

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

March 23, 2012 Vol. 39 No. 12

www.larouche.com \$10.00

Obama, Cameron, Netanyahu Push Thermonuclear World War
The Empire's Bailout Policy: Deadly 'Alcohol to a Drunk'
Nationwide Campaign To Stop New Obama War Gathers Steam

**LaRouche: Our World's
Fast-Waning Options**



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

Surely there's a devilish irony in the fact that, as we observe the 29th anniversary of President Reagan's March 23, 1983 announcement of the LaRouche-authored Strategic Defense Initiative, which, in Reagan's words, would make nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete," we are confronted with the very real prospect of thermonuclear World War III. As Lyndon LaRouche writes in his *Feature* article this week, "Our World's Fast-Waning Options," "Had Andropov and Gorbachov, as de facto British puppets, and also some leading American fools, not prevented the adoption of what U.S. President Ronald Reagan had put forward as what I had launched as my Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), the history of U.S.A. relations with the Soviet Union, and, later Russia, would have taken an entirely different track."

From the LPAC Basement team, Benjamin Deniston's report, "Macro-Ecological Revolutions: Mass Extinctions as Shadows of Anti-Entropic Growth," presents a counterpoint, by exploring what mankind can accomplish "as a true creator in the universe."

In *International*, we provide further documentation of the danger of war, in "Obama, Cameron, Netanyahu Push Thermonuclear World War III," and "U.S., U.K., and Allies Escalate Against Syria."

Behind the drive for war is the accelerating meltdown of the imperial financial system: See *Economics* for "The Empire's Bailout Policy: Deadly 'Alcohol to a Drunk'."

The extremity of the crisis however is producing optimistic developments as well: See "It's Official: Cheminade Is on the Ballot for French Presidential Race," and "Russia's Anti-Drug Policy: Afghan, Central Asian Development on Agenda," in *International*.

In *National*, "President Put on Notice: Nationwide Campaign To Stop New Obama War Gathers Steam," an update on the mobilization to pass Rep. Walter Jones' resolution, followed by an draft article of impeachment against President Obama by the noted Constitutional lawyer Bruce Fein.

Our *Science* section continues our coverage of the Feb. 25-26 Schiller Institute conference, with "Exploring Space: The Optimism of an Infinite Universe," by Rudolph Biérent, and, from the Basement, Oyang Teng's "The Lesson of the Great Japan Earthquake."



Cover This Week

President Obama and Prime Minister Cameron share a private moment, as they walk across the South Lawn of the White House, July 20, 2010.



White House/Pete Souza

4 Our World's Fast-Waning Options

“Now, we have come to the time that the British empire has currently launched the attempt to push forward the greatest crime against humanity in all modern world history, writes Lyndon LaRouche. “This crime, an attempt at virtually global thermonuclear, mass bombardments, an intended, and prepared crime, which has been perpetrated, chiefly, by British influences . . . an attempted thermonuclear war against the principal and other nations of Eurasia and other places; it is not only necessary, for the sake of the existence of humanity on this planet, to defeat the evil schemes of that British empire and its puppets; it is essential to define and implement the means needed to properly identify, understand, and remove that evil from among important nations of this planet.”

15 Macro-Ecological Revolutions: Mass Extinctions as Shadows of Anti-Entropic Growth

“What are the invariant, qualitative characteristics governing the history of life here on Earth? What does this history tell us about the universe in which we live? What lessons must we learn, if our own species is to survive the present threats?” These are the issues that Benjamin Deniston addresses, in this contribution from the LPAC Basement Team.

International

21 Obama, Cameron, Netanyahu Push Thermonuclear World War III

In the aftermath of back-to-back Washington summits, President Obama, British Prime Minister Cameron and Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu are all dancing on the edge of thermonuclear war and the potential extinction of the human race. To say anything less would be to lie in the face of the greatest threat to humanity in recorded history.

24 U.S., U.K., and Allies Escalate Against Syria

26 It's Official: Cheminade Is on the Ballot for French Presidential Race

The French Constitutional Court has confirmed that Jacques Cheminade, a long-time friend of Lyndon LaRouche, has qualified as a candidate for the Presidency of France.

28 Documentation: A World Without the City or Wall Street

32 Russia's Anti-Drug Policy: Afghan, Central Asian Development on Agenda

Victor Ivanov, head of Russia's Federal Narcotics Control Service, a close associate of Prime Minister and President-elect Vladimir Putin, has proposed two new initiatives to promote massive economic development of Afghanistan and the former Soviet Central Asian republics.

35 West-Based NGOs Stall India's Nuclear Program; But, at Whose Behest?

India's nuclear power program is under attack from foreign NGOs and other anti-science handmaidens of the British Empire, whose target now is the Koodankulam Nuclear Power Plant in Tamil Nadu.

40 Zepp-LaRouche: Defeat Threat of Nuclear War

Economics

41 The Empire's Bailout Policy: Deadly 'Alcohol to a Drunk'

While a number of influential Europeans are raising the alarm over the accelerating hyperinflationary policy of the ECB, on this side of the Atlantic, it's still "happy days are here again."

43 Economics in Brief

National

44 President Put on Notice: Nationwide Campaign To Stop New Obama War Gathers Steam

Rep. Walter Jones' House Concurrent Resolution 107 to restore the Constitutional standard for declaring war, and prevent the launching of a new catastrophic war by President Barack Obama, is gaining support throughout the country.

45 'An Impeachable High Crime and Misdemeanor'

46 Constitutional Lawyer's Call for Obama Impeachment Over War Against Libya

The complete text of a draft article of impeachment against President Barack Obama, by Bruce Fein, a well-known Constitutional lawyer and civil libertarian.

55 'Executive Power To Kill': Holder Declaration Triggers Backlash

Attorney General Eric Holder has formally declared that President Obama has the right to execute an American citizen without any judicial due process or oversight.

Science

58 Exploring Space: The Optimism of an Infinite Universe

Rudolph Biérent, a young researcher from the French Aerospace Lab ONERA, gave this address to the Schiller Institute conference in Berlin, Feb. 26. In it, he happily demolishes the concept of entropy, and presents a vision of the future in which mankind extends his reach far beyond Earth.

63 The Lesson of the Great Japan Earthquake

Oyang Teng of the LaRouche Basement Team poses the question, "Can earthquakes be predicted?" Despite denials on the part of mainstream seismology, the qualified answer is: Yes.

Editorial

65 JFK Warns of Thermonuclear War

Our World's Fast-Waning Options

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Thursday, March 8, 2012

Profound matters at issue are sometimes presented to us from amid grotesque settings of misbelief.

As of the close of Russia's March 4, 2012, Sunday election, the British-controlled enemies of Russia, who were typically represented by my rather long-standing personal enemy, the British empire's notorious tool, Mikhail S. Gorbachov, had represented less than 20% of the Russian vote cast, according to the end-of-the-day estimates on the Russian election and related developments.

Therefore, on the basis of that and related evidence, the urgent question is: is it now this fact, taken together with the immediate push for an Israeli war against Iran, which now signals us toward what the British empire, backed by British puppet-President of the United States, Barack Obama, now intends to unleash as an intended, full-scale, thermonuclear-weapons-launch against Russia, China, and related targets, now, in addition to other victims of British empire-led, and implicitly treasonous crimes against humanity, targets such as those of the British tool, the Emperor Nero-mimic, U.S. President Barack Obama, against such targeted, sovereign nation-states as Syria and Iran. The British and their nominally American puppet-President, Obama, are following up the Hitler-like, war-criminal actions of the Obama puppet-regime in Libya.

Gorbachov has been, unfortunately, relevant. Had Andropov and Gorbachov, as de facto British puppets, and also some leading American fools, not prevented the adoption of what U.S. President Ronald Reagan had put forward as what I had launched as my Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), the history of U.S.A. relations with the Soviet Union, and, later Russia, would have taken an entirely different track. None of the crises which both



Incoming Russian President Vladimir Putin and incoming Prime Minister Dmitri Medvedev on March 5, at a huge rally in Moscow celebrating their victory in the previous day's election. The British-controlled enemies of Russia are furious that their effort to smash Putin has failed.

Western Europe and Eastern Europe have suffered since that time, would have occurred as they did. My intended science-driver operation would have become the rich destiny of a shared science-driver orientation which would have defeated our republic's truly principal, British adversary since the likes of the British "Wall Street" agents Aaron Burr, Martin Van Buren, and their treasonously inclined, corrupt fool Andrew Jackson. Such have been merely typical among the elements of that British imperial program which has destroyed the peace and economy of the world among leading groups of nations then, as still today.

What has now happened thus far, instead of my own initiative for what had become known as a "Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)" has been a London-Wall Street swindle which has now brought the entirety of the trans-Atlantic region of the planet into the wretched state of a presently doomed, intrinsically physical-economic, as much as hyper-inflationary, breakdown-crisis of the entire trans-Atlantic community. However, as I shall indicate in due course in this present report, there is the still remaining, proverbially "last-minute" prospect of a brilliant new triumph of mankind awaiting our species, if we will adopt the great potential opportunities before us, on the condition that we will be agreed to change our presently foolish ways, in time.

For the most crucial of the answers to those and related questions which those British-led crimes pose, we must look back to the instance of the British-led opposition to U.S. President Ronald Reagan's March 23, 1983

presentation of his proposal for A Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). None of the leading questions pertaining to a presently swelling campaign of world-wide mass-death, today, could be competently understood and answered, until the significance of that original SDI is carefully, precisely and urgently reconsidered now.

For the key to the answer to related such historical questions, look back to a policy which I had first presented at the close of Summer 1977, during one of my stays in Europe, through President Ronald Reagan's March 1983 proposal to Moscow then, and beyond.

That Summer 1977 was the time of the birth of that policy-conception of mine which would come to be known as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), as later adopted by U.S.A. President Ronald Reagan. Unless you understand that single fact, stretched from late Summer 1977, to the present day, you do not understand the trajectory of the military or related history of the world over an interval since the beginning of those intervals of time, the history which currently threatens you, still today, with a repose in Hell, unless you intervene to deserve better, in an appropriately timely manner now.

To enjoy what is sometimes called your "personal freedom to choose," you must also recognize that you have thus also earned the punishments which you have helped to bring upon yourselves, at least as much as the pleasure you have adopted as your own on that account. "Free to choose," can turn out to signify more the freedom for you to enjoy the pains of the sequels of intent or neglect which you have brought upon yourselves. Often it is your own choice of opinion which will ruin you, as it has done in the cases of your complicity in the choices of George H.W. Bush, his son, George W. Bush, Jr., and Barack Obama. Was that the work of public, or, perhaps, somebody's public opinion?

The Evil British Empire

Now, we have come to the time that the British empire has currently launched the attempt to push forward the greatest crime against humanity in all modern world history. This crime, an attempt at virtually global

thermonuclear, mass bombardments, an intended, and prepared crime, which has been perpetrated, chiefly, by British influences, has been prepared for immediate deployment under the rubric of a massive, fully intended British scheme of “pro-environmentalist” genocide throughout the planet. This is a crime aided by the British orchestration of an attempted thermonuclear war against the principal and other nations of Eurasia and other places; it is not only necessary, for the sake of the existence of humanity on this planet, to defeat the evil schemes of that British empire and its puppets;¹ it is essential to define and implement the means needed to properly identify, understand, and remove that evil from among important nations of this planet.

Here, we examine the profundity of the lessons to be learned from this, learning, hopefully, from insight into a far deeper, and long-ranging, ontological basis of your experiences.

An Introduction: Evolution Today

During the recent years, up through the present date, the set of associates of mine known as “The Basement Team,” had developed what have proven to be, chiefly, an important series of closely related scientific discoveries. What that team has discovered, has been premised chiefly on already well-established, consolidated sets of facts of scientific discovery by others. My team of associates, with some important points of participation in this by me, has pulled the relevant evidence, included their own added discoveries, together, that chiefly by means of some crucial discoveries of their own. My contribution has been crucial in bringing the needed conclusions of that team together.

1. The current, British monarchy-led plan for its (and President Barack Obama’s) launching of a massed-attack with thermonuclear means has two presently intended phases. First, to threaten a general thermonuclear assault en masse against Russia, China, and related targets; but to offer, but only briefly, certain pre-conditions of surrender first, and then direct a mass-killing operation more strenuous than that delivered against a defeated Russia. If Russia and China refuse to submit to those conditions, then a full-throated thermonuclear mass-kill, would be unleashed sometime soon. The result of the latter option of attack would be a fully mass-attack intended to destroy the targeted nations at first shot; therefore, that could be, probably, the not necessarily intended extinction of the human species. Hence, the apparent wiggle-waffle of President Barack Obama during his public chat with Israel’s grotesque Netanyahu.

These discoveries, whose most crucial implications have been drawn out by my own work during the recent several years, have included what has been a long-overdue clarification of the fact, that a fairly estimated, ninety-eight percentile of living species had come, and vanished from our planet Earth. The deeper meaning of my associates’ accomplishments, which I present in this present location, had been developed, chiefly by me, in a wider dimension on the included basis of my own original work, including work done by me since a time even long before those present “Basement” associates of mine had been born.

For example, this has been the fruit of my original presentation of the evidence defining the underlying basis for a science of forecasting of those kinds of developments which must be classified under the specifications of the competent form of a science of physical economy, as that science had been illustrated by my own discoveries in that field, as by those discoveries added, recently, for today.


Both of two converging sets of scientific developments, my associates’ and my own, the one in physical biology, the other in the science of physical economy, are now combined, in effect, to demonstrate the fact of the absolutely, and intentionally fraudulent character of what was introduced, fraudulently, after the 1866 death of Bernhard Riemann, by such as Rudolf Clausius, as an intrinsically absurd, alleged “Second Law of Thermodynamics.”

That experience shows more clearly than otherwise, why the British imperial monarchy has presently demanded a rapid, mass-murderous collapse of the human population of our planet from seven billions persons, to less than one. Most among our readers here, are almost certainly among those on the British monarchy’s urgent, global death-list today. A thermonuclear attack on Russia and China (two among the leading, presently proposed, British and Obama targets for virtual extinctions), would have, for you and other intended victims, the chain-reaction-like effect of bringing the human species to the verge of extinction, that for already noted reasons which I shall explain within the context of this present report.

The most crucial of the practical issues on the table of strategy for this present time, is the fact that the presently intended program now staged for launching by that present British monarchy, has been the British empire’s intention to bring off such an act of global genocide with the help of the present British monar-

FIGURE 1

Anti-Entropic Development Emerges from Mass Extinctions



LPAC-TV

This diagram by the LaRouche Basement Team shows the points of mass extinction of species. New species emerge during and after such periods, species which mark a qualitative evolution.

chy's mentally deranged puppet, the Emperor Nero-like, unbalanced mind known as that of U.S. President Barack Obama. That British monarchy's repeatedly stated intention, is to kill off all but about one billion of the world's present, seven billions human beings; however, it were likely that, under conditions of thermonuclear warfare launched by Britain and its current puppet, President Obama, the result might far exceed such a mark, might set off even an ultimate extinction of the human species: whether the principal criminal, the British empire, had intended that ultimate outcome, or not.

The launching of mass-killings directed against a list of targets including Russia, China, Libya's now late President Muammar Gaddafi, and, soon thereafter, the similar targetting of Syria and Iran, represent the using of the aforesaid targets of those three nations as "detonators" to trigger a war of thermonuclear mass-extinctions against Russia, China, and related targets for intended extinctions. The primary source of the publicly avowed intention for that horror of global population reduction on such a global scale, is an expression of the "green" neo-malthusian dogma of the presently proposed mass-kill phase of the British mon-

archy's current phase of the global oligarchical system on this planet.²

The British imperial intention in that prescribed global atrocity, includes two leading, alternative options, as follows. The first choice of the British monarchy and its confederates, is to threaten Russia, China, et al. with a thermonuclear mass-extinction within their own present domains, seeking, thereby, to proffer the immediate alternative option of those targeted nations' submission to the conditions, acceptance of which would be then followed by imposing mass-deaths upon those targets by a somewhat slower, alternative means which would

be more pleasing to the scheme of genocide (and, for the British side, incidentally, less strain, less risk, and fewer general losses on the side of the British and their selected accomplices). However, if Russia, China, et al., resist those demanded terms of submission, a presently prepared, probably full-scale thermonuclear launching remains to be promptly set into motion, without explicit warning, by the British empire. In either of these alternatives, the ability to launch such horrors on mankind require the pre-condition that *the British monarchy were able to secure the intended degree of support from clearly treasonous elements of the U.S. Presidency, such as those currently associated with President Obama, for this British imperial monarchy's operation.*

Those alternatives are the present fact of the matter, silly doubters notwithstanding. Hence, all sane, seri-

2. Clausius' fraud relied upon his deliberate misreading of the discovery presented in 1824 by Sadi Carnot. Clausius' swindle depended upon overlooking the reality of scientific practice, that for which an experimental fact is not necessarily also intended to be mistaken for the proof of an alleged universal physical principle. Hence the fraud by Clausius et al., in claiming actually non-existent evidence of an actually fraudulent "Second Law of Thermodynamics."

ous and patriotic military leaders of the U.S.A., and relevant leaders within other leading nations, know that a British-directed provocation by Netanyahu and others, the latter including both the British monarchy and the Obama Presidency itself, is directed to the launchable alternative of setting off a global thermonuclear barrage without notice, a barrage whose immediately intended effect would be no less than a relatively global, mass-extinction.

How will it be known when that barrage is being delivered, until the time of the first crushing barrage has happened? But, then, if the targeted nations are still able, they will quickly launch their own counterattack by comparable means. The consequences of such developments are, by their nature, incalculable.

The immediate danger to humanity comes, therefore, not only from the British empire, but also from the actions which an “Emperor Nero-like” British puppet, Barack Obama, is now preparing to unleash (with the adequate thermonuclear resources of the United States) as a mass-extinction of much of the world’s population in a single, “surprise-like” thermonuclear “blast” which only the U.S.A. possesses the adequate means to deliver.

Those are the most essential facts of the present world-wide situation. Only homicidal lunatics, or simply cringing cowards in positions of power, could deny these essential facts.

‘Conscience Doth Make Cowards of (Almost) All’

I have some relevant memories from what are now many decades ago.

My own first relevant political action after my World War II military service, was a very brief 1947 letter to General Dwight D. Eisenhower, then in authority at Columbia University, in which I had urged him to seek election to the Democratic Party’s nomination for the U.S. Presidency against the depraved incumbent, and Churchill and Wall Street flunky, Harry S Truman. My specific, stated intent was to requicken what had become, under President Franklin Roosevelt, the cause of the victory in World War II, of all among those citizens who had served, to bestir the conscience of the nation to return to those intended,



Russian military leaders are fully aware of the danger of thermonuclear war, and are saying so with increasing frequency. Chief of Staff Gen. Nikolai Makarov was especially explicit in his November 2011 address to the Russian Public Chamber.

The possibility of local armed conflicts virtually along the entire perimeter of the border has grown dramatically. I cannot rule out that in certain circumstances, local and regional armed conflicts could grow into a large-scale war, possibly even with nuclear weapons.

—Gen. Nikolai Makarov

post-war intentions of the President Franklin Roosevelt, whom the wretched Harry S Truman had betrayed.

General Eisenhower had responded to my message, with his own clearly stated intention, which one should have expected from a seasoned commander of a great force, who would have been accustomed in his replies, to what I would describe in retrospect still today, as the relatively most concise, but what could only be read as an efficiently clear intention. That set of facts has remained within the bounds of the essence of my outlook still today, as then.

The later election of Dwight D. Eisenhower as President, and, then, the role of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt’s proposed champion of our patriotic mission, President John F. Kennedy, had presented richly hope-filled prospects in precisely the same sense of intention as my brief 1947 letter to General Eisenhower, and my confidence in his reply. So, the assassinations of John F. Kennedy and his brother Robert, as subsequent events have shown, has killed the essential intention of Franklin Roosevelt, as also those of the United States since the Warren Commission’s abomi-

nable act of implicit consent to the murder of the Kennedy brothers.

Since that time, the reverberating effect of the Warren Commission cover-up of the Kennedy assassination, has rotted-out more and more of the moral fiber of the later leadership of our Federal Government, and of our population generally. Only a relatively few deeply committed figures, today, have lived to share, now, the devotion to the truth on that account which I still share as a personal commitment in turn.³ For today, Presidents and all, it appears that the political stuffing has been taken out of almost all of our certified national leaders, that, it appears, almost as soon as they had entered the political orifice of “go along, to get along.”

Nonetheless, weeping does almost no good for long, nor even at all; now, the matter is simple, very simple: get the proverbial “guts” to overturn the British imperial scheme, or prepare to be sent into something tantamount to a quality of extinction resembling the K-T doom of the dinosaurs.

However, there is a far deeper aspect of the whole matter to be considered by me in this matter, here and now:

Now, in the following pages, examine the later, and deeper facts behind all the points which I have listed in this introduction. As you shall read, in due course here: these are facts which go very, very deep.

Look back to my “two-volume” report: **I Keep a Promise Made on September 30: The Mystery of**

3. I have experienced some politically rough treatment for the policies which I had uttered prior to my leading role in creating the SDI policies which President Reagan had proffered in March 1983. After that, the intention of relevant factions within the governments of both the U.S.A. and Europe, assumed the expressed intention of my virtual extinction and that of everything which I have represented, especially on the matter of the SDI.



Library of Congress

President Franklin Roosevelt and Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in 1943. LaRouche wrote to Eisenhower in 1947, urging him to seek the Democratic Party's Presidential nomination, in order to continue FDR's post-war policy intentions.



FDR Library

John F. Kennedy and Eleanor Roosevelt in October 1960, a month before Kennedy was elected President. The national hopes raised by Kennedy's Presidency were dashed by his assassination and the Warren Commission's coverup.

Your Time⁴ and Science-vs-Oligarchism.⁵ I had left to a future occasion to treat what might become an intended, crucial sequel to those two volumes, that done solely for reason of the immediate urgency of other tasks. Since that time, I have reconsidered that postponement; the matters to be added can not wait now. Therefore, now, reference that two-volume piece as the present starting-point of reference for the point from which I now proceed in the following pages: as you and I venture here into the domain of reality which lies only beyond—as if “outside”—the domain of the regime of human sense-perception.

4. *EIR*, January 20, 2012 (http://www.larouchepub.com/lar/2012/3903mystery_your_time.html) or Lyndon LaRouche PAC (<http://larouchepac.com/node/21206>).

5. *EIR*, Feb. 17, 2012 (http://www.larouchepub.com/lar/2012/3907_science_v_oligarchism.html) or Lyndon LaRouche PAC (<http://larouchepac.com/node/21503>).

I. Speaking as if to the Creator

The essential error of presumption in even what might pass credibly for scientific arguments delivered so far, as even in the known history of mankind, is that such presumptions are burdened with a systemically false quality of error, which remains the typical presumption, even in scientific circles: the notion that the ideas of universal physical principle could be effectively encompassed *explicitly* within the bounds of “underlying sources of proofs” attributable to human sense-perceptions. The result of that viciously systemic error of sense-perceptual-based presumptions, is the attempt to build up what passes for knowledge, by resort to the means of what might be defined as the simplest rudiments of scientific knowledge (e.g., so-called “elements”) from mere sense-perceptions as such.

The most efficient, outstanding access to true insight into this problematic feature, of even the relatively best of merely customary teaching of physical science, even in creditable institutions today, has been that approach which has appeared from among a series of great intellects beginning with the true founder of all competent modern science, Nicholas of Cusa,⁶ and thence, through such followers of Cusa as Johannes Kepler, Gottfried Leibniz, and Bernhard Riemann.

Otherwise, the most useful steps toward freedom from those past customary follies which have been posed within an otherwise competent notion of science, are steps which are to be recognized in that developmental process described as leading from the fundamentals of the work of Bernhard Riemann, through exemplary successors of Riemann such as Max Planck and Albert Einstein, and, then, V.I. Vernadsky. However, it is now essential that we advance beyond even those desired achievements. We must call into question certain among an array of what have come to be accepted as the fundamentally axiomatic, but systemically mistaken presumptions of education, as from cradle to death.

From that point of view which I emphasize here, the essential notion of science must be associated with the notion, that the higher authorities of principle which I point out here, are defined by the principle of command which may be stated as: *of that higher which always, necessarily, rules over that which is lesser: the notion of a higher, universality of creativity, under which all*

that is less is subordinated by universal principle. The truth respecting the very existence of that which is lesser than universality, depends upon that which is its superior.

Only the universe in its ontological essentiality could define a true existence. This most essential of all facts must supplant the pathological form of blind faith in particularity which pollutes the mind of the credulous habit of dependence on “starting with” so-called “elementary particulars” of what are considered the “elements” presumed to underlie higher education taught as from below.

Hence, for example, consider Vernadsky’s principle of the willfully certain superiority of human creativity: one which reflects the existence of a certain power in the universe; an agency which exerts the superior power over that which is less than human creativity is the notion of creativity in Vernadsky, which is implicitly definable (initially) from the standpoint of such as Cusa, as in his **De Docta Ignorantia**, through, in succession, most notably, Gottfried Leibniz, Bernhard Riemann, Max Planck, and Albert Einstein as those who have preceded V.I. Vernadsky. However, as is to be recognized in the essential conflict between such as Plato, and his opponents such as the radical reductionist Euclid (or, for example, the doctrine of Karl Marx), there is a universality of ontological difference separating those two. opposing types of world-outlook from one another.

The vicious lunacy polluting what is presently presumed as an “elementary” education, which is often presumed as being the fundamental principle of education, makes the error of presuming that the “underlying elements” of taught science (and the like) are the only valid cause, for education, of the existence of the relatively superior subject-matter! Compare the erroneous notion that mere particles are the “building blocks” of the universe, as a matter of contrasts. So, the great Nineteenth-century genius, Bernhard Riemann, employed the concluding portion of his 1854 habilitation dissertation, to deliver a much-needed warning against the misuse of deductive mathematics as the foundation of physical science. So, the great V.I. Vernadsky, who discovered that the physical principles of life and of human creativity, pre-existed the existence of elementary parts as such, had expressed this not by deduction, but as a matter of essential ontology.

Competent science henceforth, must contain that principled correction, a universal quality of correction.

6. E.g., **De Docta Ignorantia**, 1441.

The universe has created, as from above, in its expression of wholeness, that which is enabled to lie within it. Man's obligation is to act on that universe through a universal quality of that efficiency by means of which mankind has been demonstrated to express a principle of creativity, which, when appropriately understood, points mankind to its next chore, that of discovery of a power of creativity which had not been mastered, nor, possibly, even existed, earlier.

Take, as a useful illustration of this point, the astounding effects of the work of such as Max Planck and Albert Einstein which redefined the notion of physical universality, if, then, by only a preliminary approach to such notions of universality, as against the reductionists of both the late Nineteenth-century Austrian school, and of the more viciously, satanically evil Bertrand Russell and his own present-day as earlier devotees.

For example, consider the role of the principle of "matter-anti-matter actions," as superior (i.e., a subsuming authority) with respect to simple thermonuclear fusion, as thermonuclear fusion is superior to fission, and it, in turn, to all that is less than nuclear fission. Above all, including that which is above the notion of the existential principle of our galaxy, leads our mind's eye to ever higher orders of conception, to the notion of an explicitly universal principle of creativity *per se*, which acts within the universe from the top, down, rather than from "elements": which, for our experimenters, changes the universe through the top-down application of such discovered knowledge of man's willful potential to recreate, to change the universe we inhabit, as if, by means provided by what mankind may adopt as a new discovery of some true principle, as from "the top down."

All of these exemplary categories, those to which I have just referred as matters of illustration, are to be subsumed as efficient conceptions under the reign of an essentially necessary power of what is properly named as a universal principle of creation as such. Such a notion as that was already specified as a quality of knowledge which is implicit in what is effectively the corresponding traits of what is associated with "scientific creativity" as the expression of a top-down command of the higher power in the universe.



Russian biogeochemist Vladimir I. Vernadsky (1893-1945) identified a universal principle of creativity which distinguished mankind as a force in the universe. He called this the Noösphere, and saw the development of nuclear power as a crucial example.

We are approaching a great transformation in the life of mankind, with which nothing it has lived through previously can be compared. The time is not far off when man will take atomic energy into his hands, a source of power that will make it possible for him to construct his life just as he desires. This may happen in the immediate years ahead, it may happen a century from now. But it is clear that it must happen.

—V.I. Vernadsky, 1922

On this account, it is to be added and so recognized, that the distinction which V.I. Vernadsky has identified as human creativity, as being a power specific to the human mind, is to be recognized as a power superior to all animal behavior. In Vernadsky's work during approximately the last decade of his life, he viewed relevant matters of universal scientific fact, by adopting the urgently needed correction supplied from the standpoint of Bernhard Riemann; on this account, he had accomplished a great leap for all subsequent mankind in respect to the notion of a universal principle of creativity. That is a principle of creativity which identifies the actual specificity of that creativity in the universe which distinguishes mankind as a force within the universe, which is a force operating, as if top-down, in respect to all known matters which mankind has shown itself able to know as elements in a universality of creativity: man in the likeness of an ultimate power of a Creator as being in and of the universe.

While what I have just summarized in this fashion, is true; the problem which I am addressing explicitly

here, is that of the inherent tendency for adopting the standpoint of mere bestiality, as in the case of the intrinsically fraudulent, reductionist role of Euclidean geometry, in the fashion which is commonly promulgated in classroom and related beliefs, which tend to lead mankind into a process of self-willed destruction, as that is typified by the popular, academic and other reductionist modes of argument and belief prevalent currently.

The Crucial Theological Implication

As clearly implied for competently educated persons today, all that I have just written above, is clearly true. The question which is thus posed, becomes, therefore, why should those often treated as if they were the ostensible overlords of mankind, ever be believed to the contrary? Why has the most wretched belief called “reductionism,” ever been tolerated? The answer to that question is, “the oligarchical principle.” Virtually entire populations of nations have made themselves willfully stupid on this account. Why? How has this been done? Why has this been done? Who has done it?

The only competent reply to that question is, the oligarchical principle, as that oligarchical principle was explicitly fostered (notably) by the (frankly) Satanic cults of Euclid and Aristotle, as opposed to Plato. Or, to restate the same point in a better mode of clarity in expression; why has mankind submitted to the depravity inherent in that oligarchical system typified by the imperial British monarchy and its “fellow-travelers” of today?

It were relatively more readily adducible, that all that is worthy of the name of physical science, is represented only by truly universal principles, as defined, not from the parts upward, but by discoverable principles applied for efficient proof, experimentally, downwards. This is a quality of the human mind, a quality fairly named “human individual creativity,” which is not presently known to us to exist in any other known, specific form of life, but, which is demonstrated to us, on a qualitatively lower expression, as by the powers of living processes which distinguish them from the processes of non-life, but which exist in a humanly willful form presently known to us, only by human life. It does not exist in the form of deduction.

Animal life, and stubbornly stupid people, alike, can recognize and employ life-forms’ activity, and human beings who are otherwise defective, that to a

similarly inferior mental effect, respecting actual human creativity, may, somewhat like trained animals, imitate what has been demonstrated by mere copying (e.g., merely deductive human behavior in an animal-like mode of imitation).

So, before returning to the subject of the still relatively rare phenomenon of a conscious form of human creativity *per se*, we must examine the problem of what is most fairly classed as “oligarchical behaviorism” which remains, to this day, the popular intellectual weakness of the thinking of the majorities of populations: the weakness which prevents the majorities of human populations of today from commanding an efficiently actual creativity, which were otherwise a natural potential of all healthy human individuals.

II. On the Oligarchical Principle

It is fairly and truly said, that the essential distinction of mankind from all the lower forms of life presently known to us, is the quality of what is defined as the distinguishing principle which separates a true development of the human mind, such as that of a Plato, from the outlook of malicious fools such as that notorious hoaxster, Euclid. The fools include those who, in one way or another, have lost access to powers of human creativity which they may have enjoyed at some earlier, better times. This particular form of depravity in human development, may reflect the effects of a lack of opportunity for development of innate creative potential; or, it might be considered as a change of character of persons and groups of persons, through an induced form of adaptive “demoralization,” such as torture, or related expressions of great fear, or, it may be said, either by being terrorized in that way, or simply as a matter of “opportunism.”

Cases of such communicable forms of adaptive depression, which are often, euphemistically mis-identified as “being practical [e.g., ‘obedient’],” are notable in the cases of what are often identified as so-called “lower social classes.” The most useful attempts to define this problem as a form of social pathology, are presented in the Classical Greek legacy of Zeus-Apollo versus Prometheus. The essence of the relevant notion, is to be found in the identification of Prometheus with the use of the power of willful use of fire. Only truly human beings are potentially capable of the willful employment of fire; men and woman who are not overlords of the type

associated with the Apollo cult, are ordered to submit, as by the worshipers of Apollo, to subjugation to the quality of condition of life of mere cattle-like creatures. That is the quality of subjugation which is met in such notable examples as the original Roman Empire, Byzantium, the old-Venetian monetarist system which deployed the Crusaders, and the New Venetian system of such as William of Orange and his British, Anglo-Dutch, imperial successors to the present date.

The contemporary, morally depraved class of British-directed “environmentalists,” are typically victims of being reduced in practice to be less-than-human, by the Roman imperial legacy expressed as the present-day British Empire’s depraved “greenie” category.

Thus, for as far back as a more or less well-defined, literate account of history could reach, the human cultures of the Mediterranean-centered region of this planet, and more, have shown, that what has passed for nominally European-centered civilization (for example) has been dominated by the state of moral disorder formally describable as a reigning **oligarchical** form of tyranny. The form of such tyrannies can be usefully separated between forms of oligarchical tyrannies which may be properly identified as of either, or both **maritime**, or **riparian** forms.

With the emergence of the original Roman Empire, the previously conflicting modes of oligarchical systems within and bordering the Mediterranean were united as a single “world” empire which had taken initial shape as the Roman Empire.

The most notable peculiarity of that virtually world-empire form of European cultures, has passed, chiefly, through, four, successively, intrinsically doomed, distinct qualities of form of content: (1.) The original Roman Empire; (2.) Byzantium; (3.) The so-called Crusader system; and, (4.) The “New Venetian empire,” spawned by the followers of Paolo Sarpi, and the spawn



England's King William III (Prince of Orange) embodied the New Venetian system of oligarchism, and his successors in the House of Windsor today have continued that mass-murderous tradition.

of such as the New Venetian party’s William of Orange. William was of that same empire fairly identifiable, still today, as the presently mass-murderous, British world empire under the current reign of Queen Elizabeth II.⁷

It is essential to emphasize the fact here, once more, that that system of intended world empire, whose origin had been rooted in a maritime mode of imperial, virtually world-wide rule, is the basis for the presently immediate threat of an intention to reduce the population of the entire planet from a present level of seven billions living persons, to the current British empire’s goal of reaching an early reduction of the world’s human population, from a recent level of seven billions persons, to less than one.

The result of such a survey, compels us to compare the history of imperialism with that of the extinction of the Earth’s great reptile-like breed which occurred, as at the beginning of the Cenozoic, which is known as the “K-T” extinction. As when the “mass kills” of Paleozoic, Mesozoic, and Cenozoic are compared with the breakdown-phase of the original Roman Empire, its successor the Byzantine, its successor “the Crusader system,” and its impending successor, the British empire, we have the basis-elements needed to understand a certain apparent similarity between the extinction of entire sets of species, and the direction of developments which are now the immediate threat of the extinction of the human species under the domination of the British empire today.

Is Britain Now a Doomed Dinosaur?

Indeed, the so-called “green policy” of the British imperial monarchy, now, is an appropriate virtually human copy of the mass-extinction of the dinosaurs, then. Those nations and persons which prefer not to join

7. The oligarchical principle as such, reaches much further back as a virtually world-wide mental-moral disorder of human society.

the dinosaurs in extinctions of species, will, certainly, reject the mass-suicidal doctrines of the so-called “environmentalist’s” choice of a cessation of movement. The difference between all preceding “mass kills” of successive Roman empires, and the situation of the human species under the virtually global domination of the British empire today, is that the magnitude of the forces of mankind’s threatened extinction under the British empire of today, has reached the level of warfare fought to a point of human mass-extinction under wars fought with a massed deployment of thermonuclear detonations.

Beyond that point, the comparison just presented breaks down, in the following terms.

The “Basement Team” members Sky Jason Shields and Creighton “Cody” Jones have led in conducting a leading role in our scientific teams’ successes on the subject of the evolution of living and related species. They have conducted a leading role in a graphic scientific report which had been first published under the title of “The Economics of Extinction and the Principle of Progress.”⁸

The work of that “Basement Team” on this account, not only has a very significant importance in respect to the matter in this present report, but has contributed significantly to advances in research pertaining to matter-antimatter and related subjects of presently great urgency for the security of the possibility of continued existence of human life today. That same point for emphasis bears most emphatically on the urgency of matters bearing on the prospective colonization of Mars, and the related urgency of emphasis on the actual development of scientifically known potentials for man’s ability to reach the distance between our Moon and Mars within a foreseeable lapse of a single week of travel, and the ability of mankind to protect the human species on Earth from the extermination of the human species, on Earth, by an asteroid or the like hitting

8. E.g., see **Executive Intelligence Review**, February 3, 2012 (http://www.larouchepub.com/other/2012/3905weekly_rpt_extinction.htm) or Lyndon LaRouche PAC (<http://larouchepac.com/weekly/jan26?page=1>). The general law adducible from the physical history of our Solar system, has two most prominent characteristics for understanding our Solar system today. That that system’s action is defined as an increasing energy-flux density of the evolution of life within that system, and that systems which fail to meet that standard, are implicitly en route to extinctions. Human life is, implicitly, a systemic quality of exception to that customary form of ultimate destiny; the human species is enabled to evolve to a higher (willful) standard of energy-flux density (true self-creativity); other presently known species are not.

Earth—defenses of the human species which the mentally depraved President Barack Obama strictly forbids.

The case of a foreseeable human flight of one week’s duration of fusion-driven travel between Earth and Mars, is typical of a range of developable measures which mankind must accomplish in a foreseeable time within this present century, if the human species is to continue to exist.

However, there is a deeper, more urgent consideration to be taken into account in this matter. For example: our human species, which has existed on Earth only some mere millions of years of life, is presently gripped by a change in condition within the galaxy which it inhabits, which has not previously existed during the time during which the human species has existed. While many features of the effect of this change in our Solar system’s position within the galaxy are yet to be adduced, the need to advance the science and related technology of human life within our Solar system, is clearly the threat which we must be working now to treat. We must develop the conditions of human life on Earth and within the Solar system, by means of which we will become enabled to meet this oncoming galactical challenge.

The most essential feature of the case which I have just posed here, is the subject-matter of human creativity, when that creativity is applied to the known, if still uncertain principles of the universe by means of which our human species could be enabled to continue to exist successfully during a future space of time which reaches throughout the unfolding of the remainder of this century, into centuries to come.

The one feature of this thought which I have thus expressed to you here, which is certain, is that we must rid the systems of government of this planet, from all significant remnants of the oligarchical principle. That means, emphasis on those known powers of physical creativity which are innate to the human species, but which are antithetical to the adopted notions of self-interest of forces of evil typified by the British Empire of today and predecessor systems of oligarchical domination extant heretofore: the same intention on which Nicholas of Cusa premised the warning to Europeans to cross the great oceans of our planet, to, as a result develop North America to be a refuge for the sake of future benefit by which to secure a survival of the peoples of an oligarchism-riddled “old continent” for the sake of the true, inherent goals of our human species, as now.

Mass Extinctions as Shadows Of Anti-Entropic Growth

by Benjamin Deniston

What are the invariant, qualitative characteristics governing the history of life here on Earth?

What does this history tell us about the universe in which we live?

What lessons must we learn, if our own species is to survive the present threats?

March 10—Over the recent few years our [LaRouchePAC] Basement team has taken up these questions, and I present here a short but significant contribution to this ongoing investigation. The other night, the abstract of a 2002 academic paper on evolution, specifically its last sentence, drew out my curiosity:

“Early Paleozoic radiations established stable ecosystem relationships, and thereafter only the great erabounding mass extinctions were able to break patterns of incumbency, permitting the emergence of new community structures with distinct proportional diversity relationships.”¹

Having participated in developing our Basement team’s thesis on mass extinctions—that they express the anti-entropic development of life as a whole, expressing itself against the fixed nature of any particular, individual ecological system—this concluding sentence of the above-mentioned abstract piqued my interest, not necessarily for the conclusions which its authors may have drawn, but for the implications of the evidence they might present, understood in the context of our ongoing work with Lyndon LaRouche on the subject of creativity in the history of life.²

Any given stage of an ecological system is inherently bounded, and yet life as a whole has continued to prog-

ress beyond such fixed constraints—as if being pulled from somewhere beyond that initial system. It is this process of advance, as measured in the progression to higher levels of biospheric energy-flux density, that defines the character of, and necessity for extinctions, even the very largest of the mass extinctions, as we will see here.

To get to the new evidence, a little background is required first. This 2002 study examines the changes in marine biodiversity over the past half billion years, as expressed to us in the fossil records. There are various measurements of this, such as by counting the total number of *families* or *genera* recorded at any given time (**Figures 1 and 2**).³

These biodiversity records have been analyzed in search of underlying structures or patterns in the history of life.⁴ For example, one of the most famous divisions is known as the “three evolutionary fauna.” First discovered in the early 1980s, it was seen that three successive groups of animals dominated the planet: the Cambrian group, the Paleozoic group, and then the Modern group (**Figures 3 and 4**).⁵

As will be seen below, these studies indicate very specific conditions required for the survival of any species, including our own. The idea of a universe governed by the Second Law of Thermodynamics is shown to be a complete fraud—*meaning if mankind is to continue to exist in this universe, we must completely abandon the entirety of the “sustainability,” or “green” ideology, and revive a commitment to true physical economic progress.*

1. Richard Bambach, Andrew Knoll, and John Sepkoski; “Anatomical and ecological constraints on Phanerozoic animal diversity in the marine realm,” May 14, 2002; PNAS.


2. See the Jan. 26, 2012 LaRouchePAC Weekly Report, “The Economics of Extinction” (<http://larouchepac.com/weekly/jan26>).

3. This is keeping with the standard biological taxonomic system: phylum, class, order, family, genus, species.

4. Such as the ~26, ~62 and ~140 million year periodicities in biodiversity discussed in other locations.


5. See, John Sepkoski, “A factor analytic description of the Phanerozoic marine fossil record,” *Paleobiology*, Vol. 7, No. 1, Winter 1981, pp. 36-53.

FIGURE 1



LPAC


FIGURE 2



LPAC


Two examples of measuring biodiversity over the last 540 million years, one at the family taxonomic level, another at the genera level.

FIGURE 3



LPAC

FIGURE 4



LPAC

Sepkoski's "three evolutionary fauna" (groupings of animals), measured in the total number of families found at any given point in time over the past 540 million years. **Figure 3** shows all three groups together; **Figure 4** shows each group separately.

Conditions for Survival

This classic division of the biodiversity record is interesting, but it is not the only structure we can identify in the fossil record. In the 2002 study quoted above, the authors decided to try something new, dividing the entire biodiversity record by specific *physiological characteristics* of living organisms.⁶ Classi-

6. They make an interesting note about the original derivation of the three evolutionary fauna: "No biological criteria were used to group the taxa *a priori*, and the only unifying biological attribute suggested by the study was a similar level of evolutionary volatility among members of each fauna." That is, the rate of emergence and extinction was the only

fying different organisms by those characteristics, they could then examine what relationships emerged from the biodiversity record as a function of this new classification.

The physiological characteristics chosen express significant qualitative features of living organisms, and are very much coherent with what we've been discussing in our Basement research.

For example, one feature of life that we have dis-

consideration used to identify these three groupings as distinct subsets of the entire biodiversity record.

cussed is what we might call the *increasing self-determination of life*—the power of life to more and more determine its own conditions of existence, becoming less of a passive participant on Earth, and more of a determinant, dramatically changing the face of the planet in order to meet life’s needs. For example, the “Hypersea” concept of life’s colonization of the land expresses this very clearly.⁷ For life to move onto land, the plants had to bring an entirely new water cycle onto land, literally changing the entire planet forever (including the electromagnetic conditions extending far, far beyond the planet’s surface)—*granting life a greater freedom to spread its reach and act*.

Or take the development of the watertight skin of reptilian animals, freeing them from being immediately tied to moist environments, as were their amphibian cousins. The shelled egg was another crucial development, separating life from a purely water-dependent life cycle (such as the tadpole stage of the amphibians).


Advances in thermoregulation and warm-bloodedness were also considerable innovations, breaking the metabolic activity of living organisms free from being bound to the ambient temperature.⁸ The list goes on.

Associated with this process has been the steady increase in the energy-flux density of the biosphere as a whole. Both the total energy of the system and the rate of consumption per organism have increased, characterizing a definable metric of *biospheric energy-flux density*, a direct correlative with the progress of life.⁹

For the 2002 study in question, they chose three key physiological characteristics which are relevant to our own investigations:

1. **Motile vs. non-motile animals:** simply, if the animals had the ability to willfully


FIGURE 5



PNAS/Bambach et al., 2002

Genera level marine animal biodiversity over the past 540 million years, divided into motile and non-motile animals.

FIGURE 6



PNAS/Bambach et al., 2002

Proportion of motile to non-motile marine animals over the Phanerozoic. A fish is given as an example of a motile animal, and a brachiopod as a non-motile example.

move around (motile), i.e., free-swimming, or if they were just passive, floating around in the sea (or stuck on the bottom), with no means to move themselves around.

2. **“Buffered” vs. “unbuffered” animals:** distinguishing between animals more susceptible to being directly influenced by their immediate environment, and

7. See LPAC-TV, “The Hypersea Platform” (<http://larouchepac.com/hypersea-2011>).

8. See LPAC-TV, “The Ecology of Anti-Entropy” (<http://larouchepac.com/node/19467>).

9. This will be the explicit subject of an upcoming writing, “In a Series on Anti-Entropic Ecology: Defining Biospheric Energy Flux Density,” to be completed by this author.

those more independent.¹⁰ For example, and perhaps the most interesting for our immediate investigation, the “buffered” animals have higher metabolic rates than the “unbuffered.”

3. **Predation:** examining the biodiversity of predators (animals which live by consuming other animals) relative to non-predators. Predation itself is a very energetic mode of life, and as such, was much rarer in earlier periods.¹¹ Predation has only increased as the entire energy-flux density of the biosphere as a whole has increased, making it a useful indicator of that process.

Taking the entire biodiversity record over the past half-billion years, we can classify species according to these physiological characteristics to see what the fossil records tell us. Starting with the motile vs. non-motile animals, we have the following graph (Figure 5).

We see that the motile and non-motile animals follow the same general ebbs and flows of biodiversity over this entire period, expanding and collapsing together. However, instead of focusing on the total levels, if we just examine the ratio of motile to non-motile animals, something much more interesting appears.


Remarkably, despite the general fluctuations of the overall biodiversity trend, clear plateaus emerge with relatively *stable ratios* between motile and non-motile animals over very long periods of time. For example, across the entire Cenozoic era (the past 65 million years), the biodiversity has been steadily increasing for both motile and non-motile animals, but the ratio between them has remained generally the same.

As indicated in **Figure 6**, three clear plateaus stand

10. To quote from the paper, “[unbuffered animals are] characterized by low rates of metabolism, limited internal circulation, gas exchange across little differentiated or undifferentiated body surfaces, and massive investment in CaCO₃ [calcium carbonate] skeletons ... [whereas ‘buffered’ animals are] characterized by relatively high metabolic demand, well-developed gills and circulatory systems that aid in physiological regulation, and skeletons limited in mass or made of materials other than CaCO₃ [buffered and unbuffered groups] identify distinct and biologically coherent suites of animals based on physiological responses to certain types of environmental perturbation. [Unbuffered Animals] can be regarded as open systems, vulnerable to or ‘unbuffered’ against a range of chemically related physiological stresses. In contrast, [buffered animals] comprise closed, physiologically ‘buffered’ systems expected to be less vulnerable to ambient chemical insult.”

11. For example see, “Seafood through time: Changes in biomass, energetics, and productivity in the marine ecosystem,” Bambach; *Paleobiology*, Vol. 19, No. 3, Summer 1993, pp. 372-397.

FIGURE 7



Three successive macro-ecological systems in the history of life.


out most, which we will refer to as the Paleozoic system, the Mesozoic system, and the Cenozoic system. So instead of either continuous change, or erratic change, the growing dominance of motile life occurred through three discrete steps. This indicates life’s inherent direction towards a self-determining character, as freely swimming life became more and more dominant. What’s more, certain boundaries demarcate discrete shifts in the entire ecological system of life. These are not just arbitrary boundaries.

The major transitions from one stable system to the next are marked by mass extinction events! In fact, the Ordovician, Permian-Triassic (P-T), and Cretaceous-Tertiary (K-T) mass extinctions are thought to be the three largest mass extinctions of this entire half-billion-year period.

Examining this entire arc, what do the mass extinctions express from the standpoint of the process in its entirety?

Although they are traditionally seen as purely destructive events, *they are only destructive relative to the fixed system being surpassed*. Whereas any particular ecological framework is fixed, as the species participating within it cannot willfully change their


FIGURE 8



PNAS/Bambach et al., 2002

Proportion of “buffered” to “unbuffered” marine animals over the past 450 million years. An example of a buffered animal is a crab, an unbuffered example is an ancient form of coral.

FIGURE 9



behavior, the system of life, taken as a whole, does move to higher levels of organization.

It is this progress, moving from one system to the next, which is the real principle governing the process. Since any particular species has a fixed ecological existence, as the biosphere moves to a new level, those species that cannot keep up are eliminated. The larger the up-shift, the larger the mass extinction—*extinctions as the shadows of progress*.

This is a subject the Basement has discussed exten-

sively in terms of heuristic conical expressions of our three stages in this process (Figure 7).¹²

Biospheric Energy-Flux Density

Examining the second physiological characteristic, “buffered” vs. “unbuffered” animals, uncovers the exact same set of systems. Again, even though the total biodiversity fluctuates extensively, the *proportions* show that life advanced through three successive systems, as the “buffered” forms of life (more independent from their ambient environment) became increasingly dominant (Figure 8).

One particularly interesting character of buffered organisms, *their higher metabolic rates*, sheds some light on how these system up-shifts have occurred. The significant difference in *metabolic rates* between the two systems is highly compelling, as the different metabolic rates of various species have a clear generalized relationship to Vladimir Vernadsky’s work on the organization of the *biosphere* as a whole, specifically as expressed in his understanding of the “biogenic migration of atoms.”¹³

What we are seeing with the step-wise takeover of the “buffered” animals (with their higher metabolic rates) necessitates jumps in the rate of flux of the biogenic migration of atoms throughout the entire biosphere, a clear expression of the increasing biospheric energy-flux density.¹⁴

This takes us directly to the third physiological characteristic under consideration: *predation* (Figure 9).

As mentioned above, the increase in predation directly expresses up-shifts in biospheric energy flux density. To quote from one study relating to the subject:

“The increase in predation over time indicates that more calories are being spent in the fauna with the passage of time. Because the survival of predators requires an adequate biomass [food web] to support them,

12. A broad presentation of the qualitative shifts between the Paleozoic, Mesozoic, and Cenozoic macro-ecological systems is being prepared in the form of a large table.

13. See V.I. Vernadsky, *The Biosphere* (Complete Annotated Edition), Springer, 1998.

14. See LPAC-TV, “The Ecology of Anti-Entropy” (<http://larouchepac.com/node/19467>).

the increase in the number of predators over time suggests that the biomass of the prey must have increased to support them.¹⁵

There is more that can be said on the significance of predation, but taking this together with the leaps in metabolic rates, we have clear expressions of a metric for the anti-entropic development of life here on Earth, occurring in three successive macro-ecological systems.

The Principle of Survival

Despite the general fluctuations in the total biodiversity over time, the *relative changes* in dominance of the three physiological characteristics, each independently demonstrate our three successive macro-ecological systems. Taking the process in its entirety, life has successfully transitioned from one system to the next, *even though any given species may or may not have been able to continue to exist, given its particular fixed mode of existence.*

Thus, *the irony of the mass extinction.*

These great kills can never be understood outside of the larger context of the principle of the anti-entropic

15. Bambach, "Seafood," op. cit.



Solar Flares, Asteroids, and Why We Need a Trillion People

Natalie Lovegren of the LPAC Basement Team explains why recent Solar activity, and a close encounter with an asteroid, among other developments in Earth's neighborhood, call for a rapid increase in the human population.

<http://www.larouhepac.com/node/20230>

progress of life. The largest mass extinctions on record over the past half billion years demarcate the largest system up-shifts, and the largest increases in biospheric energy-flux density.

That is, until the emergence of mankind. Never before, *in the entire history of billions of years of life*, have we seen a species that can willfully subsume and act upon this entire process. With mankind, that power exists. Mankind has the potential to generate—even within a single human lifetime—the qualities of system up-shifts that took other life-forms millions of years, and necessarily required the elimination of countless species (purely as a consequence of life's own inherent ecological/biological characteristics). We do not do this by changing our biological structure, but through the action of the uniquely willful creative powers of the human mind.

Through the willful action of the human mind, man wields the force of billions of years, the force of shaping entire worlds—and we are even now only beginning to get a glimpse of what a thermonuclear, or even matter-antimatter mankind can be, as a true creator in the universe.

If we wish to keep with rigorous technical terminology, we cannot justifiably use the term "species" to encapsulate these qualities of mankind. Given the potential for what can only be defined as fixed-species-transcending actions, perhaps the term "metaspecies" would be more satisfying to the subject at hand? To be the most precise, we have Lyndon LaRouche's scientific determination of mankind as the *potentially immortal species.*

But this only comes with the willful choice to act. We have hundreds of millions of years of warning, as the inherent directionality of life in this universe guarantees an inescapable fate to any fixed (i.e., "sustainable") mode of life—whether fixed purely for unchangeable biological reasons, or fixed by the immoral choices of action, or inaction.

Thus, *the lesson of the mass extinction*—one to be taken with the utmost seriousness and urgency at the immediate time.

(This article can be viewed online at: <http://larouhepac.com/node/21941>)

Benjamin.Deniston@gmail.com

Obama, Cameron, Netanyahu Push Thermonuclear World War III

by Jeffrey Steinberg

March 20—In the aftermath of back-to-back Washington summits, President Barack Obama, British Prime Minister David Cameron, and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu are all dancing on the edge of thermonuclear war and the potential extinction of the human race. To say anything less would be to lie in the face of the greatest threat to humanity in recorded history.

The Israeli Prime Minister's Washington visit in early March, highlighted by his three-hour Oval Office session with President Obama and speeches by the two leaders at the annual American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) convention, was widely reported in the American mainstream media as a victory for the U.S. President. Obama ostensibly stood his ground and insisted that Israel must cancel any plans for preventive military strikes against Iran's nuclear facilities—at least until the completion of the pending P5+1 (UN Security Council Permanent Five plus Germany) talks and the pending imposition of a Western embargo on Iranian oil exports and access to the international banking system.

Unfortunately for the world, nothing could be further from the truth. According to one senior U.S. intelligence official with direct access to the Obama White House, the President gave Bibi everything but the kitchen sink. Behind closed doors, Obama gave Israel precisely the added military assets needed to carry out

an Israeli attack on Iran, according to the source. These assets, according to an Israeli Ministry of Defense source, include additional mid-air refueling tanker planes, upgraded U.S. bunker-buster bombs to penetrate hardened Iranian nuclear facilities at Fordo and elsewhere, and jamming equipment to penetrate Iran's formidable air-defense systems.

According to the Israeli source, President Obama also agreed to work with Israel to secure access to countries bordering on Iran for SAR (search-and-rescue) teams that would be activated to rescue downed Israeli pilots. According to the source, who traveled with Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak to Washington recently, the United States might even provide Israel with U.S. Special Forces to abet SAR operations. According to a retired U.S. four-star general, who served for decades in the Middle East, Israel already has secret military training teams in Azerbaijan. The general did not rule out Israeli efforts to access Azeri air bases for an Iran attack, which would cut 800 miles off the distance.

The Israeli source also asserted that the United States and Israel are already at war with Iran. He described seamless cyber-warfare collaboration between the two countries, explaining that Barak has told his cyber-war teams that he wants eight hours of quiet—meaning a massive disruption of Iran's power grid during an initial bombing assault.

The senior U.S. intelligence source suggested that

the Israeli report that the U.S. was about to deliver two new Boeing mid-air refueling tankers could be accurate, but that these would be on commercial contract, and not from the Pentagon's arsenal (the U.S. Air Force no longer purchases the Boeing tankers, following a contract scandal several years ago).

Media Leaks

The reports from these confidential sources have been buttressed in recent days by media leaks, reflecting an intense behind-the-scenes policy battle in both the United States and Israel over the existential issue of war versus diplomacy.

On March 15, Aluf Benn, an editor of the Israeli daily newspaper *Ha'aretz*, reported that, since his return from Washington, Prime Minister Netanyahu has been boasting that he received a green light from President Obama for an attack. Drawing the parallel between Israel's 1967 preemptive attack on Egypt, Syria, and Jordan, and its 1981 bombing of Iraq's Osirac nuclear reactor, Benn reported that Obama and Netanyahu agreed to publicly disagree over an Israeli attack, on Iran while secretly reaching accord.

That being the case, Benn wrote, then Netanyahu is hinting that in his Washington visit, he received Obama's tacit approval for an Israeli attack against Iran under the guise of opposition. Obama will speak out against it, but act for it, just as the past U.S. administrations publicly condemned the settlements in the territories, but allowed their expansion. And in this manner Netanyahu summarized the visit: "I presented before my hosts the examples that I just noted before you, and I believe that the first objective that I presented to fortify the recognition of Israel's right to defend itself—I think that objective has been achieved."

Benn concluded: "To use Netanyahu's 'duck' allegory, what looks like a preparation for war, acts like a preparation for war, and quacks like a preparation for war, is a preparation for war, and not just a 'bluff' or a



White House/Pete Souza

During Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu's recent tête-à-tête at the White House with President Obama, Bibi got just about everything he came for, despite Obama's public statements to the contrary.

diversion tactic.' Until his trip to Washington, Netanyahu and his supporters in the media refrained from such explicit wording and made do with hints. But since he's been back, Netanyahu has issued an emergency call-up for himself and the Israeli public."

Several days after the Benn story, *Ma'ariv's* top national security correspondent Ben Caspit reported that, for the first time, Netanyahu had gotten the endorsement of a majority of members of his security cabinet for an attack on Iran. Caspit claimed that, since his return from Washington, Netanyahu has been meeting individually with all 14 members of the security cabinet, and now has the informal endorsement of at least eight members. So far, Netanyahu has not formally convened the security cabinet to seek official authorization, but that could happen at any moment.

In response to the accelerating threat of war, the U.S. military and intelligence establishment, which is nearly unanimous in its opposition to any Israeli preventive strike, fired back through a series of leaked stories.

On March 18, James Risen, the national security correspondent of the *New York Times*, published a front-page story, providing previously undisclosed details of the 2010 U.S. National Intelligence Estimate on Iran's nuclear program. That update of the November 2007 NIE upheld the conclusion that Iran had abandoned pursuit of a nuclear weapon in late 2003, and had not resumed work on weaponization. According to Risen, the completion of the 2010 NIE was delayed when new intelligence, drawn from intercepts of conversations among leading Iranian officials, suggested that Iran might be preparing to resume work on building an actual bomb. After months of in-depth probing and re-evaluations, the 16 agencies that comprise the U.S. intelligence community concluded that Iran had not resumed bomb research.

Risen also reported that the U.S. evaluation, contained in the still-classified NIE, is shared by the Mossad and other Israeli intelligence services. This same message has been delivered, repeatedly, by top U.S. military and intelligence officials in public testimony. Both Gen. Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, have testified before Congress that Iran's leaders have not yet decided to go for a nuclear weapon.

Motivated To Attack

A senior U.S. intelligence official explained, on condition of anonymity, that Israel's leaders are motivated to attack Iran at this point, despite the recognition that there is no threat of an imminent Iranian nuclear weapons breakout. According to the official, the immediate concern for Netanyahu and Barak is Iran's advanced work on ballistic missiles and precision guidance systems. Iran has developed solid-fuel missiles that can reach targets in Israel, with an improved degree of accuracy, carrying conventional explosives. Once Iran has a large enough arsenal of these longer-range missiles, it will have a devastating, albeit conventional, retaliatory capacity to punish Israel for any preventive attack. It is *this* factor, the source argued, that is driving Israel to attack Iran sooner rather than later. When Israeli Defense Minister Barak refers to a closing window of access to select targets in Iran, he is not actually referring to Iran's ability to harden the targets underground or deep within mountains. He is referring to Iran's ability to devastate Israeli population centers with conventional missile strikes.

In recent weeks, several top-rank American military strategists have warned that any Israeli attack on Iran will lead to thermonuclear war. Harlan Ullman, known as the author of the shock-and-awe doctrine adopted by then-Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Gen. Colin Powell, in the 1991 Operation Desert Storm against Iraq, wrote about the imminent danger of thermonuclear war in a highly polemical article, carried by UPI, titled "Dr. Strangelove, Israel and Iran." Earlier, Gen. Barry McCaffrey had also warned that any military strike by Israel against Iran would lead inevitably to nuclear war.



White House/Pete Souza

The slavishly Anglophile Obama, shown here exchanging beer bottles with Prime Minister Cameron, is ready to start World War III, on behalf of his British Imperial masters.

The day after the Risen article was published, the *New York Times* again took the war-avoidance side in another leak, based on a recent classified war-simulation exercise. Pentagon correspondents Mark Mazzetti and Thom Shanker provided a detailed account of a recently concluded two-week war game, *Internal Look*, which began with an Israeli bombing attack on Iranian nuclear facilities. According to the authors, the war game played out a narrative in which the United States found itself pulled into the conflict, after Iranian missiles struck a Navy warship in the Persian Gulf, killing about 200 Americans, according to officials with knowledge of the exercise. The United States then retaliated by carrying out its own strikes on Iranian nuclear facilities. In the end, the war game reinforced for military officials the unpredictable and uncontrollable nature of a strike by Israel, and a counterstrike by Iran.

'British Brains, American Brawn'

While the Obama-Netanyahu summit drew far greater attention and far more speculation about the actual substance, the two-day love-fest between President Obama and British Prime Minister David Cameron may have been far more significant in escalating the drive for global confrontation. While President Obama's personal interactions with Netanyahu have been frictional, the President is a slavish Anglophile, committed to the old Winston Churchill vision that with

British brains and American brawn, we can rule the world. In the current context, the British monarchy is fully deployed through their puppet Obama on a two-track policy. Either Russia and China, the two leading thermonuclear-weapons powers in Eurasia, capitulate to Anglo-American demands for full participation in the bailout of the doomed global financial system, and the de facto imposition of radical population reduction, or the United States and Britain will launch preventive thermonuclear war, knowing full well that Russia and China will retaliate with devastating thermonuclear assaults of their own, wiping out most of humanity.

That is the desperate posture of the British Empire, facing the imminent total disintegration of its global financial system.


It is for this reason that Lyndon LaRouche has repeatedly stated that the only durable war-avoidance option on the table is the removal of President Obama from office by impeachment, or by invoking the 25th Amendment. Anything short of that puts all of humanity in immediate jeopardy.

DOPE, INC.

Is Back In Print!

Dope, Inc., first commissioned by Lyndon LaRouche, and the underground bestseller since 1978, is back in print for the first time since 1992. The 320-page paperback, includes reprints from the third edition, and in-depth studies from *EIR*, analyzing the scope and size of the international illegal drug-trafficking empire known as Dope, Inc., including its latest incarnation in the drug wars being waged out of, and against Russia and Europe today.

*This edition, published by Progressive Independent Media, is currently available in limited numbers, so there is no time to waste in buying yours today. The cost is \$25 per book, with \$4 for shipping and handling. It is available through www.larouchepub.com, and *EIR*, at 1-800-278-3135.*



U.S., U.K., and Allies Escalate Against Syria

by Hussein Askary

March 19—Following the early-March operations carried out by the Syrian Army to remove the armed groups controlling the central parts of the cities of Homs and Idlib, a major shift on the ground and internationally has taken place. While Damascus has reclaimed control over most of the country, including its borders with Lebanon and Turkey, from which arms and militants had been pouring in to support the Syrian insurgents, the hysteria is increasing among the allies of the United States and Britain, especially Saudi Arabia and Turkey, to launch a military offensive against the country.

This Russian and Chinese intervention in the UN Security Council last week generated further hysteria, as they practically removed from the discussion table any talk of regime-change, or of the Syrian President stepping aside. Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov presented a five-point program, including ceasefire on all sides, sending monitors to oversee the ceasefire, starting negotiations between the government and the opposition, supporting a political solution through the mission of former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, and providing unhindered humanitarian aid.

Another aspect of the collapse of the operation to impose regime-change from within Syria, was the fall-out in the Syrian opposition's main group, the Muslim Brotherhood-dominated Syrian National Council (SNC). Three leading members of the SNC (Haitham al-Maleh, Kamal al-Labwani, and Catherine al-Telli) defected on March 14, and Labwani accused the SNC of being "accomplices in the bloodshed in Syria." Al-Maleh even accused the Anglo-French-backed head of the SNC, Burhan Ghalioun, of running the group with dictatorial rule. Even intelligence and military insiders in the U.S. have deemed this group untrustworthy.

While the control of the Western/Saudi-backed militants in key cities in Syria is weakened, al-Qaeda terrorist attacks against both government institutions and civilians continue. On March 16, two car bombs exploded in Damascus, killing 29 and wounding more than a hundred, many of whom were employees in the



While Damascus has reclaimed control over most of the country, arms and militants, crossing the border from Lebanon and Turkey, are pouring in to support the insurgents. Shown: a terrorist bombing in Aleppo, Feb. 11.

aviation intelligence offices. The next day, a car bomb exploded in a residential area in Aleppo, killing three.

These attacks came simultaneously with the shutdown by Saudi Arabia, other Gulf States, and a number of EU countries, of their embassies in Damascus, in a move coordinated between the Saudis and British EU Foreign Affairs Commissioner Catherine Ashton. Turkey, on the other hand, is being pressured by the Saudis and the U.S.-British-French alliance to launch an offensive into Syria to establish a humanitarian zone to allegedly protect Syrian refugees. If allowed to happen, this would trigger a direct military confrontation between the Turkish and Syrian armies, which could be used by the Western alliance to launch a larger military offensive, similar to the one against Libya last year.

An Ominous Russian Response

In the meantime, and more ominously, Russian officials are warning that such Anglo-American interventions, whether against Iran or Syria, could force Russia to intervene, leading to a global conflict. The Russian daily *Ekho Moskvy* reported on March 14 that the Russian General Staff has developed an action plan for the eventuality of strikes against Iran. The daily *Kommersant* reported that Defense Ministry sources warned, “We have worked through our actions for the case of war with Iran. We are mobilization-ready for that eventuality.”

Russia is ready for both the huge number of refugees that might result, as well as the re-ignition of old conflicts, such as that between Azerbaijan and Armenia over

Nagorno-Karabakh. On the same day, *Russia Today* cited Chief of Staff Gen. Nikolai Makarov’s November 2011 address to the Russian Public Chamber, warning that the danger of local armed conflicts along Russia’s borders had grown: “The possibility of local armed conflicts virtually along the entire perimeter of the border has grown dramatically. I cannot rule out, that in certain circumstances, local and regional armed conflicts could grow into a large-scale war, possibly even with nuclear weapons.”

Last week, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Mikhail Bogdanov warned the West that allegations that Syrian President Bashar al-Assad’s

regime is illegitimate are unacceptable, and not likely to foster a peaceful settlement: “In our view, such opinions are counterproductive, as they give a false signal to the opposition that there is no reason to engage in dialogue; that it’s better to expect help from NATO and the West, as was the case in Libya. We believe that this scenario is absolutely inadmissible, and it will have grave consequences for Syrians and the stability in the region.” Bogdanov condemned Saudi Arabia’s decision to shut its embassy in Syria.

Interestingly, while Christian leaders in both Syria and Lebanon have been denouncing the Western support for the Islamist insurgents in Syria, whose actions could lead to religious war throughout the region, the Saudis, who are allies of the U.S. and Europe, are fomenting religious wars through their Salafi-Wahhabi pseudo-religious incitements. The Grand Mufti of Saudi Arabia, Sheikh Abdul-Aziz Al-Asheikh, told Kuwaiti students in a meeting on March 12, that all churches in the Arab Peninsula should be destroyed, because accepting them would mean accepting a religion other than Islam. He also urged his followers to send money and support to the insurgents in Syria, because that is considered to be Jihad (holy war).

The Saudis, who are oppressing their own minorities, and crushing any protests or opposition to the Al-Saud dictatorial and autocratic rule, and are occupying Bahrain to protect the monarch there against demands for political reform, are the most active Anglo-American allies in the regime-change scheme against Syria.

It's Official: Cheminade Is on the Ballot for French Presidential Race

by Karel Vereycken

PARIS, March 19—The French Constitutional Court today announced the official list of candidates who have been validated for the Presidential election on April 22. Ten candidates qualified, including Jacques Cheminade, a long-time friend of Lyndon LaRouche. While 500 signatures of elected officials are required for ballot status, the Council confirmed that Cheminade had 585. The three “major” candidates are incumbent Nicolas Sarkozy, François Hollande, and François Bayrou.

Cheminade's candidacy represents a major strategic opportunity for those political forces determined to return to a world of sovereign nation-states devoted to scientific and technological progress, “A World without Wall Street and the City,” as his campaign book puts it. Known as the candidate who, in his 1995 Presidential campaign, forecast the upcoming financial-economic breakdown crisis, Cheminade is promoting a policy of a global Glass-Steagall, a return to productive credit, and of war avoidance through global economic development.

Cheminade is getting increasing attention from voters who are fed up with the shop-worn stump speeches of the established parties, and also from important institutions and civic associations. While the fellow-travellers of the oligarchy in the media are livid that Cheminade's program is being discussed as widely as it is, and are resorting to desperate slanders, other media are more honest and let him speak, or provide links to his program.

Most galling to Cheminade's enemies is the fact that French election law mandates giving all candidates equal time in the major media, meaning his message will be more prominent than ever. The state also sends out the program of each candidate to all voting households (more than 40 million) the week before the election.

Getting Out the Word

Journal du Dimanche posted an excellent, lengthy interview with Cheminade on March 17, titled “Cheminade: I'm Inspiring the Debate.” Asked if there were not enough discussion already about solutions for the global and European economic crisis, Cheminade replied: “No, because no one is talking about a policy for great works. While Europe is collapsing, the banks in



EIRNS/Julien Lemâtre

Jacques Cheminade at the Constitutional Court on March 8. He filed 585 signatures from elected officials, thereby qualifying for the Presidential ballot.

Frankfurt are running riot. They are putting a stranglehold on Greece. This is a pseudo-Europe, which has to be rebuilt. And nobody is talking about that.”

The interview continues:

Q: Sarkozy wants to reform the Schengen Agreement¹ to confront the flood of immigration. What do you think?

Cheminade: Instead of worrying about migration flows, it would be better to be concerned about financial flows. He promised to do so in Toulon in 2008, but hasn't done anything since. That gives the measure of his character. . . .

Q: You don't want budget austerity?

Cheminade: No, I want to bet on the future, that is, long-term credit. Look at Germany in 1932 and its budget austerity policy, which allowed Hitler to come to power, financed by some American circles. . . . If Europe continues this way, it is going to create monsters. We will have Viktor Orban in Hungary, Marine Le Pen. . . . We are creating the conditions for a conflict.

Interest in Regions Outside Paris

The press in the regions, where much of Cheminade's support is located, is especially interested in covering Cheminade when he visits their locale. In Lille, France3 TV showed a Cheminade team of organizers in a central plaza of this formerly industrial city of the north. When a journalist asked why Cheminade is not only for “a world without Wall Street and the City [of London],” but also a fervent proponent of space exploration and colonization, his spokesman replied that this is precisely the type of long-term project, oriented toward the future, that France now needs. It would create many highly skilled jobs in R&D and high-tech industry, which makes much more sense than bringing back “the Barbie dolls that are



EIRNS/Julien Lemâtre

Organizers for Cheminade in Paris, Nov. 12, 2011. The sign reads, “Bankruptcy for the City [of London] and Wall Street to save the municipalities.”

now produced in China,” as some other candidates are proposing.

Ouest France covered Cheminade's visit to the nuclear-reprocessing plant in La Hague. The company that owns it, Areva, had initially agreed to allow him to address its workers as they entered the cafeteria, which is outside the plant. But they did an about-face and forbade him to do so. Cheminade denounced Areva for its despicable policy of secrecy.

Later in the day, the candidate spoke at a an event organized by the Socialist mayor of Flamanville, who signed for Cheminade, as the press reported. In addition to the existing nuclear power plant at Flamanville, construction is underway for a new generation European Pressurized Reactor. The mayor invited all candidates to speak on the subject of nuclear energy, and the regional TV network France3-Basse Normandie interviewed Cheminade.

At a debate with candidates' spokesmen on agriculture at the think-tank Cevipof, linked to the Sciences Po university in Paris, while Cheminade was not officially invited, a Cheminade spokesman presented the candidate's policy to overcome the world food crisis by scrapping the green paradigm.

Attack Dogs of the Oligarchy

The same oligarchical forces that tried to destroy Cheminade juridically and financially, during and

1. The agreement allows visa-free movement throughout the EU countries.

after his 1995 Presidential campaign, are unleashing their media attack dogs again this time around, to try to prevent the candidate from gaining more traction. Leading the pack are media closest to the City of London, and the London *Independent* itself already felt compelled to take note of Cheminade's campaign.

In *Le Parisien* on March 17, Brice Teinturier, the director general of the polling agency Ipsos, grumbles that "the system has a real defect which results in the candidacy of Cheminade and the absence of a de Villepin. It is somewhat strange." The xenophobic candidate Marine Le Pen opined that it was a shame that Cheminade got the signatures, while former prime minister Dominique de Villepin failed to do so. Le Pen is the daughter and political heir of the infamous right-wing bigot Jean-Marie Le Pen.

But the brutal attacks on Cheminade are often backfiring, since many citizens, increasingly mistreated by the oppressiveness of the current system, identify with Cheminade and the treatment he gets.

Political commentator Bruno-Roger Petit, in his *Nouvel Observateur* blog, took exception to the snarling conduct of France Inter's Pascale Clark in an interview she conducted with Cheminade. "The method employed by Pascale Clark against Cheminade is dreadful," Petit wrote. "Each question comes with an implicit subtext aimed at the cortex of the listener. Examples: 'Did 9/11 really happen?' 'Was the death of bin Laden a montage?' 'Is Obama Hitler?' 'Your technique to get signatures, by offering mayors what they want to hear. Aren't you lying?' 'Don't you still owe money to the French state?...' Illustrating the famous maxim: The questions count more than the answers."

More effluent from the backed-up sewer of reworked lies about LaRouche and Cheminade was dumped into an article on March 17 in *Nouvel Observateur's* Rue89 blog by Julien Giry, a self-proclaimed conspiracy theory specialist at the University of Rennes. Giry's conclusion: "By the worldview he promotes and his political friendships, Jacques Cheminade is in no way a candidate like the others. He is, incontestably, in the 2012 French Presidential elections, the candidate of Lyndon LaRouche." Presenting Cheminade as a cultist or an agent of a foreign power trying to meddle in national politics is a deliberate strategy to create a context in which Cheminade's state-supplied campaign financing (to which all candi-

dates are entitled) can be called into question and eventually taken away.

The absurdity to which the opposition is resorting was illustrated by the daily *Le Figaro* on March 17 in which it devoted its entire second page to a candidate profile, including a large photo, to asserting he was insignificant.

But even as these attack dogs are letting loose their latest farts, Cheminade is receiving invitations to debates with layers of industry, military, media, think-tanks, and everyone in France who is still willing to think about the future. With the Cheminade campaign, reality in France now finally has the chance to "go primetime."

Documentation

A World Without the City or Wall Street

Here is the text of French Presidential candidate Jacques Cheminade's campaign platform. It has been translated into English.

Two-thirds of Frenchmen find this Presidential campaign dismaying. They are right. In response to the human drama we are living through, the candidates are merely pulling out their calculating machines, repeating slogans and uttering preconceived opinions as if they were playing in a sandbox.

I intervene therefore to attempt to introduce a reality principle, an inspiration and a project. Priority must be given once again to social justice and to labor, but it is impossible to do so in the context of the present financial and monetary system. It must therefore be changed. Peace must be re-established, against the risk of war lurking from the greater Middle East; but it is impossible to do so without great projects for mutual development. These must therefore be launched.

France cannot do those two things on its own, but she can become a catalyst for the success of this experiment. My objective is also to catalyze the engagement of political forces that can lead our country to play this role. This is the adventure of a new Resistance, this time against the world of finance, and of a new Renais-

sance, this time against a moneyed elite, which is a direct emanation of the financial globalization which degrades human beings.

Therefore, let us pick up the real challenges ahead of us and block out distractions.

Stop the Social Devastation

We will never be able to stop the ongoing social devastation if we accept the obsession of a balanced budget being promised by Mr. [François] Bayrou for 2015, by Mr. [Nicolas] Sarkozy for 2016, by [François] Hollande for 2017.

What that balance masks, is the fact that all [EU] States have agreed to reimburse the illegitimate gambling debts of the large banks by imposing austerity on the people. Under those conditions, the Greek catastrophe will be nothing but the first domino of a generalized economic collapse, in Europe and in the world.

Quite the contrary, the financial bull must be taken by the horns: Illegitimate debt must be eliminated so that priority goes to skilled human labor and to high technologies.

1. Banks must be cut in two in order to break open the financial lock, just as was done at the Liberation [of France after World War II].

We must dry up the resources of the financial oligarchy, and it must be rendered harmless through the separation of banks managing credit and deposits on the one hand, and investment banks on the other. Today in France, they are mixed. In order to separate those that offer credit to companies and households from those that gamble in the markets, we must convene a parliamentary commission of investigation, on the model of the U.S. Pecora Commission of 1933, endowed with powers to investigate and subpoena. The aim is first to let the people know what is happening; then to protect the useful functions of credit and deposits. Those who reject this approach are those who despise the people and want to continue looting them.

2. Declare the investment banks bankrupt that bet and lost.

We must be able to tell investment bankers: “We will not bail you out anymore.”

We’re stopping the little game at the European Central Bank. You have lost; you must therefore pay your own gambling debts and be declared bankrupt if you are not capable of doing so. Let’s stop feeding the financial corpse to the detriment of the living standards of people and of the real growth of the economies!

At the same time, the means to speculate in the markets must be eliminated as much as possible:

- The European Union’s Directive for the MFI (Markets in Financial Instruments), which allows financial companies to speculate without restraint and with the greatest opacity, on “alternative platforms,” must be abrogated.

- Forbid gambling with financial titles on what we eat, what we breathe (CO₂ emission permits), and on life itself.

- Opt out of the all-day trading system which allows insiders to distort the markets and to despoil workers and producers.

This is the minimum to clean up the Augean stables, polluted by the gamblers.

3. Create a National Bank to invest in public infrastructure, schools, hospitals, laboratories, and small and medium-sized entrepreneurial companies.

That clean-up will not be sufficient to create the means for an economic restart. The only fuel for that can be productive public credit organized around a national bank. Not an “independent” central bank—i.e., one managed by financiers—but a system under the control of the people and their elected officials, which allows the stimulation of the economy through the emission of long-term and very low-interest-rate credit.

To pretend that one can ensure social justice and finance schools, hospitals, laboratories and medium and small companies without such a system of national banking and public credit is tantamount to deceiving the electors—i.e., ourselves.

With it, quite the contrary, we will be able to finance great projects that can create skilled jobs (energy, water, rapid transport, R&D).

Then yes, we will be able to finance the training of teachers before they plunge into their tasks, to increase their wages like elsewhere in Europe, to give as much to the universities as we give to the “great schools” [engineering and high-level administration].

Then yes, we will be able to finance professional training for those who need it. Then yes, we will be able to offer to every youth looking for a job an allowance corresponding to a rise in the minimum assistance revenue (RSA) to EU600, plus an allowance for studies which really merits that name. Then yes, we will be able to save the institution of labor medicine and public hospitals, creating a situation where being



Cheminade's website shows him on the campaign trail, with a video clip from a TV interview.

sick is no longer a luxury. Then yes, we will be able to increase research to more than 3% of GDP.


Then yes, we will be able to grant equal access to all for justice and for politics, by multiplying juridical aid by four and by offering aid for the financing of political parties to the rich and to the poor, and not reserving the advantage of tax deductions to the 50% wealthier Frenchmen who pay income tax.

Enough of a France where “it’s the galley for the youth and misery for the elderly”; enough of a France where, for the majority, work is misery!

Guarantee World Peace Through Great Projects

Our domestic and international policies have to move hand in hand. To fight to succeed will occupy more than half the time of the future President, even though this is hardly being raised in this campaign. For me, quite the contrary, our country must become an example for the rest of Europe and the world. This is the very foundation of the left-wing Gaullism which I’m engaged in.

This is why, after having enacted the separation between deposit and credit banks, and investment banks,



Cheminade's programmatic book for his election campaign: “A world without the City or Wall Street: A great project for the future.”

that money with interest, from private actors who thereby earn a profit to our detriment.

At home, we must abrogate the laws of Aug. 4, 1993, and May 12, 1998, which forbid, *de facto* and *de*

2. Gen. Charles de Gaulle’s term, as opposed to a supranational conception of Europe—ed.

at home, I would immediately go to Brussels, Washington, Moscow, and Beijing to urgently assemble a true world consultation forum to create the basis for peace, social justice, and mutual development.

4. Build a Europe of the Fatherlands² to fight financial feudalism.

I will start with Europe, brutally telling our partners that we have gone astray.

Either we commit ourselves to the perspective that I just outlined—i.e., rebuilding, through great projects, the conditions

for a common future of our fatherlands—or we can no longer live together; because the present logic of competition toward the lowest wages leads us to mutually assured destruction.

Europe must no longer be the Trojan Horse of financial globalization, of the City [of London] and Wall Street, but a locomotive for world growth.

Is that still possible? Yes, if we together immediately abrogate Article 123 of the Treaty of Functioning of the European Union (TFUE), which forbids central banks to lend money to States without interest or at a lower rate, and forces them to borrow

jure, the emission of public credit. To start anew, Europe must break that lock.

If it does not do so, France must immediately return to the franc for its domestic transactions, while maintaining a euro common currency for the realization of great European projects. Is that blackmail? No, it's the challenge for a recovery.

5. Give ourselves the means to populate the world, with the aid of nuclear physics.

We must make of Europe, of Eurasia, of the entire world, a great creator of construction sites, of skilled jobs: The economy is not earning money by buying cheap and selling dear, but creating the best conditions possible for human creativity and for harnessing nature.

It is here that I break totally with the environmentalist theses, those of the NPA [New Anticapitalist Party] and of Mr. [Jean-Luc] Melenchon, because there is no solution that leads us to the past. Peace and the increase of world population cannot be ensured except through a platform of great projects at the international level. The forms of production of energy and technologies of the highest density, per capita, per surface unit and material utilized, must be the foundation of this development, which means today using all the resources of nuclear physics. It's not a matter of simple repetition of the same technologies, but of incorporating constantly new ones, until one day we will master [controlled] thermonuclear fusion and matter/anti-matter reactions.

It is thus and only thus that a dynamic of improvement of productive labor will be created. Without nuclear power, physical anti-growth would have to be accepted, which would lead fatally to war and to the depopulation of a world without resources.

6. Take up the challenge of the development of Africa and space exploration.

It is those human discoveries that will transform or transmute things that today are nothing but waste or useless objects, into the resources of tomorrow, which will allow us to open the doors of development to Africa and to space exploration. As the Glorious Thirty [post-war years, 1945-75] of the past century proved, social justice and development of science must work hand in hand. To do so, we should not extrapolate from the past to deduce our immediate experiences, but see and act with the eyes and the spirit of the future.

Because if we don't see far off, we will remain near-sighted, and if we stay in the cradle, we cannot become adults. Without African development, for instance, by replenishing Lake Chad, we will leave that part of the world without a lung. Without space, we will not see beyond the end of our proverbial terrestrial nose—which is the destiny of those who laugh at this part of my program, without seeing that China and Russia are going into those areas, where the immediate comfort and intellectual laziness [of my opponents] will never lead them.

This is thus why I am waging this fight; this is the real challenge in a Presidential election. Not “how much does it cost?” or “how are we going to bail out the large banks?” but how we can build together the world of tomorrow, for which France must be one of the main catalysts? A vote for those ideas will uplift the stakes to the level required by our time. I call that a “useful vote,” a real one.

There is in our France, on vital matters, an inertia of thought, a somnolence of the mind, which exposes us to all surprises until the day when those luminous awakenings occur that happily come to save our country, even though between them are intervals of time which are too long.

—From Jean Jaurès, “*Brain Failure*”

Here we are, facing one of those moments where history, as Jaurès describes it, offers us the chance for one of those luminous awakenings. We have no right to let it go by.

The real debt is not the one due to speculators and predators. It is the debt we owe to past generations and to future generations.

To hand on the torch, we must lead a double war—economic and cultural—at home, as well as on a world scale. We can win it, if we engage in this fight everywhere: at work, at the ballot box, and in the domain of the imagination.

We must never accept that human life becomes a matter of accounting. It is defined by the creative imagination which shakes off pre-conceived opinions and prompts the emergence of a society of patriots and world citizens. France can and must set the example. I will fight for her to be that. It is not a utopia; a utopia means to continue what we are doing, because that leads us straight into the wall.

Afghan, Central Asian Development on Agenda

by Rachel Douglas

March 16—Victor Ivanov, head of Russia's Federal Narcotics Control Service, and a long-time associate of Prime Minister and President-elect Vladimir Putin, has proposed two new initiatives to promote massive economic development of Afghanistan and the former Soviet Central Asian republics. In the broader one of the two interrelated measures, Ivanov told the UN Commission on Narcotics, meeting in Vienna March 12, that the time has come to dump neoliberal economics altogether, since globalized finance is the real market for the dope trade. Thus, he reiterated the call he made in Washington last November to get rid of the drug-addicted global bubble economy, stressing this time that he has the backing of Putin on this perspective.

On March 7, the daily *Kommersant* reported that Putin has instructed the Russian Foreign Ministry, Finance Ministry, and Economics Ministry to study proposals submitted by Ivanov in January, and to state their opinions by April 10. Ivanov, according to *Kommersant* (which did not state its sources), has proposed "to create a Russian Corporation for Cooperation with the Countries of Central Asia." He reportedly wants Russia to allocate 2 billion rubles (about \$70 million) to support the undertaking. It would aim to acquire shares in Central Asian hydroelectric power plants; promote the poultry industry; and develop "high-tech" assembly plants in Central Asia, competing with China.

Ivanov reportedly envisions the new firm as a "development corporation," similar to the North Caucasus Development Corporation, which is a subsidiary of VEB bank. It would operate through public-private partnerships (PPPs) to promote development in the region "to protect Russian national interests."

Kommersant wrote that Ivanov has the support of Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov for this idea. His memoranda reportedly list a slew of Russian state corporations which should help set the new one up, including Rosneft, RusHydro, VTB, Gazprom, UES, Russian



UN/Evan Schneider

Russia's anti-drug chief Victor Ivanov proposed that Russia allocate \$70 million for economic development of Central Asia, while condemning the "humanitarian narco-catastrophe" that has overwhelmed the region.

Railways, VEB, Sberbank, and Rosatom, as well as the private Alfa Group (banking) and Sistema (IT). Foreign partners from Central Asia could be involved. One of the aims would be to get control over two hydroelectric dams, the Kambaratinsk in Kyrgyzstan, and the Rogun in Tajikistan.

The draft includes a water-energy-food program for the region, with restoration of Soviet-era energy supply lines, construction of a Central Asian nuclear power plant, and a South Siberia-Fergana Valley water pipeline, originating in Tobol. Another aspect would be a "protein security" program, involving poultry.

The Stunning Scope of the Drug Economy

In his speech to the UN Commission, titled "On approaches to a comprehensive and balanced anti-narcotics policy based on infrastructure development in the context of the challenge of eliminating the planetary center of narcotics production in Afghanistan," Ivanov situated the Russian proposal in light of "NATO's planned withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan," which he said would "create a fundamentally new and extraordinary situation" there by 2014. He then outlined the stunning scope of the drug economy in Afghanistan, with Afghan heroin having killed 1 million people in the past decade, in a "humanitarian narco-catastrophe" afflicting Afghanistan itself, and all Eurasia.

FIGURE 1



Victor Ivanov

“An extraordinary situation requires extraordinary measures,” said Ivanov, “to be implemented with full responsibility by the international community in accordance with the Charter, the law and the spirit of the United Nations.” He cited existing international commitments to an anti-drug policy. One of them is “the now classic method of alternative development, which is an important component of the anti-drug fight in the UN system.” Too often, however, this is implemented as merely an afterthought, and goes no farther than crop substitution.

An example is American and NATO soldiers handing out bags of wheat in exchange for promises from farmers to stop growing poppy. The Afghan peasants take the wheat, and continue growing their lucrative poppy crop. This is a travesty of “alternative development.” The November 2012 International Conference on Alternative Development, to be held in Lima, needs to be a watershed, he said.

“Full-fledged alternative development is what Afghanistan needs most of all today,” Ivanov continued, “What does this mean in practice? It means organizing the industrialization and electrification of long-suffering Afghanistan, so that new technologies and infrastructure become the main source and locomotive of public wealth creation. I am convinced that the way to solve the problem of drug production is precisely to organize a socioeconomic upsurge through creating next-genera-

tion infrastructure, capable of providing access to a modern world-level quality of life for the majority of the population of the countries involved. It is the construction of a new generation of infrastructure, not for limited access, but for general use, that provides a substantial solution to the planetary challenge of drug production.

“Essentially, the world today faces the necessity of abandoning sick neoliberal economics, which breeds inequality and makes the Earth a narcotics zone, and of shifting to a new socioeconomic development model, which would realize the UN-recognized right to development and social progress. The viewpoint I have stated here coincides with the position of Prime Minister, now the President-elect of Russia, Vladimir Putin.”

To illustrate the point, Ivanov displayed his graphic of the financial bubble crushing the real economy (**Figure 1**), which is simultaneously milked for criminal drug money flows. This was the illustration he introduced in his November Washington speech, in which he invoked “the logic of Glass-Steagall,” as what the world should follow.


The Global Economy: Addicted to Drug Money

Returning to this polemic, Ivanov said, “I would like briefly to show how the situation in Afghanistan today is absolutely a consequence of the global economy, which has a critical need for any money it can get, including dirty drug money, to cover its gigantic liquidity deficit. The [diagram] shows that cultivation of the drug economy is a mandatory condition for the very existence of the current global economy. That means that by developing Afghanistan, we work for the benefit of the whole world.”

Ivanov then proposed five points to concretize his earlier Rainbow-2 anti-drug plan for Afghanistan:

- an international operations staff to assist Afghanistan in achieving the goals of industrialization and elimination of narcotics production;
- an international ad hoc commission or agency, something like an “Afghanistan Development Corporation,” to function as an intergovernmental operator for these tasks;
- “Elaboration of development projects for Afghanistan. In particular, transit pipeline projects should be

FIGURE 2



Institute of Demography, Migration, and Regional Development, Moscow

stepped up. Intensifying the geo-economics of pipelines will serve as a powerful incentive for integrating the region and pushing drug production out of Afghanistan’s economic life. Russia is prepared to participate in a product to build the Turkmenistan—Afghanistan—Pakistan—India (TAPI) gas pipeline, as well as to support the Iran—Pakistan—India (IPI) one, insofar as this will make it possible to uplift the economy of provinces where Baluchis live. I would like to note that Russia in the recent period has developed good relations with countries in the region, such as serious progress in anti-drug cooperation with Pakistan and Iran, and creation of the anti-drug quarter with Pakistan, Tajikistan, and Afghanistan”;

- an ad hoc group of experts to analyze the planetary impact of drug production on the global economy;
- an interactive map showing progress in the elimination of drug production in Afghanistan, in tandem with the country’s industrialization and electrification.

Several Russian press commentaries on the two Ivanov plans noted their similarity to the “New Central East” economic development program, published by

the Institute for Demography, Migration, and Regional Development (IDMRD) in 2009, and quoted by Ivanov in his first anti-drug proposals for Afghanistan (see *EIR*, Feb. 27, 2009 for excerpts). The full pamphlet, titled “The Path to Peace and Concord in Afghanistan Will Be Determined by the Position Russia Takes,” is available in English,¹ and includes a map of the New Central East development zone concept (**Figure 2**), extending from the Persian Gulf up through Iran, Afghanistan, and Central Asia, and including the important Siberian centers of science and industry, Novosibirsk and Tomsk.

The online publication Nakanune.ru backed up its report of the *Kommersant* story March 7 by interviewing Yuri Krupnov, head of the IDMRD. He called the twin proposals “the only realistic idea for seriously stopping drug trafficking out of Afghanistan. Without a radical uplifting of the economy in Central Asia, it will be impossible to break this planetary center of narcotics production.” At the same time, he added, “creating a system of this type will be the first step in providing a firm economic and ideological basis for the Eurasian Union.”

Among other things, the proposal calls for Russian participation in creation of a new university for 50,000 students in Central Asia. Asked about the geopolitical impact of the plan, Krupnov said, “This will be a radical transformation of the entire geometry of today’s world politics. As I understand it, Vladimir Putin, who has been elected with an overwhelming majority, wants in this way to prepare a tool for implementing the objectives of building the Eurasian Union, i.e., the construction on the ruins of the USSR of a new civilizational unit, while preserving the sovereignty of the nations involved.”

Krupnov emphasized the inclusion of Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, and Turkey in the development plans, noting that, on a recent trip to Iran, he had met business circles who “are offering dozens of simply stunningly beneficial projects for Russia.” This region has been too much of a “blind spot” for Russian corporations and diplomacy, he said, but in the context of the global financial crisis, Russia should not miss the boat.

1. Available at http://afghan.idmrr.ru/afghan.idmrr.ru_eng.pdf

West-Based NGOs Stall India's Nuclear Program; But, at Whose Behest?

by Ramtanu Maitra

After sleeping through a six-month siege of the Koodankulam Nuclear Power Plant worksite by protesters, India's Prime Minister Manmohan Singh woke up on Feb. 24 to tell the U.S.-based *Science* magazine in an interview: "The atomic energy program has got into problems because these NGOs [non-governmental organizations], mostly I think based in the United States, don't appreciate the need for our country to increase the energy supply."

What the Indian premier was referring to is the foreign NGOs' opposition to the commissioning of the almost-completed 1,000 MW power plant, KNPP-I, which should have been connected to the grid months ago. The siege began in August 2011, and, as a result, construction work has been halted on two large nuclear power plants—KNPP-I and KNPP-II. KNPP-II is another 1,000 MW plant, which is scheduled to go on-line this year. The ongoing siege, even if it is lifted forthwith, will certainly delay the commissioning process.

There is no question that lack of assertiveness by New Delhi is a major reason that this NGO-directed siege continues, but the silent support lent by J. Jayalalithaa, the chief minister of the state of Tamil Nadu where the plant is located, has provided a boost to the protestors. Reelected in May 2011, Jayalalithaa did nothing and, in fact, had issued a statement that endorsed the suspension of operations at Koodankulam "until people's concerns had been allayed."

On March 17, India's

Shipping Minister G.K. Vasan issued an appeal to the chief minister demanding the state deal with the protestors with an "iron hand," and help New Delhi commission the much-awaited project. On March 19, Jayalalithaa said that work to make the plant operational should resume immediately. She cited a report submitted last month by an expert committee appointed by the state, which gave the project the green light. The Tamil Nadu government announced allocation of 5 billion rupees (Rs) to the locals, who are mostly members of a large fishing community, to set up, among other things, cold storage for the fish catch, to construct housing and roads, and to fund repair of mechanized fishing boats.

The Anti-Russia Movement

Following Prime Minister Singh's allegations, the U.S. Chargé d' Affaires in India, A. Peter Burleigh, told



IAEA/Petr Pavlicek

India's Koodankulam Nuclear Power Plant is the target of an anti-nuclear campaign run by foreign NGOs, who are determined to shut down the Russian-built reactors, and deprive the Indian people of the electric power they so desperately need.

FIGURE 1

Site of the Koodankulam nuclear plant, in Tamil Nadu (shaded area), India



the local media that the U.S. will have to find out the “facts” before commenting on Singh’s remarks. Those “facts” remain to be found out.

On the other hand, Russia’s Ambassador to India, Alexander M. Kadakin, upon hearing the Prime Minister’s statement, issued a public comment saying, “We have been suspecting this all along. I was open to even saying this because it was very strange that six months after the Fukushima tragedy, all of a sudden, those protestors raised their voices. They were sleeping for six months, and all of a sudden they raise their voices against the most secure and the world’s best [nuclear power] station.”

Both these Koodankulam reactors are Russian reactors (VVER-1000 model). Two more Russian-supplied reactors (VVER-1200) are scheduled to be installed at the same site. Under an inter-government agreement signed in December 2008, Russia is to supply to India four additional third-generation VVER-1200 reactors for the same site, and has arranged to supply India with a dozen more reactors each of 1,000 MW, or larger, power capacity.

Meanwhile, the delay in commissioning the KNPP-I

has seriously affected the local economy. According to S.A. Bharadwaj, the technical director of the Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd (NPCIL), a state-owned builder of the plant, the delay has raised the overall cost of the project by Rs10 billion (about \$425 million). But, that is only the direct cost. Considering the fact that Tamil Nadu is 5,000 MW short of its energy requirements, the cost of not getting the reactor on-line has had a much broader effect on the commerce and industry of that state. If KNPP-I had gone on-line on time, it would have generated a significant amount of wealth by now, and would have provided employment to thousands.

Indian Home Minister P. Chidambaram has informed the public that New Delhi has cancelled the operating licenses of four Tamil Nadu-based NGOs allegedly involved in the agitation against the nuclear power project, and the Ministry has put a large number of NGOs under its watch. A German protestor has been deported. Meanwhile, India’s nuclear program has been virtually put on hold, while most of the country continues to incur power shortages, and thousands of villages continue with no power at all.

Both these plants had been under construction for more than four years, and the locals never made any complaints, but months after the earthquake/tsunami in Japan that debilitated a number of reactors in Fukushima, organized protestors moved into Tamil Nadu, backed by the foreign-funded NGOs, harping on the ostensible lack of safety of the plant.

Burleigh’s reaction to Manmohan Singh’s statement was not altogether surprising. At the site and around it, anti-Russia posters appeared soon after the siege began. Back in November, Indian analyst Radha Rajan gave a detailed report in an article on why the siege had occurred and who had organized it. Her report opens a can of worms that had long been eating into the vitals of India.

Rajan pointed out then that the Minister of State in the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO), V. Narayanaswamy, the point-person coordinating talks among all parties—state government, central government, and the villages around Koodankulam—had said at a public meeting in Chennai, that those foreign anti-nuclear intruder-activists, stirring up trouble at the nuclear site, were all from America, Finland, France, Australia and Germany, among other places. What Narayanaswamy did not say—wittingly, or unwittingly,



The radical environmentalist group Greenpeace is one of many Western NGOs which are organizing the campaign to close the Koodankulam plant. This photo appears with a Greenpeace-sponsored petition on the Internet.

tingly—was that the protestors were all from countries of the Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) member-nations.

What does that imply? Rajan, in her article, “Koodankulam stalled again: Sinister geopolitics,” dated Nov. 29, 2011, made that amply clear.

She said: “Cutting through the maze of information and disinformation, the real issues surrounding the Koodankulam nuclear power project are:

- “America’s desperation to halt the project for geopolitical reasons;
- “India is in a partnership with Russia to develop the Koodankulam site (several placards at the protest gathering were anti-Russia, and not anti-nuclear power);
- “If not stopped now Koodankulam may emerge as one of India’s largest nuclear plants with the capacity to generate 9,200 MW or 9.2 GW of power;
- “India has already closed the fuel cycle at Kalpak-kam [a major nuclear power research and development center—ed.] and in the near future, may yet render the NSG mafia irrelevant to national requirement for reactors and reactor fuel;
- “If India tides over the current deficit of overall national power requirement through short-term and interim arrangements by taking the less travelled light water, enriched uranium road, while simultaneously

pursuing its indigenous nuclear program via the heavy water, plutonium and thorium, fast-breeder path, the NSG may become almost certainly irrelevant to India’s nuclear program, civilian or military;

- “Therefore, lure India into the Indo-US nuclear deal to cut ice with the NSG mafia, lure India away from her purely indigenous, wholly self-reliant nuclear program with the promise of short-term benefits of uninterrupted supply of enriched uranium; promises which can and will be broken going by President Obama’s letter to the US Congress seeking approval for the Indo-US Nuclear deal where the American President stated that American assurances of fuel supply to India are not legally binding (meaning when, not if, America reneges on its contract to supply India with reactor fuel, India will have no case or avenues for redress);

- “The idea behind leading India down the proverbial garden path to make this prohibitively expensive detour is to delay progress on the fast breeder reactor (FBR) front;

- “Will buy America and other members of the NSG time to create and instigate a violent anti-nuclear front in the local villages around Koodankulam; the PIL [Public Interest Litigation—ed.] filed by the anti-nuclear mafia in the Supreme Court calling for a total halt to India’s civil nuclear program, which will also halt all work on the fast-breeder front, thus perfectly serves the American agenda;

- “Senior officials from Koodankulam (Station Director, Site Director and Chief Engineer) indicated as much during the course of a press meet in Chennai last month [that is, October 2011—ed.] when they made a passing reference to significant dislocation (perhaps permanently) of Russian and Ukrainian scientists, engineers and other personnel working on the site leading to cost overruns and further delay in commissioning of the reactors.”

Rajan points out another reason why the United States would like to scuttle the Russia-supplied nuclear power plants in India: “Currently, America is nowhere in the picture—either as builder of reactors or as fuel supplier from the enriched uranium NSG cartel. The last minute, stage-managed protests at Koodankulam are therefore only last-ditch attempts by the Bretton Woods Bandits to coerce the Indian government to give them a share in the Indian nuclear pie on their terms.

“America wants India to amend/dilute/bend/circumvent/ the Civilian Liability for Nuclear Damage Act 2010; altering a comma or a full-stop in effect nullifies the Act and Dr. Manmohan Singh stated as much to US President Obama in Bali in November 2011 when they met on the sidelines of the India-ASEAN and East Asia Summits.

“The Prime Minister made clear to the American President that any changes to the Act will have to be done within the defined parameters of the Act as passed by Parliament, and that the government had no power to amend it without parliament sanction.”

India’s Civilian Liability for Nuclear Damage Act 2010 has remained intact. In the event of an accident involving nuclear reactors, because of faulty design, faulty technology, or any other cause, the Indian Parliament sagaciously refused to cap the extent of liability that will be borne by foreign companies selling nuclear reactors and associated technology to India, Rajan pointed out.

The Russian Reaction

In addition to the Russian ambassador, who had made clear from day one that the objective of the protestors was to prevent strengthening of the Russia-Indian nuclear cooperation, there are others in Russia who have made the same point. For instance, Vanetsov Georgy in his article, “Kudankulam: Price of delay,” in *Voice of Russia* on March 12, 2012, said: “I would like to point out that given the absence of significant deposits of oil and gas in India, in the near future there are no alternatives to nuclear energy in that country. Moreover, India is one of those countries that are beginning a massive development of nuclear energy production and that possess a significant technological, scientific and human potential in this area. That is why those considerations that the local population in Kudankulam has are primarily the result of inadequate work of nuclear energy representatives with the local population who let the people be misled.

“But is this the only cause? The market size of the nuclear energy generation in India is estimated at 150 billion USD. Almost all countries with nuclear technology participate in the competition over this market. An acute fight is taking place. Only Russia has achieved concrete results: two units have been built and are ready for launch at the Kudankulam nuclear power plant. Could that be the reason why the West has transferred 7 million USD to the NGOs that were the loudest in pro-

testing the nuclear energy generation?”

With the cat out of the bag, Washington went into its familiar damage-control mode. Burleigh issued a statement saying: “The government of [the] U.S. has certainly no objection with regard to nuclear programs. [The] U.S. is also involved in potential participation in the civilian nuclear program. The Indo-U.S. relationship is growing in every sense at all levels. [Our] relationship has been cordial. We want American companies to be here.”

NGOs: Foot-Soldiers of Colonial Forces

On Sept. 20, 2011, R. Christopher Rajkumar, Executive Secretary, Commission on Justice, Peace and Creation, National Council of Churches in India, issued a call: “It is a very crucial time. Therefore, I kindly request you to please go there [Koodankulam] and register your solidarity with your colleagues. Secondly, please take a printout of the attached letter and send it to the Chief Minister and Prime Minister today yourself. Let us not waste a minute in this regard.” Subsequently, Europe Solidaire Sans Frontières, in its November 2011 report, “India: On the protest movement against Kudankulam Nuclear Power Plant,” issued a collage of articles, including Rajkumar’s appeal, urging New Delhi to cancel the plant.

What Rajkumar represents has little to do with religion. The National Council of Churches (NCC), with its international ties, has long been an instrument of the British liberal-leftist faction in the West. Over the years, under the pretext of being a religious organization, it has pushed its human rights, environment-protection, and rights of indigenous people campaigns for the colonial forces in order to stop development activities. The NCC is virulently anti-science and anti-development.

At the same time, it must be noted that in India, as in many other developing countries where the colonial forces had their regimes, some missionaries, associated with regular churches, have worked with the NCC and various Western NGOs. Once the British Raj got its grip on India in the 18th Century, some Christian missionaries were deployed by the Empire as tools in pursuit of a silent conquest. After the Raj left, its legacy continued under new handlers, and its assets were subsequently handed over to other Western powers that wanted India to remain underdeveloped and vulnerable to constant instability.

During the Cold War days, India’s proximity to the

Soviet Union—the “godless Communists”—was a convenient excuse for these forces to subvert its security. India’s northeast, bordering China, Bangladesh, and Myanmar, already Christianized under the British Raj, became victim to anti-India movements, funded and morally supported from outside, particularly Britain.

In the post-Cold War days, some of these missionaries began receiving funds from foreign NGOs and got involved in creating “mass movements” on the NGOs’ behalf, opposing development projects, particularly dams in northeast India. Now, these NGOs, active in the West and procuring part of their funding from their respective governments, are financially supporting their Indian collaborators to carry out actions, such as the one at Koodankulam, under the pretext of protection of human rights, environmentalism, and the rights of indigenous people.

The evidence of such anti-development activities has been known to New Delhi for decades, but India, for a long time under “soft” leadership, was unwilling to call a spade a spade, lest it would antagonize the West, the so-called engine of growth and prosperity. New Delhi keeps most of the NGOs’ activities hidden from public eyes, while jeopardizing the nation’s security.

However, there were occasions when some of the government’s findings were made public. For instance, minutes of a meeting held on Sept. 29, 1999, under the chairmanship of the then-Joint Secretary, Northeast (NE), is one such occasion. It said that the authorities had received reports which “indicated continued Western interest in the North-Eastern region of the country and possibility of proliferating activities of Dutch NGOs/individuals in the region. The Joint Secretary suggested that it is possible that this is conjecture but facts available give credence of the conjecture.”


The Joint Secretary then outlined the following possibilities:

- The U.S.A. may be promoting non-American NGOs to camouflage its own interests.
- Dutch activities have increased in the region in the post-Cold War period. Dutch missionaries have been found to be active in Tripura (a northeastern Indian state bordering Bangladesh, near Myanmar) without having any permission from the Government of India. Dutch NGOs, NCIP (Netherlands Council on Indigenous People) is giving support to various insurgent groups of the NE region on international forums.

• Many, if not most, Dutch NGOs are directly funded by their government. It is possible that funds flowing from the Dutch government finally trickle down to insurgent groups in the northeast region. It was found that when NCIP contacted the National Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN)¹ factions in 1993, the Dutch government provided \$25,000 to this NGO. This linkage of flow of funds (Government-NGO-militants) has to be ascertained further.

• It has been found that leaders of the NSCN(I/M) faction meet the Dutch officials before and after each time they meet Government of India representatives. It may be possible that the factions brief them about the outcome of meetings. NSCN(I/M) leaders have been immunized from any restriction from entering the Netherlands on fake passports. It is not possible that the Dutch Government is totally unaware of the terrorist movement that the NSCN(I/M) is leading.

1. The NSCN consists of two major terrorist groups—NSCN-I/M and NSCN-K—in India’s northeastern state of Nagaland seeking a Naga nation independent from India. These groups began working closely with the British immediately after the Raj left the scene.



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

Zepp-LaRouche: Defeat Threat of Nuclear War

March 17—A Berlin [webcast](#) by the Civil Rights Solidarity Movement (BüSo) today, under the theme “Stop the Acute War Danger! A Referendum on the ESM Treaty Now!”, heard BüSo chairwoman Helga Zepp-LaRouche give an extensive briefing on the war danger and the destruction of human civilization under globalization, counterposed to the “common aims of mankind,” which must immediately be taken up to ensure human survival on the planet.

Zepp-LaRouche declared that she intended to shock her audience with the reality of the threat of a global nuclear war, and what it would actually do to human civilization. She reviewed in some detail the current danger, as laid out in a March 15 *Ha'aretz* article by Aluf Benn, and buttressed by U.S. war preparations. She also noted various Russian statements making it clear that they are aware of the threat to their nation, behind the attacks on Syria and Iran, and are preparing to meet it.

For example, Academician Yevgeni Velikhov, the president of the Kurchatov Institute, the leading nuclear science lab of the Russian Academy of Sciences, proposed last month that Russia re-arm its anti-missile defenses around Moscow with nuclear bombs, to achieve a “nuclear interception” capability against potential strategic nuclear missile attack. This refers to the explosion of a nuclear bomb over one’s own territory, in the trajectory of an incoming missile. It would mean massive fallout and damage on Russian territory, but far less than what a successful nuclear missile hit would bring. He described the proposal as a “wake-up call” to NATO about the realities of nuclear war.

Zepp-LaRouche then provided a detailed picture, taken from a scientific study in 2007 by Rutgers University professor Alan Robock, about what the consequences for life on Earth would be, should as few as 0.03% of the explosive yield of the current nuclear weapons arsenal, or a “mere” 100 Hiroshima-sized bombs, be launched. The environmental effects, espe-

cially the blocking of the Sun’s rays by clouds of dust and the pulverizing of the ozone layer, would lead to a “nuclear winter,” with such cold and darkness that vegetation would not be able to grow, animal life would die out, and human life would become impossible.

Leading military and political figures are well aware of this situation, she stressed, noting the resolution submitted to the U.S. Congress by Rep. Walter Jones (R-N.C.), which says that if a President were to launch war without the explicit support of Congress, this would be an impeachable crime.

Replace the Dying Financial System

She then shifted to the strategic-economic front, describing how a dying financial empire is using globalization to destroy sovereign nations. Her key examples were the devastation of Afghanistan, and the European Union’s policy of genocide (as in Greece) and supranational dictatorship.

This is why we are demanding a referendum on the European Stability Mechanism, she said.

Zepp-LaRouche then described the solutions to this crisis: a global Glass-Steagall, a credit system that would fund projects with ever-higher energy-flux densities, and international agreements for cooperation around the common aims of mankind.

She outlined five such “common aims of mankind”:

1. Overcoming famine;
2. Assuring long-term security for raw materials and energy;
3. Development of the Arctic, including as a launchpad for space exploration;
4. Construction of the world land-bridge; and
5. Development of the frontiers of science, which her husband Lyndon LaRouche is working on with the LaRouchePAC Basement Team, which can protect humanity from the galactic dangers we now face—and without which, mankind faces the fate of the dinosaurs.

In conclusion, Zepp-LaRouche addressed the need for mankind to take the “next evolutionary step,” by making breakthroughs on the order of those taken by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa in the 15th Century, the founder of the idea of the nation-state and of modern science. This step is not just in the realm of science, she said, but also in aesthetical education—the creation of what Friedrich Schiller called beautiful souls.

The Empire's Bailout Policy: Deadly 'Alcohol to a Drunk'

by Our European Bureau

March 19—"What is going on with the ECB now is like giving more alcohol to a drunk. The problem is that when it is over, we will be worse off than now. Our life is threatened," declared former Italian Economics Minister Giulio Tremonti, in a March 15 appearance on the Italian TV news magazine "Linea Notte." In fact, Tremonti explained, the economy is going backwards—and nothing has been done to address the causes of the financial breakdown crisis which pulverized the trans-Atlantic system in 2007-08.

Tremonti is right, and he is not alone in raising his voice against the accelerating hyperinflationary policy of the European Central Bank (ECB), which now, according to some, is outdoing the U.S. Federal Reserve in pumping out liquidity based on *nothing*, while imposing austerity conditions that threaten the very continuation of life in one nation after another. Former ECB chief economist Jürgen Stark addressed a conference of insurance companies and related financial institutions on March 7, and charged that "the balance sheet of the euro system isn't just gigantic in size, but also shocking in quality."

What both these prominent former officials realize is what is virtually unstated on this side of the Atlantic: that the measures taken to bail out the bankrupt system will only lead to a much bigger blowout later, and that, potentially, in the very near term. All talk of a "recovery," including in the United States, is nothing but hogwash. And if emergency measures, starting with Glass-

Steagall, are not adopted soon, in order to segregate the phony from the real debt, there will be nothing to stop a mass-murderous implosion.

The campaign for those measures is being led by Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Unlimited Money

The unlimited lending of the past three years, in particular the two spectacular three-year bailout loans to the private banks in December 2011 and February 2012, of more than a trillion euros altogether, has pushed the ECB's balance sheet to no less than EU3 trillion, as Stark charged.

Earlier, Bundesbank chief Jens Weidmann had pointed in warning to the ECB's payments system, known as Target 2, under which the German central bank has built up EU547 billion in claims on the rest of the euro system, including the highly indebted central banks of Greece, Ireland, and Portugal, but also France and Italy. Since that amount, as well as the giant bailouts, can be considered as largely non-repayable loans, Weidmann has called for measures to protect German interests against the threat of hyperinflation, and prevent Germany from becoming the "bailouter of last resort" for the rest of the Eurozone.

Referring to the ECB's EU1 trillion three-year loans (LTRO) to the banks, Tremonti put it this way: "An insane amount of additional liquidity has been injected

into the system.” Banks use their money to either inflate their capital or to buy government bonds; that’s the secret behind the alleged improvement in the condition of Italian bonds.

Thus, no aid at all is given to the physical economy, simply more gambling money for the banks.

This is the very same *modus operandi* working on the U.S. side of the trans-Atlantic financial system, in which banks can continue to borrow at near 0% interest rates for their own speculations, while the physical economy and labor force are left to rot, and the population pays greater and greater fees to sustain the hyperinflationary bailout policy for the economy as a whole. Nor should it be overlooked that the Federal Reserve itself is heavily committed to providing swaps and other funds to sustain the “European” system, in reality, the internationalized banking monstrosity that controls the entire trans-Atlantic economy and most of the world.

Then, There’s the Austerity

Contrary to the Austrian School monetarists who scream about hyperinflation, the evils of that system are not simply monetary. The flip-side of hyperinflation, as is being implemented in Europe and elsewhere, is fascist austerity, just codified for all European nations in the so-called Austerity Pact (which still has to be ratified by all the parliaments, and will be subject to referendum in Ireland.) The examples of Greece, Portugal, and Spain should chill the blood of any normal human being, but that’s the part the Austrian School loves.

A recently published Compliance Report from the European Commission, on the Greek economy, demands that Greece cut another EU11.7 billion from its budget in 2013-14. This is the equivalent of 5.5% of its gross domestic product, and includes EU7.6 billion in cuts in 2013, and another EU4.1 billion in 2014—or else they will not receive the bailout funds. The cuts will be made in pensions, social transfers, pharmaceutical and health-care spending, defense spending, and a restructuring of central and local administration. Already, disease is skyrocketing due to health-care cuts.

The jobless rate rose to 20.7% in the fourth quarter of 2011, from 17.7% in the previous three-month period, according to the Hellenic Statistical Authority (Elstat). As for youth between the ages of 15 and 29, the figure is over 40%.

Portugal’s economy shrank 1.6% last year, as austerity measures adopted in return for a EU78 billion bailout took their toll, the national statistics

agency reported on March 9.

The Portuguese government is predicting a contraction by another 3.3% this year, and unemployment is up to 14.8%. The GDP last year amounted to EU171.1 billion, the statistics agency said. The economy contracted 2.8% in the last quarter, as compared to the same period in 2010, and domestic demand plunged 9.5% over the same period.

Spain also is implementing unprecedented austerity measures aimed at cutting EU30 billion from its budget. Prime Minister Mariano Rajoy has announced a 40% reduction in infrastructure and other investments, a 12% cut in spending at central government ministries, and layoffs and salary cuts of up to 30% at public companies. Unemployment is 23%, and youth unemployment is 50%.

The Only Solutions

In a statement issued on March 9, German political leader and Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche delivered a scathing attack on the fiscal union treaty that was just signed by the Eurozone heads of states. That pact, she wrote, which provides for a zero deficit in all member countries, “robs the respective Parliaments of their power by transferring the right to approve the budget to Brussels,” and does away with democracy. The European Stability Mechanism (ESM), which is supposed to work secretly, transforms Europe de facto into a transfer union and a federal state, with a common destiny.

By agreeing to this, Zepp-LaRouche says, the German government “has clearly crossed the limits set out by the Constitutional Court in 2009 in a ruling on the Lisbon Treaty.” Expanding to such a point the competence of the EU demands a new German constitution, which in turn, must be approved by popular vote. Therefore, a referendum must be organized to ask the Germans whether they “really want to transfer the remainder of their sovereignty to a soulless dictatorial bureaucracy, whose incompetence leaves no room for doubt.”

Zepp-LaRouche, and the LaRouche co-thinkers in France, Italy, Sweden, and Denmark, are not only campaigning to dump the supranational European dictatorship, but to go back to those nations’ respective national currencies. This should then be followed by a global Glass-Steagall reform, and adoption of a credit system to spur great projects, like the Eurasian Land-Bridge. A bill for restoring Glass-Steagall banking separation has been introduced into the Italian Senate.

Economics in Brief

Austerity

Dutch Labor Party: No To EU Fiscal Compact

March 15—The Dutch Labor Party has announced that it will vote against the European Union Fiscal Compact if the government of Prime Minister Mark Rutte capitulates to the EU-mandated deficit of 3% this year, which would require more cuts. (The 3% figure is a step in the direction of the zero-deficit clause included in the Fiscal Compact). With the right-wing anti-Islam Freedom Party having already announced its intention to vote against the Pact, Rutte's minority government would lose the vote.

This comes after the Spanish government of Mariano Rajoy announced that it would not meet similar deficit targets for Spain; and French Socialist Presidential candidate François Hollande had announced that he would renegotiate the treaty if he is elected President.

Labor

2.5 Million Germans Earn Poverty-Level Wage

March 14—Under European Union policy, now more than 23% of the German working population (almost 8 million people) are subsisting on an income of less than EU9.15 (\$12) an hour, a study by the Institute for Work and Skills and Training (IAQ) of the University Duisburg-Essen shows.

This is defined as a “low-wage level limit,” or two-thirds of the mean wage. From this gross amount, taxes, social security, etc. are deducted. Germany does not have a minimum wage, but in neighboring France, for comparison, it is EU9.22.

In reality, the median low-wage income is much lower: in the western states of Germany, people earn EU6.68/hour, in the east, EU6.52. Some 2.5 million hourly employees are earning less than EU6/hour, and almost 1.4 million do not even earn EU5. Almost half of

these low-wage earners work full-time, and some 800,000 full-time employees earn less than EU6. The biggest increase of low-wage earners took place in the western German states, where the numbers have jumped in the last 15 years by 68%; in the East, where wages were already lower, the rise in numbers was 3%.

Education

U.S. Student Loans: The New ‘Debt Bomb’

March 11—U.S. National Association of Consumer Bankruptcy Attorneys chief William Brewer reports that the rising inability of college graduates to land jobs, while having huge student loans which have been co-signed by their parents, means families are losing everything to collection agencies. “This could be the next debt bomb for the U.S. economy,” said Brewer.

The outstanding volume of student loans has burgeoned from \$100 billion to \$867 billion in a few years, as existing loans go unpaid and are loaded with interest, penalties, and fees. Student loan interest rates are significantly higher than for mortgages, and have risen during the Obama Administration, while almost all other rates have fallen. This is larger than the \$704 billion in outstanding credit card debt in the United States, according to the Federal Reserve of New York, and is about one-tenth of total mortgage debt. It is securitized, and nearly 15% of it is now delinquent.

World Food Supply

Obama: Export More, as U.S. Output Collapses

March 16—A string of new food globalization initiatives has come from the Obama Administration in recent weeks, aimed in particular at busting up national-prerogative agriculture actions in China

and India, especially those restricting entry of U.S. meat products. At the same time, U.S. meat production is declining. In 2012, U.S. beef output is headed for at least a 4% drop; chicken output is also in decline for 2012, the second annual decline since that of 2009. (Before then, there had been no annual drop since 1973.)

To conduct an “export expansion drive” for beef and poultry under these circumstances, is just another feature of a *de facto* famine policy. What is required, is to take both emergency and long-term measures to shore up and expand U.S. agriculture production, and that of other nations.

These are a few of the latest features of the imperial Obama food trade binge:

- Obama issued a Presidential Executive Order in late February, to establish a new Interagency Trade Enforcement Center to unleash coordinated action by the Departments of Justice, Treasury, Agriculture, and Homeland Security, with the U.S. Office of Trade Representative, to go after targeted nations for “unfair” trade restrictions, especially on food.

- On March 6, the United States filed a case against India at the WTO, charging that India's ban on imports of U.S. poultry must cease.

Transportation

Yakunin: Bering Strait Crossing Will Be Built

March 17—Russian Railways CEO Vladimir Yakunin announced in London this week that Russian Railways will soon begin a campaign to sell 70 billion rubles worth of ruble-denominated bonds and raise another 30 billion rubles (\$1 billion) through foreign currency-denominated eurobond issues.

Yakunin said, “I am certain that the prospects for extending our railways to Kamchatka and beyond, to connect with North American railways through a tunnel, are a project that can be realized in the not very remote future,” the Russian business daily *Vzglyad* reported.

PRESIDENT PUT ON NOTICE

Nationwide Campaign To Stop New Obama War Gathers Steam

March 19—Rep. Walter Jones (R-N.C.) took his courageous action to introduce House Concurrent Resolution 107 on March 7, to start a process which would restore the Constitutional standard for declaring war, and prevent the launching of a new catastrophic war by President Barack Obama. The news of Jones' action has spread rapidly in the blogosphere, and his home office in Greenville has been inundated with calls of support (9-1 in favor), so far, from virtually all 50 states.

Given the opportunity to speak out on two national radio talk shows (Savage Nation and the Alex Jones Show), Jones has urged the public to immediately take action in support of his measure, by calling their Congressmen and demanding they co-sponsor the bill, by calling their Senators in order to get a similar bill introduced into the Senate, and to demand of members of the House Judiciary Committee that they immediately schedule hearings on the bill.

Meanwhile, LaRouchePAC has escalated its ongoing campaign for Obama's removal, issuing a leaflet entitled "President Obama Is Put on Notice," which is being mass-distributed in population centers around the nation. The leaflet includes Lyndon LaRouche's assessment that "This bill could save the United States," especially in light of the fact that it is being raised in the midst of Obama's British-directed drive toward a ther-



LPAC-TV

LaRouchePAC is leading the campaign in support of Jones' resolution, with rallies around the country, and release of a mass leaflet. Shown: an LPAC rally in San Francisco, March 3.

monuclear confrontation with Russia and China, over the trigger "issues" of Syria and Iran.

Asked by radio host Alex Jones (no relation), at the end of the March 16 show, why he didn't go ahead directly with a bill of impeachment, Jones said: If people like you all around the country rally in support of H. Con. 107, "I think this will lead to other avenues that need to be led to, like that you are making mention of."

Restore the Constitution

Throughout his interviews, Jones has kept a sharp focus on making a clear, impassioned case for restoring the U.S. Constitution, by reasserting Congress's perog-

ative over the declaration of war. Ever since World War II, he stressed, Congress has abdicated its responsibility, increasingly leaving the decision to the President, with disastrous results.

Walter Jones, who has represented a North Carolina district with several major military bases since 1992, has a history of opposing illegal wars, even when it meant breaking with his party. In 1999, he filed a Federal lawsuit, together with 31 other Members of Congress, when President Clinton brought the country to war in Bosnia. He publicly attacked the Bush Administration's policy in Iraq in 2005. Again, in August 2011, when President Obama launched the war against Libya, while explicitly refusing to seek Congressional approval, he joined other Members of Congress, led by Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio), in going to court against that unconstitutional action.

The courts refused to take up the cases, claiming that the Congressmen could cut off funding for the war, if they opposed it. But, as Jones explained, they would never do so, because it would be tantamount to putting American soldiers in grave danger. Therefore, he demands that the authorization be obtained before deploying armed forces.

When Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta told U.S. Senators on March 7 that the President need only seek international approval for military action against Iran or Syria, and would inform the Congress after the fact, a firestorm erupted among a large number of political activists and Constitutional scholars. But Jones emphasized that he had been working on his resolution for at least five months—it was already filed when he learned of Panetta's outrageous statement.

With great pungency and irony, Jones quoted former Vice President Dick Cheney on how the President doesn't need Congress to go to war, and even Obama (from 2007) on how it's unconstitutional for the President to go to war without Congress's approval.

He said we have to go back to the Constitution, which is why he introduced H. Con. 107, to reassert the principle that it is Congress which declares war.

Will the Citizens Act?

Responding to a question from Alex Jones on why attempts to stop the war in Libya failed, Jones said the Republican leadership wouldn't even allow a resolution of condemnation. When asked what citizens could do, Jones said they should contact their members of Congress to get them to co-sponsor the resolution, as


well as to pressure for the Judiciary Committee to have the resolution debated. They should also press to have the same legislation introduced in the Senate.

It is going to take enormous pressure from the citizenry to get Congress to act. The overwhelming majority of Americans are dead set against any new wars, particularly in the Islamic world, and a recent poll, published by World Net Daily, revealed that 90% of the 10,000 people polled would favor impeachment of President Obama over Constitutional violations. But expressing an opinion to a pollster, and fighting to galvanize a mostly cowardly Congress into action, are two very different things.

Jones' resolution was drafted by Constitutional lawyer Bruce Fein, who is also known for having authored draft bills of impeachment for President George W. Bush, and Vice President Dick Cheney for their abuse of Constitutional powers. Fein is personally campaigning for the Jones resolution, although he has also authored a comprehensive impeachment resolution against President Obama, which we include in full in this issue of *EIR*.

'An Impeachable High Crime and Misdemeanor'

Here is the key portion of House Concurrent Resolution 107, introduced by Rep. Walter Jones, in Congress, on March 7.



Rep. Walter Jones

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.

Constitutional Lawyer's Call for Obama Impeachment Over War Against Libya

Bruce Fein, a well-known constitutional lawyer and civil libertarian, who served as an associate deputy attorney general under President Ronald Reagan (1981-82), drafted this article of impeachment against President Obama, in April 2011, over his attack on Libya. Here is the text (punctuation, capitalization, and emphasis as in original):

ARTICLE OF IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT BARACK HUSSEIN OBAMA

RESOLVED, That Barack Hussein Obama, President of the United States, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and that the following article of impeachment to be exhibited to the Senate:

ARTICLE OF IMPEACHMENT EXHIBITED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE NAME OF ITSELF AND OF ALL OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AGAINST BARACK HUSSEIN OBAMA, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IN MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT OF ITS IMPEACHMENT AGAINST HIM FOR HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS IN USURPING THE EXCLUSIVE PREROGATIVE OF CONGRESS TO COMMENCE WAR UNDER ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 11 OF THE CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I

In his conduct of the office of President of the United States, Barack Hussein Obama, in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitu-

tional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has usurped the exclusive power of Congress to initiate war under Article I, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution by unilaterally commencing war against the Republic of Libya on March 19, 2011, declaring that Congress is powerless to constrain his conduct of the war, and claiming authority in the future to commence war unilaterally to advance whatever he ordains is in the national interest. By so doing and declaring, Barack Hussein Obama has mocked the rule of law, endangered the very existence of the Republic and the liberties of the people, and perpetrated an impeachable high crime and misdemeanor as hereinafter elaborated.

I. THE IMPEACHMENT POWER

1. Article II, Section IV of the United States Constitution provides: "The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors."

2. According to James Madison's Records of the Convention, 2:550; *Madison*, 8 Sept., Mr. George Mason objected to an initial proposal to confine impeachable offenses to treason or bribery:

Why is the provision restrained to Treason & bribery only? Treason as defined in the Constitution will not reach many great and dangerous offences. Hastings is not guilty of Treason. Attempts to subvert the Constitution may not be Treason as above defined—As bills of attainder which have saved the British Constitution are forbidden, it is the more necessary to extend: the power of impeachments.

3. Delegates to the Federal Convention voted overwhelmingly to include "high crimes and misdemeanors" in Article II, Section IV of the United States Con-

stitution specifically to ensure that “attempts to subvert the Constitution” would fall within the universe of impeachable offenses. *Id.*

4. Alexander Hamilton, a delegate to the Federal Convention, characterized impeachable offenses in *Federalist 65* as, “offenses which proceed from the misconduct of public men, or in other words, from the violation or abuse of some public trust. They are of a nature which with peculiar propriety may be denominated political, as they relate chiefly to injuries done to society itself.”

5. In 1974, the House Judiciary Committee voted three articles of impeachment against then President Richard M. Nixon for actions “subversive of constitutional government.”

6. Father of the Constitution, James Madison, observed that, “Of all the enemies of public liberty, war is, perhaps, the most to be dreaded, because it comprises and develops the germ of every other. . . . War is the true nurse of executive aggrandizement.”

7. James Madison also instructed that “no nation could preserve its freedom in the midst of continual warfare.”


8. The exclusive congressional power to commence war under Article I, section VIII, clause XI of the Constitution is the pillar of the Republic and the greatest constitutional guarantor of individual liberty, transparency, and government frugality.

II. THE ‘DECLARE WAR’ CLAUSE

9. Article I, Section VIII, Clause XI of the United States Constitution provides: “The Congress shall have the power . . . To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;”

10. Article II, Section II, Clause I of the United States Constitution provides: “The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States.”

11. The authors of the United States Constitution manifestly intended Article I, Section VIII, Clause XI



Creative Commons/Gage Skidmore

Bruce Fein has laid out a meticulously documented case for the impeachment of President Barack Obama.

to fasten exclusive responsibility and authority on the Congress to decide whether to undertake offensive military action.

12. The authors of the United States Constitution believed that individual liberty and the Republic would be endangered by fighting too many wars, not too few.

13. The authors of the United States Constitution understood that to aggrandize power and to leave a historical legacy, the executive in all countries chronically inflates danger manifold to justify warfare.

14. John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the United States, in *Federalist 4* noted:

[A]bsolute monarchs will often make war when their nations are to get nothing by it, but for the purposes and objects merely personal, such as thirst for military glory, revenge for personal affronts, ambition, or private compacts to aggrandize or support their particular families or partisans. These and a variety of other motives, which affect only the mind of the sovereign, often lead him to engage in wars not sanctified by justice or the voice and interests of his people.

15. Alexander Hamilton explained in *Federalist 69* that the president’s Commander-in-Chief authority

. . . would be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the confederacy; while that of the British king extends to the declaring of war, and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies; all which by the constitution under consideration would appertain to the Legislature.

16. In a written exchange with Alexander Hamilton under the pseudonym *Helvidius*, James Madison wrote:

In no part of the constitution is more wisdom to be found, than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department. Beside the objection to such a mixture to heterogeneous powers, the trust and the temptation would be too great for any one man; not such as nature

with war powers invites tyranny and the reduction of citizens to vassalage:

In time of actual war, great discretionary powers are constantly given to the Executive Magistrate. Constant apprehension of War, has the same tendency to render the head too large for the body. A standing military force, with an overgrown Executive will not long be safe companions to liberty. The means of defence agst. foreign danger, have been always the instruments of tyranny at home. Among the Romans it was a standing maxim to excite a war, whenever a revolt was apprehended. Throughout all Europe, the armies kept up under the pretext of defending, have enslaved the people.

I do not believe that the President can take military action—including any kind of strategic bombing—against Iran without congressional authorization.

—Sen. Hillary Clinton, Dec. 20, 2007

may offer as the prodigy of many centuries, but such as may be expected in the ordinary successions of magistracy. War is in fact the true nurse of executive aggrandizement. In war, a physical force is to be created; and it is the executive will, which is to direct it. In war, the public treasures are to be unlocked; and it is the executive hand which is to dispense them. In war, the honours and emoluments of office are to be multiplied; and it is the executive patronage under which they are to be enjoyed. It is in war, finally, that laurels are to be gathered, and it is the executive brow they are to encircle. The strongest passions and most dangerous weaknesses of the human breast; ambition, avarice, vanity, the honourable or venial love of fame, are all in conspiracy against the desire and duty of peace.

19. In a letter dated April 4, 1798, James Madison wrote to Thomas Jefferson:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, & most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care, vested the question of war in the Legislature. But the Doctrines lately advanced strike at the root of all these provisions, and will deposit the peace of the Country in that Department which the Constitution distrusts as most ready without cause to renounce it. For if the opinion of the President not the facts & proofs themselves are to sway the judgment of Congress, in declaring war, and if the President in the recess of Congress create a foreign mission, appoint the minister, & negotiate a War Treaty, without the possibility of a check even from the Senate, untill the measures present alternatives overruling the freedom of its judgment; if again a Treaty when made obliges the Legislature to declare war contrary to its judgment, and in pursuance of the same doctrine, a law declaring war, imposes a like moral obligation, to grant the requisite supplies until it be formally repealed with the consent of the President & Senate, it is evident that the people are cheated out of the best ingredients in their Government, the safeguards of peace which is the greatest of their blessings.

17. James Madison also wrote as *Helvidius* to Alexander Hamilton:

Those who are to conduct a war cannot in the nature of things, be proper or safe judges, whether a *war ought to be commenced, continued, or concluded*. They are barred from the latter functions by a great principle in free government, analogous to that which separates the sword from the purse, or the power of executing from the power of enacting laws.

18. On June 29, 1787, at the Federal Convention, James Madison explained that an executive crowned

20. During the Pennsylvania Convention to ratify

the Constitution, James Wilson, a future Justice of the United States Supreme Court, observed:

This system will not hurry us into war; it is calculated to guard against it. It will not be in the power of a single man, or a single body of men, to involve us in such distress; for the important power of declaring war is vested in the legislature at large: this declaration must be made with the concurrence of the House of Representatives: from this circumstance we may draw a certain conclusion that nothing but our national interest can draw us into a war.

21. In 1793, President George Washington, who presided over the Federal Convention, wrote to South Carolina Governor William Moultrie in regards to a prospective counter-offensive against the American Indian Creek Nation: “The Constitution vests the power of declaring war with Congress, therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they have deliberated upon the subject, and authorized such a measure.”

22. President Thomas Jefferson, who served as Secretary of State under President Washington, in a statement before Congress regarding Tripoli and the Barbary Pirates, deemed himself “unauthorized by the Constitution, without the sanction of Congress, to go beyond the line of defense.” He amplified: “I communicate [to the Congress] all material information on this subject, that in the exercise of this important function confided by the Constitution to the Legislature exclusively their judgment may form itself on a knowledge and consideration of every circumstance of weight.”

23. In a message to Congress in December, 1805 regarding potential military action to resolve a border dispute with Spain, President Thomas Jefferson acknowledged that “Congress alone is constitutionally invested with the power of changing our condition from peace to war, I have thought it my duty to await their authority for using force.” He requested Congressional authorization for offensive military action, even short of war, elaborating:

Formal war is not necessary—it is not probable it will follow; but the protection of our citizens, the spirit and honor of our country, require that force should be interposed to a certain degree. It

will probably contribute to advance the object of peace.

But the course to be pursued will require the command of means which it belongs to Congress exclusively to yield or deny. To them I communicate every fact material for their information, and the documents necessary to enable them to judge for themselves. To their wisdom, then, I look for the course I am to pursue; and will pursue, with sincere zeal, that which they shall approve.

24. In his War Message to Congress on June 1, 1812, President James Madison reaffirmed that the shift in language from *make* to *declare* in Article I, Section VIII, Clause XI of the United States Constitution authorized at the Constitutional convention did not empower the Executive to involve the United States military in any action aside from defense against an overt attack. Although President Madison was convinced that Great Britain had undertaken acts of war against the United States, he nevertheless maintained that he could not respond with military force without congressional authorization. He proclaimed:

We behold, in fine, on the side of Great Britain, a state of war against the United States, and on the side of the United States a state of peace toward Great Britain.

Whether the United States shall continue passive under these progressive usurpations and these accumulating wrongs, or, opposing force to force in defense of their national rights, shall commit a just cause into the hands of the Almighty Disposer of Events, avoiding all connections which might entangle it in the contest or views of other powers, and preserving a constant readiness to concur in an honorable re-establishment of peace and friendship, is a solemn question which the Constitution wisely confides to the legislative department of the Government. In recommending it to their early deliberations I am happy in the assurance that the decision will be worthy [of] the enlightened and patriotic councils of a virtuous, a free, and a powerful nation.

25. In his Records of the Convention, 2:318; *Madison*, 17 Aug., James Madison wrote that the power “To

declare war” had been vested in the Congress in lieu of the power “To make war” to leave to the Executive “the power to repel sudden attacks.”

26. Mr. Elbridge Gerry “never expected to hear in a republic a motion to empower the Executive alone to declare war,” but still moved with Mr. Madison “to insert *declare*—in place of *make*” in Article I, Section VIII, Clause XI. Id.

It is precisely because the consequences of war—intended or otherwise—can be so profound and complicated that our Founding Fathers vested in Congress, not the President, the power to initiate war, except to repel an imminent attack on the United States or its citizens. . . . That’s why I want to be very clear: if the President takes us to war with Iran without Congressional approval, I will call for his impeachment.

—Sen. Joseph Biden, a speech in Iowa, 2007

27. Mr. George Mason was against “giving the power of war to the Executive, because not safely to be trusted with it; or to the Senate, because not so constructed as to be entitled to it. He was for clogging rather than facilitating war; but for facilitating peace.” Yet Mr. Mason “preferred *declare* to *make*.” Id.

28. Mr. Roger Sherman “thought [the proposal] stood very well. The Executive shd. be able to repel and not to commence war.” Id.

29. Delegates to the Federal Convention overwhelmingly approved the motion to insert “*declare*—in place of *make*,” to deny the Executive power to initiate military action, but to permit the Executive to repel sudden attacks unilaterally. Id.

30. Then Congressman Abraham Lincoln sermonized:

Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation, whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so, *whenever he may choose to say* he deems it necessary for such purpose—and you allow him to make war at pleasure. . . . Study to see if you can fix *any limit* to his power in this respect, after

you have given him so much as you propose. If, to-day, he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada, to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, “I see no probability of the British invading us” but he will say to you “be silent; I see it, if you don’t.”

The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress, was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons. Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This, our Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all Kingly oppressions; and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us. But your view destroys the whole matter, and places our President where kings have always stood.

31. Crowning the President with unilateral authority to commence war under the banner of anticipatory self-defense, prevention of civilian slaughters, gender discrimination, subjugation of ethnic or religious minorities, or otherwise would empower the President to initiate war without limit, threatening the very existence of the Republic. Although a benevolent Chief Executive might resist abuse of an unlimited war power, the principle, if ever accepted by Congress, would lie around like a loaded weapon ready for use by any successor craving absolute power.

32. Thomas Paine justly and rightly declared in *Common Sense* that “in America, *the law is king*. For as in absolute governments the King is law, so in free countries the law *ought* to be king; and there ought to be no other.”

33. Article 43 Paragraph 3 of the Charter of the United Nations provides that all resolutions or agreements of the United Nations Security Council “shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.”

34. Article 43 Paragraph 3 of Charter of the United Nations was included specifically to allay concerns that prevented the United States of America from ratifying the League of Nations Treaty in 1919.

35. That treaty risked crowning the President with the counter-constitutional authority to initiate warfare. On November 19, 1919, in Section II of his Res-

ervations with Regard to Ratification of the Versailles Treaty, to preserve the balance of power established by the United States Constitution from executive usurpation, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge resolved as follows:

The United States assumes no obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country or to interfere in controversies between nations—whether members of the League or not—under the provisions of Article 10, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which, under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military or naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so provide.

The rejection of Lodge's reservations by President Woodrow Wilson and his Senate allies insured defeat of the treaty.

36. Section 2(c) of the War Powers Resolution of 1973 clarifies Presidential authority to undertake military action as follows:

The constitutional powers of the President as Commander-in-Chief to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities, or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, are exercised only pursuant to (1) a declaration of war, (2) specific statutory authorization, or (3) a national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.

37. In *United States v. Smith*, 27 F. Cas. 1192 (1806), Supreme Court Justice William Paterson, a delegate to the Federal Convention from New Jersey, wrote on behalf of a federal circuit court:

There is a manifest distinction between our going to war with a nation at peace, and a war being made against us by an actual invasion, or a formal declaration. In the former case it is the exclusive province of Congress to change a state of peace into a state of war.

38. In *Geofroy v. Riggs*, 133 U.S. 258, 267 (1890), the Supreme Court of the United States held:

The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the government or of its departments, and those arising from the nature of the government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the government, or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent.

39. In his concurrence in *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 642-643 (1952), which rebuked President Harry Truman's claim of unilateral war powers in the Korean War, Justice Robert Jackson elaborated:

Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than that declaration of a war is entrusted only to Congress. Of course, a state of war may in fact exist without a formal declaration. But no doctrine that the Court could promulgate would seem to me more sinister and alarming than that a President whose conduct of foreign affairs is so largely uncontrolled, and often even is unknown, can vastly enlarge his mastery over the internal affairs of the country by his own commitment of the Nation's armed forces to some foreign venture.

40. All treaties are subservient to the exclusive congressional power to commence war. In *Reid v. Covert*, 354 U.S. 1, 18 (1957), the United States Supreme Court held:

There is nothing in [the Constitution's text] which intimates that treaties and laws enacted pursuant to them do not have to comply with the provisions of the Constitution. Nor is there anything in the debates which accompanied the drafting and ratification of the Constitution which even suggests such a result.

41. Unconstitutional usurpations by one branch of government of powers entrusted to a coequal branch are not rendered constitutional by repetition. The

United States Supreme Court held unconstitutional hundreds of laws enacted by Congress over the course of five decades that included a legislative veto of executive actions in *INS v. Chada*, 462 U.S. 919 (1982).

42. In their dissent in *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507 (2004), Justices John Paul Stevens and Antonin Scalia recognized the “Founders’ general distrust of military power lodged with the President, including the authority to commence war”:

No fewer than 10 issues of the *Federalist* were devoted in whole or part to allaying fears of oppression from the proposed Constitution’s authorization of standing armies in peacetime. Many safeguards in the Constitution reflect these concerns. Congress’s authority “[t]o raise and support Armies” was hedged with the proviso that “no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years.” U.S. Const., Art. 1, §8, cl. 12. Except for the actual command of military forces, all authorization for their maintenance and all explicit authorization for their use is placed in the control of Congress under Article I, rather than the President under Article II. As Hamilton explained, the President’s military authority would be “much inferior” to that of the British King... (Citing *Federalist* 69, *Supra*.)

43. On December 20, 2007, then Senator Hillary Clinton proclaimed: “The President has the solemn duty to defend our Nation. If the country is under truly imminent threat of attack, of course the President must take appropriate action to defend us. At the same time, the Constitution requires Congress to authorize war. I do not believe that the President can take military action—including any kind of strategic bombing—against Iran without congressional authorization.”

44. Then Senator Joseph Biden stated in a speech at the Iowa City Public Library in 2007 regarding potential military action in Iran that unilateral action by the President would be an *impeachable offense under the Constitution*:

It is precisely because the consequences of war—intended or otherwise—can be so profound and complicated that our Founding Fathers vested in Congress, not the President, the

power to initiate war, except to repel an imminent attack on the United States or its citizens.

They reasoned that requiring the President to come to Congress first would slow things down ... allow for more careful decision making before sending Americans to fight and die ... and ensure broader public support.

The Founding Fathers were, as in most things, profoundly right.

That’s why I want to be very clear: if the President takes us to war with Iran without Congressional approval, I will call for his impeachment.

I do not say this lightly or to be provocative. I am dead serious. I have chaired the Senate Judiciary Committee. I still teach constitutional law. I’ve consulted with some of our leading constitutional scholars. The Constitution is clear. And so am I.

I’m saying this now to put the administration on notice and hopefully to deter the President from taking unilateral action in the last year of his administration.

If war is warranted with a nation of 70 million people, it warrants coming to Congress and the American people first.

45. In a speech on the Senate Floor in 1998, then Senator Joseph Biden maintained: “... the only logical conclusion is that the framers [of the United States Constitution] intended to grant to Congress the power to initiate all hostilities, even limited wars.”

46. On December 20, 2007, then Senator Barack Obama informed the *Boston Globe*, based upon his extensive knowledge of the United States Constitution: “The President does not have power under the Constitution to unilaterally authorize a military attack in a situation that does not involve stopping an actual or imminent threat to the nation.”

III. USURPATION OF THE WAR POWER OVER LIBYA

47. President Barack Obama’s military attacks against Libya constitute acts of war.

48. Congressman J. Randy Forbes (VA-4) had the following exchange with Secretary of Defense Robert Gates during a March 31, 2011 House Armed Services Committee Hearing on the legality of the present military operation in Libya:

Congressman Forbes: Mr. Secretary, if tomorrow a foreign nation intentionally, for whatever reason, launched a Tomahawk missile into New York City, would that be considered an act of war against the United States?

Secretary Gates: Probably so.

Congressman Forbes: Then I would assume the same laws would apply if we launched a Tomahawk missile at another nation—is that also true?

Secretary Gates: You're getting into constitutional law here and I am no expert on it.

Congressman Forbes: Mr. Secretary, you're the Secretary of Defense. You ought to be an expert on what's an act of war or not. If it's an act of war to launch a Tomahawk missile on New York City would it not also be an act of war to launch a Tomahawk missile by us at another nation?

Secretary Gates: Presumably.

49. Since the passage of United Nations Security Council resolution 1973 on March 19, 2011, the United States has detonated over 200 tomahawk land attack cruise missiles and 455 precision-guided bombs on Libyan soil.

50. Libya posed no actual or imminent threat to the United States when President Obama unleashed Operation Odyssey Dawn.

51. On March 27, 2011, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates stated that Libya never posed an "actual or imminent threat to the United States." He further stated that Libya has never constituted a "vital interest" to the United States.

52. United Nations Security Council resolution 1973 directs an indefinite United States military quagmire in Libya, authorizing "all necessary measures" to protect Libyan civilians, which clearly contemplates removal by force of the murderous regime of Col. Muammar Qadhafi.

53. In a Letter From the President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate sent March 21, 2011, President Barack Obama informed Members of Congress that "U.S. forces have targeted the Qadhafi regime's air defense systems, command and control structures, and other capabilities of Qadhafi's armed forces used to

attack civilians and civilian populated areas. We will seek a rapid, but responsible, transition of operations to coalition, regional, or international organizations that are postured to continue activities as may be necessary to realize the objectives of U.N. Security Council Resolutions 1970 and 1973."

54. In his March 21, 2011 letter, President Barack Obama further informed Members of Congress that he opted to take unilateral military action "... in support of international efforts to protect civilians and prevent a humanitarian disaster."

55. President Barack Obama has usurped congressional authority to decide on war or peace with Libya,

The President does not have power under the Constitution to unilaterally authorize a military attack in a situation that does not involve stopping an actual or imminent threat to the nation.

—Sen. Barack Obama to the
Boston Globe, Dec. 20, 2007

and has declared he will persist in additional usurpations of the congressional power to commence war whenever he decrees it would advance his idea of the national interest. On March 28, 2011, he declared to Congress and the American people: "I have made it clear that I will never hesitate to use our military swiftly, decisively, and unilaterally when necessary to defend our people, our homeland, our allies, *and our core interests*" (emphasis added).

56. President Obama's humanitarian justification for war in Libya establishes a threshold that would justify his initiation of warfare in scores of nations around the globe, including Iran, North Korea, Syria, Sudan, Myanmar, China, Belarus, Zimbabwe, Cuba, and Russia.

57. In *Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U.S. 438 (1928), Justice Louis D. Brandeis wrote on behalf of a majority of the United States Supreme Court:

Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers

to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding.

58. President Barack Obama has signed an order, euphemistically named a “Presidential Finding,” authorizing covert U.S. government support for rebel forces seeking to oust Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi, further entangling the United States in the Libyan conflict, despite earlier promises of restraint. Truth is invariably the first casualty of war.

59. In response to questions by Members of Congress during a classified briefing on March 30, 2011, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton indicated that the President needs no Congressional authorization for his attack on the Libyan nation, and will ignore any Congressional attempt by resolution or otherwise to constrain or halt United States participation in the Libyan war.

60. On March 30, 2011, by persistent silence or otherwise, Secretary Clinton rebuffed congressional inquiries into President Obama’s view of the constitutionality of the War Powers Resolution of 1973. She

failed to cite a single judicial decision in support of President Obama’s recent actions, relying instead on the undisclosed legal opinions of White House attorneys.

61. President Barack Obama, in flagrant violation of his constitutional oath to execute his office as President of the United States and preserve and protect the United States Constitution, has usurped the exclusive authority of Congress to authorize the initiation of war, in that on March 19, 2011 President Obama initiated an offensive military attack against the Republic of Libya without congressional authorization. In so doing, President Obama has arrested the rule of law, and saluted a vandalizing of the Constitution that will occasion ruination of the Republic, the crippling of individual liberty, and a Leviathan government unless the President is impeached by the House of Representatives and removed from office by the Senate.

In all of this, President Barack Obama has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and subversive of constitutional government, to the great prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

EIR Special Report

The New Economics | A Science-Driver Program for Recovery

EIR
Special Report

The New Economics



February 2012

Price: \$100

(Plus \$10 shipping; Va. residents add 5% sales tax)

Includes a 3-month trial subscription to **EIR Online**

Order from
EIR News Service
1-800-278-3135

Or online:
www.larouchepub.com

This new 80-page report leads with Lyndon LaRouche’s **State of the Union address**, followed by:

I. NAWAPA

Project Overview

NAWAPA, from the Standpoint of Biospheric Development

II: Arctic Development

Economics for the Future of Mankind

III: The Moon-Mars Mission

From the Moon to Mars: The New Economics
‘The Woman on Mars’ (excerpt)

IV: Appendix

Constitutional Principles for a Recovery
Franklin Roosevelt’s 1933 Glass-Steagall Act
Alexander Hamilton’s Economics Created Our Constitution

Holder Declaration Triggers Backlash

by Edward Spannaus

March 18—Winning himself a nomination for the worst U.S. Attorney General since Richard Nixon's John Mitchell, Attorney General Eric Holder formally declared that President Obama has the right to execute an American citizen without any judicial due process or oversight.

Holder's lawless speech, ironically delivered at Northwestern University law school March 5, has drawn condemnation from across the political spectrum—although shamefully, many Democrats who would have loudly protested had George W. Bush and Dick Cheney enunciated such a "legal" doctrine, are silent when it comes to a President of their own party claiming this unprecedented power. Obama, here again, follows in the footsteps of the Crown Jurist of the Third Reich, Carl Schmitt, who asserted that the Executive is not bound by any legislative or judicial constraints under conditions of "emergency."

Qualified observers in the U.S. intelligence community have noted that Obama's "right-to-kill" doctrine, the latest expression of his "Unitary Executive" policy, is especially dangerous when combined with the Administration's "humanitarian intervention" or "Right to Protect" (R2P) doctrine—formalized in Presidential Study Directive No. 10, issued last August—in which Obama claimed the right and duty to launch military action against any regime it deems to be carrying out mass atrocities or genocide.

Broad Reaction Against Holder

Holder's Northwestern speech—an attempt to defuse the clamor from the Senate and elsewhere for the release of the Justice Department's legal memorandum justifying the policy of "targeted killing" which the U.S. government had always previously opposed—claimed that, since "we are a "nation at war," the President has the authority to use "lethal force," without geographic limit, against any person deemed a threat to

the United States, even if that person is a U.S. citizen. And in a depraved display of sophistry, Holder asserted that "due process" does not equal "judicial process," but that *this* "due process" can be undefined and secret, carried out entirely within the Executive Branch.

As the *New York Times* wrote in an editorial March 7: "President Obama, who came to power promising transparency and the rule of law, has become the first President to claim the legal authority to order an American citizen killed without judicial involvement, real oversight, or public accountability." As to Holder's claim that Constitutional due process is not the same as judicial due process, the *Times* noted: "The judiciary has the power to say what the Constitution means and make sure the elected branches apply it properly. The executive acting in secret as the policy, prosecutor, jury, judge and executioner is the antithesis of due process."


George Washington University law professor Jonathan Turley wrote on March 6, on *Foreign Policy* magazine's website, that "what Holder is describing is a model of an imperial presidency that would have made Richard Nixon blush.

"If the President can kill a citizen," Turley continued, "there are a host of other powers that fall short of killing that the President might claim, including indefinite detention of citizens—another recent controversy. Thus, by asserting the right to kill citizens without charges or judicial review, Holder has effectively made all of the Constitution's individual protections of accused persons matters of presidential discretion. These rights will be faithfully observed up the point that the President concludes that they interfere with his views of how to best protect the country...."

Former foreign service officer Peter Van Buren, in a March 7 *Huffington Post* piece called "The Day 'Due Process' Died: Obama, Holder the End of Rights," wrote:

"Like most of the Bill of Rights, the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution is beautiful in its brevity and clarity. When you are saying something true, pure, clean, and right, you do not need many words: '...nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.'

"There are no footnotes in the Fifth Amendment, no caveats, no secret memos, no exceptions for war, terrorism, mass rape, creation of concentration camps, acts of genocide, child torture or any evil. Those things are unnecessary, because in the beauty of what Lincoln offered to his audience as 'a government of the people, by the people, for the people,' the government would be



Attorney General Eric Holder and his boss President Obama have asserted a “kill-at-will” Executive power—which goes beyond even the extremes of the Bush-Cheney regime.

made up of us, the purpose of government was to serve us, and the government would be beholden to us. Such a government would be incapable of killing its own citizens without care and debate and open trial.”

At least that was the case up until Sept. 30, 2011, Van Buren notes, when a U.S. drone missile killed U.S. citizen Anwar al-Awlaki in Yemen, and then a week later, the U.S. murdered al-Awlaki’s 16-year-old son.

Bush, Cheney, and ... Obama

The notable parallels between the Obama-Holder justifications for targeted killings, and the legal rationalizations set forth by Bush-Cheney Administration lawyers and legal theorists, were duly noted by constitutional lawyer and Salon columnist Glenn Greenwald on March 6. Not only the arguments that “we are at war, the battlefield is everywhere,” that “the Executive Branch is the sole organ for war and no courts can interfere,” etc., but also the exact same argument that “we are only using these powers against bad people,” and therefore, “if you’re not a terrorist, you have nothing to worry about.” These were precisely the arbitrary and unchecked assertions of power which both Barack Obama and Eric Holder fervently denounced during the Bush-Cheney years, and which they have just as fervently adopted today.

That these claims—that unchecked Executive powers are not a threat to law-abiding citizens—are not

exactly new, Greenwald shows with a quote from Nixon’s Attorney General John Mitchell, in defending the government’s eavesdropping, powers: “Any citizen of this United States who is not involved in some illegal activity has nothing to fear whatsoever.”

Except for the Bush-era neocons, many conservatives have also denounced Holder’s claims. Fox News legal analyst Andrew Napolitano, a former New Jersey Superior Court Judge, warned, in the most dire terms, of the dangers of the Obama-Holder doctrine. “Obama is taking the position that he can be judge, jury, and executioner, without a jury, without a charge, without a grand jury, without any of the basic requirements of due process. Due process is not something that the government gives,”

said Judge Napolitano, “it is a natural right that every human being has, and the Constitution requires the government to respect that in the Fifth Amendment.”

Napolitano also pointed out that the Fifth Amendment gives that right to *all* persons, not just American citizens—but, that doesn’t even matter, he says, “because the three people who died [on Obama’s orders], Anwar al-Awlaki, his 16-year-old son, and their friend, were all Americans.”

“If accepted uncritically,” Napolitano concluded, “then we are doomed, our freedoms are gone!”

Holder’s March 5 speech was ostensibly an effort to dampen criticism from both Democrats and Republicans for the Administration’s legal memorandum justifying targeted assassinations. As a number of observers have pointed out, Holder’s speech was no substitute for the memorandum, including for the reason that it contained not a single legal citation or footnote purporting to show whence the Administration claims such extraordinary powers.

Among those who have unsuccessfully demanded access to the Administration’s legal memorandum is Sen. Chuck Grassley (Iowa), the senior Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee. At a committee session on March 15, Grassley noted that the Obama Administration has refused to even admit that such a memo exists, even in the face of demands for the memo from

both himself and Senate Judiciary Committee chairman Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.). Grassley's view of the inadequacy of Holder's speech was shown when he noted that "if the Attorney General is going to justify targeted killings based on 'robust' Congressional oversight, he needs to follow through and make these documents available to Congress, not just give us the Cliff Notes in a speech to law students."

International 'Permission'

A related, unprecedented claim of the Executive's power to bypass and ignore Congress and the Constitution—in service of "humanitarian intervention"—occurred in an exchange between Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.) and Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, at a March 7 Armed Services Committee hearing. Ranking member Sessions stated that he thought Panetta had "circumvented" Congress in joining NATO in operations in Libya, and asked his plans for Syria. As reported by CNN, the exchange went as follows:

Sessions: We spend our time worrying about the UN, the Arab League, NATO, and too little time, in my opinion, worrying about the elected representatives of

the United States. As you go forward, will you consult with the United States Congress?

Panetta: You know, our goal would be to seek international permission. And we would come to the Congress and inform you and determine how best to approach this, whether or not we would want to get permission from the Congress.

Sessions: Well, I'm troubled by that. I think it does weaken the ability of the United States to lead. I do think ultimately you need the legal authority from the United States of America, not from any other extra-territorial group that might assemble.

Even as Sessions gave Panetta a chance to explain, Panetta continued to use the word "permission," to the point of forcing Committee chairman Carl Levin (D-Mich.) to state, "I don't think the word 'permission' is appropriate even in that context."

Whether Panetta actually believes what he said, or was just stating the position of President Obama and some of his top advisors, is open to question. In any event, there is no doubt that this is another area in which British-puppet Obama feels free to ignore and violate the Constitution of the United States.

Released on Thanksgiving 2011, the LPAC-TV documentary "NAWAPA 1964" is the true story of the fight for the North American Water and Power Alliance. Spanning the 1960s and early '70s, it is told through the words of Utah Senator Frank Moss. The 56-minute video, using extensive original film footage and documents, presents the astonishing mobilization for NAWAPA, which came near to being realized, until the assassination of President Kennedy, the Vietnam War, and the 1968 Jacobin reaction, killed it
... until now.

NAWAPA 1964



PUEBLO, COLORADO
AUGUST 16, 1962

<http://larouchepac.com/nawapa1964>

RUDOLPH BIÉRENT

Exploring Space: The Optimism Of an Infinite Universe

Rudolph Biérent, a young researcher from the French Aerospace Lab ONERA, gave this speech to the Schiller Institute conference in Berlin, Feb. 26.

I want to thank Helga Zepp-LaRouche very much for having invited me to speak to this Schiller Institute international conference.

I have been asked to talk about space exploration. But above all, I would like to remind you of something quite obvious, quite common, which seems to be forgotten today, even though it determines the future we can imagine for our societies. We live in an infinite world. It seems like this doesn't have any real consequence; but let's imagine the opposite. Let's imagine the world is finite. Then we have to admit right away that the resources available are also finite, as well as the territory to be shared. Then, population growth becomes a problem, given that resources are diminished. If this



EIRNS/Christopher Lewis

The false belief in a finite world leads to viewing human beings as animals, without reason, Biérent said. "What a sad story, while in reality life is much more beautiful!"

is the case, then we can consider the future only with a growing feeling of fear.

Progress in technology makes life easier, but by improving the well-being of the population, it also leads people to live longer and to become more numerous. Then we become suspicious about progress and about people's welfare, and prefer to allow the existence of poverty, and thus war and famine, in order to reduce human population, as if humans were animals which are not endowed with Reason. We then end up rejoicing about those terrible things, having become convinced that they are indispensable to the well-being of the happy few, who have the right to a dignified life. Such is the logic of that

very pragmatic "finite" world. We end up hating man, and seeing in him nothing but smallness and egoism.

What a sad story, while in reality life is much more beautiful! What a ridiculous hypothesis, that of a finite



NASA



We owe a great deal to two great German scientists: Wernher von Braun (left), who convinced President Kennedy to launch the Apollo program; and Krafft Ehricke, who developed a philosophy of space exploration for the greatest good of mankind.

world! We need only look above—to the heavens—to be convinced of the contrary. And if we do so, I can promise you an era of great optimism and love for life, an era which will certainly beat any scenario of managing of a world of finite resources.

We have difficulties believing it today, but that optimism has already existed. And, by the way, we owe a lot of it to two great German scientists who are certainly not unknown to you. More than 40 years ago, humanity proved that it was capable of accessing other worlds. More than 40 years ago, man walked on the Moon, realizing what just 20 years before was nothing but a utopian scenario.

We owe this to Wernher von Braun, who convinced President Kennedy to launch the Apollo program with the perspective of setting foot on the Moon in only 10 years. Then came Krafft Ehricke, who made significant progress in the use of liquid propellant and proposed to separate the transport of cargo from the transport of men, leading to improved efficiency for both those types of very different missions.

The Unconditional Duty To Extend Human Life

Foremost, Krafft Ehricke developed a philosophy of space exploration for the greatest good of mankind, in which he demonstrated the unconditional duty we

have to extend human life, precisely to avoid the scenario of the terrible fable I told you in the beginning. Because the stagnation of our species can only lead to its extinction, and I will not be among those who will do nothing about it, because overcoming the challenges ahead of us is also a pleasure and gives sense to our existence. That's what our power of Reason is made for, and it is using it that makes us really human.

And at the moment when humanity met the challenge of extracting itself from the Earth to reach another celestial body, what a wave of optimism moved all minds! I was not there, but I know it. Some among you here had the luck to witness that. And I wish that the young generation will also demand its own share of the infinity which surrounds us. That was the long term plan of von Braun and Krafft Ehricke. Their intention was not to set foot on the Moon and then leave. They had a plan reaching out over some 50 years. They projected that by the 1990s, man would have already established a permanent base on the Moon.

Why, some of you might ask? For many reasons.

First, the Moon harbors enormous resources for use on Earth, including titanium, aluminium, and iron. Also, the Moon has a decisive advantage relative to the Earth, in the purification of those metals, which are always found in raw minerals that contain a lot of

oxygen. On Earth, the molten metal must be placed in a vacuum to achieve oxygen extraction, thereby obtaining the best mechanical and anti-corrosive qualities possible. But to create that vacuum is very costly. Because the Moon has no atmosphere, the vacuum is free, and of a much better quality than anything we have been able to create on Earth. With a perfectly purified lunar titan, we could build bridges on Earth which would last forever. All this is possible only if the metal purification is achieved on the Moon.

But the advantage of setting up a lunar base is not solely industrial. The scientific potential is equally enormous. On Earth, space observation is of poor quality because of atmospheric turbulence. To remedy that problem, the best solution was to extract ourselves from that atmospheric turbulence by sending telescopes into space, such as the Hubble telescope.

The results of those observations enabled us to realize a revolution in the comprehension of the universe. But Hubble is just a small telescope. Indeed, we cannot carry large mirrors in a rocket, and the mechanical constraints during the rocket takeoff degrade the optical qualities of the mirror, and it is very difficult to repair a telescope in space.

But on the Moon, there is no atmosphere, and observations, especially on its hidden face, would be excellent. It would be possible to build much larger telescopes there than those in orbit, and of even better quality, since they would be built with lunar silicon dioxide. Once again, in the absence of atmosphere, the optical components built on the Moon would be much better. Another advantage: Gravity on the Moon is one-sixth of that on Earth; therefore, an immense mirror is much less subjected to the constraints of its own weight. It is possible therefore to build mirrors there which are much larger than those on Earth.

We could also respond to other fundamental questions, such as the detection of other planets of the size of the Earth (thanks to interferometer techniques), at a reasonable distance from their stars, and to know if the Earth is an exceptional object of its galaxy or not. One could search for traces of life in the atmospheres of those planets. Such a telescope would be a revolution in our comprehension of the universe, and the Moon is our best hope to get answers to those questions.

One can also add the possibility to build particle accelerators in space, while at the particle accelerator of the CERN [European Organization for Nuclear Re-

search] in Geneva, it takes hard work to create a vacuum, over many kilometers of tunnels.

The Moon harbors important reserves of Helium 3, very rare on Earth, which is the ideal element to realize nuclear fusion, the very same source of energy of the stars, and of the light we receive on Earth every day. From a very small amount of matter can thus come an inconceivably abundant and non-polluting source of energy.

Numerous other applications can be conceived on the Moon, such as the utilization of the phenomenon of free superconductivity, available due to the cold conditions that reign on our satellite.

A Medical Revolution

We can also envisage a medical revolution as a result of experiments we can conduct on the Moon. On this, I refer to the work of the [Basement](#), which demonstrates the influence of the electromagnetic environment on living processes, and more precisely, on the communications among living cells. On the Moon, we would be out of reach of the Earth's electromagnetic field, and one could study the communication among cells. The real cure for cancer is probably in that direction, because it's a typical problem of a cell which no longer responds to the organism. All we are able to do at this point is to apply chemical treatments to destroy the cells, but one could imagine the possibility of simply rallying them back to Reason!

I hope that you are now able to see humanity's potential to inhabit the Moon. Not much is missing to carry out that type of project. First of all, we need a rocket capable of delivering a very heavy cargo to the Moon: the first components of a base to be occupied later by astronauts. As of today, there is no operational heavy launcher in the world. Before, we had the Russian Energia, and the Saturn rocket of the American Apollo mission. Those rockets were able to deliver up to 100 tons to low Earth orbit. In comparison, the Ariane rocket today can only deliver 20 tons to low orbit.

Because of the lack of such projects, we are losing the competency of engineers; and since the Space Shuttle was abandoned, the Americans are not even capable today of sending men to space! Only satellites are being launched; that's not what we can call space exploration!

Having the vision of a lunar base, we need to de-



NASA

Because of the lack of projects such as Apollo, we are losing engineering capabilities, and since the Space Shuttle was abandoned, Americans are no longer capable of sending men into space. Shown: Liftoff of Apollo 11, July 20, 1969, which landed the first men on the Moon.

velop new launchers. The Russians had called on us, the Europeans, to work with them on the Clipper project for a reusable shuttle. Having no vision for the future, however, the Europeans refused. We also need to develop a shuttle used exclusively for travelling between low Earth orbit and low Moon orbit, and we need a Moon lander for landing on non-flat areas at the poles of the Moon, areas where one can find water at the bottom of craters which are never exposed to the sunlight.

It's Not Too Expensive

All those who promote space exploration know what policy must be applied, but they are always told: "It's too expensive." So, for the first time in this speech, I will speak like a pragmatist. Space exploration is a

source of a lot of income, more than any other investment. With the Apollo space program, it is estimated that for each dollar invested, the U.S.A.'s gross national product rose \$2.50; personal income by \$2; and consumer outlays, \$1.50. All three increases led to a Federal tax return of \$0.50 on every space dollar invested. You can't imagine a better business. And you must understand why.


All the new technologies of information, electronics, and materials for space resulted in massive spin-offs for civilian industry. Without the exploration of space as a catalyzer, as a long-term objective, we never would have imagined all those solutions which today feed our progress, our economy, and our well-being. That's the real economy: a will, a vision of the future. And it is only afterwards, without really looking for it, that purely material benefits will occur, such as would never have been possible with a short-term perspective.

Some years ago, I met several German students at the European Space Agency. They came, for the most part, from the University of Stuttgart. I think, in fact, that it is in this university that one finds the best training in space engineering of all of Europe. Very recently, I heard some news about them. They are developing a system to refuel rockets in space. Indeed, most of the propellant is burnt just to reach low Earth orbit, and we don't want to carry more propellant, because then, you have to burn more propellant just to lift propellant.

And those students showed us a new path for space exploration.

With the heavy launcher, we must develop this refueling in space, and we can expect to carry more than 100 tons of cargo to the Moon. Without refueling in space, the same heavy launcher only carries several tons to the Moon! Those students are working on a project which can greatly facilitate Space exploration. These young people illustrate perfectly how space exploration can give a creative impetus to the young generation, and help them to express their maximum potential for projects that will uplift us all.

As Krafft Ehrlicke said so well: "The idea of traveling to other celestial bodies reflects to the highest degree the independence and agility of the human mind.



NASA/Pat Rawlings, SAIC

To reach Mars, we will need higher orders of technological breakthroughs, to reduce the travel time of one year allowed by chemical propulsion. We will need to develop ionic propulsion. Shown: an artist's concept of a nuclear thermal rocket arriving in the vicinity of Mars.

It lends ultimate dignity to man's technical and scientific endeavors. Above all, it touches on the philosophy of his very existence."

I know that those students are endowed with creativity, and I am happy that youth still have the possibility of investing their energy in that type of project.

The Next 40 Years

As Ehrike and von Braun did in their time, we have ideas for space exploration for the next 40 years. The Moon is an excellent platform for the pursuit of space endeavors. Once again, because of the much weaker gravity, it is easier to launch rockets from there. Propellant would be produced on the site, from lunar resources.

But to reach an objective like Mars, we will need higher orders of technological breakthroughs, in order to reduce the travelling time of one year allowed by chemical propulsion. We will need to develop ionic propulsion. In fact, in space, there is no support for generating an upward thrust. Thus, the only means for a rocket to move is to eject matter, causing a thrust in the opposite direction. The faster the ejection of gas, the bigger the thrust will be.

Today, what is ejected is the product of the chemical combustion of hydrogen and oxygen. But the chemical combustion does not eject matter at very fast speed. Ionic propulsion first ionizes a gas. An ion is a particle with an electrical charge. One can apply a force to this charge, and accelerate it by way of an electrical field. But this process—the ionization and the acceleration of particles—consumes a lot of electrical energy; this is why the rocket must be fuelled by a nuclear reactor. With a lighter gas, one could produce a more efficient thrust and reduce the travel time to Mars to some 30 days!

It is thanks to the principle of increase of the energy-flux density in the rocket that we can solve the challenge of making a planet like Mars accessible. Chemical propulsion suffices for the Moon, which would be within three days' reach with that mode of propulsion.

I shared with you my views about our imperative to explore space, I have tried to convince you that we need it in the near future, but I can't prove to you that we have to do it. It is faith, the same faith which pushes every scientist to investigate: the faith that there are physical laws in nature; the faith that man is able to understand the laws of nature; and the faith that man has to use these laws for his own benefit.

Everything in science starts with faith, intuition. It is the way Planck or Leibniz thought about science. You can only demonstrate that your intuition was correct afterwards, once you have made a discovery. This is the same with space exploration. I have faith that expansion in space is our future, and some day, we will laugh about the fact that we believed we were bound to stay on Earth, the same way we once believed the Earth is flat.

We must believe in our ability to create the future we dream of. Space is a natural step for the future of mankind. And the new generation is ready for it!

The Lesson of the Great Japan Earthquake

by Oyang Teng

March 11—The death toll from last year's March 11 earthquake and tsunami off the coast of Japan was the highest in memory for any natural disaster in the industrialized world, and would have been unimaginably worse had Japan not been the most disaster-prepared nation on the planet. A year later, the media continue to focus on the bogeyman of nuclear contamination, while the looming and very real threat of future such megaquakes points to the fundamental question: Can earthquakes be predicted?

Despite denials on the part of mainstream seismology, the qualified answer is: Yes.

To understand the scientific debate, it is necessary to consider how the pervasive reliance on statistical methods has largely supplanted rigorous physical hypothesizing in science (as in economics, with similarly destructive consequences.) At issue, is the fact that the process of earthquake generation is still poorly understood.

Earthquakes originate deep beneath the surface and are therefore outside the range of direct observation. The field of seismology has, therefore, come to depend almost exclusively on the study of how stress accumulates along faults in the ground, by measuring minute movements in the crust. Along with historical records, examination of sediments in trenches dug across faults provides a paleoseismic record of past earthquakes, from which expected average rates of motion along a fault are calculated. Seismic hazard assessment maps extrapolate such past trends forward to establish the probability that a given region will experience an earthquake of a certain magnitude within a 30- to 50-year time interval.

Not only are such methods useless for short-term prediction, but

have failed even within the broad terms set out by the hazard maps: The Japan quake, for example, occurred in a region considered relatively low-hazard. This has led some, such as the University of Tokyo's Robert Geller, to declare that earthquakes are inherently unpredictable. As was done in the field of quantum physics by the irrationalist Copenhagen School in the 1920s, the shortcomings of a particular method of scientific investigation are used to claim that the process under study is inherently random (and, therefore, unknowable), its behavior only susceptible to a broad statistical description.

Measurable Precursor Phenomena

This ignores the fact that there is strong evidence of cyclicity in the appearance of certain earthquakes, on timescales varying from as short as the 11-year solar cycle, to as long as the roughly 60-million-year cycles of volcanic and seismic activity evident in the geological record. More importantly, there is indisputable evidence (as presented in LPAC [videos](#) over the past year) that the complex process of earthquake preparation involves a host of measurable precursor phenomena.

To take the case of the Japan quake, a number of studies have shown that, in retrospect, clear precursor signals appeared in the atmosphere and ionosphere in the days and hours before the main shock struck in the subduction zone off the country's northeastern coast.



US Navy/Mass Communication Spc/Ben Farone

One year after the massive Tohoku earthquake and tsunami, the media continue to focus on the bogeyman of nuclear contamination, while the very real threat of future such megaquakes points to the fundamental question: Can earthquakes be predicted? Shown: Matsushima Air Base on March 20, 2011, following the M9 quake of March 11.

These included:

- a sudden decrease in the height of the ionosphere over the future epicenter, some five days before the quake, measured by the transmission and reception of very low frequency radio signals through the ionosphere;
- satellite-detected anomalous infrared emissions in the atmosphere above the future epicenter beginning three days before;
- a sudden increase in the total electron content of the ionosphere over the future epicenter beginning about one hour before, as measured by GPS satellites.

(For a more detailed treatment, watch for the feature article on earthquake prediction in the upcoming issue of *21st Century Science & Technology* magazine.)

The key to precursor studies has been a multi-parameter approach; that is, not only different measurements of the same parameter (such as ground- and satellite-based measurements of the electron density of the ionosphere), but simultaneous measurement of different signals from the ground, atmosphere, and ionosphere. Given our current lack of direct observation of deep-earth processes, these can serve as guideposts for understanding the underlying physical processes in-


involved in earthquake formation and triggering.

In the meantime, hindcasts like those performed for the Japan quake have proven remarkably successful for a number of medium and large earthquakes studied with the multi-parameter approach. However, there has been very little funding for an expanded and integrated “sensor web” for precursor monitoring, or for scientists involved in such work to collaborate on real-time prediction. A notable exception is [China](#), which has launched an ambitious ground- and satellite-based precursor monitoring program.

In the United States, the Obama Administration has led the charge in cutting funding for new Earth-monitoring satellites, as well as for agencies tasked with disaster preparation. Meanwhile, scientists have been warning that the Pacific Northwest would suffer even greater damage than Japan did if a [megaquake](#) struck the Cascadia subduction zone.

From the standpoint of policy, the tragedy of March 11, 2011 has so far been a catalyst for such anti-scientific measures as the takedown of nuclear power. Instead, let it be the catalyst for a new science of earthquake prediction.

21st CENTURY SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY



Featured in the Fall 2011 issue

- **“Are Carbonic Solutions Alive?”** by V.L. Voeikov and his research team at the Lomonosov Moscow State University, Faculty of Biology. The article presents their research showing that solutions of ordinary baking soda show proto-lifelike properties, such as photon emission, water “burning,” and response to lunar and solar eclipses.
- **“How a ‘Big Lie’ Launched the LNT Myth and the Great Fear of Radiation.”** This interview with Dr. Edward Calabrese, a well-known toxicologist discusses his startling discovery that the linear no-threshold or LNT hypothesis, which governs radiation and chemical protection policy today, was founded on a deliberate lie to further a political agenda.
- **IN MEMORIAM: Zbigniew Jaworowski (1927-2011)**, including an obituary, Dr. Jaworowski’s extensive outline for his autobiography, and his curriculum vitae.
- **IN MEMORIAM: Michael R. Fox (1937-2011)**, including an obituary, the transcript of an interview (“What We Can Learn from Fukushima”), and a remembrance by one of his young students.
- **An interview** with nuclear expert Clinton Bastin: “Iran Has a Nuclear Power, Not a Weapons Program.”
- **An in-depth review** of the biography of Fritz Schumacher, who was a founding father of today’s green movement, and the inventor of the murderous concept “small is beautiful.”



Subscribe! Electronic subscriptions are

\$25 for 6 issues, \$48 for 12 issues Single electronic copy is \$5.

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

21st Century P.O. Box 16285, Washington, D.C. 20041

JFK Warns of Thermonuclear War

In this culture of videogames and other forms of virtual reality, there are few people indeed—and most of them are military leaders—who understand the implications of detonating a general war today. For the reality is that we are looking at a threat of *total war*, which could wipe out the conditions for survival of all forms of life on this planet. It is this kind of war which the British Empire (dependent on its control over the U.S. President) has threatened against the world's other major nuclear powers—Russia and China—and thus it is this kind of war which we face, unless we act to crush this evil oligarchical plan.

The last time such an extinction event was threatened was in the mid-1970s. It was under those circumstances that Lyndon LaRouche developed the concept of strategic ballistic defense, a concept picked up by Ronald Reagan in 1983. The British oligarchy killed the SDI—to our peril.

The world also faced such a horror in the early 1960s, when a great U.S. President, John F. Kennedy, later to be murdered by the British, raised his voice about the danger. He provides a sharp reminder for why we must defeat the British threat today, and remove Obama.

“In the thermonuclear age, any misjudgment on either side about the intentions of the other could rain more devastation in several hours than has been wrought in all the wars of humanity” (report on the Berlin Crisis, July 25, 1961).

“Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished

before they abolish us” (Address to the UN General Assembly, Sept. 25, 1961).


“I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all the Allied air forces in World War II. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn” (Commencement address at American University, June 10, 1963).

“A war today or tomorrow, if it led to nuclear war, would not be like any war in history. A full-scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than 60 minutes, with the weapons now in existence, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans, and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere. And, as Chairman Khrushchev warned the Communist Chinese, ‘the survivors would envy the dead.’ For they would inherit a world so devastated by explosions and poison and fire that today we cannot even conceive of its horrors. So let us try to turn the world away from war. . . .

“If only one thermonuclear bomb were to be dropped on any American, Russian, or any other city, whether it was launched by accident or design, by a madman or by an enemy, by a large nation or by a small, from any corner of the world, that one bomb could release more destructive power on the inhabitants of that one helpless city than all the bombs dropped in the Second World War” (Address on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, July 26, 1963).

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.

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

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

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

Name _____
 Company _____
 Address _____
 City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____
 Phone (_____) _____
 E-mail address _____

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to

EIR News Service Inc.

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

Please charge my MasterCard Visa

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____