! So therefore, they are working with an enforced incompetence; enforced by the Federal government under Obama, and other similar institutions, to commit a fraud. Then, in order to try to make their keep and get a record of having discovered something, they fake something up, by eliminating things they know they should be taking into account.

Now, our Russian friend said exactly that. He was asked, can we predict earthquakes? He said, "No, but let me explain why: because we are not creating the kind of instrumentation, and maintaining the kind of instrumentation which is necessary to do this kind of investigation."

The lid's on it. When President Obama cuts out all these instruments that we could use, that we had been using—like space instruments—you realize that what you're dealing with is, this is not something you can find out by taking a local area. You can not define a universal principle of physics by looking at one area inside the United States. You can not draw that kind of conclusion. You can say, here's something we are estimating with these limited conditions, and we're getting this lousy answer. But you don't come around and have big arguments over matters you have not investigated.

So we're dealing then with a great degree of utter incompetence, practiced in science under the Obama doctrine. That's our problem.

The White House and the Budget Crisis

Freeman: The next question comes—I'm kind of putting together several questions from some people up on Capitol Hill, Democrats from both the House and Senate side. They say, "Mr. LaRouche, as you may know, over the course of the last 24 hours, several of us have held press conferences to talk about this Gang of Six proposal, and the deep cuts, as well as the cut and cap nonsense that has been going on. However, it's increasingly the case, that we are coming to the conclusion that really all of this is being run by the White House. And that, in fact, the whole question of the lifting of the debt ceiling, is simply being used as a pretext to impose cuts that President Obama has wanted to impose from the very beginning. But this does raise several questions, that it would be helpful if you commented on.

"Number one is on this very question of the debt ceiling. Because we are now beginning to doubt that this really is as much of an existential question as Mr. Geithner is portraying it as. We don't right now really know what President Obama is up to, but we are being forced to vote on a package which is being negotiated without our participation, and which frankly, at this moment, is a package in which we're not even aware of the details. But we'd like you to comment overall, on first of all, what your thoughts are on this whole debate of the lifting of the debt ceiling, and then also whether or not you would agree that President Obama is using this with other motives."

LaRouche: Utter motives? Udder motives? No, this is a fraud, a complete fraud; there's no truth to it. The point is, what we have to do—and there is no substitute for doing it—is, we have to crack down with a Glass-Steagall law. Otherwise, anything you're doing is just nothing but an act of masturbation. Without Glass-Steagall, you're not serious.

First of all, you've got to eliminate the *monetarist system*. That's not money—it's money, yes, but it's worthless money. It can never be redeemed. What are you kidding yourself for? It can never be redeemed, it's worthless! It's part of the instrument of destroying the United States, for example, which is British intention. You've got a British stooge for the President of the United States; he takes his orders from the Queen of England—*literally*. You want to talk about this. It's irrelevant! *Put Glass-Steagall through now!* If you're not putting Glass-Steagall through, you're wasting your time and you're wasting our time. Because there's no

chance of saving the United States from Hell in the immediate future unless you get Glass-Steagall through now. It has to be that way.

See, the problem is, you find, people get themselves asking questions based on the assumption that something is accepted practice. And they try to take what they believe is currently accepted practice, and they try to interpret it to solve a problem. When what you have to eliminate is currently accepted practice! You have to shoot the enemy, not your foot. And that's the problem here. That's exactly it. Don't get sucked into this stuff. I know exactly what to do, and we have other people who know exactly what to do about this. Let's do it; let's not change the subject into worthless discussions.

Implementation of Glass-Steagall

Freeman: The next question is also on Glass-Steagall. It's from a member of the professional staff of House Ways and Means, and she says: "Lyn, I know you're aware of the fact that there are now two Glass-Steagall bills before the House, and soon there will be a Glass-Steagall bill before the Senate. Momentum continues to build, and those bills are, we believe, likely to pass before the end of August. However, in reviewing the bills for my boss, one of the things that has come up is that both bills seek to restore Glass-Steagall, but they have no mechanism for implementation. And my question to you is, should we be doing something? Do we need to worry about this? Should we be writing additional legislation, or is it sufficient to just say, 'Reinstitute Glass-Steagall'? Because certainly, the first time that Glass-Steagall was passed, you had a President who was friendly to it, and took the appropriate action."

LaRouche: It's very simple. There's no problem. Get Glass-Steagall rammed through, both versions, and in the process, kick the President out of office. If you don't do that, you're wasting your time. You've got to get Glass-Steagall through. You cannot have a United States continue to exist without Glass-Steagall. So, don't talk about alternatives to Glass-Steagall. Glass-Steagall in its original form, is copied more or less accurately by the two sets of candidates for the bill. Ram it through! Throw the bum out!


When you ram this thing through, what do you get? You get that Wall Street goes bankrupt, right away. Because all the dirty money that's worthless, is given to Wall Street, to *pay*, all the worthless debts are given to Wall Street to *pay*. Now, the problem is going to be the

following: The problem is, if we clean out all the garbage which belongs to Wall Street, there's very little money left in the banking system. So what's your solution? It's elementary, buddy. Hey, Sherlock Holmes, you've missed the point! The point is, we don't have enough money after we enact Glass-Steagall, to cover the debts; to maintain the banking system, the legitimate banking system.

So what do we have to do? We have to create, and utter, a mass of U.S. Federal credit, which then is applied to a credit system to make sure that we are running large projects, and smaller projects as well, on the Federal and state level. We are putting the unemployed back to work. As Alexander Hamilton prescribed, we take these jobs and the people who are fit for them, and we give them the work. These projects, then, become the basis for the assets which are being created to pay the debts, which we're covering with Federal credit, in the various parts of the nation.

So, suddenly, we create—as Alexander Hamilton's reform, which was called the U.S. Federal Constitution—we use that thing, because Glass-Steagall is nothing but that, exactly that. We use that form, immediately, to get large projects going, especially, because the smaller projects will come free. In other words—take NAWAPA, for example: If we decide to launch NAWAPA immediately, we know what the costs are, in fair terms. We know what the benefits are. We know, for example, in addition to NAWAPA, we've got to carry the thing further, because we've got to have a link, as we need now in the Missouri, Mississippi, and Ohio rivers; we have a flooding condition there, which means no food supply from that area, this coming year. So we do need this project.

We need these projects, and what we do is we extend NAWAPA, we go back to the Tennessee Valley Authority organization, rebuild that, extend it through other systems. Now we have a system, whereas we had a flooding in that river system, earlier this year. We now have a drought in the complementary area. With the



National Nuclear Security Administration

With a return to Glass-Steagall, we can begin to rebuild; we can start putting people back to work, increasing the productive powers of labor; raising the skill levels of the workforce. Here, a technician assembles a neutron generator.

volume of water involved in this, if you had a connecting system, you would be able to *absorb* the excess water from the north, and you would supply the water to the area in the south.

With the NAWAPA system, we would have the *means* to do that, and then we would have a balanced water supply system inside the United States' territory. And we would have a project, which is one of the greatest drivers the world has ever seen, in terms of large-scale development of territory.

So, you have to think in these terms. You have to think of production. You have to think of putting people to work. You've got to think about increasing the productive powers of labor. You've got to increase the skill levels of people in labor. You've got to rebuild the nation the way it was built, by the United States under the Constitution: same way. Same thing done by Lincoln, and after Lincoln, the Transcontinental Railway, all of the great projects that we did, which were imitated by Europe. All the great railway systems were done by Europe, on the basis of U.S. inspiration. So, we have vast projects, including emergency projects, which are needed immediately. We still have people who have skills, high-level skills, in production. We need to put

them to work while they're still alive! We need to create cadres around the people who have these skills, but who are getting old. And by doing that, we are creating an engine of progress, for the people and the nation of the United States. And there's the money. There's the credit. It's sitting up there, and what's happening? The value is being *produced* that backs up that credit. We have re-created the United States, which is what the British are terrified of. And we sit there laughing, while the British cry.

Gutless Politicians

Freeman: . . . The next question comes from someone who serves on the staff of the Angelides Commission. And she says, "Mr. LaRouche, I'm sure you're aware of the fact that some of the disclosures by Congressman Elijah Cummings over the course of this last week, promise to rejuvenate the credibility of the Angelides Commission, despite the fact that there have been significant attempts, since we issued our report, to just put a lid on the content of the report itself.

"But, having said that, what I wanted to ask you was this: I know that you have frequently talked about [Italian Economy Minister] Mr. Tremonti, and you've talked about him in a favorable light. I know also that some members of the Commission had the occasion to talk to him when they were in Italy. I'm asking this question because I find it very confusing, and I think that it's also confusing from the standpoint of the actions of certain people here in the United States: On the one hand, Mr. Tremonti has been an advocate of things like the convening of a New Bretton Woods system. What I don't understand, and my boss hasn't been able to explain it to me either, so perhaps you can, is why is Tremonti pushing the kind of austerity that he's pushing in his own country? It would seem to be contradictory to what he has done over the last ten years."

LaRouche: Ah, but one must not underestimate contradictions! Most politicians are contradicting themselves all the time, because they want to please this one, placate that, and so forth. It's all done, this kind of thing.

You see, we have a gutless government. Now, I'm not President of the United States. Even now, if I were in there for a few weeks, we'd have a lot of fun. You'd also have people scampering out of the United States who would be wanted for arrest, you know; because I can be an arresting person, you know. And I'd delight in

doing something like that, these days!

No, just give me a little time to shake things up. And that's exactly the problem.

You have the politicians of Europe, even the ones who have some good instincts and so forth—they're gutless wonders! The leading people of the United States are gutless wonders. Most of the politicians of the United States of the highest rank, are gutless wonders. Members of the courts are gutless wonders, fakers. What do you expect? You're looking for consistency? What are you, baking a cake? My God, man, what do you want? We've got a bunch of gutless wonders out there, and [with Scottish accent] ye need a little kick in the rear end, now and then.

No, that's why I say, if I were President for just a short period of time—I'm not eligible for that position for a long period of time—I could do a fine job in a short period of time. I know exactly where to plant the foot, and with vigor, shall we say. The point is, you've got gutless people in politics. Our politicians are gutless wonders. I know it. The whole generation since the Baby Boomers came into existence, has been gutless wonders, ever since the beginning of the Indo-China War. They're gutless wonders! There's not a gut in the carload! Right?

And that's the situation. Tremonti is maneuvering in a situation of a world of gutless wonders, in Italy and elsewhere. The most crooked system you ever saw in your life. And manifesting it all over the place.

But, we rival them in gutlessness and corruption. What are you talking about? You shouldn't treat such questions so seriously. When the one-term gutless wonder, another gutless wonder, is what you're talking about. Now, he's not a gutless wonder, but he's living in a nation which is full of gutless wonders.

An older generation of Italian gentlemen, whom I used to know, were less gutless. They had some stuff in them. But things are so rotten these days, ever since the milk scandal in northern Italy, everything has gone to hell. Take the milk scandal, as an example. This company was producing milk products; it was an excellent product. And some thieves got in there and made a mess of it, and the company is sadly damaged. And the milk product in northern Italy is damaged in terms of production. Gutlessness, pure gutlessness!

We have a collection of the most gutless politicians in the world. They snarl, like the character in the *Wizard of Oz*, who sits behind there with the organ and makes



Library of Congress



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Jessica White (above), of the New Jersey LPAC, described the resistance she had met while lobbying at the state legislature for Glass-Steagall. LaRouche responded by contrasting the response of the U.S. population to the attack on Pearl Harbor: “Suddenly there was an influx of young American males going to recruiting stations” (as seen in this photo), because they trusted President Roosevelt.

big noises, and says, “I’m the king of everything.” He’s a coward, and he doesn’t have an idea in his head, usually.

Tremonti? Well, he’s a sophisticated gentleman. Talk to him privately, very smart. Talk to him publicly, don’t expect too much.

Where the Gutlessness Came From

Jessica White: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Jessica White and I’m from the New York City LaRouchePAC, out of New Jersey. My statement is—and then my question—over the last few days, after gaining the support and encouragement of the New Jersey/New York LaRouchePAC embodied in one of the six LaRouche candidates, Diane Sare, I and several of my colleagues embarked on a mission to lobby many of the Congresspersons in the House of Representatives. We insisted that they sign on and co-sponsor H.R. 1489, the “Return to Prudent Banking Act of 2011,” which in principle is the FDR Glass-Steagall of 1933. In too many cases, we were met with resistance, to say the least, from some of these Congresspersons, who seem unable to commit to ending the systemic collapse of the United States, and Europe by collateral damage, and insisted on blaming everyone and everything except Obama and their own cowardice. How can we continue to rally the necessary patriotic response and move past this sophistry? Thank you.

LaRouche: Okay, very nice! *Very, very nice.* Precise and to the point. Simple. It’s called guts. Now you have shown guts. But I find that many people in the same environs have not shown guts. This is the principle of leadership. Now, I was in World War II. I was not very important in the war itself. I achieved my importance in World War II after the defeat of Japan, when I was shipped back to India and I began creating trouble. But I know from this experience, and from the experience of my generation which went to war at that time, that the Baby Boomer generation that came after me, is gutless. It’s systemically gutless. It’s not just many gutless people; the generation itself is systemically gutless in its character.

Now, what do you do with that? You go back to World War II and you think about how leadership was conducted during World War II. It was conducted on the basis—in my experience on Dec. 7, 1941, when I happened to be in New York City, and I was going down the street, across Midtown, to visit a hotel where I was going to meet some people on a business basis. I walked up the street. The streets were silent. Central Manhattan—silent! I walked toward the East Side—silence! I walked into the hotel where I was going to meet—silence! Then I looked and I saw the reason for the silence. Pearl Harbor had been struck. In the early aftermath of that occasion, suddenly there was an influx of young American males going to recruiting stations—

which were not even open at that time in many cases—to be recruited into military service—a response to the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Now, because Roosevelt was President, the reaction of the American people was the sense that Roosevelt was going to act. And these fellows who packed the recruiting stations—and I was almost one of them, I was close to it—were reacting to the fact that Roosevelt was the President. The confidence in the leadership shown by this man, in peace, corresponded to their trust in this man as a leader in war.

And it worked out that way. About 17 million of us were engaged in military service during that period.

What happened was, immediately after, Roosevelt was out. Dead. And Truman took over, who was a British whore. A Wall Street whore. The American people lost their guts. It didn't happen all at once, but it became a creeping thing. The wives were really at first responsible for it. The men who had been in military service generally retained their experience in military service as their attitude, but the wives would say—and it's typical: "You've been away for five years. We don't have a family. You don't have a good job. You don't have a university education. You've got to behave yourself! Don't get our family into trouble." That was when cowardice moved in.

Now, I was in that period. I was sometimes the brunt—not that I wanted war, but I was the brunt of opposing Truman and what he represented. I saw people cringe; and these people who I saw cringe, were the mothers and fathers of what became the Baby Boomer generation.

That was bad enough! But then with the killing of Jack Kennedy, the cowardice spread. Real cowardice! And the cowardice was accompanied by a great movement in a war, on hashish and other kinds of recreational substances, shall we say. What we got out of that whole process, and out of the university generation of the 1960s, we got a bunch of prostitutes—that is, equivalent to prostitutes. No guts! No morals! No purpose. Just pleasure, different kinds of pleasure. Practically every week, a different kind of pleasure! Smoke this, drink that. A new fancy kind of sex—no human being required. That sort of thing was going on. And that's what we faced.

Now you have a generation which is born to the Baby Boomers. Those were the Baby Boomers—just because of the loud noises they made from their rear ends, I guess. And you have another generation, which

has come along, and it's not quite as gutless, but it's uncertain in its choice of values. It's confused on values, moral, all kinds of values. Now, what that generation is waiting for, is a clear voice, on a choice of a system of values. Right now, that generation is somewhat shattered, to more or less degree, by the lack of a sense of specific kinds of values which actually function, in the sense of providing the moral guidance for leadership.

And you have to look at leadership. There are some people in society who tend to become leaders, and the values adopted by those who tend to become leaders are the key to what society is capable of doing. We have now a youth movement, which is not just a youth movement: It's a movement among a certain layer, a small layer generally, of people who have the guts and are looking for the light to find the way to making their lives meaningful. The problem is that the politicians generally do not provide that courage. They don't! And those among us, the young people who are doing this organizing out in the field, are facing exactly that. How do we define for a certain number of potentially leading people, within that age group in society—say, between 25 and 35 is a key area you have to look at; are we providing them an assurance and knowledge required for them to fulfill the role of the kind of leadership which they are disposed to supply, provided they can get a decent answer as to what leadership is, as to what the standard of leadership is? That's the issue.

I'm an *o-o-o-old* man, with certain pretensions of a certain kind. An *old* man, among the *oldest* you can find these days, but I'm a fire they'll remember from the time I walked the streets of Manhattan to that visit. I'm still the same fire, and I'm looking for people who want to become the modern equivalent of *my passion back then*. That's the solution. Accept the standards of value, the goals which are right, and provide leadership to people who want to become part of that process. And the great crisis that we face today will tend to create the opportunity, if the leadership of them is provided. *My* job, *my* role, is to try to make that real. That's how leadership works.

We have people in this room who have a sense of moving in the direction, of assuming that role of leadership. We've got a couple here in the front row. Exactly that. They represent the Group of Six,² which is not just

2. Six young candidates for Congress, LaRouche Democrats.

the Group of Six. They're six people who are the core of an organization which is in part smaller, and in part larger. A leadership within the leadership; and then the broader mass of people who these leaders are going to pull together around an adopted sense of the moral principles and ideas which are needed to defeat the enemy in this struggle. That's us! Including this *o-o-old* man, me. And the *old* man is around, just to show you there's a connection between *then*, as the Irishman said, and *now*.

'Why Not Windmills?'

Freeman: Lyn, some of your earlier remarks set off a whole series of questions on the question of environmentalism. Now, those questions can be divided up into two groups. One are questions by people who, in the way that they phrase their questions, express that they do hate humanity, and they think that human beings have screwed up the planet and things like that. I don't see any point in entertaining those questions, because if those people feel that strongly, they should just all kill themselves and that would be a big plus for the environment. But there are a series of other questions from people who are honest, and honestly confused about some things, and I'm going to try to put those together generally, although I will read you one which came from one of our Irish friends, because it's a funny question.

He says, "Lyn, one of the main arguments of the environmentalists is that 'the gene pool must be preserved because it provides for the development of medicines and other useful things for humanity.' Now, I think the gene pool being referred to is the genetic information contained within a population of organisms, rather than my own family, of course, which has consisted almost exclusively of Genes until recently. My father, my uncle, my cousin, myself, we're all Genes. But I think that there is an inherent fallacy in this—my own family aside—that I'd like you to address."

But then a question from someone here in the audience, who obviously doesn't hate humanity and whose questions is actually reflected by half a dozen other questions that have come in, and that question is: "Lyn, I'm truly puzzled as to why you see solar and wind energy as harmful. I want to understand this, and what I can't understand is why something that doesn't pollute the environment is wrong to use." A number of people have written in saying, "Look, I'm pro-nuclear, but why not use this, as long as we have it available to

us? Why do you see it as such a problem?"

LaRouche: Because the windmills and solar collectors *are* pollution. That's a fact. The standard of proof of cleanliness, is *energy flux-density*, and the incremental rate of energy flux-density, which is produced by certain kinds of technology and scientific progress. The problem is those who say there's pollution. There *is* no pollution in nuclear power, any more than there is in anything else. The worst pollution is the *lack* of nuclear power, because the ability of the human species to exist now depends absolutely on nuclear power. If you're against nuclear power, you're against humanity, because humanity now depends upon it. The greatest pollution is the pollution of ideas with that kind of character, because those kinds of ideas determine your behavior. Your choices determine your behavior. Your behavior is either beneficial to the human species, or it's not. If it's not beneficial for the human species, or is used as a substitute for that which is beneficial, that is pollution.

You choose to define pollution in the wrong terms. You're giving it a very restricted meaning, which it does not rectify. Excess windmills are pollution! They are inherently pollution. The birds will tell you that immediately, and they may come down in great numbers and unleash their bowels upon you, to let you know about that! I wouldn't blame them if they did it. It would probably help fertilize the territory at the same time as—you know, this kind of thing.

No, this is the point. It is pollution! It's a *scientific* question. These are not things of what I like and what I feel, or what I don't like and what I don't want to feel. That's not the standard of anything. That's nonsense. It's pure gibberish. Lack of critical judgment.

Our job is to maintain the human species, and the function, as I said earlier this evening. There's the immortal species, mankind. Or *an* immortal species, among others we may yet discover, is mankind. Anything that worsens the conditions of life and progress for mankind in that direction, is pollution. The President of the United States is a pollution, because he's destructive. And the thing lies in a process of developing a nation.

Look what's happening; look what the pollution is. These windmills are killing people. Is that pollution? Look at these damned things up there! They're pollution. Look at the energy flux-density of a windmill. Look at the cost to build it, to maintain it. It's pollution, pure pollution! Solar collectors are pollution by any



First Entergy

In response to a question about wind and solar power, LaRouche responded that the worst pollution is the lack of nuclear power, because the ability of the human species to exist now depends absolutely on the energy-flux density of nuclear power. Shown: the Beaver Valley Power Station, Pennsylvania.

rational standpoint. They substitute something which is rotten, inefficient, and actually criminal in effect, the solar collectors. Pollution! Pollution is as pollution does. That's your standard, not whether you like it or not. You want to kiss it, or you want to do something else to it. Who knows what? Want to sodomize it, I don't know. But that's the point. That which is not useful to humanity is questionable. It's pollution. That which causes a deterioration of the spread of the standard of living of humanity *is* pollution. Something can be pollution for what it does *not* do, as much as for what it does. You cannot pick and choose, and set a standard which you pick and choose because you want to prefer something. It's sophistry. And the argument that I heard in terms of pollution, is a clear case of the use of sophistry. To make something sound pretty when it stinks.

A Question of Leadership

Freeman: Okay, now, there are some other questions, but I don't think I'm going to ask them, because given the mood Lyn is in and given the fact that I know these people, I would like to see them continue to exist for a while longer. To the people here who have submitted questions asking for tips on practical survival

techniques and tactics, you guys owe me, because I'm not going to ask him those questions. Now Lyn, there have been a number of questions submitted which really get at the same point, and this question I will ask, because it's people asking for direction.

One question, interestingly, comes from a group of members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and they say: "Mr. LaRouche, we are increasingly upset, obviously, with the actions of President Obama, although we are not prepared to move for his impeachment, for a variety of reasons which we know you don't agree with, but they are what they are.

But there's a larger question

which is posed, which is that if Obama and his team were to go, then the question comes of what in fact would replace them. You yourself have said that you're too old to be President, and the problem that many people have—and I'm not saying that we would move for impeachment if this were not the case, but I think that this is coming up with many American citizens who would turn away from President Obama if they had someone else to turn to—the question is, number one, who are people supposed to rally around? Number two, the so-called elite or establishment are not about to go down without a fight, and even if they did, the question is, what do you propose to do with these people? Many of them have committed criminal acts!

"And finally, do you still hold that you want to limit your slate of candidates to just six, or would you be open—given the fact that there doesn't seem to be much out there—to expanding it?"

LaRouche: Well, first of all, on the six, that's not true. The six are very big! They're infinitely expandable, if you're willing to do it, as the Irishman said. Now, on my leadership role, don't kid yourself, buddy. I may not be becoming President, but I'm prepared to run this whole damned shebang, if I get a chance at it.



LPAC-TV

I may not become President, LaRouche averred, "but I'm prepared to run this whole damned shebang, if I get a chance at it.... If people want to survive ... they're going to support me." Things can change quickly: "Look what happened in New Jersey recently, with this sudden surge in turnout against the Obama Presidency." Shown: the June 6 labor rally in Trenton, where an estimated 8,500 came out to protest the Obama-Christie austerity policy.

As a matter of fact, there are more people who are afraid of me in this country than anyone else. And they can prove it, very easily. The reaction our people get, at the mention of my name. "Awwhhhh!!" Right? You got the picture? These guys are scared bunnies. So I just say, "Boo!" And they jump.

The minute they think, that X number of people are agreeing with me vocally, they'll be out there trying to kiss my butt! I won't let them do that, of course. I want to keep my butt clean! But you've got to take the whole thing with a certain sense of merriment. It's necessary.

Leadership is defined by circumstance, by trend and circumstance. Now if people want to survive, and they've got half a brain to do it with, they're going to support me if I'm put in that position; if these wonderful six young people do the job, they'll do it. It'll work. It can spread fast. Look what happened in New Jersey recently, with this sudden surge in turnout against the Obama Presidency. And the crowd grew rapidly, because it had a trade union complement, and that helped it grow, very fast.

There can be very sudden changes in the composition of the political process now. The hatred of Obama is enormous, and anyone who wants to say, "But he's the President!" He's the President for expulsion! More people hate this SOB than almost anyone else. They're only inhibited in their hatred of him by their contempt for him! They don't know whether to hate him, or show

contempt for him, or to urinate on him, perhaps. All of these things are likely things to happen, if the people get a chance.

The question is one of leadership. Have you got the guts to get out there and stand and provide some leadership to get some other people to show some leadership and get this thing moving? It's up to you! You are the people. Don't you think you're a people? Don't you think you can push things? Don't you think you can influence people on the streets? Of course you can! It's the lack of confidence, that prevents you from doing it. And you also have to watch very carefully for the weather vane: When are the people ready to go? And you'd better be ready at that time, or you're going to lose.

Now, as for the action, I may make my last shot with that kind of thing, in this life. I don't give a damn about that. My job is to do that. My job is to make things happen, which you need. And I'll expend myself for that one, but not for anything less, not willingly. You want leadership? I'll give you leadership. I know these jokers there. I may have my limitations, but I don't have their limitations.

Freeman: Well, I promised you clear solutions, and I think that we have provided them. I have nothing to add. I'd ask you to join me in thanking Lyn.

LaRouche: I can only say to all of you: Have a hell of a good time!

LaRouche Warns of ‘Reichstag Fire’ Drive for Dictatorship

by Jeffrey Steinberg

July 25—In January 2001, Lyndon LaRouche warned, in an international webcast, of the danger of a Reichstag Fire incident within that year, which would be used as the pretext for establishing a dictatorship over the United States. Under the Bush-Cheney regime, the effort came precariously close to fully succeeding, following the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

Now the situation is far more desperate from the standpoint of the London and Wall Street controllers of President Barack Obama. On July 23, LaRouche issued a warning about a new drive for dictatorship, emanating from the London-Wall Street financial oligarchy, which now faces imminent doom. As in 2001, the pretext for dictatorship would be a spectacular act, or series of acts, of irregular warfare, labeled “terrorism.”

“If you look around the corners of society,” LaRouche began, “you will see that there are operations being staged which have a certain resemblance to 9/11. What was the characteristic then? On the 3rd of January, 2001, I stated—which shocked the Clinton family very much, both of them, but especially her—I said, ‘We’re looking at a terrorist operation against the United States, sometime during this year.’

“And it happened. The warning signs came. Various deployments were made, in various directions, feints, in other words, of the type you’re seeing in Europe and elsewhere now. You see deception opera-

tions, a credible threat here, say, Norway; a credible threat there. Now there’s a real one in there. So why all these threats? Because if you have many different kinds of threats coming on simultaneously, your attention is diverted, to try to find which is the real one! Which is the real one?

“Now, if there were the original threat, you could detect it, you could detect its ancestry. But if you have conflicting threats, which each seem to be equally prevalent, as was true in 2001—and what happened? I didn’t know *what* was going to happen; I had all kinds of things I knew were likely to happen. I knew what the threats were, generally. We were working on one, which was being built up around Washington, D.C., and into the surrounding areas, for a major targetting against Washington. Now, that did become the attack on Washington, by one of the craft that was shot into the Pentagon. There were attacks also in Washington against the White House and other locations. Some of this stuff worked, some of it didn’t, but it was all being done.

“So, all of these attacks were given a certain credibility, like what had happened in Italy, in northern Italy earlier—same thing. But then, finally, the ‘real one,’ the ‘mother’ (using the ‘mother’ in the usual ghetto pejorative) exposed herself, right in New York City. The attack was run, by what?

“The attack was run by two agencies chiefly: The Israelis were in on it, but they were not an active part.



Precisely as LaRouche warned on July 20, a global pattern of asymmetric warfare attacks, as occurred in the lead-up to 9/11, has broken out, the most spectacular being the July 22 attacks in and around Oslo, Norway (shown here).

They were out there, watching. They were all stationed, in Jersey, looking at the Tower! And then they skedaddled; exposed themselves afterward. They were looking at the Tower! Why were they gathered there, looking at the Tower? It was an intelligence operation, an Israeli intelligence operation. Because they knew about the attack, and they knew where it was coming from, and they were out there to watch the show.

“It was run by the Saudis who funded it, indirectly. It was backed by the Saudis, who organized the personnel who were used for some of the attacks. The Saudi ambassador to Washington, to the United States, was one of the key operators behind the launching of 9/11! In the course of the investigations, it was made absolutely clear that this was a Saudi-British, that is, BAE and British intelligence operation. The money for it was raised by an operation there.

“When the hearings were held on the 9/11 event, which had been organized with the Bush family—because the bin Laden family was in Texas at the time of the attack on New York. The whole damned bin Laden family!

“And after the attack, when the smoke had cleared, and the United States was under siege conditions, occupation-type siege conditions, the whole bin Laden

family were given an escort. The only flight out of the United States was the Saudi family; they were given an escort, safe back to Saudi Arabia! An operation which the Saudis had been a part of planning, and financing, and running.

“So, the investigation occurred, and the meetings were held, and the discussions were had, and then, there were these paragraphs of the [9/11 Commission] report which indicated, positively, what exactly the relationship was, of the Saudi and British operations in this case.

“It’s all there! We don’t have it all, but we have the indicative evidence, which

locates these agencies as being involved in it, including the Saudi Ambassador to Washington! The operation was run by the BAE, which funded the operation and organized features of it; it was organized by the Saudi Kingdom, the Saudi monarchy! It was organized by other, collaborating elements within it.

“Now, this was frozen by the Bush Administration. Well, it was the Bush Administration which had organized the attack on the United States! Maybe not poor, stupid Bush, but the Bush interests: It was the Bushes that were holding the family as guests, down in Texas, at the time the attack occurred. So, we have an act of war against the United States, and the President of the United States is complicit in covering up the attack, the authorship of the attack.

“And you respect him? You respect George W. Bush, Jr.? What kind of a creep are you? This guy was guilty, by virtue of his position and the knowledge of his institution, of an act of war against the United States! An act of war, actual destruction of American citizens, in an act of war! And the President of the United States was complicit in covering up that act of war against the United States.

“Now, look at the citizens of the United States! Look at their bravery, the boldness, the efficiency, with which they defended the United States!

“Now, look at the present situation in light of that. The incumbent President of the United States has just made a new coverup of 9/11! By suppressing one section of the report, in the findings—he said it should be expunged on the grounds of ‘national security’! When this son-of-a-bitch called the current President of the United States is complicit in the attack on the United States, as an act of war against the people of the United States.

“Now do you know why I’m saying what I’m saying, when you consider this and similar kinds of institutions? When I say you’re looking at doom? What’s the doom, now? The doom is the bailout.”

London’s Drive for Dictatorship

In leading financial circles in London and on Wall Street, there is a complete recognition that the so-called bailout policy is doomed, because the entire global fi-

ancial system is hopelessly bankrupt—as of right now. The dog-and-pony shows in Brussels and Washington, seeking interim solutions to such surface manifestations of the overall disintegration as the Greek bankruptcy and the U.S. debt ceiling debacle, are doomed to failure—and some of the smarter people within that system are fully aware of the impending doom. For London and Wall Street, the only available option is a drive for immediate dictatorship, starting in the United States.

The only way to defeat this London-centered drive for a police-state dictatorship is by starting from a top-down understanding of the moment of crisis that has now arrived. It is the London-centered “oligarchical system” that is demanding dictatorship now, because their system is already dead, and they must be in a position to politically control the replacement system.

Glass-Steagall Juggernaut Becoming Unstoppable

July 26—As the global financial system gasps its last breath, and the political leadership on both sides of the Atlantic having exposed itself as a (tragic) laughingstock, those who still have a grasp on sanity are reaching for the only solution available: a return to Glass-Steagall.

Here are the latest developments.

Glass-Steagall in Congress

- Rep. Marcy Kaptur’s H.R. 1489 “Return to Prudent Banking Act” now has 32 co-sponsors, including 4 Republicans; the latest signers are Tammy Baldwin (D-Wisc.), who is also a candidate for the U.S. Senate, and Bob Filner (D-Calif.).¹

- Rep. Maurice Hinchey’s H.R. 2451, a second Glass-Steagall measure, currently has five co-sponsors.

- Former Sen. Ted Kaufman (D-Del.) calls for

1. For the complete, up-to-date list of co-sponsors of H.R. 1489 and H.R. 2451, as well as all labor and other endorsements and resolutions, see <http://www.larouchepac.com/node/18182>.

the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall in a *Huffington Post* op-ed July 21, that blasts the “fatal flaws” in the pro-Wall Street Dodd-Frank bill.

Labor and Other Support

- The California Federation of Labor on July 21 issues a resolution of endorsement for Glass-Steagall, H.R. 1489, urging members of the California Congressional Delegation in the House and Senate to co-sponsor and vote for the bill.

Also on July 21, the Northwest Washington Central Labor Council passes a similar resolution in support of H.R. 1489.

- An AFL-CIO blog on June 8, posts a link to an LPAC video “LaRouche: We Demand Emergency Food Price Controls Now!” (<http://www.larouchepac.com/node/18376>) “Marlene R” replies to a posting on the need for states to boost the minimum wage, “the solution is to get Glass-Steagall restored,” adding a call for a mobilization to get H.R. 1489 passed. <http://www.larouchepac.com/node/18182>

- Financial columnist Malcolm Berko headlines a piece posted on numerous websites, “Bring Back Glass-Steagall.” He writes: “Wall Street has no more conscience than a fox in a poultry farm. But that’s the immutable nature of these people.”

—Bonnie James

LaRouche warned explicitly on July 20, in a statement widely circulated on the www.larouchepac.com, about the imminent threat of chaos and assassinations, as the knives come out in the great shakeout of the system. The statement read:

“Lyndon LaRouche warned once again today that unless Glass-Steagall is implemented in the United States and in Europe, the entire trans-Atlantic region is going to plunge into chaos. And under those circumstances, the kind of each-against-all warfare among the European financial oligarchy is likely to lead to some high-level assassinations. The now-unfolding political assassination of Rupert Murdoch, on the flimsiest of evidence, is just a mild indication of the chaos and mayhem that is about to be unleashed—unless a return to full national sovereignty, under a fixed-exchange-rate credit system, is established in the otherwise doomed trans-Atlantic nations.

“According to a senior U.S. intelligence source contacted today by *EIR*, the inherent flaws in the Maastricht Treaty system, from the very outset, have now reached a breakpoint. ‘Either there is a financial federalization or the Euro is doomed,’ he said bluntly, noting that any attempt at a political restructuring of Europe at this point, in favor of dictatorship by Brussels and the ECB, would trigger an all-out factional war among the entire European financial establishment. ‘Any such radical change in the power structure of Europe would precipitate a tremendous and bloody brawl,’ the source further warned. He added that the proposal on the table from the IMF and others to bail out the European banks, through European Central Bank dictatorship, would mean the end of what remains of the national sovereignty of the countries of the Eurozone. ‘It would mean a post-Westphalian order.’

“Lyndon LaRouche fully concurred with this assessment and emphasized that this has been the British objective since the launching of the Maastricht strait-jacket two decades ago.

“The source also noted that any further moves in the direction of an ECB dictatorship and surrendering of additional power to Brussels would be strongly opposed by a significant faction of German bankers and industrialists.

“This German opposition was the subject of an hysterical column in the July 20 *Daily Telegraph* by British spook Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, writing under the ominous headline ‘Only Germany can save EMU as conta-

tion turns systemic.’ Evans-Pritchard began by quoting HSBC currency chief David Bloom: ‘We are heading towards fiscal union or break-up. Talk is no longer enough as the fire threatens to leap over the firebreak into Spain and Italy. What the market is worried about is Germany’s long-term commitment to the euro project.’ Evans-Pritchard noted that German Chancellor Angela Merkel appears in no rush to adopt fiscal union, and has the Sword of Damocles hanging over her head, in the form of the pending Constitutional Court ruling on the legality of German participation in any European bailout, which will not be announced until September. Bundesbank president Jens Weidmann also recently told *Bild Zeitung* that German taxpayers would never accept a ‘transfer union’ requiring Germany to ‘fully’ bail out Greece and other debt-strapped states of Europe.

“‘The bottom line,’ Lyndon LaRouche concluded, ‘is that there is no solution to either the European or U.S. financial disintegration outside of Glass-Steagall. Even the effort to impose dictatorship would fail, and would only trigger chaos. They are all doomed unless they do what I say has to be done, starting here in the United States with the immediate reinstatement of the Glass-Steagall wall of separation.’”

Global Activation for Distraction

Precisely as LaRouche warned on July 20, a global pattern of asymmetric warfare attacks has broken out. The most spectacular recent incident was the set of July 22 attacks in and around Oslo, Norway, in which a 32-year-old man, Anders Breivik, first exploded car bombs outside a downtown building housing the office of the Prime Minister, and then went on a shooting spree on a nearby island, killing scores of youth attending a Labor Party outing.

But beyond that single incident, there have been other attacks and threats in recent days, indicating precisely the broad pattern of operations that LaRouche warned of in his statements. By being forced to respond to a simultaneous series of contradictory terrorist attacks and threats, security services are overwhelmed, and easily blinded from the real pending attacks.

It is precisely this global pattern of activations that has been under way for the past two weeks.

- On July 13, three suicide bombs were set off in Mumbai, India, the site of the Nov. 26, 2008 massive

irregular warfare attack. In the July 13 bombings, at least 24 people were killed.

- On July 19, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security put out an alert, “Inside Threat to Utilities,” warning of possible sabotage and cyber attacks against major U.S. power installations, including nuclear power plants. The alert was based on specific instances where individuals linked to Islamist terrorist networks were able to obtain jobs at utility company facilities; and additional intelligence derived from reviewing the documents seized in the raid on the Osama bin Laden compound in Abbotabad, Pakistan earlier in the year.

- On July 22, six hundred New York State National Guardsmen were put on alert to deploy to the New York City subway system, following credible threats that a serious attack was imminent. At the last moment, the deployment was delayed. While Gov. Andrew Cuomo and Mayor Michael Bloomberg were both silent on the activation, sources within the state National Guard confirmed the state of mobilization, and the fact that the alert status remains in place.

- Senior U.S. intelligence officials have also confirmed that they are convinced that the al-Qaeda apparatus is still intent on pulling off some dramatic terrorist incident on or around the 10th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks.

The source warned that there are many neo-Salafi radical Muslim networks in place, with no formal links to al-Qaeda or other known international terrorist organizations. “They are recruited to an ideology, not to a terrorist organization. The structure bears more similarity to large street gang structures. But they can be activated on short notice, before security services even take note of the personnel.” He further emphasized that, while it would be almost impossible to carry out another 9/11-style suicide airline hijacking, the type of commando attack on Mumbai in November 2008 could be repeated in almost any major city in the world.

Obama’s Hitler Moment

Many of President Obama’s former supporters have come to despise the fact that he has gone far beyond the Bush-Cheney White House in pursuing Unitary Executive rule by bureaucratic dictatorship. Some have even come around to accepting that LaRouche was correct on April 11, 2009, when he described Obama as a dangerous narcissist, like Emperor Nero and Adolf Hitler.

Those who doubted LaRouche’s prophetic January 2001 warnings of a Reichstag Fire incident to justify a



White House/Chuck Kennedy

Obama has gone far beyond the Bush-Cheney White House in pursuing rule by bureaucratic dictatorship. Some former supporters have now recognized that LaRouche was right when he described Obama as a dangerous narcissist, like the Emperor Nero and Adolf Hitler.

dictatorship by Bush and Cheney, only to find themselves facing a near-dictatorship after the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks, should heed his current warnings. Obama was installed as President precisely because of his Nero personality, and his slavish devotion to London and Wall Street. Under the present circumstances of absolute breakdown of the global financial system, the oligarchy’s impulse is to go for dictatorship.

As LaRouche declared at the outset of his July 21, 2011 webcast, Obama must be removed from office by Constitutional means, if the United States is to stand a chance of surviving this here-and-now crisis.

Banks Dictate Bailout Policy to EU Summit

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

This article was translated from German.

Wiesbaden, July 23—Article 20 of Germany’s Basic Law states:

1) The Federal Republic of Germany is a democratic and social state....

4) All Germans have the right to resist any person seeking to abolish this constitutional order, if no other remedy is available.

Unfortunately, it appears that in the wake of the July 21 EU Summit, a situation has arisen which meets the criteria of Article 20, Paragraph 4.

Because what was decided at the summit has turned the European Union into a transfer union,¹ one in which the chief burden is shifted onto the German taxpayer. In the context of the new EU109 billion bailout package for Greece, it was also agreed to expand the European Financial Stability Fund (EFSF) such that, beginning this Autumn, it will be able to buy up Greek and other toxic bonds, and/or exchange such bonds held by banks and insurance companies for new, EFSF-guaranteed securities.

The fact that German Chancellor Angela Merkel

managed to obtain the participation of private investors in these bailout packages, while mooted as her “great success,” looks quite different when examined more closely: Semi-toxic government bonds which currently have a market value of perhaps 50% or less of their face value now be transformed into 15- to 30-year bonds with a low 3.5% interest rate. So, the banks are supposed to write off 21%, while exchanging securities which are only worth 50%? What a good deal for the banks! And on top of that, private debts have once again been transformed into public debt—to the banks’ advantage, and at taxpayers’ expense.

French President Nicolas Sarkozy was overjoyed, calling it “a first step toward a European Monetary Fund.” “The embryo of a European national debt,” concluded *La Repubblica*, while the Italian economic daily *Il Sole 24 Ore* termed it “the birth of a lender of last resort.” “The Euro region has become a complete community of liability,” writes the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*.

And in fact, with the expansion of the EFSF, this agency can now also grant preventive lines of credit to countries that get into trouble, and it can even fund the recapitalization of private banks. Thus it is a giant step toward a European finance ministry, as was demanded recently by European Central Bank head Jean-Claude Trichet. And as Jacques Attali, the *éminence grise* behind former French President François Mitterrand, likewise recently boasted, the euro’s defective birth was planned deliberately, so that in the future, under emergency con-

1. The term means that the debt of one or more EU members gets transferred to one or more others; this is specifically ruled out by the EU’s Lisbon Treaty.

ditions, a European federal state could be rammed through.

Behind the Scenes

The recent summit also gave us a foretaste of who is going to be calling the shots in this prospective European federal state. The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* cited banking circles on the outcome of the negotiations: “We cannot be dissatisfied with the solution, since, after all, [Deutsche Bank board chairman] Josef Ackermann was sitting at the table.” And in fact, only hours earlier, a handful of top bankers, gathered in a room at Rue de Loi 155 in Brussels, just a few blocks from the European Council’s headquarters, had formulated the final details of the long-prepared Greece/EFSF package—which then, from noon to 9:00 p.m., the 17 heads of state “prepared,” i.e., translated into an “acceptable” EC communiqué.

The bankers’ group was headed by Ackermann, who, in addition to his day job at Deutsche Bank, also heads the Institute of International Finance (IIF) in Washington, the “only global institution of financial institutions, where the top 420 banks, insurance companies, and capital management firms from 70 countries have all teamed up.”

Other IIF members present, in addition to Ackermann, were Boudouin Prot, board chairman of BNP Paribas, the world’s biggest bank (as measured in “assets”), and Charles Dallara, CEO of the IIF, both of whom had attended under the pretext of providing “technical assistance” and “advice” over the telephone to the heads of state.

The result therefore suited not only the architects of the euro, whose long-held plan has always been to transform the EU into a supranational empire, but also the financial oligarchy’s interest in maintaining, at all costs, their casino economy of high-risk speculation.

The EFSF’s goal is to be a gigantic bank into which the toxic waste of financial speculation can be dumped, at the population’s expense. And thus, a mechanism has been created equivalent to the liquidity creation of U.S. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke’s “Quantitative Easing 3,” which feeds hyperinflation, but by no means eliminates the danger of an uncontrolled collapse, because the EU heads of state and their “technical advisors” haven’t even broached the necessity of a



Creative Commons/EPP

German Chancellor Angela Merkel attempts to stare down EU Commission President José Manuel Barroso at a meeting last year. But now, she is allied with “Helicopter Ben” Bernanke’s hyperinflationary QE3 policy and the bailout of the banks.

re-regulation of the banking sector. They have given no consideration whatsoever to the vast array of problems cited by the reports of the Angelides Commission of the U.S. Congress, and of the Senate’s Levin Commission—problems such as the shadow banks, derivatives, the securitization market, and so much more. And thus, the next mega-disaster, national bankruptcy and hyperinflation, is now pre-programmed.

Unconstitutional and Suicidal

Some important circles do recognize these dangers. Kurt Lauk, president of the German Christian Democratic Union’s economic advisory council, warns of the danger that Europe “is rushing by leaps and bounds toward an unregulated transfer union.” Freiburg constitutional law expert Dietrich Murswiek sees, in the EFSF’s planned preventive activity, an unbelievable expansion of its powers. Virtually no restrictions on the EFSF remain, recourse to Parliament is totally ineffective, and “the existing deficit in parliamentary control will become much greater,” he argues.

Clemens Fuest, deputy chairman of the German Finance Ministry’s economic advisors council, finds that “The Bundestag’s power over the budget has been further encroached upon, perhaps not formally, but *de facto*.” And it is telling that even Merkel’s own former economic advisor, Bundesbank head Jens Weidmann, has been sharply critical. The Euro summit’s decisions have made it extremely difficult from now on to practice any kind of stable financial policy, he said.

Calculations by Stephen L. Jen, head of the London hedge fund SLJ Partners, that the cost of all bailout packages up to this point totals some EU900 billion, fall short of the mark, but are interesting nevertheless. This, he says, has bought us approximately 500 days of peace, which works out to almost EU2 billion for each day of peace—too steep a price, in his view. But if you also consider that out of the EU109 billion package for Greece, half is being used to collateralize the risks of the participating private creditors—which the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* rightly describes as “just another way of making the debt into communal property”—then it becomes clear that we have fallen into the hands of bandits—oh, excuse me, I meant to say “convergence, competitiveness, and governance,” as it is called, of course, in the EU-speak of the official communiqué.

Since the brutal austerity policy imposed upon all states by the EU can only serve to further dramatically ruin the economies of Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, Italy, and all the others, the ability of these states to ever pay back these credits, is virtually zero. The idea floated by some politicians, of a Marshall Plan for the Mediterranean countries, should, to be perfectly clear, be de-

scribed as a Morgenthau Plan,² since these proposals consist solely of programs for renewable energy and luxury tourism, which only the mega-speculators will be able to afford.

And we don't have that much time left. With the EU's decision to turn the EFSF into a mechanism for buying up toxic government securities, the end-game has gone into overtime, such that Ben Bernanke's “Quantitative Easing 3” now applies to Europe, too. The next thing Chancellor Merkel will have to do, is interrupt her vacation in order to join Ackermann in flying over Brussels, Frankfurt, and London, to drop wads of cash from their helicopter.

The Glass-Steagall Alternative

The only alternative to this policy—a policy which threatens Germany's prosperity and its citizens' savings, by imminent hyperinflation—is to immediately replace the casino economy with a two-tier banking system—known in the U.S. as a Glass-Steagall standard—whereby commercial banks' activities in areas where personal savings are managed and people's life's work is honored, are maintained and put under government protection, so that, in a credit system, they can issue credit to the real economy. The high-risk speculative sector, on the other hand, which was spawned by deregulation, must be written off, without compensation. In the United States, there is a growing citizens' movement for the reintroduction of the Glass-Steagall standard, along with growing bipartisan support for it in the House and the Senate. We need the same thing here, too: a two-tier banking system.

The EU's current policy is a threat to Germany's fundamental character as a democratic and social state. And therefore, Article 20, Paragraph 4 of the Basic Law applies. And if the Bundestag, whose sovereignty over budget matters has been almost completely annulled by the EU decisions, goes ahead and approves those decisions—as is, unfortunately, to be expected—then all Germans have the constitutional right to resist, because no other remedy remains.

If you don't want to live under the dictatorship of “governance” by the IIF and its executive organs, and if Germany and its future are dear to you, then join with the Civil Rights Movement Solidarity, the BüSo, for a two-tier banking system, a new D-mark, fixed exchange rates, and a New Bretton Woods System!

2. The Morgenthau Plan for deindustrialization of Germany after World War II was ultimately rejected.

Lyndon
LaRouche
ON
Glass-Steagall
AND
NAWAPA:


The North American Water and
Power Alliance

“The greatest project that mankind has ever undertaken on this planet, as an economic project, now stands before us, as the opportunity which can be set into motion by the United States now launching the NAWAPA* project, with the preliminary step of reorganizing the banking system through Glass-Steagall, and then moving on from there.”

“Put Glass-Steagall through now, and I know how to deliver a victory to you.”

Subscribe to **EIR Online** www.larouchepub.com/eiw
1-800-278-3135

For subscription rates: <http://tiny.cc/9odpr>



Cash-Starved Bankers and Terrorists Keep Asia Narcotics Boom Going

by Ramtanu Maitra

July 21—On June 23, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) released its World Drug Report 2010. Replete with data, the voluminous report (307 pages) gives the impression that drug production and consumption have stabilized. However, this could not be further from the truth.

In fact, what is happening today, due to the globalization and hot-money transfers that drive the drug trade, is an opening up of new drug-consumer markets among the drug-producer countries.

For example: Afghanistan, now flush with cash, shows a huge growth in the number of addicts. Deputy Counter-Narcotics Minister Mohammad Ibrahim Azhar estimates that at least 1 million Afghans, including a large number of women and children, are addicted to heroin. India, which is not far from Afghanistan, is also becoming an illicit producer and consumer of drugs. This new phenomenon spells real danger to the lives of hundreds of millions, in the same way that Britain's Opium War did in the 19th Century.


Equally important, but omitted from the UNODC report, is the reality that illicit, mind-destroying drugs have not only addicted millions of human beings, but fully hooked the corrupt, bankrupt financial system itself. Dope, Inc.'s illegal drug money is keeping the

system afloat, while it funds the terrorism and arms traffic that the financial oligarchy uses to maintain control over the world's populations. The financial institutions which organize this drug money flow are buying up political figures who are becoming increasingly brazen in demanding legalization of their menticidal crimes. Unless this top-down financial reality is taken on, the drug- and crime-fighters at the UNODC will be helpless in defeating the drug scourge.

And UNODC executive director Antonio Maria Costa knows this.

The Banks Are Addicted to Drugs

In January 2009, by which time, the world financial system's collapse had become obvious even to the most short-sighted observer, Costa told the Austrian magazine *Profil* that drug money has been the only thing that has kept many major banks in business: "In many instances, drug money is currently the only liquid investment capital. In the second half of 2008, liquidity was the banking system's main problem and hence liquid capital became an important factor." Costa went on to say that the UNODC has discovered that "interbank loans were funded by money that originated from the drug trade and other illegal activities." He pointed to "signs that some banks



The UNODC Report deploys a myriad of statistics to claim that worldwide drug production and consumption have stabilized. But, the facts tell a different story.

were rescued in that way.”

It is evident that the world financial system is now in its death throes. Non-payable European sovereign debts of trillions of dollars have shaken up the European Union and the United States. The latter, under the Obama Administration, has gone so deeply into debt that it is teetering on the verge of default, while the Wall Street and City of London banks, which have created a new financial bubble, are now bankrupt and desperately looking for cash. Under the circumstances, as Costa pointed out earlier, a major cash-generating source for the banks is the drug traffic, which thrives on continuously expanding drug addiction.

Take the case of the Wachovia bank, which is now part of the Wells Fargo Company (WFC), one of the top five U.S. banks. Michael Smith of Bloomberg reported in June 2010, that Wachovia admitted it didn't do enough to spot illicit funds in handling \$378.4 billion for Mexican currency-exchange houses from 2004 to 2007. That's the largest violation of the Bank Secrecy Act, an anti-money-laundering law, in U.S. history—a sum equal to one-third of Mexico's current gross domestic product. Wachovia was charged, but what happened? The bank paid \$160 million in fines and penalties, and the company is now off the hook for further punishment.

One explanation is that President Obama's political campaigns, beginning with his run for the U.S. Senate in Illinois, were funded by the number one drug pusher in the United States: George Soros. Soros is also part of the drug-money dependent Wall Street elite. As Lyndon LaRouche recently noted, it was Soros's dirty money that bought Obama the White House.

Fallacy of Composition

According to the UNODC report, there has been a stagnation in production of narcotics because of a drop in production of opium in Afghanistan. Such a drop, about 20% of the peak value in 2007, occurred after Afghanistan's opium production went up 40-fold (!) between 2001 and 2008. In fact, in 2007, Afghanistan



Creative Commons/Jacksoncam

Deputy Counter-Narcotics Minister Mohammad Ibrahim Azhar estimates that at least 1 million Afghans, including a large number of women and children, are addicted to heroin. Here, a woman opium addict at a detox center in Mazar-i-Sharif.

alone produced at least 3,000 tons more opium than the entire world's addicts could consume.

Following the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan, and after the poppy fields were transferred from Osama bin Laden's watch to the care of the British troops, Dawood Ibrahim, a major smuggler and former Mumbai mafia boss, became a transporter of drugs from Afghanistan to Dubai by means of his "mules," protected by the intelligence agencies and his beneficiaries. It is said that containers that carry large equipment to Dubai from Kandahar and elsewhere in southern Afghanistan for "repair," also contain drugs.

The drugs were converted to cash in Dubai. The tax-free island-city, sitting at a strategic crossroads of the Persian Gulf, South Asia, and Africa, is a major offshore banking center. With the development of the Dubai International Financial Centre (DIFC), the latest free-trade zone there, flexible and unrestricted offshore banking has become big business. Many of the world's largest banks already have a significant presence in Dubai: Abbey National Offshore, HSBC Offshore, ABN Amro, ANZ Grindlays, Banque Paribas, Banque de Caire, Barclays, Dresdner, and Merrill Lynch all have offices there.

Outside of Dubai, most of the offshore banks are located in former British colonies, and all are involved in money laundering: Legitimizing cash generated from drug sales and other contraband for the "respectable banks" is the lifeblood of these offshore institutions. Arguably, the most important of the Caribbean offshore financial centers is the Cayman Islands, a British Overseas Territory run by a royal governor appointed by



WEF/swiss-image.ch/Sebastian Derungs

The world's leading promoter of drug legalization, financier George Soros: It was his dirty money that bought the White House for Barack Obama.

Queen Elizabeth II. The Caymans are mainly a mail drop and regulation-free zone, a place where hot money is welcome, and few questions are asked.

In 2001, a French parliamentary report exposed the connection between the drug money laundered by terrorist groups through the City of London. In a *Guardian* article Oct. 10, 2001, John Henley, citing an exhaustive 180-page French report, wrote that up to 40 companies, banks, and individuals based in Britain can legitimately be suspected of maintaining direct or indirect relations with the narcoterrorists. The report is based on interviews with senior Metropolitan Police officers, leading City financial regulators, and European judges investigating cross-border financial crimes in Spain, Belgium, and France.

According to a 70-page addendum, "The Economic Environment of Osama bin Laden," attached to the French report, compiled by an independent team of financial experts whose identity has not been revealed, the structure of bin Laden's financial network bears a striking similarity to that used by the collapsed BCCI bank for its fraudulent operations in the 1980s.

The report establishes numerous links between bin Laden and international arms and oil traders, and even members of the Saudi elite. It also pinpoints the relationship and its subsequent breakdown between bin Laden and his family's holding company, the Saudi Binladin Group, and its multiple subsidiaries, investments, and offshoots in Europe. The names of half a

dozen former BCCI clients and officials, including Ghaith Pharaon, wanted by the U.S. authorities for fraud, and Khalid bin Mahfouz, a Saudi banker who was closely involved with the bank before it was closed down by the Bank of England in 1991, recur throughout the report, and are directly linked to Osama bin Laden through banks, holding companies, foundations, and charities, at least one of which, the International Development Foundation, is headquartered in London.

"This document clearly shows the great permeability of the British banking and financial system and the fragility of the controls operated at its points of entry," the French report concludes. A copy was obtained by the *Guardian*.

Many of the individuals concerned, several with British connections, were also involved in various senior roles with BCCI, the now-defunct drug bank set up in the 1970s, the report says. Hundreds of banks and companies are mentioned, from Sudan, Geneva, and London, to Oxford, the Bahamas, and Riyadh, Henley wrote.

"The convergence of financial and terrorist interests, apparent particularly in Great Britain and in Sudan, does not appear to have been an obstacle with regard to the objectives pursued [by bin Laden]," the report concludes. "The conjunction of a terrorist network attached to a vast financing structure is the dominant trait of operations conducted by bin Laden."

Less Production, More Addiction, More Cash

The World Drug Report 2010 does not deal with where the money goes and how it gets there. The report shows that drug use is shifting towards new drugs and new markets. It claimed that drug cultivation is declining in Afghanistan for opium. While last year's Afghan poppy crop was reportedly damaged by blight, the news from Afghanistan suggests that this year's crop is robust, and that opium production will show a significant jump over last year's harvest. Also, in Afghanistan, more and more provinces have taken up opium cultivation, unlike in 2007, when more than 50% of opium was produced in the southern province of Helmand. Cannabis production has also skyrocketed.

Opium production is moving northward in Afghanistan. Meanwhile, Soros and his Open Society Founda-



Creative Commons/isafmedia

Afghanistan produces most of the world's opiates, but seizes less than 2%, despite the presence of some 150,000 foreign troops, and 200,000 Afghan National Army personnel. Shown: ISAF and Afghan troops on patrol in a poppy field in Zharay District, April 2011.

tion have been extremely active over the years in the social and political scene in Central Asia—particularly in what are known as the “stan” countries. The objective of the drug lobby that Soros represents is the Fergana Valley. With its abundant water and fertile soil, the valley sits between two potential large consumers—Russia and China. Moreover, the area, like southern Russia and western China, is full of terrorists who are sustained by the drug money.

The UNODC report says that drug (coca) cultivation in the Andean countries is declining, and drug use has stabilized in the developed world. However, there are signs of an increase in drug use in developing countries, and growing abuse of amphetamine-type stimulants (ATS) and prescription drugs around the world. It shows that the world's supply of the two main problem drugs—opiates and cocaine—continues to decline. Coca cultivation, down by 28% in the past decade, continued to decline in 2009. World cocaine production declined by 12-18% over the 2007-09 period.

Pointing out that the drop in potential global heroin production by 13% to 657 tons in 2009, reflects lower opium production in both Afghanistan and Myanmar, the report said the actual amount of heroin reaching the market is much lower (around 430 tons), since significant amounts of opium are being stockpiled. The UNODC estimates that there are currently more than

12,000 tons of Afghan opium, or around two and a half years of global illicit opiate demand, being stockpiled. However, supplies are abundant despite small declines—and the threat as dangerous as ever, not only in terms of funding terror, but destroying lives and minds.

The report says that Afghanistan produces most of the world's opiates, but it seizes less than 2% of them. And this is despite the fact that almost 150,000 foreign troops are based in Afghanistan, in addition to 200,000 Afghan National Army personnel. What that means is that those who need the drug-generated cash to stay afloat, or to carry out terrorist activities, have become a part of an “arrangement” which allows the poppies to grow, become laden with opium sap, then harvested, refined, and transported. The entire operation takes months from seeding to final product, getting saddled on a mule, or carried on a truck, or flown out by a helicopter.

In Iran and Turkey, the interdiction is significant, accounting for over half of all heroin seized globally in 2008. Interdiction rates elsewhere are much lower. Along the northern route, the countries of Central Asia are only seizing a meager 5% of the 90 tons of heroin that cross their territory heading towards Russia. In turn, Russia, which consumes 20% of the Afghan heroin output, seizes only 4% of this flow. The figures are even worse along the Balkan route: Some countries of south-

eastern Europe, including EU member-states, are intercepting less than 2% of the heroin crossing their territory, the report says.

Terrorists also need the drugs to buy arms and to bribe officials. They provide protection to the drug growers and traffickers; they take their cut before handing the rest over to the bankers. Around the globe, more and more irregular conflicts are opening up, and many more are expected to do so, as the global financial collapse begins to bring down the social systems in various countries. Who will fight whom cannot be foretold, but what is certain, is that the treasure trove of unaccounted for money—coca, heroin, cannabis, and chemical drugs, bought with cash—will continue to flood the world, bringing further misery to the suffering populations and hopelessness to the generations to come.

In one chapter, the report touches upon, but does not go into detail, the security threats posed by the drugs and drug trafficking, focusing in particular on the case of cocaine. It points out how underdevelopment and weak governments attract crime, while crime deepens instability. Drug-related violence in Mexico receives considerable attention, but the Northern Triangle of Central America, consisting of Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, is even more badly affected, with murder rates much higher than in Mexico. Venezuela has emerged as a major departure point for cocaine trafficked to Europe: Between 2006 and 2008, over half of all detected maritime shipments of cocaine to Europe came from Venezuela.

Also highlighted in the report is the unstable situation in West Africa, which has become a hub for cocaine trafficking. It notes that “traffickers have been able to co-opt top figures in some authoritarian societies,” citing the recent case of Guinea-Bissau.

Cocaine Market Is Shifting

The World Drug Report 2010 shows that cocaine consumption has fallen significantly in the United States in the past few years. To some extent, the problem has moved across the Atlantic: In the last decade, the number of cocaine users in Europe doubled, from 2 million in 1998, to 4.1 million in 2008. By 2008, the European market (US\$34 billion) was almost as valuable as the North American market (\$37 billion). The shift in demand has led to a shift in trafficking routes, with an increasing amount of cocaine flowing to Europe from the Andean countries via West Africa. This is causing regional instability. “People snorting coke in

Europe are killing the pristine forests of the Andean countries and corrupting governments in West Africa,” said UNODC director Costa.

In addition, the report says the global number of people using ATS—estimated at 30-40 million—is soon likely to exceed the number of opiate and cocaine users combined. There is also evidence of increasing abuse of prescription drugs. “We will not solve the world drugs problem if we simply push addiction from cocaine and heroin to other addictive substances—and there are unlimited amounts of them, produced in mafia labs at trivial costs,” warned Costa.

Manufacturers are quick to market new products (e.g., ketamine, piperazines, Mephedrone, and Spice) and exploit new markets. “These new drugs cause a double problem. First, they are being developed at a much faster rate than regulatory norms and law enforcement can keep up. Second, their marketing is cunningly clever, as they are custom-manufactured so as to meet the specific preference in each situation,” said Costa. The number of ATS-related clandestine laboratories reported increased by 20% in 2008, including in countries where such labs had never been detected in the past.

Meanwhile, another “designer drug,” Desomorphine, unmentioned in the report, is wreaking havoc in Russia. Nicknamed *krokodil*, it is horribly dangerous, the British newspaper *The Independent* reported. A drug user named Sasha described a friend who refuses hospitalization because she wants to keep on using *krokodil*. “Her flesh is falling off, and she can hardly move anymore,” Sasha told the newspaper.

Viktor Ivanov, head of the Russian Drug Control Agency, said that sales of codeine-based medicines have skyrocketed in the past five years: “It’s pretty obvious that it’s not because everyone has suddenly developed headaches.” Ivanov estimates that 1 in 20 of the 2 million drug abusers in Russia use *krokodil* and other home-made preparations. Some claim the explosion of *krokodil* is a combination of price and of the crackdown on the heroin traffic from Afghanistan.

The report concludes that cannabis remains the world’s most widely produced and used illicit substance: It is grown in almost all countries of the world, and smoked by 130-190 million people at least once a year—although these parameters are not very telling in terms of addiction. The UNODC found evidence of indoor cultivation of cannabis for commercial purposes in 29 countries, especially in Europe, Australia, and North America. Indoor growing is a lucrative business,

and is increasingly a source of profit for criminal groups. Based on evidence gathered in 2009, Afghanistan is now the world's leading producer of cannabis resin, otherwise known as hashish.

Emerging Markets for Drug Traffickers

The primary reason that drug abuse in the developing world had remained confined within a small community was that it did not fetch sufficient amounts of cash. The report indicates that that situation has begun to change. Russia, for instance, is now a lucrative market for the drug dealers since it is brimming with cash. A similar situation is developing in India, where not only is a significant amount of heroin moving in from Afghanistan, but the drug producers, utilizing the weak government of the present Singh Administration, have begun cultivating drugs in the northern part of the country, particularly in the state of Himachal Pradesh, which is popular with tourists.

In May 2010, OneIndia.in noted that illegal opium cultivation was on rise in Himachal Pradesh. The illegal cultivation of poppy and cannabis has increased in the state with each passing year, particularly in the regions

bordering Shimla district. This has posed a threat to the credibility of the state government and the police, as critics are of the view that top brass in the police administration have failed to tackle this social hazard. The estimated land used for cultivation of opium in these areas is believed to be 175 hectares.

Himachal Pradesh has also become a major center for cannabis production. Vishal Gulati in the TheWeekendLeader.com reported on July 16, that women in the Chamba district have formed a group using sickles to destroy cannabis. They have been provided protection by the local police and employed by the village panchayat (a council elected by the villagers) under the central government's rural jobs guarantee scheme—as per the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MNREGA).

Costa cites the boom in heroin consumption in Eastern Africa, the rise of cocaine use in West Africa and South America, and the surge in the production and abuse of synthetic drugs in the Middle East and South East Asia. “We will not solve the world drugs problem by shifting consumption from the developed to the developing world,” he writes.

LPAC Video

An Interview with
Lyndon LaRouche

QEIII and The Fate of Mankind



The latest run on Italian state bonds and the downgrading of the bonds of Greece and Ireland have signaled the final days of the Trans-Atlantic monetary-financial system. The problem is that cowards on both sides of the Atlantic are accepting the continuing bailout of the Inter-Alpha banks, at the expense of the lives of ordinary people and the existence of nations. There is only one remedy: Glass-Steagall.

<http://larouchepac.com/node/18767>

In Memoriam

Tibor Kovats: Patriot And World Citizen

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

A good friend, the great Hungarian patriot and world citizen Tibor Kovats, died on July 15, 2011. Everyone who had the good fortune to know Tibor was blessed by the encounter with this true humanist. Although his life was overshadowed by long stretches of the great tragedies of European history, and his upright character repeatedly drew him into conflict with the changing totalitarian systems that oppressed Hungary, he never lost his gracious personality. He demonstrated that man is free when he is inwardly free, although outwardly he may be in chains.

I got to know Tibor and Judit in October 1990, barely a year after the fall of the Berlin Wall, when I was invited by POFOSZ, Hungary's National League of Political Prisoners, to attend the memorial service for the 1956 Revolution. I had the honor, at this event on Oct. 23, to thank the 10,000 participants for the Hungarian contribution to German reunification, and to tell them about the programmatic proposals of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche.

In that October of 1990, the political conditions in Hungary were still very tense, and while Tibor and other POFOSZ representatives were showing me the sites where the uprising of 1956 had been crushed, there was still great uncertainty as to whether that might occur again. These Hungarian friends enabled me to understand more deeply than would have been possible from reading historical documents, how the freedom struggle of courageous people is covered up by official historiography, if the powers-that-be deem it opportune. There was then great uncertainty about whether the newly tasted freedom would last.

Intensive political cooperation developed out of this encounter, as well as a personal


friendship. Tibor, because of his personal experience, had a profound understanding of the fate of political prisoners. He visited the innocent imprisoned members of the LaRouche movement in the United States, and gave added force to the call for their immediate release, when he led a Hungarian delegation to the U.S. Congress and passionately asked the Congressmen to remedy the injustice.

After that, Tibor and Judit took part in many conferences and seminars of the Schiller Institute in Europe, and organized many public and private meetings in Hungary, where Tibor considered himself to be the representative of the Schiller Institute.

Tibor was committed to Schiller's idea of the beauty and dignity of mankind. He spoke marvelous Classical German, and it was a special experience to hear this gracious Hungarian use old literary figures of speech that are no longer part of the usage of our contemporaries today.

A particularly special event was the invitation to Lyndon LaRouche, from Tibor, Judit, and the friends of POFOSZ, to attend a seminar in Budapest. Tibor's stories about the Puszta in Hungary and many important events from Hungarian history will never be forgotten.

Tibor was a man whose character was defined by honesty and courage, by love of freedom and love for humanity. He was a loyal friend, and his soul will always be with us.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Kovats addresses a Schiller Institute conference in 1991, during the campaign to free political prisoner Lyndon LaRouche.

The Courage Deficit

You don't have to be some kind of financial or political "expert" to understand that the deficit and debt ceiling debate which is being played out in Washington, D.C. is a cynical charade. Most of the American people know in their bones that neither of the political parties, nor their own Members of Congress, are telling the truth, or acting in the people's interests. The population's experience over the past 10 years has driven that point home.

The reality is, there is no "deficit" problem, nor an existential problem based on the (probably unconstitutional) setting of a debt ceiling for the U.S. government, which will allegedly expire on Aug. 2. This discussion is all a ruse, manufactured in order to drum up a crisis atmosphere, in which the murderous austerity program which the London-Wall Street bankers insist upon in order to maintain their political control—a de facto dictatorship—can be rammed through. The real deficit is the courage deficit.

Remember The Fall of 2008? There's a true parallel here: While the Bush Administration was already pouring hundreds of billions into bankrupt private banks behind the scenes, it went to Congress for the public bailout, called TARP. At that point, Congress listened to the people! Despite massive pressure from the bankers and the Congressional leadership, the House of Representatives *rejected* TARP on Sept. 29.

And the sky did *not* fall—although the popular mythology today would lead you to believe it did. Instead, the level of threats and intimidation dramatically escalated, including some Congressmen being told that the "markets" would collapse so much that there would be an outbreak of social unrest that would lead to "blood in the streets." By Oct. 3, a sufficient number of Congressmen

had knuckled under, and the massive scam known as the Bailout got under way with official sanction—and, despite non-stop lies, it has not ended since.

It is precisely this kind of pressure campaign which the Obama Administration, hand in hand with the Wall Street-backed Republicans, are applying, claiming the sky is about to fall, to ram through their so-called deficit-debt ceiling package. Now, as then, there is *no* need to ram through legislation which amounts to an accelerated bailout for the bankers, and slashing of living standards for the population. The Obama-Republican "solution" is just more of the disease, and it goes a new giant step toward imposing an outright dictatorship to impose its austerity measures against the elderly and the poor.

The real problem is the bankruptcy of the entire world financial system, and the consequent looting of the physical economy, through the attempt to bailout of the bad gambling debts. Once you understand the problem, you can cut through the fog, and fight for the real solution: Glass-Steagall.


That's where the courage deficit comes in. The LaRouche movement has carried out an aggressive campaign for nearly three years now, and has now been joined by more than 35 courageous Congressmen, who have co-sponsored H.R. 1489 and H.R. 2451, bills to reinstate Glass-Steagall. These bills, not some murderous anti-deficit legislation, are what must be rushed through Congress—coupled with the removal of Obama from the White House.

Ultimately, the nature of our national leaders reflects who *we* are, because *we* are the ones who elect them, and either hold them accountable, or not. We know *they* have a courage deficit. The question is, do *we*?

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

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 _____