

EIR


Executive Intelligence Review

May 18 , 2012 Vol. 39 No. 20

www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

Putin Calls Obama's Bluff, Says 'Nyet' to NATO Threat
A Needed View in Russia: The Roots of the U.S.A.
JP Morgan Fiasco Shows Need for Glass-Steagall

**Bring the Constitution Back
Before Obama's Next War**



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*

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

Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany

Tel: 49-611-73650

Homepage: <http://www.eirna.com>

e-mail: eirna@eirna.com

Director: Georg Neudecker

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

You may have noticed that the “news” this past week was dominated by a single story: “gay marriage.” This foolishness so dominated the nation’s news coverage, that it may have occurred to you that something else, something very big, was happening, and that someone was throwing sand in your eyes. If so, you were right. In fact, as you will read in this issue, there are earth-shaking events taking place that will shape your future in the weeks, months, and years ahead.

Start with our cover story: “Rep. Jones: ‘We Need To Bring the U.S. Constitution Back,’” in which nine-term Congressman Walter Jones, interviewed on The LaRouche Show, issues an urgent call for citizens to join him in pressing the Congress to adopt his HCR 107, citing the Constitutional provision that, if a President “violates the exclusive power of Congress to declare war . . . that he has committed “an impeachable high crime and misdemeanor. . . .” In the same vein, on the floor of the Senate, Jim Webb announced his intention to introduce legislation requiring the President to seek Congressional approval before taking military action for so-called “humanitarian interventions.” His speech is reprinted here. Of course, *EIR* and Lyndon LaRouche have, for three years, been calling for Obama’s removal from the Presidency on these and other grounds; this week, we review the case against the “Queen’s Own Lunatic.”

In *International*, we report on the looming global showdown, in “Putin Calls Obama’s Bluff, Says ‘Nyet’ to NATO Threat”: The Russian President has overturned the chessboard; Putin’s speech to Russia’s patriotic Victory Day celebrations, made it clear: Russia will not back down in the face of U.S./NATO threats, and is prepared to defend the nation and its sovereignty.


On the *Economics* front, there are also huge shifts underway: JP Morgan’s announcement that it blew \$2 billion in the global casino, is just the “tip of the tip of the iceberg” which the trans-Atlantic Titanic has already struck. The ship is sinking, but the band plays on. The tremors can be seen as well in Greece, which may be about to jump into the lifeboat and rescue itself from Euroland.

Three special items fill out the issue: From LaRouche, “A Needed View of Russia Today!: The Roots of the U.S.A.”; a defense of the U.S. Post Office, founded by Benjamin Franklin; and an interview with astrophysicist Dr. Alan Harris, on how to defend Earth from “near space objects.”



Cover This Week

Army Chaplain Col. Richard Rogers performs last rites for six airmen killed in Afghanistan.



U.S. Army/Pvt. Terri Rorke

4 Rep. Jones: ‘We Need To Bring the U.S. Constitution Back’

The LaRouche Show interviews Rep. Walter Jones (R-N.C.), the initiator of House Concurrent Resolution 107, which threatens the impeachment of any President who violates the exclusive constitutional prerogative power of the Congress to declare war.

16 ‘Humanitarian Intervention’: Sen. Webb Challenges Obama War Policy

Documentation: Sen. James Webb’s speech on the floor of the U.S. Senate May 9, announcing his intention to introduce legislation requiring Congressional approval before the President could take military action for so-called “humanitarian interventions.”

20 Obama: The Queen’s Own Lunatic

A dossier addressed to those who have a great deal of difficulty in understanding, or can’t understand at all, that the real source of the “Obama problem” is the British Empire, and that this Empire *controls* the U.S. President.

International

27 Putin Calls Obama’s Bluff, Says ‘Nyet’ to NATO Threat

Russian President Putin’s rebuff to the threats from the British and President Obama has created a crucial opening for sane forces to bring the world back from the brink of thermonuclear confrontation.

30 Putin on Victory Day: ‘We Have a Great Moral Right...’

32 Greece to Europe’s Bankers: We Are Hungry and We Are Angry, Very Angry

The Greek elections May 6 delivered a resounding “No!” to the brutal austerity that has crushed the Greek economy.

Economics

35 **JP Morgan Fiasco Shows Need for Glass-Steagall**

Thanks to JP Morgan's greed and arrogance, and thanks to the whole trans-Atlantic financial system's recidivism in committing the same speculative lunacy that brought the global financial system to its knees in 2007-08, Glass-Steagall is back on the table in a big way.

39 **Handle with Care: Why the Post Office Is Under Attack**

The U.S. Postal Service is in trouble, not because it doesn't work, but because it does: because it is an institution of national stability and infrastructure, under attack by the monetarists since 1970.

Science

45 **'Exploring the Universe Is an Entirely Natural Thing'**

An interview with Dr. Alan Harris, a British astrophysicist and director of the NEOShield Project at the German Aerospace Center (DLR). NEOShield is an international research program for researching "Near Space Objects" and how to defend against them.

Feature

51 **A Needed View of Russia Today!: The Roots of the U.S.A.**

By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.
What Russian policymakers need to understand about the United States. "My intention in these pages," LaRouche writes, "is to inform the reader of what had been those specifically original, essential constitutional principles of the American system, which remain urgently needed, but virtually unknown among European nations today. Notably, there is the fact of the crucial role of the Franklin D. Roosevelt whose legacy is still bitterly hated by the combination of such places and persons as London, Wall Street, and U.S. President Barack Obama, up to the present moment."

Editorial

59 **Reintroducing the American System**

Rep. Jones: ‘We Need To Bring The U.S. Constitution Back’

by Harley Schlanger

May 12—We’ve entered into a most fascinating but dangerous moment in our nation’s history. We have in the White House a President who has shown repeatedly his lack of respect for the Constitution he swore in his Oath of Office to uphold. His refusal to be accountable to constitutional principles has been clear in many areas of policy, from economics to health care; his preemptive attack on the Supreme Court, which heard arguments on the so-called “Affordable Care Act”; or his disregard for the role of Congress, with recess appointments, signing statements, etc. But in no area is it more dangerous, than in military policy and defense policy, such that he absolutely refused to go to the Congress before engaging in military action in Libya.

As a UN Special Report recently released showed, it was the U.S. military which bore the brunt of the so-called NATO operation, and which was primarily involved in the regime-change in Libya. While some in Congress did move to assert the constitutional authority of the Congress, President Obama rejected their efforts, and in the Senate, he was supported in this rejection by a bipartisan grouping headed by John McCain (R-Ariz.) and John Kerry (D-Mass.), who ran cover for him on Libya.

In the aftermath of the overthrow and murder of Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi, Lyndon LaRouche warned that an attempt to repeat the Libya process in

Syria could lead to a confrontation with Russia and China, risking a blowup into a possible nuclear World War III. Yet the White House has continued to insist that it has the right to act in “humanitarian defense” whenever it determines that an atrocity is about to occur, without having to go to the Congress. Under the doctrine of “responsibility to protect,” the Administration has established an “Atrocities Prevention Board,” and claims to itself the right to take offensive military action which violates the constitutional requirement that only the Congress may authorize the use of military force. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta even brought up at a congressional hearing, that he would consult with the United Nations and NATO, before going to the Congress.

While most of the Members of the Congress have tolerated or even accepted this unconstitutional behavior, one Member decided it was necessary to act, to preempt yet another destructive war, destructive to our nation, to our men and women in the Armed Forces, as well as to international law, if such a war would be conducted outside of our law. That Member of Congress is U.S. Rep. Walter Jones, a Republican from North Carolina.

His interview on The LaRouche Show today, published here, kicked off a national mobilization of the LaRouche movement to pass House Concurrent Resolution 107, Jones’s resolution that threatens the im-



Rep. Walter Jones urges his audience to tell their Congressman very simply: "There are two issues that I'm very concerned about: One is fighting wars without a constitutional approval. The second is, the repeal of Glass-Steagall that allowed banks to create a Sodom and Gomorrah on Wall Street!"

peachment of any President who violates the exclusive constitutional prerogative power of the Congress to declare war.

The LaRouche Show

Representative Jones was the guest on the LaRouche Show radio at www.larouchepub.com/radio on May 12. The co-hosts were Harley Schlanger and Jeffrey Steinberg.

Jeffrey Steinberg: First of all. Let me thank the Congressman for taking the time, on a Saturday afternoon, to join us.

Congressman Walter Jones has served with distinction as an elected official for more than 28 years. He served for 10 years in the North Carolina General Assembly, and is now completing his ninth term in the U.S. House of Representatives, where he serves both on the House Armed Services Committee and the House Financial Services Committee. Earlier this week, on Tuesday, Congressman Jones won a resounding victory in his Republican primary, and he's obviously up for general election in November.

The Congressman is joining us today from his campaign office in North Carolina. And I want to join

Harley in welcoming you to the show, and thanking you profoundly for the efforts that you're making on behalf of this country, and particularly, our men and women in service.

Rep. Walter Jones: Thank you for the kind words in the introduction, Jeff, and I'm delighted to be on the show with you and Harley. I can't think of a more important subject than a country that continues to send our young men and women to fight overseas without a declaration of war. And that is why you have me on the show, today, to talk about H.Con. Resolution 107. I'd like to give you a little bit of history about why this has become more and more of an important issue in my mind for this country.

H.Con. Resolution 107 expresses the sense of Congress, that except in response to an actual or imminent

attack against the United States, the use of offensive military force by a President, without prior and clear authorization of an Act of Congress, violates the exclusive power of Congress to declare war, under Article 1 of the Constitution, and therefore, constitutes an impeachable high crime and misdemeanor under Article 2.

I have been in Congress for 18 years, as Jeff just made reference to. I did not serve in the military. This all started in my mind, about the role of Congress, back in 1999, when I joined other Members of Congress and we went to the Federal courts when President Bill Clinton went into Kosovo. In our filing, led by Congressman Tom Campbell [R-Calif.] at the time, we accused Clinton of not reporting to Congress within 48 hours of the status of the action, as required by the 1973 War Powers Resolution, in not first obtaining a declaration of war from Congress as required in the Constitution.

Since that time, Dennis Kucinich [D-Ohio] and I, in June of 2011, along with Jonathan Turley—he's a constitutional lawyer at George Washington University—Mr. Kucinich and I went to the Federal courts in Washington, D.C., about President Obama not seeking authority from Congress, to invade and attack Libya. And this is why I feel so strongly about the fact that we send our young boys and girls, to give their life, their limbs, and we spend *billions* of dollars that we as a

nation don't even have any more, it's all borrowed money!—and I hope your listeners today will join us in asking members of Congress to use the vehicle H.Con. Resolution 107, and let's have a full debate in Congress as to what is our role when it comes to war. Let's stop all these little resolutions here and there, and resolutions that we gave to President Bush in a war that *never* should have been fought, in Iraq—the misleading lies that were told by the previous administration. And we spent billions of dollars in Iraq, and our kids died and lost their legs—plus the Iraqis who were killed, including children.

I feel very passionate about this. Jeff, you know that. I've just met Harley today, but the American people need to take back the Constitution.

A Bipartisan Effort

Schlanger: And as I understand it, this is not a partisan issue for you. You mentioned Clinton, you mentioned Obama, and you also mentioned that you thought the vote to give Bush power to go into Iraq was a mistake—

Jones: Absolutely.

Schlanger: But you're pushing this to apply, not just to Obama, but to any future President, is that right?

Jones: Harley, that's exactly right. It says "a President," instead of "the President." "The President" would certainly imply Mr. Obama. No, this says, "a President." I want Congress to get out of the stands and get on the field when we make decisions about war, because the one thing we found from the 1999 Federal court ruling, and also the June 2011 [ruling], is that the Federal courts will always say, "Well, you can do something about going to war. You can cut the budget for war." That never happens. And I want to be fair about it: Many colleagues will say—and I understand this, I've got military bases in eastern North Carolina—they'll say, "You send them over there, now how are you going to cut their budgets so they can't buy bullets to fight with?" So that is why this resolution, I think, is so important.

We need to either amend the War Powers Resolution, or we need to take this Concurrent Resolution and debate it in Washington, and let the experts come and testify before the Judiciary Committee, and say, what is the role of Congress? Is the role of Congress what the

'An Impeachable High Crime and Misdemeanor'

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

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

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
March 7, 2012**

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

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

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

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

Constitution requires us to do? *We* declare war. Or, are we just supposed to sit by and let any President decide what he or she wants to do?

Congress Has Been ‘Neutered’

Schlanger: My next question for you is one that previously would have seemed somewhat obvious: Given that this is clearly stated in the Constitution, that it’s the exclusive right of the Congress, why is it necessary to have a resolution now?

Jones: Harley, you’re right. It is obvious, but the problem is that Congress has allowed itself to be neutered, if I can use that word, when it comes to the Constitution and the duties of Congress, when it comes to war. We haven’t declared war since World War II. And we as a nation have been manipulated from—in my opinion, the Vietnam War probably started the manipulation that I could maybe refer to; maybe even before that—but certainly the Vietnam War was manipulated by Lyndon Baines Johnson and those people surrounding him, McNamara and others, in a war where we lost 55,000 Americans—for what? For what? And now we’re trading with Vietnam.

We need to bring the Constitution back, and make some sense out of going to war.

Schlanger: Now, as far as the immediate situation, to situate the urgency of your resolution, we have an almost uncontrolled situation going on in Syria, where you have Republicans and Democrats—again, Senator McCain, Joe Lieberman, John Kerry—all seem intent on a replay of Libya in Syria. Is that part of what you see as the urgency here?

Jones: I’m very concerned about Syria, but also concerned about Iran. I think there are a lot of war games going on right now, and I think there are people within this administration and outside this administration that are putting pressure on the Obama Administration to be prepared to go, whether it be Syria or Iran.

I’m not against having a strong military. In fact, I am for a strong military; I think the Constitution requires that. But to use our men and women as policemen around the world, to go into countries where we do



Library of Congress

Wounded American soldiers in Hue City in 1968. The American people were manipulated into a war in Vietnam in which we lost 55,000 soldiers, said Jones. “For what? For what?”

not like the leader of the country—Qaddafi was an evil man, but how many evil people are there around the world? We are a debtor nation; we spend \$10 billion a month in Afghanistan right now, and it’s all borrowed money!

Schlanger: And has there been any discussion in the Congress about this “Responsibility To Protect” doctrine, which is now being institutionalized with an “Atrocities Prevention Board”?

Jones: The answer is, yes, but not much conversation. The whole issue is that the American people need to take back their government. We, for too long, have been controlled by special interests and political action committees. That’s not a real great answer to your statement, but I see it all the time—I’ve said so many times.

If you want to change Washington, you want to give it back to the people, create national public financing of campaigns. And this does impact on the issue we’re talking about today. But the whole thing comes back to the fact that the American people need not to allow Congress to ever send another young man or woman to spend 10 years walking the roads of a foreign country so they can be killed or lose their legs.

And this is a start, by having this discussion on H.Con. Resolution 107. I hope those listening to your show today will contact their Member of Congress, in the House—this bill is not in the Senate, at this time, so

we're concentrating on the House. We need to get co-sponsors right now, and we're just starting. That's why I wanted to be on this show.

Rep. Dan Burton [R] from Indiana is a co-sponsor of H. Con. Resolution 107. Mike Coffman [R-Colo.], himself a former Marine, is a co-sponsor. John Duncan [R] from Tennessee is a co-sponsor; Tim McClintock [R] from California; and Reid Ribble [R] from Wisconsin—they're the co-sponsors we have at this time. But I want to thank Jeff, and Rochelle [Ascher], and Stu [Rosenblatt], and all the LaRouche people who are out there trying to push all the Members of Congress to join in this effort to defend the Constitution.

Schlanger: I think it's important that you raise this point, because our listeners—certainly we hope that our listeners are not just sitting there, shaking their heads and saying, "Aw, the Congress is no good." Here you have a Congressman who's put himself on the line. In fact, I think the reason that you had an opponent in the Republican primary may well be because of your commitment to these issues.

Jones: That's true.

Schlanger: But I think it's important that we make this a bipartisan fight, because, after all, as one of my friends said the other day, when soldiers are sent to war, they don't go as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans. And so we have to get some Democratic co-sponsors on this.

Now, you mentioned the Senate. I understand that Sen. Jim Webb [D-Va.] has introduced a bill on this idea of "humanitarian deployments." Are you familiar with the bill?

Jones: Actually, Jeff brought it to my office. We had a meeting Thursday, to map out some strategy, and I've had a chance to bring it home. I've not read it in detail, but, let me say, I have great respect for Senator Webb, and any, any effort to create a discussion of this country



U.S. Air Force/Tech. Sgt. J.T. May III

Jones points to the Afghanistan War as another undeclared war upon which we've spent billions of dollars. The wounded veterans "have earned the right to be paid! And yet, I worry about how we're going to keep their benefits moving forward." Here, Air Force medics in Afghanistan move an injured soldier from a helicopter to a litter for transport, April 2010.

going to war without declaring war based on the Constitution is worth it.

Raise the Level of Debate

The problem is, we hardly ever debate the role of Congress when it comes to war! If it wasn't for these lawsuits, where I joined Dennis Kucinich, I joined Tom Campbell in 1999—it's sad for me to say it this way, but it would just keep going on and on and on! Ten years, and now the President is trying to sign a security agreement with Afghanistan to stay there 12 more years? Where are we going to get the money from?

Steinberg: It's \$44 billion.

Jones: I'm worried about fixing the veterans, who've lost arms and legs and body parts. They've earned the right to be paid! And yet, I worry about how we're going to keep their benefits moving forward.

Schlanger: On the constitutional question, I think the most important thing—I'm sure you're familiar with the statement attributed to Benjamin Franklin, after the Constitutional Convention, when he was asked, "What kind of government did you give us?" And he said, "A republic, if you can keep it."

And if you look at what we had, the kind of idiotic

debates in the last couple of Presidential elections, the use of “social issue hot buttons” as opposed to serious discussions about what is the future of this nation: Where should we be investing money? What are we doing to our young men and women? What’s happening to our education system? These are issues that affect every family! And these are issues which actually are addressed in our Constitution! So, I think this is a crucial matter, of getting this kind of discussion going.

The People Must Lean on Congress

Jones: Harley, if I could divert for just one moment, but it does tie in: A couple years ago, we had the Democrats in the majority—and again, I am a Republican, and proud to be one. I introduced a bill [in 2007], working with [constitutional lawyer] Bruce Fein, and it would be part of the public law, and it basically said that if any President had intentionally misled the American people to go to war, and it could be proven after the fact, then that individual could be indicted, and brought to trial.

Well, I was able, thanks to Rep. John Conyers [D-Mich.] who at that time was the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, to get a subcommittee hearing, and it was pretty good. We had a couple of experts—and I’m not an expert by the way—but we had a couple of panels of experts.

Then I went back to Mr. Conyers and asked him if he would hold a full committee hearing and vote, in the committee. There was some opposition from Republicans, and I’ll explain that in a minute. Mr. Conyers said, “If you could get Lamar Smith [R-Tex.] to agree to bring it to the full committee, I will bring it up for a debate and a vote.” And that’s all I was trying to get, even if it could not pass: Somebody has to be held responsible when we send our kids to war and it’s not necessary. Mr. Conyers is very close to the new chairman, now, Lamar Smith, who’s a fine, fine person, let me make that clear, from Texas.

So, Bruce Fein and I went to see Lamar Smith, who I’m very fond of, to see if he would agree. And Lamar was very honest. He said, “Walt, the problem is, I think this might be something that we really need to talk about. But I know what’ll happen in that committee: The Democrats will demagogue, and talk about George Bush.” And so, it died; it never got anywhere.

So, that’s why in working again [now] with Bruce Fein, I’ve been to meet with Lamar Smith; he’s now the chairman, he’s going to consider entertaining a hearing.

That’s why we need your people to get behind talking to Members of Congress and say, “Get behind H.Con. Resolution 107, HCR 107.” Because, I think that Lamar, even though he would not tell Mr. Conyers to move the bill I just explained, about holding someone responsible after they leave office, still, he will entertain H.Con. Resolution 107, because he does know that we need to have this debate.

Dancing and Dodging

Steinberg: I want to go back to the earlier discussion when, Harley, you raised the issue of why would it be necessary to state something that is already explicit in the Constitution.

Congressman, I was very struck, about two weeks ago, when there was a hearing of the House Armed Services Committee, at which Defense Secretary Panetta was testifying, I believe also with General Dempsey, and you and Rep. Randy Forbes [R-Va.] really backed him into a corner. And from my reading of what Panetta said, he reiterated what the policy was in Libya, and *would not commit* that the President would go to Congress for authorization, before going to war.

Jones: You’re right. He was really very clear that the President would not commit, in my opinion. I mean, he was not quite that plain, but he said that we have to go to the foreign countries and get the foreign countries to agree that we’re doing the right thing, before we come to Congress. And that’s the point you were making: Where in the world is the Constitution? It says nothing about Congress having to get the approval from foreign countries, before it debates and declares war! That’s how far away from the Constitution America has gone.

Steinberg: Really a frightening situation. And I thought that the sort of back-to-back questioning by you and Representative Forbes¹ was crucial in drawing that out. If I remember correctly, the very last thing that Secretary Panetta said, was exactly the issue that Congress always has the option to cut off funding. But that’s only one of the responsibilities that the Constitution gives to Congress. The overriding one, as you say in HCR 107, is Article I, Section 8, paragraph 11, that gives Congress the exclusive authority to declare war.

Jones: Randy Forbes is a very, very fine member of the House Armed Services Committees, from Virginia;

1. For details, see “Panetta Testimony Reaffirms Need for Rep. Walter Jones’ Impeachment Bill,” *EIR*, April 27, 2012.

and let me go back just a year or so, to make another point that involves Randy, and also the issue we're talking about.

Shortly after President Obama went into Libya, we held hearings on the Armed Services Committee, and the Secretary of Defense at that time was Bob Gates, a very fine gentleman, just like Pannetta.

And Randy asked Gates a question that I will never forget. He said, "Mr. Secretary, since [the Administration] did not even notify Congress that we were going to bomb Libya, let me ask you a question. In your opinion, if Libya sent missiles and struck New York City, in your mind, would that be a declaration of war?"

You know, Randy never got a straight answer.

They just dance and dodge around this thing, because nobody has ever put them in the spotlight. And H.Con. Resolution 107, in a very small way, will put them in the spotlight! Because Congress—I blame Congress as much as I do an administration. If we're not willing to buck an administration, whether it be Democrat or Republican, and say, "Listen, you might be the President of the United States, but by God, we have a Constitution. And if you want to go to war, you need to come to Congress and ask for a declaration of war!" I don't want to oversimplify it. There are certain situations; I realize that. But when you really look at it, the Congress, since the Vietnam War, has just been in the stands, not on the playing field.

An Imperial Presidency

Schlanger: This actually brings up a bigger issue as well, which is this idea of an imperial Presidency: that the President has, President Obama now, I'm talking about; President Bush and Vice President Cheney were moving already in this direction, with signing statements and recess appointments. But it's almost as though—and I think President Obama has stated this—the Congress is in his way, and he's going to act for the



U.S. Navy/Mass Comm. Spc. 2nd Class Julio Rivera

Marines embark upon the assault ship USS Bataan for deployment to the Libyan coast, March 2011. If Libya bombed New York City, would that be a "declaration of war"? When a Congressman asked this question of the Secretary of Defense last year, he got no answer.

people above the Congress.

Is this something that troubles you?

Jones: Harley, it concerns many Members in Congress on both sides, when a President makes a public statement similar to what you just said, or takes action. And yet, there's no outrage by the Congress, and the people say, "Well, I voted for you to go up there and speak for me." It gets very depressing, truthfully, that we can have any President—you made that clear—that feels that he is—. You know, we're supposed to be equal branches, the Legislative, Judicial, and the Executive. And for goodness sakes, the Executive—as you have said—too many times, they do not see particularly the Legislative branch, as equal.

Schlanger: I think you see, in the population, one of the things they're using [to claim Executive privilege] is the low poll ratings for Congress. But I personally think, from the work that I do in organizing—and I'm involved in running five campaigns of LaRouche candidates for Congress—is that part of the anger at Congress, is that they're not standing up! It's not that they're doing so many bad things, but they're not fighting on principle!

Jones: That, again, is why I'm grateful to the La-



EIRNS/Joanne McAndrews

it. But let me get to another point: Where is the outrage on the streets about spending \$10 billion a month, sending kids to die for a corrupt leader named Karzai [President of Afghanistan—ed.], in a country that you're never going to change—no matter what you do! You're never going to change Afghanistan!"

Schlanger: There are some in Congress who have questioned the Memo of Understanding that was signed last week with Karzai, committing us to another 12 years there. Are you involved in some of the action on that?

Jones: I will shortly be dropping a bill that, if it should become law, says that nothing will happen unless Congress approves it. I hope to have that bill either next week or the first week in June. I might just go and drop it next week, like I did H.Con. Resolution 107.

Getting Congressmen To Listen



2012 Occupy DC

Congress's approval ratings are at an all-time low. Clockwise from left: A demonstration in Washington on Nov. 27, 2011; LaRouchePAC organizes at the Capitol building, May 18, 2010; a poster for the Jan. 17, 2012 "Occupy DC" rally.



Interoccupy Admin

Rouche radio show, that you allow me to be on. That's why I believe sincerely—not because I introduced this, let me make it clear—that H.Con. Resolution 107 is an opportunity for the American people; I don't think there's anything as important as making a decision to send a young man or woman to a foreign country to get killed, or have their legs blown off. And yet, there is no outrage in this country. I've been raising Cain! I had the Tea Party people—I've said, I can understand you being upset and concerned, but why aren't you upset about going to war, without declaring war, and kids dying?

I said, to the [Occupy] Wall Street group—they came in my office, and I met with some of them. I didn't meet with all of them—my staff did—but I met with a few of them. And I told them, "You know, you've got some valid points, I agree with you. Glass-Steagall needs to be reinstated in this country. I'm sorry I ever voted to repeal

And I want your listeners to understand, that even though I've named only five members of Congress, the way the Congress works, is if you get a bill in, then you get a bill number, like we have "107," on this issue. Then you get shows like this, to encourage membership throughout this country to get behind H.Con. Resolution 107.

So, when I drop the bill, I hope we're going to be able to do the same thing, and get a lot of American people behind that legislation, just like I hope to get behind this resolution. Because there is no way—if the people don't speak, Congress will just do what Congress wants, actions they take without the will of the people.

Schlanger: For the listeners who may want to do something: What's the best way to approach a congressional office? If you have a Congressman who you

think should be supporting this, or even if they won't support it, but you want to put some pressure on them, how do you go about organizing people to move the Congress?

Jones: The way to really get a congressional office to respond, is either telephone calls, or letters, or asking for meetings. We will be breaking in about two weeks, I think. We'll be all going home (except those that take overseas trips, but that's another issue for another time); we will all be going home and the citizens that want to go meet with that member of Congress and say, "Come on and get behind H.Con Resolution 107, it's time that you take action as the Constitution requires and not just pass resolutions." But yes, telephone calls will do it. If a member gets 10 or 15 phone calls, I guarantee you, that young man or young woman at the front desk taking those calls is going to bring it to somebody's attention, saying, "Look, we just got 15 or 20 phone calls a day about H.Con. Resolution 107." Then that Member of Congress is going to take some interest in it.

Schlanger: I hope our listeners heard that, because a lot of them say to me, "Well, I made a phone call and nothing happened." But you are saying that in congressional offices, people pay attention to that, and also especially visits.

Jones: Absolutely. To me, the Internet is fine, but e-mails, you get thousands of them per day from your Congressional District, and that's when it's really hard for a Member. But when you start getting phone calls, and you get 5, 10, 15 phone calls—. Anybody listening that agrees with us on H.Con. Resolution 107, why not ask your friends, get them the telephone number of the district office of Congressman Walter Jones—and, I'm just using myself as the example, obviously—but get them the telephone number, and say, "All you got to do is call, and all you've got to say, is 'HCR 107, HCR 107. Support HCR 107.'"

And then that Member of Congress or his staff, if they get 10 or 15 phone calls, they're going to say, "Well, what is HCR 107?" And then it'll come back: "This is the resolution, that if a President bypasses Congress and bombs another country, he can be impeached!"

Winning Democratic Support

Schlanger: Now, let me take this one step further, because I'm very happy that you laid this out, so that people are hearing that people in the Congress *do* respond, or they will have to respond. We're also seeing a

bit of an upsurge again, of anti-incumbency. We saw Sen. Richard Lugar [R-Ind.] defeated, and I think it's unfortunate, because he was someone who was speaking out on these questions, along with Sen. Bob Corker [R-Tenn.].

But, the next question I have for you, if HCR 107 is passed, is there the guts in the Congress, if the President does this, to move for impeachment?

Jones: That's a good point. I would put it this way, that if the House of Representatives passed H.Con. Resolution 107, I promise you—and very seldom do I promise anything, because I learn I can't keep them in Congress much; but I can just about promise you, that it will get the attention of the Administration. Because it will send a signal, if you make some decision bypassing Congress, and you go and bomb another country that is not an imminent threat to America, then we will proceed with impeachment. It will have that kind of effect, truthfully. If we could just get it passed in the House.

Schlanger: Now, my other question is that to pass it in the House, you would need some Democratic support, I would think?

Jones: Yes.

Schlanger: Are there Democrats you've talked to and Democrats who recognize that this is a problem? Certainly with the budget crisis, with the financial crisis, with the imperial Presidency, the precedents that are being set, both by Bush and Obama, if you end up with a Republican President, they could do the same thing. So aren't some of the Democrats getting a little nervous about this? And do you think you can get some Democrats on board?

Jones: Well, Harley, with the LaRouche team that works Washington, I think we can get some Democrats on it. But it does take your listeners back home; if they have a Democratic Congressman or a Republican Congressman, it doesn't really matter, just call them and remind them that this is not about Mr. Obama, this is about the weakness of Congress. And that's really what it's about, it's about the weakness of Congress, when it comes to declaring war. Congress gets stronger: Meet your constitutional responsibility, back HCR 107!

That's what this is about. It's not a Democratic or Republican effort. This is an effort by a Congressman, and now five Congressmen, who believe that Congress has a role, that's based on the Constitution. That's what it's really all about. That's really what it's about.

Glass-Steagall

Schlanger: I want to come to the question of Glass-Steagall in a moment, but Jeff, I wanted to see if you had anything else from the strategic standpoint that you wanted to ask the Congressman.

Steinberg: I think that it's really appropriate at this point, to just point to the fact, since we're talking about the need for Congress as an institution to act in a bipartisan fashion, that Congressman Jones was one of the initiating co-sponsors of a critical piece of legislation, introduced by a Democratic colleague, Marcy Kaptur [Ohio], which is a bill that now has over 50 sponsors in the House, that would reinstate the original Glass-Steagall separation of commercial banks from the investment and insurance sectors. And I think this is exemplary of where the interests of the country as a whole trumped any partisan considerations.

And I hope that Democratic Members of Congress, who know that Congressman Jones is absolutely right on HCR 107, will have the same courage that the Congressman showed in helping to get the ball rolling on the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall.

These issues of war and peace, and the issue of the bankruptcy of our country, are, I think, two of the gravest threats to the survival of our constitutional republic. We've talked about the Glass-Steagall issue; you were enthusiastic about the importance of reinstating it. Maybe you could say some things about that, as well.

Jones: Sure. Jeff, as I've mentioned so many times in the nine terms I've been in office, there are two votes that I regret the very most, the first being the Iraq War, a very unnecessary war. I didn't vote my conscience, and I wish I had.

On the second vote, that I feel that I've let the people down, was the repeal of Glass-Steagall. At the time, some people back in my district, which was very important, said, "Do not expand the opportunity of the banks to get into real estate, and to get into insurance, into stocks." And I wish that I had, on both issues, the strength I have now—and I give God credit for that—to do what I think is right, and not do what some political action committee or special interest says needs to be done.

And you know—I'm going to be bipartisan now—President Clinton was the President at the time of the repeal of Glass-Steagall. And his Administration and my Republican Party (we were the majority in the House and Senate at the time) [both pushed for repeal], and I



U.S. Army/Sgt. Jeffrey Alexander
U.S. soldiers on patrol in Adhamiya, Iraq, May 4, 2007.

was part of the problem, because I voted to repeal it.

But thank you for mentioning it, I'm also on Marcy Kaptur's bill. It needs to be reinstated, because if not, then we're going to continue to see these failures on Wall Street! They're just going to continue.

Schlanger: We saw this last week another shock delivered, with JPMorgan Chase acknowledging a \$2 billion loss, which could have been more than that, from the same involvement in collateralized debt obligations, and credit default swaps, that was behind the 2008 collapse of Lehman Brothers and others.

Now, the Congress passed a bill, the Dodd-Frank Bill, which we identified as a bill that the bankers would love. It did nothing to really install new regulations, and there was an effort to get Glass-Steagall that was specifically crushed by President Obama and Tim Geithner. Now, given that there are 58 co-sponsors [for the Kaptur bill], including some Republicans, what are the chances that we can get the Glass-Steagall bill, now that it's become clear, with the euro crisis and with the recent JPMorgan scandal, that we've done *nothing* to prevent *this from happening again*?

Jones: Harley, as we're saying about H.Con. Resolution 107, the American people have more power than they realize. The Congress and the special interest

people realize that we've got a difficult economy, people are losing jobs, people are afraid they're going to lose jobs, so they take advantage of this. I want the American people to do what those people in [Occupy] Wall Street did—I mean, I'm not saying they got to go put up a tent somewhere, but for godsakes! Pick up the phone and make a call! As you or Jeff said a while ago, Harley, our approval rating is around 12 or 14%! If you can't pick up the phone, now, and say to a member of Congress, "There are two issues that I'm very concerned about: One is fighting wars without a constitutional approval. The second is, the repeal of Glass-Steagall that allowed banks to create a Sodom and Gomorrah on Wall Street!"

Schlanger: Yes, the concept of "too big to fail," which is something which we should *never* have! There's nothing too big to fail, except the U.S. government, which we can't allow to fail. And our lack of interest in these issues is precisely allowing that to happen.

'Pick Up the Phone!'

Jones: Well, I know Mr. LaRouche, and the LaRouche team that I work with in Washington, one of them being Jeff, and yourself, but the point is, I don't want to oversimplify it, but when I was in Washington during the bailout of Wall Street, we were there two days; and my chief of staff Glen Downs and myself were the only two in the office. I didn't ask the staff to come in on Saturday and Sunday, and we ended up voting on Sunday. I couldn't watch enough football, quite frankly. What I would do, is every four or fifth call—I didn't really time it, you understand—I would go answer the phone. And people would say, "I want to leave a message for Congressman Jones." And I'd say, "Well, you got him. That's me." "Really? You're kidding me, it's you?" "Yes, it is."

And then I would take the question. And I'm not exaggerating!—it was running nine to one *not* to bail out Wall Street. I didn't vote to bail out Wall Street.

But I would tell the listeners to your show today: Pick up the phone on these two issues, and call, and you know what? Hold the people to the fire. The time for the American people to take back their government is now. It won't be tomorrow. Tomorrow will be too late. It's now.

Schlanger: And we do have an election this year, and it's not too late to make these issues central issues in the election, which I think are probably more important

for the future of this nation, than the issues in the Republican debates, or the ones the President seems to want to take up, with gay marriage and things of that sort.

This is our whole *raison d'être*: to move the American people back into politics! And I think the point that's come through repeatedly in this discussion, is that you believe that principles, ultimately, are more important than party; that patriotism and love of country, and the future of the nation, trump partisanship any time.

Jones: Absolutely, Harley. I can honestly say that many, many people say, "Walter, you know, I vote for you because I know that you'll take a stand against your own party, if you think it's the right thing to do for the people." And there are more than just me; I'm not saying I'm the only one, and Jeff knows them, and probably you know them, too. But the problem is, that people get into Washington, and it's all about fundraising, it's all about, "We got to raise money; we got to hold the power; we got to do this; we got to do that." Well, look and see where the majority of the money comes from: opensecrets.com, any of your listeners can go on that and look and see where the money's coming from.

And I take PAC money, too, I want to be fair about it. But I'm also on a couple of bills, one by John Larson [D-Conn.], to have voluntary public financing of the campaigns. I'm part of the problem on this issue, but I'm also trying to be part of the solution.

The BMD Deployment in Europe

Steinberg: Speaking of political activism and getting the American people behind the right policies, I just want to interrupt with a question that's been sent in. There's a group of about 20 organizers gathered in New Jersey, basically volunteers for Diane Sare's campaign in New Jersey—she's one of the five members of the [National] LaRouche Democratic Slate.

Clark King from Philadelphia has sent in a question for you. He says: "It appears that perpetual war is expanding with the European anti-ballistic-missile expansion set to be ratified on May 20 at the Chicago NATO meeting, where there'll be new elements installed in Poland and other parts of Europe, potentially aimed at Russia. Will the Congress challenge this deployment, and make other efforts to curb this potential expansion of war?"

Jones: My answer would be that—of course, this is a treaty that goes to the Senate, not to the House—but I believe sincerely, that there are those of us in both parties, that are saying, it's time—. John Garamendi from

California, during the Armed Services markup last week, had an amendment that would delay the creation of a missile defense system on the East Coast. I was among the one or two Republicans that voted with him. It'll come back on the floor; it failed.

But I think the gentleman from Philadelphia is exactly right: The voices of the people have got to be heard. And this lady [Diane Sare] in New Jersey that's running, I hope she'll start—I'm sure she will—speaking out, and telling people. There are those in all parties, I'll be fair about it, that are trying to do what's right for this country. But if you're not going to follow the Constitution, you'll never get this country straight, it will never happen.

'I'm Going To Fight for It'

Schlanger: Well, I hope people are getting the sense, here, that this is something that you actually believe could be done. And even if it couldn't be done, you know it's the right thing to do and you're going to fight for it.

Jones: Harley, I'm going to fight for it, for this reason. I'm 69; I'm healthy at this point; I'm going to do everything I can, because there's not a whole lot of time left for this country to be a great nation. A great nation is great because it rebuilds itself when it's hurting; and when I look at the fact that we're borrowing money from the Chinese, and spending it all over the world—\$10 billion in Afghanistan!—I think America is on a 12-hour clock, and we're in the 11th hour. There's no 1 a.m.!

We either get it fixed now—we're not going to fix it overnight. I won't live long enough to see it fixed, but maybe your son or your daughter ... maybe that child that you and your wife have brought into this world, maybe when he or she gets to be 30 years of age, she'll be able to say to you and your wife, "Mom and Dad, you know what? This is the greatest nation in the world."

But it's only going to be great, because we come back to the Constitution.

Schlanger: We have a couple of minutes left, if you want to make one final statement to our listeners. And I'm *really* insisting that our listeners not be listeners today, but be turned into activists. Because I think your passion for this resonates with people who are supporters of Mr. LaRouche, but we need to make sure there's



U.S. Army/Sgt. 1st Class Michael J. Carden

Soldiers train for the inaugural Warrior Games at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, April 13, 2010. Don't we owe it to these veterans, asked Jones, to demand that Congress support HCR 107? To say, "Congress, return to your constitutional powers in declaring war."

no cynicism that gets in the way.

So, do you have some final comments you'd like to make?

Jones: Yes. Harley and Jeff, thank you for this opportunity, I've really enjoyed it. I've learned a lot by listening to both of you. Please, just take one issue, that deals with the Constitution, and that is the role of the Executive branch and Congress, and make the calls, tell Congress to get a backbone! And to meet its constitutional responsibilities when it comes to declaring war.

I've seen four kids at Walter Reed, who have *no* body parts below their waist—*nothing, nothing, nothing! below their waist!* Don't we owe it to them, who gave half their body, for the war to be based on the Constitution, based on the fact that Congress declared war? Please pick up the phone, call that Member of Congress, and just say, "Please join in the effort on HCR 107. Congress, return to your constitutional powers in declaring war."

Schlanger: I thank you for your time today, and I thank you for your commitment to this fight. And hopefully we'll be able to bring you on again, to get an update on this.

Jones: Well, thank you both, and God bless America. Thank you so much.

Sen. Webb Challenges Obama War Policy

May 10—Virginia Democrat Sen. Jim Webb today moved to erect a U.S. Senate barricade against the British-Obama global war policy carried out under the guise of “humanitarian intervention” or “right to protect” (R2P); Lyndon LaRouche commented that Webb’s move has to be viewed as of a piece with Rep. Walter Jones’s actions in the House of Representatives (See Jones’s interview on The LaRouche Show, above.) A rapid build-up of support for both actions, together with the strong resistance of military leaders to the British war policy, could stop the threat of thermonuclear war.

Webb announced that he will introduce legislation to require Congressional approval before President Obama (or any President) could take military action for so-called “humanitarian interventions.” Webb’s release says, “The legislation would require the President to obtain formal approval by the Congress before using military force; would require that debate begin within days of such a request; and that a vote must proceed in a timely manner.”

A Washington source told *EIR* that a bipartisan group of Senators has been working with Webb on the bill for two weeks, as a potential war confrontation with Russia looms over the placement of a U.S. ballistic missile defense system in Eastern Europe, and over potential Mideast “triggers.” The Webb initiative has the potential to pass the Senate, the source said.

In the House, Representative Jones is organizing hard for his HCR 107, introduced March 7, which declares any new Presidential war action without Congressional authorization “an impeachable high crime and misdemeanor.”

‘A Bridge Too Far’

Webb insisted he was closing a dangerous “loop-hole in the interpretation of our Constitution. It will serve as a necessary safety net to protect the integrity and the intent of the Constitution itself. It will ensure that the Congress lives up not only to its prerogatives, which were so carefully laid out by our founding fathers, but also to its responsibilities.” Webb further explained in a floor speech, “One of our strongest adjustments from the British system was to ensure that no one person would have the power to commit the nation to military schemes that could not be justified by the interests and the security of the citizen.”

While Webb did not name President Obama, he attacked the British/Obama war on Libya as “potential harm to our Constitutional system itself.” “This administration conducted month after month of combat operations in Libya, with no American interests directly threatened and no clear treaty provisions in play. . . . The unprecedented—and quite frankly contorted—Constitutional logic used by this Administration to intervene in Libya on the basis of what can most kindly be called a United Nations standard of humanitarian intervention, was not even subject to full debate or a vote on the Senate floor.”

In his floor speech, Webb said, “This Administration’s argument that it has the authority to decide when



Jack Looney

Sen. James Webb (D-Va.) has announced his intention to introduce legislation requiring that the President seek Congressional approval—as required by the Constitution—before he orders U.S. forces into war.

and where to use military force without the consent of Congress, using the fragile logic of ‘humanitarian intervention,’ . . . is gravely dangerous. It is a bridge too far. It does not fit our history. To give one individual such discretion ridicules our Constitution.”

Documentation

Webb: Congress Must Approve Use of Force

Here is Sen. James Webb’s speech on the floor of the U.S. Senate May 9, announcing his intention to introduce legislation requiring Congressional approval before the President could take military action for so-called “humanitarian interventions.”¹ Subheads have been added.

I rise today to address perhaps the most important constitutional challenge facing the balance of power between the Presidency and the Congress in modern times, and also to offer a legislative solution that might finally address this paralysis.

It is an issue that has, for far too long, remained unresolved. And for the past ten years, the failure of this body to address it has diminished the respect, the stature, and the seriousness with which the American people have viewed the Congress—to the detriment of our country and our national security.

The question is simple: When should the President have the unilateral authority to decide to use military force, and what is the place of the Congress in that process? What has happened to reduce the role of the Congress from the body which once clearly decided whether or not the nation would go to war, to the point that we are viewed as little more than a rather mindless conduit that collects taxpayer dollars and dispenses them to the President for whatever military functions he decides to undertake?

We know what the Constitution says. Many of us also know the difficulties that have attended this situation in the years that followed World War II.

We are aware of the debates that resulted in the War Powers Resolution of nearly forty years ago, in the wake of the Vietnam War, where the Congress attempted to define a proper balance between the President and this legislative body. I have strong memories of the policy conflicts of that era, first as a Marine infantry officer who fought on the unforgiving battlefields of Vietnam on which more than 100,000 United States Marines were killed or wounded, and later as an ardent student of constitutional law during my time at the Georgetown University Law Center.

But it was in the decades following Vietnam that our constitutional process seems to have broken apart. Year by year, skirmish by skirmish, the role of the Congress in determining where the U.S. military would operate, and when the awesome power of our weapon systems would be unleashed, has diminished.

In the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, especially with the advent of special operations forces and remote bombing capabilities, the Congress seems to have faded into operational irrelevance. Congressional consent is rarely discussed. The strongest debates surround the rather irrelevant issue of whether Congress has even been consulted. We have now reached the point that the unprecedented—and quite frankly contorted—constitutional logic used by this Administration to intervene in Libya on the basis of what can most kindly be called a United Nations standard of “humanitarian intervention,” was not even subject to full debate or a vote on the Senate floor. Such an omission, and the precedent it has set, now requires us to accept one of two uncomfortable alternatives. Either we as a legislative body must reject this passivity and live up to the standards and the expectations regarding Presidential power that were laid down so carefully by our Founding Fathers, or we must accept a redefinition of the very precepts upon which this government was founded.

This is not a political issue. We would be facing the exact same constitutional challenges no matter the party of the President. In fact, unless we resolve this matter, there is no doubt that we someday will.

What the Constitution Says

The conflict in the balance of power between the President and the Congress has always been an intrinsic part of our constitutional makeup. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution provides that the Congress alone has the power to declare war. Article II,

1. A video of the speech is posted at <http://webb.senate.gov/>

Section 2 of the Constitution provides that the President shall serve as Commander in Chief. In the early days of our Republic these distinctions were clear, particularly since we retained no large standing army during peacetime, and since Article I, Section 8 also provides that the Congress has the power to “raise and support armies,” a phrase that expressed the clear intent of the framers that large ground forces were not to be kept during peacetime, but instead were to be raised at the direction of Congress during a time of war.

Our history confirms this, as our armies demobilized again and again once wars were completed. Only after World War II did this change, when our rather reluctant position as the world’s greatest guarantor of international stability required that we maintain a large standing military force, much of it in Europe and in Asia, ready to respond to crises whose immediacy could not otherwise allow us to go through the lengthy process of mobilization in order to raise an army, and because of that reality made the time-honored process of asking the Congress for a declaration of war in most cases obsolescent.

But any logical proposition can be carried to a ridiculous extreme. The fact that some military situations have required our Presidents to act immediately, before then reporting to the Congress, does not in and of itself give the President a blanket authority to use military force whenever and wherever he decides to, even where Americans are not personally at risk, and even where the vital interests of our country have not been debated and clearly defined. This is the ridiculous extreme that we have now reached.

The world is filled with tyrants. Democratic systems are far and few between. I don’t know exactly what objective standard should be used before the United States government decides to conduct a “humanitarian intervention” by using our military power to address domestic tensions inside another country, and I don’t believe anyone else knows, either. But I will say this: No President should have the unilateral authority to make that decision, either.

I make this point from the perspective of someone who grew up in the military, and whose family has participated as citizen-soldiers in most of our country’s wars, beginning with the American Revolution. I was proud to serve as a Marine in Vietnam. I am equally proud of my son’s service as a Marine infantryman in

Iraq. I am also deeply grateful for having had the opportunity to serve five years in the Pentagon, one as a Marine, and four as Assistant Secretary of Defense and as Secretary of the Navy.

And I have benefited over the years from having served in many places around the world as a journalist, including in Beirut during our military engagement there in 1983, and in Afghanistan as an embedded journalist in 2004. As most people in this body know, I am one of the strongest proponents of the refocusing of our national involvement in East Asia, and was the original sponsor of the Senate resolution condemning China’s use of force with respect to sovereignty issues in the South China Sea.

The point is that I’m not advocating a retreat from anywhere. But this Administration’s argument that it has the authority to decide when and where to use military force without the consent of the Congress, using the fragile logic of “humanitarian intervention” to ostensibly redress domestic tensions inside countries where American interests are not being directly threatened, is gravely dangerous. It is a bridge too far. It does not fit our history. To give one individual such discretion ridicules our Constitution. It belittles the role of the Congress. And for anyone in this body to accept this rationale is also to accept that the Congress no longer has any direct role in the development, and particularly in the execution, of foreign policy.

Clear Boundaries

There are clear and important boundaries that have always existed when considering a President’s authority to order our military into action without the immediate consent of the Congress. To exceed these boundaries—as the President has already done with the precedent set in Libya—is to deliberately destroy the balance of powers that were built so carefully into the Constitution itself.

These historically acceptable conditions under which a President can unilaterally order the military into action are clear. If our country or our military forces are attacked; if an attack, including one by international terrorists, is imminent and must be pre-empted; if treaty commitments specifically compel us to respond to attacks on our allies; if American citizens are detained or threatened; if our sea lanes are interrupted, then—and only then—

should the President order the use of military force without first gaining the approval of the Congress [emphasis added].

At least until recent months, the Congress has never accepted that the President owns the unilateral discretion to initiate combat activities without direct provocation, without Americans at risk, without the obligations of treaty commitments, and without the consent of the Congress. The recent actions by this Administration, beginning with the months-long intervention in Libya, should give us all grounds for concern and alarm about the potential harm to our constitutional system itself. We are in no sense compelled—or justified—in taking action based on a vote in the United Nations, or as the result of a decision made by a collective security agreement such as NATO when none of its members have been attacked. It is not the prerogative of the President to decide to commit our military and our prestige into situations that cannot clearly be determined to flow from vital national interests.

Who should decide that? I can't personally and conclusively define the boundaries of what is being called a "humanitarian intervention." Most importantly, neither can anybody else. Where should it apply? Where should it not? Rwanda? Libya? Syria? Venezuela? Bangladesh? In the absence of a clear determination by our time-honored constitutional process, who should decide where our young men and women, and our national treasure, should be risked? Some of these endeavors may be justified, some may not. But the most important point to be made is that in our system, no one person should have the power to inject the United States military, and the prestige of our nation, into such circumstances.

Our Constitution was founded upon this hesitation. We inherited our system from Great Britain, but we adapted and changed it for a reason. *One of our strongest adjustments from the British system was to ensure that no one person would have the power to commit the nation to military schemes that could not be justified by the interests and the security of the average citizen [emphasis added].* President after President, beginning with George Washington, has emphasized the importance of this fundamental principle to the stability of our political system, and to the integrity of our country in the international community. The fact that the leadership of our Congress has failed to raise

this historic standard in the past few years, and most specifically in Libya, is a warning sign to this body that it must reaffirm one of its most solemn responsibilities.

A Legislative Solution

I have been working for several months to construct a legislative solution to this paralysis. This legislation would recognize that modern circumstances require an adroit approach to the manner in which our foreign policy is now being implemented. But it would also put necessary and proper boundaries around a President's discretion when it comes to so-called humanitarian interventions, where we and our people are not being directly threatened. My legislation requires that in any situation where American interests are not directly threatened, the President must obtain formal approval by the Congress before introducing American military force. This legislation will also provide that debate on such a request must begin within days of the request, and that a vote must proceed in a timely manner.

I would remind the leadership on both sides of this body that despite repeated calls from myself and other Senators, when this Administration conducted month after month of combat operations in Libya, with no American interests directly threatened and no clear treaty provisions in play, the Congress of the United States, both Democrat and Republican, could not even bring itself to have a formal debate on whether the use of military force was appropriate, and this use of military force went on for months and was never approved. The Administration, which spent well over a billion dollars of taxpayer funds, dropped thousands of bombs on the country, and operated our military offshore for months, claimed that "combat" was not occurring, and rejected the notion that the War Powers Act applied to the situation.

I am not here to debate the War Powers Act. I am suggesting that other statutory language that covers these kinds of situations must be enacted. The legislation that I will be introducing will address this loophole in the interpretation of our Constitution. It will serve as a necessary safety net to protect the integrity and the intent of the Constitution itself. It will ensure that Congress lives up not only to its prerogatives, which were so carefully laid out by our Founding Fathers, but also to its responsibilities.

Obama: The Queen's Own Lunatic

by Nancy Spannaus

May 10—Lyndon LaRouche, the strategist who immediately picked up on the British intent to provoke thermonuclear confrontation with the powers of Asia, especially Russia and China, if they did not capitulate to the British anti-sovereignty agenda after the assassination of Muammar Qaddafi, has been adamant: If the decision is made by the United States to go to war against the Russians, it will be made not by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or President Barack Obama, but by the British imperial controllers of the U.S. President. The fact is, LaRouche says, that Obama is a de facto British puppet, whose own insane Nero complex has been used by his sponsors and controllers to carry out one imperial policy after another. If his controllers order him to push the nuclear button, he will do so.

This reality puts extraordinary urgency behind LaRouche's demand that Obama be removed from power immediately, through the application of Section 4 of the 25th Amendment, or impeachment, as the only insurance that such a global war will not be launched.

There are a growing number of Americans, especially prominent ones, and international figures, who have caught on to the fact that the "Nobel Peace Prize winner" Barack Obama is committed to a war policy, despite whatever balderdash comes out of his mouth, and they have gone into action to try to deter such action. But most have a great deal of difficulty in under-



White House/Lawrence Jackson

In April 2009, the Obamas made a high-profile trip to London, where they met with Queen Elizabeth II at Buckingham Palace, and were honored with a gala State Banquet (shown here). The Obamas' obsequious behavior was widely noted.



White House/Pete Souza

standing, or can't understand at all, that the real source of the problem is not the sick Obama, but the British Empire—and that this Empire *controls* the U.S. President.

LaRouche's assertion, of course, cannot be proven in the traditional Sherlock Holmes-style way, by pointing to check stubs, or electrodes, or the like.

The crucial evidence lies in the question of *mindset*, specifically the oligarchical mindset which characterizes the British oligarchy that runs the international financial system today, its junior partners on Wall Street,

and a frighteningly large number of people in the U.S. “political class,” not to mention the personal mindset and personality of an Obama who has been thoroughly diagnosed, by LaRouche and psychological experts such as Sam Vaknin, as a Nero-like personality and “malignant narcissist.”¹

But valuable aids toward understanding the British oligarchical control over this American President (by no means the first time such control has taken effect) can be found in the public domain. For it was the City of London crowd which picked up Obama and helped steamroll his victory over the Hillary Clinton they hated and feared; and it was this same crowd which developed the genocidal, even Hitlerian, policies which the Obama Administration has carried out to a tee; and this same British grouping, from former Prime Minister Tony Blair, up to and including the Queen and her evil Prince Consort, which has stood by Obama’s side every step of the way.

Who Crowned Obama President?

Barack Obama, a first-term U.S. Senator from Illinois, was indeed considered an improbable Presidential candidate for the 2008 elections. The frontrunner by all accounts was Hillary Clinton, wife of former President Bill Clinton; she had a considerable national base within the Democratic Party, and experience on the national and international scene, and was expected to win. Obama had little experience, but much ambition, and a reputation for being a compelling speaker, based on his speech at the 2004 Democratic Convention. He had also written an acclaimed biography entitled *Dreams of My Father*, first published in 1995, and reissued in 2004.

London’s hand first emerges publicly in 2004, in the person of **George Soros**. Soros, as *EIR* has thoroughly proven, may have an American passport, but he is a British agent.

In 2004, “former” Rothschild employee turned hedge-fund bandit Soros held a fundraising cocktail party in his New York Fifth Avenue apartment for guest of honor Barack Obama, who was running for the State Senate in Illinois. Obama won, and within a couple of years, turned to higher ambitions, starting with the U.S. Senate. Again, Soros played a sponsoring role, holding a meeting in Manhattan on Aug. 2, 2007, where a dozen

of New York’s top Democratic contributors met Obama, and his Presidential campaign was effectively launched.

The role of Soros as an agent of top levels of the British oligarchy should not be underestimated. As elaborated in *EIR*’s 1997 Special Report “The True Story of Soros the Golem,” and further elaborated in LPAC’s 2008 pamphlet “Your Enemy, George Soros,” George Soros has been a highly protected operative of the British financial oligarchy since the 1950s. His major conduit was the Quantum Fund, which operated out of the Netherlands Antilles, and carried out massive financial speculation, much of which has gained international attention, such as his 1992 speculation against the British and Italian currencies which wrecked the European Exchange Rate Mechanism. He has been charged with financial fraud in a number of nations, and has occasionally been convicted (as in France).

But in the United States, Soros is known as a “philanthropist,” funder of causes such as drug decriminalization (read: legalization) and the right to die, and, more recently, of social networking and “democracy” movements such as MoveOn.org. These were the networks which, along with the big financial rollers—like Robert Wolf, head of United Bank of Switzerland-America—provided the core of alleged mass popular support for the Illinois parvenu, as he launched his Presidential campaign.

While Obama gave vague, promising speeches about “hope and change,” the London crowd worked on the concrete policy questions. Among the most visible “friends” and advisors of Obama was Tony Blair, architect of the Iraq War that Obama ostensibly opposed, and of the policy of eliminating the principles of the Treaty of Westphalia, specifically, national sovereignty. Obama’s top foreign policy advisors, Ivo Daalder of the Brookings Institution and Anthony Lake, signed on to the policy of the so-called Princeton Project called the “Concert of Democracies,” which laid out in 2008 a perspective for circumventing the United Nations “to provide a framework for organizing and legitimizing international interventions, including the use of military force.”

Nor was it simply his advisors who embraced the British outlook. Obama himself, in a closed-door fundraising event held April 28, 2008—publicized by the *Guardian* and the *Telegraph*—declared that the U.S. relationship with Great Britain had to be “recalibrated” to make it more fair and equal for the British. “Full part-

1. See <http://larouchepac.com/node/16343?page=6>; and <http://larouchepac.com/node/19464>.



EU photo



WEF/swiss-image.ch/Annette Boutellier

Obama's "first friend" Tony Blair (left) is the monarchy's controller of the American President; hedge-fund bandit George Soros (above) carries a U.S. passport, but functions as a British agent.

friend," and whom he praised as an example of what "dedicated leadership can accomplish." Obama repeatedly chose to have tête-à-têtes with Blair rather than Blair's rival, then the serving British Prime Minister, Gordon Brown. Where that relationship began is still shrouded in secrecy, but it continues to this day.

Then, on April 1, the Obamas made a high-profile trip to London, for the Group of Eight Summit, where they met with Queen Elizabeth II at Buckingham Palace, with deference broadly recognized as unbecoming to a President of the United States meeting a British Mon-

arch, and with celebrated embraces.

But, much more significant than these symbolic events, was the pattern of decisions on policy being made by the incoming Obama Administration, which can be clearly identified as "made in London," buttressed by the new President's political appointments. We take for granted that the reader understands that Obama's retaining of Wall Street operatives such as Tim Geithner and Larry Summers showed his fundamental commitment to the British-style banking system. Here we review the even more distinct British pedigree of policies and personnel.

A Note on Glass-Steagall

But first, let's briefly discuss one of the most significant policy issues to face the new President when he came into office, Glass-Steagall. At the time of the inauguration, the urgency of stopping the bailout process by implementing a replica of Franklin Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall bill was obvious. But Obama turned it down flat.

The man Obama appointed as National Economic Advisor, Larry Summers, obviously counseled him against renewing Glass-Steagall. Summers was the leading force in the Clinton Administration arguing for the repeal of bank separation, on the grounds that the U.S. banks had to go global. Concretely, that meant that the big Wall Street banks, like Goldman Sachs and AIG, set up their most rabid speculative operations directly

ners not only listen to each other, they also occasionally follow each other," Obama reportedly said in his telephone address. "And in some cases, we should follow London's, rather than Washington's lead on issues of foreign policy cooperation."

The fundraiser, by the way, was hosted by Elisabeth Murdoch, daughter of another leading British agent and media mogul, Rupert Murdoch. It netted \$400,000 for Obama's Presidential campaign.

Obama's overall fundraising success owed a lot to pulling in the young generation through online social networking websites such as MySpace, Bebo, and Facebook, the first two of which are traceably British, and all of which are perfect for good old-fashioned money-laundering. Add to that the top-down media bias toward Obama during the primary election campaign, and the thug operations run by the Obama campaign against the Clinton campaign, and the outcome was almost predetermined: Obama in a landslide.

Policies Made in London

In several high-profile events immediately after his inauguration, President Obama made it clear that he was looking to Britain, and the Queen herself, for guidance on policy matters. First, at the Feb. 5, 2009 National Prayer Breakfast, sponsored by the ideologically British Fellowship Foundation, Obama appeared with Blair, to whom he referred as his unofficial "first

out of London. When they bet wrong, of course, they insisted on being bailed out, and Summers did not want to stop that.

The London role became even more direct in 2010, when two U.S. Senators, Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.) and John McCain (R-Ariz.) introduced an amendment to the Administration's financial reform bill, which would have reinstated the Glass-Steagall restrictions on the investment banks. As it came time for the amendment to be heard, in May of that year, it was clear that it would pass the Senate overwhelmingly. While the Obama Administration had assured Cantwell that the amendment would be considered, the President ultimately gave the word that it would *not*. The amendment died.

What had really happened? London had intervened with a direct order.

EIR received a report from a top American economist, who described a dinner he attended at the London School of Economics that Spring. When the conversation turned to Glass-Steagall, an official from the British Ministry of Finance shocked the American by saying that if the U.S. were to reinstate Glass-Steagall, it would be "viewed as a hostile act by Great Britain and by the nations of Europe." He added that someone from the British Foreign Office would be contacting his counterpart in the U.S. State Department to make this position clear.

Is it now clear who is calling the shots in the Obama Administration?

Start with Green Genocide

As soon as Obama took office, he rushed to declare his Administration's commitment to phony climate science and environmentalism, or, to be more precise, green genocide. None other than British Crown agent Tony Blair came to Washington in March 2009 to hold closed-door brainwashing seminars in preparation for the December UN International Climate Conference scheduled for Copenhagen in December, a conference dedicated to implementation of the British Monarchy's depopulation/deindustrialization agenda.

During the Presidential campaign, Obama had paid lip service to maintaining and expanding nuclear power. Now there was not a word about anything but "green" energy technologies—wind, solar, biomass—none of which can possibly provide enough power to support the current, much less growing, population at a human level.

In tandem with this Obama commitment was his early appointment of his Science Advisor, **John Holdren**. Holdren was notorious for his joint writing projects with outright depopulation advocate Paul Ehrlich, with one of their articles advocating putting sterilization agents in the water supply. Clearly this was no bar to appointment by Barack Obama, who was faithfully following his British agenda. And Holdren has carried out that murderous agenda step by step, primarily by presiding over the dismantling of the core of the scientific capacity of the United States, most notably its manned space program.

Note that Holdren's close colleague Paul Ehrlich, author of the 1968 book *The Population Bomb*, gave an interview to the London *Guardian* on April 26, 2012, calling for a reduction of the world's population to 1.5 to 2 billion, an echo of the monarchy's radical population reduction plan. One has to ask: Will Holdren and Obama be far behind?

British Nazi Economics: Health

The most stunning example of Obama's adoption of the British agenda was in his policy on health care—slashing health care, that is. The new President's very first appointment showed that direction, and it got more explicit as the contours of his Administration's health-care "reform" took shape. And again, right in the middle of the actually Hitlerian policy was Tony Blair.

Obama's first relevant appointment was taken in the transition period, with the naming of **Peter R. Orzag** as head of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Orzag, a graduate of the London School of Economics in the 1990s, was a supporter of "behavioral economics," especially as applied to coercing physicians and patients to accept new medical practices which would *cut costs*. In June 2008, as head of the Congressional Budget Office, Orzag had been invited to give a presentation on his "how to cut health care" methods to the Cabinet of British Prime Minister Brown.

Orzag was preaching to the choir. For almost a decade earlier, under the prime-ministership of Obama's friend Blair, the British government had set up its own pioneering health-care-cutting institution, the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE), whose "health" policies proceeded from the same premise as that of Adolf Hitler: Resources are limited, so *don't* waste them on those with lives "not worthy to be lived." From this standpoint, NICE has a lengthy

record of using statistics to make decisions as to what medications and treatments will be available to the British public through the National Health Service (NHS), and which will not. The resulting triage is a matter of public record.

It was precisely this model and philosophy which Obama, starting with his April 8 Executive Order mandating health-care reform, moved to implement.

It gets even more specific.

As the Obama Administration was going through the process of selling its health “reform,” it directly brought in the chairman of NICE since its inception, **Sir Michael Rawlins**. While not all the details of this collaboration are known, in April, from London, Rawlins made a video presentation to a Health Channel TV Summit on U.S. health-care policy. *Time* magazine interviewed him on March 27 on the thinking behind his proposals. We provide excerpts:

Time: Why is NICE needed? Shouldn't you get the drugs you need when you are sick, regardless of cost?

Rawlins: All health-care systems are facing the problem of finite resources and almost infinite demand... We are best known [for looking] at a new drug, device or diagnostic technique to see whether the increment in the cost of that treatment is worth the increment in the health gain...

Time: How is that measured?

Rawlins: It's based on the cost of a measure called the “quality-adjusted life year.” A QALY scores your health on a scale from zero to one: zero if you're dead and one if you're in perfect health. You find out as a result of a treatment where a patient would move up the scale. If you do a hip replacement, the patient might start at 0.5 and go up to 0.7, improving 0.2. You can assume patients live for an average of 15 years following hip replacements. And .2 times 15 equals three quality-adjusted life years. If the hip replacement costs 10,000 GBP [about

\$15,000] to do, it's 10,000 divided by three, which equals 3,333 GBP [about \$5,000]. That figure is the cost per QALY.




U.S. State Department



YouTube



Creative Commons



Creative Commons

Obama has surrounded himself with a group of ghoulish advisors who are pushing the British Imperial agenda. Clockwise from top: Science Advisor John Holdren pushes depopulation, advocating placing sterilization agents in the water supply; Sir Michael Rawlins pushes the Nazi-like “quality-adjusted life year”; “behavioral economist” Peter Orszag, former OMB head, promotes murderous cuts in health care; Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel is associated with the Hastings Center euthanasia lobby; and Dr. Donald Berwick, an honorary Knight Commander of the British Empire, specializes in cutting health-care costs.

Rawlins was asked by the interviewer, “You are basically deciding how much a year of life is worth?” He agreed, admitting that this is “controversial,” but saying it has to be done.

Need we provide any more evidence that this “health” policy is Hitler’s policy, of determining by “cost-effectiveness” who should live, and who should die?

To add frosting to the cake, Obama and Orzag brought in another advocate of health-care rationing, **Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel**, as a Special Health-Care Advisor to Orzag. Emanuel’s pedigree, despite all his protestations to the contrary, is established by his status as a leading member of the Hastings Center, home of one of the most aggressive euthanasia lobbies in the United States. Emanuel fully subscribes to the Hitlerian calculus described by Rawlins above.

It is unknowable how much consultation and collaboration went on between the Blair-British health-care slashers and the Obama Administration, in the latter’s campaign to ram through the “Affordable Care Act.” But Obama himself unabashedly signalled its pedigree when, in July of 2010, he made a recess appointment of the head of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the institution which would be the enforcer of the Hitler health cuts, of **Dr. Donald Berwick**.

Berwick, who claims to be an American, is known for his programs to cut down “unnecessary treatment” in the U.S. health-care system. But he really won his spurs in Great Britain! Berwick had just been named an honorary Knight Commander of the British Empire by Queen Elizabeth, specifically for his role as consultant and advisor to the British National Health Service from 1996 to 2003. That was precisely the period when Blair had launched his Hitlerian NICE project, of which Berwick was an integral part.

Today, although almost all of these particular personnel have left their posts—some, like Emanuel and Berwick, under the most intense popular pressure because of their Nazi policies—Obama *has* established Blair’s Nazi-modelled health system in the United States. This British agent has made Hitler health the law of the land.

British Imperialism, Blair-Style

The other major thread of British policy that runs through the Obama Administration and its history is located in foreign policy. The principal Obama appointee associated with this policy is the person he nominated

as UN ambassador, **Susan B. Rice**. The distinctive characteristic of Rice’s policy, and that of Obama personally, is a direct copy of that formulated by Tony Blair.

Blair, Her Majesty’s Prime Minister from 1997 to 2006, is a British Fabian, who follows, as does the current British Monarchy, the policy of “liberal imperialism” pioneered by H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell in the late 19th Century. Specifically, the “new imperialism” calls for destroying nation-states and national sovereignty through the spread of globalization and encouraging “competition,” as well as strengthening supranational institutions, including military ones.

Blair spelled out the cornerstone of this modern British imperial foreign policy in April of 1999, in a speech to the World Affairs Council in Chicago on the 50th anniversary of NATO. He called for overriding national sovereignty in the name of “defending human rights” (today, called Responsibility to Protect, or R2P). Five years later, in a speech in Sedgefield, England, he explicitly declared that the era of the Treaty of Westphalia—the great document which brought an end to the Thirty Years War in 1648, by establishing the principle of national sovereignty based on caring for the “benefit of the other”—was over, and some nations had the obligation to impose their standards on others.

As is evident with the results of Blair’s 2003 Iraq War, the result of such a policy is perpetual (and often religious) war.

In addition to Blair’s direct interventions with President Obama—he’s travelled to the U.S. innumerable times, often in secret—the key implementor of this policy has been Susan Rice. During the early days of the Obama Presidency, Rice had to contend with the countervailing influence of what has been called the Security Cabinet—Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, National Security Advisor James Jones, and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton—who formed a kind of bulwark against such insanity. Since the resignations of the two military men, however, Rice has been enabled to run amok.

Thus, we have had not only the counterproductive “surge” in Afghanistan, but also an escalating process toward imposing the R2P policy on locations ranging from Africa to the Middle East and Eastern Europe. In all these initiatives, Her Majesty’s government—which now has a Conservative prime minister, but maintains the same new imperialist policy—has only had to pro-



UN/Jenny Rocke



Creative Commons

Susan Rice (left), Obama’s UN Ambassador and a Rhodes scholar, has a strictly British pedigree, as seen in her imperial mindset toward Africa; while Samantha Power, a Special Advisor to the President, heads the Orwellian Atrocities Prevention Board, whose role is to justify preemptive wars.

May 1999: Honored as the Bram Fischer Memorial Lecturer at Rhodes House, Oxford, while she was U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Rice said how happy she was to be there: “To be at Rhodes House tonight with so many friends, benefactors, and mentors is a personal privilege. It is like a coming home for me, for much of what I know about Africa was discovered within these walls, refined at this great university, with generous support of the Rhodes Trust.” (Cecil Rhodes was a leading Fabian-imperialist racist who, in the second half of the 19th Century, was determined to bring all Africa under the control of the British Empire.)

vide support, rather than take the lead.

Rice has her own British pedigree as well. We quote from an *EIR* article from December 2009:

1990: A Rhodes Scholar, she received her PhD in International Relations from New College, Oxford.

1990: Awarded Royal Commonwealth Society’s Walter Frewen Lord Prize for outstanding research in the field of Commonwealth History.

1992: Recipient of the first annual award given by the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) and the British International Studies Association for the most distinguished dissertation in the U.K. in the field of international studies. Her dissertation, “The Commonwealth Initiative in Zimbabwe, 1979-1980: Implications for International Peacekeeping,” praised the British peacekeeping transition, after the Empire engineered a 13-year war against the liberation of the people of Zimbabwe.

1993-95: Director for International Organizations and Peacekeeping at the National Security Council.

1995-97: Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for African Affairs.

1997-2001: Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. Many speculate that her mentor or godmother, Madeline Albright, who was then Secretary of State, was instrumental in securing this position. Albright is associated with the ideology of Zbigniew Brzezinski and, like her father, is a follower of the British Fabian H.G. Wells.

determined to bring all Africa under the control of the British Empire.)

2002: Brookings Institution, Senior Fellow in the Foreign Policy and Global Economy Development program.

Rice’s record at the United Nations speaks for itself. She is also flanked in her efforts by **Samantha Power**, a creature of the Soros networks who specializes in genocide “studies.” Power now operates as a Special Advisor to Obama, as head of the Atrocities Prevention Board, the Administration’s latest institution established for justifying preventive wars.

If Obama follows the same pathway as these two British agents, we are headed toward World War III.

Obama Must Go

LaRouche has often commented that it is as if Tony Blair were President of the United States; all he has to do is show up, and Barack Obama does what he’s told. This is currently the case with the impending showdown with the Russians over Ballistic Missile Defense—and it’s been true all along.

But if it weren’t Blair, it would be some other British agent.

The truth is, that as long as Obama and this coterie occupy the Executive, the genocidal British monarchy will have its finger on the nuclear button, and control over the most powerful nation on Earth, for good or evil. The solution should be obvious.

Putin Calls Obama's Bluff, Says 'Nyet' to NATO Threat

by Jeffrey Steinberg and Nancy Spannaus

May 14—With President Vladimir Putin's surprise phone call to Barack Obama on May 9, in which he announced that he would not be attending the May 18 G-8 Summit at Camp David, the global strategic situation has shifted in a fundamental way. The newly inaugurated Putin, now beginning his third term as President, has delivered an unequivocal rebuff to British and Obama threats, and thus created a crucial opening for sane forces to bring the world back from the brink of thermo-nuclear confrontation.

Contrary to the White House line, and most press coverage, Putin's polite, but pointed announcement that he is too busy to attend, and is sending Prime Minister Dmitri Medvedev in his stead, stems specifically from Russia's strong objection to NATO's intention to announce the "interim operational capability" of its European-based Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) during the NATO Conference in Chicago on May 20-21. The meeting of the Russia-NATO Council, traditionally held on the sidelines of NATO heads of state conferences, had already been cancelled by the Russian government, in light of that impasse.

At the beginning of May, the Russian government



Presidential Press & Information Office

President Putin has delivered a clear rebuke to Obama's threats to deploy an BMD system on Russia's borders. He is shown here speaking at the May 9 military parade on Red Square, celebrating the 67th anniversary of Russia's victory in the Great Patriotic War (World War II).

hosted a Moscow conference on ballistic missile defense, attended by representatives of 50 nations, including all 28 NATO member countries, at which top Russian defense officials publicly explained the dangerous consequences of deployment of a European ballistic missile defense shield without Russian full participa-

tion, and threatened to take preventive military action (see *EIR*, May 11).

Those credible Russian threats have blown a hole in the British efforts to intimidate Russia into capitulating to its agenda to save the current system through eliminating national sovereignty and imposing killer austerity and hyperinflation. Yet, at the same time, the Russians continue to express hope that NATO, and particularly the United States, will negotiate a workable arrangement with Russia on missile defense, including *written*, legally binding guarantees that the BMD system is not aimed against Russia, and agreement on a verifiable set of parameters to ensure that that was the case.

Putin's cancellation has definitely delivered a shock to the NATO governments; and some high-level sources in Washington indicate that, contrary to previous statements that NATO will go ahead with building the BMDS, no matter what, the governments will seriously seek to find a way to accommodate Russian concerns, during the NATO summit discussions. But May 20-21 remains a crucial point of decision, as to whether the British Empire succeeds in pushing forward its confrontation policy toward World War III, or whether saner heads prevail.

Another Warning of a Preemptive Strike

Gen. Nikolai Makarov, Chief of Russia's General Staff, was unequivocal in his warning during the May 3-4 BMD conference. Given the threat to Russia's ability to retaliate against a U.S./NATO first strike attack, a threat represented by the planned BMD installations in Poland and Romania, "the placement of new strike weapons in the south and northwest of Russia against [NATO] missile defense components, including the deployment of Iskander missile systems in Kaliningrad region, is one possible way of incapacitating the European missile defense infrastructure," Makarov said. Taking into account the "destabilizing nature of the missile defense system . . . the decision on the preemptive use of available weapons will be made during the period of an escalating situation."

Deputy Chief of the General Staff Gen. Col. Valeri Gerasimov later in the conference, provided extensive documentation, with video animations, of the fact that the planned system is not aimed at Iran, but does, in its intended later phases, represent a threat to Russia's strategic deterrent.

On May 11, Russian Minister of Defense Anatoli Serdyukov reiterated Makarov's warning, according to

a report in the official Russian news agency Itar-Tass, but in even blunter terms:

"At the conference on ballistic missile defense (BMD), we once again drew attention to the fact that the EuroBMD deployment causes us certain concerns; we shall destroy the anti-missile defenses accordingly," Itar-Tass quoted Serdyukov. He named Russia's Iskander missile as capable of doing this: "The Iskander can handle neutralization of systems that could hinder our missiles," he said, referring to the BMD threat to Russian intercontinental ballistic missiles, fired in a retaliatory "second strike" under a scenario of a U.S. nuclear missile first strike against Russia.

The Iskander is a truck-mobile, nuclear-capable tactical missile with a range of up to 400 kilometers. NATO calls it the SS-26. It is a successor to the Oka missile (SS-23), which was taken out of service and destroyed under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force treaty of 1987; the Iskander also succeeded the famous Soviet Scud-B missile. In his televised national address of Nov. 23, 2011, then-President Dmitri Medvedev warned that Russia would station Iskander missiles in Kaliningrad, if the U.S.A. and NATO proceeded with the BMD program in Poland.

Asked his view of the May 3-4 Moscow conference on BMD, and of some remarks by State Department spokesman Philip Gordon on seeking a compromise with Russia on BMD issues, Serdyukov said that the Russian side awaits specific proposals from the Americans. "We shall wait for what they offer. If they offer legally binding guarantees, we are prepared to look at the matter differently. Hitherto we have received only verbal promises. So far, at the conference it was said that they were prepared to work on some kind of proposals."


The Putin Message

Putin's call to Obama, declaring his intention to skip the Camp David summit, was placed on May 9, the day of national celebration of the Allied victory in World War II, and one of Russia's most patriotic commemorations (see accompanying article).

Putin told his American counterpart that he would not be coming to Camp David for the May 18 G-8 heads of state summit, claiming that he was "too busy" putting the new government together to travel to the U.S. He told Obama that the newly appointed Prime Minister and ex-President, Dmitri Medvedev, would be attending instead.

FIGURE 1

Engagement Event Timeline for Engagement of SS-18/19 from Dombarovskiy with 2-Stage Missile Defense Interceptor



Courtesy of Dr. Theodore Postol

Using the correct data for the speed of the ICBM and interceptor, and the distances to be covered by both, at seven minutes after the ICBM is launched from western Russia, Dr. Ted Postol demonstrated that it can be intercepted by the Poland-based missile, with help from the U.S. radar proposed to be based in the Czech Republic.

The message was clear: Putin will wait to see what happens at the NATO meeting in Chicago, and will act accordingly. The danger of thermonuclear war, while not a certainty, is definitely real and immediate.

What the Russian leadership is looking for was outlined in Makarov’s May 3 speech. He listed various criteria that would indicate that the European BMDS was not directed at Russia, including data on missile velocities, basing locations, radar ranges, and interception capabilities at different phases of flight. He also laid out procedures for joint development of confidence and monitoring measures to guarantee security of strategic capabilities of both sides, preparatory to a legally binding agreement, and identified a number of other crucial topics of discussion geared toward restoring trust.

Will the U.S. Respond?

In the immediate wake of the Moscow conference, NATO and U.S. officials made repeated public statements indicating that they were not taking the Russian concerns or threats seriously. President Obama himself met with NATO Secretary General Fogh Rasmussen on May 10, but no reports have surfaced from that discussion. Instead, there have been declarations several Ad-

ministration spokesmen—Obama’s Special Envoy for Strategic Stability and Missile Defense Ellen Tauscher; Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs Madelyn Creedon (both of whom heard the Russian warnings in person at the May 3-4 conference in Moscow); and NATO spokesperson Oana Lungescu—that the BMD system represents no threat to Russia, and that they expect to go ahead.

Yet, there is public dissension in the ranks.

In recent weeks, both the U.S. Defense Science Board and the National Academy of Sciences have urged Obama to cancel the European BMD deployment, because the system is unreliable, and actually heightens the danger of a blunder into thermonuclear confrontation. There was also the detailed analysis given by at an American Association for the Advancement of Sciences briefing on Capitol Hill on Aug. 28, 2007, in which Dr. Ted Postol, professor

of Science, Technology, and National Security Policy at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and former scientific advisor to the Chief of Naval Operations, provided an airtight case for why the U.S. system in its later phase represented a strategic threat to the Russian deterrent against nuclear attack (Figure 1).

In addition, top American military leaders are fully aware of the Russian position, and of the folly of going forward with the European BMD provocation. At recent hearings of the House Armed Services Committee, Gen. Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, emphasized that there are many areas where U.S.-Russian cooperation is vital to global stability—including the U.S./NATO mission in Afghanistan, the global war on terrorism and war on drugs, and ballistic missile defense.

The problem that looms the largest is President Obama himself. As Lyndon LaRouche has been warning since April 2009, the greatest threat to the survival of mankind is the continued presence of British agent and extreme Narcissist Barack Obama in the White House. As long as Obama is allowed to continue as President, the British Crown maintains a finger on the U.S. thermonuclear trigger. Putin and the Russian de-

fense establishment have made clear that they are fully aware of the threats directed against them, and they are not going to capitulate in any way.

Now it's up to the American political leadership to take the same kind of courageous step, and remove Obama from his position of power before it's too late.

Putin on Victory Day

'We Have a Great Moral Right...'

by Rachel Douglas

May 9—Newly inaugurated Russian President Vladimir Putin presided over today's Victory Day military parade in Moscow's Red Square, marking the 67th anniversary of the defeat of fascism in Europe in 1945. Putin's speech to the event, as well as features of the parade itself, and other events during the day, available on the Kremlin website, should be heard and seen by anybody foolish enough to dismiss current Russian warnings about the danger of a new world war.

The commander of the parade, which featured marching units from every branch of the Russian Armed Forces, and military hardware including strategic nuclear weapons, was Deputy Chief of the General Staff Gen.-Col. Valeri Gerasimov. He is the same officer who, just last week, presented video animations of the nuclear war danger, at the Moscow conference on missile defense held May 3-4.

Putin repeatedly referred to the current situation in the world, citing the historic failure of war-avoidance before World War II, as he ad-

ressed the crowd and the nation during the parade:

"This is our day of memory, our day of pride and mourning, the day that unites everyone in Russia. Sixty-seven years ago, we defeated the terrible and cynical force that was Nazism. We must never forget how that force was born and grew stronger and ever more audacious before the world's very eyes. We must never forget how barbarians planned the destruction of entire peoples and sought to dictate the destinies of whole countries and continents.

"We must be open in recognizing that the Nazis' aggressive plans did not meet with timely collective resistance, and that the divisions between countries and their mutual suspicion and ideological disputes prevented them from being able to stop World War II. Humanity paid a terrible cost for this, but in the end, the inevitable happened, and responsibility and the collective determination to vanquish this evil finally triumphed. Countries rose in common coalition against the Nazi enemy. Today, we pay tribute to the countries that made an enormous contribution to defeating our common ruthless enemy.

"It is our common duty to remember why the war began and to analyse its lessons, which remain just as relevant today. I stress today that strict respect for inter-



Presidential Press & Information Office

"...It was our country that bore the brunt of the Nazi attack, met it with heroic resistance, traversed immense hardships, determined the war's outcome, routed the enemy, and liberated the world's peoples," Putin said in his Victory Day address. Here, Red Square, as the parade is about to begin.

national law, state sovereignty, and the independent choice of each people is one of the crucial guarantees for ensuring that the tragedy of World War II never happens again.

“Russia is consistent in its policy of strengthening security in the world. We have a great moral right in taking this principled and firm stand, because it was our country that bore the brunt of the Nazi attack, met it with heroic resistance, traversed immense hardships, determined the war’s outcome, routed the enemy, and liberated the world’s peoples. This victory provides a strong foundation for our young generations too. . . .

“Veterans, you stood shoulder to shoulder throughout this war, united as brothers, enduring hardships, deprivation, and torment such as seem more than a man can bear. But you did not give in to the enemy, and became those who truly made victory with your own hands. You drew strength from Russia’s glorious military traditions and from the true values that shone so brightly during those times of great trial, and you prove once more that victory is won not only by strength of arms, but by the spirit, solidarity, and faith.

“The Great Patriotic War is part of history now, but your courage and your ability to love and defend your motherland will never fade, and will always remain the yardstick of moral sense, patriotism, and duty for the generations to come. Today too, your descendants follow the Victory Banner and parade with pride across legendary Red Square, and they do so in a sign of deepest respect to those who gave them this great day, those who remained forever on the battlefields and will never celebrate this most sacred of holidays together with us here.

“We will always remain true to your great deed. This is the guarantee of our future, and we will do everything to ensure that it is a safe and peaceful future. Glory to the victorious people! Congratulations! Congratulations on Victory Day! Glory to Russia! Hurrah!”

Parade Highlights

Among the highlights of the parade itself: A color guard carries the national flag and the Victory Banner



The Topol-M, Russia’s most modern intercontinental ballistic missile, on display in the Victory Day parade.

into Red Square. The Victory Banner is the Soviet flag that was raised over the Reichstag in Berlin, in May of 1945. When Putin’s speech begins, the camera pans the crowd of World War II veterans who were present.

Near the end of the parade, several units of truck-mobile Iskander short-range missiles cross Red Square. This is the system being deployed in the far western district of Kaliningrad (historically German Königsberg) as a capability to attack U.S./NATO anti-missile installations in Poland. Soon after the Topol-M, Russia’s most modern intercontinental ballistic missile, appears.

Russian national TV also broadcast excerpts from a meeting Putin held in the afternoon with the families of soldiers of the 6th Paratroopers Company, 104th Guards Airborne Regiment of the 76th (Pskov) Airborne Division, which was nearly entirely wiped out in March 2000 during the 2nd Chechen War.

Speaking with 100 relatives of the 84 paratroopers who died, Putin said once again that in that conflict (it was launched by the British- and Saudi-backed separatist forces just when Putin became acting President in 1999), Russia’s survival was threatened. “Your loved ones did not die in vain,” he said, “because they really blocked the collapse of the country. In truth, that is no exaggeration. I know this. Because we could quite well have had a situation develop like in Yugoslavia. There, the country simply disintegrated, and with bloody fighting. . . . If, God forbid, it had come to that here, things would have been far worse.”

Greece to Europe's Bankers: We Are Hungry and We Are Angry, Very Angry

by Dean Andromidas

May 10—The Greek elections May 6 delivered a resounding “No!” to the bankers’ brutal austerity that has crushed the Greek economy and the living conditions of the population. As one former Greek politician said, “Through these elections the Greeks have given two very loud messages: ‘We are hungry; and we are angry, very very angry.’” The electorate has overthrown the Greek political class, represented by the Pan Hellenic Socialist Party (Pasok) and the conservative New Democracy, which have ruled the country since the overthrow of the military junta in 1975.

Despite “winning” the election, New Democracy garnered only 18.96% of the vote, down by more than 14% from the last election. It won 108 seats in the 300-seat parliament only because under the Greek Constitution, the party with the most votes automatically gets an extra 50 seats! Pasok received no more than 13.23%, down more than 30 percentage points. It will have 41 seats. Most of its former ministers were not even re-elected. These included the hated Yiorgos Papaconstantinou, the Finance Minister who signed the first austerity Memorandum with the International Monetary Fund, and then became Energy and Environmental Minister, from which post he pushed for Project Helios, which would spend billions building solar parks to export electricity to pay off the debts he had negotiated.

Thus, the two parties that supported the hated Memorandum, drafted by the European Commission, the European Central Bank, and the IMF, known as the Troika, with its crushing austerity measures, could only muster about 32% of the vote. Every other party, including several of those which will not be entering parliament, was against the Memorandum.

The big winner was the anti-Memorandum Coalition of the Radical Left (Syriza) which received 16.73%, a 300% increase over its previous vote, and will have 52 seats. The second-biggest winner was the anti-Memorandum Independent Greeks, formed only a few weeks

ago, which won 10.57%, or 33 seats. Other parties were the Communist Party (KKE) with 8.46%, and 26 seats; picking up protest votes, the extreme-right Golden Dawn won 6.96%, or 21 seats; and Democratic Left, which while not as strongly anti-Memorandum as the others, won 6.09%, for 19 seats. Its leader Fotis Kouvelis said he will not join a New Democracy-Pasok government.

A Chance for a Different Course

Following the announcement of the election results, the Syriza leader, 38-year-old Alexis Tsipras, issued a statement declaring: “We strongly believe that the country’s salvation will be achieved through the rejection of these barbaric measures, through relief from recession and the looting of pensions and salaries, through the cancellation of austerity measures and their replacement with measures to boost the economy and to tax built-up wealth so that funds are found to help the weaker sections” of society. He concluded that, “after the people have spoken, [there is] a chance for a radically different course. . . . We issue a clear warning to all parties, inside the country and outside the country, to respect the expression of the electorate.”

Earlier, in a post-election statement, Tsipras said the austerity policies of German Chancellor Angela Merkel “have suffered a crushing defeat.” He said his party’s showing in the elections constituted a “strong message to Greece and to Europe to overturn the status quo,” and “a message of peaceful revolution.”

Democratic Left leader Kouvelis declared, “The [election] results show people’s frustration and anger.”

A Greek collaborator of the Schiller Institute said that now is the time to push very hard to get the Glass-Steagall reform and a Marshall Plan for Southern Europe directly into the hands of the the Syriza, the Independent Greeks, and the Democratic Left, and anyone else who wants to save Greece.



Creative Commons

Alexis Tsipras, leader of the Syriza (Radical Left) party, was the biggest winner in the Greek elections; he is calling for rejection of the “barbaric measures” of the IMF “Memorandum,” and for expanding the economy.

The call for a “Marshall Plan for Southern Europe—Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal,” issued by Schiller Institute chairwoman Helga Zepp-LaRouche, in Greek translation, has begun to circulate in Greece. Presented in an April 27 webcast, “Dialogue with Spain and Portugal,” Zepp-LaRouche called upon the engineers, scientists, students, trade unionists, and others” throughout these nations “to collaborate in assembling the bold reconstruction program required to survive the disintegration of the present global financial system.”

While Europe’s bankers were betting on a New Democracy-Pasok coalition coming to power, to continue their occupation of Greece, the two parties did not win enough seats to form a government. Under the Constitution, the mandate to form a government goes to the party winning the largest vote. If it fails, the mandate goes to the second, and then the third party. As of this writing, New Democracy leader Antonis Samaras failed in his bid to form a government, as did Syriza’s Tsipras, and Pasok’s Evangelos Venizelos. Now it is up to President Karolos Papoulias to attempt to form a national unity government, which, as of this writing, it appears he will fail to do; if so, new elections will be called.

The reaction to the elections from Euroland hardliners and the European Commission is to threaten Greece with expulsion from Euroland, and, if not from planet Earth, at least from the European Union. But, these are simply scare tactics, since if Greece is “thrown

out” of the euro, it will not only immediately default, it will bring the Eurozone down with it, while “investors” lose all confidence the euro and start pulling their investments and deposits out of Italy, Spain, Portugal, and other euro countries.

Both Pasok and New Democracy are using these hollow threats in an attempt to win back votes if fresh elections are held. But they are likely to fail. According to the first post-election poll, Syriza would come in with 27.7%, giving it 128 seats, enough to form a minority government.

New Leadership Coming Forward

Syriza, which now has a fair shot at winning the next election, is a coalition of left-wing parties, including elements of the old Communist Party. They have won the support of the new resistance movement founded by Greek composer Mikos Theodorakis, whom Tsipras met shortly after the election, along with the other founders of the movement, Prof. George Kassinatis, and the celebrated World War II Resistance leader Manolis Glezos. The latter, in fact, won a seat in parliament on the Syriza ticket.

Theodorakis issued the following statement: “I support with all my strength Alexis Tsipras in his efforts to form a government that will terminate the Memorandum and will seek to recover the sovereignty of our country. I urge all patriotic Greeks to give him creative help to lead the way in Greece to self-reliance, progress, and the a new Renaissance.”

Following the failure of Tsipras to form a government, Theodorakis issued a second statement, asserting that if there are fresh elections, he will be “present.” “I will take part in elections; however, with whom and how is something I will announce later. I will be on the front line.”

In an open letter to the leadership of the EU, including European Commission president José Manuel Barroso, and European Central Bank president Mario Draghi, declared that the reality of the Greek economy has demonstrated the failure of the Memorandum and can only lead to “a humanitarian crisis.” If the policy continues, it “not only threatens social cohesion and stability in Greece, but also is a source of instability for the EU itself and for the Eurozone,” he wrote. It calls for a solution on the “European level.”

Although his attempt to form a government has failed, Tsipras took the opportunity to articulate his party’s policy, setting out six requirements for any agree-



Eurokinissi

The legendary composer and political activist Mikos Theodorakis (speaking) has endorsed the efforts of Tsipras to form a government, terminate the austerity Memorandum, and “to recover the sovereignty of our country.”

ment with other parties: 1) immediate cancellation of the terms of the EU-IMF Memorandum; 2) the cancellation of the law that ends collective contracts; 3) changes to the electoral system; 4) an end to parliamentary immunity; 5) public oversight of Greek banks; and 6) the formation of a debt inspection committee that will investigate whether any of Greece’s debt can be termed “odious.”

On the other end of the political spectrum, the center-right Independent Greeks led by Panos Kammenos—a former member of the New Democracy who, along with ten others, left the party because they refused to vote for the Memorandum—has now become one of the major actors in Greek politics. In his first address before his new parliamentary faction, Kammenos, echoing the late French President Charles de Gaulle, said, “We must support Greece, and a Europe of the Nations, and not the bankers of Europe.”

Kammenos said that Greece needs a “national solution right here and now,” and said his party had pulled off a “miracle” by winning 33 seats in the election. He said that 68% of the electorate had voted against the Memorandum. “We are the anti-Memorandum front. The fight to liberate the country comes above all else. . . .”

As a basis of cooperation with other parties, he called for agreement on basic principles similar to those outlined by Syriza’s Tsipras, including the termination of loan agreements, the termination of the Memorandum, and the removal of burdensome and contemptible debt, as well as the punishment of those guilty of bringing Greece into this situation.

Drinking the Kool-Aid

The only option that would prevent fresh elections is for the President to try to organize a unity government that would have to include New Democracy, Pasok, and Syriza, along with one or two others, per-

haps around the idea of “renegotiating the Memorandum.” But Syriza and the other anti-Memorandum parties would have to make compromises that would only destroy their credibility. As one Greek political observer said, “renegotiating” the Memorandum without a credible alternative policy would be like “drinking the Kool-Aid,” with the inevitable Jonestown-like political massacre that would follow.

While the anti-Memorandum front is morally committed to overthrowing these policies, it has yet to put forward a comprehensive alternative that addresses the international crisis, the ultimate cause of Greece’s and all of Europe’s unfolding tragedy.

“You need a credible alternative, and the Schiller Institute’s Marshall Plan for the Mediterranean is very credible,” Associate Prof. George Tsobanoglou of the University of the Aegean told *EIR*. “We are in a transition. It is not just Greece; we are now in a regional crisis. Spain, Portugal, Italy, and even France, are in this crisis. The Schiller Institute’s Mediterranean Marshall plan is the equivalent of a Glass-Steagall for Southern Europe.” Tsobanoglou said that if France adopted this policy, it being both Atlantic and Mediterranean, and with its interest in Africa, it would be in the best place to take leadership in this effort.

JP Morgan Fiasco Shows Need for Glass-Steagall

by John Hoefle

May 14—The May 10 surprise announcement by JP Morgan Chase of a \$2 billion loss on derivatives trades, and the response to that loss by its critics, form a delicious irony. The bank which led the crusade against Lyndon LaRouche’s demand for reimplementing Roosevelt’s 1933 Glass-Steagall law, the bank which has fought tooth-and-nail against any and all financial regulation for decades, has now been mortally wounded by its own speculative hand, and has brought on the next stage of global financial meltdown. And thanks to JP Morgan’s greed and arrogance, thanks to the whole trans-Atlantic financial system’s recidivism in committing the exact same speculative lunacy that brought the global financial system to its knees in 2007-08, Glass-Steagall is back on the table in a big way.

“The system is about to blow,” Lyndon LaRouche stated on May 12. “The U.S. and British banking system is in the process of collapse right now. The new wave of collapse is happening,” and it is going to rapidly spread, LaRouche noted. The implosion of the Spanish banking system—including the London-run Inter-Alpha Group giant Banco Santander, and its friendly rival BBVA—is an expression of the same financial meltdown that is bringing down the entire trans-Atlantic system.

“It’s important to note how stupid people are,” LaRouche added. “I mean, here you have a banking crisis which has been going on, since I warned against it in

2007. And in 2008, they went into a bailout! And what I was fussing against was that: No bailout! And they went to a bailout!”

As a result of not heeding LaRouche’s demand, from 2007 onward, for Glass-Steagall and replacing the current financial house of cards with a production-oriented credit system, the edifice is now imploding. “This present financial system, in its present form, is now extinct,” LaRouche emphasized. “It’s dead. The bodies are still moving because, with these kinds of animals, they’re not so good on brains, so they don’t know when they’re dead. And that’s what it is: This is all dead. The whole system is dead!”

The only solution to this, is the one advocated by LaRouche. Reinstate Glass-Steagall; close the Fed and replace it with a new National Bank of the United States; impose strict regulations, and enforce them tightly. The attempts to “fix” the current British-model financial system have failed. We have to junk that system, and return to American System economics, not only in the United States, but in the world as a whole.

Morgan’s Loss

The \$2 billion loss announced by JP Morgan, is of course just the tip of the tip of the iceberg. JP Morgan itself reportedly has at least \$100 billion in exactly the kind of losing derivatives bets that led to the \$2 billion admission. And JP Morgan may be the biggest deriva-



JP Morgan's \$2 billion loss was "egregious" and self-inflicted," admitted CEO Jamie Dimon. The surprise announcement has revived calls for Glass-Steagall.

tives addict in the U.S. banking system, but it is hardly alone in this. Every big bank in the U.S. and Europe is in trouble, sitting on piles of worthless assets, covering up giant losses, and fighting for survival. In Europe, the dominoes are falling one by one, with the Spanish bank bailout simply the latest in an unending, and inevitable meltdown. The whole system is finished.

JP Morgan Chase held an extraordinary conference call on the afternoon of May 10, to announce that it had lost at least \$2 billion in the derivatives markets. The losses, in the words of bank CEO Jamie Dimon, were "egregious, self-inflicted," and the result of a strategy that was "flawed, complex, poorly executed, and poorly monitored."

The loss stems from trades made by JP Morgan's Chief Investment Office (CIO), and in particular, with trades made by the CIO in London. It appears that the bank was placing huge bets which arbitrated the difference in price between the cost of a credit default swap on an index, and the cost of the buying credit default swaps individually on the same companies. Not only that, but it appears that the bank was using its market power to manipulate the price of those credit default swaps in its favor.

The CIO office, which supposedly was being used to hedge bets held elsewhere in the bank, appears to have become a giant proprietary trading operation,

placing bets for the bank itself. According to its filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), the CIO unit had nearly as much market exposure on an average day in 2011, as did the bank's much larger investment-banking operation. The CIO unit appears, in effect, to have become something of an internal hedge fund. Everything indicates that they had been tasked to generate quick speculative profits, to cover up what was likely an even larger hole in the bank's balance sheet.

The positions taken by the CIO became so large that they were distorting the market, and causing some of the bank's competitors to complain. But Morgan's strength


was also its weakness—once the competitors figured out what Morgan was doing, they began to move against it. The result was \$2 billion in losses in five weeks, with more to come, as some of the bank's bets are still open. Dimon admitted in the conference call that the losses could grow by another \$1 billion, and that may be an underestimate.

Political Fallout

The response to JP Morgan's loss announcement was felt far beyond the banking sector. Dimon himself admitted during the conference call that loss "plays right into the hands of a bunch of pundits out there" who advocate stronger regulation of the banks.

JP Morgan has hated Glass-Steagall for a very long time, as it was one of the prime targets of President Franklin Roosevelt's original law in 1933. Glass-Steagall was passed because the big banks—led by JP Morgan—had been caught red-handed manipulating markets, bribing officials, and stealing from their customers. FDR used Glass-Steagall to break up the big banks, forcing them to choose between being commercial banks or investment banks. No more would customer deposits be used by the banks to speculate and manipulate for their own benefit. As a result of Glass-Steagall, JP Morgan was forced to split into two parts, the commercial bank JP Morgan & Company, and the investment bank Morgan Stanley.

FIGURE 1



After FDR’s death, JP Morgan began pushing to undo the strict, modern regulations that had been imposed under his Presidency. The push bore fruit beginning in the 1950s, and in 1984, the bank launched a concerted attack on Glass-Steagall, in the form of a pamphlet authored by Alan Greenspan, at the time a director of the bank. During the 1980s and 1990s, JP Morgan was in the vanguard of the deregulation market, and in particular, in beating back all efforts to regulate derivatives.

When Jamie Dimon took over the bank in 2005, he continued this assault on modern bank regulation. In the wake of the “banking crisis of 2008” (which we put in quotes because it is far from over), JP Morgan Chase (formed by the 2000 merger of JP Morgan with Chase Manhattan) gained an undeserved reputation as being largely untouched by the crisis, and Dimon gained an equally undeserved reputation as Wall Street’s top banker—and a possible candidate to succeed Tim Geithner as Treasury Secretary. Backed by Wall Street’s lobbying and public relations machine, Dimon became the leading spokesman for the anti-regulation crowd, and also began whining loudly about supposed public mistreatment of bankers! That, from a man whose bank got \$25 billion from the TARP (Troubled Assets Relief Program), and \$391

billion in loans from the Federal Reserve Bank.

So when JP Morgan and Dimon shot themselves in the foot with their derivatives disaster, the fallout came quickly.

Re-Regulate Now!

A fair amount of the discussion revolved around the Dodd-Frank Act, with its Volcker Rule provision against proprietary trading. Dimon had been a leading opponent of the Volcker Rule, claiming that it would hurt Wall Street and hurt America. But the more serious responses cited Glass-Steagall.

“We really do need this boundary between traditional banking—that is, taking deposits and making loans—and hedge-fund style investing,” said Sen. Jeff Merkley (D-Ore.) in a conference call on May 11.

“JP Morgan’s losses are a stark warning about the dangers of having major banks take these risky bets, so-called proprietary bets,” said Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.) on the same call.

“What just happened at JP Morgan—along with its leaders’ cavalier dismissal followed by lame reassurance—reveals how fragile and opaque the banking system continues to be, why Glass-Steagall must be resurrected, and why the Dallas Fed’s recent recommendation that Wall Street’s giant banks be broken up should be heeded,” former Labor Secretary Robert Reich wrote on his blog.

The call for Glass-Steagall was picked up by many others, and is now gaining strength. Rather than worry about the Dodd-Frank Act with its Volcker Rule, a law passed as little more than a cover for doing nothing, we need to strike now, before Wall Street can regroup.

The Drain in Spain

The day before JP Morgan admitted its big loss, the Spanish government escalated the bailout of its banking sector by nationalizing Bankia, that nation’s fourth-largest bank. The Bankia takeover is part of a larger operation, demanded by the British Empire, to create a “bad bank” where losses from the entire Spanish banking sector can be dumped.

Bankia was formed less than two years ago, in December 2010, when the Spanish government merged seven ailing *cajas*—savings banks—into a new bank.

As part of the deal, the government pumped EU4.5 billion into Bankia's parent holding company, BFA. In 2011, Bankia went public. Now, in 2012, this creature of a previous bailout is being bailed out again—and is still going to be bankrupt after this second bailout!

While Bankia is clearly suffering from property loans in the Spanish real estate bubble, the bigger danger is in the two Spanish giants, Banco Santander and BBVA. Santander is the biggest bank in the Eurozone by market capital, and a leading member of the bankrupt Inter-Alpha Group. Santander has significant operations in Britain, and both Santander and BBVA have large exposure to Ibero-America. Santander, in particular, is a key bank in the Brazilian carry trade, which has generated the cash flow that has so far kept Santander a step ahead of the Grim Reaper.

Spanish banks have also borrowed heavily from the European Central Bank in their efforts to appear solvent, and Santander CEO Emilio Botin, while claiming that his bank is "just fine," is demanding that the ECB give the banks even more money.

That the Spanish bailout was only beginning was signalled by the *Financial Times*, the Rothschild-con-

trolled mouthpiece of the City of London. "If the government wants to restore trust in the banks and sovereign debt, the solution has to be both industrial in scale, and unimaginably bigger than the market expects—as TARP was in the U.S.," the *FT*'s Lex column insisted May 10.

Talk about recidivism.

The lesson of Bankia is the same lesson we've seen elsewhere in Europe and in the U.S. *Bailouts do not work*. And they are not intended to work. The banks are hopelessly insolvent, being kept "alive" by the cash flows from the bailout. But the bailout is just an illusion, a form of derivative itself. The actual content of Britain's policy, is the imposition of full-tilt fascist austerity, global depopulation, and the destruction of the nation-state in order to install a supranational financial dictatorship over the rubble.

The only alternative that will work is what LaRouche has detailed since 2007. Perhaps others, internationally, will now be prepared to listen and act, with the implosion of the Empire's House of Morgan.

johnhoeft@larouchepub.com


Seven Necessary Steps for Global Economic Recovery

A 40-minute feature video presenting Lyndon LaRouche's Emergency Program to End the Global Depression


<http://larouchepac.com/node/19282>



5. IMMEDIATE NATIONAL MOBILIZATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NAWAPA PROJECT




6. ENGAGE LATENT LABOR FORCE FOR SUBSIDIARY PROJECTS SUCH AS TRANSPORT AND NUCLEAR




7. EXTEND COOPERATION INTERNATIONALLY TO MEXICO, CANADA, RUSSIA, CHINA AND OTHERS




1. FORCED RESIGNATION OF BARACK OBAMA & IMMEDIATE PASSAGE OF GLASS-STEAGALL



3. FOR LACK OF REAL ASSETS REMAINING, ISSUE HAMILTONIAN CREDIT FOR NATIONAL PROJECTS



2. DIVISION OF FICTITIOUS FROM REAL LIABILITIES ACCORDING TO GLASS-STEAGALL STANDARD



4. THE ONLY BAILOUTS WILL BE HONEST BAILOUTS FOR THE BANKRUPT CITIES AND THE STATES

Why the Post Office Is Under Attack

This [1970] postal corporation bill is the “Tonkin Gulf Resolution” of domestic legislation. I know of no precedent for this bill. The Constitution provides that Congress shall establish the Post Office and Post Roads. We abdicate this constitutional responsibility when we turn the function over to a corporation.

—Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex.),
Aug. 3, 1970

Just a couple of generations ago, the United States rescued a world in chaos after years of global economic depression and two world wars. The intention of President Franklin D. Roosevelt was for the U.S. to lead the world out of colonialism, by ending the era of empire and strengthening and spreading the principles of the nation-state everywhere in the world, including to the former colonies in Africa and the Indian subcontinent. The concepts of man that grew out of the Renaissance and reached their zenith with the founding of the United States, were to be spread to all the peoples of the world. Humanity would be freed from serfdom and feudalism.

Instead, after the death of FDR, the global financier oligarchy counterattacked, launching a renewed assault on the nation-state. Structures that had been designed to keep the oligarchy in check were targeted for destruction, as were the institutions through which sovereign nations served and defended their citizenry. One such institution is the U.S. Post Office, which has been “corporatized” into a government-owned Postal Service, as a major step toward eventual privatization.

Were you to believe the news media, the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) is in a serious financial crisis, facing the prospects of raising prices, cutting back mail delivery, and closing smaller post offices. But this is an engineered crisis, a stunt calculated to create the conditions under which draconian measures can be imposed, not only on the Postal Service, but upon the entire country.

Postmaster General Patrick Donahoe (he prefers the



USPSTV

Patrick Donahoe, who likes to be known as the “CEO” of the postal system, services the junk-mail clientele, ignoring the rest of us.

title of “CEO”), is in on the game, claiming—along with President Obama—that painful sacrifices are necessary due to reductions in mail volume. Mail volume has indeed decreased, from a peak 208 billion pieces in 2000 to 168 billion pieces in 2011, but the Postal Service still outsources 20% of its workload, at a cost of \$12 billion a year! The USPS still delivers nearly half the mail in the entire world, so volume is not really an issue. It delivers enormous quantities of mail, in the most affordable and efficient postal system in the industrialized world. It is five times more efficient than Germany’s Deutsche Post and twice as efficient as Japan Post. And all of that is paid for out of the fees for postage and other services, without any Federal subsidies. The USPS does its job, and does it very well. Which is precisely why it is being targeted.

Throughout its history, the Post Office has been a force which unified and developed the nation. It has not only adapted to changes in the economy, but has often acted as the catalyst promoting these changes. Through an expanding network of postal roads and post offices, it tied urban and rural areas together. During the Great Depression, the Post Office not only survived, but expanded, building over 1,100 new post offices—many on the National Registry of Historic Places, with sculptures and murals promoting democratic ideals. Just as Abraham Lincoln completed the dome of the U.S. Capitol during the Civil War as a symbol of a united country, FDR wanted every American to have faith during

the Depression that the Federal government served as a force of social stability.

The Post Office has traditionally been a great equalizer, hiring whites, blacks, immigrants, men and women. It is one of America's largest unionized workforces, providing middle-class wages, with retirement and health benefits, to allow for dignified living, even in sickness and old age. Today, its employees include 38% minorities, 39% women, 28% veterans, and 6% disabled. It has been so progressive in its hiring practices, that even in 1801, some feared that slave revolts could be triggered by having self-confident African-Americans, trusted by a government agency, carrying mail to every town in America.

Yet Postmaster General Donahoe objects to the attachment that many Americans have to their local post office or their mailman. Mentally, Donahoe has already abandoned the traditional customers, and over the recent years, only two new products have been offered to them, "stamps-by-mail" and flat-rate boxes for shipping. It is strange that self-styled "CEO" Donahoe, so obsessed with running the Postal Service as a "business," views this broad postal presence as a burden. Postal workers are in daily contact with far more Americans than Walmart, McDonald's, and Starbucks combined. Most business leaders would embrace such a wide-reaching, daily contact. If Donahoe loved his customers as much as he loves his "crisis" he could find many ways to grow the Post Office and build a better nation.

The March of the Philistines

The Postmaster General has a different agenda, or to be more precise, he is the front-man for this new agenda. Last year, he paid \$125 million to the global management consulting company Accenture, which has expertise in technology outsourcing. Mass-mailing companies receive "work-sharing discounts" for pre-sorting and barcoding their mail; however, any small savings to the Postal Service never cover the large discounts that are extended to these companies. Also invited into the postal family is Boston Consulting, well known for advising in the rape of Eastern Europe during the privatization feeding frenzy of the 1990s.

Another Donahoe favorite is Evercore, arriving fashionably late, but potentially most dangerous of all. Evercore gives advice on restructuring, but is an investment bank and may be more interested in Donahoe's recent attempts at pulling the Postal Service (and its tens of billions of dollars) out of the Federal retirement

plans and Federal health systems. (This would be devastating to these Federal programs, but Evercore could make astronomical short-term profits.)

In this era of "shareholder values," the Postal Service is controlled by "stakeholder values." The giant corporate mailers use the Postal Service and deserve a voice like anyone else, but their interests may not be the same as those of other postal customers. For the most part, the direct mailing industry does not care whether mail is delivered six days per week or only three. They don't care if your local post office is closed (they know that Donahoe will not close any of their favorite post offices). They have an army of lobbyists, and it was actually easy for FedEx-Kinkos, for example, to convince Congress to remove all copy machines from post office lobbies. The question that needs to be answered is whether the Postal Service should serve the nation or the interests of a small group Wall Street pirates and junk-mail shippers?


The History of Mail Service in America

Some historians have characterized Benjamin Franklin (1706-90) as the "essential founding father,"

Treason in America

NOW AVAILABLE ON KINDLE!

Anton Chaitkin's *Treason in America: From Aaron Burr to Averell Harriman* is an authoritative inquiry into the criminal apparatus of the British Empire and its arms in Wall Street, Boston, and the Confederate South—that usurped power in America.



The Kindle edition (from Executive Intelligence Review, 1999) is available at www.amazon.com for \$9.99.

since he established the structures for a successful revolution and an enduring nation. In 1775, Franklin and his partner William Goddard (1740-1817) founded the “Constitutional Post”—an unusual name, since there would be no constitution for 12 years, no nation, nor even an identity of a united people. But Franklin wanted a new direction for mankind, and the “New World” was uniquely perfect for this new direction.

Empires in the Old World kept science and art exclusively for small circles of elites, while ample spectacles from gladiator fights to religious flagellations were provided to keep the serfs and peasants diverted and stupefied.

Franklin’s Constitutional Post was the first postal system designed to promote a literate, educated, thinking, and responsible citizenry. He wanted this outlook to reach every home in America, and he would seek the advice of local patriot leaders during the Revolution to guarantee that every postmaster and post rider was honest, trustworthy, and loyal to the American cause. In many ways, the achievements of America are a testament to the structures that Franklin helped put in place.

Ancient Rome had a far-reaching Imperial Post, but it was reserved by law for government officials and military orders. In the Holy Roman Empire, the mail was a family business of Venetian intelligence’s princely Thurn und Taxis clan, which read the mail as well as delivering it, to keep the oligarchy well-informed. Under the British Empire, revenues from the mail service also served as a tax stream to help defray the huge costs of its “perpetual war” strategy. (When Ben Franklin took over from the British, he lowered prices 20%, increased the speed, quality, and coverage of service, and—something the British could never do—he made a profit! Even years after America’s independence, Britain still sent its mail headed for Canada through the United States, knowing that Franklin had better infrastructure—even in Canada—than did the “mother country”).

First Domestic Letter and First Post Road

America’s first domestic letter, delivered by America’s first mailman (John Sharpe), on Jan. 22, 1673,



The Post Road linking Boston and New York City began to be constructed in 1673, when the first American mailman, John Sharpe, delivered a letter from the governor of New York to the governor of Connecticut. Sections of the road still exist.

helped to defend the colonies. America’s mail system has been vital to the nation ever since. That first letter was from New York Gov. Francis Lovelace to Connecticut Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., warning of 40 Dutch warships threatening to attack and recapture New York. (Those warships would attack the Virginia coast instead.) Sharpe’s instructions were not merely to deliver a single letter, but to survey the land, scout strategic sites, and build a “Post Road” from New York City to Boston for future trade and intelligence. The postal system was an anti-colonial project from its inception—100 years before independence!

From New York to Boston, sections of this old Post Road still exist; it is one of America’s most historic corridors. Paul Revere used it for his famous ride from Boston; George Washington used it for his victory parade in Manhattan; and during the British naval blockade of the War of 1812, it was a lifeline for the Northeast. Passenger stagecoach service was established from Boston to New York, and blacksmith shops sprang up along the route to keep the coaches rolling. (The stagecoaches depended on their contract to carry the mail, and when they lost the contract, a large section of the service was shut down.)

Carriage manufacturing grew (by 1811 New Haven, Conn. had nine factories), employing carpenters, painters, assemblers, and other trades. Railroads were built

along the road, since it was easier to obtain the legal right of way there; these railroads could more efficiently serve the passenger and freight needs of the corridor. As these railroads attracted industry, the industry attracted immigrants—creating perhaps the most diversified and advanced economy in the world. By today’s standards, the Post Road may seem like a small infrastructure project, but it was this type of development that allowed the country to grow.

Some also say that the Post Road created an American culture of speed, since the first letters from New York to Boston took 14 days to arrive, but by 1824, it only took 36 hours. By 1800, there were 9,000 miles of post roads. These bustling corridors through the wilderness were in stark contrast to the British colonial plan of keeping the population concentrated in pockets, where access to the coastline was their only hope of survival. The British thought that fear might be their best ally, and promoted the idea that the wilderness was the “devil’s workshop.” In 1635, a law was passed in Massachusetts to prevent anyone from building a home more than half a mile from the town’s meetinghouse. In 1634, two New England men lost their way for six days in the wilderness and were “almost senseless” from fear, exhaustion, and lack of sleep when they returned.

Newspapers and Postmasters in 1776

America’s early newspapers were vital to the independence movement, and virtually all of the publishers were also postmasters. Everything from local gossip to international news would gravitate towards the post office, and the postmaster saw it as his civic duty to produce a newspaper. The country’s first newspaper, *The Boston News-Letter*, was published by postmaster John Campbell, who set up shop just steps from the eastern end of the Post Road. For 15 years, Campbell’s newspaper would be unrivaled in importance—until his replacement as postmaster established America’s second newspaper, *The Boston Gazette*, which was even more critical to the Patriot movement. The entire Patriot leadership used this and other papers in their call to arms, and when they could not openly call for certain actions, they used pen names. (Samuel Adams had seven pseudonyms.)

The *Gazette* would continue to be published by the next five postmasters, and it was this *Gazette* that called for the assembly of Patriots on the night of the Boston Tea Party. It was Benjamin Edes, postmaster and *Ga-*



Benjamin Franklin co-founded the “Constitutional Post,” 12 years before there was even a U.S. Constitution.

zette publisher, who led the 5,000 *Gazette*-reading Patriots to throw the British tea into Boston harbor. But before they went to the harbor, Edes first took the leaders to his newspaper office, in order to change into Indian costumes. Since 1770, the hated Loyalist Gov. Thomas Hutchinson had Benjamin Edes and his partner, John Gill, high on his “enemy list” of American rebels.

Ben Franklin worked hard to ensure that every house in every colony would be connected to the critical events of the day. Thomas Jefferson wrote that the mail was vital during this period, since the British were using rumors, falsehoods, and propaganda to undermine the American cause. Jefferson said the only trustworthy news was mail arriving from Congress or the battlefield. John Adams confirmed that Franklin’s system kept the American public well informed, writing that he once stopped at a remote tavern on a lonely road and encountered two “local yeomen” discussing how, “If the British Parliament can take away John Hancock’s wharf, why can’t they take away your barn?”

The Post Office and Mobility

The United States has been perhaps the most mobile country in the world, and much of this is due to the influence of the Post Office. Even when new modes of transportation were met with skepticism (and some-



Creative Commons

The first U.S. Air Mail flight takes off from Washington, D.C. on May 15, 1918. Onboard was the letter shown above (among others), bearing the stamp “Inaugural Aerial Post.”

times even fear) by many in the general public, the Post Office was often the chief motivating factor promoting that technology. In 1831, trains began to carry mail for short distances, even though some, shocked by the idea of a train traveling at the fearsome speed of 15 miles per hour, accused it of being a “device of Satan to lead immortal souls to Hell.” In 1896, when few American had even heard of an automobile, the Post Office was experimenting with various manufacturers to develop the “horseless wagon,” and by 1899, the first trucks were used regularly on a route in Buffalo, N.Y. By 1914, the Post Office had so many vehicles that it was the first government agency in the world to have a “motor pool” and garage for repairs.

The Post Office may have had the greatest impact of all in aviation. Congress passed legislation in 1925 to require the Post Office to “encourage commercial aviation,” but there were only three public airports in the entire country. The Post Office had to establish airports, build terminals, runways, create radio communications to direct the pilots, install safety lights and beacons, etc. Aviation throughout the world would copy the design, the procedures, and even the safety standards set by the

U.S. Post Office. Soon, when commercial airlines were established, the Post Office transferred the airports to the local municipalities and the control towers to the Department of Commerce. Charles I. Stanton, head of the Civil Aeronautics Administration (and early airmail pilot), said, “We planted four seeds . . . airways, communications, navigation aids, and multi-engined aircraft . . . They are the cornerstones on which our present worldwide transportation structure is built, and they came one by one, out of our experience in daily, uninterrupted flying of the mail.”

Crisis Management: Made in Britain

In 1969, Great Britain turned its Post Office from a government department with a Cabinet-level Postmaster General, into an independent corporation, now known as Royal Mail Holdings, PLC. A few weeks later, the U.S. foolishly copied the British model. The only difference was that the Americans wanted to avoid the term “Postal Corporation,” so they chose “Postal Service” instead. When the United States uses American System methods, no matter what the field, it usually becomes the envy of the world; but when we abandon our own principles, we invite disaster.

This business model has been imposed on the world. British imperial foreign policy had been run by the “private” British East India Company. Emerging nations would have “experts” from the World Bank and IMF replace national goals with “accepted business practices.” The Eurozone has replaced national sovereignty; private mercenary armies fight wars; the “markets” determine the value of our currencies; and insurance companies make medical policy. In America, perhaps our first step into this horror show was the passage of the 1970 “Postal Service Act.”

President Nixon’s Postmaster General, Winston Blount, said that his goal was to insulate his new mail “business” from any external pressure—even from the Congress or the White House. Business executives and a small army of accountants were brought in, and 8% of the workforce was purged—mostly for its lack of ideological commitment.

The Postal Service Act had a very cold reception in Congress, so Postmaster Blount bypassed Congress and ran a media campaign. The bill was not announced



Postal workers on strike in 1970, the year of passage of the 1970 “Postal Service Act,” which Sen. Ralph Yarborough called the Tonkin Gulf Resolution of domestic legislation. It made the Post Office a corporation.



Creative Commons/David Shankbone

Ron Bloom, consultant to the postal unions. Would you trust your post office to this man?

at a Congressional committee hearing, but at the National Press Club in Washington. After five months of mostly negative hearings on Capitol Hill, a decision was made to have six months of closed-door “executive deliberations,” where a deal was struck.

The Role of Labor—and Ron Bloom

Some of the strongest voices for the nation-building outlook and against this corporatist direction of the economy were traditionally from the labor movement. AFL-CIO President George Meany (1894-1980) gave blistering testimony against the Postal Service Act. But today, postal unions have hired Ron Bloom as a consultant, precisely because he is so well versed in corporate jargon. “He talks their language,” some insist. Bloom was vice president at the corporatist/fascist investment bank Lazard Frères, where he worked in mergers and acquisitions. Few would view his shift to the Post Office as a “labor-friendly” career move. He also worked for

the Steelworkers Union, but not because he was developing a plan for the United States to again lead the world in steel production, using modern technologies such as plasma steel furnaces, laser welding, or laser machine tooling. His only claim to fame was when two steel mills in the Pittsburgh area were closed and all the retirees lost their health plans, he was able to get a discount for the retirees’ current prescription drugs—but no health plan. Bloom was senior advisor to Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner, on the President’s Auto Industry Task Force, and currently has the title of “Senior Counselor for Manufacturing Policy” for President Obama.

Other labor leaders, such as UAW President Walter Reuther (1907-70), had advised President Franklin Roosevelt because of Reuther’s in-depth knowledge of machine tools, and how to quickly reopen closed factories for the World War II mobilization.

Today, there is a world out there that is dying for American know-how and industrial potential, but Bloom’s idea is not to build the world with maglev trains, NAWAPA water projects, or to put a man on Mars. Any good “organization man” never questions the trends, but learns to adapt. So Bloom helped to organize Obama’s bailout for the auto industry,

whereby taxpayers paid billions to a plan in which auto companies would hire back workers at half the salary and with no benefits, but continue with Obama’s free-trade agreements with auto-producer South Korea. Bloom’s “industrial” policy is to establish (at taxpayers’ expense) a few boutique manufacturing plants to make wind turbines, solar panels, and electric car batteries for a post-industrial utopia.

The ongoing takedown of America’s Post Office is but another flank in the assault upon the United States by the British Empire and its Wall Street agents. The USPS is in trouble because it works, because it is an institution of national stability and infrastructure. We don’t need our Postmaster General to be a CEO; we need him to be a patriot, to save the institution, not destroy it!

‘Exploring the Universe Is An Entirely Natural Thing’

An Interview with Dr. Alan Harris


Dr. Alan Harris, a British astrophysicist, is director of the NEOShield Project at the German Aerospace Center (DLR). NEOShield is an international research program led by DLR for researching “Near Space Objects” and how to defend against them. On Feb. 15, 2012, Toni Kästner of the Civil Rights Solidarity Movement (BüSo) in Germany interviewed him for the BüSo website (<http://bueso.de/node/5572>). The interview was conducted in German and translated by Daniel Platt.

Kästner: I first heard about Project NEOShield around Jan. 20. Could you say a few words about what this program is, what its mission is, and what your responsibilities are within this program?

Harris: NEOShield is a research program within the so-called FP-7 of the European Commission. A few years ago, the European Commission put out a call for ideas on how best to deflect threatening “NEO” asteroids or comets: how to protect the Earth from impact.

I have personally been doing research for years on asteroids, comets, and the so-called small bodies of the Solar System. The call for proposals appealed to me, so I discussed it with my colleagues, and we decided to submit a proposal, along with five other groups in Europe. We were selected, and were awarded the contract. Now we have the work, and naturally, the responsibility goes with it.

The consortium includes 13 partners from six countries. Although we receive funding from the European



DLR

Dr. Alan Harris: “For me, our environment is not only the environment that we see in the countryside and the air and the water; our environment is the universe.”

Commission, it is not only EU nations that are participating, but also an American institute that is part of the SETI Institute in California, and TsNIIMash, an organization that is part of the Russian space agency Roscosmos. Therefore, we also have some influence of our own in this subject area.

We are working toward a space mission to test meth-

ods of defense against Near Earth Objects. We won't be able to do this with the money we are currently receiving from the EU, because space missions are very expensive—I'm talking about several hundred million euros—but we want to be able to say at the end of the day, that the next step in the defense of the planet would be a space mission of this sort. We will make some precise proposals for detailed missions that could be started in order to test methods of defense against threatening near-Earth asteroids.

The Threat of Small Celestial Bodies

Kästner: I have read that car-sized objects show up once a year, football field-sized objects every 2,000 years, and really big hunks of rock every million years—at least according to the statistics. Could you tell us, in order to avoid preconceptions introduced by these statistics, how important it is to prepare ourselves in time to defend the Earth from a danger like this?

Harris: The average person thinks mostly just about his own life, his house, his car, his family—in other words, “Could I as an individual be affected?” I must admit that the chances are very, very slim—approximately one in a million—that a given individual on this planet could lose his life in an asteroid collision.

The problem here is that we're talking about more than one person; we're talking about our civilization. In the last few hundred years, the Earth has become much more densely populated. We have an insanely complicated, networked infrastructure with the Internet and all that goes with it, and if any part of this infrastructure were to go kaput, whole domains of human life would have big problems, which could really lead to a breakdown of the normal functioning of our society.

I'm talking about the possibility, for example, of a major city suddenly disappearing. That would only take an asteroid of 30 to 50 meters in diameter. We experienced an example in 1908, when an object about this size came down in Siberia. It didn't reach the ground, but exploded in the air 5-10 km high and totally destroyed an area of 2,000 square kilometers. Eighty million trees were knocked down by this explosion. One can only begin to imagine what it would be like if this were to happen over a city like Berlin or London or Paris or Los Angeles. There wouldn't be very much left. We know how many million people can live in such a compact area. Millions of people live in a concentrated




In 1908, an object about 30-50 meters in diameter crashed near the Podkamennaya Tunguska River in Siberia, creating an explosion that destroyed over 80 million trees.

area like a city, and it could be annihilated in an instant. Thank God we have never yet had any concrete experience with an event like that, because such a thing has not happened in recent memory, except in Siberia, where almost no one was living at the time.

We know the discovery statistics for Near-Earth Objects; we can also count the craters on the Moon, because the Moon is exposed to the same stream of Near-Earth Objects. Through such studies and information sources we can make a very good estimate of the frequency with which such objects strike the Earth. We know that an object with a diameter of 30-50 meters could strike the Earth at any time without warning, because these objects are so small that they are not always detected by the search programs. To be sure, we now have some very good search programs, which scan the skies every night for NEOs; yet we find relatively few of the smaller objects. We have already found 95% of the relatively large objects, with a diameter of 1 km or more. We will have no problem with such objects in the next hundred years. There is no object that we have found, which could be a threat to the Earth within that time-frame; but smaller objects could strike at any time. Within the interval of some hundreds of years, we expect that something like that will happen somewhere on Earth. It is only a matter of time. The fact that nothing more has happened since 1908 doesn't mean a thing. It could happen again tomorrow.

FIGURE 1

Asteroid YU55 Passed Between the Moon's Orbit and the Earth in 2005



NASA

Too Much Bureaucracy, Too Little Money

Kästner: Other countries have also responded. In Russia and Belarus, two programs have been initiated in the past two years—the Strategic Defense of the Earth and IGMASS—with which they want to study asteroids, with an intention similar to yours: to find out how many of these there are. What kind of software does one need in order to see them? But one wants to go beyond that and start a renaissance of space travel, in order to understand many other phenomena: What is going on with the Sun, the climate, with earthquakes, with asteroids, with the cosmic weather—Saturn has been having giant storms.

To what extent can you imagine international cooperation with such programs as the SDE, IGMASS, or entirely new programs, or to what extent is this already perhaps occurring?

Harris: Such initiatives are of course excellent. We always need new ideas—nowadays that is very important. With today's technology, it is also relatively simple to collaborate with groups in other countries. As I said, we're doing this in NEOShield with Russia and America and a number of European countries. I think that that should be done.

It's a question of funding. My experience, with our proposal to the European Commission, is that it takes a great deal of work. Just writing a proposal took me at least a year. I was fortunate that the work was not in

vain. The funding of science has become very bureaucratic, and my scientists work too much on things that don't directly serve science. In my opinion this has gone over the top. We need to reduce the bureaucratic administration, not only in institutes such as this one, but generally in the universities, and abroad as well. I've had experience in other countries as well, so I would say that in Germany, things are going relatively well, but there is still a ton of bureaucracy. Hopefully there are other ways, but money is tight, and the tighter the money becomes, the more bureaucracy we get.

Our Environment Is the Universe

Kästner: This makes me wonder what significance society attributes to activities like space flight, or anything that happens outside the Earth. Today, it can't be much. How do you assess the significance of space for mankind today, and what should the significance of space actually be?

Harris: When one considers the Earth, it is very much dependent upon whether one is standing upon it, or looking back at the Earth from the outside, from somewhere on another planet. Or perhaps one is seeing our Solar System or our Sun from another star, or looking at our galaxy from another galaxy. For me, our environment is not only the environment that we see in the countryside and the air and the water; our environment is the universe.

We have had the good fortune so far on this Earth, as seen from space, that our environment has been relatively friendly, that is to say, mankind has had time to develop. We have had enough time for evolution, which today has led up to humans; but the question is, how long it will continue that way. We have misgivings, because we have mostly not experienced any great catastrophes during our lifetime. Most people don't know what a great catastrophe is.

I think in terms of an infinite future for mankind. I think that mankind ought to continue to exist, that it will develop. In a thousand years, the world will look entirely different, but I hope that in a thousand years, ten thousand years, a hundred thousand years, there will still be intelligent life on Earth. Perhaps more than today. Sometime during this span of time, though, something will happen. It could come from space as well. The catastrophes that could come from space are much greater than those that we have experienced on Earth. Therefore, if we really want to survive over the long term on Earth, we must begin to deal with these phenomena.



U.S. Geological Survey/D. Roddy

The Barringer meteor crater in Arizona was created by a piece of an asteroid crashing to Earth 50,000 years ago. The crater is one mile in diameter. No humans are known to have lived there at the time.

There is a series of relevant issues: Our Sun is not as stable as we might wish it to be; we all know that the solar wind with its charged particles can also lead to problems on Earth. Radiation and interaction with the magnetic field could lead to problems with the electrical power grid and communications networks, with satellites, etc. In the long run, there may also be entirely different phenomena, such as supernovae, although one must say that this is highly unlikely. But the problem with asteroids and comets is already very real and could also lead to great catastrophes in a timespan of hundreds or thousands of years.

Consequently, I also think about this problem, because it actually led to the evolution of humans; impacts on the Earth made it possible for *us* to be able to walk the Earth today—rather than still the dinosaurs. But now that we are here, we have to deal with the same natural phenomena, which will continue. The fact that we are here doesn't mean that the danger stops now. If we want to survive over the long term, we must understand such phenomena and be able to defend ourselves.

Kästner: We recently posted a study to our website on the question of the defense of Earth. It is increasingly apparent that we are going through cyclical processes that have to do with the motion of our Solar System through the galaxy, and perhaps even beyond. We can also discern various relationships among the galaxies. At the same time, there is a fundamental progressive de-

velopment that naturally poses certain questions to mankind today. Astronomically, we find ourselves at the same point that the dinosaurs were, 62 million years ago, which is why we have to say that progress is the best defense. We should not be investing a mere EU6 million in the defense of Earth, while pumping EU750 billion into the banking sector; we should immediately begin to reorganize the financial system, rebuild a rational economy, and make scientific breakthroughs. Therefore, my question: Which breakthroughs do you think we need, in order to actually make this step forward?


Harris: It would be lovely if we could do that. But I think that it can hardly happen with the present-day world political structure. We would need some sort of revolution, hopefully a peaceful revolution, before our civilization would think that way. A nation can have such visions, like the Americans did with the Moon program. An example of the next step would be for us to launch a manned mission to Mars.

I also see how the ESA's [European Space Agency] Mars research and cooperation with the Americans is going—or rather, how it is not going. A project was initially contracted with the Americans, but I heard yesterday that it will apparently cease. So then we look to Russia. Could we possibly do the whole thing with Russia? There is no international structure to administer such a project.

We definitely need the European Space Agency, which does fantastic things for Europe and space research, and which has significantly advanced space activities in Europe. We need this for the whole world. We must bring together all space-faring nations, such as China, India, and Brazil, with Europe, the United States, and Russia, and also with other nations that would like to participate.

There Is Still So Much To Explore

There is still so much more that we could do in our Solar System. We even could go much further outside it, for the farther we go, the more we learn about the origin of the Solar System—for example, in the direction of Pluto or the Kuiper Belt. There are asteroid-like



Creative Commons/Rogelio Bernal Andreo (Deep Sky Colors)

Dr. Harris comments: “For me, it is entirely natural for us to want to leave the Earth, so that we might explore our environment in space. I think that the absolutely most important thing is for humanity to go out and look at what is out there.” Shown here is a digitally “stitched” and color-enhanced composite image of an area in the constellation Orion, taken over several nights.

objects out there, comet-like objects, that have remained unchanged since the beginning of the Solar System. The farther we go, the more we learn. We could still do many more explorations of the big planets, which is done with unmanned robotic missions.

It’s my view that we are just at the beginning. We could do so much more, and that doesn’t cost much, compared with saving Greece. I admit that the latter would be far more important. It is frightful how Greece is being dealt with at the moment, also to save the banks. Our economy apparently only survives if banks make big profits, and they’ve always got to have billions at their disposal. Otherwise, it doesn’t function. I’m no economics expert, no economist. But I know that with just a fraction of this capital—we’re just talking about hundreds of millions, not billions—we could send space missions to Jupiter, Saturn, or even Pluto.

At first we thought of asteroids as uninteresting hunks of rock, and that once you had explored one asteroid, you’d know everything there is to know about asteroids. Now that we have explored a few of them, we know that that is absolutely not the case. Asteroids are also like different worlds. Of course they have no atmospheres, but there were always surprises whenever we examined an asteroid up close.

Our Solar System is more colorful, more interesting, more multifaceted, and has much more to offer than the layman imagines. In my opinion, we could start a lot with just a bit more money—it doesn’t have to be much. But above all, we scientists shouldn’t have to spend half our time begging. Writing a proposal is like begging. You go to an investor and say, “I think I have a good idea—I need money.” It is important that the money flow a bit more freely, and that science enjoy a higher priority in society.

We are now finding planets around other stars. Planet formation is taking place wherever there are stars. Naturally there is also the possibility that there is intelligent life on other planets—perhaps not too far from us at all! We don’t know, but it is entirely possible. We have here, before our eyes, a Solar System with planets, and we presume that these planets came into existence exactly like the planets around other stars. We could learn more about such exo-planetary systems, if we examine our own Solar System carefully and do more research. That leads us to an understanding of how and where there could be life elsewhere, and, in my view, the discovery of life on other planets would be the greatest revolution in human philosophy that has ever occurred. Perhaps there are indeed other intelli-

gent beings, and we could then begin to talk politics, economics, and religion with them! That would be my dream, to speak with beings who live on other planets and have an entirely different history than mankind.

I am a passionate astronomer and space researcher; that has shaped my entire life. Already in childhood I was interested in astronomy. For me, it is entirely natural for us to want to leave the Earth, so that we might explore our environment in space. I think that the absolutely most important thing is for humanity to go out and look at what is out there.

I often think, when we look outside with our telescopes at the stars and galaxies, and when we try to understand why there are planets and how they came to be, and what that has to do with life, then I think of a child, who for the first time finds his way out of his crib, begins to crawl around, and finds his way into a library. He looks around and finds order, sees fantastically beautiful things, but understands nothing whatsoever, although he sees that it is important. Perhaps later, he will understand what it is. Similarly, we don't understand anything right now, but we are looking around and thinking that here is something we must begin to investigate, so that one day we will be able to understand.

I believe that mankind right now is more or less at this point, with respect to the universe. We understand really very, very little. There is so much out there to discover! Perhaps there are other universes. All sorts of things are possible. When one looks at quantum mechanics, one likewise sees little universes. One sees how the world in the very, very small is just as difficult to understand as the world in the very, very large. We are somewhere in the middle. I think it will happen. Regardless of how much nonsense we are creating in the world now, someday we will do it. If not we, then another life in our universe.

Either we are here alone, or we are not alone. Whichever is true, whichever of these possibilities is a fact, it's a crazy thought either way. If we are alone in this universe, then we could really play God. Perhaps we even have the responsibility to play God, if we are alone. If we were no longer around, then nothing would be here at all, and nothing would make any sense. Therefore, we have such a great responsibility to make the best of it.

If we are not alone, then we also have a responsibility to survive until we have made contact with the other beings. One way or the other, we must strive for this.

21st CENTURY SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

OUT OF THE SHADOWS

The Emerging Science of Earthquake Prediction

Oyang Teng

INTERVIEW: DIMITAR OUZOUNOV

Earthquake Precursors: 'The Science is Ready, and Needs to Be Applied'

INTERVIEW: SEYIA UYEDA and PANYIOTIS VAROTSOS

Approaching the Critical Point in Earthquake Prediction

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



International Astronautical Congress, Cape Town: Looking to the Heavens To Develop Africa

Marsha Freeman

In Memoriam: Lynn Margulis (1938-2011)

Pioneering American Biologist and Geoscientist
Mark A.S. McMenamin

Evidence-Based Medicine: Treating by Chance

Cathy M. Helgason, M.D.

How to Construct an Astrolabe, Using Your PC

Christine Craig

INTERVIEW: DR. AKIRA TOKUHIRO

Fukushima, Science, And Radiation

Decoding the Heavens: A 2,000-Year-Old Computer—and The Century-Long Search to Discover Its Secrets

Jo Marchant

Reviewed by W. Leonard Taylor, M.D.



A NEEDED VIEW OF RUSSIA TODAY!:

The Roots of the U.S.A.

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Saturday, May 5, 2012

*The birth of what was to become the United States, must be traced from the powerfully radiating impact of the work of one of the greatest scientific minds in modern history, Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa. The most crucial elements of Cusa's expressed genius are to be found most concisely as the central, crucially ontological principle of his **De Docta Ignorantia**.*

The impact of his most exceptional achievements in science includes the gripping historical fact, that the discovery of North America by Christopher Columbus, was the result of Cusa's own specific influence in generating what became Christopher Columbus' trans-Atlantic discoveries. This is to be recognized as a direct consequence of the resonant influence on Columbus of Cusa's founding of an actually modern science. That is also a consequence which must be recognized as fact when the process in that development of science is combined with insight into the original creation of the modern trans-Atlantic settlements within the Americas, but also, most emphatically, the original development of that Massachusetts Bay Colony which was the origin of the United States of America.

Just as there can be no adult without the earlier birth and preceding conception of the child, there is no competent insight into the history of modern trans-

Atlantic civilization without the most historically crucial developments of Europe's development since the birth of both that man of his century, Nicholas of Cusa, and the life's work of Cusa's relevant predecessor and contemporary in modern science and Classical artistic composition, Filippo Brunelleschi.

We must, therefore, take into account the historically crucial combination of the facts, that Cusa has been a leading figure in the founding of the European Renaissance, and a leading founder of the root-principles of a modern European science. He was a singular man, who had been confronted with those ruinous effects of what had been, for a time, that late Fifteenth-century Venetian resurgence which would be centered directly into those ruinous great waves of mass-murderous religious conflict which would dominate Europe from 1492 until the Peace of Westphalia, and what was yet to come.

In serious scientific investigations, no mere sequence of successive events is to be permitted. The succession in actual history is not simply sequential, it must be systemically "organic," contrary to those fools who wish to know very little of historical importance for mankind.

It was a Cusa who had taken, thus, a combination of the new-Venetian crisis-factors of his own time into account, who would have, personally, set into motion



Cardinal Nicolas of Cusa (1401-64), in response to New Venetian Party's takeover of Europe, set into motion a cultural "earthquake" with Columbus's trans-Atlantic missions establishing the roots of a new-born culture within the Americas. Left, Columbus; right, Cusa.

the evolving policy which motivated the virtual cultural "earthquake" which had been set into motion by Christopher Columbus' trans-Atlantic missions for establishing the roots of a new-born culture within the Americas.

What was to become the United States, had been prompted, directly, by the original Massachusetts settlements of the early through middle of the Seventeenth Century. The brilliant cultural and scientific-economic accomplishments of the Massachusetts Bay Colony during that earlier interval, had been, admittedly, crushed, if temporarily, by an imperial Britain abroad, during the last quarter of that century. A Massachusetts which had been crushed by the invasion by the New Venetian Party which was led, then, by the consummately evil William of Orange.

However, it would be through the critical role of the inspiration of Benjamin Franklin by Cotton Mather, that the British imperialism which was actually established by the 1763 Treaty of Paris, prompted the reactions of those patriotic American circles which came to be led in a most-exemplary fashion by the scientist-statesman and genius Benjamin Franklin. Franklin's life was to appear to span a century with his role as the sheer genius who did so much, as since the time of the death of Leibniz, to establish a new kind of constitu-

tional system of government specific to North America.

This was a system founded as a reflection of principles derived chiefly from the same great influence of Gottfried Leibniz, as this was later re-echoed in the U.S.A.'s West Point, as by the scientific contributions received from places such as France's Ecole Polytechnique of Gaspard Monge and Monge's associate known as the military and scientific genius Lazare Carnot.

That system of government and economy launched as the original Federal Constitution of the United States, had been greatly in-

fluenced beforehand by such as the scientist-statesman Benjamin Franklin who had developed features largely original to himself, but through those of his own accomplishments respecting those crucial, distinctly scientific features of economic and related development which have not yet been sufficiently well understood by most other nations of the world, still to the present date: even among most among those who had actually been the nominal founders of my United States.

The principal source of what we must admit as having been the imperfections of the United States as a system, has been an effect of a ruinous, continuing influence expressed by the British imperialist policies of Wall Street, and by the related financier interests expressed by such wretched, effectively treasonous scoundrels as the British agent Aaron Burr, the consummate scoundrel Andrew Jackson, and the wicked Martin Van Buren, then, and in the present likeness of the American followers of Britain's most consummately evil Bertrand Russell and his like today.¹

My intention in these pages, is to inform the reader

1. See H. Graham Lowry, **How The Nation Was Won, America's Untold Story 1630-1754** (EIR, 1987); Anton Chaitkin, **Treason In America**, New Benjamin Franklin House, 2nd ed. (1985).

of what had been those specifically original, essential constitutional principles of the American system, which remain urgently needed, but virtually unknown among European nations today. Notably, there is the fact of the crucial role of the Franklin D. Roosevelt whose legacy is still bitterly hated by the combination of such places and persons as London, Wall Street, and U.S. President Barack Obama, up to the present moment. This fact is a consideration which needs urgent attention, again, today: all of which can be fairly identified, as I shall do in the course of the following pages.

Those principles which I present here, are of absolutely crucial importance now. They are crucial for the purpose of the reshaping of the future fate of the world into the becoming of a refreshed gathering of respectively sovereign nation-states today. The need is an immediate one, as Russia's present leadership will be, hopefully, successfully continued as typical of such a direction.

The particular potential of our United States to be called, or recalled to our attention here and now, is to be recognized as located in our republic's most crucial, strategic role in providing the needed historical link among the sovereign nations of Asia and Europe, as also elsewhere, a link which reaches from across the respective reaches of the Pacific and Atlantic oceans, as also from the Arctic to a crucially needed base once more operating on our Moon.

I. The Needed End for Empire

There are two mutually opposing currents of thought which are to be regarded as having been combined to express the characteristics of what is named as our United States today. Such a division had long been presented as what has become a United States divided between, chiefly, bitterly opposed Patriot versus Tory during the Eighteenth Century, or a similarly continued moral division within the United States of today. This had been the relevant situation since the time of that 1763 Treaty of Paris which established the British Empire as both an offshoot of the New Venetian Party of such as Britain's William of Orange, and as the original British Empire of the Lord Shelburne who was a leading political heir, still to the present moment, of the evil tradition of the same original Roman Empire which had slaughtered Christians and others *en masse* in its own reign, as today.

The key to the strictly scientific definition of that British Empire which reigns under the present Queen Elizabeth II today, is that specifically oligarchical tradition which is deeply embedded in European cultures since a time as early as the siege of Troy. During such times, European culture, in particular, has been, most often, dominated by a process which has been predicated upon what is classed as a systemic "oligarchical principle." That has remained as a principle, an outlook which has been based on the wicked fiction of belief in money *per se*, a mode systemically distinct from the U.S. Constitutional principle of a credit-system, as that latter, constitutional, credit system, has been distinct, even when frequently violated, from all monetarist systems of the planet, still today.

For this time, as I do here, what I have prescribed is an urgently needed renewal of the original intention of the Constitution of the United States. This renewal is to be based upon the need for a threefold, leading economic policy of a type which would be indispensable for the present recovery of the United States of America, and other nations, too.


Two of these indispensable features of such a currently needed reform, are to be derived simply and directly from the U.S.A.'s original Federal Constitution, which include: (a) a Glass-Steagall reform which is still required to provide needed corrections for the exemplary wickedness of such as the trio of Wall Street's treasonous combination of such as Aaron Burr, Burr's Wall Street accomplice, Martin van Buren, and the consummate, murderous scoundrel Andrew Jackson; (b) the needed replacement of a Wall-Street-design for a monetarist system, by a credit system.

Why NAWAPA Now

In addition to those two just stated affirmations of the intention of a constitutional composition of a proper government of the United States, I have now added the urgently needed remedy of c) the prescribed, now urgently needed installation of a program named "NAWAPA" (North American Water and Power Alliance), the greatest project of this type within the known history of mankind, this far.

NAWAPA is a project which shall employ about six millions trained persons directly, a project whose benefits will be combined, developed as an undertaking based on a system of public credit, which will be employed as the investment-driver for the massive economic recovery of the otherwise, presently, hope-

FIGURE 1
North America: 'NAWAPA-Plus'



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

lessly bankrupt United States. The effect of NAWAPA would prompt the development of productive employment reaching beyond the estimated six millions and more immediately engaged within the project itself.

NAWAPA, which embraces the potential development of North America as far south as northern Mexico, and deep into the Arctic, would be the essentially needed, immediate complement to the mutual advantages of such leading projects of Russia as the Bering Strait development and the leading great developments

now projected as immediate prospects for the Russian Arctic and leading Siberian projects, among others.

This development perspective, as promoted to be shared among cooperating nations such as the U.S.A., Russia, and many others, is, at the same time, the basis for a new space-development program which is urgently needed now for such purposes as defense of our planet Earth from the deadly threats to mankind from shards and comets of Solar space, and beyond, which are threats to the continued existence of human life on our planet during the span of the immediate and later times ahead.

What is otherwise crucial in the design which I am committed to support, is the use of a credit system, rather than an oligarchical tyranny known as a monetarist system. This preference for a credit system, presents us with the only method of finance which could fulfill the kinds of objectives which these projects now require.

In other words, by removing the notion of economic value from the notion of merely money as such, we are enabled to establish a system of credit already consistent with the originally successful intention of our republic's Federal Constitution. That means a system which pledges credit to national economies based on the

expansion effected as future developments, rather than past events, rather than an *a-priori* fiction of a nominal value of money *per se*.

In fact, all the greatest achievements in economy by the United States during the exceptionally appropriate times past, had been premised on a notion of "national banking" which is opposed to even the very existence of a monetarist system. The replacement of that oligarchical relic, which is called a monetarist system, by the re-establishment of a U.S. constitutional system of public credit, provides a model which establishes a

means for development of the interacting governments of nations whose physical-economic value grows as the nation grows; such is the only means by which a general recovery of this planet might be presently induced, that through emphasis on the realization of great science-driver programs which could be realized under such policy-shaping from now onward.

These were precisely the principles of economy and related practice, by which a United States led by Franklin Roosevelt enabled the build-up of the credit system on which the crushing defeat of the Nazi monster was accomplished among the allied nations. Without the role of that credit system, the military and related economic achievements of the military forces against Hitler, could not have been sustained.

The present, globally dominant British empire, must be superseded by a system of credit-systems of respectively sovereign republics. The replacement of monetarist systems by credit systems according to the model which I specify for a credit system, is required. That is the only method by which the presently accelerating general, physical collapse of the planet, especially that within the trans-Atlantic system, could be reversed. That was already the quality of remedy specified for President Franklin Roosevelt's continuing intention—had he lived.

Unfortunately, it has been a radical, anti-Franklin Roosevelt change in U.S. policy, which was imposed on our United States by the British empire and its accomplices (i.e., Winston Churchill, et al. and the U.S. Wall Street flunkey Harry S Truman) which sent the United States into a direction contrary to the intention of Franklin Roosevelt, as into the continuing plunge of the U.S. physical economy launched by that assassination of President John F. Kennedy through which the present plague of British-created “permanent warfare and permanent revolution” had been set into motion throughout the planet.²

2. The actual author of “Permanent War, Permanent Revolution,” was the British Fabian Society asset, (Vickers, et al.) arms trafficker, terrorist, and mercenary, Alexander Helphand aka “Parvus.” The source of much of the mistaken opinion on the subject of Helphand can be blamed on a mistaken view on the origins of what was called “World War I.” The actual beginning of that period of British imperialist schemes is properly dated to events such as the ouster of Prussia's Chancellor Bismarck, which was done to unleash a series of events which were intended to break up Bismarck's role in preventing the Great Powers of Prussia, Russia, Austro-Hungary, and France from launching a series of wars, beginning with the original British-Japan alliance against China and, later, Russia. In his own time, Chancellor

In the meantime, the British empire proffers viciously, and shamelessly, mass-murderous prospects which are nothing different in their effect than genocide, even global mass-extinctions throughout the planet.

II. The Notion of an “American System”

The implicit intent of what the original Massachusetts Bay Colony had represented, was first made clear during a precious interval of the economic policy embedded as the intention of that Colony under the policy of what became known as the reign of a mid-Seventeenth Century system known then as “The Pinetree Shilling.” The proper name of that policy is “A Credit System,” rather than a monetarist system. This was the same policy embedded in the pre-stated intention and successes to be recognized in the practiced qualities of the original U.S. Federal Constitution under the leadership of the first U.S. Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton.

That was the same Hamilton who was later assassinated by that U.S. traitor and British agent Aaron Burr (1756-1836), an assassin and traitor who was closely associated with the utter scoundrel and (later) sometime U.S. President Andrew Jackson (1767-1845), and also with Jackson's accomplice and swindling Wall Street banker Martin Van Buren (1782-1862), as also others of a kindred inclination and ilk.

The standard opponent of the concept of the “credit system” is what is named as a “monetarist system.” The other, technically precise name for a “monetarist system,” is the same “Oligarchical System” of pure usury associated with such precedents as the mass-

von Bismarck and Graf von Moltke had recognized that the threatened war among the nations of continental Europe was a British imperial scheme which Bismarck and von Moltke referenced among themselves as “A New Seven Years War.” This was a reference to seven years of war, concluded at the 1763 Peace of Paris which established the British Empire (in fact). Both of what have been misnamed as World War I and World War II were actually what Bismarck and von Moltke had recognized as “New Seven Years Wars,” wars organized to establish and extend world domination by the British empire. The now-threatened thermonuclear warfare, using U.S. and British forces against Russia, China, et al., would be, in effect, a “Fourth ‘Seven Years’ War.” Hence, the true political identity of Frederick Engels' playing host to Alexander Helphand in London on behalf of what are referenced as “The Fabians.”

murderous outcome of the siege of Troy, as also the same policy of practice associated with both the British monarchy and U.S. Wall Street cliques presently. In effect, Wall Street finance and the existing form of the British Empire, are inseparable institutions which prey, through the present day, under an intrinsically treasonous conduct of a President Barack Obama's preying, in the practical expression of a London-Wall Street predator and tyrant, upon the nation and people of the United States.

However, that much said respecting London and Wall Street, still presently, a competent understanding of the real implications of the present world's existential crisis, must go to the deep-rootedness of the legacy of an actually oligarchical system, a system which has been based traditionally on the notion of money, rather than the actual creation of the realizable wealth of human beings, and the creation of the existential nature of their actual progress as an increasingly powerful species within the universe.

III. Creativity & Life

Some necessary considerations which must now be included here, include a required scientific world-outlook of specifically Russian origin: if not in language, then at least in the powers of the human mind shown by V.I. Vernadsky. That outlook is in opposition to the hand-held puppet of the British empire's evil Bertrand Russell: the unfortunate Alexander I. Oparin, the Russell puppet who was nothing more than a kind of "wind-up toy," expressing a mechanical sort of an intrinsically lifeless physics. A person whose conception was based on blind faith in randomly ordered collisions, as in John



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

A credit system, rather than a monetarist system, was embedded in the original U.S. Constitution under the leadership of the first U.S. Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton. This statue of Hamilton stands in front of the U.S. Treasury building in Washington.


von Neumann's lunacy of randomness in space. What I have to present now, may present systemic difficulties to the reader, but they are both truthful and indispensable.

The study of living processes presently known to our Solar system shows them to have been ordered by the requirement, that living processes be adapted to an ordered increase in the relative "energy-flux density" of the "ambient" medium which the relevant living species inhabit. The exterminations of failed classes of species in nature, reflect this sort of "natural selection," rather than the silly opinions of Charles Darwin.

To state the point as simply as it were permissible, we are presently confronted with three most notable classifications of existence: non-life, simply living, and human-creative. The essential consideration, is the exper-

imental proof that a so-called "Second Law of Thermodynamics" was already a fraud when the mathematician Rudolf Clausius had concocted that hoax, a hoax which violates every bit of evidence adduced from the record of living processes of evolutionary succession. It was "simply believed" because Clausius had asserted it, but is contrary to every successive phase of the history of life.

The particular point of emphasis in treating the human species, distinguished from other forms of life known to us presently, is the requirement of a progressively increasing standard of relatively higher energy-flux density. This is typified by the fact that only the human species, among all presently known living species, "willfully uses fire." Today, we examine that standard of fire by different categories of fuel-equivalent substances, each and all ordered according to rising patterns of energy-flux density through to the range of



NASA/JPL-Caltech

“The continued existence of human life on Earth depends on the ability to destroy or evade the trajectories of nasty objects in space, including very much worrying comets.” Shown: an artist’s concept of NASA’s Dawn spacecraft orbiting the giant asteroid Vesta.

so-called “matter/antimatter” actions. This coincides with the patterns broadly adduced from study of the long-ranging, evolutionary progress of living species generally.

These patterns to which I have just referred in such a fashion, correspond to what we may fairly approximate by the notion of “energy-flux density” as an ordering principle specific to the progress of processes from relatively lower, to relatively higher orders of “energy-flux density.”

To bring a needed improvement in the ordering of such arguments, we should make the following categorical distinctions. 1. The argument to be made respecting a confinement to the category of non-living processes. 2. The argument to be made, as by V.I. Vernadsky, for non-human living species. 3. The unique quality of “experiment” specific to the progressive ordering of what are recognizable, as in the specific case of the characteristically noëtic processes of the human mind.

The same topics, but topics treated by a different standpoint of reference, lead us to recognize the categorical distinction between human mental life and the behavioral characteristics of both non-life, and of life as

expressed by plant and animal species (other than human). In study of the charts which outline the relatively comparative, categorical data, the noëtic capabilities of the human species present phenomena in that universe which exists “outside the bounds of” both non-living and merely living processes.

From the specifically human standpoint, there are two types of cases to be considered which have a certain unique importance for the human species. One case is the fact of the expected extinction of the Sun (within an estimated two billions years), and the worrying fact that the continued existence of human life on Earth depends on the ability to destroy or evade the trajectories of nasty objects in space, including very much worrying comets.

We human beings are not “individual” objects in space; we are a part of the realities of space which are, by implicit design, existences implicitly challenged by the concept of a quality of “survivable” existence which converges on an implied “motivated-destined” characteristic embedded in the existence of the model provided as visualizing the role of the human species in Solar or galactic space. This is a conception intrinsically absent from the presumptions of such as either a wicked Bertrand Russell, or those of the pitiable likeness of an Alexander I. Oparin.

Yet, such conceptions as these are not only the inherent characteristic of human morality; they express the origins of any notion of an actually human morality: we may die, and most probably will die; but, the natural intention of our existence is not only immortal: it performs service to an immortal intention which clearly resides “outside” any simplistic vision of our own mortal existence.

Another Side of the Question

The properly developed, and matured, individual human mind, was once expressed for us as a wonderful illustration of Albert Einstein’s notions of “matter/anti-

matter,” and, also, of universes which are finite, but not bounded. So, the great Johannes Kepler had foreseen the effects of a principle which he named as that of a principle of “vicarious hypothesis,” for which we might prefer the term “metaphor.”

There is nothing properly regarded as “queer” or “exotic” in this distinction. Consider a Classical drama presented as “on stage.” There are the persons (treated as characters on “stage”) and the actors whose performance is attributed to the drama itself, not the actors as such.

So, Nicholas of Cusa presented his **De Docta Ignorantia**. So, akin to that, the challenge we must include on our listings of experiences, is the need to recognize what is, on the one side, the ironically juxtaposed folly, but also, on the other side, the usefulness of those mere shadows which are presumed to represent human “powers of sense-perception,” such as what Kepler identified as “vicarious hypothesis.” Truth lies not in the flesh as such, but what casts the efficient effect of the efficient dreams, as on the great stage of our own Commedia. “The reality is the effect!” which you must seek to understand, and learn to master in effect.

But, “effect on what?” You must be the experience of reality, as the great conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler identified as “between the notes.” What is sensed, in the case of a meaningful presentation of a story on stage, is of the content of meaning as a form of “vicarious hypothesis.” Which is real, the sense-perception of the process on stage, or what we identify as the “meaning” of the story put on stage? Which is meaningful, the images on stage, or “the story” on stage?

That is essentially what Kepler had done in emphasizing the effects of “vicarious hypothesis.” The point here is to recognize that human sense-perceptions should be recognized as also a form of expression of what is tantamount to “vicarious hypothesis.” That was the significance of the argument constituted as Cusa’s **De Docta Ignorantia**: the same viewpoint is to be adduced in considering Kepler’s “vicarious hypothesis.” The same class of experience as the use of instruments as vicars of what is real, but not simply seen. That is the same class of experience as the work of Max Planck and Albert Einstein.

That takes on a most interesting character when we begin to appreciate the rarely understood principle of musical composition as presented by Wilhelm Furtwängler’s use of the musical form of expression of the

principle of higher hypothesis.

What is rightly identified as Classical musical composition, especially so when this is extended to embrace Wilhelm Furtwängler’s exceptional notion of “between the notes,” or the reading of the ironical principle of Bach’s compositions from a related vantage-point, is to be considered as an example of the manner in which the

Truth lies not in the flesh as such, but what casts the efficient effect of the efficient dreams, as on the great stage of our own “Commedia.” “The reality is the effect!” which you must seek to understand, and learn to master in effect.

cultivated human individual mind reads the message which lies behind the mere experiences of human sense-perception.

The point of my argument here, is my emphasis on the fact of the systemic difference between sense-perceptions and their properly adducible “meanings. “*Die Hauptsache ist der Effekt!*” [“The important thing is the effect!”] of “Das Spukschloss im Spessart,” (German 1960 comedy film) is “a playful play” on exactly such ironies cast in Classical metaphor.

In the instance of the compositions of Johann Sebastian Bach or the direction by Wilhelm Furtwängler, musical composition is carried to a much greater “depth” of meanings for the real world than most people attempting to understand that real world are enabled to recognize. My essential point in this present moment here, is that we must work to expand our abilities to apprehend the metaphorical messages which the experience of sensing the universe implicitly wishes us to recognize in a manner akin to the reality of the drama on stage rather than the mere sense-perception of what is presented in the so-called literal activity as such on stage.

“If the Creator spoke to you, would you hear the message, or merely the sounds projected as the utterance?” In short: the principle of Kepler’s *vicarious hypothesis*. In brief, the method of Nicholas of Cusa. Extended, the methods which must be extended for a more efficient comprehension of what is being “spoken” by such voices as that of our galaxy.

Reintroducing the American System

In introducing his legislative initiative to prevent the President from unilaterally launching pre-emptive war in the name of “humanitarian intervention,” on May 9, Senator Jim Webb, Democrat of Virginia, made a crucial historical point of which all Americans and others need to be reminded:

“One of our strongest adjustments from the British System was to ensure that no one person would have the power to commit the nation to military schemes that could not be justified by the interests and the security of the average citizen [emphasis added]. President after President, beginning with George Washington, has emphasized the importance of this fundamental principle to the stability of our political system, and to the integrity of our country in the international community. The fact that the leadership of our Congress has failed to raise this historic standard in the past few years, and most specifically in Libya, is a warning sign to this body that it must reaffirm one of its most solemn responsibilities.”

In fact, Senator Webb understates the problem. Over decades, actually from the time of the death of President Franklin Roosevelt, that clear sense of the distinction between the British *imperial* system, of both economics and politics, and the American System of economics and politics as defined by the U.S. Constitution, has been almost eliminated from the schools, public life, and even much of our institutional memory. There is a reality to the description of the current bankrupt financial system as an “Anglo-American” one, but only because the American System has been virtually buried.

It has been the mission of the political movement initiated by Lyndon LaRouche over the last approximately 40 years, to educate both Ameri-

cans, and patriots worldwide, on the *principles* that underlie the foundations of the American republic, and the nature of the evil oligarchical system, now centered in the British monarchy, which still considers the United States Constitutional republic as its mortal enemy. We have, as they say, kept the flame alive—even when our fellow citizens declined to fight.


But now, as Webb’s remarks attest, crisis conditions are once again creating the opportunity for success. There will, of course, be no spontaneous uprising by the people to overthrow what is a tightening British Empire-directed dictatorship. The mass of people need leadership, and it is their leadership which has continually failed them. And it is that leadership which must respond in this moment of existential crisis, by finally dumping the British system in favor of their American heritage.

The requirements of the American System today are just as plain as they were when Franklin Roosevelt took office in the midst of the catastrophic Great Depression. First, reinstate Glass-Steagall. Second, restore a credit system, based on great projects like NAWAPA, which will engage the entire nation in a grand mission of rebuilding for the future. Third, dump the policy of “permanent war” and reach out for economic cooperation with all nations, but especially those nations of Eurasia which can lead the world to prosperity once again.

Barack Obama not only manifestly does not understand these principles; he is committed to implementing the British policies which have led us to the current disaster. But that’s not a problem if we apply our Constitutional standard to his behavior. That is the pathway to restoring the American System once again.

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 _____