

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

March 16, 2012 Vol. 39 No. 11

www.larouche.com \$10.00

LaRouche: Mobilize To Stop Thermonuclear War
Rep. Jones Takes Leadership in Drive Against War
Cheminade Campaign Creates an Uproar in France

Can American Patriots Prevent World War III?



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 Almaro

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: Ulf Sandmark

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.executiveintelligenceview.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.,

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

(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: ©2012 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

Is it possible to impeach a sitting President in an election year? Many would say it is not—and those in the Democratic Party's leading circles who agree that Barack Obama is not fit to be President, but are doing nothing to kick him out, certainly think it is not. But Lyndon LaRouche, as usual, is not approaching things pragmatically. In his webcast speech to six national town meetings (our *Feature*), he stresses that *principles* are more important than how many votes you have at a given moment. Get the principles across to the public, fight for what is right and necessary, and—hopefully—the votes will come in time.

But there is not much time. Obama's British-backed drive for war against Syria and Iran—as well as against Russia and China—is gathering steam (see *International*). In fact, it is *only* in a catastrophic situation such as that now unfolding—both militarily, and with respect to the financial-economic system—that it is conceivable for a sitting President to be impeached in an election year. This election year, there's no “business as usual.”

Rep. Walter Jones's House Concurrent Resolution 107, putting Obama on notice that if he commits the United States to war without explicit Congressional approval, he will be impeached, is a courageous step in the right direction. It is the first time that the “i word” has been used in this Congress, under this President. See *National* for the story on this and other efforts to prevent thermonuclear World War III, coming mainly from U.S. military and intelligence figures, both retired and active duty.

On the other side of the Atlantic, LaRouche's friend Jacques Cheminade has filed the required number of signatures by elected officials for his petition to run for the Presidency of France (see *International*). The oligarchs who thought they had silenced him for good in the 1995 election are chewing up their Persian carpets, and the press is in an uproar—whether attacking him or praising him. Now the campaign moves into its hot phase.

We also continue our coverage of the Schiller Institute's conference in Berlin last month, with Bruce Director's presentation smashing “The Tyranny of the Second Law of Thermodynamics” and Gene Douglas's report on the work of the LaRouche Irish Brigade.



Cover This Week

U.S. Army Chief of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey (center) is leading a group of top military officers speaking out against war vs. Iran and Syria.



USAF/Tech. Sgt. John Orrell

4 LaRouche: Thermonuclear War Looms; How We Must Prevent It

Lyndon LaRouche's opening statement to a simulcast on March 10, to town hall meetings convened in their respective states, by the six Congressional candidates who make up the LaRouche National Slate. LaRouche details the factors that are presently leading us into a potential thermonuclear World War III. Added to the threat of war, he says, is that, among the current crop of so-called Presidential candidates are "one Democrat, who is not fit for anything, the current President of the United States; and we have four Republicans of note, of which three are absolutely intolerable, and one, who might be accepted as a continued member of the Congress, but is obviously not qualified for getting anywhere near the Presidency."

National

10 Rep. Jones Takes Leadership in Drive Against World War

Rep. Walter Jones has submitted House Concurrent Resolution 107, effectively putting President Obama on notice that, if he commits the U.S. to war, without getting explicit Congressional approval, he will be impeached.

11 'An Impeachable High Crime and Misdemeanor'

The full text of Jones's House Concurrent Resolution 107.

14 Obama's NASA Budget: A Death Sentence for the U.S. Space Program

Obama's 2013 NASA budget is a frontal assault on the nation's space program. Without an aggressive space exploration effort, which catalyzes scientific breakthroughs and the advancement of revolutionary new technology, mankind faces a bleak future.

International

- 17 Can U.S. Patriots Stop Maniac Obama/British Drive for War?**
The issue put the table by the warm and fuzzy special relationship between the British Prime Minister and the U.S. President is: Will Her Majesty's government once again drive the United States to war, this time a thermonuclear World War III?
- 21 Cheminade's Presidential Campaign Is Creating an Uproar in France**
Jacques Cheminade's campaign as "the new de Gaulle of France" has overturned the chessboard of French politics, and forced the political elites to take notice.
- 22 Jacques Cheminade: 'We Must Swear an Oath To the Future'**
Cheminade's address to the February Schiller Institute conference in Berlin.
- 26 Why Christians in Syria Love the U.S., But Despise Its Pro-British Policies**
As the British Empire accelerates its gameplan for regime change in Syria, some influential voices in that nation are speaking out against the danger of religious wars, and exposing the lies in Western media and capitals about what is happening there.
- 32 International Intelligence**

Science

- 33 Toppling the Tyranny of the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics**
Bruce Director, a member of the U.S. Board of the Schiller Institute, gave this speech to the Institute's conference in Berlin on Feb. 25.

Conference Report

- 45 Hold a Referendum! Ireland Is a Test Case for the EU Austerity Pact**
Gene Douglas of the LaRouche Irish Brigade gave this speech to the Berlin Schiller Institute conference, Feb. 25, 2012.
- 47 Educating a Renaissance: Ireland—An Economic Revival**
The policy statement of the LaRouche Irish Brigade and the LaRouche Irish Science Team, based on marine transport, engineering, and scientific exploration.

Editorial

- 55 The Science of Survival**

LAROUCHE ADDRESSES TOWN HALL MEETINGS

Thermonuclear War Looms: How We Must Prevent It

Here is Lyndon LaRouche's opening statement to a simulcast on March 10, addressing town hall meetings convened in their states by the six congressional candidates who make up the LaRouche National Slate: Diane Sare (N.J.), Rachel Brown (Mass.), Bill Roberts (Mich.), Kesha Rogers (Tex.), Summer Shields (Calif.), and Dave Christie (Wash.). LaRouche was introduced by Summer Shields, who moderated the webcast. The video of the event, including questions and answers, is available [here](#).

Summer Shields: ...With growing clamor for military intervention into Syria and Iran emanating from the British, a group of patriots has gathered, led by those gathered watching this event here at the various audiences, and the leadership of the U.S. military as well. And now, a resolution has been introduced into the U.S. Congress by Congressman Walter Jones, re-emphasizing the constitutional role of the U.S. Congress, and *only* the U.S. Congress, in authorizing the declaration of war, and stating that any move by this President to unilaterally authorize war will be met with impeachment—and might I add, long overdue impeachment. Since its introduction, House Concurrent Resolution 107 has gained widespread attention by several independent media outlets around the country. In response to the introduction of this resolution, Mr. LaRouche commented, “This bill could save the

United States from destruction.”

With that said, I believe what you will be participating in today will be of monumental historical importance. I have been personally associated with Mr. LaRouche for about a decade now, and the one thing that I know with absolute certainty, is that you are never going to find it easy to predict what he's going to say. So, without any further delay, I introduce to you, and ask you to join me in welcoming economist and statesman, Lyndon LaRouche.

LaRouche: Thank you very much. I bring you some bad news, and you're treating me very kindly for the kind of news I have to deliver up front. I have some better news to propose, which could be adopted, which I will get to in this process, but first, let's take the really tough issues.

The Threat of Thermonuclear War

We have presently, on the national scene, that is, nationally recognized candidates—there may be others who are appropriately filing, but in terms of the major appearances on the screen—we have five such persons: one Democrat, who is not fit for anything, the current President of the United States; and we have four Republicans of note, of which three are absolutely intolerable, and one, who might be accepted as a continued member of the Congress, but is obviously not qualified



LPAC-TV

Lyndon LaRouche addresses simultaneous town meetings in New Jersey, Texas, California, Washington, Michigan, and Massachusetts on March 10.

for getting anywhere near the Presidency. So therefore, we have a Presidential campaign which is developing, in which all of the presently acknowledged leading candidates are unfit for public office, except the one from Texas, who is not fit to be President, but is still fit to serve in the Congress, as such.

The worst part about this, is that we are faced with general thermonuclear warfare. This is no estimate; this is no joke. It could be averted, but as of now, there's nothing in place which is going to avert it, except for a heroic and patriotic element in our national defense system, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But for that Joint Chiefs of Staff and its intervention, thermonuclear war, number one, would have already occurred. It's only circles associated with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others involved, who have blocked the current President of the United States from successfully launching what he has intended as *World War III, thermonuclear World War III*. Under British direction.

What makes the thing more complicated, is that there is no alternative President for occupying the office right now. That is, Obama's presence as the President of the United States means there's nothing except the Congress standing in the way of World War III, thermonuclear World War III.

Let me just detail for you what some of the param-

eters are that we're talking about. World War III, in terms of the forces which are now deployed by the United States and others for such a war, would be a *thermonuclear war*, not any kind of conventional war. This war, if it were to be launched, would probably lead to the extinction of the human species. Because the kind of operation they have declared themselves committed to do, would mean that in order to carry out this thing successfully, they would go to a level of launch of thermonuclear weaponry, which probably would lead to the extinction of the human species, because of the by-products of such a war.

Now, there are elements, like the leading elements in terms of

our Defense Department, our military department, who understand this, or at least understand an approximation of it, very well. And therefore, if we assume that the five—four Republicans and one Democrat—were to be the candidates for President of the United States, it would be almost certain that there would be an extinction, in the United States and elsewhere, coming as a result.

So therefore, it's not a question of who's going to be a rival of these five clowns. The question is, how are we going to get rid of, number one, the current President of the United States, whose continuation in office would virtually ensure, except for some extraordinary measure, would ensure probably the extinction of the human species, but certainly something approaching that?

Because in order to launch a war against Russia and China, which are thermonuclear powers, the level of thermonuclear attack on these powers, and other powers, by the United States, Britain, and so forth, would mean a threatened possible extinction of the human species. And so voting for any one of these five candidates, for one reason or another, given the disqualification of those candidates, would probably mean an extinction of the human species. Because in order to do the job which is required to be done, if they're going to pull this operation off, would mean the virtual extinc-



White House Photo/Pete Souza

If Obama continues as President, said LaRouche, or any of these four Republicans becomes a Presidential candidate, this nation will not survive.

tion of the human species. It goes to a level where the effects of such warfare are *absolutely incalculable*. Such warfare would never occur, on this planet, if sane people were in charge.

Now, there is important resistance, and you don't have to be in the majority to defeat this evil. People exaggerate numbers when it comes to voting. In the history of mankind, it has often been a minority of any nation, which has blocked evil of this type before, or a similar type before. Majority vote is much overrated. It is the way in which a people expresses itself, which causes some people to withdraw from their conceits and others to proceed with force, to make sure the proper measures are taken.

So, that considered, *there is no way in which you could allow President Obama to continue as President, and allow these four Republicans, now prominent, to be included as a Presidential candidate, under which this nation could survive*. We already have a worldwide financial breakdown crisis in progress; that is bad enough. This would mean mass deaths of American citizens, during the course of

this year. Measures need to be taken, already, now, feasible measures of reform, which could avert that problem.

Two Urgent Measures

Essentially, on my agenda, there are two distinct measures which are absolutely indispensable, as constitutional measures to prevent the collapse of our economy. Because our economy right now is hopelessly bankrupt. In its present form of organization, the U.S. economy is hopelessly bankrupt. The Federal Reserve System has nothing in it that's worth anything! And all that happens, is someone declares, "Ah! The Federal Reserve System is worthless, it has a lot of obligations and no means for paying them, for meeting them."

Therefore, what we have to do is essentially take these measures, which I will indicate now, as constitutional measures, which are the only measures which should be featured as the principal issue of the Presidential election, apart from the fact of forbidding World War III.

These measures are, first, *reenact the original Glass-Steagall law, put into place by President Franklin Roosevelt*. Without that, the United States is as good as dead! And that is an absolute.

The second thing is, because of the degree of bank-



Millions of people who are unemployed, including skilled workers, could be put back to work building the great NAWAPA project for revolutionizing the water system.

ruptcy of the United States, the loss of the number of people who were employed and qualified for actual *physical* production, as opposed to some kind of make-work—the United States is hopelessly bankrupt, under the present financial-moneymetary system. And it's merely a matter of time, on the day in which that bankruptcy is declared, that you will begin to count the increase in the mass of deaths in the United States, from hunger and similar kinds of conditions. Those conditions are coming along in the Spring and Summer of this year, unless a change occurs.

The changes are possible, but the present incumbency, either these Republican four, or the only Democratic candidate of note, these are hopeless cases, and the United States under their leadership, is also a hopeless case. So in this respect the reenactment of President Franklin Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall, *exactly as he specified*, would be sufficient to prevent the disintegration of the United States, and allow for some degree of stability.

But it's not enough.

What we also have to do, is we also have to create a mass of credit, involving chiefly physical improvements, quality physical improvements, which will relaunch the buildup of the economy of the United States. If that is done, if these two measures are taken, number one, Glass-Steagall; number two, a measure of national economy, which revives real production on the basis of the original Constitution of the United States, that is, the pre-Andrew Jackson United States.

Andrew Jackson's destruction of the national economy was the cause of the degeneration of the United States, since the election of Andrew Jackson, when he killed the essential provision of the Constitution for a *credit system, rather than a monetarist system*. When they shut down the Second Bank of the United States, that was the time that the United States took a tumble, leading into the Civil War and other catastrophes, up to the present time.

So what we have to do, is we have to restore not only Glass-Steagall; we have to go back and restore, in effect, the original National Banking system of the United States. In other words, we will no longer depend upon *money*, as a standard of wealth. We will use credit as a standard of wealth, *as we did, to save the United States, which was bankrupt, having won the Revolu-*



Library of Congress

This cartoon of President Andrew Jackson was inspired by his 1832-33 destruction of the Bank of the United States: an act which the nation has never fully recovered from.

tionary War. So we're going to have to go back to that provision, which worked, excellently, until it was killed by the election of Andrew Jackson. And we have never fully recovered from the effects of that bum, a virtual traitor, Andrew Jackson, and his reforms and those which followed along the same lines.

But if we return to the National Banking system, set into motion under Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton, then, in that case, we will be able to launch a full-scale, full-blooded recovery. And there is no other way that there will ever be an economic recovery, in the United States. These two measures, of constitutional weight, are the only thing that is required, to set into motion a recovery program, which will save us during this year, because these are measures which will be pushed into effect during this year, especially the Glass-

Steagall Act, immediately; these measures will allow us to recover.

For Example: NAWAPA

We have one major program which is already being worked on by my associates and I, and this program is NAWAPA, the North American Water and Power Alliance. This program, which we're working to re-work and bring into play, is a 30-year program of a revolution in the water system of North America. It's the greatest project undertaken by any nation, in history to date. This program will enable us to take the unemployed people, as well as the unemployed who are still skilled, and take them into a process of development of their skills, along with a small number of people who still are leading skilled people, and to launch a program which will lead to a prolonged recovery of the United States. Together with similar programs added to it, we can begin, *this year*, to save the United States and bring it back to security.

We don't need any other gimmicks! We just need a few programs, led by the Glass-Steagall, and led by NAWAPA, and those two programs, together with others of the same kind, and seeking also international cooperation with other nations on related types of programs. With these kinds of things, we can totally rebuild our United States, to what it once was, before some of the recent developments have occurred.

These are our options. And they are the *only* options!


Work with Other Nations

Now, on the other side, outside the United States, we have, intrinsically, no problem, essentially, with Russia, under the presently elected new Presidency. The intention is there on their part, and it's not just a proposed intention, it's a very serious intention; it's a

commitment which is as much, or more, in their interests, as it is ours. That means, we open up a recovery of Europe, Western and Central Europe, at least continental Western and Central Europe, which is now about to crash entirely. The whole present European continental system of Western and Central is now hopelessly bankrupt. It's just a matter of when the explosion occurs.

These actions by us, in the United States, in that direction—by putting these issues on the table, we can

FIGURE 4
North America: 'NAWAPA-Plus'



Sources: Parsons Company, *North American Water and Power Alliance Conceptual Study*, Dec. 7, 1964; Hal Cooper; Manuel Frías Alcaraz; *EIR*.

NAWAPA would divert water from the north-flowing rivers in Alaska and Canada, bringing it south to the parched regions of the United States and Mexico.

induce Western and Central Europe to save themselves, and to save civilization thereby as well.

So these are essentially our options.

Now, China is also a great partner in this process. India is a significant partner. China represents 1.4 billion people! India represents more than 1.1 billion people! These are not unimportant nations. The economy of Russia, and that of China, have been progressing, however poorly in some respects, but effectively, during the same time we, in the United States, have been recently going downhill, especially since Bill Clinton left the Presidency. We're headed toward collapse; Europe is headed toward disintegration. The European Monetary System is already disintegrating; there is no currency in Europe, which is actually defensible! We're simply waiting for the day, in which they all go, chain-reaction, collapsing, and their currencies become worthless. They're all in the situation like Germany was in 1923. That's where they are, and they're just waiting for the shoe to drop, when they go under.

Principles Are More Important than Numbers

Now, under such circumstances as these, the number of supporters you have, the number of voters that you can induce to support you, is not decisive. Because if you take the way most voters have been thinking, in the recent two Presidencies—George W. Bush and Obama—we've been going nowhere but down! We're a doomed nation! And until we get the junk heap that these Presidencies have represented, there's no recovery, no possibility of recovery: We're finished!

But if we take these measures for ourselves, that I indicated, those kinds of projects to rebuild our economy; if we cooperate with the great projects which Russia has underway—and they're really great projects, with very great importance for the world as a whole; with China and India, and with some nations in Europe, like my friend Jacques Cheminade, who is a leading candidate for the election as President of France, right now—so with these resources, and pulling these resources and people together, we could save this planet. We still can.

What's important here, is not the number of votes



MK.ru

Russian press coverage of the government's proposal for international cooperation for the Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE) included this graphic of an asteroid striking the Earth, in the daily Moskovskii Komsomolets, Oct. 19, 2011.

you think you have on hand right now. Most of our citizens are confused. They have no idea what's going on; most of them would have no way of defining a conception of what would work; they might come up with ideas, but none of them would work. And we represent, together with people who we cooperate with, we represent people who *do* represent the solutions; all they need is the support, and the implementation.

And therefore, it's not the number of people we now represent. It's the principles that we represent, which will work, whereas the principles now presented to most people *will not work! They will fail!*

You can win an election, and lose a nation! And that's the situation right now. Continue to vote for these candidates, and you will lose the United States, and they will lose you. Adopt policies that will work—and they are available, especially in cooperation with other nations that are willing to cooperate—and we can solve this problem; we can manage it and solve the problem. That's where we stand.

And, I think at this point, I'll just throw this open, because I'm sure that I've provoked questions and challenges and so forth. And I think the most useful thing at the moment is to take that course, and stir up the debate, stir up the discussion among the people assembled here, and I think that will help to clarify what I've just said.

Rep. Jones Takes Leadership In Drive Against World War

by Nancy Spannaus

March 12—On March 7, North Carolina Republican Rep. Walter Jones took the courageous action of submitting to the U.S. Congress House Concurrent Resolution 107, which effectively puts President Barack Obama on notice that, if he (or any other President) commits the U.S. to war, without fulfilling the Constitutional requirement of getting explicit Congressional approval, he will be impeached. Coming in the immediate aftermath of the extraordinary Feb. 27 ad against war on Iran, signed by leading military and intelligence professionals, Jones' action raises the standard of the U.S. Constitution, as a crucial impediment to the escalating British-Obama drive for war.

The text (see box) is simple and direct: “*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that, except in response to an actual or imminent attack against the territory of the United States, the use of offensive military force by a President without prior and clear authorization of an Act of Congress violates Congress’s exclusive power to declare war under Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the Constitution and therefore constitutes an impeachable high crime and misdemeanor under Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution.*”



Rep. Walter Jones, shown here in an interview with LPAC-TV's Ardena Jones (no relation), in October 2011, has introduced a resolution that puts President Obama on notice that he may be subject to impeachment.

LPAC-TV

“This bill could save the United States from destruction,” commented Lyndon LaRouche, upon being briefed on the action. It must be passed immediately, in the House and in the Senate, he added.

LaRouchePAC immediately launched an all-out mobilization to get co-sponsors, and mass popular support, behind this first Congressional action against Obama's war drive. Within days, the good news had been picked up on dozens of websites, including the official Russian outlet, Russia Today. Members of Congress, who are now spending a week in their districts,

can be expected to meet with an outpouring of constituent support for this action.

Military Establishment in Motion

The context for the action by Jones, a 9th-term Congressman who represents a district in which three military bases are located, and who sits on the Armed Services Committee, is the increasingly aggressive action by the U.S. military and intelligence establishment against the danger of provocation of World War III.

Jones himself has had a principled position against aggressive war since at least 2005, when he broke with the George W. Bush Administration on the matter of the Iraq War, and began sponsoring legislation for U.S. withdrawal. Jones has co-sponsored legislation for the U.S. to withdraw from Afghanistan, and joined a bipartisan group of Congressmen, led by Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio), last August in a lawsuit charging that the Administration violated its Constitutional prerogatives in the war against Libya. That lawsuit was thrown out.

However, as leading layers of the U.S. military have increasingly realized, the British-U.S.-French aggres-

sion in Libya was intended as only the first step in a campaign against Syria and Iran, which would function as triggers for a potentially thermonuclear confrontation with Russia and China. Since the Obama Administration has shown its determination to act *without* or *in opposition* to the will of Congress, there was no guarantee that the President would not move ahead for war, with devastating consequences for all mankind.

Beginning no later than December 2011, leading military and intelligence figures, led by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey, began to speak out publicly against the drumbeat for U.S. and NATO military intervention in Syria and Iran. The most dramatic example of that campaign came with the full-page *Washington Post* ad on March 5, headlined “Mr. President: Say No to a War of Choice with Iran,” which featured warnings against war from leading current and former military officers, including Dempsey, and was signed by eight prominent members of the military-intelligence establishment.

Immediately after the ad’s publication, a number of the signers gave interviews to the press, or wrote articles to further buttress their arguments against war.

‘An Impeachable High Crime and Misdemeanor’

Here is the full text of Rep. Walter Jones’s House Concurrent Resolution 107.

H.CON.RES.107—Expressing the sense of Congress that the use of offensive military force by a President without prior and clear authorization of an Act of Congress constitutes an impeachable high crime and misdemeanor under article II, section 4 of the Constitution.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 7, 2012

Mr. JONES submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress that the use of offensive military force by a President without prior and clear authorization of an Act of Congress constitutes an impeachable high crime and misdemeanor under article II, section 4 of the Constitution.

Whereas the cornerstone of the Republic is honoring Congress’s exclusive power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that, except in response to an actual or imminent attack against the territory of the United States, the use of offensive military force by a President without prior and clear authorization of an Act of Congress violates Congress’s exclusive power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution and therefore constitutes an impeachable high crime and misdemeanor under article II, section 4 of the Constitution.

No ‘Existential Threat’

Former CIA Middle East chief Paul Pillar, a leading figure in the “Generals’ ad,” followed up with an article in the March/April issue of *Washington Monthly*. “No one knows what the full ramifications of such a war with Iran would be, and that is the main problem with any proposal to use military force against the Iranian nuclear program. But the negative consequences for U.S. interests are likely to be severe,” he wrote.

Pillar’s forceful argument throughout is that the government and political leadership of Iran are rational actors, meaning that they are not about commit national suicide by attacking Israel, for example. This is the same argument to which General Dempsey has hewed in his stubborn opposition to Obama on attacking Iran. “The principles of deterrence are not invalid just because the party to be deterred wears a turban and a beard,” Pillar wrote.

“The judgment of the U.S. intelligence community, as voiced publicly by Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, is that Iran is retaining the option to build nuclear weapons but has not yet decided to do so. Much diplomatic ground has yet to be explored,” he continued.

Pillar notes that the lack of an “existential threat” from Iran is recognized by most political and military leaders in Israel, while such an existential threat is hysterically claimed by neocons and Democrats, including President Obama, in the United States.

In a second article appearing March 6 in *The National Interest*, Pillar writes, “The president’s [Obama’s] comments about how no Israeli government can tolerate a nuclear weapon in the hands of Iran and reference to Israel’s sovereign right to make its own decisions about what is required to meet its security needs, sound almost like an invitation to Netanyahu to launch a war.

“It is very clear that a military strike against Iran will be catastrophic in its consequences, not just on us but the world in general.”

‘I Cannot Find a Single Voice’

Also speaking out last week were ad signers Col. Lawrence Wilkerson, the chief of staff for Secretary of State Colin Powell (2002-05), and Gen. James Hoar, who was chief of Central Command from 1991-95. Both retired officers have also given interviews to this magazine, to elaborate their views.

“Inside the Pentagon, civilian and military, I cannot find a single voice in favor of striking Iran,” stated

Wilkerson in an interview with *Vanity Fair* magazine dated March 2. “What I understand,” he continued, “from talking with the intel community and with people in the White House is that our position, and I agree with this position, is that Iran has not made a decision to weaponize. Iran may be looking for a Japanese-type, latent capability. The inclination, I think, of the current government is not to make that decision. What I’m very concerned about is that our diplomacy, such as it is—mostly sanctions—is forcing them into a decision that we don’t want them to make, which is to weaponize.”

On March 7, General Hoar gave an interview to KPBS radio news (San Diego), where he said that anyone who thinks of going to war with Iran simply doesn’t understand the nature of that part of the world. He cited the economic costs from the rise in the price of oil that had to be expected, and the massive death toll, which would dwarf that of the 2003 Iraq War. Now is the time for a “national discussion,” Hoar emphasized.

The Syrian Trigger

It’s not just Iran that could be the trigger for the confrontation the British and Obama are seeking with Russia and China. There’s also Syria.

President Obama has ordered the Defense Department, by way of the National Security Council, to take the first steps towards planning military operations against Syria. Hearings held March 6 and 7 before the Senate Armed Services Committee and Foreign Affairs Committee provided few details, but saw numerous Senators chomping at the bit for such a confrontation.

But on March 12, leaks from “high Pentagon officials,” published in the *New York Times*, spelled out the views of top military figures about the dangers and difficulties of taking any military action against Syria, even creating safe havens. More importantly, “senior Pentagon officials” told *Times* Pentagon correspondent Elizabeth Bumiller that military intervention would not be a local matter, but would lead to a confrontation with Russia—i.e., the danger of a global war.

Bumiller writes in her article, datelined March 11, that “senior Pentagon officials” told her that any U.S. intervention in Syria, has “the potential for starting a proxy war with Iran or Russia, two crucial allies of Syria.” Even more ominously, Michele Flournoy, a former top Pentagon official, said in Washington last week, that “If we jump in with purely military instruments as the U.S., absent a broader strategy, we could very quickly hasten reactions from others, namely

Russia and Iran, to bolster the regime *and start the U.S. down a road towards greater confrontation*” (emphasis added).

Referring to the military operations in Libya that led to the assassination of President Muammar Qaddafi, and a total breakdown of law and order, and the governing mechanism, one senior military official told Bumiller: “We’ve been sucked into this open-ended arrangement before, and we’re not going there again.” The official pointed out the hundreds of cruise missiles fired from U.S. ships and submarines—to take out Libya’s air defenses so that European warplanes could operate freely above. Even then, the United States continued to supply ammunition and refueling planes and to fly combat missions.

The reference above to “the assassination of Libyan President Muammar Qaddafi,” further shows that the Joint Chiefs had absorbed LaRouche’s forecast, which featured that event as the key turning-point towards nuclear war.

Will Congress Act?

As of now, there are no reports that any other members of Congress, Republican or Democrat, are prepared to sign on to Jones’ bill, nor has a Senator yet stepped forward to introduce a similar resolution in the Senate. The uttering of the word “impeachment,” and the assertion of a simple Constitutional principle on the power to declare war, is apparently too scary for the cowardly Congress.

On March 8, Jones, along with Reps. Lee, Conyers, Woolsey, Kucinich, Waters, Stark, Ellison, Filner, and Jackson Lee, all Democrats and members of the Progressive and/or Black Caucuses, did file H.R. 4173, the “Prevent Iran from Acquiring Nuclear Weapons and Stop War Through Diplomacy Act,” which implicitly criti-

Mr. President: Say No to War of Choice with Iran

“It’s not prudent at this point to decide to attack Iran. I think it would be premature to exclusively decide that the time for a military option was upon us. A strike at this time would be destabilizing and would not achieve President Obama’s objectives.”
—Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Martin Dempsey

“...the United States would obviously be blamed and we could possibly be the target of retaliation from Iran sinking our ships, striking our military bases. I think that the consequences of a strike would have an escalation that would take place that would not only involve many lives, but if it could continue that would eventually lead to confrontation and a conflict that we would regret.”
—Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta

“A military solution is far as I am concerned, it will bring together a divided nation. It will make them absolutely committed to obtaining nuclear weapons. They will just go deeper and more covert. The only long-term solution is avoiding a nuclear power war even by the for the training exercises it is not in the interest. Everything else is a short-term solution.”
—Former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates

“... what happens if another preemptive strike by the West the U.S. and Israel, they go to the streets and now we get positions just and we have to deal with all that. That’s why. Because eventually if you follow this all the way down eventually it’s putting bones on the ground somewhere. And like I call my friends, if you like Iraq and Afghanistan, you’ll love Iran.”
—Former CENTCOM Commander General Anthony Zinni (ret.)

“No strike, however effective, will be in and of itself decisive. We haven’t had a contact with Iran since 1979. Even in the darkest days of the Cold War we had links to the Soviet Union. We are not talking to Iran so we don’t understand each other. If something happens it’s really stupid that we won’t get it right — that there will be miscalculations — which would be extremely dangerous in that part of the world.”
—Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Michael Mullen (ret.)

Dear Mr. President,

The U.S. military is the most formidable military force on earth. But not every challenge has a military solution.

Unless we or an ally is attacked, war should be the option of last resort. Our brave servicemen and women expect you to exhaust all diplomatic and peaceful options before you send them into harm’s way.

Preventing a nuclear armed Iran is rightfully your priority and your red line. Fortunately, diplomacy has not been exhausted and peaceful solutions are still possible.

Military action at this stage is not only unnecessary, it is dangerous -- for the United States and for Israel. We urge you to resist the pressure for a war of choice with Iran.

Sincerely,

Major General Paul Eaton (USA, Ret.)	Brigadier General John H. Johns, PhD (USA, Ret.)
Tom Fingar, Fmr. Deputy Director of National Intelligence for Analysis	Major General Rudolph Ostovich III (USA, Ret.)
Lt. General Robert G. Gard, Jr. (USA, Ret.)	Paul Pillar, Fmr. National Intelligence Officer for the Near East and South Asia
General Joseph Hoar (USMC, Ret.)	Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson (USA, Ret.)

National Iranian American Council - www.niacouncil.org

This ad, signed by prominent members of the U.S. military/intelligence establishment, appeared in the Washington Post March 5.

cizes Obama for breaking off negotiations with Iran after only four meetings, as Trita Parsi described in his recent book, *A Single Roll of the Dice: Obama’s Diplomacy with Iran*, and makes detailed prescriptions for Iran negotiations rather than a drive towards war. The bill also restates the Constitutional requirement that only Congress can authorize war, except for response to an actual or imminent attack against us or against a treaty ally.

But nothing is going to work to “convince” Obama not to follow the directions of his British puppet-masters, other than decisive action to remove him from power—preferably by Section 4 of the 25th Amendment, or by threat of impeachment. Numerous Congressmen, from Kucinich to Rep. Ron Paul, have publicly stated that the President’s actions make him “impeachable” on numerous fronts. A draft bill of impeachment, devoted specifically to President Obama’s violation of Article

I, Section VIII, Clause 11 of the U.S. Constitution (the specification of Congress’s power to declare war), was published on April 8, 2011 by constitutional lawyer Bruce Fein. It has yet to be taken up by those who have given impassioned speeches on the subject.

Herein lies the crucial role of Lyndon LaRouche and his political movement, which have uniquely grasped the cause of the war drive (the bankruptcy of the British financial empire and its determination to maintain global control), and the threat of *extinction* which it would represent for the human race. The LaRouche movement has determined to build the support necessary for backing up Jones and the Joint Chiefs, as the crucial first step toward freeing the world from the grip of that murderous financial empire. That means getting rid of Obama immediately—an action the drive behind Jones’ courageous resolution will facilitate.

A Death Sentence for The U.S. Space Program

by Marsha Freeman

March 9—Two years ago, President Obama proposed that this nation's manned space-exploration program, Constellation, be shut down. In response, Lyndon LaRouche called for the impeachment of the President. Since then, many more crimes have been added to Obama's portfolio, including the assassination of heads of state and American citizens, and a foreign policy whose logical end could be global thermonuclear war.

The President's attack on NASA's exploration programs is a frontal assault on the nation's future, and is understood to be so by Apollo astronauts, some in Congress, space scientists, and former NASA officials. Without an aggressive space exploration effort, which catalyzes scientific breakthroughs and the advancement of revolutionary new technology, mankind faces a bleak future. And that is the intention of the President's policy.

With the submission of the White House request for NASA's fiscal year 2013 budget in February, not only is progress in the limping manned space-exploration program virtually halted, but scientific missions to Mars that will lay the basis for mankind's move out into the Solar System are cancelled.

No Men in Space

The first target of the Obama attack was NASA's Constellation program, when, in February 2010, the White House proposed that astronauts get to the International Space Station via vehicles provided by untested fledgling private companies, subsidized by NASA. Constellation's manned lunar program was to be cancelled, and a fuzzy road-to-nowhere-in-our-lifetimes "technology development" program was to take its place.

The Congress rebelled, but after nearly two years of wrangling, compromised with the President. NASA's Orion capsule would continue its development, but

only as a back-up for the commercial companies, which were to get a slice of NASA's budget.

A heavy-lift rocket, the White House finally agreed, would be developed, first, to carry Orion to the station, and later, cargo and crew beyond Earth orbit. The law that was passed and signed authorizing this program for NASA, laid out a budget profile and timeline for the next five years.

But the President had no intention of keeping his part of the bargain. The budget that has been submitted to the Congress for FY13, with NASA funding cut slightly to \$17.7 billion, is *\$2 billion below* what the projection for the budget had been two fiscal years ago. With the prevailing fixation on the crazy idea that arbitrarily balancing the budget is the road to economic happiness, more than the manned space exploration program is now on the chopping block.

In the proposed FY13 budget for NASA, Mars and other planetary missions are under attack, either slated for cancellation, "de-scoping," or delay.

Without an increasing budget, NASA cannot move forward on new missions. If we keep cutting, and simply wait "until economic times are better," as has been tearfully proposed by White House "Science" Advisor John Holdren, a notorious depopulation advocate, while we are waiting, we will see the future of this nation disappear.

Mars Program Under Attack

From President Kennedy's May 1961 announcement of the Apollo program, manned missions to Mars were to have been the next leap after the Moon. Since the 1960s, NASA has successfully sent spacecraft on increasingly difficult unmanned missions, to fly by, then later to orbit, and finally, to land on Mars. Each mission has revolutionized our understanding of the Red Planet. Each has laid the basis for the next.



NASA

Mars is a dynamic planet, and long-lived missions have enabled scientists to observe weather, climate, atmospheric, and geological developments there over decades. Shown here: The change of seasons on Mars produces duststorms, similar to tornadoes on Earth (right). Instruments aboard Mars orbiters have observed the waxing and waning of gullies inside the rims of craters, indicating the presence of liquid water underground (above).



NASA

Until last Spring, the next major step in Mars exploration was to have been the joint U.S./European Space Agency (ESA) multiple-spacecraft ExoMars project, which includes an orbiter, to be launched in 2016, and a rover to land on the surface, to be launched in 2018. The 2016 Mars Trace Gas Orbiter is tasked to measure methane, which appears to continue to be produced on the planet, and could be a by-product of life. The 2018 ExoMars lander, complete with drill and sample collec-

tion box, is designed to collect and cache soil samples from the surface, which would await a future craft to retrieve them, and return them to laboratories on Earth.

Both of these missions are critical to bring us closer to answering the question of whether there has been, or is, life on Mars, and to prepare for the arrival of life from Earth.

But last Spring, NASA informed ESA it would probably not have the resources to meet its commitments to either of these two joint missions. This was made final in February, when Obama's proposed budget for NASA cut the Mars exploration program about 40%, by \$226.2 million. In total, the planetary exploration program was reduced by \$300 million, from the current \$1.5 billion.

To try to placate the furious scientific community, the Administration has told NASA to have a new Mars Program Planning Group try to cobble together something small to send to Mars during the 2018 launch opportunity. No longer would there be any "flagship" missions, in the more than \$1 billion range. The new mission would be capped at \$700 million.

Steve Squyres, the principal scientist on the Mars rover Opportunity program, and head of the National Research Council's Decadal Planetary Survey, responded to this sabotage by stating that "small and medium-sized missions can't address the most challenging questions about Mars." Speaking at the Feb. 27 meeting of the Mars Exploration Program Analysis Group (MEPAG) in Washington, NASA Associate Administrator, physicist, and former astronaut John Grunsfeld, described the Administration's proposed Mars

program as "you can plan, but you can't go."

The damage Obama's plan creates, the scientists stressed, is that it disrupts a well-planned, multi-decade, coherent Mars exploration *program* which is not just a series of individual missions. If the goal is to eventually land people on Mars, crucial scientific questions must be answered. Dr. Grunsfeld pointed out during the MEPAG meeting that the Mars program has, indeed, been revamped twice before, first, in re-

sponse to results pertaining to science, when the mid-1970s Viking landers ostensibly observed no evidence of life on Mars (this is still being debated); and then, again, after the 1999 technical failures of two NASA Mars missions. This is the first time the Mars program is being revamped due to the budget.

Congress has already weighed in on this proposed sabotage of Mars exploration. Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.) has objected to what the impact will be on the irreplaceable team of Mars scientists and mission planners at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, who will have to be laid off.

On Feb. 29, Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va.), chair of the Appropriations subcommittee which determines NASA's budget, wrote a letter to NASA Administrator Charles Bolden rejecting the request to ditch the Exo-Mars missions, and reprogram the funds to "drastically scale back spending on Outer Planets Flagship missions." Describing the proposal as a "radical change" from what Congress approved for planetary exploration for FY12, Wolf said this cannot be done by simply "reprogramming" funding.

What is not being addressed is the challenge of how that planetary funding would be restored, without a substantial increase in the top line of NASA's budget, which no one has, as of yet, proposed. And within the current bankrupt system, such a proposal is unlikely, to say the least.

Robbing Peter

The ostensible reason for the cutbacks in the planetary exploration program are the cost overruns of the Webb Space Telescope, and the Mars Science Lab mission, which is now on its way to Mars. That is stupidity, or worse. As Grunsfeld pointed out, the Defense Department has "never been able to estimate its costs," so this is not unique to NASA. In fact, when a program is on the cutting edge, takes a decade to develop, and requires doing things that have never been done before, demanding accurate estimates of the projected total cost from the start is ridiculous. Now, it is proposed that the future be penalized for the past.

But it is not only the Mars and planetary programs that are slated for extinction by the White House.

When the Congress compromised, and agreed to pursue both a NASA manned program (Orion and the heavy-lift rocket), which it wanted, *and* commercial development of manned transport systems, which the President wanted, it basically agreed that *neither* would

be adequately funded. Now they will reap what they have sown.

Already in this current FY12 fiscal year, there is not enough money in NASA's budget to carry out the Congressional mandate. On Jan. 10, Orion's program manager, Mark Gever, reported that work on the new crew capsule was being slowed down. "We don't have the money every year to do [development of] every system," he said. To try to save money, earlier this year, NASA started discussions with the Europeans, to see if ESA would provide a service module, which is an integral part of Orion. The Europeans have since told NASA that they are not interested.

Now, in the proposed FY13 budget, \$362 million is to be *cut* from NASA's Orion and rocket programs, and \$330 million is to be *added* for commercial companies, to over \$800 million. It has escaped no one's attention that this is a direct trade-off. Congress will hem and haw, and likely cut the commercial crew funding by half, which it did last year, to keep more funding for Orion and the heavy-lift rocket. But, is this a solution?

The previous Congressional cuts in funding to the commercial crew programs have now pushed the expected operation of the transport system to the space station from 2016 to 2017. If funds are cut again this year, there is no telling when, or whether, such a capability will ever materialize. But wasn't the Orion capsule a back-up, in case the commercial companies are delayed, or do not come through?

In fact, at the current level of funding, the rocket to carry Orion with crew to the station is not scheduled to be ready until 2021. But the space station has only been approved to continue operations until 2020! There is no NASA back-up to commercial crew transport.

The complaint that the U.S. will be paying Russia \$450 million per year to transport our astronauts to the space station until we can do it ourselves is completely disingenuous. Neither the White House nor the Congress has provided the resources to allow NASA to develop a manned space system for Earth orbit as the replacement for the retired Space Shuttle, much less the means to explore the rest of the Solar System.

We are quickly reaching the limit of how long this sabotage can continue, before human and material capital can no longer be mobilized by the United States for any serious effort in space.

We have long ago passed the limit where keeping President Obama in the White House can be tolerated, if mankind is to have a future, at all.

Can U.S. Patriots Stop Maniac Obama/British Drive for War?

by Michele Steinberg

March 13—On March 6, a seemingly breathless British Prime Minister David Cameron, having just been briefed, with his Cabinet, by the imperial National Security Advisor Sir Kim Darroch, told his Parliament that Iran posed a danger far beyond just the Middle East. Iran “is a danger more broadly, not least because there are signs that the Iranians want to have some sort of inter-continental missile capability. We have to be clear this is a threat potentially much wider than just Israel and the region.”

Just prior to Cameron’s speech, Darroch had warned Cameron and the Cabinet about “the imminence of the threat to the UK posed by Iran,” reported the *Guardian* March 6. It was the first time that a Western head of state had claimed—as the Israeli warhawks do regularly—that Iran poses an “imminent” threat to the West. It was a performance at Parliament that chillingly recalled Tony Blair’s 2002 speech, in which he asserted that, in “45 minutes,” Iraq could deploy weapons of mass destruction against the West—a speech that pushed the world over the edge to accepting the Anglo-American preemptive war against Iraq.

The issue is thus put again squarely on the table: Will Her Majesty’s government once again drive the United States to war, this time a thermonuclear World War III? Indeed, Obama appears prepared to proceed.

At almost the same time that Cameron was engaging in his hysterical tirade, on March 5, during a series of White House meetings with Israel Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Obama pronounced Iran to be a “threat to the national security of the United States.” At the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) on March 4, Obama had declared the U.S.-Israel alliance is “sacrosanct.”

“My administration’s commitment to Israel’s security has been unprecedented. Our military and intelligence cooperation has never been closer,” Obama added. “Our joint exercises and training have never been more robust. Despite a tough budget environment, our security assistance has increased every single year. We are investing in new capabilities. We’re providing Israel with more advanced technology—the types of products and systems that only go to our closest friends and allies. And make no mistake: We will do what it takes to preserve Israel’s qualitative military edge—because Israel must always have *the ability to defend itself, by itself, against any threat* (emphasis added).

But at the same AIPAC meeting, and in later interviews, Netanyahu insisted that Israel alone, not the United States, will determine when it is necessary to attack Iran, and that it could happen within months. “We’re not standing with a stopwatch in hand,” he said

in an Israeli TV interview, one of three he gave after returning from the United States. “It’s not a matter of days or weeks, but also not of years,” he said.

The British Deciders

On March 13, the day the prime minister arrived for an “official visit with state dinner” in Washington, Cameron and Obama had co-authored an op-ed in the *Washington Post*, in which they invoke the war-time Winston Churchill, in proclaiming the unbreakable alliance of “hand and heart,” which today is triumphing in wars around the globe. The two puppet heads of state praise the mission in Afghanistan, where the U.S. and the U.K. are the “largest contributors” to the war; boast of how they will spend the “next few days” consulting about the upcoming NATO summit in Chicago, where “our alliance” will determine the next phase of NATO operations; and crow that “we’ll continue to tighten the noose around Bashar al-Assad and his cohorts, and we’ll work with the opposition and the United Nations-Arab League envoy Kofi Annan to plan for the transition that will follow Assad’s departure from power” (emphasis added).

Not least of all, Obama and Cameron jointly threaten Iran to “meet your international obligations or face the consequences,” all the while, paying lip service to the empty phrase “We believe there is time and space to pursue a diplomatic solution.”

The Cameron-Obama threats underline the March 4 warning from American statesman Lyndon LaRouche that Obama’s commitment to “a diplomatic solution” is a lie.

“We know what the program is,” LaRouche said. “The British policy is known, and it is not limited to Iran. *The British are the ones defining the so-called ‘red line,’ not Israel or Obama. They are gunning for global nuclear war...*

“Netanyahu will meet with Obama tomorrow, and will reportedly ‘pressure’ him to take a hard line on Iran. That is just cover for Obama, so that he can



White House/Pete Souza

Prime Minister Cameron and President Obama have invoked the war-time Churchillian alliance of “hand and heart,” which today, has brought the world to the brink of World War III.

‘appear’ to oppose certain things that he can then agree to, ‘under pressure,’” LaRouche added. “Basically, Obama doesn’t give a damn. He won’t risk his own options, by bothering to tell the truth.”

LaRouche insists that the only way to truly prevent war is to remove Obama from the Presidency under the provisions of the U.S. Constitution, either by impeachment, or for mental unfitness under Section 4 of the 25th Amendment.


Iran Nuclear Talks Threatened

In the face of all the war talk, sane forces in Russia and elsewhere have succeeded in achieving an agreement for new talks on Iran’s nuclear program, between Iran and the so-called P5+1 (the UN Security Council permanent members plus Germany).

One of the biggest dangers to the success of the P5+1 talks is that *no* Western country—not the United States, nor any nation in Western Europe—will openly tell the truth: that there is no evidence that Iran has a nuclear weapons program, and that, as even the most fanatical among the Israelis know, Iran does *not* have a nuclear weapon. Instead, disinformation in the Anglo-American media, and corruption of the International

Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)’s integrity through lack of transparency and the planting of evidence by countries desiring to start a military confrontation with Iran, drive the campaign for war.

However, the game is being called by highly qualified commentators. On March 6, writing in the *National Journal*, former Special Forces Col. W. Patrick Lang (ret.) stated: “Contrary to the propaganda drivel in the media, the US Government has believed since 2007 that Iran does not have a nuclear weapons program and has not had one since the Autumn of 2003. That remains the US Government position, expressed recently by James Clapper, the DNI [Director of National Intelligence], in testimony before the Senate. The ‘rent a media’ crowd keep trying to make a separate case for the existence of such a weapons program. Most recently the failure of the IAEA to inspect the facility at Parchin has been held up as evidence of dark secrets. Iran today offered to allow the IAEA to inspect the facility.”



righttruth.com

Col. Patrick Lang

Lang, the first director of the Defense Intelligence Agency’s Defense HUMINT (human intelligence) Service, is no ordinary commentator; his analysis of current military problems in Southwest Asia have been prescient. In 2004, he wrote “Drinking the Kool-Aid,” about how, in the run-up to the Iraq War, intelligence personnel who did not agree that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction were driven from government, and “bullied and undermined,” until “they, too, had drunk from the vat,” of Kool-Aid.¹

Lang is one of the few commentators who constantly reminds the U.S. public, elected officials, and the media, that the United States intelligence estimate is that Iran *has no current nuclear weapons program*, a reality that has been buried, because the 2010 National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) on Iran has never been released in declassified form, unlike the 2007 NIE. The decision to keep the positive 2010 finding about Iran

under wraps is a *political* decision by the Obama Administration, and it has kept the world on the brink of war with Iran, every time a new faked intelligence report surfaces.

At the same time, there has been a concerted effort to influence the IAEA under its current director (since 2009), Yukiyo Amano, to use the agency as a propaganda tool.

According to former IAEA Chief Inspector Robert Kelley, the treatment of Iran by the IAEA is “*déjà vu*,” from the disinformation of 2002-03 against Iraq. “The same thing is going on again,” Kelley told *EIR* on Feb. 28. “A very small group of people, if not down to individuals, are doing analysis and putting forth their opinions, and those opinions are not being checked.”² Former Director General of the IAEA, Dr. Hans Blix, speaking to a standing-room-only audience at the Rayburn House Office Building Feb. 21, also criticized the indiscriminate use of “intelligence” from “third parties,” i.e., individual countries to the IAEA. Referring to criticisms of the November 2011 report of the IAEA, Blix said, “I think that if we haven’t seen the real evidence [underlying the intelligence report submitted to the IAEA], then the IAEA should be reticent in its use of it. And the intelligence—if Obama doesn’t want to cite it, well, then, let them bring it out themselves, to the public....”

International Fightback

There is hope that the British duplicity is being cracked, through the concerted mobilization by the LaRouche movement against a new British imperial *thermonuclear* war, and by the continued resistance by Russia and China, to any further misuse of the United Nations resolutions or IAEA reports to go to war against Iran or Syria.

On March 12, an effort by the U.S., Britain, and France, to push through a resolution against Syria, justifying the regime change called for by the Obama/Cameron duo, was never even voted on, due to the clear opposition from Russia, which sent Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov to the UN meeting.

And, as of now, the P5+1 talks are being planned, with the West’s acceptance of a series of Iran’s offers to cooperate with the IAEA.

1. W. Patrick Lang, “[Drinking the Kool-Aid.](#)” *Middle East Policy*, vol. 11, no. 2, June 2004.

2. Michele Steinberg, “Robert Kelley: IAEA Should Investigate November 2011 Report on Iran for Forgeries, Lie,” *EIR*, March 9, 2012.

And Iran is calling the question on dirty tricks by some members of the IAEA.

On March 6, Iran made public a communiqué to the IAEA, that accused—in very polite, calm language—Agency head Amano of ordering the IAEA inspectors who went to Iran on Feb. 20-21 to resolve outstanding issues, to *break* an agreed-upon framework that had just been negotiated in Tehran and Vienna. In the communiqué, delivered to the 35 member countries of the IAEA board of governors, Iran says that the visit to Parchin—a military base alleged to be engaged in illegal activities—had been put off to a later date, by joint agreement, *before the inspectors got to Tehran*. Issuing this communiqué, and making it public through the official government news agency, could counter British attempts to use the IAEA as a vehicle for pushing war.

The communiqué shows duplicity by Amano and the IAEA Iran team; Amano, in his provocative briefing on March 5, left out the fact that Iran has worked out a plan with the IAEA for the specific modes in which the Agency can inspect, and how they should report. The sites like Parchin that the IAEA wants to visit are outside the scope of the treaty obligations to the IAEA.

In a detailed Prelude, Iran's communiqué says that the IAEA "based on [a] work plan [that had been formally agreed to between Iran and the IAEA in 2007]," acted "quite against the formerly reached agreement and did not declare the end of its job in Iran," as had been agreed, in 2011. Instead, Amano's IAEA, in 2011, demanded further visits, in response to which Iran, in good faith, "invited the agency's team of inspectors to visit Iran on October 30th, 2011," to survey the remaining issues and end the process "which seemed to be an endless one...."

The important basics of the communiqué show that in the first meetings of Jan. 29-31, 2012, there was an exchange of drafts between Iran and the IAEA regarding the modality for the continued inspections. There were "two rounds of talks" in Tehran, and "three rounds in Vienna," at which agreements were reached. The main points of these agreements were that the matters would be surveyed "issue by issue"; and that "related technical matters would be classified under same topics, in order to facilitate the process of the intensive work," i.e., instead of *carte blanche* for inspection of a given location.

The IAEA also "declared that the entire remaining issues are exclusively those mentioned in document GOV/2011/65," which was the November 2011 IAEA report.

The communiqué, in highly formal language, speaks about the first and second modalities, but it is important that "it was agreed that the agency would deliver the documents that prove that Iran is involved in the claimed activities to Tehran officials." (Apparently the delivery of these documents—presumably reports from some nation's intelligence agencies—did not happen.)

The Parchin 'Issue'

Of particular note is the flap around the site of Parchin, which provocateurs such as Cameron are pointing to as a site for illegal activities, and claiming that Iran's recent refusal to permit a visit proves something bad is happening there. Yet, Iran and the IAEA had already agreed on a later visit.

Regarding Parchin, the communiqué says "it was also agreed that ... the request on having access to Parchin facilities, in accordance with the issue-by-issue approach, would be delayed till after the March session of the IAEA Board of Governors," but this agreement was broken on orders from Amano.

The communiqué says, "Despite the reached agreement in Vienna (referred to under letter B above), and even contrary to the agreed text with the agency, referred to before, the IAEA team based on the agency secretary general's order, asked for having access to Parchin facilities.

"It should be noted that Parchin facilities were inspected twice in the year 2005 by the agency, following which the former secretary general (Dr. ElBaradei) announced that the matter is finalized and would be part of history, and he reported the matter to the Board of Directors."

U.S. intelligence sources say that the U.S. intelligence services believe that Iran's offer concerning the Parchin site inspections is genuine.

But, unless British puppet Obama is out, it is the Churchillian alliance that determines U.S. policy, not the U.S. Constitution. The alliance of the U.S. patriotic military, the Russians and Chinese, and the LaRouche movement have held off disaster so far—but the crucial step remains to be taken.

steinberg_mj@hotmail.com

Cheminade's Presidential Campaign Is Creating an Uproar in France

by our European Bureau

March 11—When Presidential candidate Jacques Cheminade, the well-known French co-thinker of Lyndon LaRouche, arrived at the Constitutional Council in Paris to register his candidacy on the morning of March 8, it was a huge media event; over 20 reporters and camera crews were there to film his entry, and deluge him with questions. At the press conference he gave on his way out, he announced that the batch of sponsorships for his Presidential candidacy he had just delivered, brought the total number to 538. Since then, hundreds of articles have appeared covering his Presidential bid, and numerous interviews have been aired.

The threshold for gaining a place on the French Presidential ballot, whose first round of elections occurs on April 22, is 500 valid signatures of local elected officials, and Cheminade is one of the few “minor candidates” to have succeeded so far. As of March 12, Cheminade had submitted 560 signatures, and that number may grow by the March 19 deadline. France’s most influential press agency, Agence France Presse (AFP), was the first to announce the news, announcing in its release that: “the candidate proposes the ‘use of public productive credit, as during the Thirty Glorious Years [of post-war growth] in order to rebuild our economy by financing great infrastructure projects, fundamental research, public services, and skilled jobs.’”

“He also proposes ‘a strict separation between deposit banks, and investment banks and insurance companies,’ and a return to national currencies, with the euro remaining as ‘a common reference for major projects involving several countries.’”

This part of the release immediately made the rounds of the other media in their on-line editions, and



Jacques Cheminade is met by a crush of reporters as he arrives at the Constitutional Council in Paris March 8 to register his candidacy for President of France.

EIRNS

Cheminade is now clearly identified with these issues. The candidate is also directing public attention to the danger of a Third World War, a threat being avoided by most media and candidates, with the exception of former French Prime Minister Michel Rocard.

A New de Gaulle

“I’m in the spirit of June 1940,” Cheminade told the packed press conference (which actually took place on the sidewalk outside the building), hearkening back to the time when Charles de Gaulle flew to London to rally his countrymen to the resistance against the fascist occupation of France. As can be seen in the video statement he prepared for the conference of the Schiller Institute (see below), Cheminade is raising the standard of France from the best of its history, and demanding that it fulfill its role as a leading nation in the creation of a new, just economic order, based on an international Glass-Steagall standard and cooperation among nation-states for great development projects. No longer can the

French people tolerate a government, like that of Nicolas Sarkozy, which is behaving as a vile servant of the British Empire.

Some of the media coverage is extremely nasty, filled with innuendo, if not outright slanders, especially in the state-run channels. But at least part of the “powers that be” in France, who are very worried by the breakdown of the financial system overall, and in particular in the Eurozone, and by the danger of war, apparently want Cheminade’s warnings to go out . . . at least for now.

Most interviewers would rather stick to banal “anecdotes” avoiding the “heavy ideas” with which Cheminade is defying the entire political elite, but Cheminade should have the chance to present them, once the list of qualified candidates is announced, and the official campaign begins on March 20. From then on until April 8, the major media must give all candidates equal time, although with more advantageous time slots for the major candidates, and from April 8 to 21, equal time slots, to present their programs, to all candidates. This represents an unprecedented opening for all of LaRouche’s allies worldwide.

Until now, the greatest buzz created was the interview Cheminade gave to well-known attack dog Pascale Clark of France Inter on her early morning prime-time radio show March 9, when she asked the candidate why Lyndon LaRouche compared Obama to Hitler. Calmly and precisely, Cheminade went on to explain why Obama deserves the moustache: his health policy of social triage, his unconstitutional assassination of U.S. citizens, the drone attacks, and the war drive.

Interestingly enough, the release AFP put out on that intervention, which quoted Cheminade’s reply in full and without commenting it, was also picked up by hundreds of websites.

A ‘Tour de France’

Now, in the coming six weeks until the first round of the Presidential election, the political landscape of France will be turned upside down by the Cheminade campaign, mobilizing the citizenry to defend the republic against the “oligarchy of incompetents” and alerting them to the danger of war. During that time, Cheminade’s campaign team of 15-20 young adults will be criss-crossing the nation, bringing Cheminade’s message to every nook and cranny.

That team began its nationwide effort with phone calls to some 25,000 mayors across the country, back in October 2010. In the intervening time, the team has met

with more than 2,000 of them, and the vast majority of those met have been reading the materials put out by Cheminade.

As one member of the campaign team put it in a letter to supporters the day Cheminade filed his signatures:

“Now, 43 years after the death of Charles de Gaulle, a true leader can start a true dialogue with the soul of the country. Whereas politicians after de Gaulle’s presidencies were without character and abandoned the long legacy of a certain idea of France and humanity embodied by de Gaulle himself, Charles de Gaulle’s action continues to live now in the Jacques Cheminade’s candidacy. He, while others quit, ‘picked up the hilt of the broken sword.’

“And in the eyes of mayors whom we met with again over the last weeks to fill out the official forms of their signature, we, the young adults we are, our responsibility. Mayors make common cause with us, inspired by a better future, our responsibility, as de Gaulle did in 1958 by putting the new Constitution on the table.”

With that sense of historic mission, Cheminade and his campaign are determined to press through this crucial Presidential campaign, and make a revolution in thinking—and perhaps much more.

Jacques Cheminade

‘We Must Swear an Oath to the Future’

The leader of the French LaRouche movement and a candidate for President of France, gave this video address to the Schiller Institute Conference in Berlin, Feb. 25-26, 2012.

To all of you who are gathered there today, I’m going to say something to begin with, which might surprise you. I am not among you physically, but I am much more with you, than if I were with you physically, because we are engaged in the same fight. And the fight I am waging here, and that I cannot leave even for a few hours, is the same as yours. That is what brings us together.

Being a candidate in the Presidential election in France today is a paradox which is both exciting and, at

the same time, calls forth in one something which is the most profound, the most human and sometimes the most difficult to express, and to convey to others.

Here, behind me, you have the theme of our campaign: “A world without the City or Wall Street, great infrastructure works for tomorrow.” It is a theme of the future, an assertion that the future defines the present. And in our campaign, we are coming across much that is in the history of our country that defines the future.

We find the translation of the Bible into French by Lefèvre d’Etaples, who was very close to Nicholas of Cusa. We find the Judaism of Rachi of Troyes. We find the Islam that is coming to us today; and we find the humanism that runs through our entire history. Gerbert d’Aurillac, for example, the Pope who became Sylvester II [946-1003], and went all the way to Spain to find science in the Spain of Islam, and who was born in Cantal, where many mayors gave me their signatures.

And we made a trip to the Familistère of Godin. Godin was a creator from the end of the 19th Century, who invented, among other things, a cast iron oven, which supplanted the cooking pot, and completely changed the concept of nourishment. He was a great industrialist, who created collective housing for all, equipped with the very latest achievements in terms of hygiene; a utopian, but he was not so utopian when he dealt with reality. He wanted to ensure that everyone would have a productive job. We are coming across all this history in this campaign.

Use the Future To Define the Present

But, at the same time, we also find the present. Socialists who have betrayed socialism, Gaullists who have betrayed Gaullism, Catholics who have betrayed Christianity, and human beings who have given up on what is human inside themselves. That, at a time in our history when the international financial system is disintegrating, when we are headed for social destruction, and an austerity and “rigor” policy like that which Brüning in 1930-32 in Germany, and Laval in France, when he was president of the Council in 1935, carried out.

At the same time, it’s a policy which is not forward-looking, which does not see the future, which refuses to see it: the fall of the house of Europe.

Then we have the policy that is leading us to war, where we are headed inescapably, the war of all against

all, perhaps tomorrow, perhaps further down the road, but inescapably so, because all the conditions for such a war have been created in a world controlled by the oligarchy—a world in contraction. The oligarchy is attempting to implement a policy which goes against the people, against the populations. That is what we are up against, at the same time as we rediscover what is best in our history, during this campaign.

What We Must Do

So, in these circumstances, I am glad to be among you, in thought, and to address you, because we absolutely must build together. It cannot be done in a single country; it has to be done in all the countries of the world.

We must build this platform toward the future which is, for us, for all of us, what we need to bring future generations to an age which is better than ours. That was the dream of those two great German poets—who were also French, or had a French side to them—Schiller and Heine. This is the dream of all those who have fought on the front lines, just as we are fighting today.

This means moving toward what Franklin D. Roosevelt dreamed of, and attempted to achieve at the end of his life, and which Truman betrayed. It is the Alliance for Progress sought by Kennedy, who was assassinated for trying to build it. It is the “universal republic” that Victor Hugo spoke of. It is the fatherland that defines itself by what it contributes to the common good of all of humanity. This orientation is completely opposite to that of the Europe of the euro, which is destroying itself right now, and destroying whatever Europe could contribute, as a continent, to the rest of the world.

This means that we can only make our history meaningful, by achieving the common aims of humanity. Among them, we have the Eurasian Land-Bridge, which Helga Zepp-LaRouche first developed, which will have to become a worldwide land-bridge. Those common aims of humanity, for each country that participates through national banks, must be oriented towards investment in the future, with a technological platform and a vision of the future shared by all.

The Arctic, the Antarctic, Africa—every region of the world should be opened up and led to take part in universal history, in the history of our future. That is not just an opinion, of course; it is much more—it is a necessity. This necessity is what we have to fight for, so



EIRNS/Julien Lemaître

In contrast to the tragedy that has overtaken Europe, as represented by “Merkozy,” Cheminade puts forward the concept advocated by himself and Helga Zepp-LaRouche: the common aims of mankind, as expressed in the notion of the extraterrestrial imperative.

that the world has a future, and so that we free ourselves from this straitjacket of war which is leading us to the threshold—and we will cross that threshold, if we don’t act in time—of thermonuclear war. Because man will always use the weapons he has, if he fails to define a better world above and beyond. That was described by Hobbes himself when he spoke of the Leviathan.

I Fight for the Future

Here again, that implies educating the creative capacities of all. It also implies having a conception of human labor, which is really human. Today, everyone is talking about work in France, but nobody knows what it is. They even say that prostitutes are “sex workers.” We have lost the sense of work which is not something repetitive. It is not some *thing*; it’s not an activity, or an occupation that you do; it’s not earning a living to make money. Work involves an effort for the future, it involves creating the basis for future generations to live better than we ourselves do.

Our great philosopher of the 20th Century, Simone Weil, said it very clearly. She said that all work has to have a certain poetical part to it. It is this poetical part that defines human work, in contrast to an animal’s work, which is the repetitive side. The poetical part allows us to imagine human beings for the future, who will be better than we are. The significance of a Presi-

dential campaign is to create the basis for such a future.

And then of course, there are the daily aspects of the campaign, and on the daily side, you are submerged in the world of media, submerged in a universe where every single person does not necessarily have bad intentions, but where the overall climate is destructive in respect to this human capacity, this capacity of human work. A Presidential campaign has to fight on a daily basis to revive this conception of human creation and human work.

In the campaign, what do we hear? “How much does it cost?” “How much does it cost?” “But how much does it cost?” Or on another subject: debt. “How will you pay the debt? The debt, the debt.”

Austerity is called for on the right, and “rigor” on the left. We hear all these voices coming from a finite world, from a world which is doomed to self-destruction, if we don’t save it.

Man as Explorer

What I have to fight in this campaign, is not so much the other candidates. I have to fight for what the other candidates are *not* fighting for. That means that in this campaign, we have to try to change, by all possible means, the way of thinking of a country, of our country: by immersing it in the creative moments of its history, so that it sees what it can give, what it can offer to the

future. Of course, France alone can do very little. She can only act as a catalyst or an instigator, drawing on her history, knowing that she was only great when she was universal.

Today, we have a problem before us, a French-German problem, to be solved. France and Germany can simply not be “Merkozy”: Can you imagine something so ridiculous in the midst of a tragedy, like in a Shakespeare drama?

Therefore, Helga Zepp-LaRouche and myself, in these circumstances, have to represent what France and Germany truly are. And I can think of an example: With respect to our extraterrestrial imperative, to the imperative to explore—man must become an explorer; with respect to that, I think of Krafft Ehrlicke, who was a friend of Helga Zepp-LaRouche. This German scientist thought, just like many others, that the Earth is the cradle of humanity, but man is not made to remain in his cradle.

Krafft Ehrlicke, who spoke of this extraterrestrial imperative, in my mind, joins Jean Robieux in France, who was the inventor, in France and in the world, of thermonuclear fusion by laser, by inertial confinement. This is the means of transportation of the future, at least toward Mars, which will allow us to get to Mars from the Moon in about one week.

This is what must be defined by a French-German alliance, moved by the sense of the future that we all need to have, those who are gathered in this room physically, and those who are not, like myself. This is the sense we have to share. Communication of this is put across through a presence that cannot be touched, or seen; it is done through ideas.

De Gaulle used to say that France is a certain idea, Germany is a certain idea, and this association of ideas must be the basis for the common aims of humanity.

That is the proper sense of our combat. I think back, at this point in history, to what was said by someone who was more French than if he had been born French. He was Romain Gary, an author who, when thinking of his experience with the Free French, thinking of the Resistance fighters, the partisan snipers and the French Forces of the Interior (FFI), thinking of those in the Normandy-Niemen squadron, said, thinking about it profoundly: No one is dead, no one is dead any more.

If We Fail Our Mission

I am of the Gagarin generation; I was 20 at the time, and I can tell you that over the course of this

campaign, I have felt very profoundly what Romain Gary meant. If we sound the depths of ourselves, no one is dead, because all our friends of the past come forth to us.

At the same time, the condition of no one being dead, is that we receive every person with a beautiful face, and this beautiful face is the face of the future. The face of the future is what must determine our fight.

But if we fail to fulfill our mission, this future may very well never exist. We have to make the commitment, from deep within ourselves, to be human beings, and not dinosaurs who are vulnerable to the destruction that a species brings upon itself, or to the extinction produced by outside events, and the inability to understand the universe. We must swear an oath to the future, with all our heart.

And I am sure there is no other choice, if we are to ensure a future for the human species.

This choice is one we have to make together. I am very much aware of that in my campaign, in France, in Europe, in the world, and I am committed to bringing this dimension into it.

I think of all those who, in the Basement as it's called, in the new catacombs, located in the “belly of the beast,” are thinking about, reflecting on, working towards a new Renaissance.¹ Such a new Renaissance must be the goal of every campaign that we wage, armed with a pedagogy which, like every good pedagogy, provokes a shock within people, and serious thought and change.

At a time when everybody is talking about “change,” “change,” “change,” true change involves realizing that we have to transform ourselves, to change our society, but in depth, on the basis of principles.

This is the sense of mission which brings us together today. But we must prove it by acting, by working, by doing something for the future. We have to prove our ability to be real French republicans, and Europeans, just as those people did who felt the fresh wind coming from the America of the Founding Fathers, and who were inspired to leave, in order to create something better on the other side of the Atlantic.

We have to think of all that, carry it inside ourselves, to give it to future generations. That is the challenge before us.

1. A reference to the LaRouchePAC Basement Team of scientific researchers.

Why Christians in Syria Love the U.S., But Despise Its Pro-British Policies

by Hussein Askary

March 10—As the British Empire accelerates its game-plan for regime change in Syria—merely a way-station on its way to thermonuclear confrontation with Russia and China—some voices in that nation are raising the alarm over the danger of religious wars. We at *EIR* are determined to let their well-founded warnings be heard.

- Some Relevant History -

Before the Crusaders came to the Eastern Mediterranean and Syria in 1096, Christians, Muslims, and Jews had lived in peace and harmony for more than 300 years. The Holy Land of Syria was cleansed of the remains of the rotten Byzantine Empire by the Muslims, who enjoyed the support and respect of the Christians after the decisive battle of Al-Yarmouk, in which the Muslim army defeated the Byzantine Army of Emperor Heraclius in 636. Christians were protected in their cities and towns, and freedom of religion was granted without interference from the Muslim state.

Christians were not obliged to join the Muslim armies, but had to pay Al-Jizya, a tax to the Muslim state. Christian priests, monks, the old, disabled, and poor were exempted. On the other hand, Christians did not have to pay Al-Zakat, which was an obligatory tax for all Muslims.

Christians were integrated into the Islamic Renaissance which flourished in Baghdad and Damascus in the 9th and 10th centuries. Christian scholars in Syria had the great advantage of speaking and writing Greek, Assyrian, and Arabic. Many were recruited to the House of Wisdom in Baghdad in their youth, to help translate from Greek the greatest works of philosophy, astronomy, geometry, and medicine. Hunayn bin Ishaq, his son Ishaq bin Hunayn, Thabit bin Qurra, Johanna ibn Al-Batrik, and Ibn Al-Homsi are some of the most prominent Christian translators who enriched the Islamic or Arab Renaissance with the great works of Plato, plus those of Aristotle, Galen, and many more Greek scientists and philosophers.

When the Crusaders came 200 years later, this humanist Islamic culture had dwindled, and had been weakened by the power struggle among Arab, Turkic, and Persian elites. The Christians, especially during the late Crusades, were caught between the mad Venice-directed Crusaders, who claimed to be Christians, and the barbaric Turks who claimed to be Muslims. During the long sieges of cities in Syria and the Eastern Mediterranean coast, Christians were regarded as “traitors” and “fifth columnists” by both sides of the conflict. The Crusades had no moral basis in any religion, but were geopolitical, imperial wars for the benefit of the Venetian empire, just as Tony Blair’s, George W. Bush’s, and Barack Obama’s regime-change wars in Southwest Asia are for the benefit of the British City of London Empire today.

Christians are caught in the same dilemma today, especially in Syria. After seeing their cousins in Iraq being forced into a mass exodus, thanks to the Blair-Bush extended invitation to al-Qaeda and the Wahhabi/Salafi terrorists to open shop in Iraq after the 2003 invasion, Christians have had second thoughts about the real purpose of the Western support to the so-called Arab Spring which was transformed from a revolt against the unjust global economic and social order, into civil wars.

Now that it has become evident that the U.K., the U.S., and France are working hand-in-hand with al-Qaeda and other Islamic terrorist groups, backed by Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Turkey, Christians in the region, in addition to a great majority of Syrians from other faiths and political colors, are becoming aware that it is their nation-state, not the Bashar Assad regime, which is the real target of this policy.

Christian Leaders Speak Out

The strongest denunciation of the current policy, targeting the sovereignty of Syria, was issued by Mel-



The groups who want to destabilize the country are a minority in Syria, and have foreign support, as can be seen in this photo: A sign, in English, reads, “Thank you BBC,” a reference to the British Empire’s main news service.

kite Roman Catholic Archbishop of Aleppo, Jean-Clément Jeanbart, in an interview with reporters from the International Catholic News Agency (APIC) and the French daily *Le Figaro*, which published it on Feb. 17.

“We are afraid. We have always lived in a safe country. We do not want to be like Iraq. And the evolution of the transitions in Libya and Egypt do not reassure us,” Jeanbart had declared to *Figaro* Jan. 11. The Archbishop spoke out against the international media, declaring that it is mostly opposed to the Syrian regime, and too often spreads false reports about his country. But in one case, *Figaro* journalist Georges Malbrunot pointed out that the French reporter Gilles Jacquier, who was hit by a shell in Homs on Jan. 11, was killed by protesters. “They fired on a pro-Assad protest. The direction from which the shells came was obvious.”

The Archbishop denounced the media propaganda: “No one in the media speaks of the infiltration in Syria of extremists and mercenaries from Turkey, Iraq, Jordan, Libya, Pakistan, some from Afghanistan.... From without, we see the West attacking our president, and from within, we see groups of armed Muslims who come to sow terror and death in certain zones of the country. Unfortunately, several thousands of innocent civilians and soldiers—at least 2,000 soldiers, police officers, simple civilians—have been victims of the hate and hostility of these groups. They have often been savagely tortured, mutilated and killed.”

Archbishop Jeanbart had warned in November 2011, as the attacks on Syria from outside intensified, that the operation against Syria had nothing to do with democracy and reforms. During a visit to Spain and

Switzerland in November, he told APIC, “In the field, the situation is quite different from what one sees at home on television.... Aleppo is about 20 minutes from the Turkish border. The border is open, and many people come there by car to do their shopping. There are only a few hundred Syrian refugees who have settled in southeastern Turkey, while the Aleppo Governorate has about 5 million inhabitants. They registered many simple travelers as refugees.”

He said that he himself has not seen the fighting, but certain of his priests had witnessed the carnage committed by unidentified armed groups terrorizing the population, as in Jisr al-Choughour. “If the UN speaks of 3,500 dead, it may be correct, but there was violence on both sides. Thus, in these figures there are many security force members and soldiers, because the armed insurgents without hesitation shot at law enforcement.”

The groups who want to destabilize the country are a minority in Syria, and have foreign support, including certain Gulf countries or Sunni fundamentalists, such as the Salafist group close to al-Qaeda based in Tripoli, Lebanon, noted the 68-year-old Archbishop. He deplored that television stations such as Al-Jazeera or Al-Arabyia transform a demonstration of hundreds of opponents into thousands of adversaries to the ruling regime, and when the majority who are in favor of Bashar al-Assad take to the streets by the millions in Aleppo, Damascus, Latakia, and in other cities, they are depicted as being only a few thousand.

“I daresay that President Bashar al-Assad has great support ... from no less than 75% of the population in cities and in rural areas. The vast majority of Syrians do not want an Islamic regime. The new defense minister Gen. Daoud Rajha is a Christian, as is the director of the Central Bank. Bashar al-Assad is an educated man, a doctor, who has studied and lived in Europe.... I hope that Syria will not be the fourth country to experience a sudden overthrow of power, after Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya. It would be a catastrophe for the entire region, not just for Christians,” he emphasized.

“The abolition of the principle of citizenship, which guarantees equal treatment for all minorities—Christians, Druze, Shi’a, Ismaili, Alawite—and a return to sectarianism would be an unmitigated disaster,” he continued. This would cause a great exodus among the

1.7 million Christians who, for half a century, have experienced real friendship with the Muslim majority of the country: The Syrian Christians fear the establishment of a fundamentalist Islamic regime that would impose Sharia, the Islamic law. He pointed out that under the pretext of “democratization,” they are preparing for a much worse situation should the current regime suddenly collapse, because the vacuum would then be immediately occupied by the fundamentalist movements which are well organized.

“For us, Muslim-Christian conviviality is not an empty word. There is no discrimination against Christians, neither from the point of view of the State, nor from the law,” said Jeanbart. But today the danger of sectarianism, eradicated for nearly four decades, has resurfaced. And the emigration of Christians, which had slowed during the last ten years, risks picking up with renewed vigor, he explained. He is convinced that Christian young people should remain in the country to fulfill a mission. “Is not Syria, after Jerusalem, the first home of Christianity?” Seat of a diocese since the end of the Third Century, Aleppo has known a Christian presence since the time of the Apostles, but today, more than 200,000 Greek Melkite Catholics, originally from Aleppo, live abroad. “Our young people are literally sucked into the diaspora. Yet the government does protect us...”

Reform, without Violence

Archbishop Jeanbart, like most other Christian leaders in Syria, has also voiced his support for political reform, freedom, equality, and social justice. They do not like to be viewed as supporters of the regime for their narrow interests, but are fully aware, as patriots, of the dangers that are lurking behind the current Western/Saudi-backed operation against their country.

In the meantime, in neighboring Lebanon, the leader of Maronite (Catholic) Christians in Lebanon, Patriarch Beshara al-Rai, with 1 million followers in Lebanon, and many more in Syria, expressed similar concerns about Syria. In an interview with Reuters Middle East chief Michael Stott, published March 5, he said: “We are with the Arab Spring, but we are not with this spring of violence, war, destruction, and killing. This is turning to winter... We say that we cannot implement reforms by force and arms. No one can guess the scale of the great losses and damage



Patriarch Beshara al-Rai, leader of Maronite (Catholic) Christians in Lebanon: “Syria, like other countries, needs reforms which the people are demanding... But we regret that Syria, which wants to take a step forward... is undergoing this violence and destruction and [use of] power and weapons.”

which could result.”

Al-Rai drew a parallel to the situation in Iraq: “How can it be an Arab Spring when people are being killed every day? They speak of Iraq and democracy, and 1 million Christians out of an original 1.5 million have fled Iraq.

“Syria, like other countries, needs reforms which the people are demanding,” he said. “It’s true that the Syrian Ba’ath regime is an extreme and dictatorial regime, but there are many others like it in the Arab world. All regimes in the Arab world have Islam as a state religion, except for Syria. It stands out for not saying it is an Islamic state... The closest thing to democracy [in the Arab world] is Syria... We are not defending it. But we regret that Syria, which wants to take a step forward... is undergoing this violence and destruction and [use of] power and weapons.”

Al-Rai also expressed his concern that extremist Is-



The Melkite Roman Catholic Archbishop of Aleppo, Jean-Clément Jeanbart: “No one in the media speaks of the infiltration in Syria of extremists and mercenaries from Turkey, Iraq, Jordan, Libya, Pakistan, some from Afghanistan... From without, we see the West attacking our president, and from within, we see groups of armed Muslims who come to sow terror and death in certain zones of the country.”

lamist groups are getting foreign support. “It’s not the people who want them. There are countries behind them, supporting them financially and militarily and politically,” he said. “Moderate people do not want them. . . . We do not speak out against any sect, and we do not fear moderate Islam. We fear the extremist groups that use the language of violence.”

Al-Rai said the Lebanese were divided by events across the border, and he feared the shock waves could have an impact in Lebanon, home to Shi’ite and Sunni Muslims, Maronite and Orthodox Christians, Druzes, and Alawites—the same sect as Assad. “God forbid that the conflict turns into a sectarian conflict between Sunnis and Alawites. In Tripoli, we have Alawites, and the situation there is like a fire [smoldering] under the ashes.”

A Special Relationship with America

The Greek-Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch and All the East, Ignatius IV Hezim, who is the spiritual leader of the largest Christian community in Syria, is a good example of Syrian leaders who have a special relationship to America, while being patriots of Syria. In a March 8 interview with [LPAC-TV](#) (see below), Patriarch Ignatius denounced the foreign attack on his country, and the media disinformation which is leading to sectarian and religious strife.

Born in 1921, Patriarch Ignatius belongs to a generation in Southwest Asia which was looking forward to see the United States taking the lead in the world for freedom from British and French colonialism following World War I. Before the war had ended, the whole region was under the yoke of the backward Ottoman Empire. The British and the French, who had urged the people of the region to support them to get the Ottomans out, and promised them independence, betrayed those people. It was revealed later, that already in 1916, the British and the French had signed the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement to divide the spoils of the Ottoman Empire between them. When that betrayal was revealed, the people of the region revolted and called upon the U.S. to come to their aid, because they knew it to be a nation with no imperial past, which had fought against British imperialism, and which harbored the highest aspirations of freedom, independence, and national sovereignty.

Under pressure from patriotic forces in the U.S., pro-British President Woodrow Wilson was forced to reject the British-French secret treaty, and to allow a special commission to survey the opinion of the people



The Greek-Orthodox Patriarch Ignatius IV Hezim, spiritual leader of the largest Christian community in Syria, reflects his generation’s love for America, which is strongly attached to the images of FDR; Eisenhower’s opposition to the British-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt in 1956; and to President John F. Kennedy.

in Syria and Mesopotamia (Iraq) about what type of mandate they wished to have in the transitional period towards independence.

The most interesting finding of the commission, called the King-Crane Commission, after Charles Crane and Dr. Henry King,¹ was that the peoples of the region rejected British rule, and demanded an American mandate. Their findings “showed that the people knew the grounds upon which they registered their choice for America. They declared that their choice was due to knowledge of America’s record, the unselfish aims with which she had come into the war, the faith in her felt by multitudes of Syrians who had been in America; the spirit revealed in American educational institutions in Syria, especially the College in Beirut, with its well-known and constant encouragement of Syrian national sentiment, their belief that America had no territorial or colonial ambitions, and would willingly withdraw when the Syrian state was well established, as her treatment both of Cuba and the Philippines seemed to them to illustrate; her genuinely democratic spirit, and her ample resources. From the point of view of the desires of the ‘people concerned,’ the Mandate should

1. For a thorough review of the commission’s work and the circumstances surrounding it, see Dean Andromidas, “When America Fought the British Empire and Its Treacherous Sykes-Picot Treaty,” *EIR*, Jan. 27, 2009.

clearly go to America. The commissioners, therefore, recommend, as involved in the logic of the facts, that the United States of America be asked to undertake a single Mandate for all of Syria.”

King and Crane rightly identified the nature of the British mischief as they wrote: “We should hardly be doing justice however, to our sense of responsibility to the Syrian people, if we did not frankly add some at least of the reasons and misgivings, variously expressed and implied in our conferences, which led to the preference for an American mandate over a British mandate. The people repeatedly showed honest fear that in British hands the mandatory power would become simply a colonizing power of the old kind; that Great Britain would find it difficult to give up the colonial theory, especially in case of a people thought inferior; that she would favor a civil service and pension budget too expensive for a poor people; that the interests of Syria would be subordinated to the supposed needs of the Empire; that there would be, after all, too much exploitation of the country for Britain’s benefit; that she would never be ready to withdraw and give the country real independence; that she did not really believe in universal education, and would not provide adequately for it.”

Patriarch Ignatius’s reference to the American University of Beirut (called the Syrian Protestant College until 1920) is interesting, as he himself and many Arab intellectuals of all religions were educated and introduced to the ideals of the American Revolution and Republic there. It was American missionaries who, during the American Civil War in 1862, suggested establishing these schools in the region, which would follow the American educational system, but not pursue a sectarian evangelical mission.

The college’s own definition of itself states: “This college is for all conditions and classes of men without regard to color, nationality, race or religion. A man, white, black, or yellow, Christian, Jew, Mohammedan or heathen, may enter and enjoy all the advantages of this institution for three, four or eight years; and go out believing in one God, in many gods, or in no God. But it will be impossible for anyone to continue with us long without knowing what we believe to be the truth and our reasons for that belief.”

It was such ideals that young students, including Patriarch Ignatius IV Hezim, were introduced to at a time when Ottoman oppression and British colonialism showed their ugly imperial face to the people.

It is in this light that the deep appreciation and love

expressed by Patriarch Ignatius towards America should be understood. His generation’s memory of American politics is strongly attached to the images of Franklin Roosevelt; Dwight Eisenhower’s opposition to the British-French-Israeli aggression against the young, independent Egypt in 1956; and to President John F. Kennedy.

Interview: Patriarch Ignatius IV Hezim

Here are excerpts of the interview with Patriarch Ignatius IV Hezim conducted by Hector Rivas from La-RouchePAC, and Hussein Askary from EIR.

Rivas: In the United States, there’s a lot of confusion about the situation in Syria. So, I was hoping you could tell people what, in your view, is going on in Syria, and the situation there, and what the sentiment of the people in Syria is?

Patriarch Ignatius: Well, I know one thing, that we are, up until this time, even this hour, we are in the country, and we feel that we will not, you see, be face to face with a bad situation or something like that, because we feel that maybe we have until now lived the best way, in the open.

And we wish peace; we wish everything well to this country, because until now, we know that all people do not like it, but we don’t know really why, and no people have shown that there is a substitute for the future. We don’t see absolutely anything, and we find we don’t have to go from that which is a concrete situation [now], to a situation that we have no idea about, that doesn’t exist up until now.

And further, there is no reason, really to try to make a whole movement to say which is human, and causing another [to be] unhuman.

This is what we feel really, in order to be sincere about this situation in which we live. You see, there is nothing against—a kind of movement, let’s say—against the Christians, or something like that. We don’t have it. We still are living, we have our churches, we have our schools, and we live as well, you see, as all the Muslim people in this country. . . .

Askary: Would you like to say something in Arabic and I translate it into English?

Patriarch Ignatius: What I want to say is that I

wish that the United States, which we love because we are related culturally... We learn in its schools. We make our schools similar to American schools, our cultures are not unfamiliar... Therefore, I wish it to be positive because it can be positive.

Askary: So, you are against any military intervention by the U.S. or Europe?

Patriarch Ignatius: I don't understand military matters. I don't understand fighting and people killing each other or using violence. I don't want anybody to be hurt. The framework we work within is a framework in which we don't want anybody to be unhappy, or not have a good living, or be oppressed, and so forth. I say these things in the church here in Damascus, and I don't hesitate ever to say these things, and I don't hear anybody protesting or complaining about what I say.

My hope is that the U.S. does not become cheap, and go the same way as the others. We love America and we have 50% of our children living over there. When we travel to America, it feels like going home. And when we return from [America], we are very joyful, and we have a lot of people over there whom we

love. We know America is a new world for civilization. This is my opinion.

Final Comment by the Author

It is this spirit of love which unites many people in Southwest Asia with what they regard as the "real America"—not the America which betrayed them by succumbing to the British colonial schemes in the 1919 Versailles Treaty; nor the America which betrayed them again after the death of FDR; and not the America which has betrayed them time and again after the murder of John F. Kennedy, by siding with the British Empire, and becoming a silly parody of empire.

It is happening all over again under Obama, who is wholeheartedly embracing the British Empire's schemes. It is this terrifying fact which is bringing the whole region to the brink of total disintegration and religious war, and the world closer to a thermonuclear holocaust, as American patriot Lyndon LaRouche has been warning.

This war is not about the survival of Christians, Alawites, or Bashar al-Assad. It is about the survival of civilization in the form we have known it so far.

EIR SPECIAL REPORT

The True Story Behind The Fall of the House of Windsor

Reprints of EIR's 1994-1997 groundbreaking exposés

What political battles lie behind the assassination of Princess Diana?

Why do 22 out of 30 top terrorist groups have their headquarters in London?

EIR's series on the House of Windsor is indispensable for understanding today's news.

The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor
(Oct. 28, 1994)

The Sun Never Sets on the New British Empire
(May 24, 1996)

Britain's "Invisible" Empire Unleashes the Dogs of War
(Aug. 22, 1997)

Epilogue: Can the House of Windsor Survive Diana's Death?
(Sept. 12, 1997)



EIR News Service <http://www.larouchepub.com>
P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390 Order number EIR 97-004 \$50

International Intelligence

ISDA Swaps Group Admits Greece Is in Default

March 10—The International Swaps and Derivatives Association (ISDA) reluctantly announced yesterday that the Greek default was indeed a default.

That may not sound like such a big deal, but the ISDA—which sets what few rules there are for the floating crap game known as “derivatives,” and is made up of 15 global banks and investment funds—found itself in a rather ticklish situation. First, they had to make sure that, if they did announce a default, the payouts on \$3.2 billion in Greek Credit Default Swaps that would be activated, wouldn’t sink one of their brethren, then lead to a chain-reaction that would bring the whole system down. Second, they had to ensure that their CDSs were left intact as instruments of speculative looting for one more day.

The *Financial Times* reported that the ISDA decision had resolved “worries that a failure to trigger [the payouts] could have undermined an important hedging instrument for holding government bonds.” An ING bank senior strategist cited by Bloomberg said the decision will “restore confidence” in the market. Bloomberg notes that CDSs are used “to speculate on creditworthiness.”

500,000 Sign Against European Bank Bailouts

March 9—The Civil Coalition for Germany (Zivile Koalition für Deutschland) announced that it has gathered a half-million signatures from German citizens, sent via email to members of the Bundestag, against the planned European Stability Mechanism (ESM), the permanent bank bailout machine. It has a [video](#) out, on what measures the ESM—which it calls the organization for debt and inflation—involves.

This group is carrying out the largest nationally organized activity in Germany

against the bailout, other than the campaign of the LaRouche movement for a national referendum on the European Union and the euro.

Obama Kills Petition For Glass-Steagall

March 8—After more than 23,000 Americans signed a petition on the White House website, calling for reinstating the Glass-Steagall standard of separation between commercial and investment banking, White House Deputy Director of the National Economic Council Brian Deese sent out a letter to all the signers, purportedly explaining its opposition. White House rules require that once a petition gets a certain number of signatures, it must be answered.

At the same time, White House *expunged* the Glass-Steagall petition from the list of active ones. In other words, “We say no—so forget it.”

The White House argument against Glass-Steagall is full of the known lies. We quote the relevant parts, for the record:

“In the wake of the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression, the President took on fierce lobbying and put in place some of the most sweeping financial reforms in history. These reforms were comprehensive and aimed at solving problems in our system exposed by the financial crisis. The President is fighting daily against special interests who want to roll back, delay, defund, and dismantle these reforms.

“Wall Street Reform did many things, including protecting and empowering consumers, and bringing transparency and oversight to previously unregulated and opaque markets and institutions. The Administration chose not to simply re-establish the Glass-Steagall separation between commercial banks and investment banks and opted instead for more comprehensive reforms for several reasons:

“Simply going back to Glass-Steagall would not have solved the failures of our modern financial system or prevented the financial crisis that led to the worst finan-

cial crisis in our lifetimes: It is important to remember that Glass-Steagall would not have prevented the most dramatic failures in 2008. Glass-Steagall would not have avoided the problematic activities of the institutions that defined this financial crisis—Fannie and Freddie, Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, AIG, and Countrywide.”

Food-Deficit Countries Hit By Fall in Grain Crops

March 8—The UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) today released a quarterly report which amounts to a hunger-as-usual update, with no suggestions of emergency measures or policy shifts which would overturn the globalist powers behind the breakdown process. This is the assigned role of the FAO at present.

The FAO *Crop Prospects and Food Situation, March 2012*, includes these updates:

- The grains-imports bill for the poorest nations is the highest ever for this category, which includes 34 nations that the FAO terms Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries (LIFDC).

- The 2012 world wheat crop is projected to decline 1.4% from last year, coming in at about 690 million tons, 10 million less than 2011. Rice, fortunately, has not had the same extreme decline. However, corn supplies are drastically low.

- Morocco, grain-import dependent, may suffer a 50% loss this year in its grain output, because of bad weather, its state agriculture institute said on March 7.

- In the West African Sahel, the dry 2011 conditions ruined grain crops and pastures, so that there is now malnutrition all across Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, and Niger.

- Mexico’s crop prospects are low for the 2012 secondary corn crop, because of reduced plantings in the severe dry weather. The area planted to corn for the Fall-Winter season—accounting for 30% of aggregate yearly output—is down by at least 15%.

Toppling the Tyranny of the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics

by Bruce Director

Bruce Director, a member of the U.S. Board of the Schiller Institute, gave this speech to the Institute's conference in Berlin on Feb. 25. It can be viewed [here](#). The entire conference is or will be posted [here](#).

It is clear from what we just heard from Lyndon LaRouche, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and the others, that the future of mankind—whether we will face extinction in the very near period ahead, or whether we will launch a new renaissance, in science and in culture, that will take mankind places that mankind has never been before—depends on an act of will, an act of the human mind. This question, the issue that the human mind is an actually efficient power in and over the universe, is the central question, and always has been the central question of science. And it continues to be the central question of science today.

But we have a population, and a scientific community, which has been brainwashed to believe there are two universes: a universe of the mind, which behaves



EIRNS/Christopher Lewis


Bruce Director addresses the Schiller Institute conference in Berlin, Feb. 25, 2012. "We have to abandon the Second Law of Thermodynamics," he said, "and put the creative minds of the scientific community to work, to elaborate the concept of an anti-entropic potential."

in one way, and the rest of the universe, which behaves in a different way, and the two are not connected. This is a condition of clinical insanity, because the fact is that the human mind is an efficient power in and over the universe, and the kinds of insanity that we see dominating our culture, such as the Green movement, or the underpinnings of monetarism itself, of the belief in the power of money, are symptoms of the kind of insanity which denies the very central feature of the universe, which is the efficient power of the creative powers of the human mind.

What I and the subsequent speakers intend to do today, is to try and clear this question up for you, so that people can actually understand what we're facing. This centers really around the question of rooting out some of

the false beliefs which have been introduced into science, and into culture more generally, that are based on brainwashing people to believe that the power of the human mind is not an efficient power in the universe.

FIGURE 1
World Population
 (Billions)



Typical of this is an idea which was introduced into science in the middle of the 19th Century, known as the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which most people today may not even know anything about, or only vaguely. It wasn't a new idea at the time, but it was a new manifestation of an old idea, and it effectively became the central tenet of the official cult-religion of the British Empire. And today, even though people may not even know what the Second Law of Thermodynamics is, they adhere to it, sometimes with such fear that the mere mention of attacking the tenets of the Second Law of Thermodynamics, causes all kinds of reactions.

The Human Mind vs. Aristotle

But let's first start with actually looking at what the universe actually is, the actual efficient power of the mind in and over the universe.

Some of you have seen this graph before (**Figure 1**), which shows the population growth of the human species, at least estimated, going far back. And you can see that there is a slow, but steady secular increase in the growth of the human populations. And then you see, towards the end of this graph, that there's a sharp drop in the population, which is denoted as the Black Death—the major collapse of population which occurred in the middle of the 14th Century. And then you see, after the Black Death, a huge, dramatic increase in

the population.

Now, what happened at that period? We obviously know that the biological characteristics of human reproduction did not change at that point in history. If you read Boccaccio, he clearly describes that people reproduced biologically at that time, the same way they do today! What changed was something in the human mind. What changed, led by a small group of people in the Renaissance, was the nature, the power of the mind in and over the universe: specifically, the rejection of the Aristotelean idea that the universe was essentially

fixed.

This is typified by Aristotle's cosmology, which is based on looking at the universe the way we see it from the standpoint of sense perception. You have the Earth at the center, and the planets moving around the Earth, and the stars moving around the Earth, and in this cosmology, as it's based on sense perception, you have an Earth in which everything is changing, and the further away you go from the Earth, the less things change. The argument of this cosmology is that the Earth is the least perfect, because everything is changing, and the further away you go from the Earth, toward the circumference, the less things change, and the less things change, the more perfect they become.

Which is a cosmology of an imperial system! It's a cosmology which was designed to justify a social organization that was organized around the idea of keeping everybody in their place, preventing new scientific discoveries, keeping people generally stupid, not allowing anything new to happen. And that organization of society rested on a false science, which said that this organization, this imperial order of society, conforms to the way the universe works; and the way the universe works, you can see, with your eyes and sense perception, is this idea of a fixed universe.

This thought, this belief, and this social order, is what caused the collapse of population in that period of the Black Death.

The reaction to that was an act of human will, of the power of the mind, especially led by Nicholas of Cusa, to revive the work of Plato, but also extended to assert and show that the universe did not conform to this false impression that one gets from sense perception. That it is actually organized the same way the human mind works; that the human mind is capable of making new discoveries of science, new discoveries about itself, discoveries of art, which add to our knowledge things which we didn't know before. And so, the ability of the human mind to change in a fundamental way, was a power of man that was reflected in the universe as a whole.

To put it succinctly, instead of the concept of perfection being a lack of change, a point of no change at all, the actual perfection was understood to be the self-perfectability of the universe, as reflected in the self-perfectability of the human mind. Or Cusa's concept of "learned ignorance," the ability of man to become less ignorant, and that this was an infinite characteristic.

And as a result of this, you had this excommunication of Aristotle from science. And the effort to reorganize society led to major breakthroughs in science and art, which is demonstrated by the huge growth in population. That this *idea* has an efficient power in and over the universe.


Of course, the Greenies will tell us that this was a bad thing; that the ability of mankind to exercise the power of the mind to overcome that crisis, that existential crisis, and produce the result that occurred, is something that in this crisis today, we should not make that mistake again. Instead, we should let that dip continue to decline.

Increasing Energy-Flux Density

Now, that increase in population occurred through, as I said, new developments in science and art, which expressed themselves in economics, as an increasing power, per capita, of mankind in and over nature. And one of the most direct measures of that capability is an increase in energy-flux density. I think Sky Shields is going to address this in a little bit more detail, so I'll just go through it quickly.

Figure 2 is a graphic which was put together by

FIGURE 2
Mankind's Energy Use




people on the Basement Team. It shows the time period of the introduction of new energy sources, and you can compare this, in your mind, with the population graph you just saw. You see during that period in which you had a steady, but relatively slow increase in population, you had basically a continuation of the same energy source, of mankind. And after the Renaissance, the ability of mankind to harness these more and more dense forms of energy—energy of greater flux density, greater power per unit area—and the greater energy-flux density available in the economy, enables us to maintain expansion of the human population.

And of course, if we're going to do what Mr. LaRouche just discussed with us—that is, extend mankind's existence out to Mars and beyond—we're going to have to increase our population quite dramatically. And that requires an increase in energy-flux density. You can see the correlation between these two things. And this is very important, this question of energy and power, relative to the economy, for what I'm going to discuss about the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

Now, there's a sophistry which sometimes creeps in here, which says, "Okay, well, that might be illustrative of human activity, but, as the Greenies would say, that activity of mankind is working against the natural tendency of the universe." That is, when you get outside of man, the universe is tending in a different direction,

FIGURE 3



tending towards equilibrium, not tending towards growth and development. Tending towards lower states of organization of the system, not tending toward higher states of organization and existence. So the Greens may accept this as documentation of what mankind does, but they would argue that it's a violation of the natural balance of the universe. And nothing could be further from the truth.

Figure 3 shows man's interaction—this again came out of the Basement team, the series of cones—and this is a heuristic device which shows the relationship of the interaction of human society with the biosphere, those parts of the Earth which are dominated by non-human forms of life, and the so-called abiotic domain, correlated with the type of increase in density of energy.

But if you look at just life itself, the study that has been done by Sky and the others on the Basement Team shows dramatically, that the actual characteristic of life itself, even before man developed, was exactly consistent with what we see later happening in human development. That is, throughout the evolution of living species, you see that the evolution occurs from lower to higher forms of species, which are all characterized by a biological equivalent of an increase in energy-flux density. And during that course of development, you have mass extinctions—we refer to the dinosaurs, but

there are many others—in which those species which do not have an increase in energy-flux density, those species were not able to sustain themselves, and they disappeared.

So, contrary to what Greenies will tell you, the characteristic of the evolution of life is consistent with what we see with human beings—which should not surprise a human being, but it might surprise a Greenie.

But the difference between other forms of life and human life, is that man makes this evolutionary changes through a willful act of the mind, whereas the other species evolve and de-

velop, but they have no control over their ability to adapt and conform. And at no point do you have, in this series of evolutionary developments, a situation where a lower species, a species with a lower ability of energy-flux density, takes over dominance from a higher species.


The direction of the evolution of life is irreversibly towards higher states of organization, not towards lower states.

Evolution in the Universe

But this is not limited to life itself. If you look at things which some people would say are abiotic, non-living, you see exactly the same type of process. Although I would argue that there is really no way to distinguish these divisions between abiotic, biotic, and life, and noetic processes; in fact, all three are interacting at all times in the universe. But if you look at something that's very far away—such as astronomical processes—that appears to have nothing to do with life, or is not being governed by living processes, or noetic processes, you see exactly the same thing.

This is a series of photographs of the Crab Nebula (Figure 4), which is one of the most interesting objects in the sky. These pictures come from different wave lengths in the electromagnetic spectrum. So you can see that the same object appears differently, whether you ex-

FIGURE 4
The Crab Nebula



amine it through the optical band—which is the wavelength of the electromagnetic spectrum that your eyes are sensitive to—versus the x-ray, infrared, and radio, which are wavelengths which your ordinary sense-perceptual apparatus does not react to—at least, as far as you are conscious of. You’re actually reacting to them, and interacting with these wavelengths, even though you may not call it perception, because they don’t deal directly with your eyes. But more on that in a minute.

The Crab Nebula is hypothesized to be a remnant of an exploding star. It appeared as a big flash in the sky that Chinese astronomers noted in the 11th Century, and if it were conforming and behaving according to the principles of the Second Law of Thermodynamics, it should be just dissipating. A big explosion that just dissipates, and gets to a less and less and less state of order.

But you can even see in these pictures, just naively, that not only is it not dissipating, but it’s actually organizing higher and higher structures. And in fact, recently, as Sky noted, last year there were some gamma ray bursts, intense bursts of energy in the very high wavelength spectrum, the gamma ray spectrum, which emerged and dissipated so intensely and so rapidly, that they defied any explanation consistent with a process which was devolving toward a state of equilibrium.

And we see this in other supernovas. **Figure 5** is a

FIGURE 5



picture of what is believed to be the oldest supernova that we know of, another exploded star. And you see that even after a very, very long time, what appeared to be a big explosion is actually organizing new structures. We don’t understand what’s actually going on there, partly because the effort to understand these phenomena is clouded by the attempt to impose upon them a view of the universe consistent with the Second Law of Thermodynamics, instead of looking at it from the standpoint that these structures actually confirm what I said at the beginning: that the universe is inherently creative, and intrinsically organized towards higher states of organization and existence.

The Second Law: How We Were Brainwashed

So, how did we get to this point? This point where, despite the irrefutable evidence that the characteristic of the universe is disposed toward progress, toward higher states of development, how did we get to the point where, to say such a thing, in either a popular discussion or in a scientific conference, is greeted with skepticism. And, in fact, the organization of our society, as I’ve already mentioned with the Greenie movement, or if you take just the financial system, in which all these fancy financial instruments—derivatives, credit default swaps, and so forth, which were invented over the recent years—were all invented in order to force the money system to obey the principles of equilibrium; to try and maintain an equilibrium in financial flows. And

the collapse of the financial system, and the collapse of the physical economy under the pressure of this Greenie movement, proves that the universe itself will actually crush any attempt to create a state of equilibrium.

So, how did this come about? That the universe behaves one way, and yet people are brainwashed so strongly, that they will organize their society according to principles which are exactly contrary to the way the universe works.

Well, let me give you a very brief history of how the Second Law of Thermodynamics was introduced. And when you see what a fraud it is, you'll be absolutely surprised that it's been able to achieve such dominance.

After the period of the Black Death and the Renaissance that emerged out of it, as I said, man with new ideas, and new concepts of the way the universe works, which were consistent with the view that the human mind is an efficient power of the universe, began to dominate, and as a result, you saw a huge increase in man's power in and over nature, through technology.

This occurred by the work particularly of Cusa, of Johannes Kepler, and also Gottfried Leibniz, whose work on dynamics, which elaborated the means by which man can understand the physical universe as an essentially creative process. Leibniz's work led to a new development in technology which was absolutely crucial for economy: the heat-powered machine. Now this was the first time that man had actually used heat as a form of power.

If you think about it, prior to the development of the heat-powered machine in the mid-17th Century, all of human economy was based either on muscle-power, animal or human, gravity power, or wind power. But now heat became a power source, and initially the view of heat was that it behaved like, for example, gravity. A water wheel powers a mill because the water falls under the force of gravity; the power of gravity pushes the water and turns the wheel. And heat appears to behave similarly, because it flows from the hot to the cold. And so the initial idea was that the power of heat comes from this inherent condition, where heat flows from hot to cold.

But here's a crucial difference between heat and my example here of the water wheel. Because while the



EIRNS/James Rea

The Greenie movement insists that human development violates the natural "equilibrium" of nature. Nothing could be further from the truth! Here, anti-nuclear demonstrators in Berlin, Sept. 28, 2010. The banner reads: "The uranium has to stay in the earth!"

water can flow from high to low, it can also be pushed back up again, which of course is the principle of how the water wheel works. But heat only flows in one direction. It only flows from hot to cold. You can't get the heat to flow back from the cold to the hot.

Now, understanding this process is crucial to being able to understand the efficiency of the heat-powered machine. Because obviously, to increase man's power over the economy, one wants to be able to construct the most efficient heat-powered machine, and to increase the energy-flux density per capita of mankind. And this is what Leibniz's studies involved, and it's also what was involved in the studies of Sadi Carnot, Riemann, Dirichlet, Fourier, and others—to actually try and understand exactly what *is* the nature of heat. We don't have time to go into this today, but let me just show you how this investigation was misused to create a brainwashing that you see today expressed in the Green movement, and in monetarism.


Kelvin and Clausius: Heat Death

It actually probably began in the middle of the 19th Century, with the writings of Lord Kelvin, who initially was known as William Thomson, but probably because of his writings on heat, he was made the first Baron Kelvin of Largs by Queen Victoria, for articulating what became the center of their cult religion. And Thomson (Lord Kelvin) wrote many works on this, one called *On the Universal Tendency for the Dissipation of Mechani-*

cal Energy, in which Thomson said: Since heat only flows from hot to cold, and always tends toward equilibrium, and since all action in the universe ultimately turns into heat, therefore all mechanical energy, all action in the universe, is going to eventually turn into heat; all the heat is going to flow from hot to cold, and ultimately go into equilibrium, and therefore the universe will inevitably come upon an ultimate heat death. In which all motion will stop, and everything will stop.

In such a conception of the universe, what is the meaning of human life? What is the power of the human mind? Man might be able to make inventions and make discoveries, or compose beautiful compositions, but it's all meaningless, because ultimately, according to Lord Kelvin, the universe is going to die in an equilibrium heat death.

Now, of course, this is a pretty unscientific view, and it fell to Rudolph Clausius to actually try and come up with a more rigorous scientific concept of this ultimate heat death of the universe. So he wrote a book on heat and heat-powered machines, in which he basically reworked the ideas of Sadi Carnot, and he looked at this question of how, in a machine, you get this



Lord Kelvin (1824-1907), portrait by Hubert von Kerkomer.

dissipation of heat, and he coined a new term, because you can get a dissipation of heat without changing the amount of heat in the machine, and so he said there has to be a new idea other than energy. So he invented a word which he called "entropy." He wanted it, as he says, to sound as close to "energy" as it could. From the Greek word change (*tropé*) and the prefix *en*: internal change. He asserted that this is a measure of the potential for change. And he gave it a mathematical expression, in which an increase in entropy was a decrease in the potential for change, and a decrease in entropy corresponded to an increase in the potential for change.


So, that's a little trick he plays, but then at the very end of this book he makes the most radical assertion, without any foundation whatsoever, in two statements. The very last two sentences of his book on machines are: "The energy of



Kelvin's vision of the heat death of the universe was aptly foreseen by Peter Brueghel the Elder's "The Triumph of Death" (1562).

the universe is constant,” and “The entropy of the universe always tends toward a maximum.”

Now, on what basis does he make an assertion about the universe, from a narrow investigation of a heat-powered machine? It’s completely absurd. But that became, and has become, basically, as I said, a central tenet of a cult-religion, where people believe this; they will state it as a mantra, or believe it without any basis for realizing that they’re making a statement about the universe which is completely without foundation.



Rudolf Clausius: “The entropy of the universe always tends toward a maximum.”

Boltzmann: Probability, Not Causality

Now, of course, because it was without foundation, it required that there be some kind of basis to say *why*. Why does the heat always tend toward equilibrium? What is the purpose of this? And nobody could come up with an actual causal reason consistent, for example, with Leibniz’s idea of least action, the curve of the catenary, or the pathway of the planet in a Keplerian orbit, which is a pathway that is determined because it’s the least action pathway with respect to the physical principles that are acting. No such formulation could occur to give a foundation for the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

So this task fell to Ludwig Boltzmann, who introduced into science a completely new basis for a foundation, which was the mathematics of probability. Equilibrium, according to the mathematics of Boltzmann, was a more *probable* state than disequilibrium. That is, a change from a higher state of organization to a lower state of organization, in which no more change is possible, because equilibrium is a state in which there is no more change—you can’t get more equilibrium than equilibrium! When you get to equilibrium, you’ve reached the end.

And so, Boltzmann said, that’s a more probable state—again, an assertion that has no foundation. It’s true that equilibrium doesn’t change any more, but why should that be more probable, than a state of disequilibrium?

And so, this introduced a new false idea, which was

that the universe was fundamentally random, and that anything that happened in the universe happened because it was more probable than were it not to happen.

Well, how is the composition of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony a “more probable” event, than its non-composition? How is the creation of a great work of art something more probable than were it not to occur?

But remember the process we saw, with the development of mankind through new scientific discoveries, which, by their very nature, when they come into existence, prove that the way everybody was thinking about the world, is wrong. That

man’s future development depends on *only* the improbable, the improbable event that somebody will come up with a new creative discovery that proves the way everybody thinks is wrong. How, from that, do you get that equilibrium is the most probable state?

This, again, is the underpinnings of the Green movement: that anything man does disrupts the balance of nature; that somehow nature seeks a balance; that somehow the universe is seeking a state of equilibrium.



Ludwig Boltzmann: Man cannot know causality in the universe, only “probability.”

The British Imperial Project

These doctrines are not just falsehoods that affect the design of machines, or academic scientific theories. These are false doctrines which were used by the British Empire, to build a political movement, a social movement, which was consistent with what else was going on at the end of the 19th Century. A pessimistic movement that was being pushed, to counter the optimism that was expressed by Lincoln’s victory over the Confederacy in the Civil War, and the achievement in the U.S. of a continental economy, and the spread of that to Europe, especially to Germany and Russia, and then into Asia, through Japan, in the second half of the 19th Century, a potential for what we want now: The development of continental powers based on increasing man’s power in and over nature through technology.

And the British wanted to destroy that, because that was obviously a threat to their Empire, a threat to the imperial system, which tried to maintain a balance of power, tried to impose an equilibrium on society. And so, the introduction of this false scientific idea was an essential ingredient to the maintenance of that imperial organization of society.

And of course, it led to the predictable result: The attempt to impose such an equilibrium, against what was in the best interests of mankind, led to the disaster that we now call World War I.

Planck's Refutation

And this issue, as I'm stating it today, was spoken about on the eve of that disaster, by no less a scientific authority than Max Planck. Right here in Berlin, in August 1914, as the "guns of August" were mobilizing, he spoke at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute, and addressed this question of the absurdity in science of accepting the idea of what today we would call the Second Law of Thermodynamics, as a universal law. Planck gave a rigorous investigation of it, showing the assumptions which underlie it. So that if a scientist is going to use a certain theoretical framework, the scientist has to understand, what are the underlying assumptions on which that theoretical framework is based, so as to avoid error.

And after giving this rigorous discussion of thermodynamics, Planck says that one cannot, however, apply any of these concepts to mankind. Because mankind is governed by moral law; and moral law, as Planck said, is typified by the question, "What am I to do with my life? As a mortal human being, what is my immortal contribution, not only to mankind, but how do I contribute something that expands the universe as a whole?" And Planck, and his collaborator Einstein, who also held this view, were bitterly attacked, because the pressure from the British Empire was to go back to the days before the Black Death. The Second Law of Thermodynamics had



Max Planck: Concepts of thermodynamics cannot be applied to man, because mankind is governed by moral law.

become the New Aristotle, the new fixed system, in which everything tends toward a greater and greater state towards equilibrium.

And Planck's insistence that science and man must be governed by moral law, not false doctrines, was antithetical to what science was becoming at the time, especially typified by things like the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics, which held, again, that the very fundamental characteristic of the universe was random and probabilistic.

Planck starts his speech by saying, "We don't know"—think about it, August 1914—"We don't know what's going to happen to us tomorrow." It's a very similar situation to where we're in today: We don't know if something's going to happen,

whereby we will lose our country. But the answer to that is not found in saying, "Well, what will happen will be whatever is the most probable thing." The most probable thing to happen to us, in the next few weeks, is to become extinct in a thermonuclear war! So, if you think the universe is predisposed to the most probable thing, that's what you get!

Obviously, human existence depends on, not the most probable, but on what appears to be the most *improbable*, which is something based on moral principles. And this means, in my view, that science actually has to develop a foundation of a new concept of an *anti-entropic* potential, a potential which characterizes man and the universe, as a tendency for development from lower to higher states of organization and existence, a creative principle.

Now, just parenthetically, this is also sometimes confusing, because of the term "anti-entropy." Because I've just described that the concept of entropy, as Clausius introduced it, is a false idea; so, why would we say, what the universe really is, is not what it isn't? And sometimes people get confused about the question of "anti-entropy." But because the concept of entropy and

the increase of entropy is ingrained, it's absolutely essential that we make the point in this way. However, I think that at some point, we have to have a positive term which actually defines, scientifically, this creative notion. I propose the term "dynatropy," from dynamic change. And we'll see if that ever takes hold.

But, this means that we have to have a concept of a potential, which has an intrinsic characteristic to generate a new potential. And there's much we can say about this, but I think the best way, at least, to get this concept across in this setting, is to first think about how the human mind works.

How the Mind Works

I'm reminded in this respect, the example I think is the most instructive, is Plato's *Meno* dialogue. It is the story, where Socrates is arguing with Meno, who is a bit of an oligarch, about what is the nature of man. And Socrates is arguing that the nature of man is essentially creative, to discover new things, even from within himself. He says this new discovery is an intrinsic character of the human mind, to generate something from within itself, which is totally new and changes itself.

And he uses the example of trying to teach the slave boy how to double the square. He says, I'm going to show that the slave boy will be able to discover how to double the square, without telling him how to do it, but by simply asking him questions. And you know the story, that the slave boy, just by being asked questions, doubles the square, and not only amazes himself, but also Meno, who thought the slave boy was too stupid to ever learn what, at the time, was one of the most important principles of science.

But, what was the discovery there? The discovery was not the discovery of how to double the square. The slave boy did discover that, but the discovery was about the power of the human mind: The slave boy, in the nature of that discovery, *showed himself*, from *within himself*, that he had a power to change himself into something he hadn't been. And the act of doing that in front of Meno, changed Meno, because it proved to him that his view of man was wrong. Now, he wasn't changed by it, but that's a whole other story.

But you see in that example, and in the example of human creativity generally, that the human mind contains within it a type of anti-entropic potential. Because the new discovery is not *in* the mind, until it's discov-

ered, but the discovery is the effect of a potential, which is a potential not to continue to do what it's doing, but a potential to create something totally new. And the essential characteristic about this, as Mr. LaRouche has always emphasized, is that this does not occur simply in the individual human mind, but the individual human mind makes these discoveries only with respect to human culture, as it radiates across the generations, past, present, and future.

So that there's a type of harmonic interaction between the creative powers of an individual human mind, and society as a whole and culture as a whole—when I speak of that, all the generations. We absorb the creative discoveries, not through osmosis, but by replicating those discoveries in our own minds, and we add to the culture, the creative discoveries that we make. Because the action of the individual mind on the universe doesn't occur directly from the individual mind, but only through this development of culture. So, human culture, as it evolves to higher and higher states of knowledge of man and knowledge of the universe, represents the concept of an anti-entropic potential field.

I think the greatest advance in this direction, in science to date, really, has come from Lyn's work and breakthroughs in the science of physical economy, which truly lay the foundation and develop the concepts of what I'm calling today an anti-entropic potential field. But the roots of it, I think, you can find in the work of Nicholas of Cusa, in especially two works that he wrote, on this question of potential: One was the work called *De Possesset*, a word he made up, from the Latin word *posse*, which means possibility, and *est*, to exist. And a later work, he called *On the Summit of Vision*, in which he refers to "the idea of the potential itself." And Cusa says that it's the potential which is where ontological existence, where reality lies, not in the thing.

He gives an example of life: Living things exist, so life exists, but life itself does not account for its own existence. What accounts for the existence of life is that the possibility for life exists in the universe. These forms of potential, the potential for life, he calls "potentials with additions." And then, Cusa says: But what's the most important thing to understand, what's the summit of vision, is what he calls the potential itself, which is the potential which makes potential possible. Why do we live in a universe in which it's possible to make things possible? And when you think of the power

of the human mind, you see that's exactly what the human mind does.

An Anti-Entropic Potential Field

So, from this standpoint, if we start with the nature of the human mind, we can begin to construct an actual, communicable concept of the idea of an anti-entropic potential field. But, as LaRouche has emphasized, the problem we have, is how do you express such an idea? Because all our language, no matter how skillful we are, is rooted in sense perception. The language you have, that is, all the words you use and all the concepts, are tied to some type of object or action which you know through sense perception.

Now, we recognize that, in certain abstract concepts, such as justice, or truth, or love, we have to rely, not on direct language, but on metaphor, to be able to communicate such ideas, and we, of course, recognize that we're indebted to the poets and the artists for being able to develop the forms of expression by which we can communicate concepts which lie completely outside the domain of sense perception.

But this is true, also, in the domain of science, where

you think you're looking at and dealing with things that are concrete, things which exist in the domain of sense perception, or appear to be, such as supernovae, or living things. And this is something, also, that LaRouche has been quite provocative about, which I think everybody appreciates how provocative, but also how truthful it is, going all the way back to the 1970s, when LaRouche wrote a paper titled "[Poetry](#) Must Begin To Supersede Mathematics in Physics" (*Fusion*, October 1978).

So, in order to express this concept of an anti-entropic potential field, we have to actually use the principle of metaphor that we see from the great scientists.

The concept we have to express here, is a concept of a potential field, which has the potential to create a state which doesn't exist, and which is a higher state of organization of existence, and which is a necessary state of organization existence. Which means that there must be an intrinsic power in this anti-entropic potential field, the same power which we associate with the passion that's required to make the decision today, that the human race is not going to be extinct. We can all sit in this room, and agree, that we would prefer going to Mars and developing mankind, than to become extinct in the next three weeks, but without the passion to make that happen, the most probable will happen, and not the necessarily improbable.

So, our notion of an anti-entropic potential field has to have a characteristic of passion, and our science must be able to deal with this question of passion, and power. And because this is a necessary transformation: The anti-entropic potential field must exert a pressure, a pressure towards higher states of organization of existence. We see this in the question of evolution, as well.

And there's a tension also associated, which is the resistance that the anti-entropic potential field exerts on *any* attempt to produce and to increase entropy. So, rather than an increase in entropy being the characteristic of the universe, the decrease of entropy is the characteristic of the universe, and a tension arises in any attempt to impose an increase in entropy.

A Riemannian Approach


Now, this, of course, is quite a difficult program, which I outlined that we have to develop, and I don't claim to have solved the problem, but I think that by stating it in this way, we can perhaps get more of a scientific approach to solving the problem. And I'll just give a very quick indication of the kind of concepts which I think are appropriate to this.

Toward a New Council of Florence

'On the Peace of Faith' and Other Works by Nicolaus of Cusa

Translations of seminal writings of the 15th-century Roman Catholic Cardinal Nicolaus of Cusa, who, through his work and writings, contributed more than anyone else to the launching of the European Golden Renaissance. The title of the book, *Toward a New Council of Florence*, expresses our purpose in publishing it: to spark a new Renaissance today.

- 12 works published for the first time in English
- New translations of 3 important works



\$15

plus \$3.50 shipping and handling

Schiller Institute, Inc.

P.O. Box 20244 Washington, D.C. 20041-0244
phone: 703-771-8390 www.schillerinstitute.org

FIGURE 6
Proposed Transport Routes
 (Projection from the North Pole)



LPAC-TV

For that, we should look at probably the greatest person who exemplifies the idea of replacing mathematics with poetry, or poetry superseding mathematics in science, and that's Bernhard Riemann, who, in all his work, showed that any attempt to try and express the way the human mind works through deductive mathematics, obviously fails, and all deductive mathematical systems are totally worthless.

His seminal work on this, was a paper he wrote which is too technical to discuss here, called "On the Subject of Abelian Functions." But in that paper, Riemann introduces an idea of connectivity, and that, as a way to express the development of a system from a lower to a higher state, the development of a potential from a lower state of potential to a higher state of potential. We can see this in the noetic domain, in the domain of human culture: That is, if you think about it, as we add to human knowledge through the development of new scientific

principles and new creative discoveries of art, across the generations, we increase the connectivity among the individual minds, all mankind, and the universe as a whole.

And we see this also expressed, for example, in economics. In this map of the Arctic development (**Figure 6**), I would just ask you to think about the economy, think about the connections in the economy, between the way the world is now, and the way it's headed. What is the relationship, for example, between Tierra del Fuego and Shanghai? What is the relationship of Berlin to Vietnam? And you think in your mind of different connections: sea transport, air transport, trade among products, different labor relations, and so forth. But what if we actually look at the world in a different way, and think about what would be the actual frontier development for the future of mankind?

And you can see this exemplified in the program for the Arctic development, where we take this region of the planet, which right now is pretty barren and empty. But when you look at the globe from the North Pole, you see that this is actually the most crowded place: It's from the North Pole that we find that countries which you think are widely separated, are very close neighbors. And by building the Bering Strait tunnel and subsequent high-speed rail connections, we change the connectivity of the planet, we change the connectivity of mankind. And we bring about a higher state of development that previously didn't exist.

So, as I said, this is just a beginning of what kind of direction science must go. We have to abandon the Second Law of Thermodynamics, and put the creative minds of the scientific community to work, to elaborate and develop this concept of an *anti-entropic* potential. And, to paraphrase Riemann's great habilitation paper, this is a subject in which we must enter the domain of politics, and the current occasion emphatically demands that we do so.

HOLD A REFERENDUM!

Ireland Is a Test Case For the EU Austerity Pact

by Gene Douglas

Gene Douglas of the LaRouche Irish Brigade gave this speech to the Berlin Schiller Institute conference, Feb. 25, 2012.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to give just a brief address to introduce our group, and to summarize the current political landscape in Ireland.

My name is Gene Douglas, and I represent the LaRouche Irish Brigade. We chose this title because we thought that these three words, “LaRouche”—“Irish”—“Brigade,” may generate some anxiety in certain circles of the British establishment! It is unfortunate that Ireland had not developed such a group long ago, so that it may have been firmly established and more able to face the present challenges.

And, personally speaking, I wish I had discovered the LaRouche Movement 30 years ago, because I would certainly have joined up then. However, our new group is growing quickly and we will endeavor to make an



EIRNS/Christopher Lewis

Gene Douglas spoke on behalf of the Irish LaRouche Brigade at the Schiller conference. “The essence, the bedrock, of our nation is republicanism,” he said.

impact in the critical period ahead.

I would like to begin, if I may, by sending our best regards to our republican friends in Sinn Féin. Gerry Adams, the Sinn Féin president, was an invited speaker to this conference; however, due to work commitments in the Dáil (Irish Parliament), he has been unable to attend. For that, he sends his sincere apologies and also his best wishes for the event.

A Republican Tradition

Sinn Féin and we, the LaRouche Irish Brigade, represent an unbroken, centuries-long tradition of republicanism in Ireland. The essence, the bedrock, of our nation is republicanism, and the various manifestations

of British Liberalism that have afflicted us in recent years are, you could say, merely a film of detritus which will be soon washed away as our republican principles come to the fore once again.



Ireland's nationalist leaders Michael Collins (left), and Arthur Griffith, founder of Sinn Féin, are an inspiration to today's Irish republican movement, in its determination to sweep away all "manifestations of British liberalism."

In fact, now, as we rediscover and begin to disseminate the ideas of physical economy presented by Arthur Griffith¹ in 1905, at the nation's inception, and later by Michael Collins,² we trust that we can play a significant role in the final defeat of the British Empire. Wouldn't that be a just cause for celebration after 800 years of occupation?

The most immediate battle ahead for us is to force the Irish Government to live up to its moral and constitutional obligations and hold a referendum on the Eurozone fiscal compact. Then, we must ensure that this "austerity pact" is firmly rejected by the Irish people. I believe that outcome is already practically guaranteed, given the austerity and misery imposed on the people by the Troika [the European Commission, the European Central Bank, and the IMF].

This is a particularly important issue for all of Europe, given the confirmation by German Minister for European Affairs Michael Link, in Dublin recently, that EU negotiators sought to design their policy in such a

1. See Paul Gallagher, "What Is Sinn Féin? The American System vs. British Geopolitics in Ireland," [EIR](#), Dec. 10, 2010.

2. See Paul Gallagher, "Aiming at Victory in Ireland," [EIR](#), March 21, 1997.

way as to avoid a referendum in Ireland. So, they are using Ireland as a kind of test case for their policies.

We are fortunate to have a patriotic, republican-minded and wise President in Michael D. Higgins, and we are confident that he will defend the Irish Constitution robustly in the face of this assault upon it. President Higgins has earned our admiration, in recent years in particular, as he has been the only President in Europe, as far as I'm aware, to have spoken out in support of the Glass-Steagall principle. He has also highlighted the folly of Austrian School economics, at every opportunity, and his most recent engagement on both these issues, at the London School of Economics, was both timely and courageous.

Looking Toward the Arctic

The Irish Brigade has become more emboldened over the past year, as we follow LaRouche's lead, and look towards the Arctic, and the potential for new alliances based on the principles of physical-economic development and cooperation. In this respect, we were greatly heartened by the visit to Ireland last week of Chinese Vice President Xi Jinping. The significance of this visit should not be overlooked or trivialized, as those who think in monetarist terms may tend to do. It is much more than simply an opportunity to increase trade. As the only European country on the Chinese delegation's itinerary, I hope and trust that the visit signals the beginning of precisely the kind of alliance that is so critically necessary at the present time, as we referred to in our recent brief paper, "Ireland—An Economic Revival" (see below).

We look forward to long-term cooperation with our Chinese friends and others, who are committed to physical economic development, in the decades ahead.

To finish, let me give you a nice example of how the LaRouche message is spreading and becoming increasingly recognized worldwide. The LaRouche Political Action Committee (LPAC) has created a new Twitter channel, and had noticed recently a surge in activity on it. Upon investigation it turned out to be taxi drivers—not from Italy, but from all over Ireland—who were tuning in. This was a completely new development, and a tribute to the impact of Claudio Giudici,³ not only in Italy but far beyond.

Thank you.

3. See Andrew Spinaus, "Glass-Steagall Bill Sent to Italian Senate," [EIR](#), Feb. 17, 2012.

Educating a Renaissance: Ireland—An Economic Revival

This policy statement of the LaRouche Irish Brigade and the LaRouche Irish Science Team is dated October 2011. It is based on marine transport, engineering, and scientific exploration. The complete program, with maps and Appendix, can be found at: <http://laroucheirishbrigade.wordpress.com/>.

Just as other nations, such as the United States and Russia, have used space exploration as a national driver of technological progress, Ireland must use its unrivalled access to another virtually unexplored frontier—the ocean—as the catalyst for establishing its unique contribution to the future of human economic and scientific progress. The LaRouche Irish Science Team presents the following outline for a United Ireland free from bailouts, austerity, and the corpse of the British Empire’s financial system.

The Atlantic Ocean is right on our doorstep, and much of this undersea territory remains almost completely unexplored and undiscovered, but presents vast opportunities for the Irish economy, and for the future of mankind’s scientific understanding. Furthermore, Ireland must realise the potential of its strategic location as the doorway to Europe, to establish itself as a primary, international, trans-shipment hub. It is ideally placed to receive both Trans-Atlantic shipments and, most significantly, those which will come via the newly opened Northern Sea Route (NSR), and there are a number of deep water inlets around the coast which may prove suitable for a deep draught port capable of accepting the largest of tomorrow’s cargo ships. Of these, it seems that the Shannon Estuary provides the greatest potential, and the Irish Academy of Engineers (IAE) have already made reference to this potential in their September 2004 paper “A Vision of Transport in Ireland in 2050.”

The British Financial Empire has been the dominant political force on the planet since the founding of the East India Company, maintaining their ascendancy through imperial wars, political manipulation, and whatever despicable means they found necessary. Now, even for those who have been willing to acquiesce with this unspeakable evil for their own selfish gains, it should be

abundantly clear that the policies of the financial oligarchy, such as globalisation, have failed catastrophically.

In the wake of this failure, the economy of Ireland, like other nations of the Trans-Atlantic region, lies in ruin, totally bankrupt, and the only way we can salvage it is by our commitment to a strategic, long-term, science-driven development of the physical economy. We must look to advance technologically on every front, and to increase the energy-flux density of our economic activity as a whole. This will require the use of nuclear power generation and a move to advanced energy carriers and storage mediums like hydrogen, as the IAE have prescribed in their visionary paper looking towards a productive and prosperous Ireland in 2050, and beyond. Such a strategy also involves maximising the potential of our key assets, and the most prominent of these are our very significant marine resources.


Ireland: Third Biggest Country in the EU

When you look at a map of the real Ireland (**Figure 1**)), which includes not only the territory of the island, but also the full extent of the underwater continental shelf, it turns out that Ireland is the third largest country in the European Union, in terms of total area of the globe within its sovereign control. This extended Ireland comprises a marine resource of some 220 million acres, or ten times the area of our land surface.

One of the most crucial national projects now ongoing in Ireland represents a significant potential which must now be tapped and augmented as part of the strategic and scientific global re-alignment now in process. The work currently underway and the plans being developed, as outlined on the Irish Marine Institute [website](#), give an indication of this potential. Besides the tremendous, immediate economic benefits of, for example, the development of ship-building industries and an engineering capability for the new field of deep-ocean mining, the key prize for a new Irish Republic is the prospect of a leadership role at the forefront of scientific exploration which may have untold significance for mankind in the future.

For example, recent discoveries in Mono Lake, Cal-

FIGURE 1
The Real Map of Ireland



www.marine.ie

ifornia, in the field of astrobiology, where previously unknown life forms have been found thriving in hostile environments, give a tantalising glimpse of the potential for further such finds in the recesses of the Atlantic deep-ocean. “The definition of life has just expanded,” said Ed Weiler (NASA’s associate administrator for the Science Mission Directorate) of the Lake Mono discovery. “As we pursue our efforts to seek signs of life in the solar system, we have to think more broadly, more diversely, and consider life as we do not know it.”

In 2003, Ireland commissioned its first-ever deep-sea research vessel, the *RV Celtic Explorer*. The ship, which can stay at sea for up to 45 days, accommodating 31 crew and scientists, carries state-of-the-art laboratories and data management systems onboard, allowing data to be collected and processed at sea, and directly communicated back to research facilities on shore. The *Celtic Explorer* is part of a broader program called the

“Deep Sea Frontier Initiative.” The website for the initiative describes the program thus: “The deep sea and the deep marine seafloor form an extensive and complex bio-geosphere system. It modulates global climate and global ocean circulation, contains many of today’s and tomorrow’s marine resources, and hosts a partly unknown, but significant part of earth’s biosphere.”

In July of this year [2011], the *Celtic Explorer* sailed for the hydrothermal vents around the mid-Atlantic Ridge on a groundbreaking mission to research and catalogue the “alien” deep-sea chemosynthetic life forms which live without sunlight off of the heat-energy and chemicals which erupt from these ocean-floor vents. Patrick Collins, from the National University of Ireland Galway’s Ryan Institute, was on board to catalogue and characterize the various species found at the vents. Collins leads Ireland’s marine biological team currently investigating this unique and extraordinary ecosystem.

Collins said that this research could give us valuable insight about how life might have evolved on other planets, as well as being a rich source of new understanding of biochemical processes with valuable medical and industrial applications. According to Patrick, “We hope to find a whole community of previously unknown species, increasing our understanding of deep sea biogeography. There is potential here to put Ireland on the global map as a serious player in deep sea science. This is all the more timely with the exploitation of deep sea and hydrothermal vents for precious metals and rare earth minerals now a reality.”

Irish Mercantile Marine

Ireland once had a thriving merchant marine, the envy of many including England, which established her as an economic power and a key trading partner throughout Europe. The following lines written by Sinn Féin founder, Arthur Griffith, under the title “The Economic Oppression of Ireland,” give a brief insight into its history and its ultimate demise:

“The history of Irish trade, commerce and industry has yet to be written. Ancient Ireland traded extensively with the Roman Empire, Gaul, Spain and Greece. In the Middle Ages, Ireland carried on extensive commerce with France, Flanders, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Germany and independent Wales, Scotland and England. The Guild merchants of the great continental trade centres mostly included Irishmen—Bordeaux, Rouen, Bruges and other cities contain memorials of the Irish merchants. The mercantile marine of Ireland was numerous and powerful. After the definitive establishment of English power in Ireland by Queen Elizabeth, it was decreed treason to export Irish goods in Irish vessels. Irish shipping was destroyed or seized by England and it was forbidden for an Irishman to own a ship. Subsequently, Ireland was forbidden to export to America aught except victuals, horses, salt and people.”

The coming realignment in world politics and economics presents an ideal opportunity to revive this proud tradition of trading and sea faring, and to make it a key economic driver to deliver future prosperity. Presently, it is estimated that 90% of goods produced are transported by sea. Research undertaken in 2006/7 indicates that 7.4 billion tons of goods were loaded at the world’s ports and hauled by around 16,000 cargo ships to their markets. With a return to a productive world economy, driven by developments around the Arctic in particular but elsewhere also, the volume of traded

goods is set to increase dramatically, and consequently so will the volume of sea cargo.

The opening of the NSR, underpinned by the economic development of Siberia and strategic political planning in Russia, will change the current pattern of world trade significantly. The Southern Sea Route, through the Strait of Malacca and the Suez Canal, or round the Cape of Good Hope for larger vessels, will inevitably become a less attractive proposition for cargo between Europe and Asia. The unavoidable choke point nature of the Suez Canal as well as its associated fees, the restrictions on ship size imposed by the Malacca Strait and the Suez Canal, and the comparative distances, all augur well for the NSR, not to mention the piracy threat on the southern route.

An additional factor which will also have major implications for international shipping is the inexorable trend towards ever larger container ships, the latest generation of which are able to carry up to 20,000 TEU (20 ft equivalent units) at a time. With the costs of sea freight escalating in line with other transport costs, shipping lines recognise the need for the improved economies of scale offered by larger vessels, both in terms of greater cargo capacity and their newly designed, more fuel-efficient engines.

AP Moller Maersk, the Danish world leader in container shipping, has committed to spending \$1.9 billion on a fleet of ten such ships, with the view that they will be cheaper to send across the oceans than a larger fleet of smaller vessels. The new ships will be able to transport 16% more cargo than their current flagship, the *Emma Maersk*, the world’s biggest, and will stand 73 meters tall, 400 meters long and 60 meters wide. At present, only two ports in the world, Rotterdam and Shanghai, have adequate infrastructure and sufficiently deep water to facilitate these huge vessels that require 20+ metres of water for transit and docking, and geological restrictions will prevent most of the world’s major, established ports from being able to deepen their access channels and docking facilities adequately to accommodate these giants.

With European shipping routes and their associated ports suffering from increasingly heavy congestion, particularly around the English Channel (where shallow water is also a major problem), as illustrated in the map (**Figure 2**), a deep-draught super-port at the Shannon Estuary will provide a compelling option for NSR and Trans-Atlantic ships. As the aforementioned IAE paper confirms, the Shannon Estuary had long been


identified as an ideal location for the construction of a high-capacity/deep-draught container port. Its development and eventual connection—with a dedicated high-speed rail connection across Ireland, via the proposed “Tuskar” Sub Sea Tunnel across the UK and via the Channel Tunnel to the Continental High Speed Rail Network—would allow double-stack container trains to distribute the trade onward to Europe.

The development of the Shannon Estuary and rail link (Figure 3), together with its multiple ancillary support services, would provide a massive boost to the economy of the South West and South East of the country in particular and would also greatly enhance plans to develop a western economic corridor from Cork to Derry. At the northern end of this corridor, Lough Swilly in Co Donegal is another substantial deep-water inlet with potential for development as a port facility, although this potential has yet to be fully explored.

The development of the Shannon Estuary should be approached with the same bold view and nation-building passion as was the building of the Shannon Scheme. This project, which aimed to electrify Ireland, inspired the then Governor of New York State, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to enquire into the building of the scheme and to undertake the similar implementation of the Tennessee Valley Authority when he was elected President of the United States of America.

But although plans were announced by the state-owned Shannon Foynes Port Company in 2004, for a 350 million euro investment to transform the River Shannon Estuary into one of Europe’s largest cargo hubs, the plans have barely moved beyond the public discussion stage. Although the investment is a welcome move, it should be seen as only the first step towards the development of an international deep-water shipping resource which will rival Shanghai and Rotterdam as the biggest port complex in the world. This new Shannon Super-Port, connected by high-speed maglev rail to the Tuskar Tunnel between Wexford and Pembrokeshire, could facilitate the efficient delivery of freight right into the heart of Europe. The plan mandated by the provisions of the bailout package, to rationalize

FIGURE 2
European Shipping Routes



European Space Agency

FIGURE 3
Shannon Estuary and Rail Link



Irish Academy of Engineering

and sell off the Shannon Foynes Port Company, will no doubt be rejected by the Irish people, as it becomes clear what a crucial asset the Shannon Estuary is.

The Northern Sea Route

The planned development of the Arctic will have major implications for world trade and for maritime trade in particular. At the recent International Arctic Forum (22-23 Sept 2011), entitled “Arctic, Territory of Dialogue,” Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin announced to the assembled gathering of politicians, scientists and journalists, Russia’s intention to turn the Northern Sea Route, “the shortest route between Europe’s largest markets and the Asia Pacific region, into an international transport artery that will rival traditional trade lanes in service fees, security and quality. States and private companies that choose the Arctic trade routes will undoubtedly reap economic advantages.”

The NSR is a navigable passage from the Pacific to the Atlantic along the Siberian coast. Parts of the route are believed to have been used by local traders as early as the 11th century, but Russian diplomat Demitry Gerasimov, in 1525, is thought to have been the first to conceive of the possibility of a continuous route from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In the early part of the 17th century, Isaac Massa, a Dutch grain trader, diplomat and explorer, further contributed to studying the possibilities of using the NSR for developing the eastern boundaries of Russia. Later, in 1648, Semyon Dezhnev and Fedot Popov proved the existence of a strait between Russia’s east coast and Alaska, now known as the Bering Strait.

Many early expeditions along the route, also known as the North East Passage, foundered due to the perilous conditions, and it was not until technological developments such as radio, steamships and icebreakers that it became a viable proposition. Even then, though, various factors prevented its use for international commercial shipping; in particular, World War 2 and the Cold War which followed turned the region into a strategic battleground dominated by submarines and surface naval vessels, and off limits to international commercial vessels, although the Soviet commercial fleet did use it extensively, with freight transport increasing dramatically from 500,000 tons to over 6,000,000 tons during the period 1953 to 1987.

When the route was eventually opened to non-Russian shipping, during the Perestroika era, the traffic generated was insufficient even to cover the cost of keeping it open. High charges for the necessary ice-

breaker assistance, the precarious nature of the trips and high insurance premiums were the reasons cited for the scant interest shown by the international shipping lines. At the same time, the Shock Therapy attack on the Russian economy saw domestic freight movements decline greatly from a peak of 6.5 million tons in 1987 to a mere 1.5 million tons in 1998.

Climatic Factors

As has been documented by our friends at www.Turn180.ie, a general increase in temperature in the Arctic region has already produced a considerable melting of ice around the extremities of the Arctic Ocean. This welcome development currently permits navigation of the NSR for up to seven months of the year, according to Russian officials, and access will be further enhanced by the expansion of the Russian icebreaker fleet with six new ships, three of which will be nuclear powered. Many predict that the melting trend will continue and may possibly intensify during the present century, to the point where the entire ocean will be navigable all year round with the aid of icebreakers. If this were to come about, the trip from the Atlantic to the Pacific would be even shorter, as ships could sail directly over the North Pole.

In all other respects, the Arctic is climatically well suited to shipping, with an almost constant area of high pressure over the North Pole giving predictable, generally settled, conditions with sudden weather changes uncommon. The danger of fog during the summer months is largely eliminated due to the enhanced satellite navigation technology now available.

The melting of Arctic ice and the opening of the NSR which that has facilitated is very timely, coming as it does during a period of massively increasing trade between Asia and Europe. However, there is another, even more compelling dynamic, which will establish the route as a major transport artery: that is, the planned development of Siberia.

Development of Siberia

A resurgence of Russian domestic freight traffic on the NSR in recent years has been driven by the discovery and extraction of oil and gas resources, mainly in North West Russia. These abundant natural resources, and particularly those as yet untapped in eastern Siberia, which Russia has committed itself to developing, will be the key driver in bringing the NSR to full prominence in the coming years and long into the future.

The very scale of [Siberia](#) is difficult to fathom, par-

ticularly relative to a small country like Ireland. It stretches from the Ural Mountains in the west to the Pacific Ocean in the east, and from the Arctic Ocean in the north to the borders of Kazakhstan, Mongolia and China in the south, encompassing 75% of the territory of Russia, some 5 million square miles. To put this in perspective, it is 1 1/2 times the size of the USA (including Alaska) or 1/10 of the Earth's land surface.


It is a sparsely populated region containing just 36 million people, less than 1/3 of Russia's population, and roughly equivalent to the State of California. Its vast forests, principally of Larch, constitute approximately 1/6 of the world's total forest cover and its rich fishing waters produce over 10% of the world's annual fish catch. Lake Baikal, near the Mongolian border, is the world's deepest and most voluminous freshwater lake, with an average depth of 744 meters and containing 20% of the world's unfrozen surface fresh water.

Mineral Resources

Apart from oil and gas deposits, which are substantial, and the forestry and fishery resources that I have just mentioned, and which are currently being utilized to some extent, the real physical wealth of Siberia lies in the rich accumulations of mineral resources that abound throughout the region. Although most areas remain largely unexplored, geologically, what deposits have been found represent some of the highest concentrations of industrially useful minerals anywhere on the planet. The 9,000 mineral deposits thus far registered make up an estimated 16% of the world's mineral resources. The table in the appendix refers to just a sample of these by way of illustration.

Russia has declared its intention to base its economy on science-driven manufacturing production and technological development. Therefore, in contrast to the exploitative, imperialist, mining operations that have been common practice, in Africa and South America, for example, the primary use of Siberian mineral re-

FIGURE 4
Main Lines of a Worldwide Rail Network, as Sketched by H.A. Cooper



sources, once extracted, will be by newly established indigenous industries which will process them into higher value materials, both for use at home and for export. This said, given the scale of the resources available, there would undoubtedly be adequate surplus raw material available for export around the world.

This very brief sketch will, we hope, provide some aid to visualizing the colossal potential of this, as yet, largely undeveloped region.

Eurasian Land-Bridge

It is important to emphasise that the development of Siberia will take place in the context of a new economic and political dynamic, as summarily described elsewhere in this document. This new dynamic will be characterised by physical economic development and cooperation between independently sovereign nations, and a major, tangible expression of this will be the Eurasian Land-Bridge (**Figure 4**), a high-speed rail network which will extend throughout the Eurasian continent, connecting the existing European rail network to the countries of the East and, via a Bering Strait tunnel or bridge, to North America. The Eurasian Land-Bridge has been a key component of development since the campaigns of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche to reunite Germany, in anticipation of the fall of the Berlin Wall. The blackmail of the British Empire's Iron Lady, together with France's Mitterrand and George H.W. Bush, led to the last dozen years debacle of the collapse of the ill-fated Eurozone.

But with the Eurasian Land-Bridge now back on

track, so to speak, a feature of this massive rail network will be a new 3,000 miles long northern Trans-Siberian track which will run along the Arctic coastline parallel to the existing Trans-Siberian route. Like the other proposed main rail lines of the world land-bridge, this track will utilise leading-edge, high-speed, magnetic levitation technology employing trains running at 300 mph.

The northern Trans-Siberian line will not be a stand-alone project, but will form the backbone of an extensive development corridor through the region, which will include multiple hydroelectric dams and numerous nuclear-powered, major industrial cities. Therefore, together with similar developments planned for Alaska and northern Canada, this entire extended Arctic region will become the most technologically advanced region anywhere on the planet. The scientific and technological expertise required to make these plans a reality will be provided by the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Science (RAS), which employs 31,000 technicians, scientists and engineers in a network of multi-disciplinary science centres throughout Siberia. The RAS has stated its commitment to broadening international cooperation at all levels from government down.

A Credit System

With China and Russia now fully committed to a future based on cooperation and the scientific development of their physical economies, America stands just one small step away from joining them in an alliance which will change the world for the better, beyond anything most of us can imagine. Those famous words of Neil Armstrong which signalled such hope for mankind, have, if anything, an even greater significance in our present context, for once the small step is taken of replacing the now bankrupt monetary system with a credit system, based on the American model of Alexander Hamilton, then the final breakthrough will have been made, opening the way for those three leading nations to instigate an economic and cultural renaissance, the likes of which has never before existed in known human history. British puppet Obama remains the only obstacle to progress, his malicious intent on behalf of the financial empire matched only by his incompetence. However, following his safe removal from office, by constitutional means, the convergence of political will amongst these three nations, directed towards a physical-economic orientation, will quickly attract other like-minded nations, including Ireland we hope, to adopt a similar approach and join in this new alliance.

The credit system that will facilitate all these possibilities is based on a model designed by Hamilton following the American War of Independence. The fledgling nation was bankrupt from war debt, and he realised that its independence would be short-lived if measures were not taken to alleviate this problem. His strategy was to institute a national bank through which credit could be issued for large-scale production and development projects thereby wresting control of the nation's finances away from the international financiers and delivering it to the government on behalf of the people.

Hamilton's credit system was recognised as vital for maintaining national sovereignty and as such became a tenet of the US Constitution. Based on this system, America rapidly became, and remained, an economic powerhouse, faltering only when it deviated from this policy, as in the recent decades from around 1970. Now, the US stands poised to return to its founding principles of American System Economics, with the re-instatement of the Glass-Steagall Act.

Ireland must seize the opportunity to follow its lead and establish our own credit system economics that will allow us to develop the large-scale projects outlined here, and to build the nation, free from the control of our present financial overlords.

To initiate the necessary, immediate economic recovery, Ireland must first write off the toxic so-called assets of the banking sector, and then look to projects such as outlined in this document—high-technology, capital-intensive projects of sufficient scale to provide full employment for the population in real, productive jobs. To facilitate this, a credit system must be introduced whereby the sovereign government issues money as credit, directly to the identified projects, and also through the reconstituted banks, to rebuild other productive businesses, as an investment in future generations, in the future of the nation.

We assert that Ireland is close to writing off those toxic assets and going ahead to that investment in the future of the nation. At this writing, the Trans-Atlantic financial system hangs between promise and doom. On October 18, [2011] in order to avoid the abyss, economist Lyndon LaRouche issued the following statement: LaRouche: "Glass-Steagall will not sink all the banks. It will sink about six, big fat banks which ought not to be banks, at all! And the sooner they're wiped out, the better! That's good for you!

"The fact is, you're going to have thousands of other banks, which are not these merchant banks! And what

we're going to do is two things: We're going to eliminate the obligations of those banks, those honest banks which are real banks, to this kind of illegal obligation! We're essentially going to exterminate the merchant banking system, in the present form it exists! Not by going out and exterminating, but simply by taking away all the pleasure of their money.

"Now, as a result, we're going to have banks which will still exist! Of commercial banks, and commercial banking institutions, or things like commercial banking institutions, under similar law—we're going to have them. But what are we going to do? Well, the Federal government is going to put this whole system through bankruptcy reorganization, and two measures will be taken:

"First of all, we will protect banks which may be insolvent, but are still viable as banks. We're going to keep them alive. We're going to supply, under the Hamilton rule, of the Constitution, we're going to go back and supplement the present financial system with a banking system, which is a federally guaranteed banking system. As for the Federal Reserve, we're going to replace that by going back to a Hamilton National Banking System, based on a credit system, which is the U.S. system."

It is our hope that, in short order, the wise words of Lyndon LaRouche will be followed, and once Obama is safely ushered out of office, HR 1489 will be passed in the US Congress bringing about the reinstatement of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall law. With that accomplished and the US returning to a Hamiltonian credit system, as opposed to the presently bankrupt monetarist system, the nations of Europe will be freed from the British imperial financial system to follow suit.


Conclusions

The US, Russia and China, three nations that have fought the British Empire determinedly and emerged victorious as sovereign republics, are now on the verge of forming an alliance based on economic cooperation and development, the very scale of which will transform the world and render the empire a historical curiosity. This new alliance is the long-awaited, natural home of an Ireland reunited with its republican principles and traditions, and we can assure you it will be welcomed into the fold with open arms and with celebration. And our economic endeavours, such as we have outlined, as a reflection of our new orientation, will become a vital part of this new alignment and will be appreciated as such. After all, who do you think the

governments of Russia, China and the US would prefer to do business with—the representative of a repugnant, and now defunct, financial oligarchy or the president of a sovereign Irish Republic, founded on the same principles and with the same political and economic outlook as their own nations?

The development of Siberia and the NSR, which we have briefly outlined, will be only the beginning of an economic revival which will propagate throughout the globe, to include Central Asia, South America and Africa. Extensive plans have been ready for implementation in these regions for decades now; all that was missing was the political will to act on them.

Now as we look to put the era of imperialism behind us once and for all, and move towards a world of truly sovereign nation states, economic activity is set to flourish as never before. Russia and China are leading the way, and the US, we are confident, will join them soon. Ireland should embrace this emerging new political and economic reality at the earliest opportunity, and the development of an international deep-water trans-shipment port, coupled with a massive expansion of our deep-ocean scientific and engineering capabilities, would put us firmly on the right path.



THE EURASIAN LAND-BRIDGE
'The New Silk Road'—Locomotive For Worldwide Economic Development
An EIR Special Report

(1997) 260 pages \$100 (EIR 96-007)

Available from
EIR News Service
P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
Phone: 1-800-278-3135 or www.larouchepub.com

The Science of Survival

Will mankind survive the multiple threats of extinction which now threaten it? The British oligarchy's threat of thermonuclear war, that same oligarchy's drive for global depopulation through economic cannibalism, and the ever-greater dangers presented by galactic changes—all can be defeated—but only by a radical shift in thinking by the leadership of nations, especially in the United States.

It is that shift of thinking which the LaRouchePAC scientific team, along with Lyndon LaRouche, is addressing in its weekly video reports. The first step, the team emphasizes, is to remove British puppet Obama from the Presidency. Then, the real work begins—as LaRouche summarized in the March 7 broadcast:

“We’ve come to the time, where the extinction of the human species is a possibility, it’s a very live possibility now, unless mankind can improve its behavior and being able to cope with some of these considerations; the extinction of the human species is a possibility, it’s even a likelihood. And therefore, it’s extremely important that we change our way of thinking, along these lines, to understand that the universe is not defined scientifically from the bottom up, but from the top down.

“In other words, mankind is not a product of something on a lower level of existence, but quite the contrary. The higher level of existence which is expressed *by* mankind, demonstrates itself to be a principle of the universe, and therefore, you have to judge everything from the standpoint of that view of the necessary evolution of mankind.

“Now, we’ve noted that in some of the work in the previous weeks here: The fact that the rate of increase of productivity, in which we’re going to a higher phase of productivity from a lower phase,

has been aborted. That mankind has slowed down the rate of its keeping up with the rate of deterioration with the circumstances of human life.


“So therefore, we have to say, first of all, you can not derive science *from the bottom up*: You can’t start with mathematics, you can not start with various kinds of gimmicks. You’ve got to start from the top; you have to say, “What is the universe?” What is the universe which created, or creates and incorporates these qualities which we recognize in the ability of mankind to create conditions that no other living form of life can do! That mankind *typifies*, in its expression, the nature of the universe. And typifies it, because it represents a power, which is the most powerful thing we know of in the universe! A principle of power, which we are beginning to understand, gradually, but which has always been there: That the universe is actually a creative process, run by a willful kind of process, which raises the level of the universe from a lower level to a higher level. And therefore, the attempt to adduce science from sense-perception, is the great idiocy which poisons the ability of the human species.

“We have to think in those terms: We no longer try to think in deductive, mathematical terms. Because in this [current] system, there is no principle. The deductive method in mathematics *does not lead us to any physical discoveries*. We use mathematics as a product of *sense-perception*, and are limited to the qualities of *sense-perception*. And sense-perception is the lowest form of life, in terms of thinking. Whereas the higher forms of life occur in the terms of creativity, and especially expressed in the specific quality of *human creativity*.”

Want to save mankind from extinction? LPAC’s Weekly Reports are a must-see.

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 Movement, we are changing politics worldwide, 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.

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail address _____

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

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

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

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 _____