

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

August 24, 2012 Vol. 39 No. 33 www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

LaRouche: Obama's Crony, Cass R. Sunstein Departs

The Secret Is Out: The Euro Will Not Survive

Which Way: The Common Aims of Mankind, or Destruction?

Obama's Anti-Science Policy Endangers Planet Earth



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 Hoeffle, 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.executiveintelligencereview.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


Worldwide, people were inspired and delighted at the Mars landing of the Curiosity rover. But it has much greater significance than just “good news, for a change,” as Lyndon LaRouche, Peter Martinson, and Ben Deniston discuss in the LPAC-TV Weekly Report that is our *Strategy* section. The excitement over Curiosity provides a crucial opportunity for a policy shift, if people act quickly—very quickly.

Why is President Obama’s budgetary sabotage of the manned space program in general, and the Mars research in particular, *an impeachable offense*? The Lord knows he has committed plenty of impeachable offenses, as *EIR* has documented at length. But in this case, we are dealing with a matter of strategic urgency for all mankind, from the possibility of near-Earth objects, such as asteroids, striking a totally defenseless planet. The Russians are ringing alarm bells and calling for international cooperation; Obama is shutting down crucial programs that could deal with the threat.

LaRouche encapsulates the current situation more broadly in his *Feature*, “Cass R. Sunstein Departs,” as follows: “My crucial consideration in presenting the report of the subject-matters which I present here, is, that, without both the expulsion of President Obama, and, also, a radical and sudden change away from President Obama in the methods of U.S. economic policy-shaping, this nation of ours is simply, as it is sometimes said, ‘not going to make it,’ even in the short term before the next Federal election, or, even before the coming Democratic Party’s Presidential nominating event. Otherwise, his continuation in the role of President, would almost certainly be your personal doom.”

Would Mitt Romney be any better? Forget about it! The policies we require are neither Sunstein’s crazed “behavioral economics” nor Romney’s lunatic free-market liberalism, but the American System economics that LaRouche has long espoused. In our news sections, we report the policy fights over the necessity for Glass-Steagall internationally, plus the escalating attacks on Obama’s refusal to prosecute the banksters for financial crimes.

In *International*, we focus on the danger of world war, as the Obama Administration escalates its failed policies with respect to Russia, China, Afghanistan, Syria, and Iran.



Cover This Week

An artist's concept of a giant asteroid hitting the early Earth.



Courtesy of NASA

4 Obama's Anti-Science Policy Endangers Planet Earth

In the LaRouchePAC Weekly Report of Aug. 15, Peter Martinson and Ben Deniston from the Basement Team joined Lyndon LaRouche for a discussion of what will be required to build on the tremendous breakthrough represented by NASA's successful landing of the Curiosity rover/scientific laboratory on Mars. The major stumbling block in driving this scientific achievement forward, including in developing a defense of Earth from galactic threats, is Obama himself. "As long as you have Obama in office, you have zilch chance of saving civilization," LaRouche declared.

International

19 To New Worlds, Like Christopher Columbus! Which Way: The Common Aims of Mankind, or Destruction?

By Helga Zepp-LaRouche.
Never before in the history of mankind have the choices been so clear: On the one hand, the collapsing world of the financial oligarchy, and the threat of global war; and on the other hand, as the landing of Curiosity on Mars demonstrates, a shift toward the future, and the laws of the order of Creation.

22 Oxford's 'Project Democracy' Goes Hard-Core: 'Pussy Riot' Against Russia

The atrocious behavior of a feminist, punk rock band is being exploited by the "democracy" mafia and the Western news media, as part of a campaign to bring down Russia's President Putin. *EIR's* Russia editor Rachel Douglas reports.

25 Why Are We Killing Off Our Soldiers in Afghanistan?

American soldiers are now sitting ducks for "green-on-blue" killings in Afghanistan, at the same time that suicide rates among U.S. military personnel are rising dramatically. *EIR's* New Delhi correspondent Ramtanu Maitra reports.

Economics

29 In Europe, the Secret Is Out: The Euro Will Not Survive

While the desperate Eurocrats attempt to come up with a “Plan B” (read: hyperinflation) for the euro, following the inevitable “Grexit” (Greek exit), those in the know, know the party is over. By Our Wiesbaden Bureau

31 Interview—Álfheidur Ingadóttir: Iceland—First To Recover from Crisis; First To Restore Glass-Steagall?

Fifteen Icelandic parliamentarians representing a majority of the parliament have introduced a motion to implement a Glass-Steagall-style banking reform. Althingi member Álfheidur Ingadóttir was interviewed by Michelle Rasmussen of the Schiller Institute in Denmark.

35 Geithner Exposed Again, Took Delphi Pensions

A bipartisan group in the House and Senate is looking into who ordered the elimination of the pensions of 20,000 white-collar Delphi employees; Geithner's name is at the top of the list of suspects.

37 Obama Protects, While States Pursue Banksters

National

39 Will Congress Fulfill Its Duty To Oust Obama in Time?

With the start of the Democratic Convention less than two weeks away, time is running out for Congress to fulfill its Constitutional responsibility to remove President Obama from office for his many crimes.

Feature

41 ‘Barack Obama’s Crony’: Cass R. Sunstein Departs

By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. The departure of Obama's Chicago and Harvard Law buddy, the behavioral economist Sunstein, still leaves in place a passel of similar scalawags, as well as Obama himself, and the nation prey to their murderous policies. LaRouche contrasts his exceptional successful economic forecasting method to that of those who have depended on “established statistical trends.”

Editorial

56 Obama's Next War?

Obama's Anti-Science Policy Endangers Planet Earth

This is an edited transcript of the LaRouchePAC Weekly Report of Aug. 15, 2012 (<http://larouchepac.com/node/23641>). Peter Martinson and Ben Deniston from the Basement Team joined Lyndon LaRouche.

Peter Martinson: First of all, the most important program that's underway in the world right now, is not really a program underway *in* the world: It's a Solar System program. We had this victory last week of the landing of the Mars Science Laboratory on Mars. But what I wanted to begin with, is a perspective from the White House. Several days ago, the President of the United States gave a call to JPL [NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory in California], and congratulated the Curiosity lander crew for their magnificent landing. On the one hand, it's a nice thing for a President to do. It's the third time that that's happened: Ford did it when they landed the Viking; Bush Jr. did it when the Spirit landed; and now, Obama did it. So, on the surface, it's a very good thing.

But there's a big problem with how it was carried out.

Obama said, "This is a great thing"; he commented on the Mohawk guy; he said, "Let me know when you find life up there," and "I promise, I give you my commitment to ensure that you will continue to have the continued investments into this type of program, so that you can continue the type of work that you're doing." Now, he says this, in the midst of already having established the budget for NASA for 2013, which *slashes*, not just the manned space program—the manned space program is in a shambles right now in the United States, but also slashes the planetary space program, specifi-



NASA/JPL-Caltech

Engineers celebrate the landing of the Curiosity rover on Mars, on the morning of Aug. 6. The exuberance they are expressing here was echoed in reactions by people all over the world.

cally slashing the Mars program by 40%, almost half!


At this point, JPL and NASA can not do any Mars program that costs more than about \$700 million. The Curiosity lander cost, at this point, upwards of \$2.5 billion; it's a so-called "flagship" program. So the new budget established by Obama prevents any more projects of the class of Curiosity.

He had the audacity to go even further and set up what he calls the "Mars Program Planning Group," where he gets all the scientists together to say, "Okay, under this new budget, let's look at what other great programs we can do. Let's see how we can rearrange, and come up with some other great programs for the Mars mission."

Now, this is a big slap in the face to anybody who studies the Solar System. Because anybody who knows anything about exploring the Solar System knows that we have a full program already laid out for getting out and understanding our Solar System. Curiosity is a crucial point.

Curiosity, as I described last week [<http://larouche.pac.com/node/23584>], is inside a crater, a pretty magnificent crater, because it has tons of evidence of previous water. It's sitting right next to what appears to be a feature called an alluvial fan, which is where water swept tons of material into the crater, at some point in the past, as part of flooding. On the other side of the rover, you have a mountain which looks like it's made of sediments, a sedimentary record, which will give the history of Mars going back something like 4 billion years.

Now, the importance of the rover, is that it will go into this area of the sediment, and make measurements



White House Photo/Pete Souza
President Obama congratulates the Curiosity Mars rover team on Aug. 13. The graph shows the impact of Obama's proposed 20% budget cut for NASA's planetary science (Mars exploration gets the worst hit).

that can then be compared to the observations that were made from orbital spacecraft, to correct and im-

prove what we're getting from the orbital spacecraft.

The next step is already very clear: We need to go to Mars, collect samples, and bring them back to Earth. The next step after that is pretty obvious: We need to send people there.

So, the program is already laid out, and there are already people working on aspects of the next step, to go there and start collecting samples. But what Obama does, after submitting his budget, and then putting together this Mars Working Group, is he says we need to define a whole new program for Mars exploration—as if we don't already have one! It's a slap in the face, for anybody studying the planet.

And what I think should be looked at, is a security threat. Because, what we're going to get into more is

that the existence of man in the Solar System *is not assured*. We don't have a donation for our species living for the rest of time, or something like that. We know that we're going to face major threats, because we have evidence on the Earth of major species extinctions that have happened in the past. We know that we're going to face those same types of extinctions.


In order to understand what the threats are, and defeat those threats, we have to understand the history of the Solar System, and how do we control the Solar System? The way we ask, do that, is by expanding our knowledge, by sending instruments out into the depths: We need to go to Mars, we need to send a lot of instruments to places like Mercury and Venus. We need to immediately get back to the Moon and colonize the Moon. We need to get *out* there!

If we don't continue that, then no matter what you do on the ground, on the Earth, in terms of your budgetary policies, no matter what development you do on the ground, our species is still at risk of extinction. So, what Obama's doing, should be looked at as essentially a criminal act. The call to JPL was probably a campaign trick: He doesn't give a *damn*, about space exploration. If anything, he wants to stop exploration into space, which is what's represented by this budget. And it's a *threat to man*, if that continues.

So, I just wanted to state that outright. And then, maybe we can go into some of the asteroid defense.

Bring the Inner Planetary Region Under Man's Control

Ben Deniston: Sure. Last week we discussed mankind getting a foothold in the whole Earth-Mars orbit region, as the first step toward ensuring the continued existence of mankind. Looking from the galactic perspective that we've discussed repeatedly here, the first step for man, ensuring that we can actually protect and ensure the continued existence of mankind, in comparing mankind's existence to all the previous forms of life that we know of, is going to be mankind taking the whole inner region of the Solar System, with Mars as the obvious first target—taking the Earth orbit, taking the Mars orbit, taking this whole region of space, and bringing that under mankind's control. And that's going to be the first necessary step to ensuring that we can protect our species from known threats, that have al-



NASA

Vesta is the second-largest known asteroid (525 km mean diameter). The false colors highlight the mineral content of the surface. (Don't worry about this one: Vesta travels in the Asteroid Belt and is not on a trajectory to hit the Earth.)

ready demonstrated the ability to wipe out entire species, repeatedly, throughout billions of years of the history of life.

It has to be seen as mankind's mind coming to control this region, first typified by the expansion of what we call the synthetic sensory capabilities, expanding the power of mankind's mind, to understand, to see and perceive, this entire environment, in new ways that we couldn't do before, and to use that as the first ability to give early warnings, and the ability to give us a greater control over all these processes.


The question of asteroid defense, the Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE), is kind of an obvious first step in that direction, the first avenue for nations to begin to come together and take this threat seriously, and give it the weight it needs as an issue for all of mankind.

And so I have a couple of slides, to continue the discussion from last week.

We discussed a little bit about the scale of the threats we're dealing with. Now, I want to get a little bit more into the question of the observation systems we need, and how we need to begin to populate the Solar System with synthetic instrumentation, and how that has to be seen, as we said, as the extension of mankind's mind, to actually enveloping this whole region of the Solar System and bringing it under control.


The first image here (**Figure 1**) is just a classic cartoon-image of the inner Solar System. This is the

FIGURE 1



NASA

FIGURE 2




NASA

region we want to begin to focus in on; we'll step back outside of this in a minute, but, to take the basic first threats we have to deal with, we want to focus on this region here. So, you have here the four inner planets, Mercury, Venus, Earth, Mars, and you have this discontinuity of the Asteroid Belt, this famous discontinuity that Kepler forecast, looking at his conception of the harmonic organization of the whole Solar System; Gauss did a lot of work, taking Kepler's work further, discovering this anomalous character of the whole Solar System, this main Asteroid Belt.

So, this sticks out as the greatest density of these smaller objects in the Solar System. But if we take it a step further, **Figure 2** is a representation of the actual known populations of asteroids, as of 2006. We've done a lot of observation, some space-based observation, a lot of ground-based observation, to try to find as many of these objects as possible, for both scientific and defense reasons.


And so here, the white objects are the main Asteroid Belt; you see Jupiter just outside the main Asteroid Belt, and you've got the four inner planets, and this very large population of asteroids. But as you can see, as you look inside that main Asteroid Belt (**Figure 3**), there is a very significant population of other types of asteroids, they're shown here as blue, green, red.

FIGURE 3



NASA

FIGURE 4



<http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/User:Antonsusi>

Near-Earth Objects

One of the classes here that we're particularly concerned about, that NASA, Russia, and other agencies are particularly concerned about, is this specific class of objects, called "near-Earth objects," "near-Earth asteroids." And they are the next image here (Figure 4). They have orbits that are significantly different from the main belt asteroids; they have orbits that are not all that different from the Earth's orbit. Here are three typical cases of the types of near-Earth objects that we are concerned with: The black is the Earth's orbit, and the blue, red, and green are three classes of near-Earth asteroids, near-Earth objects.

And so, you can see that these objects orbit the Sun, but the red and the blue ones have orbits that *cross* the Earth's orbit. So these become an object of great concern, because if the Earth is at that point of intersection when the asteroid is, then you're going to get an impact.

This is this particular class of objects that is being studied in great detail, these near-Earth objects. It's a little different than the main belt as-

teroids, a different class of objects. We want to find all of them, know where they all are, watch them, and forecast their orbits, to make sure that if we think one of them is going to impact the Earth, we can take proper measures to ensure that doesn't happen.

That's by no means the extent of what we need to do, but that's how to get into it, as an opening. Because the most immediate, on-the-table, up-front issue to deal with, is these near-Earth objects, specifically.

Last week we discussed a little bit about the range, the scale of impacts we're talking about. You have, on the one end, massive, global, devastating impacts of very large objects, like the object that hit the Earth about 65 million years ago, ten kilometers across. This is the size of Mount Everest,

FIGURE 5




FIGURE 6

Impact Site of the Tunguska Near-Earth Object, 1908



so just imagine Mount Everest falling from the sky, down onto your continent; not even just falling, but coming in at 20-30,000 miles per hour! It's a mind-boggling event, and we know it's happened repeatedly in the past. Thankfully, these are significantly rare, on the order of hundreds of millions of years.

But there are many more smaller objects, and a lot of these smaller objects can have very significant regional or local effects, as we discussed last week.

So looking at **Figure 5**, as you go up from the bottom right to the upper left, you're looking at the slope of changing asteroid size, and also the frequency of impacts. As you go up toward the upper left, you get a greater frequency of impacts, which also represents a greater population. There are a lot more of these smaller bodies than there are of the large ones.

What we have here with the red line, the lower curve—and this is really important to emphasize—is a rough estimation of currently how many we think we've discovered. As you can see, towards the bottom right, we think we've discovered a significant amount—most, if not pretty much all, of the really large ones. The really large ones are obviously easier to see, easier to track; we think we've discovered 90-plus percent of the

really large ones. But as you get to smaller and smaller sizes, there are more and more of them, and we haven't found anywhere near all of them.

And again, to just make the point, last week we discussed the Tunguska case where an object—frankly, a pretty small object, 30-50 meters across—if it were to come in, could wipe out an area the size of any major metropolitan area. In 1908, you had an impact that leveled a huge area in Siberia (**Figure 6**). If you were to map this same area onto, say, San Francisco Bay area (**Figure 7**), this is the size of impact you'd be looking at. This range of 30-50 meters is about how big they think this object

was; it's a rather small object!

Figure 8 shows the results of a relatively recent study, giving a different graphical representation of how many we think we've discovered, of different


FIGURE 7

San Francisco Bay Area



LPAC/EIR

FIGURE 8



sized objects. Again, the really big objects—each of the asteroids there, represents about 100 objects; the ones that are filled in that look like a normal asteroid, those are the ones we found. The green areas represent how many we *haven't* found. So, it gives you an idea of the percentage, somewhat rough estimations, but NASA thinks they have a pretty good idea of how many are out there, at different size ranges. And the green [at the bottom and on the right] represents how many we haven't yet found.

For the larger ones, say on the order of a kilometer or bigger, we think we've found over 90% of them. When you start to get to smaller sizes, the amount we haven't found grows, and you get down to the size range of 300-500 meters—if one of these were to come in, it could have an impact that would affect a small continent, a major country, that's the size of the impact there. So these are not insignificant events; even if they're not incredibly huge, they're still incredibly destructive, incredibly large effects. It looks like we've found maybe half of those.

When you get down to 100-300 meters, we've found maybe 10% of those, so 90% of those objects are still floating around. You get down to less than 100 meters, and there's not even a clear estimate of how many of these there are. Early estimates were saying there were upwards of a million. Upwards of a million objects!

And these are just near-Earth asteroid objects, not even in the main Asteroid Belt; near-Earth objects that have orbits similar to the Earth's, that could intersect the Earth's orbit. Some estimates say upwards of a million; this more recent study said it was hard to even estimate, because there are so many of them out there, less than 100 meters. Tunguska was 30-50 meters.

So, we don't even know how many of these are out there. We think it's probably well over a million; we've found a very small percentage of these.

So these are a completely

unknown population out there, that could pose dramatic threats in the near future. And we don't even have the dedicated observational capability to, at first, even have the proper observation, to even know what the threats are that we're dealing with.

So, to emphasize, this is a first step, to get a sense of where we're at. There's been some work done at getting an estimation of the population, where they are, which ones are threatening, which ones aren't; but we still have a long way to go, even to deal with that. And that's even just a first step, because that's just expanding mankind's sensorium to know the environment we're living in.

Then, it's a question of how you're going to deal with potential threats. How would you go up and alter an orbit of one of these objects? How would you blow one up, if that's what you needed to do? What would be the best method to ensure that it doesn't hit the Earth? This is another range of open questions, and we haven't even solved this one, yet, of getting a real census of what the full population is.

And then, to highlight one more thing on the subject specifically of getting the right type of instrumentation. Many of the observations have been done with ground-based systems; this one (Figure 8) was done with a space-based satellite, called the WISE satellite, an infrared satellite. It wasn't sent up to find asteroids. It did

the mission it was sent up to do, and then they extended its mission a little further, to say, “Hey, we have this infrared satellite up there, let’s use it to look for asteroids, as long as it’s up there.” So it did that for a couple years, maybe; not all that long. And it did a significant job in finding a lot of these objects, because when you’re dealing with these things, as you see in **Figure 9**, they’re relatively small objects, especially the really small ones we’re talking about, and they’re not necessarily easy to see.


There’s another complication, which is that they’re made of different things! Some of them are very dark, so they’re very hard to see against the blackness of space; some of them are very bright, more of a chalk-like color, so they’re very reflective, and they’re easier to see in normal, visible wavelengths. So, you could have a very small object that’s very reflective, or you could have a very large object that’s very dark, and they might look the same, if you’re just looking in the visible range.

So, what was significant in what this infrared space telescope did, is it demonstrated that if we use the infrared spectrum, what we see is just the warmth of the body, basically. We see the infrared emissions in this different range of the spectrum, and it’s much easier to see darker, colder bodies. It demonstrated that these infrared space telescopes could be of huge benefit, in at least this first step of getting a census of what the near-Earth environment is like, what the near-Earth asteroid population is like; and again, this is the very first step in even addressing this problem.

Telescopes in the Orbit of Venus

Now, a committee of some of the top specialists in the field of planetary defense, in the field of asteroid defense, came together about three, four, or five years ago—the NASA Ad Hoc Working Group on Planetary Defense—and they put together a very short proposal to NASA, to say, “These are the first things we’d like to do, to help protect the planet from asteroids.” One of the things to highlight, is that they proposed that we put

FIGURE 9



NASA


one, if not more—two, three, four—infrared space telescopes, in the orbit of Venus; not orbiting around Venus, but orbiting around the Sun, maybe either ahead of Venus, or behind Venus, and that’s what **Figure 10** expresses. The Earth’s orbit is in green; inside the Earth’s orbit is Venus’s orbit; and then in red and blue, you have a couple of typical examples of near-Earth asteroids, near-Earth objects.

And what this NASA report said, is that if you put these infrared telescopes closer to the Sun, say, in Venus’s orbit, then you get a wider angle out, so you have a better vantage point to see a greater amount of space, a greater amount of the Solar System, and to perceive these near-Earth asteroids, these near-Earth objects.

NASA, unfortunately, as you opened with, Peter—their budget’s been slashed across the board; they’ve said they have no money for this. So now this group is basically trying to do it with private funding. They just announced that they’re trying to squeeze money out of the private sector, to pull together their own satellite to do this.

So, you have people who are concerned with actually defending the planet, and they are forced—they don’t want to go to private funding. They’d rather do this in a serious way, with government support. But

FIGURE 10



PHA = potentially hazardous asteroid NEA = near Earth asteroid

NASA

they're forced now to try and scrape up money from the private sector, just to try and do this. They're now discussing a 2018 launch for a mission designed to do this.

This is just to give a sense of one aspect, the most immediate, on-the-table issue with asteroid defense, which is dealing with these near-Earth objects. But again, we should really emphasize that that's just the beginning. Frankly, that should have been done already. This has been a clear issue for a couple of decades. There's nothing new in terms of recognizing what the threat is—and this is just the beginning.

Comets: An Even Bigger Challenge

You also have different issues: Take the case of comets, for example. Near-Earth asteroids have orbits similar to Earth's; they're much easier to see. But comets are a different case. Their impact is significantly


less frequent, but they represent a significantly greater threat, for certain reasons. One, they're larger, usually, so you're talking now, often on the scale of multi-kilometer objects. You're talking about global devastation, not just regional effects. Two, they often travel significantly faster. The speeds are incredible! The reason why these things are so devastating is that you're talking about 20, 30, 40, 50,000 miles-per-hour impacts! Which means these things explode and have huge impacts if they hit us.

Also, their orbits are different. If you look at what they call "long-period comets," they have orbits that take them around the Sun, and then way out into the depths of the Solar System, past Neptune, past Pluto; some even much farther than that.

They have highly elliptical orbits, and they go way out into the far depths of space, and then, when they come back in, their trajectory is much more like a straight line into the Solar System. Whereas these near-Earth objects are orbiting the Sun, so we can see more or less their entire orbit over the course of one year; with the long-period comets, all the way out to the depths of, say, Pluto, you're going to have a helluva hard time seeing a comet out at that distance.

And the estimates, currently, from NASA and other agencies that have looked at this, is that if you have one of these long-period comets coming into the Solar System, say it's on an impact trajectory with the Earth, you might, if you're lucky, see it a year or 18 months before it impacts. And that is not enough time to do anything! To really do anything, you need to see this thing years ahead of time, to 1) prepare, design, and launch a mission to actually do something about it; and to 2) in-

FIGURE 11



Eric Frappa

intersect it early enough so you that can affect it with a small change, so by the time it reaches where the Earth would have been, what you have done has a larger effect on the trajectory.

This is another issue which we should already be tackling. We should have already have solved a lot of these issues with the near-Earth asteroids. With the comets, the open discussion is that we need fundamental breakthroughs in new telescope capabilities. We need much larger telescopes, very large apertures, that can see way farther out there. And we also need to look at new ways to intersect and to move these things with greater force.

I think that definitely puts on the table things like fusion propulsion systems, where ultimately, we're going to improve mankind's ability to again now control thie inner Solar System region, by moving to a nuclear/thermonuclear platform, where we're going to increase the power-density per capita of mankind, to be able to alter and control this whole system.

So I wanted to highlight some of that, just getting in some of the basics, and what the immediate steps need to be. But where we need to go further beyond that.

Get Obama Out!

LaRouche: The first thing we have to consider, then, once having considered these points, is, what are the capabilities which we can muster from mankind for dealing with these kinds of problems. First of all, as long as you have Obama in office, you have zilch chance of saving civilization. So if you care about the human race, you're against Obama, because he's an absolute obstacle.

On the other hand, you have Russia and China, the two most significant nations, in terms of this kind of work that we should be doing in the United States. So we have to take into account that factor. We can't just talk about what we're going to do to defend Earth; we have to think about getting the willingness to defend Earth, from nations; and the United States still is, despite all its shortcomings now, a keystone for doing this program. It's a vestige of what was being done before. And Russia has capabilities, China has capabilities, which are notable. But they also have defects and holes in their program. However, if we can mobilize the cooperation of nations such as the United States, Russia, and China, we then have a broader base from which to specialize appropriately and use our resources appropriately.

So, I think the thing we have to do, is immediately get beyond what we're talking about so far today. Do that! But don't leave it hanging. Mankind can't take it.

You saw the positive effect of Curiosity: The psychological effects we have to generate, on this issue, are key to doing it. And therefore, we've got to break this thing, and even our best people here are still stuck with the old idea of, you know, "the Communists," this, that, and so forth, which is no longer a relevant issue. But we have not developed a system of cooperation, particularly among major nations, and China and Russia are key. Russia's key for one reason; China's key because of its broad base.

And we're also involved now in developing systems on Earth, which can anticipate some of these problems, because we can develop on-Earth qualitative capabilities we don't have now! And China and Russia are key in that.

Europe is generally dead right now, because of what the British have done, so we don't have much capability there. The morale of the nations of Europe, doesn't really exist! Germany is the one nation on the continent of Europe which still exists in some sense; it still has some degree of integrity. The rest of Western and Central Europe has lost its integrity. The euro system, it's lost it!

So therefore, what we have to think about is, if you want to save civilization, you have to get rid of problems like Obama. You can not have Obama, and you certainly don't want the other creeps, the Republican creeps. So the question is, we have to *immediately*, in this period—the hot issue—we have to immediately take this into account, put this in the picture, put this whole thing in the picture. Don't worry about just what these comets can do; that's not the point. How can you

defeat that process? How can you control it? We've talked here, at the table, about certain things that can be done, and certain possibilities, but that isn't going to save humanity from Hell. What we've done on Mars, that's more open.


What we need is an international program, especially among leading nations, with combined resources, and that have these kinds of technological resources within their capacity. We need an *offensive* program, not just a defensive one! And we've got to go from what we're doing now, to actually kick butt, on the fact that mankind *must do this!* We must take these resources and cut this crap out! We have to defend the existence of the human species, and that means we have to have cooperation among, especially, leading nations, who command more resources of this type.

We have to outflank Obama, totally; and we have to get rid of him, really. As long as he's President, the United States doesn't have a chance. And of course, we've got all these poor idiots out there, our fellow citizens, who haven't got a *dream* of reality. They have no sense of what reality is. I mean, just ordinary people out there. Our citizens have, in general, no competence whatsoever to understand what the reality is. They don't know anything! They're ignorant! And they rotate, like something on a rotisserie, in their own ignorance.

But we do have allies, in reality; we do have allies like Russia and China, who do have significant capabilities, outstanding above other nations right now, and therefore, our cooperation with these nations, and bringing others in, additionally, for a planetary policy, is possible.

But don't sit there and say, "What's our problem, within these parameters?" We can't accept the parameter which is an Obama parameter. The human species can't accept it! And particularly the United States can not afford an Obama!

And this other jerk [Mitt Romney], we can deal with him, easily. This other jerk [Paul Ryan] is just thrown in there, in order to hope to bring Obama back for a new term. I mean, Ryan? He's nothing! He's an idiot! He hasn't got a head on his shoulders. All he's got there is a body, and I don't know where that fake head image comes out. I don't think he has a head. But in any case, he's just a bugaboo, that's all he is: He's thrown into the thing, to try to build up support for Obama, by putting in something really creepy and evil, like this kid!



Planetary Defense

Leading circles in Russia have made clear their intent to judo the current British-Obama insane drive towards war, by invoking the principle of Lyndon LaRouche's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Termed the Strategic Defense of Earth, the SDE would focus on cooperation between the U.S.A. and Russia for missile defense, as well as defense of the planet against the threat of asteroid or comet impacts.

The destiny of mankind now is to meet the challenge of our "extraterrestrial imperative"!

Available from [LaRouchePAC](#)

Deniston: Right, to play the counter-gang.

LaRouche: Yes, and we can not tolerate this. If we want to save humanity, if we don't want to see the extinction of the human species, we're going to de-promote Obama, and we're going to get ourselves a different Presidential candidate. And that is not difficult! We can get a better candidate than Obama, almost from Mickey Mouse! But we don't want Mickey Mouse.

There are actually members of the Senate who are obviously qualified to take the position of President. You can create a President for the United States, very easily!

I mean, there will be a little squabbling and so forth, but nonetheless, in terms of reality, the reality is, almost any jerk would be better than Obama. There isn't a jerk who is not better than Obama. So we don't need Obama! We don't need these jerks! All we have to do, is pick some sane people as Presidential candidates, and with just sane people, given the reality of what we face, what mankind faces on this planet now, all the problems, it's not hard to pull a program together to define it. This idea, the mystery—that it's got to be this guy or that guy? No!

So, I think what we have to do, is take this thing and spin it a little bit, to get it okay.

What Will It Take for Victory?

If we confine ourselves to the United States government now, what's the chance of survival of civilization? Under Obama? Zilch. Zilch! You want to become exterminated, vote for Obama. You think this guy Ryan's a problem? He's a joke! Obama's the danger, the fact that he is President is the danger. And therefore, we have to shift the thing, to what are the measures which are required, because of this galactic problem—which is what it really is; when you start talking about comets, you're talking about galactic effects.

So therefore, what we have to do, is turn the thing from the awful dangers that threaten, and say, "What can we do to overcome this threat?" Well, if Earth is mobilized among some leading nations, we can do a space program which is attuned to meet this requirement. And I think what we have to do, is state what we're stating now, the line we're going on now. But let's talk about the other thing: What is it going to take



Lyndon LaRouche and Ben Deniston

for victory? Not, what is our pitiful defense, but what is it going to take for victory? Like World War II: What will it take for victory? And that's the message we have to give out to people out there.

They have to have a credible view that a victory is possible. Not that we're going to be defeated this way, or defeated that way—or maybe if we have great luck or something like that. And in the U.S. population and elsewhere, I think the potentiality is there, as was demonstrated by effect of the Curiosity landing, if we stress this and present this case. And even we can present it, with our resources—even we can do it.

So I think we just have to upgrade what we're doing now. These are the facts, but these are not the complete facts. What are the facts, then, if we *change* the subject to what we can do, if we go with cooperation with Russia and China, and other countries? What power do we have to mobilize the kinds of things we have to do, by going back to the Moon?

The first thing we have to do, is reopen the Moon. You want to talk about this stuff? Well, look at the difficulties of getting one rover onto Mars! Now, if we're operating from the Moon, I think we can get cracking, in a shorter period of time, on actually reaching Mars. That is, the actual [human] travel to Mars.

Why can't we get to thermonuclear fusion? We have thermonuclear fusion implicitly. We have experimental work on matter-antimatter reactions, we have studies on this matter. Well, if we go to this approach, cut out this stupid war, cut down this nonsense, and say, we are going to mobilize for the defense of man. The first thing we have to do, is reopen the Moon, and announce that immediately. And we have a place

on the Moon for Obama: It's called the "Lunatics' Hole."

So therefore, if we're serious, that's what we're going to do. And I think we would be doing a disservice to ourselves and our intention, if we don't come up with this. What is the alternative? What are the political requirements? And with any tickle from us, from the United States on that part, you'll find that China and Russia will immediately cooperate.

Deniston: And to emphasize, Russia already put it on the table, repeatedly! You had the SDE offer proposed,¹ and re-proposed. You had the international security conference held in St. Petersburg, back in April. It was the third one of these they've had, by the Russian Security Council. The previous two mostly focused on terrorism, war issues, the drug trade, stuff like that. This year, for the first time, they put asteroid defense on the table; they said it should be on the table for international discussion of international security issues.

A Science-Driver Program

LaRouche: Well, what we need is a science-driver program, and the first thing for a science-driver program: If you can force the issue on going back to the Moon, as an emergency effort, *that* cracks the ice! If you get Russia—China's already committed to that, the Moon operation, right? Russia has capabilities in that direction. When you combine these forces with a mission-orientation, you have changed the options completely. And that's what we have to do!

So, I think that with our modest resources, and what we can get from saying we're going to do this, we're initiating this, we want people to do it. And let's take the case of Curiosity: Curiosity made a change. Well, let's give it a little more impetus; expand the impetus.

Martinson: I think it exposes pretty conveniently how much, not just Obama, but also Romney, are campaigning for British Empire money, based on their propitiation of the most pessimistic aspects in the population, both candidates. The most Romney's said on the Moon program—he commented on the Chinese program to go to the Moon, and said, "Well, you know, we've already been there. Maybe they can grab our junk and bring it back for us." Which is about as

much as Obama's said about going back to the Moon. Which propitiates the most pessimistic people inside the United States, in order to get British Empire money.

But the Russians have stated their intention to go back to the Moon, as their major national space program objective. The Chinese are very public about it: This is their next-decade program, and they're following the American script perfectly. They've already docked two spacecraft; they have a functioning space station up there now, where they can practice rendezvous, and things like that. They're going to the Moon.

Now, the thing with the United States is, instead of being pessimistic about it, and saying, "Aw, screw those other people," the most exciting thing would be to use our expertise, the fact that we've demonstrated we're the masters at landing things on other planets: landing on the Moon, and also landing on Mars. We're the best at that by far! We should offer our collaboration with these other nations. We can get back to the Moon, obviously, and then begin to spread out throughout the Solar System.

LaRouche: Well, let's do that! Let's say we're going to agree to do that, today, among us. We're going to push this now. We're going to push this change in perspective, and from there we can take off with that, with the usual kinds of things that we do.

Martinson: It's usually the idiots and the Congress that say, "Oh, what is the benefit to go to these other planets? What's the benefit to go to these other places?"

LaRouche: What's the benefit of surviving on Earth?

Martinson: The power of a representative government, a republican form of government, is that you have a population that's willing to support the best aspects of the human creative spirit. Which is what you saw with the landing of Curiosity. You have a population—you've referenced this—you have a population that's been beat down, not just by Bush, but then Obama; just destroyed and defeated. But then, this one landing, the excitement around this one landing, inspires the best people in the United States to get out of their doldrums!

LaRouche: What we have to do, essentially, is to say, "Look, if you want to live, if you want the United States to live, if you want the people of the United States to live, there are two things you must do immediately. One, is throw Obama out of office. Number

1. See Rachel Douglas, "Strategic Defense of Earth: Russia To Put SDE at Top of Agenda," *EIR*, May 4, 2012, http://larouche.org/public/2012/eirv39n18-20120504/57-58_3918.pdf

two, throw the Republican ticket out of office. And start from scratch: We can do much better.” And this has to be it. We have to do that!

If we don’t take in the political factor, then we don’t have the resources to ensure any reasonable chance of saving humanity. Therefore, the political factor must come up first! Obama will not do it. He’s not qualified to be President. He’s a threat to humanity, generally, but a threat to the United States, in particular. And you can not have a threat to the United States be a President of the United States any more! And that’s where we are.

And you can not just say, “We’re going to make suggestions.” The point is, there’s a threat to the existence of civilization, a threat to the existence of humanity. You’re going to go out there and fight, like you fight a war! You’re going to fight that war. You’re going to save humanity! You’re going to use the methods and intellect of warfare, to save humanity from this threat, this strange thing, out there in space, which doesn’t talk to us. And we’ll talk to it, with what mankind can do.

We know the elements are there: For example, thermonuclear fusion, I guarantee you, they’re sitting on this thing. Not sitting on it and squashing it, but thermonuclear fusion is much closer to feasibility, at least when you’re talking about this problem, about the astronomical problem.

Deniston: Right, the propulsion.

LaRouche: Right, because we’re just on the edge of it! It’s just a matter of developing it. From Moon to Mars, we actually can have that journey, occurring on a rise and decline into orbit, we can have that, actually, within a week. If we can get to Mars and back in a week, which is possible. Thermonuclear fusion’s development is the only thing that stands in the way.

And that will force us to look at the matter-antimatter reaction program, which is the thing which is relevant for the comets.

Deniston: Yes, that’s why on the Russian side, they say, to do this Mars mission, you need to develop the

Moon. And it’s worth emphasizing really, Russia’s program, they say explicitly—we got an interview with the head of Roscosmos²—he made the point that Russia’s program is *not* to do just what was done before in the ’60s and just return man to the Moon. They want to *develop* the Moon. They’re talking about permanent space infrastructure. So you have a permanent capability for mankind to move from the Earth to the Moon; move robotic equipment from the Earth to the Moon; set telescope systems, robotic systems on the Moon; so you’re developing a permanent presence of mankind there. And you’ve got to look at, how is that going to increase mankind’s capability to defend himself?

LaRouche: And if you add not just matter-antimatter—that’s your objective—but if you have the thermonuclear fusion program, that gives you an access to Mars, an access to related things, way beyond anything feasible now. But it’s within reach! It’s technologically within reach, scientifically within reach.



Peter Martinson

Obama Cut MIT’s Fusion Budget

Martinson: And just to add to the list of indictments against Obama, as if he needs more, in the latest 2013 budget, he tried to slash one of the three major fusion programs in the United States, up at MIT. He tried to just shut it down, and there was a big campaign to stop it.

So, this guy’s completely against expanding human creativity, and increasing our power over the system.

LaRouche: He’s against the human species—actually!

Martinson: He might not be part of the human species, actually.

LaRouche: Yes, probably. He rejects the idea of being part of the human species, and he’s doing a fairly convincing job of that!

2. Interview with Gen. Vladimir Popovkin, *EIR*, June 1, 2012, http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2012/eirv39n22-20120601/31-32_3922.pdf

Martinson: We should look at the space between the Moon and Mars as our experimental laboratory for all these things. Because, Mars is not the end-point. Mars is a crucial way-point towards control of the entire system.

LaRouche: Like, for example, the defense of Earth: Mars is the best place from which to do it.


Martinson: Yes! We need to use that whole area as an experimental test bed. We need to control the entire region within the Mars orbit.

LaRouche: Which means we need to have a higher density of development: higher-density development, thermonuclear fusion.

Martinson: And you don't want to put people on fusion rockets, at first. You want to put robotic instruments on these fusion-accelerated rockets.

LaRouche: We can do that; we've just demonstrated that. So you just upgrade that; now you've got to control the landing. And you've got to put things actually in Mars orbit, not just on Mars. You have to set up an orbital system, in the Mars orbit: Plant your things there. Because the first place you go, if you're going to put people there, you're going to go to one of the moons of Mars. You probably are not going to drop people directly on Mars. You probably are going to set something up; you could have emergency capabilities. You've got to think about the defense of the life of people at risk, and if you put them into orbit on the Mars moon—which is one of the options that I planned on—if you do that first, now you've got a way of getting in and out of the situation. Because you want return flights!

And how would you do a return flight? Well, a thermonuclear-fusion drive, back to the Moon, from the



iter.org

Controlled thermonuclear fusion is urgently needed for both the space program and power production on Earth, but Obama tried to slash one of the three major fusion programs in the country, the MIT program. Shown is the Joint European Tokamak.

Mars moon to the Earth Moon, would be the easy way to do it.

We've got to launch this, talk about this, and launch it. Get some more discussion with people, on how we're going to do it.

But we have to have a positive alternative for mankind, and it has to be public and it has to be political. And we'll see what we can do with the Russians and with the Chinese.

Martinson: I think they'll be cautiously eager to join forces on this type of a project.

LaRouche: Well, I think at a certain point, some people in Russia have confidence in me, and some people in China now have confidence in me. So therefore, I have to do it. I can't trust the other guy! And, it gives us something to do!

TO NEW WORLDS, LIKE CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS!

Which Way: The Common Aims Of Mankind, or Destruction?

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Aug. 17—Never before in the history of mankind have man's fundamentally opposite choices as a species been so clear: On the one hand, the collapsing world of greed, the financial oligarchy's ruthless drive for profit, and a subservient political class interested only in maintaining its power, a world dominated by supposedly geopolitical interests that has brought us to the very brink of thermonuclear world war. But on the other hand, a very different geometry, as the landing of the Curiosity rover on Mars demonstrates, which is oriented toward the future and the laws of the order of Creation. We face the decision of which path to pursue, which means literally deciding "to be or not to be," in the weeks ahead.

In the Near and Middle East, the playing with fire continues. U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's remarks during her recent visit to Turkey, that she agreed with her Turkish counterpart Ahmet Davutoglu, that the option of a no-fly zone over the rebel-held areas of Syria should be thoroughly discussed, triggered worldwide



Christopher Columbus

Library of Congress

consternation, because such an option could only be enforced militarily, and Russia and China would never agree to it in the UN Security Council. Many of her supporters in "Hillary 2012," a grouping that had still hoped she would run against Obama at the upcoming Democratic National Convention, were appalled by this total surrender to Obama's confrontational strategy toward Russia and China.

Playing with Fire

U.S. Ambassador to Turkey Frank Ricciardone, immediately after her visit, set a distinctly different tone at a press conference with Turkish media.

"Issues like a buffer zone or no-fly zones are easy to talk about conceptually but very difficult to realize practically," he said. "We are a state of law, as Turkey is, so we will operate under international law in trying to promote this transition. We'll keep working with the General Assembly and with the Security Council to try to get forthright resolutions by the world community to bring relief to Syria."

U.S. Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey made clear, at a joint press conference with Defense Secretary Leon Panetta at the Pentagon on Aug. 14, that the U.S. military leadership does not favor either a no-fly zone in Syria or an Israeli military strike against alleged nuclear facilities in Iran. Asked about an imminent Israeli attack, General Dempsey formulated a clear message: “I’m not privy to their planning, so what I’m telling you is based on what I know of their capabilities. And I may not know about all their capabilities, but I think that it’s a fair characterization to say that they could delay, but not destroy Iran’s nuclear capabilities.”

Dempsey’s remarks obviously hit a raw nerve amid an intensified debate about an Israeli military strike, which could take place even before the U.S. elections in November. Atilla Somfalvi wrote on the website YNETNEWS on Aug. 16 that Dempsey “assumed the role of responsible adult and slapped Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Defense Minister Ehud Barak, the duo orchestrating the national hysteria surrounding the possibility of an attack on Iran.” The message is clear, he said: Without the U.S., there is not much Israel can do, and the U.S. would not itself be drawn into this war.

But informed sources see precisely this danger. The situation in the region as a whole has long been a powder keg, and in reality the confrontation with Syria (where the CIA is now openly cooperating with al-Qaeda and Saudi-financed Salafists) and with Iran is a thermonuclear “chicken game” with Russia and China. Even though there are regional issues between Shi’ites and Sunnis, they are still just pieces on the great chessboard that geopoliticians such as Zbigniew Brzezinski, Bernard Lewis, and Samuel Huntington have described. The question of war and peace, and thus the question of the potential extinction of the human species—if thermonuclear weapons are used—hangs on the outcome of the conflict in the trans-Atlantic establishment over whether to respond to the collapse of the financial system by the reintroduction the Glass-Steagall Act and an economic development program, or by war and dictatorship.

The campaign of demonization of Russian President Vladimir Putin is also part of this strategy of confrontation against Russia and China, for if you are going to raise the threat of war, you also have to create an enemy image. The media hype surrounding Pussy Riot is part of this, notwithstanding all the pronouncements of solidarity by foolish politicians and clueless teen-

agers. Behind Russian opposition figures Alexei Navalny and Garry Kasparov are the same George Soros-directed forces who were responsible for various “Orange” or other colored revolutions and who would be glad to stage a regime change in Russia too, in the interests of the British-based empire. The criminal offense of desecrating a religious site and chopping up a woodcarving of Christ on the cross with a chainsaw¹ have nothing to do with “democracy.” Similar actions in churches in Germany would also have resulted in criminal charges, with up to three years imprisonment or monetary penalties, according to German religious lawyer Ansgar Hense.

A Strange Coincidence

It was certainly an irony of history that the ruling against Pussy Riot and the ruling by the German Federal Constitutional Court on the use of the Armed Forces domestically were announced on the same day, because nothing makes clearer the hypocrisy and contrived nature of the media reporting. The authors of Germany’s Constitution deliberately established a strict separation between the use of the police to respond to domestic threats and the Armed Forces to deal with external threats, in light of the experience of the use of the Army in the Weimar Republic. There were, after all, mass protests in the streets by millions of people against the loosening of this separation by the Emergency Laws of 1968. The 16 judges of the Plenum of the Constitutional Court in Karlsruhe have now ruled that domestic deployment of the Armed Forces with combat weapons should not be totally ruled out—and so far there has been no resistance at all. Karlsruhe has thereby in effect amended the Constitution—a function which is the prerogative of parliament and not of the court—an aspect of the Constitution that, given Germany’s 20th-Century history, was there for a very good reason.

The only dissent came from Justice Reinhard Gaier: “The attempt to narrow down the use of the Armed Forces [as stated in the majority opinion of the Plenum—ed.] by requiring ‘imminent’ harm ‘of catastrophic dimensions’ lacks the necessary clarity and calculability. It provides great latitude for subjective interpretation, if not even rash predictions, with entirely indeterminate categories that could scarcely be effectively administered by the courts in daily prac-

1. That’s what a topless demonstrator in Kiev, Ukraine, did in solidarity with Pussy Riot on Aug. 17—ed.

tice—such as in the case of anti-government mass demonstrations. This is in any case an unacceptable use of the Armed Forces. It is difficult for free exchange of opinions to flourish in the shadow of a military arsenal.”

The deployment of troops domestically is supposed to remain the *ultima ratio*, the last resort, yet this decision comes at a time when the collapse of the euro and the disintegration of the entire trans-Atlantic financial system are imminent. And how will a population respond that has been criminally left in the dark by politicians and the media about the true situation—that literally overnight the whole system could come crashing down—and that for some time has lost confidence in politics and the banks? One can only agree with Gaier’s opinion, that this decision means it is no longer assured “that the Armed Forces are never deployed as a domestic political instrument of power.”

The Euro: Bringing Out the Big Guns

Scenarios about an imminent collapse of the euro are dominating the media. Finland is preparing for it

publicly, and other countries are doing so secretly. According to the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, the EU governments are preparing a Plan B for an “orderly” exit of Greece from the euro, and the *Economist* speculates about Chancellor Merkel having a Plan B. A war is raging—will we have hyperinflation or Brüning-style austerity?—between the “euro saviors” around European Central Bank President Mario Draghi, who are getting the “Big Bertha” ready for a “bazooka solution” of unlimited money printing, and the “guardians of the money supply” around Bundesbank head Jens Weidmann.

The only way there can be a real solution is if we turn away from the wrong-headed policies of the past 40 years. We have to reverse the paradigm shift that took place in the mid-’60s since the Kennedy assassination: the end of the Apollo program, the gradual shift away from production and towards speculation, the deregulation of the financial markets, the green ideology, and the counterculture. For that we need a two-tier banking system, sovereignty over national monetary and economic policy, and a credit system to finance construction of the real economy.

The landing of Curiosity on Mars, a fantastic breakthrough for human creativity, shows the direction we need to take toward scientific and technological progress. The technological cooperation, which was enthusiastically cheered, especially in countries whose instruments are placed on the rover, must become the standard for all problems of humanity. This is exactly what the Russian government has placed on the agenda with its proposal for a Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE). This program, which is in the tradition of Lyndon LaRouche’s Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) and President Reagan’s proposals for U.S.-Soviet cooperation, defines the level of cooperation we require to avoid the risk of an economic meltdown and a third party and probably last world war.

The Curiosity landing and the first information transmitted from Mars are a dramatic reminder that mankind is still in a very early stage of development, because man has only been on the Earth for about 2 million years. There is infinitely much more to explore and discover, not just in our galaxy, but in billions of other galaxies that are anti-entropically evolving! Let us decide now to work together for the common aims of mankind and are we will finally become really human!

Columbus

by Friedrich Schiller

Steer on, bold sailor! Wit may mock thy soul that
sees the land,
And hopeless at the helm may droop the weak
and weary hand,
Yet ever—ever to the West! For there the coast
must lie,
And dim it dawns, and glimmering dawns before
thy reason’s eye;
Yea, trust the guiding God—and follow the silent
sea,
Though hid till now—behold it rises toward the
lee!
With genius Nature ever stands in solemn union
still,
And what the one foretells, the other shall fulfill.

*Translation adapted from that by Sir Edward
George Earle Lytton (1843)*

Oxford's 'Project Democracy' Goes Hard-Core: 'Pussy Riot' Against Russia

by Rachel Douglas

Aug. 20—Project Democracy institutions, the media, and Obama Administration, and European Union officials are among the promoters of cultural degeneracy leading new attacks on Russia and its President Vladimir Putin, in connection with the Aug. 17 conviction and sentencing in the “Pussy Riot” case. Three members of the self-styled feminist punk band were sentenced to two years incarceration (minus double the time served in pre-trial detention) for criminal hooliganism, defined as “gross violation of social order, expressing overt disrespect for society,” particularly through acts “motivated by political, ideological, racial, national or religious hatred or hostility, or hatred or hostility toward any group in society.”

Last February the three young women were among those arrested while cavorting and making vulgar gestures on the ambo (a platform in front of the iconostasis in an Orthodox church, restricted to priests and participants in sacraments) in Moscow's Church of Christ the Savior, clad in brightly colored miniskirts, tights, and balaclavas. They were screaming an obscenity-laced “prayer” to the Virgin Mary to free Russia from Putin. The intruders were quickly released, but began to be rearrested two weeks later. In the interim, Pussy Riot had posted a [video of their action](#) on YouTube, with a sound track and editing that made it even more blasphemous. The three were held in jail for five months

before their trial began.

Under Article 213 (“Hooliganism”) of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, such crimes are punishable by up to three years in prison, or seven years if committed by an organized group. The prosecution in the case, which was tried at Moscow's Khamovnichesky Court, asked for a sentence of three years; the judge imposed two, which is comparable with the punishment for acts of desecration committed in churches or temples in many countries, ranging from Poland to Israel.

Major international media outlets, however, hastened to call the Pussy Riot case a demonstration of alleged “authoritarianism” by Putin. Typical headlines were “Russian Female Punk Rock Band Trial Sets Tone for Putin Presidency” (Reuters) and “Pussy Riot Verdict Caps Putin's 100 Days” (*USA Today*), referring to the time that has passed since his inauguration in May.

Amnesty International has declared the women “prisoners of conscience.” Sir Paul McCartney posted an open letter to “show my support for [them] at this difficult time.” Last week Madonna vocally supported the three from the stage of a concert in Moscow (prompting Deputy Prime Minister Dmitri Rogozin to tweet about Madonna being an “old b—” —standing for “whore” in Russian).

After the sentencing, Obama White House spokeswoman Victoria Nuland wrote in an of-



British press coverage of the Pussy Riot makes no attempt to disguise the political intent of the media campaign: to “take down Putin.”

ficial statement sympathetic to the convicted hooligans, “The United States is concerned about both the verdict and the disproportionate sentences handed down by a Moscow court in the case against the members of the band Pussy Riot and the negative impact on freedom of expression in Russia.” Spokesman Josh Earnest said to reporters that Pussy Riot may have been “offensive to some” (this refers to screaming obscenities on the altar of the cathedral), but that the three women were treated badly. EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton opined that the court’s ruling had placed a “serious question mark over Russia’s respect for international obligations of fair, transparent, and independent legal process.”



Creative Commons/Brücke-Osteuropa

The Cathedral of Christ the Savior in Moscow, scene of Pussy Riot’s obscene demonstration. Some Western observers are complaining that the Russian population fails to appreciate the artistic irony of Pussy Riot.

By the Oxford Playbook

Several elements of the Pussy Riot provocation link it to the Oxford University-centered attack on Russia, documented in *EIR*’s “Michael McFaul and His Oxford Masters” dossier (Dec. 16, 2011, Jan. 20, and Feb. 3, 2012). The group’s m.o. matches points from the “198 Methods of Non-Violent Action,” promoted by Oxford’s Gene Sharp in his irregular warfare handbook *The Politics of Non-Violent Action*: #27—New signs and names, #30—Rude gestures, #32—Taunting officials, #161—Non-violent harassment, #178—Guerrilla theater.

Formed in Autumn 2011, Pussy Riot was ready to go into action after the Dec. 4, 2011 State Duma elections. On Dec. 14, they filmed themselves doing their maenad [dances](#) and setting off Roman candles on the roof of the detention center where blogger Alexei Navalny and others were being held after the first arrests for unauthorized street protests.

Pussy Riot went on to make a 19-second [video](#) for Navalny’s Rosvybory (Russian elections) organization. It was posted in February 2012, as Navalny was attempting to rekindle a campaign to block Putin’s return to the Presidency in the March 4 elections, through a “White Revolution” built around accusa-

tions of vote fraud and featuring himself as the hero of the streets.

This Summer, Navalny attempted to testify as a character witness for Nadezhda Tolokonnikova, one of the accused, but was barred by the court. Former chess champion and current *Wall Street Journal* columnist Garry Kasparov, another White Revolution activist, was one of those arrested in a rowdy demonstration outside the courtroom after the verdict.

Vladimir Pastukhov, an advisor to Russia’s Constitutional Court, writer for Mikhail Gorbachov’s newspaper, and currently a Visiting Fellow at St. Antony’s College, Oxford, has put out two major articles in support of Pussy Riot. The British OpenDemocracy.net site posted his “Pussymania, or the Awakening of Russia’s Conscience,” in which Pastukhov said that Pussy Riot has drawn more sympathy than “Khodorkovsky alive or Magnitsky dead,” referring to two Project Democracy poster cases, and compared their potential impact with that of the Cossack Yemelyan Pugachov’s uprisings in the 18th Century. The week of Aug. 13, in the Gorbachov-owned *Novaya Gazeta*, Pastukhov launched a new diatribe against Putin’s Presidency as “a regime of the lumpens,” using the Pussy Riot “witch-

hunt” and non-lumpenized population’s alleged support for the women as evidence.

“Free Pussy Riot” international propaganda emphasizes the pre-trial imprisonment of “mothers with young children.” Baroness Ashton regretted the “sentencing of the three young women, two of whom are mothers of small children, to two years in prison for a peaceful, if controversial, expression of their views,” calling it “deeply troubling.” The London *Guardian* loves the “lightness and gaiety” of the group with their “bright colours and tights and mocking balaclavas,” saying that their protest is “crafted from art, dance and performance.”

But these latest Project Democracy favorites are a bit different: They combine “#22—Protest disrobings” with points not even listed by Gene Sharp. According to well-documented investigations posted in Russian and English blogs, Tolokonnikova and another of the convicted Pussy Riot members, Yekaterina Samutsevich, are former members of the vandalism/“art” collective Voyna (“War”). In a recent manifesto, Tolokonnikova praised the radicalism of Voyna’s early days, around 2008. Videos made by Voyna and posted online in the late 2000s include obscenities such as the same Tolokonnikova, naked and very pregnant, with giant cockroaches crawling all over her, and one in which she has or simulates sexual intercourse during an orgy staged and filmed next to a taxidermically stuffed bear in a natural history museum (supposedly to mock then-President Medvedev, whose name means “bear”).

In another Voyna video, a female member of the collective perform a sex act involving a frozen chicken in a supermarket, in the presence of a small child.

The Voyna group received a 90,000 pounds sterling donation in late 2010 from the British graffiti artist called Banksy, who sympathized with two members who were in jail after their arrest for a Voyna action called Palace Revolution, in which they overturned police cars (one of them reportedly with a policeman inside) in St. Petersburg.

In the Russian media, the name “Pussy Riot” is often translated with words meaning “Kitty Cats” or, at worst, “Blasphemers.” But one member of the gang proclaimed its credo more openly, in a February interview published on www.vice.com: “A female sex organ, which is supposed to be receiving and shapeless, suddenly starts a radical rebellion against the cultural order, which tries to constantly define it and show its

appropriate place. Sexists have certain ideas about how a woman should behave, and Putin, by the way, also has a couple [of] thoughts on how Russians should live. Fighting against all that—that’s Pussy Riot.”

Copy-Cats

Pussy-Riot support actions throughout Europe have been raucous and sometimes extremely nasty. A violent pro-Pussy Riot action took place on Aug. 17 in Kiev, Ukraine, where a member of the feminist group Femen—topless and with “Free Riot” painted on her skin—attacked a wooden cross that stands in a monument ensemble near the ancient St. Sophia Cathedral, as one of several memorials to victims of political repression in the Soviet period. The woman cut down the cross with a chainsaw, then delivered an aggressive statement that her action was “a warning” to Russian President Putin and Patriarch Kirill that Femen’s chainsaws would be turned against them, if they allowed Pussy Riot to be convicted. This spectacle was video-recorded and posted online.

Also on the day of the conviction, the New York Council on Foreign Relations posted an interview with Stephen Sestanovich, a geopolitician, former aide to the late Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and former advisor to Madeleine Albright as Secretary of State, on “Putin’s Cultural War.” Sestanovich’s view is that the Russian population fails to appreciate the artistic irony of Pussy Riot. He said, “A lot of Russians are unaware that these performance artists are inspired by [French deconstructionist] Jacques Derrida” and therefore these uninformed people perceive “not post-modernist irony, but sacrilege.”

The Moscow Patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC) officially called on the government to review the sentence and show mercy. Archimandrite Tikhon (Shevkunov), the influential head of the Sreten-sky Monastery in Moscow, said on state television, “We did forgive them from the very start. But such actions should be cut short by society and the authorities.”

At trial, the accused claimed their action was not anti-Orthodox, but only a protest against the ROC’s endorsement of Putin. The President, asked about the case, said that the offenders are young and “should not be punished too harshly” if convicted. He added that the girls were lucky they hadn’t tried to do their act at some holy place in Israel or a mosque in the North Caucasus, “because they would never even have made it to the local jail.”

Why Are We Killing Off Our Soldiers in Afghanistan?

by Ramtanu Maitra

Aug. 19—According to official records of the Department of Defense (DoD), another 11 U.S. soldiers were killed and 109 wounded last week in Afghanistan. Some of them were killed by the Afghan “soldiers” and “police officials” whom the Americans had trained. These killings, labeled as “green on blue” (green-uniformed Afghan soldiers shooting the blue-helmeted ISAF/International Security Assistance Force personnel) or “insider killings,” as U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta calls it, are reminiscent of colonial troops being killed by the “native” soldiers trained by the colonialists.

The bottom line is that U.S. soldiers, in fact all foreign troops, are now “sitting ducks,” who could be killed at any time just for being in Afghanistan. Meanwhile, suicide rates among U.S. military personnel have also been highlighted this week, with July posting the highest monthly total since 2009.

It is evident that the Obama Administration, drawn in by its close allies, such as Britain, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar, in southwest Asia, is determined to pursue its mindless policy in Afghanistan, causing more deaths of U.S. soldiers. We see here a continuation of the tragic pattern which began with the Vietnam War, made possible by the British-orchestrated assassination of President Kennedy. Thus, the United States has become, de facto, the military arm of the British imperial strategy of perpetual war. The question is, when will the United States break with this policy, which requires the removal of the current President of the United States?

Is Afghanistan on Another Planet?

At this point in time, the name of the dastardly killing game that Washington is play-

ing, is to keep it out of the U.S. Presidential election campaign. Obama is trotting out his loyalists to respond to public queries, with such inane statements as the one Defense Secretary Panetta issued today on CNN, urging Afghanistan to rigorously vet its security force recruits following the spate of attacks by Afghan soldiers and police against NATO troops.

Is Panetta suggesting that vetting of Afghanistan’s 150,000 soldiers was not done before? It is difficult to believe that the elaborate plan to train Afghan soldiers (at a reported cost of close to a million U.S. dollars per soldier) to take over security responsibilities when the foreign troops withdraw partially from Afghanistan, did not include vetting. Would the ISAF have left the U.S. and NATO soldiers to the mercy of Allah to protect them?

More realistic is what the Taliban supremo, Mullah Omar, whom the U.S./NATO troops have searched for unsuccessfully all these years, said in his Aug. 18 Eid al-Fitr message to his fellow Taliban. Omar said Afghan security forces were assisting Taliban fighters who infiltrate their ranks, kill foreign troops, and then carry their government-issued weapons back to insurgent camps. “They are able to (safely) enter bases, offices, and intelligence centers of the enemy,” he said. “Then, they easily carry out decisive and coordinated attacks, inflicting heavy losses on the enemy.”

It is unlikely that Panetta’s statement will comfort those families who have lost their sons and daughters, and other Americans who are concerned about these deaths. It is aimed at preventing them from demanding that the United States, having failed miserably in “righting what is wrong” in Afghanistan during its more than a decade’s



Taliban supremo Mullah Omar, who has escaped capture for years, in an Aug. 18 message, said that Afghan security forces were assisting Taliban fighters who infiltrate their ranks, and that they are “inflicting heavy losses on the enemy,” i.e., U.S./NATO soldiers.

stay, pull all its troops out now, and not leave these soldiers sitting there, waiting to be shot.

These insider attacks by the ISAF-trained Afghan forces are the latest demonstration of the insanity of the decade-plus-long Afghan campaign that has resolved nothing. Now that the U.S. is planning to partially withdraw, it is essential to recount some of those failures.

Increasing Death Tolls

Of concern is not just the increase in the number of suicides among U.S. soldiers, but also the rapid rise in the number of U.S. troops being killed in Afghanistan, after the decade-long ‘counterterrorism’ and ‘counterinsurgency’ campaigns conducted by 100,000-plus foreign troops. On average, ten American soldiers are losing their lives every week, and hundreds are losing their limbs. The total death toll in Afghanistan is nearing 1,700, but at the present rate of loss of life, the next ten years would see another 5,000 young Americans killed.

This “kill or be killed” policy in Afghanistan has not led to any resolution of the issues that turned Afghanistan into a killing field in the late 1990s. Distorted news reports aimed at propitiating the Administration have created a sense of numbness among those Americans whose children are not out there risking death every minute.

Patrick Bury, a former British army captain, who served in Afghanistan, in his column on the RAWA News website early this month, made the point that nothing has changed for the better, but much has changed for the worse. “Unlike other interventions in Iraq and Libya,” he wrote, “it is obvious that Afghanistan, fundamentally, is going one way, and that is down. Northern warlords are already re-arming in preparation for the coming civil war with the southern Pashtuns after NATO withdraws. ANSF troops [the Afghan National Security Force, whom the U.S./NATO trained, and some of whom have recently turned their guns on their trainers—ed.] troops occupying the ‘transitioned territories’ marked as green areas on headquarters’ maps are increasingly confined to their bases and will be more so when the West leaves. Expect a more savvy Taliban to gradually take back territories British and other nations’ blood was spilt on, as what’s left of the NATO force positions itself in a few major population centers.”

In a PBS News Hour interview Aug. 14, Defense Secretary Panetta said: “As the fighting season has progressed, we have seen an increase in enemy-initiated

attacks, though violence levels have remained consistent with past summers. We are taking the fight to the enemy. And when you’re aggressive and when you’re conducting operations against them, obviously, the number of casualties are going to increase.”

The question that PBS did not ask, but should have, was “Why, Secretary Panetta, is it that after a decade when it had been established beyond a shadow of doubt that the war has been lost, and the only recourse was to ensure the safety of the young soldiers by bringing them back home, is the U.S./NATO carrying out ‘aggressive’ actions?”

Panetta, following President Obama’s style of expressing concern while remaining determined to do nothing, had this to say: “Our enemies have attempted to undermine the trust between the coalition and Afghan forces, and, in particular, they have tried to take credit for a number of so-called green-on-blue or insider attacks that have taken place this fighting season. Make no mistake about it: I have been very concerned about these incidents—both of us have—because of the lives lost and because of the potential damage to our partnership efforts.”

The sophistry of Panetta’s statement matches those of Obama, who, on Afghanistan’s Independence Day today, authorized the message: “On behalf of President Obama and the people of the United States, I am delighted to send best wishes to the government and people of Afghanistan this August 19 as you celebrate your independence and conclude the Holy Month of Ramadan.”

Karl Gotthardt, a Canadian journalist, addressed the vacuous nature of the message, questioning what independence for Afghanistan means. “By most accounts President Karzai’s reach is not much beyond Kabul. As civilians and military personnel continue to be killed and wounded, it is difficult to fathom that there will be real independence anytime soon.”

Plus ça change...

Take the case of warlordism in Afghanistan, which had been identified by various American pundits and policymakers as the source of Afghanistan’s woes. When the U.S./NATO troops moved into Afghanistan, one would have expected that the warlords would have been tackled head-on. But, no, siree, the warlordism was allowed to continue, and to flourish. And, it indeed flourished, and this is why.

When Hamid Karzai, a Pushtun, was chosen at Bonn in 2002 to lead the Kabul regime, he did not have any support within the Pushtun population, the majority



DoD/Staff Sgt. Andrew Smith, U.S. Army

“Green on blue” (green-uniformed Afghan soldiers shooting blue-helmeted ISAF personnel) or “insider killings,” are reminiscent of colonial troops being killed by the “native” soldiers who had been trained by the imperialists. Here, a U.S. Army trainer works with Afghan Border Policemen.

ethnic group within Afghanistan, and the base of the Taliban movement. For Karzai to survive, warlords of all kinds were brought into Kabul to render support to Karzai, for pure survival reasons. One wonders what Washington’s game plan was at that time. What soon became evident, and what Patrick Bury identifies as the prevailing situation in 2012, is that Karzai’s reach is limited to Kabul, and his dependency on the warlords remain total.

U.S. Rep. John Tierney (D-Mass.), chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, in his report in June 2010, “Warlord, Inc.: Extortion and Corruption Along the U.S. Supply Chain in Afghanistan,” wrote: “At the top of the hierarchy are the well-known tribal leaders, former mujahedeen commanders, or local power brokers who command the loyalty of men beyond their ability to provide a paycheck. For these warlords, providing security to U.S. and NATO convoys is just the latest iteration of long and colorful careers in war-torn Afghanistan. Long after the United States leaves Afghanistan, and the convoy security business shuts down, these warlords will likely continue to play a major role as autonomous centers of political, economic, and military power.”

But the U.S./NATO occupation created new warlords as well. Tierney said, “other warlords are newer to the scene but have grown in strength based on their

ability to feed off U.S. and NATO security contracting, particularly the highly lucrative business niche of providing private security for the coalition supply chain. Men serve and die for these warlords for money, not tribal, ethnic, or political loyalty. In Afghan culture, this new class of warlord is undeserving of that elevated title because their power is derivative of their business function, not their political or tribal clout.”

Tierney’s report quoted an expert saying, “the partial conversion of Afghan warlords into businessmen resembles in many ways the establishment of mafia networks, which are active both in the legal and the illegal economy and are able to use force to protect their interests and possibly to expand.” Whether called “business-

men,” “commanders,” “strongmen,” “militia leaders,” or “warlords,” any individual who commands hundreds or thousands of armed men in regular combat, and operates largely outside the direct control of the central government is a competitor to the legitimacy of the state, Tierney pointed out.

Back to Square One

Meanwhile, ground reports from Afghanistan indicate that the Northern warlords, who ostensibly would like to protect the Northern Afghans, mostly of Tajik, Uzbek, and Nuristani ethnic origin, are arming themselves against a potential takeover by the Taliban when U.S./NATO troops partially withdraw. Arms are coming in from all sides, including Iran, and there are even reports of the U.S. providing these warlords with arms as well. And, herein lies a tale.

The average American, with some interest in Afghan affairs, considers the Taliban to be the second-most important reason why the United States sent so many of its soldiers there, and lost so many of them. The prime reason was, of course, Osama bin Laden. But, ten-plus years later, even the Secretary of Defense admits that the Taliban-led insurgency has gotten stronger, and the Afghan security situation weaker. As anyone would conclude, that means the Taliban outwitted, outlasted, and out-maneuvered the foreign occupiers. But, there is more to it.

Now that the U.S. and NATO want to partially withdraw their troops, mostly for reasons related to domestic politics, Washington and Brussels are eager to open talks with the Taliban. There is nothing wrong in doing that, but then, why was it not done earlier, before thousands and thousands had died?

The Taliban no longer feel threatened by the foreign occupiers. They are gaining ground. American and NATO troops do not trust their fellow Afghan soldiers any longer, and are increasingly remaining confined within their safe dwellings. Under the circumstances, it was to be expected that the Taliban would raise the stakes, and they did.

Many reports have emerged that Washington is getting desperate to open up talks with the Taliban. That is understandable, with U.S. Election Day fast approaching. So far, the Obama Administration has chosen to deny it.

It is not that the Taliban do not want to talk to Washington. They always did, knowing the benefits of such talks, but they had laid out conditions. There were two conditions in particular (perhaps more conditions will be revealed when the talks actually start): Release those al-Qaeda terrorists now imprisoned at Gitmo; and stop

the drone attacks.

According to Elise Labott, CNN foreign affairs reporter, in an article, “U.S. sweetens prisoner swap offer to Taliban,” on Aug 8, reported that “in an effort to revive peace talks with the Taliban, the Obama administration has sweetened a proposed prisoner swap under which it would transfer five Taliban prisoners to Qatar in exchange for a U.S. soldier held by the Taliban, senior U.S. officials said. The new proposal involves sending all five Taliban prisoners to Qatar first, before the Taliban releases Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl, the sources said.” Bergdahl’s release is an important issue, but the deal also meets one of the demands the Taliban issued publicly as the prerequisite for holding talks.

So, Washington is now preparing to hold talks with the Taliban, once the foremost enemy of Washington and Brussels, with the intent to bring them in “to share” power in Kabul, while arming the Northern warlords who would like to slaughter the Taliban!

Meanwhile, the American soldiers, going out on patrol with their trained Afghan partners, will keep praying that those Afghan soldiers were “vetted,” and that none of them is a Taliban—the friend and enemy of Washington.

New from **EIR**

The British Empire's Global Showdown, And How To Overcome It


In the face of a potential thermonuclear World War III, a confrontation being engineered from London by a desperate British-centered financial oligarchy operating through the vast—yet often underestimated—powers of the British monarchy, EIR has produced a 104-page Special Report, documenting both the drive for war, and the war-avoidance efforts of patriotic military/intelligence circles in the U.S., and the Russian and Chinese leaderships. The British hand behind the warmongers, and the concrete economic and strategic programs which can defuse the threat, are elaborated in depth. These include the Russian proposal for collaboration on the Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE), based on Lyndon LaRouche's original Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

The Global Showdown report is available in hard copy for \$250, and in pdf form for \$150, from the [EIR store](#).

Call 1-800-278-3135 for more information.

EIR
Special Report

The British Empire's Global Showdown, and How To Overcome It



June 2012

In Europe, the Secret Is Out: The Euro Will Not Survive

by Our Wiesbaden Bureau

Aug. 20—Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have said it from the beginning, but there's no ignoring it anymore: The breakup of the euro is now considered inevitable, even by those who swear publicly that the euro is "irreversible." Not only Finland, but the EU itself is reportedly working on a "Plan B." However, based on the reports from Brussels, Berlin, and London, the B stands for bullshit: It will not work!

Finnish Foreign Minister Erkki Tuomioja let the cat out of the bag, in a discussion with a *Daily Telegraph* correspondent published Aug. 16: "We have to face openly the possibility of a euro-break up," he said. "Our officials, like everybody else, and like every general staff, have some sort of operational plan for any eventuality." Eventually, he had to deny having said it.

Then, on Aug. 18, the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* leaked the information that EU governments' mooted Plan B contemplates an "orderly" exit of Greece from the Eurozone. According to the newspaper, no definite plan has been elaborated, because much depends on what the German Constitutional Court will rule on Sept. 12 on the constitutionality of the European Stability Mechanism (ESM), and on what the Troika (IMF/European Central Bank/European Commission) will say on Greece. If the latter does not recommend a further payment to Athens in September, Greece might be left with no other option than to return to the drachma.

So the Plan B being discussed by EU governments

is aimed at "strengthening" what remains of the Eurozone. This would include expanding financial aid to Ireland and Portugal, extending ESM loans plus ECB support to Spain and Italy, and concrete steps towards a banking union and EU governance (translation: supranational dictatorship). The underlying paradigm is, according to *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, "the consideration that single measures undertaken so far have improved the situation, but they have not re-established the confidence of the citizens and the markets in the euro." In other words, they are recommending a continuation of the Heinrich Brüning austerity policy (1930-32), which is demolishing national economies and populations.

Under the same category falls the "Plan B" pushed by the London *Economist*, which published a cover story Aug. 11, dedicated to Chancellor Angela Merkel's "temptation" to amputate one part of the Eurozone in order to save the rest. The *Economist* argues that both a "small" amputation (Greece only) and a "bolder" one (Spain, Ireland, Portugal, and Cyprus) would, in the end, be more expensive for Germany than going all the way to a political union and "mutualization" of the Eurozone debt (meaning that all countries assume responsibility for the debt of each).

The main concern of the *Economist*, of course, is to rescue the the City of London paper empire, which would be mortally wounded by a break-up of the euro, or even a partial debt cancellation.

Any Plan B that does not contemplate a Glass-Steagall standard, to protect productive categories of debt and to dump the rest, is not going to work. Any Plan B that is aimed at rescuing the euro rather than national economies is an insane proposition.

‘Merkel System’ Under Attack in CDU

As the disintegration of the Eurozone accelerates in spite of the bank bailouts, Chancellor Merkel is under increasing attack from within her own party, the Christian Democratic Union (CDU). The thrust of the criticism from the conservatives is her “totalitarian” way of governing, as concerns Europe.

One prominent critic is Gertrud Höhler, an advisor to former Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and consultant for a number of industrial companies, whose book calling Merkel the “godmother” will hit the bookstores at the end of August. In the Aug. 3 *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Höhler charged the Chancellor and her “System M” with “establishing a soft variant of authoritarian power,” otherwise not known in Germany. While the “political style” is different from the “20th Century dictatorships,” Höhler sees certain echoes of them, including marginalization of the parties, “nonchalance in dealing with Parliament, with Constitutional guarantees, laws and ethical standards.”

The same point was made by political author Stephan Hebel on DLF radio Aug. 14, where he attacked the “Chancellor’s strategy” towards the euro, which involves “testing the constancy of the Constitutional Court” and “the flexibility of the Constitution.” In his view, “Merkel does not say it as bluntly as does Italian Prime Minister Mario Monti, but she also relies more on executive freedom and less on the rights of the Parliament.”

In the same vein, Josef Schlarmann, chairman of the influential CDU association for small and medium-sized enterprises, has been denouncing Merkel for neutralizing any serious political challenger inside the party, and with suppressing programmatic debate. He even likened the CDU to a “Tsar’s court” where “Merkel has her *Strelitsen* (riflemen)” (Aug. 16 *Süddeutsche Zeitung*). Schlarmann is convinced that the CDU will lose the next national elections because of Merkel’s refusal to allow dissent.

Four conservative CDU members of the Bundestag, Wolfgang Bosbach, Norbert Geis, Thomas Dörflinger, and Thomas Bareiss, are speaking out against Merkel, as are the chairmen of the CDU groups in two state par-

liaments, Christean Wagner of Hesse and Saskia Ludwig of Brandenburg.

More Calls for Bank Separation

The implications of the failure of the euro—without an alternative national-sovereignty-based financial system being put in place—are dramatic. The whole trans-Atlantic system, already on the brink, can be expected to explode, as Barack Obama and Tim Geithner well know. Responsibility, in fact, lies with the United States to protect against the disaster, beginning with re-implementation of Glass-Steagall banking separation.

It is not at all clear that the euro crisis, which has been “put on hold” until the German Constitutional Court ruling Sept. 12, can hold out for that long. The Greeks repeatedly make it clear they cannot pay, and Spain is a political powderkeg, ready to explode Sept. 1. The lack of solvency in the major European banks is such that any default can pull the plug—but the hyperinflationary emission of a massive amount of new euros can also wreak havoc with the system as a whole.

The situation becomes increasingly ripe for Europe to adopt a policy of banking separation, especially in the wake of action in the U.S. We report below on the moves in Iceland (see *Interview* with Icelandic MP), and there is legislation pending in the Italian Parliament, despite apparent political paralysis there. A top section of the British financier oligarchy has declared for Glass-Steagall, and finally, as we reported in part last week, there is increasingly vocal discussion for Glass-Steagall in German institutions.

Another endorsement of a Glass-Steagall-type separation came last week from Bernd Scheifele, the CEO of the Heidelberg Cement firm, one of the top 30 firms of the Frankfurt DAX. He told the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* in an interview published Aug. 16: “We need a system of banking separation as it existed in the USA in former times. Normal banking business and investment banking should not be done together. Banks must not become too big.” Moreover, “As a citizen of this country,” Scheifele added, “I insist that this be implemented fast.” The state, he said, “must guarantee that the savings of the citizens are protected, and that firms are sufficiently supplied with credit.” Banks should shoulder losses on their own, rather than rely on taxpayer money to help them out, he added.

Iceland: First To Recover from Crisis; First To Restore Glass-Steagall?

In 2008, a financial volcano erupted in geologically active Iceland, during the onset of the global financial collapse. After an incredibly large speculative financial bubble burst in the small country (population 320,000), the three major Icelandic banks were put into receivership, after racking up liabilities of what some sources say amounted to ten times the nation's GDP. The population twice voted "No" to covering the private Icesave bank's debts to British and Dutch clients, which their respective governments had bailed out; legal cases have been brought against the responsible leading political and financial figures. The nation is starting to recover, and now, 15 Icelandic parliamentarians from parties and independents representing all but 16 of the 63 members of the parliament, Althingi, want to make sure this never happens again, by implementing a Glass-Steagall-style separation of commercial from investment banks.

On Nov. 1, 2011, during the Nordic Council meeting, EIR interviewed then-Finance Minister Steingrímur J. Sigfússon, chairman of the Left-Green Party, who stated, "I welcome the discussion that is taking place now about Glass-Steagall, or some kind of security for ordinary customer banking, and separating that from the more risk-taking investment. . . . Personally, I am very interested in that discussion, and would like it to materialize."¹



Creative Commons

Icelandic parliamentarian Álfheidur Ingadóttir has introduced a bill for a Glass-Steagall-style banking reorganization in the Althingi. "I hope that Iceland will not only be the first country to recover from the banking crisis, but also the first country to separate commercial and financial banking," she said.

The 15 parliamentarians want Iceland to establish a full Glass-Steagall law. After a Ministry of Economic Affairs committee issued a report in March, which many parliamentarians found not strong enough on bank separation, a parliamentary motion was introduced in April 2012, by Althingi member Álfheidur Ingadóttir, and others, which read:

"Parliament resolves to entrust the Minister of Economic Affairs with the task of appointing a committee which is to revise the framework of banking services in Iceland in order to minimize—through the separation of commercial and investment banks—the risk of disruptions within the banking sector for the national economy. The committee is to examine the policy-making of neighboring countries in this

regard, and to submit its proposals before October 1, 2012."

In the motion's explanatory text, the Glass-Steagall law was specifically referred to as a model. A committee appointed by the Ministry of Economic Affairs, led since Dec. 31, 2011 by Minister Steingrímur J. Sigfússon, is preparing a new report, to be issued in the Fall, which, however, according to informed sources, will not necessarily recommend Glass-Steagall separation. In order to keep pressing for Glass-Steagall, the parliamentarians will propose the motion again during the upcoming session, which opens in September, although postponing the date for the committee report, as the motion did not come up for a vote in the last session,

1. See [EIR](#), Nov. 11, 2011.

due to lack of time. Their hope is that Iceland can help lead the way out of the crisis, by being the first country to reinstate Glass-Steagall.

Michelle Rasmussen, vice president of the Schiller Institute (SI) in Denmark, and EIR'S Copenhagen correspondent, interviewed Álfheidur Ingadótti on Aug. 15. Álfheidur represents the Reykjavík North Constituency, is the Deputy Speaker of Althingi, and the vice-chairman of the Left-Green Movement's parliamentary group, the party chaired by Minister of Economic Affairs Steingrímur J. Sigfússon.

‘We Know What Happened to the Common People’

Schiller Institute: We became aware of the Glass-Steagall motion that was introduced in the Icelandic Althingi from the recent *Bloomberg News* article. Can you tell us about the status of the motion, its support in the parliament, and about the new motion that you are planning to present?

Álfheidur Ingadótti: As the motion was not brought up for a vote before the session was over in June, I will put the motion forward again, in the beginning of the next session of Althingi in September. The only change will be that we will propose a bill of law to be presented before Feb. 1, 2013, instead of what we had hoped for, Oct. 1, 2012, when we put forward this motion in April 2012.

SI: Can you describe the original motion, and how much support it had in the parliament from the different parties?

Álfheidur: The motion for a parliamentary resolution empowers the government, and the Minister of Economic Affairs, to appoint a committee with the aim of preparing a bill, and possibly additional proposals to the parliament. The objective is to introduce a full separation of investment banking from commercial banking in Iceland; and the committee's proposals should demonstrate how and in what steps this aim can be reached. We know what happened to the bank deposits of the common people, and the households in Iceland, before the crisis, when the deposits were risked in speculative investments, and lost by the very same banks. So this is the aim of the motion.

It is supported by members of all political parties, apart from the conservative Independence Party—and I have no explanation as to why they did not join us in this motion. In addition two non-party affiliated parliamentarians support the motion.

‘We Are Tired of Waiting’

SI: One of the reasons why you are presenting a new motion is that, while the Ministry of Economics is now preparing a report, this is about a much broader question of general structural reform of the banking system. Can you say why you are specifically calling for Glass-Steagall bank separation, and how it came about that you and the other parliamentarians decided to call for this?

Álfheidur: The fact is that, right from the time of the banking crisis and collapse here in the Autumn of 2008, we have, of course, been reforming, and building up a new and better-regulated banking system in Iceland. And I hope that Iceland will not only be the first country to recover from the banking crisis, but also the first country to separate commercial and financial banking. We have been advocating for this since 2009—actually the Left-Green Party proposed this as early as 2003—and the stand of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, after the crisis and throughout 2011, was that we should not be the first. We should not be the only ones. We should not go ahead with such separation before the other European countries. You can read about this debate in the Icelandic parliament in 2010, and in statements made by the Minister and the majority of the Trade Committee.

So, in a way, the Ministry and parliament have been waiting to see what will happen in Europe, in the U.K., in the European Union, and, also, what will happen in the U.S.

But we who are proposing this motion to parliament, are tired of waiting. So when a report on the “Future Structure of the Icelandic Financial System and its Regulation and Supervision” was introduced last Spring, we did not find it strong enough in this respect, so we found it necessary to put this motion forward.

And I must say that the introduction of the motion has attracted much attention and debate in the Icelandic media, and also abroad, and in this way, the idea has gained much wider support, also affecting the position of the Ministry, and the government.

SI: You mentioned that there is now a committee working out of the Economics Ministry, on a report, but that you are not sure that they will be strong enough about the need for actual separation.

Álfheidur: We want to ensure that the committee will include this matter in its work. We have been constantly changing the Icelandic banking and finan-

cial laws, since 2008. I don't know how many times we have made amendments to these laws, and we will continue to do so. We get new regulations from the European Union [which Iceland has applied to be a member of—mr] every other day. The situation in Iceland is special, in a way, and, as I said, we are one of the first to recover from the banking crisis, so we have learned our lessons, and I think we should be able to present what we have learned to other countries.

Therefore, I think that we should not wait any longer for what the EU or other countries will decide, but we should introduce a law, like the Glass-Steagall law, even though we would be the first ones to do so.

A Change in Attitudes

SI: Are you aware of the change in attitudes among some, even in the financial world, in the last few weeks, after the Libor scandal with Barclay's Bank, where the *Financial Times*, and other spokesmen in Britain, said that we now need a full Glass-Steagall? In the U.S., a couple of weeks ago, even Sanford Weill from Citigroup, who had been responsible, in large part, for the repeal of Glass-Steagall, came out saying that we now need full Glass-Steagall, which was followed up by editorials in the *New York Times*, and others. How do you see this change in the U.S. and the U.K.?

Álfheidur: I think it makes sense. I believe that when a scandal, like the Libor scandal, opens up before your eyes, people—even bankers, and those who have been protecting the banking system—must realize that something is very, very wrong. You have to separate these two—running a commercial bank is not really compatible with running an investment bank.

Yes, I have been trying to follow what has been happening, and, in this motion, we comment on and refer to the Independent Banking Commission in Britain, the Vickers Commission, and its proposals from September 2011, where it recommended a partial separation of commercial and financial banking, by the year 2019. That's a long time ahead, and I'm really glad that people are now realizing that this has to be



LPAC-TV

In the U.S., as well as several European nations, Glass-Steagall bills have been introduced. Here, LaRouchePAC organizes in Washington, D.C. to restore the FDR-era bill.

done much faster, and in the next few years—hopefully already next year in Iceland.

SI: What are the main arguments that you are using to explain to the people why a full Glass-Steagall separation is necessary?

Álfheidur: It's twofold. Firstly, this is an opportunity we can't afford to lose. We are in the middle of reforming the banks, and we should take the full step. We can do it now when the investment banking is only about one-sixth of what it was before the crisis. It was over 30% of the banking business before the crisis; it's around 5% now, so this is an opportunity that we have to use.

But the main argument, of course, is to protect the savings and deposits of the common people, and the households, from getting into the hands of risk-taking investment banks, or bankers, and, in that way, minimize the risk the banking system now presents for the whole society. The Icelandic banking system was grossly overgrown, and the consequences were really hard for the Icelandic households and people, who lost their jobs in thousands and even their homes, and we have to prevent that from happening again. And I believe that a Glass-Steagall law is the necessary first step towards that goal.

An International Effort

SI: The Schiller Institute, and our colleagues in the U.S., in the LaRouche Political Action Committee, and our colleagues in the rest of Europe, and else-

where, have been working very hard to get other parliaments and congresses to implement Glass-Steagall. In the U.S., there is a bill now, which has been written and introduced by Rep. Marcy Kaptur [D-Ohio], H.R. 1489, which has 78 co-sponsors, but it does not have enough support, as of now, to be passed, and LaRouchePAC is working towards that. And in Europe, as far as I know, there has been Glass-Steagall legislation proposed in Italy, in both chambers, and also debated in the Swedish parliament. In Denmark, the Schiller Institute has taken this up in our latest election campaign, and has given testimony in parliament about this.

How do you see this dialogue amongst parliamentarians and congressmen in different countries, about the need to actually get this Glass-Steagall bank separation done?

Álfheidur: Well, I think that it is very important that different countries move in their own ways in reforming and building a better society, but it's also very important that we learn from each other's experience, and that we support each other, both the people of these

countries and through governments as well. Sweden, Denmark, and Iceland are members of the Nordic Council, and I think it might be useful to take the matter up there. But with the financial market more or less open, it would also be beneficial to have similar rules across Europe and in the U.S.; and therefore a broad debate is very helpful.

SI: What is the response of the population in Iceland to this proposal?

Álfheidur: I think it's positive. I think people in Iceland understand that these two things—people's savings and speculative investment—don't mix well together—it's like oil and water.

SI: Is there anything else you would like to say about this?

Álfheidur: No. I just hope, as I've already emphasized, that Iceland will not only be the first land to recover from the banking crisis, but also the first to pass a motion like the Glass-Steagall law. That would be a milestone in the development of the financial system, in the wake of the crash.

Lyndon LaRouche on Glass-Steagall and NAWAPA:


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

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

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

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

*The North American Water and Power Alliance



Geithner Exposed Again, Took Delphi Pensions

by Paul Gallagher

Aug. 20—A bipartisan group in the House and Senate has moved in the past weeks to join a three-year effort by 20,000 white-collar employees of Delphi Corp. to find out who ordered their pensions eliminated in the Obama Administration's 2009 "packaged bankruptcy" of General Motors. It looks like Obama Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner gave that order, and this is raising Congressional concern from both parties. Geithner and the White House auto task force are charged with deciding which worker benefits to "cherry-pick" to be maintained in the bankruptcy, with United Autoworkers Union pensions fully guaranteed, and non-union employees losing both their pensions and their health-care plan.

The new exposé of Geithner comes as GM itself is now cutting pensions and health care, in both the U.S. and Canada, with some rumors the automaker is in existential financial trouble again.

E-mails obtained by the *Daily Caller* reveal that Geithner's Treasury was the driving force behind terminating the pensions of the salaried employees at the Delphi auto parts manufacturing company. They contradict sworn testimony, in Federal court and before Congress, given by several Obama Administration figures. They also indicate that the Administration misled lawmakers and the courts about the sequence of events surrounding the termination of those non-union pensions, and that Administration figures violated Federal law.

The White House and Treasury Department have consistently maintained that the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC) independently made the decision. The PBGC is a Federal agency that handles pri-

vate-sector pension benefits issues. Its charter calls for independent representation of pension beneficiaries' interests. Under 29 U.S.C. Section 1342, the PBGC is the only government entity that is legally empowered to initiate termination of a pension.

Former Treasury official Matthew Feldman and former White House "auto czar" Ron Bloom, both key members of the Presidential Task Force on the Auto Industry during the GM bailout, have testified under oath that the PBGC, not the Administration, led the effort to terminate the non-union pension plan. The e-mails appear to show the opposite.

One dated Thursday, April 2, 2009, shows PBGC staffer Joseph House discussing a meeting that he and his colleagues were anticipating with the entire auto bailout team the following day. House e-mailed PBGC colleagues Karen Morris and Michael Rae that during the Friday morning meeting, the "agenda is everything leads off with Chrysler, then we'll get into GM/Delphi." Morris had written earlier that day that the PBGC team would "probably get invited to the Monday meeting at tomorrow's meeting," and that the Monday meeting would involve "talks" on the GM and Delphi portions of the bailout plan.

But after the Friday meeting, House e-mailed PBGC staffers Karen Morris and John Menke. "We've been



White House/Pete Souza

Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner is believed to have ordered the wipeout of pensions for Delphi workers, as part of Obama's 2009 "packaged bankruptcy" of General Motors. A bipartisan Congressional group is investigating.

disinvited,” he wrote. “Who uninvited us?” Morris replied. “Treasury,” House responded.

Another e-mail chain between House and Feldman, then a Treasury official and a key member of the Obama Administration’s auto task force, show that the PBGC, rather than being independent and in charge, believed it needed to clear auto-bankruptcy decisions and action plans through senior Administration officials.

Ohio Republican Rep. Mike Turner told the *Daily Caller* that he thinks that Geithner is ultimately responsible for the decision that terminated 20,000 pensions and health-care plans. Geithner—allocating the bailout money from the TARP—was a member of the Auto Task Force bailout team, and a board member of the PBGC.

‘We Decide What Is Fair’

On Aug. 14, Michigan Republican Rep. Dave Camp, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, requested that Obama Administration officials provide all records, including e-mails to or from the U.S. Treasury and the PBGC, the Executive Office of the President of the United States, and the Departments of Labor and Commerce that relate to Delphi and General Motors’ interest in Delphi.

GM was responsible for the workers’ pensions at Delphi, its former subsidiary. The Delphi workers who lost 50-70% of their pensions were non-unionized, white-collar workers from engineering to accounting professions. They also lost their health-insurance plans. Those who still have their pensions are blue-collar workers in the United Autoworkers Union—Obama’s auto task force and GM decided to honor a 1999 pension guarantee for the union workers’ pensions, even in bankruptcy.

Obama and his surrogates repeat ad nauseam while campaigning, “Everybody gets a fair shake, everybody plays by the same rules, and everybody pays their fair share.”

But at a July 10 hearing in the Ways and Means



White House/Pete Souza

Obama has consistently sided with the Wall Street banksters, as in the so-called auto “bailout,” in which thousands were laid off, losing pensions and health-care benefits. Here, Obama grandstands at the GM plant in Hamtramck, Mich., July 2010.

Committee—the first held on the subject—Obama’s former “auto czar” Ron Bloom told the committee that the White House auto task force’s view had been that “It doesn’t have to be equal; we determine what is fair.” Bloom has a strange history with the United Steelworkers Union; but his original career was at Wall Street’s Lazard Frères investment bank, as a protégé of Felix “the Fixer” Rohatyn, who first advised Delphi management (in 2005) to put the company in bankruptcy and shed the pensions.

The push to expose what Geithner’s Treasury did to the Delphi white-collar pensions is bipartisan, especially in Ohio, where most of those workers were employed. Rep. Sherrod Brown (D-Ohio) “backs the recent bipartisan call for stronger probes into a Department of Treasury scandal that left 20,000 non-union Delphi retirees without their pensions after the 2009 General Motors bailout,” reported his office. There are reports that Rep. Tim Ryan (D-Ohio) “also signaled some distrust with how the Treasury Department and PBGC have handled this issue. Last week, he wrote his own letters to Geithner and PBGC director Josh Gotbaum asking that they provide Congress with ‘additional documents and full transparency,’” according to CNN. Gotbaum is also a protégé of Lazard’s Felix Rohatyn, and the son of New York 1970s labor leader

Victor Gotbaum, who was Rohatyn's partner in austerity cuts against city workers in New York's bankruptcy crisis then.

Now, parent company GM, with encouragement from the White House, is moving to cut the pensions of its already retired workers. The reason is the return of serious financial problems, and a collapse in the stock value of GM, which even have sparked some wild Wall Street rumors of a threatened "second bankruptcy." The automakers' profits fell 41% in the second quarter; it has a very large manufacturing and sales presence in the European Union, where all auto sales are getting killed by the debt collapse; and it is lagging the other automakers in the U.S. market. But it is seeking to "solve" the problem by going after pensions.

GM said in June it would cut its total pension obligation by \$26 billion, by offering lump-sum pension termination payments (pension "buyouts") to about 42,000 retirees. Those who don't get bought out of their pensions, will have them shifted by GM to the insurance giant Prudential Financial Inc., in effect, replacing the workers' pensions with life-insurance policies. And General Motors Canada is doing the same thing with its

retirees' health insurance plan—turning it into a lump-sum annuity. Perhaps not coincidentally, this bears a strong resemblance to the Paul Ryan/Tea Party "vouchers for Medicare" scheme.

Obama Protects, While States Pursue Banksters

by Edward Spannaus

Aug. 19—With the Obama Administration compiling the worst record in recent history for its refusal to prosecute financial crimes committed by the largest Wall Street and European banks, state officials and others have taken the lead in trying to hold some of the most notorious banks accountable for their crimes.

This has been evident in recent state actions taken against the banks involved in the interest-rate-rigging conspiracy around Libor (the London Interbank Offering Rate), as well as against the British Empire's No. 2 dope bank, Standard Chartered (the first being HSBC).

To be fully effective, of course, it is the Federal government that has to take action against the rogue banking system which has taken over the country—through prosecutions, and, most importantly, through reinstatement of Glass-Steagall, which would cut off the support for their ill-gotten gains.

Dope Banks Targeted, and Protected

Britain's leading dope bank, HSBC, formerly known as the HongKong and Shanghai Bank, has also been targeted for investigation—again, not by the Obama Administration, but in this case, by the U.S. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which, in July, issued a devastating report on HSBC's money-laundering activities on behalf of Mexican drug cartels, and its allowing of transactions by "terrorists, drug kingpins and rogue nations."

The Senate report also put a spotlight on the collusion with the money-launderers by Federal government regulators, particularly those in the U.S. Treasury Department. Rather than investigating and prosecuting banks that are laundering funds for drug-trafficking and terrorism, the Obama Administration, especially Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner—who was involved both as head of the New York Federal Reserve (2003-09) and now as Treasury Secretary—is in fact complicit in

NAWAPA 1964



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

... until now.

<http://larouchepac.com/nawapa1964>

facilitating the spread of these deadly evils.

The No. 2 drug bank, Standard Chartered Bank (SCB), was hit with a show-cause order on Aug. 6 by the New York State Department of Financial Services (DFS), which gave SCB until Aug. 15 to explain why its license to do business in New York should not be revoked. The order stated that SCB's actions had "left the U.S. financial system vulnerable to terrorists, weapons dealers, drug kingpins and corrupt regimes." The New York action triggered howls of protests from both the City of London, and from U.S. Federal regulators—the Federal Reserve, the U.S. Treasury, and the Justice Department—which were on the verge of "concluding" that SCB had not committed any criminal wrongdoing and that it should be let off the hook.

Under tremendous pressure from the Obama Administration and top financial regulators, New York DFS head Benjamin Lawsky, just eight days after filing the order, agreed to a \$340 million settlement with Standard Chartered, and did not proceed to a hearing on revoking the bank's license.¹ It is reported that SCB acknowledged that there were \$250 billion in transactions which violated anti-money-laundering laws, even though up to the point of the settlement, the bank had strongly insisted that the amount involved was only \$14 million. This admission is a major embarrassment to Federal regulators, who were not only willing to accept the lower figure, but to let SCB off with, at most, a mild slap on the wrist. And the fact that Lawsky obtained one of the largest settlements ever, in less than ten days, further put to shame those Obama Administration officials who have been dawdling for years on the same case.

Another area in which state regulators and prosecutors have taken the lead, is in the Libor-rigging cases. On Aug. 15, two state Attorneys General issued subpoenas to at least seven major banks in the Libor matter. New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman and Connecticut Attorney General George Jepsen, working jointly on the investigation, reportedly subpoenaed records from JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, UBS, Deutsche Bank, Royal Bank of Scotland, Barclays, and HSBC. The latest regulatory filings of many of these banks contain guarded acknowledgement. For example, the New York-based Citigroup stated that its subsidiaries "have received additional requests for information and documents from various U.S. and non-U.S. govern-

mental agencies, including offices of the New York and Connecticut attorneys general."

In Florida, the office of Attorney General Pan Biondi informed financial media the week of Aug. 15, that subpoenas for information have gone to a total of 14 banks, including Lloyds Banking Group. There are also open investigations in Maryland and Massachusetts, with no details so far available on their demands for information.

Goldman Off the Hook

Just as Obama refused to investigate and prosecute those officials responsible for prisoner abuse and torture during the Bush-Cheney Administration ("We're looking forward, not backward," Obama declared), he and his Administration have refused to prosecute bank officials responsible for the 2007-08 financial collapse, and the frauds that contributed to the collapse and to the ensuing suffering of millions of people.

Just a week ago, the Obama Administration's Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) dropped its investigation of Goldman Sachs, and the Justice Department announced that it would not bring criminal charges against Goldman or any of its employees, on the pretext that the charges would be too hard to prove in court.

This is a continuation of the pattern that has become well-established in this Administration. A column posted on the *American Banker* website on Aug. 6, criticized Federal regulators and the Justice Department for repeatedly entering into what are known as Deferred Prosecution Agreements and Non-Prosecution Agreements (DPAs and NPAs) with major banks which were let off with slap-on-the-wrist fines and promises that they would not violate banking regulations again in the future. This is true even though any major violations, after one of these agreements, are supposed to result directly in prosecutions.

American Banker notes that, since 2007, the DOJ has made 17 such agreements with Wall Street and/or Eurozone banks and that at least three of these banks—UBS, Barclays, and Wachovia—are recidivists, which means the DOJ can invalidate the agreement and proceed with criminal prosecutions. But, nothing of the sort has happened.

Many have pointed out that the Obama Administration has not brought criminal charges against a single top Wall Street executive. Under Obama, it seems, the megabanks are not only "too big to fail," but their executives are "too big to jail."

1. See Edward Spannaus, "British Empire's No. 2 Drug Bank Charged with Money-Laundering," *EIR*, Aug. 17, 2012.

Will Congress Fulfill Its Duty To Oust Obama in Time?

by Nancy Spannaus

Aug. 20—Time is running out for Congress to fulfill its Constitutional responsibility to remove President Barack Obama from office, for his offenses against the Constitution, and for policies which represent a clear and present danger to the American Republic—ranging from his Nazi-like health-care policy, to his threats to provoke a new aggressive war in Syria, which could quickly escalate into a nuclear showdown with Russia and China.

Despite the plethora of scandals which have created the distinct aroma of Watergate around the President, on such matters as national security leaks and the stonewalling on turning over documents pertaining to the Justice Department's Fast and Furious gunwalking scheme, the Congress continues to retreat from action. Fear of the President's retaliation, especially among Democrats, or venal partisan political considerations among Republicans, have left the President in place.

It is a national outrage, for example, that only nine Congressmen (eight Republicans and one Democrat) have had the courage to sign on to Rep. Walter Jones' (R-N.C.) HCR 107, which simply reiterates the language of the U.S. Constitution on the responsibility to declare war, and states that violation of that provision should be a *prima facie* cause for impeachment, if *any* President committed such a violation.

Such cowardice could, of course, be reversed overnight, should leading American patriots take up their

own responsibility for acting to oust the President, utilizing any number of "issues," including the immediate passage of Rep. Marcy Kaptur's (D-Ohio) H.R. 1489. One spur to activating such a decisive move might well be the landing of Curiosity on Mars—an action which flies in the face of Obama's attempted sabotage of NASA, and arouses the passion within the American people necessary to remove the major obstacle to such achievements in the future, Barack Obama.

A Bipartisan Fight for Science

On Aug. 3, one hundred Congressmen sent a letter to Energy Secretary Steven Chu, on the need to get rid of the "burdensome bureaucracy" that is threatening the ongoing successful R&D work on achieving nuclear fusion, at the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California. Their term, "bureaucracy," is a polite expression for the impediments perpetrated by the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), which the letter condemns as imposing "administrative, managerial and budgetary hurdles."

Such anti-science practices by the Obama Administration are coherent with the fact that Obama also called for crippling budget cuts to the U.S. domestic fusion research program, in his 2013 budget proposal, released in February. Obama's fusion budget cuts will shut down one of the three major research facilities at MIT, the

Alcator C-Mod, which is the largest single U.S. training facility for students in the field. This will set back scientific research in a devastating way, and also directly impact any future Mars program, which will depend upon the development of thermonuclear rocket propulsion as it advances toward a manned landing.

In February of this year, Obama proposed cutting the already paltry 2011 and 2012 annual fusion budget from \$401 million, to \$353 million for 2013, by trimming \$3 million outright (down to \$398), and then calling for a sneak-diversion of another \$45 million, away from the U.S. domestic programs (at Lawrence Livermore, MIT, Princeton, etc.), and sending the funds to the Europe-based ITER project, to meet international obligations for co-funding fusion research! Obama's so-called Science Advisor John Holdren defended this, saying it was focussing resources on "burning plasma," and allowing domestic programs to revert from "research status," down to "routine operations in support of stockpile stewardship."

Scientists raised alarms at the time, and formed a petition drive against this treason. A bipartisan group of 48 House members, led by Rush Holt (D-N.J.) and Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-N.J.), conducted a drive for fusion R&D support, culminating in June, when the House of Representatives authorized \$76 million to the Department of Energy fusion budget line, exceeding the \$53 million Obama had proposed removing. But the Senate remains in support of the Obama cuts.

The Aug. 3 letter was spearheaded by Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.), and is signed by lawmakers from across the country. It points out that, "NIF recently achieved a major milestone: the world's first successful firing of a 500 *terawatt* laser. While technical challenges remain to be solved before ignition is achieved, this milestone demonstrates major progress and provides even greater capability to address the remaining challenges. Recent technical reviews by independent experts indicate that there are no fundamental technical reasons that would preclude eventually achieving ignition."

The letter then states, "It would be severely disappointing to get so close to a tremendous scientific breakthrough—fusion ignition at NIF—only to see it prevented by bureaucracy. We must not let science be stifled by bureaucracy." Lofgren's office refers science-supporters to a forthcoming National Academy of Sciences report on "The Quality of the Management and of the Science and Engineering Research at the Depart-

ment of Energy's National Security Laboratories." The report is available [online](#).

The Mars Program Itself

A large bipartisan group of Congressmen and Senators has consistently opposed Obama's drastic cuts in the space program, since he first announced them in February of 2009. But they have so far been impotent to stop them, in no small part due to the fact that they have not taken the necessary action to free the nation from the bank bailout policy, by implementing Glass-Steagall, and then to implement a national credit policy, and they have refused to take on Obama directly. Thus, despite powerful testimony from former astronauts and others against the cuts, Congress has sat by and allowed the gutting of the Mars exploration program, with nary a peep to the public.

With the brilliant landing of the Curiosity rover on Mars, some Members of Congress, including some Democrats, are now speaking up, and acknowledging that the President, not the Republicans, are the problem. Exemplary was an op-ed penned by Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), published in the *Washington Post* Aug. 17, and reprinted in numerous other papers. Schiff's constituency is NASA, in the sense that the Jet Propulsion Lab which is running the current Curiosity mission is in his district, but his appeal was larger.

Under the title "Curiosity Mars landing highlights NASA budget woes," Schiff wrote:

"...President Barack Obama's fiscal 2013 budget proposed cutting hundreds of millions of dollars from the Mars Exploration Program. Simply put, the crown jewel of the U.S. planetary science program is hanging by a budgetary thread...."

"We in Congress are doing our part: The House has moved to restore \$88 million of the administration's proposed cuts, and the Senate has moved to put back \$100 million. It is likely that even more of the funds will be restored in the final appropriations legislation...." But Schiff also apparently realizes that with continuing resolutions and threats of sequestration, good intentions can be easily swept aside. At the Mars Society conference in Pasadena on Aug. 4, Schiff called on the participants to petition their representatives "for an increase in NASA's budget, as well as a national commitment to lead an effort to put humans on Mars by a date certain."

He's right, but he has to go further: Obama must be removed from office now.

‘BARACK OBAMA’S CRONY’:

Cass R. Sunstein Departs

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

August 1, 2012

The following report is intended, essentially, to define the significance of presently critical problems which have arisen within the fields of the heretofore little-known aspects of the physical-scientific principles of economy. This is a matter concerning the need for the cure of a kind of mental disorder which is being spread, influentially, under the pretexts of “the follies of academically popular economics.” I begin with a specific clinical case, the immediate circles of the current President of our United States. This case runs as follows.

According to reports just lately received, U.S. President Barack Obama’s notoriously slippery crony and Chicago veteran, Cass R. Sunstein, appears to have arranged his hasty exit from Obama’s team. Although, at last report, Cass’s wife, Samantha Power, remains nominally readied to continue her post with the Obama Administration, for whatever her personal reasons. In the meantime, Samantha seems thus disposed to continue with her push for what might well be, in fact, a virtual “World War III,” in fact a threatened thermonuclear war, to be launched by the included, explicit intentions of President Barack Obama. This is a scheme which has included the notorious Susan Rice, and also other authors and notable accomplices of an ongoing, massive human butchery in Syria and elsewhere: a

slaughter which is currently operating under the auspices of some from inside the UNO. Therefore, I had already set this present report into motion, a report which I had begun just briefly before receiving the news of Mr. Sunstein’s prepared retirement.

Nevertheless, while Sunstein may be fleeing from his career with the White House, or had merely modified his intentions, he has not shown any change from his regrettably personal devotion to that wickedness which he and Obama have shared, as the legacy of their all-too-common Chicago and Harvard University Law connections.¹

Notably, while some apparently upside-down citizens have denounced my perfectly truthful and fully factual report on Obama as “over the top,” the actual facts, once matters are considered rationally, show that the fact is, that those who have attacked my views of his wickedness as being “over the top,” are truly not “over the top” themselves, since they, quite to the contrary, have already touched bottom, with little prospect for a rebound. Nevertheless, Obama’s (and Tony Blair’s) copy of an Adolf Hitler-modeled “health care” policy, remains still Obama’s own philosophical “carbon

1. Cass R. Sunstein, “Conspiracy Theories” (University of Chicago Law School), and Adrian Vermuele (Harvard University Law School) 2008. (http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1084585).



White House

The U.S.A. has been ruined, “at an accelerating rate, under the pair of ‘conspiracy theorists’ and flim-flammers Barack Obama and Cass Sunstein.” Pictured here with Obama and Sunstein, is Samantha Power, Sunstein’s wife, who is part of the pro-war faction in the Administration.

copy” of both Britain’s wretched Tony Blair, and, incidentally, also the earlier version of the same spirit, that of Adolf Hitler.

What is notable about Cass R. Sunstein’s character for the purposes of this present review, is that had he not been a member of the administration of President Barack Obama, we should have counted him as merely one of those innumerable fools, high, or, mostly, low, who have been peddling “conspiracy theories” similar to his own. These have been, “theories” of the brutishly crude sort which had been lately known to us in our United States, off and on, since Harry S Truman’s entry into the U.S. Presidency.²

The difference between then and now, is, that the U.S. came out of the end of Harry S Truman’s incumbency, in a relatively far better social status than a U.S.A. now ruined, at an accelerating rate, under the pair of “conspiracy theorists” and flim-flammers Barack Obama and Cass Sunstein, but also other nations. Obama’s have been the policies which his administration has deployed in seemingly successful attempts to ruin the great majority of the citizens of the United States, often with a cruelty which has been abysmal. On

2. For the young-uns: There is no period in the spelling of the “S” of “Harry S Truman.”

that account, the present-day health-care and related doctrines of Obama and Cass Sunstein, have been, generically of a quality of likeness to both Nazi Germany’s propaganda machine, first, and the related practices of the post-Hitler, “post-World War II” Congress for Cultural Freedom, later.³

As for myself: in my opposition to those chronically lying wretches, Obama, Sunstein, and their likeness, I am writing here in my capacity as being in fact, an exceptionally successful, long-term economic forecaster (as opposed to mere statisticians). I speak and write, on record, as a singularly successful forecaster, as I have been since the success of my first public forecasting, during the

late 1950s.⁴ That distinction is not relative, but specific.

Now, putting aside what I have referenced as that pair of subjects, Barack Obama and Cass Sunstein, I have remained uniquely successful in such matters of economic forecasting. I am still advancing in an active

3. Hitler killed his victims; the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF) worked to destroy their souls.

4. The continuing study in my capacity as a management consulting specialist and closely related practice, had soon come to be concentrated for a time, in the nation’s own automobile manufacturing; but, was extended to include other leading U.S. industries with characteristics akin to those of the auto industry. My forecast during those earlier times, was first presented at the close of August 1956, warning of a deep recession to hit the U.S. economy in its auto and related sectors as a whole, beginning February-March 1957. It hit exactly as I had forecast; the crash which erupted, as I had forecast, in February-March 1957, and continued into the Spring-Summer of 1958, and was the worst set-back to the U.S. economy prior to the wave of decline which dominated the post-Kennedy U.S. war in Indo-China, and beyond. This has been broadly defined as a pattern continued, actually, to the present date; but, has been most ferocious under President George W. Bush, Jr. and, worst of all, the brutish Barack Obama. Otherwise, my putative rivals in the trade were forecasting by statistical-trends methods, which, in general, have infallibly failed on a matter of principle, as they did from the beginning of February-March 1957, exactly as I had forecast. It is the reliance on “statistical trends” which is the chief root-cause the incompetent performance of most “market forecasters.” Consider my celebrated Dec. 2, 1971 debate at New York’s Queens College for some key insights into this matter.

and successful practice in crucial aspects of relevant skills, as I have nearly touched the age of ninety years, albeit with the expected bumps and bruises of sundry sorts taken into account, as it were a likely prospect for all such professionals, if they are fortunate to enjoy an opportunity like my own.

Under those conditions, my crucial consideration in presenting the report of the subject-matters which I present here, is, that, without both the expulsion of President Obama, and, also, a radical and sudden change away from President Obama in the methods of U.S. economic policy-shaping, this nation of ours is simply, as it is sometimes said, “not going to make it,” even in the short term before the next Federal election, or, even before the coming Democratic Party’s Presidential nominating event. Otherwise, his continuation in the role of President, would almost certainly be your personal doom.

On Forecasting

To be clear with the readers on that point: the principle of any competent economic forecasting, was never premised, in principle, on the presumption of a specifically “predicted” date, although I have successfully forecasted such suggested “target-area-datings” from ranges of less than a year, to several years of the relevant “count-down,” and have done that much more than once. I have reported those datings as suggested ranges of certain datings, datings which must be always competently presented facts of the matter which I have presented.

Note this: Usually, exact “predicted” dates could not be competently presumed by anyone; usually, with rare exceptions, only patterns in trends could be measured by anyone with fair approximation; but, this must be done nonetheless meaningfully. Competent forecasting is not essentially a matter of a mechanically predetermined specific dates, but must represent a fairly esti-




Creative Commons

Since the assassination of President Kennedy, there has been a steep downturn in U.S. physical-economy trends, as can be seen in **Figure 1**; the photo shows the Bethlehem Steel plant, now closed, and used as the backdrop for the Levitt Pavilion entertainment center; Bethlehem, Pa.

FIGURE 1

U.S. Manufacturing Employment 1965-2011



research.stlouisfed.org

mable, qualitative quality of interval of change, such as “a turning-point,” in the direction which is imposed for some probable future range of dates.

For example, the assassination of President John F. Kennedy has defined a causal quality of turning-point in actual U.S. physical-economy trends since that time. A forecastable change, is one which is inherent in an (often) currently foreseeable change in quality of direction of the relevant, underlying social process. For ex-

ample, had President John F. Kennedy and his brother, Robert, been permitted to live, neither the needless Indo-China warfare of the U.S.A., nor economic disasters experienced by the United States so far, would have, almost certainly, ever occurred. It is the quality of change in characteristics of an ongoing policy for action which must be the standard for economic forecasting.

On Trends

Thus, the scientifically premised forecast's outcome, is located in the effects of the pulls and stretches of the process under way. A forecastable crisis can be hastened or delayed by certain kinds of events, or the tug-and-push of key persons, policies, and processes inserted into the relevant "count-down."⁵

The introduction of the "greenie policy" has been such a cause for what has been a series of qualitative turning-downs of the U.S. economy since that time; it was the coincidence of that factor, and the anti-Kennedy onslaught which has been the dominant factor of failure of the U.S. economy over the span of time marked by the related, deeply underlying trends. In human behavior, as distinct from animal life, it is changes in, or lack of appropriate changes in effected voluntary-economic trends, which shape the ups and downs in the voluntary determinations of economic history.

The function of any competent forecasting, is not to observe history as if passively, as a set of veritable certainties, but to change it, willfully!⁶

A change "in trend" may be foreseen through insight into physical-scientific means, either to prevent a change in quality of direction, or to create one. For example, my 1971 forecast for the breakdown, which preceded the ouster of President Richard Nixon, is typical of the matter of principle in respect to forecasting. In the 1971

case, I was the only notable economist of the time who had actually forecast what did happen, and why, during that mid-summer, when it hit. In that case, notably leading economists stated, that they had no record of their actually having foreseen that event; hence the celebrity consequently conferred on me on that occasion.

For another example: I have projected, currently, the disintegration of the present U.S. economy (and more), as it has done so, through the course of the continuing of the ruinous, current U.S. policy-trend which has persisted since the attempted impeachment of President Bill Clinton, and until the introduction of three specific measures which will be required to launch a general physical-economic recovery.⁷

Therefore, for me, the shameful thing which I recognize in the chronic failures of the kinds of putative professional rivals to which I have referred here, is a failure which has often shown its roots among statistical "forecasters" generally. That is to say, that those fellows seem to still believe in their failed method, for the greater part, stubbornly, continuing to rely on the inherently failed practice of "statistical methods," even amid the presently accelerating, general breakdown-crisis of that trans-Atlantic economy which they had done so much to create, still today.

To sum up this immediate point so far: the reason most political leaders, and kindred types have been led into bringing destruction upon our own, and others' nations, is that they depend upon what they regard as "established statistical trends," as former President Bill Clinton joined that political horde for the occasion in 2009, despite my warning. It was the failure to accept my published warnings, which unleashed the hyperinflationary lunacy which has brought the United States, like western Europe, into the grip of a threatened, virtual hyperinflationary extinction, now. The outcome of an election, for example, is often one prompted by the worst possible candidate, or the assassination, perhaps, of the best.

The chronic characteristics of those broadly indicated methods of my putative (and also foolish) rivals,

5. For example, the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln (directed from London at that time), is a clear case. However, the assassination of President McKinley, and the motivating issues which steered the assassin, were clear, as were the motivating issues of that time which led to the still presently history-changing assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and, also, his brother, and are indelible for the clear-headed and honest thinkers of today. As the "ghosts" in a most memorable, internationally famous German movie, *Spukschloss im Spessart* (1960), said, "*Die Hauptsache ist der effekt*" (The important thing is the effect). In each of the actually historical cases, the motives for the assassination lie not in the identity of the assassins as such, but who employs the capabilities available for hire.

6. Think! What would history have been had President John F. Kennedy lived through 1960-1975, or longer? Or, had President Ronald Reagan succeeded in pushing the SDI through as a U.S. program, in either of his public attempts.

7. 1.) the original Glass-Steagall law of Franklin Roosevelt's administration; 2.) the rebuilding of the U.S. physical economy through a change to a credit system of Federal physical-economic national recovery and growth; 3.) the launching of the NAWAPA program, under modernized technological adjustments. The combination of these three shifts in the U.S. economy, away from its present disintegration, to a recovery program providing no less than six millions physically-productive jobs.

was already made indelibly clear in their confrontation with me during and since that mid-Summer monetarist crisis of 1957-58, a pattern whose effects lingered then until the upturn coinciding with the election of President John F. Kennedy.⁸ Virtually every leading economist engaged in economic forecasting which had been done in opposition to my forecasts since, was exposed as incompetent, during the course of the events during that post-Kennedy time; and, there has been little improvement on that account since, as was clear in the pattern of developments since the onset of September of 2007.

That point had been made starkly clear for deeply embarrassed economists, already during my December 2, 1971, widely reported public debate with Professor Abba Lerner at New York's Queens College. That had been, in effect, my debate against the Keynesian and kindred circles of both Britain and the United States, circles from which the same generality of economic forecasters never regained its earlier reputation for credibility, still to the present date. They are still, until fairly recent report, pathetic adherents of the intrinsically incompetent practice of "statistical-forecasting methods."⁹

Those opponents were never "honestly" mistaken; they were, and still are, systematically wrong in their misconception of the actual nature of economy itself. Conformity, instead of principle, was decisive; hence, their chronic failures.

The principal subject-matter of the following pages, had been signalled as the core of my July 31 (2012) "Beyond Sense-Perceptions."¹⁰ In this, my present continuation of that same core-subject, I shall show here, that successful forms of what is actually competent physical forecasting in economy, are all, really, a matter of a lawful, and inherently foreseeable result of human science: if you have both the ability and opportunity to master the relevant aspects of that science. The urgent need I have addressed here, has been to point to the nature of the experimental evidence which helps to rid the relevant scientists of their sensed need to continue relying on sense-perception as such. In fact, the proof is

elementary, but, only once the fuller treatment of essential principles is adequately understood.

If you wish to enjoy a successful economy, you must adopt the science which will guide you to create it.

I. Why the Statisticians Failed

As I had warned earlier:

the distinction of the human species from among all other living creatures presently known to us, is expressed as the potential for what must be a strictly defined notion, a notion of the ontological quality of what we must require, as premises, for productions in the domain of general human creativity. That means the intention to create, willfully, those new states in nature, which nourish the hope which our species' mere continued existence of our own species may require.

You should begin, here and now, with the continuation of that discussion, by recalling the crucial point with which I concluded that recent, July 31 report.

Firstly, it has been a serious habit of systemic error, for anyone, to seek to adduce subjects of physical science for which data are systemically dependent upon statistically-based conclusions: conclusions such as those which depend, in turn, upon data derived merely from current human sense-perception.

A competent definition in this domain, is found for us, independently of customary human opinions of today; it lies solely in the evidence of mankind's willful ability to muster successively higher orders of degrees (intensities) of "fire,"¹¹ a perspective now ranging into thermonuclear fusion, matter-antimatter reactions, and beyond. The simplest sort of competent statement on the principled nature of that evidence, is that mankind is the only presently known species whose existence depends on devotion to mankind's escalating modes in the use of fire.

Consider the following argument on that just-stated account.


When we combine that approach to sought evidence, with the inclusion of lessons taken from the study of the principles represented by the combined work of Johann Sebastian Bach, Arthur Nikisch, and

8. The actual descent into the sudden and increasingly deep U.S. economic recession of February 1957 into the late Spring of 1958 was followed by a period relative stagnation. Since more recent decades, the reports of those developments have been customarily falsified, for obvious motives.

9. Cf. Footnote 4.

10. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., "The Secret of Fire: [Beyond Sense Perceptions](#)," *EIR*, Aug. 17, 2012.

11. I.e., per capita, per square-foot of intensity, etc.



Princeton Plasma Physics Lab

“Mankind’s willful ability to muster successively higher orders of degrees (intensities) of ‘fire,’” now extends into thermonuclear fusion, matter-antimatter actions, and beyond. Shown: the Thermonuclear Fusion Test Reactor at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory.

Wilhelm Furtwängler, we have stepped outside the ordinary bounds of sense-perception as such. We have shifted toward the acceptance of a viewpoint provided by the notion of “fire” as a principle of human existence, rather than merely its effect. We have entered, thus, into the domain of the principle of a domain of higher ontology, which does not mean merely energy-flux density *per se*; it means the implication of reaching beyond the experience of sense-perception, into the domain of human creativity as such: into the domain which bridges “fire” with the role of the noëtic powers of the human mind as such, a subject-matter, essentially, of the domain of the stars.¹²

12. When working backwards from today’s customary notion of music, a highly imperfect notion when considered as being rooted in dependency on sense-perception as such, to the apparently transcendental domain of the common (actual) principle of the human mind, upwards from the domain of sense-perception as such, to an element of discrimination which reaches beyond mere sense-perception, as such, and into the domain of mind as such. Bach’s emphasis on the principle of the future expressed in his Preludes and Fugues, as reflected so powerfully in the work of Wilhelm Furtwängler, typifies this. The same rule, when made familiar to us from the work of Johannes Kepler’s discovery of a principle of gravitation, applies here: we hear the shadow of the reality.

Now, rather than measuring reality in terms of sense-perceptions, regard sense-perception as a type of shadow which represents the typical sources and effects of humanity’s willful power to create. This means a rejection of the mistaken notion that the higher powers of the human mind can be attributed to the practice of deduction *per se*. The essential subject is not what is heard, as such; we must discover our response to the unheard principle itself: it could be said, that we must “hear” what that unheard reveals as if “from within the cracks of irony *per se*.”

This distinction actually takes us beyond deductive processes as such, into matters which react to deduction, but which are not contained within it: that which is “within the cracks of ironies *per se*,” a sense of prescience which is to be experienced as the actual human creativity which is located beyond sense-perception as such. That principle is the only one which really distinguishes man’s existence as beyond a deductive mode. That is the same distinction from the ape, which pertains to man’s ability to know the powers which lie within those higher ranks of the higher uses of power, uses which exist only by means of the actions specific to the products of the work of the human mind.¹³

“Classical music” in the sense of the domain of music for the colleagues of a Bach, Nikisch, or a Furtwängler, touches directly on the musical abilities which link the functions of the human mind to those higher powers of “fire” whose willfully human expression distinguishes man essentially from the ape.

The essential distinction of man from beast lies

The essential distinction of man from beast lies

13. Repetition of this point, in various “languages,” seems superfluous to some readers. They must remind themselves, as Johannes Kepler repeated the essential point on this account, that what passes among some people for “sense-perception,” as a direct effect, is itself a vicious error born of conventional presumptions being substituted for reality.

within the bounds of the rarely employed, but nonetheless *existent capability of the human mind to react to the future, rather than merely the past and present experiences.*

That future-oriented view which I have just summarized in that just-stated fashion, presents us with a higher order of insight into “fire,” as human practice shifts into the “more dramatic” realms of thermonuclear fusion and matter/anti-matter domains of practice, and as the development of human control over processes on, and affecting Mars, will soon prompt us to regard galactic “forces” as the foundations of those developments which enable the potential powers we shall find to be familiar within the Solar system and our galaxy. Only threadbare habits stand in the way of viewing matters from this standpoint which I have just identified as the uniquely appropriate standpoint of the human mind in the practice of physical science.

That much said this far, we should find that although this view may not have been considered “comfortable” at first glance, the practice of remote control over the functions which Mars will provide for support for man on Earth, will lead to an appropriate sense-comfortable view of these matters.

Now, it were time to consider a cruder sort of commonplace problem:

Sunstein’s & Similar Nonsense

Until now, the included consequence of the customary, but errant economists’ trend has been, that those “other” economists, to whom I have just referred, above, have been, inherently, victims of the commonplace social pressures of academic life, pressures which may be fairly identified as reflecting the status of victims of something resembling such precedents as the folly of statistical rules for a Euclidean-based arithmetic, such as the intrinsic stupidity of any so-called “marketing forecast.”

The complementary effect of that kind of persisting, regrettable trend in current opinion, has included some degree of the fostering of a “fascist-like” mentality in cases comparable to the wild-eyed, arbitrary codifications inherent in Cass Sunstein’s perverted, also essentially capriciously expressed examples of his practiced mentality. Those trends may often resist Sunstein’s obvious nonsense, which is perhaps useful in dealing with less important subject-matters, but they will otherwise tend to adopt “a professional’s respectful toleration” for even the perverted state of mind which is to be accu-

rately diagnosed as comparable, historically, to “fascism,” as that diagnosis is to be made by attention to the standards of those comparative historical practices which are urgently needed for the requirements of physical and related progress among human beings, presumably people who prefer to avoid the pathways of embedded tendencies for extinction.

The crucial element of policy to be considered in presenting this case, is that any competent attempt at “a science of economy,” must be premised upon the most profoundly essential distinction of man from beast. Specifically, and, most emphatically, *the human species is the only presently known species which is capable of generating policies which are based directly on the qualitatively principled consideration of consequences for the future, rather than the projection of deductions from conditions viewed from the past.* The crucial issue here, is, therefore, to be located in the rejection of simple predictions (a systemically reductionist standpoint), in preference for what defines a functionally absolute, systemic distinction of the mind of man, from that of the beasts. “Fascism” is essentially “man as a beast.” Or, for example, an Aristotelean, or other sort of philosophical oligarch such as, for example, the Cass Sunstein who fills what he does not actually know, with the “empty space” which he employs as a receptacle for any merely nominal future which he chooses, for him, because, for him, it never did actually exist. (In other words, he considers himself freed to lie a lot about what he apparently believes does not exist).¹⁴

Or, in other words, mankind’s true mental powers are intrinsically noëtic, as Johann Sebastian Bach insisted, rather than commonly used deductive methods.

The practical point to be restated, is: that if we are to consider ourselves as functionally human in what must become, in effect, our actually galactical outlook, we must develop our capability for successfully changing the relevant, previously adopted principles by which most of us are presently “ruled;” we must replace “practical” habits for truthful ones: which is to say, for virtually scientifically prophetic ones.

14. All of my allegations respecting the methods of argument used by Cass Sunstein are to taken from my reading of the item authored by Sunstein and Adrian Vermeule, as referenced by my first footnote of this document presented here. It was like an experience of the hollow sound left by the label on a dirty empty bottle: no substance, but mostly disease. What a fraud! Also typical of President Obama! Instead of thinking of that President or Sunstein, put the words they utter in the mouth of a delinquent among the rabble of Chicago’s “Weatherman” cult.



EIRNS/Ali Sharaf

“Mankind’s true mental powers are intrinsically noëtic, as Johann Sebastian Bach insisted, rather than commonly used deductive methods.” This statue of Bach graces the front of St. Thomas Church in Leipzig, Germany.

Thus, it is in respect to precisely that specified precondition, that human beings in a healthy state of mind are categorically unique among all known living species. This exists in respect to the fact, that we each should have cultivated a built-in potentiality to act creatively—to *act to the effect of changing the outcome of the future*, rather than proffering decisions made merely in deductions from the course of the past. Our proper human mission is as typified by those who have already shown themselves to have become capable of making the contribution to mankind made by a science-driven forecast of the future, rather than a mere deduction from which the more or less successful action is commonly adduced. No animal species is capable of doing this willfully, as the same must be said in respect to “market-forecasters,” common statisticians, or other stubborn relics of beliefs, all of which types should be soon rescued from the misfortunes of a suitably departed past.

Mankind, as known to us this far, is the only presently known species capable of actually creating an original future in a willful way, that by the means of proper choice of future efforts. Unfortunately, only a small ration of contemporary persons, even of the putative rank of contemporary “experts,” have actually developed that nonetheless accessible capability which reflects the sense of meanings to be associated with a true principle of physical-scientific progress.¹⁵ For example, the Aristotelean method associated with the strictures of Euclid, is a typically depraved, ancient example of the methodological incompetence of the “statistical” method which presently obstructs most of man’s pathway to a serious prospect for a future, for our human species.

The impaired subjects, Barack Obama and Cass Sunstein, have been typical of the quality of a spirit of despotism which reflects that pair’s share of depravity, a depravity presented in the form of a very crude sort of common habit. It is that actually mass-murderously fascistic despotism, which they typify, which must be removed from its poisonous influence on our constitutional system of government, before it is too late to do so effectively. That requires a quality absent from both of that pair—the ability to tell the truth (even in some relatively simple matters).

We may hope, here, as I do, to persuade more of our folk to agree with my counsel respecting this subject-matter. It would save human lives, that probably in relatively large numbers, considering the awful trend of conditions to which our citizens, in particular, are being subjected by nothing other than their present devotions to tolerating lies, as by President Obama, which have been regarded by some unfortunates as the presumed wisdom of the past.

That view which I have expressed, thus, is key for understanding how the human species has progressed,

15. At this point, I am pointing, implicitly, toward the unique significance of a correct insight into Wolfgang Köhler’s influence on Max Planck in their coming to a shared definition of the notion of the principle of the human mind. It is the popular misconception of the meaning of the human mind (a reductionist’s misconception based on commonplace notions of “sense perception”), which has usually blocked insight into Köhler’s profound, physical-scientific insight. The link here, is to the physical meaning of metaphor, as this was presented by Johannes Kepler’s “vicarious hypothesis.” That notion of “vicarious hypothesis,” when recognized as the meaning of “metaphor,” is equivalent to the conclusion which I present in the brief Chapter II—“The Argument Which Must Be Used” of my July 31, 2012, **Beyond Sense Perceptions**.

on those occasions when it has, in fact, succeeded. This is the point at which all other known species have not only consistently failed absolutely on this specific point; but, also as they have failed throughout the record of the emergence and decline of all other known living species, throughout the presently known existence of other forms of life on Earth so far.

Those other creatures have had their place in the process at large; but, the essential quality of human life, is unique to that of the inherently natural mission implicitly presented to mankind. It is human creativity, otherwise to be known for purposes of professional practice as a science of insight, on which the willfully continued independence of the future existence of our species depends.

Out of finding success in dealing with that experience from that standpoint of reference to which I have just referred, we are enabled to distinguish two, contrasting measures of such attempted success. The more common mistakes are clear in their natures.

First, some among us, although successful in recognizing a discovery of principle, have been thwarted in their attempts at experiencing its realization. Second, when any serious failure comes, it is a failure which is usually to be rightly blamed on our society as a social process, more than the error of any exceptional influential, individual member other than one of the highest ranks of society. Leaders of society generally require the most careful scrutiny in respect to their selection of leading policies. Many among our Presidents, for example, have been fairly described, with a few notable exceptions, as actually “bummers,” or “flops;” the best were, all too often, assassinated in mid-term, or escaped such, or related treatment, by avoiding acts which would offend our republic’s actually most influential adversaries. Some have gained a sense of security from either assassination, or brutal political humiliation, by kissing threatening interests, from the bottom up.



Library of Congress

“The case of the evil President Andrew Jackson typifies the customary follies of a credulous and small-minded general public suited to elect a President George W. Bush, Jr., or, even far worse, a Barack Obama.” The disease is called “populism.”

The argument on that account, is essentially as follows.

Actual human successes by some, *usually* require human consent by other persons. There are, admittedly, rare exceptions to that rule—putting to one side the pathological varieties. Those more successful in making true discoveries have (chiefly) *been given*, or merely permitted to have the opportunity to pursue their discovery through insight into a manifestly, and uniquely, future-based benefit to be contributed to mankind. Among all these, there has been, chiefly, so far, a small minority of persons of their own time in history, who have gained access to the potential for acquiring the use of a principle of human success in moving significant progress of society from within its ranks, voluntarily. Even in such rare

cases, such as one of our greatest statesmen, John Quincy Adams, their moments of greatest intensity of their success have been temporary, and the power they had once employed for society’s benefit, was often—“from the outside”—crushed for the advantage of a most wretched sort of scoundrel, such as Andrew Jackson and his filthy crew, and by the cessation of the progress of our U.S. republic, progress which had been ruined, as, again, during the recent dozen or so years, frequently abruptly. Hence, there is the urgency that such exceptional progress occur fairly widely, as in the present moment of an oncoming general economic breakdown-crisis throughout the trans-Atlantic system, in particular.

There is a somewhat known rule for selection and support of persons appointed to occupy the relatively highest office. Others might either expect death, or some cooked-up sort of infamy, a condition with which I am somewhat familiar. In a sense, my just-referenced case of the evil President Andrew Jackson typifies the customary follies of a credulous and small-minded general public suited to elect a President George W. Bush, Jr., or, even far worse, a Barack Obama. Such is the all-too-typical effect of a certain moral disease of among the citizens, a disease called “populism.” Crooks like

Andrew Jackson in the Presidency, breed popular toleration for treason-in-fact by their disorienting influence on a credulous mass of “populists.” Count, for example: how many U.S. citizens are still, today, dumbed-down sufficiently to admire Andrew Jackson, even warmly, still today?

Let it be said: “By their fruits you should have known them,” unfortunately eventually. There are, fortunately, remedies for that condition, if we have the skills and determination to bring them into being.

Köhler: The Issue of Mind

To reach a competent definition of the meaning of our subject here, “science,” the most significant of the actual, or merely potential successes by mankind, are those which are typified by what is to be ranked as the discovery of universal physical principles, a quality of scientific principles which is typified by such accomplishments as those by, most notably, Germany’s Max Planck and Albert Einstein, and Planck’s associate Wolfgang Köhler. Each and all of these latter are to be viewed from the vantage-point of a crucial, but (presently) rarely-held adequate notion of the human mind.

Those exceptional scientists, or their like, are to be contrasted, as most notably (and conspicuously), with the way in which such apostles of sheer evil, such as Bertrand Russell and his followers since his wretched, and his later years, typify the modes in which a corrupted popular mind of laymen and scientists alike, works largely through the tendrils of opportunism to pollute, or even destroy their own society, as “environmentalism” does today.

There is a specific principle to be emphasized, most of all, to understand the true meaning of the individual human life. On this account, the case of the leading edge of the work of Köhler on the conception of the function of the human mind, is exemplary: as I shall summarize crucial elements of that case in due course, below.

There is little to be considered as “accidental” in such a division of outcomes among our uniquely human species. Individual cases among us vary; but, the principles which define all of them in principle, are implicitly understandable as specific in one way or another. As you shall read below, “implicitly understandable” is the term of a special, and also crucial importance for the purposes of my argument here. One point on this account must be emphasized above all others, as follows. Insight into the principles of Classical musical compo-

sition and its performance, can be, and, therefore must become, of the highest relevance in gaining insight into the deepest social processes of human mind.

Beyond Merely Music

Life does not “pay us off” individually. What happens to us, is, often, less a matter of our affairs for today, than what we might have hoped to have contributed through our own exertions for the shaping of the outcomes for combined present and future.

Johann Sebastian Bach, Arthur Nikisch, and Wilhelm Furtwängler demonstrated that for the history of music, ironically, as also the appropriate framework given only to what had been members from former generations. What we do, finds its importance in our specific contributions for themselves, as of the living, to those outcomes which will be realized, likely, not by yesterday, or today, but, in the future which we must work to bring into being. Those are the most important of the achievements of any generation of human beings, including, most emphatically, those rising to influence from earlier generations than their own times. Classical musical composition is a very special, essentially unique quality of the most crucial aspects of the human mind. The loss of general access to that musical life has been, in fact, a crucial factor in the degeneration of the social-mental powers of the post-World War II generations, while a similar decline is to be recognized among composers since the death of Johannes Brahms. Nikisch and Furtwängler are exemplary pioneers of modern musical discovery on related accounts.

What we should recognize as that most gratifying to our knowledge of our Creator, is the occasion when an idea wrongly buried in the past, is as if resurrected to become new triumphs in bringing forth our future, as Johann Sebastian Bach demonstrated the principle. Ideas, especially truly mental achievements in generating physical or related principles, are the essence of all true human accomplishments, that either for now, or for the future, discovered. or rediscovered, which had been conceived in a sometimes seemingly, or actually forgotten past. If you seek to demand a payment for your having lived, try seeking that in what you will have contributed to the resurrection of what has been formerly neglected, that for the sake of unknown goals, goals which often might not be recognized for you until after you were gone, or which even you had, foolishly, ignored or even repudiated.

That is the moral price, and gain, of having lived as



Vogel als Prophet

Klavierstück aus "Waldszenen"

Robert Schumann, 1810 - 1846
op. 82, No. 7



In Classical music, such as that of Robert Schumann's "The Prophet Bird," "we touch upon a deep meaning of the principle which unites Classical musical composition and physical science, each as inherently of a common species."

the member-in-good-standing of a human species. The crucial aspect of any related sort of discussion, is best illustrated, on principle, as located in the specific quality of that point as a matter of an absolute distinction. Let us continue our statement of this case at hand, from that following perspective which I have emphasized in my most recently published treatment of the matter of the essential distinction between man and other living species.

Question: What must you accept as your obligation to the assured accomplishment for future generations?

This means the increase of the power of mankind, as through a passion for successful progress in the continuing development of the human species into its future: a purpose, an intention, which defines the true meaning of what shall be done as a fruit of our having lived to create a better future for coming generations than we shall have experienced for ourselves. This must be a greater power of our human species to bring into being a better future for mankind than we shall have experienced in our own lifetimes. Only mankind has access to active knowledge of its own delectable future.

That is the true principle of a science of political economy. In truth, there is no other true principle. All actually significant evil, assumes the form of a persisting effort to return to the condition of a life dictated by a stubborn past, as both slavery and other expressions of servitude, express a devotion to what is truly evil, the evil which is typified by the so-called "oligarchical

principle," or the inherent bestiality of the cultures of cannibalism.

Now, let us interrupt that part of that discussion at this moment, to bring another into tandem, such that both considerations may be combined.

II. The 'Prophet Bird': An Elegant Thought

Measuring practice against the scale of a likeness of clockwork, would be a doubtful proof of anything important for us in the present discussion. What is the relevant, compelling sense of order toward which I am pointing here? How is that order to be proven to be a correct, or, perhaps, a wrong choice?

There is a fundamental distinction to be emphasized respecting mankind's active, and, hence, valid notion of the existence of *a future*. The difference is illustrated by reference to that which lies between the notion of producing an event as such, and the fresh creation of a certain class of a new kind of event. As my associates and I have lately shared emphasis on this point for the case of Classical musical composition, I have added a special sort of requirement, that the best access to an actually scientific, and truly wonderful comprehension of that distinction, has been typified by what I have already referenced here, together with colleagues and others, earlier, as the succession of Johann Sebastian Bach, Arthur Nikisch, and Wilhelm Furtwängler.

Robert Schumann presents a particularly notable reference for matters of this specific quality, by his emphasis on “the species” of what he names as the “The Prophet Bird.” Here, we touch upon a deep meaning of the principle which unites Classical musical composition and physical science, each as inherently of a common species.

For example.

Truly Classical drama, when composed and performed as such, belongs, as least implicitly so, to the same category. The significance of the sometimes recurring use of the theme of the “Prophet Bird,” by Robert Schumann, is to be recognized as a kind of “return to the future,” which is already a definite kind of implied principle for Johann Sebastian Bach, and typical of all adequate performances of truly great Classical musical compositions.¹⁶ Such is the principle which was the same established by Bach’s conception of the role of the future in defining the necessary intention of musical composition. The idea of “going into the future,” is a characteristic distinction of the principle of human creativity, when it is treated as a universal principle presently unknown for any case but the human species.

This represents a sensitive problem of ordering for Classical musical compositions, such as those of Bach’s well-tempering, or the management of the relationship between earlier and later, in Furtwängler’s performances. The ostensibly formal (“beginning-to-end”) order in those, or related cases is relative, even if the intention of the composer’s score requires a somewhat more complex attitude of the performer toward the composer’s attitude toward the mental sense of the ordering of the ideas, than that of the performed score within the experiencing of a performance. The notes may seem to proceed in the order of the printed score, but the experience in the mind of the performer (and, hopefully, the audience, too) is an essential difference in the effect of what the quality of irony we might associate with that counterpoint is intended be: as by that intention of the composer of the score, which is intended to be imparted to the mind as in the meaning of the composer’s evolutionary design for a process of reciprocating development, as if returning, repeatedly, to sometimes almost impassioned attacks on the battle-

ments, repeatedly, so to harvest the fruit of a wonderful passion in a way beyond words as such. Hence, Classical song. For example: music whose meaning is to be located earlier in an element of surprise which takes over the intended meaning of the printed score.

Let us be prompted by such evidence, to bring into view, a fresh definition of human “immortality.” Admittedly, the use of the suggestion, to the effect that certain personalities from our past have been immortal, has been used in a way which is an abuse of a show of sentimentality. The only proper use, is one which springs from the notion of immortality as expressing a discovered principle of eternity, or, that which qualifies for reason of the fact that there is compelling evidence respecting principles of law in the universe, evidence which demands our attention to such discovered principles for the sake of humanity both presently and foreseeably beyond. The notion of Jesus Christ, is a prime example of the justified yearning for an—i.e., endless creation—as an immortality of principle, rather than merely impressive actions presented from the past.

It is only in the powerful notion of experiencing human immortality, that the purpose of great Classical poetry and music, and, in a different mode, great Classical sculpture and painting lies.

Having just said that much on that subject, the distinction of a qualified member of the species of human adult, is located in the fact of human creativity as a matter of an inhering principle of the worthy role in living by a member of our species. You can not punish the past; it has already escaped your reach. You can only prevent the recurrence of a past which should not have happened. All that might be properly said within such a context, is real. Even the dead are immortal, as the principle of valid, and false ideas demonstrates this point. There is a specific quality of permanence to time in our universe, as follows. My own poem’s “bending stars like reeds,” was and remains an illustration of the same principled intention. The poet’s use of the image of the churchyard serves a kindred intention.

“They Said: ‘God Is Dead!’”

In the competent practice of science, we have a record of the argument by Philo of Alexandria, against what he exposed as the fraudulent, typically Aristotelean principle of “God is dead.” Expedient varieties of notions of theology, which have come and gone, as if recurringly so, from time to time, must be put aside: the

16. Cf. The opening statement of the first movement of Robert Schumann’s Opus 14, for example. I will address this more fully in the concluding chapter.

universe is unbounded, and was forever, and the principles which it forever occupies are immortal, too, that for better, or for worse. There is no possible end to the universe.¹⁷

The issues on which that matter of Philo's thesis touches, have always been, within the scope of present knowledge since those times, reflections of what is rigorously defined as being "the oligarchical system," the same issue as associated with the legendary war between the evil of the ugly Olympian Zeus against the loving Prometheus and

Athena. The notion of this division of mankind in Hell from mankind in Heaven, has dominated virtually all of the legacy of actually known European civilization, in particular, with the included presumption that the end of the reign of an Olympian Zeus, were the end of history in some very ugly form. That specific tradition, plays an important, ugly role in our immediate present; the oligarchical tradition is, thus, the popular lie, that the end of the oligarchy, is the advent of some permanent Hell.

I have, naturally, a specifically, rather well-known, contrary view in such matters, and am therefore an active opponent of global thermonuclear warfare. I do have influential opponents in this matter; but, what sane person would desire that those opponents should be triumphant on that account?

The Consequently Leading Problem

We have a serious problem, which now needs to be overcome, and that urgently.

There has been little reason to suspect, hitherto, that our use of both language as such, and its correlatives as such, should be considered as a fountain of "wrongness." The present state of arrival of the pregnant threat of globally situated, general thermonuclear warfare, as occurring with the onset of U.S. President Barack Obama's launching of an unlawful, and mass-murder-

ous warfare into Libya, which expressed an evil Obama's intent to continue that deadly adventure with the same war launched by him into Libya, and now extended by him and his lackeys into Syria and Iran, has become, implicitly, the threat of the greatest crime against all mankind of this century: general thermonuclear warfare.

It could have been, that within the bounds of fair estimate, that the continuation of the unlawful war launched by Obama against Libya could become, readily, the chain-reaction thermonuclear warfare which ends the existence of the human species on Earth—or, actually will, if you insist on permitting a continuation of the present efforts pressing upon the membership of the United Nations Organization (UNO). It is, in practice, up to you to decide whether you permit such an awful catastrophe to be allowed; excuses in such matters could never be forgiven. Your threatened extinction hangs upon the combination of that relevant question and your answer now.

That is where we all are, presently, without personal exceptions.

I can imagine a cartoon depicting a smoking, human corpse, cusps of flame at the tips of his horns, being ushered into **The Inferno**. That corpse is shaking his flaming head, muttering, insolently still, "I do not believe this will happen." That is not a true story, of course. Hell is what a foolish mankind makes for itself by its compromises with the evil fantasy known as the game of "the oligarchical principle."

III. The Ultimate Irony: Metaphor

In a certain manner of speaking, all of mankind's literate prose, when taken by itself, is a lie, as a matter of principle. Therefore, we name it, in its rather commonplace sorts of opinion, as "literate." If it were not actually a falsehood (when taken literally), it would not be considered as civilized speech. Is this "crazy talk"? Not at all; all the greatest poets, musicians, and dramatists—but only exceptional ones—would agree: that is what would show them to have been actually "great" artists. Simply explained: the truth in putatively literate utterances lies, if at all, within the dialogue, not the mere statement; without the response, truth itself would be a lie composed of declarative statements of action. There would have been no meaningful transaction. Such is the secret genius of Classical artistic drama,

17. This must be said, since Philo's argument has been a traditional outlook, especially by the Christian and other opponents of Friedrich Nietzsche's "God is dead" thesis. What Philo did on this account, has been to focus on the evil of the Aristotelean argument for the case of "God is dead." What Philo attacked was the assertion attributed to Aristotle, that life on Earth could appear only when God, as Creator, were dead. That was very truly Aristotelean. The Aristotelean dogma is derived from the so-called "oligarchical principle" of the well-known poisoner and otherwise unscrupulous Aristotle himself. That notion of Aristotle's was central to the so-called "oligarchical principle" of the Roman Empire and that Empire's notable successors, including the monetarist form of oligarchical principle of the present day.



Wikimedia Commons/Marie-Lan Nguyen

"It is only in the powerful notion of experiencing human immortality, that the purpose of great Classical poetry and music, and, in a different mode, great Classical sculpture and painting" is to be found. Shown: The "Laocoön," a Roman copy of a Classical Greek sculpture (ca. 200 B.C.); it tells the story of a Trojan priest who is punished by the gods for warning the Trojans against accepting the Greek (Trojan) Horse.

poetry, and song. Without irony, there is no truth.

It is, of course, necessary that I explain this, as follows:

The Meaning of Metaphor

For the purposes of this present chapter of the report, reference Filippo Brunelleschi, Nicholas of Cusa, and their heir of principle, Johannes Kepler. Focus on Kepler's presentation of the working principle of "vicarious hypothesis," which found its root in the work of Brunelleschi and Cusa. Refer to such examples as Brunelleschi's discovery of the physical principle on which the crafting of the cupola of Florence's Santa Maria del Fiore, and Cusa's **De Docta Ignorantia** had depended. Locate *vicarious hypothesis* as a correlative of the scientific principle of *metaphor*. The more essential significance of the content of this present chapter of my report, will be located in the apparent ironies of the intentions of my denoted predecessors. This subject, subsumes the essential content expressed throughout

this present report, up to this specific point in the account.

Correcting the Essential Error

Excepting the greatest of mankind's known scientists, the prevalent tendency toward error is what is identified as an assigned "literal" meaning of words employed as the subject of statements. The uniquely original discovery of the principle of gravitation, by Johannes Kepler, is nothing as much as typical of insights corresponding to the root-content of that discovery.¹⁸ To be clear on this crucial point, consider the following.

In the process of "naming" a subject, the prevalent, ultimately absurd view has been the belief, that by naming what is identified as if it were an efficient object as such, that it should follow that we can attribute "properties" which are presumably "physically inherent" in the naming of the object.¹⁹ In a stricter standard for the practice of physical science (and relevant other matters) the object of what is merely sense-perception is properly treated as implicitly merely a shadow cast by an object which is not explicitly accessible to human sense-perception. It is treated, instead, as a metaphor.

For example, we do say, conventionally a "hot stove," thus escaping the implication of hotness as an object unto itself. In other words, we require a corrected notion, as if of an "influence," rather than a discrete form of object. This is made more emphatic in considering certain exceptional significant kinds of "hotnesses" such as those of the class of thermonuclear fusion and matter-antimatter. Hence, Kepler's "vicarious hypothesis." Hence, the distinction of "gravitation" is better than "gravity." Or, the generic "metaphor."

A closely related consideration appears in the work of Wolfgang Köhler's success in presenting his argu-

18. Isaac Newton discovered less than nothing. Notably, none of the alleged discoveries by Newton were real; the very notion of a "Newtonian science" was an utter fraud from inception.. The origin of the frauds generated over several recent centuries were chiefly hoaxes concocted in defense of the frauds of such as Aristotle and Euclid.

19. Hence, we have the particularly amusing ridicule of such notions of ontological properties of experiences, as the 1960 "Die Hauptsache is der Effekt" utterance of **Spukschloss im Spessart**. Anyone who appreciates the joke within the reported use of that passage within the drama, should, shall we say, "get the point."

ment on the nature of the human mind to Max Planck. The human mind has a universal characteristic, rather than an aggregation of elements. The influence of qualities upon one another, rather than the reductionist's notion of a collision of "things." "Souls" rather than "bodies."

What I have just summarized, should be more accessible as a notion of a "soul" rather than a "body." The body, for example, is prone to die; yet, the existence of the personality includes not only the effect of the personality which has lived, but the influence of ancestors on the individual's sense of personal identity. The recent case of the Mars landing of "Curiosity," is a suitable case-in-point. Consider the matter as follows.

The Defense of Earth

For a number of strong reasons, mankind can no longer tolerate the expected rates of incidence of meteorites and the like crashing into the surface of the Earth. At the same time that we are to be concerned by increased risks to humanity from the presently known evidence of such ongoing threats to life on Earth, there are indications of more serious calamities from this and other sources. One of the crucial differences between the present risks and those which have been experienced on Earth during earlier times, is that, now, we have the option of improvements in humanity's means to defend life on Earth against such calamities. That improvement was rooted during the middle to late 1970s, with the advances made in the combination of increasing feasibility provided by the 1970s and early 1980s development of strategic defense initiatives. Applying the principles of "SDI" to the mission of "SDE" ("Strategic Defense of Earth"), and now the installation of "Curiosity" on Mars, marks a condition in which it would be rightly considered a crime against all humanity not to develop these capabilities, as part of the Mars development program and the extension of SDI-like technologies on behalf of life on Earth.

The pattern of development of human capabilities within the "nearby" goals of space-exploration, brings into focus the notion that a human, either on Earth, or Mars, is capable of acting from based-locations, on a planet, or otherwise, to the effect that man-on-Earth, can direct a defense of Earth, either by means launched from Earth, or on behalf of Earth from Mars or comparable locations.

For example: it should be considered truthful to fore-

see, within a generation, or perhaps less, a rocket transport of persons, powered by controlled thermonuclear fusion, from Moon to Mars, within the passage of a week. With further progress in means, human beings can be in living transport at distances which would seem, today, beyond imagination, within our Solar system. In brief, the time and location in which one is situated within Solar space, and ultimately beyond, means a certain sense of conquest of space and time of the location from which a human individual can accomplish an efficient act within the inner reaches of our Solar system.

Then, think of the moral implications expressed in terms of mankind's powers to do good, in places to which a human passenger might travel, or might efficiently act to control developments within certain parts of our Solar system. The resulting shift in defining time and place of movements changes mankind's assessment of the effects of birth and death, and many other considerations.

Thus, from somewhere deep in our Solar system, we might think we hear a voice, or two, calling out: "Do it!"

A Strategic Defense of Humanity



Were the United States to eject Obama, and reciprocate Russia's offer for an SDE (Strategic Defense of Earth), we would not only avert the danger of thermonuclear war in the short term, but we would eliminate the reason for humanity to ever go to war again. Peace, is not the negation of conflict; it's an active commitment among all peoples to "the common aims of mankind."

An LPAC video presented by Natalie Lovegren (12 minutes).

<http://www.larouchepac.com/node/20616>

Obama's Next War?

Lyndon LaRouche and LaRouchePAC warned in early August, that Obama would take the opportunity of Congress leaving for Summer vacation, to move toward launching an illegal war against Syria. You thought that was “over the top.”

Now Obama is doing exactly what LaRouche warned against, defying the Joint Chiefs of Staff in their opposition to a war in defense of al-Qaeda in Syria, and ignoring Congress's Constitutional responsibility to decide on the waging war.

On Aug. 20, Obama made his first direct threat of military invasion of Syria, taking a page from Tony Blair's Iraq War script. You remember the false claims of Saddam Hussein's threat of biological and chemical weapons? Now we have the same coming from Obama on Syria. He is planning to go around Congress, *and* the United Nations.

Russia and China, which were meeting at a security conference in Moscow Aug. 21, responded immediately. Their joint statement reiterates their criteria for foreign policy: “strictly observing the norms of international law and the principles contained in the United Nations Charter.” That means respecting national sovereignty, without exception. Recall that last May 17, Russian Prime Minister Medvedev gave a speech in which he insisted on that principle, saying that its violation “can easily lead to full-scale regional wars, even—I am not trying to scare anyone here—with the use of nuclear weapons.”

At the same time, Obama has been exposed in the Israeli press as the prime mover behind Netanyahu's moves toward launching war against Iran—another violation of national sovereignty that would lead to confrontation with the Russians. In an interview with Leon Hadar, published in *The National Interest* Aug. 21, Aluf Benn, editor of *Ha'aretz*, contradicts the traditional line that

Obama opposes such a strike, and points to his leading role.

Hadar writes: “‘The conventional wisdom is that President Obama is opposed to an Israeli attack,’ Benn told me. . . . ‘But Obama has refrained from vetoing an Israeli action or threatening such a move with sanctions if Israel acts,’ Benn noted. ‘I believe that this is another example of Obama leading from behind, counting on Israel to do in Iran what the Brits and the French did in Libya,’ he concluded.”

As Benn implies, Obama's statement that he was “leading from behind” was pure subterfuge—as he directed that war, and the barbaric murder of the prisoner Qaddafi. Frustrated by his inability to move against Syria yet, Obama is headed toward war.

What is being played out is what LaRouche has asserted since Spring 2009: Obama is an Emperor Nero personality. He is moving toward thermonuclear war. LaRouche put it this way Aug. 20:

“And that's crucial, because this may be the extinction of civilization may occur. We have to remember, that we're on the verge of thermonuclear war, and as long as Obama remains a Presidential candidate, or nominee, the likelihood of thermonuclear war is great.

“Because Russia and China are not going to capitulate to the Obama regime, which means that Obama, if he's in charge, and if people are as cowardly among the citizens as I've found recently, then we will go to thermonuclear war, and that will be the extinction of humanity. . . . People who are patriots, have an obligation to make sure that Obama does not become President, and that's he's not nominated to become President, either.

“Only under those conditions do we have any assured hope of survival for mankind.”

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review


EIR Online

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review
June 22, 2012 Vol. 39 No. 25 www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

LaRouche: 'Beyond Sense-Perception'
Obama, Brits Escalate Confrontation with Russia
London's Hyperinflation Policy vs. Glass-Steagall

**Why the Empire Destroyed
The Second National Bank**



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 _____