

LAROUCHE EMERGENCY BROADCAST


Dump Obama; Bring on the World Economic Recovery!

Lyndon LaRouche made the following statement, followed by a dialogue with guests, on LPAC-TV, Dec. 23. The video is archived at <http://larouchepac.com/node/20916>.

Matthew Ogden: Hello, and welcome to an emergency broadcast from LPAC-TV. In the deadly conditions that we find ourselves in going into this holiday weekend, Mr. LaRouche has decided that it's of urgent necessity that he, personally, make a statement to the world. We will begin with his remarks, and then field a few questions from the live audience gathered here. So without further ado, I'd like to introduce to you, Lyndon LaRouche.

Lyndon LaRouche: What I am going to say is expert, but not officially secret. Many people may not know these things, but they're not secret in that sense.

We are now on the verge of what must be called World War III: This will be thermonuclear World War III—not pre-nuclear war, not nuclear war, but *thermonuclear* war. The targets, principally, are Russia and China. These are the two principal targets. The war is intended to start, as of now, with an operation coming out of Iran, and it will probably be set up in some form. This war targetting Iran, is supposed to bring Israel into play; that may or may not happen, but that is the option with which this war plan started.



LPAC-TV

“We are now on the verge of what must be called World War III: This will be thermonuclear World War III—not pre-nuclear war, not nuclear war, but thermonuclear war. The targets, principally, are Russia and China,” LaRouche warned, right at the outset, of his remarks.

The issue is as follows: The present world system, economic system, is in the process of disintegrating. Exactly how that will occur is uncertain, but it is happening. The intention is to eliminate two nations—Russia and China—and this means nuclear weapons; it means thermonuclear weapons. That part is engaged. Once the war starts, probably with an incident orchestrated in Iran, or against Iran, or something of that sort,

then Israel will come into play as starting the heavy fire, but in a limited way. Israel coming into the fire will trigger a set-up of thermonuclear World War III, in which the intended targets include Russia and China.

Now, at this point, the United States, nations of Europe, Russia, China, and other countries, are poised for exactly this war.

The background of the war is the fact that the entire world is going bankrupt, especially the trans-Atlantic region, especially Europe, and also the United States, and the nations of South America and elsewhere, as well. This war has been on the way since the beginning of President Obama's illegal war in Libya. This Libyan war was intended to set up the trigger for launching the larger war which would nominally involve nations such as Syria and other nations around there, but then with the attack on Iran, with the attack on Syria, it would bring into play Russia, because Russia would be, then, a major target. And Russia is prepared for this: Russia is the leading nuclear power, together with China, on the other side.

The major capability of conducting this war, depends upon the nuclear capabilities and related capabilities of the United States. European nations, such as Britain and so forth, are nuclear powers, but they don't have the depth of nuclear weaponry that we in the United States have. And therefore, the heavy burden of launching a nuclear war—or thermonuclear war, actually—depends upon the capabilities of the United States. And we, of course, have the naval forces of the United States in the eastern Mediterranean, and also in the Persian Gulf area now, staged to actually unleash a thermonuclear capability against the targeted enemies for this attack, which are Russia and also China, but other targets as well.

So this will be, essentially, if it goes, *a worldwide thermonuclear war*, in which the U.S. thermonuclear capabilities are a crucial factor. That means, that if President Obama were to be removed from office, *on grounds of his known insanity*, under Section 4 of the 25th Amendment of the Federal Constitution—if he were eliminated from that, *the war would be off!* If he remains in office, it is probable that the war, the thermonuclear war, will occur. That's the general situation.

Bankruptcy of the Trans-Atlantic System

The other part of the background, is—and there's a lot of foolery in this as well—that the trans-Atlantic region of the world is now bankrupt. The bankruptcy

from the United States' standpoint, was set into motion back in 2007, when the beginning of the bailout process was set into motion. Since that time, the entirety of the trans-Atlantic region, particularly the United States and Europe, have been trapped into a bailout crisis, a hyperinflationary bailout crisis. At this point, the debt which has been accumulated since 2007, under this program, is such that every part of Europe at this time, under the present rules and the present arrangements, is *hopelessly bankrupt! They could never recover as living nations, under the present degree of indebtedness they have.* The same thing is true of the United States; Europe is a little more acute. That's what's happened.

Therefore, if we were to remove an insane President of the United States, Barack Obama, from his position, under the terms of Section 4 of the 25th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, and also other measures, because he has violated the law—he's impeachable on the basis of his violations—if he is removed from office, it is almost certain that this great war now threatening us, would be called off. Because if the United States forces are not committed to support the thermonuclear war, which the British Empire has orchestrated and set into motion, then they could not conduct the war.

So the fate of civilization now depends upon the hope that President Barack Obama will be removed from office, or suspended from office and then removed, on the basis of his insanity, under Section 4 of the 25th Amendment of the Constitution, *and* impeachable offenses which he's also guilty of! But the main thing is, *get him out of office*, or you're going to see the world plunge into Hell! And there's nothing in sight that's going to stop that, *if he remains in office.*

The author of this thing is the British, but we've had President Bush, the young President Bush, and we've had now, with Obama, for nearly 12 years in office; and in these 12 years, the wreckage that has been done to or made of the U.S. and Europe has brought us to this point, with the aid of this hyperinflationary process, set into motion, beginning in the Autumn of 2007. That's where we stand.

Now, what we have to do—there are solutions for this bankruptcy. First of all, we have to put the world through bankruptcy, that is, a legitimate bankruptcy operation. We can do that, by, first of all, in the United States, for example—and other nations can copy this measure in cooperation with the United States—we go with a *Glass-Steagall law*, a U.S. *Glass-Steagall law*. And there are nations of Europe who are thinking of



EIRNS



EIRNS/Julien Lemaitre

Under a Glass-Steagall law, LaRouche explained, the greater part of the debt of the debt of the European nations, and the United States will be wiped out. It will then become possible to establish a Hamiltonian credit system, and to organize a financial recovery. Shown: organizing for Glass-Steagall in Berlin, Germany (left), and Aix-en-Provence, France (above).

adopting the same Glass-Steagall law.

Under a Glass-Steagall law, the greater part of the debt of European nations, and the United States and others, will be wiped out, in effect, because under Glass-Steagall, the gambling debts, which are the major part of the indebtedness of the United States, will be simply put into a special category where somebody's going to try to figure out how to get these debts paid—and they will never be paid! They will simply be wiped off the books; there's no other solution.

Wiping that debt off the books, cancelling the bailout debt, will mean that the United States, and Europe if they join, will be in a position to reorganize their finances, to create a credit system, and actually going into a new kind of Hamiltonian kind of credit system, a banking system, which will enable the United States, and also Europe if they join, and other nations, to organize a financial recovery.

In other words, what would happen, immediately: Remember, most of this bailout debt, the Wall Street debt, the London debt, the other bailout debt, is absolutely worthless! *It can never be repaid!* It never could be repaid: And the only solution, of course, for this thing, was to have this war. And if the British Empire

came out as the victor in such a war, with the support of the United States, then they would cancel their debts, and they would go about their business. But, the population of the world would be reduced, greatly, through hunger, starvation, and so forth, which is about to occur anyway.

A Recovery Program for the World

So therefore, our objective is not merely to stop the war—that's the first thing—but also to stop the great world depression, which is a very important thing to do; but then, we have to have a recovery program for the world, an economic recovery program. That is possible.

For example, we have, in the United States, one great project ready to go, in terms of design and so forth: NAWAPA, the North American Water and Power Alliance. This project would be the key for prompting *a great and rapid recovery of the U.S. economy*. Which would mean productive jobs, not make-work jobs, productive jobs; it would mean new industries coming back into play on the basis of a Franklin Roosevelt type of recovery. Europe would obviously join in this, or most of them would join in this operation.

So therefore, we have these two choices: Now, if



LPAC

In the United States, we have one great project ready to go: NAWAPA, the North American Water and Power Alliance, LaRouche said. "This project would be the key for prompting a great and rapid recovery of the U.S. economy."

Obama stays in office, and stays in power—and I don't think he's about to give up his insanity, he's too much attached to it—getting rid of Obama opens up the gates. You have to make sure he's not killed, because that would also trigger a chaos factor we must not have. But he's got to be put some place in safety, where he no longer is running the United States as a dictator. And once that happens, then, since the war will be called off, we'll be in a position to start the recovery.

The other problem in the recovery will be the following: What has happened recently, especially since the assassination of John F. Kennedy, and then his brother Robert, there was a change, a downward movement in the U.S. economy, and a loss of much of the character of our nation, of the United States, in this process.

And what we have to do now, is actually get rid of this Green policy. Because, at present, if you look at your figures and look at the situation, the food supply in the United States and in Europe is in desperate condition, and as long as this policy, the economic policy, the Green policy, and so forth, remain in power, there will be mass death in the United States and Europe, because we're on the verge of a food shortage, beyond belief. We would have to take immediate measures now, to begin to remedy the food shortage in the United States, Europe, and so forth. Those measures are necessary.

Now, the other aspect of this thing, you're talking

about Russia, China, India, and so forth—Asia: The Asian part of the world is not in the terrible condition, relatively speaking, which the trans-Atlantic part of the world is in, and that is why Asia is the target. Because when the British Empire, and its associates, are headed for the destruction of the trans-Atlantic region of the world economy, as well as a lot of people, that would mean leaving Russia, China, and so forth, in the position of the dominant nations of the world, and that's what this war is all about! The determination is to eliminate China,

Russia, India, and so forth, as nations, as powers, in order to carry out the destruction, successfully, of the nations of the trans-Atlantic region. That's where we are.

So therefore, what we have to orient toward, is the idea of doing exactly the opposite.

We have reached a point, that we, together with Russia and China, are moving with an orientation toward, of all places, the Arctic, for a worldwide economic recovery. Now, as was pointed out by some specialists of our organization recently, the reason for the disappearance of some of the ice in the Arctic region, is that the ice stayed up there, and didn't move down into the oceans; therefore, the failure of the ice to eliminate itself in the normal way in the Arctic, meant there was an accumulation of this ice in the Arctic region.

Recently, the big ice pack, according to our experts, who reported this business, the ice pack has now begun to move away from the Arctic! The ice simply slid away, and went downstream into the Atlantic and Pacific Ocean! Now, you have a warming tendency, in terms of weather conditions, in the Arctic. Suddenly, the Arctic, which has been frozen territory for a long time, is now becoming de-iced in significant degree.

Now, the development of the world, is moving toward opening up what has been the Arctic region, for a change in the general direction of the world's economy. Russia is the leader in that. Canada and the United

States, particularly Alaska, are potentially the leaders in such a recovery. If we then, at the same time, go back to the space program, which means the Mars goal program among other things, then we're on the road toward a new situation for people on this planet, in general, and for this region.

So we've reached that point.

So therefore, the point is this—and while I'm not, as I said before, I'm not telling any absolute secrets, that I know to be secrets, although I did get a lot of information in terms of my function—but we're at the point where we can escape this problem, we can escape this depression: We can save civilization, with prospects of good things to come. But if we don't remove this President from office, this *insane President*, who is suited to be removed from office on the basis of his *insanity*, and Section 4 of the 25th Amendment provides, specifically, the means to do that: *He fits all the standards for expulsion from office, right now!* And his expulsion from office, now, might save the world from a thermo-nuclear war, and could probably save much of the world economy.

That's where we stand at this time, in short.

Dialogue with LaRouche

Ogden: Good. Thank you, very much.

Just to underscore what you ended with, I think to make the point that there is no guarantee of war avoidance, despite all of the diplomacy, unless we remove Obama from office. I wanted to see if you could elaborate a little bit about the point that you've made, about the fact that Obama was placed in office from the beginning, by the British, by George Soros, by others, with the intention of starting this war.

Coincidentally, I actually was looking back at a short statement that you issued in August of 2008, right on the eve of the Democratic National Convention: It was called "A Tale of Two Generations,"

(<http://www.larouchepac.com/node/6753>) and it's worth looking at, because it's almost prophetic in its content. It was during the 2008 convention, but it was also during the provoked confrontation between Georgia and Russia, in South Ossetia. And you said at that point, that because of the rejection of your HBPA of 2007-2008, the world economy was collapsing and the British Empire had no other option than to go for a thermo-nuclear confrontation.

LaRouche: Yes.

Ogden: And so, the context was, they placed this guy Obama in office *from the beginning*, to start this war, and I think that makes it very clear, why *only* by removing him from office now, can we end this war.

Brits in the Bushes

LaRouche: I would add, you have to look at George W. Bush, Jr. Because even though he didn't have the brains to be such a menace, he did have people working with him who were specialized in brutality and similar kinds of things.

And to understand this situation, you have to look at U.S. politics in a special light: that the way in which Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany, was largely from London. It was the British monarchy that brought Hitler into power originally. He was their puppet. He didn't work out as well for them as they intended, but he was their puppet.

Now, the man who actually put Hitler into power in



The Bush family have been British assets, LaRouche stated, beginning with Hitler-backer Prescott Bush: "They are the kind of people that Benjamin Franklin wanted to kick out of the country: Put 'em on a boat back to England. But they kept them here; that was a big mistake." Above: Prescott and George H.W.; right: George W. Bush.



White House/Eric Draper

Germany, was a Bush—hmm? Prescott Bush! And Prescott Bush was the one who personally moved the money into Germany, to bail out Adolf Hitler, when Hitler was about to be excluded from politics on the basis of being bankrupt.

So, it was the Bush family, all the way through, from Prescott Bush through the other Bushes, who have been a key part, *as British assets*, just plain British assets! They're all British assets—well, of course, the younger Bush is a little bit missing a few things up here [*LaRouche points to his head*—but they really are not patriotic Americans. They belong to the British side, the kind of people that Benjamin Franklin wanted to kick out of the country: Put 'em on a boat back to England. But they kept them here; that was a big mistake.

But this element, this British element, which is tied to Wall Street, the Boston banks, and so forth, the British element of finance, which is an extension of London finance, has been the key problem here. And so, that's the source of the war.

We have to, in a sense, recognize that. We have to recognize that since the assassination of Kennedy: Look at the Kennedy assassination, for example, because, you know, we think in terms of something happening in terms of our lifetime, and we don't realize how much history is inside us. We don't realize how many Presidents in the United States were actually British assets, for example, and we had a see-saw battle between getting a patriotic President and a British-owned President, throughout our history, and the Bushes are part of that process.

But the way this happened: We had Franklin Roosevelt, who was the man who saved the United States and saved civilization, through his Presidency. Then he died, and we got a Wall Street character, Truman, in as President, who tried to change everything. Then we got disgusted with Truman, because he was a disgusting person, and we got Eisenhower, who was really an authentic hero, but with a damaged nation on his hands, and did the best he could to save the nation.

Fortunately, Eisenhower was followed by Kennedy, by John F. Kennedy. Kennedy was actually saving the nation, with his programs. And his brother Robert, who was later about to be nominated as the candidate for the Presidency in the election—so, the two Kennedys were killed. The killing of John F. Kennedy, which was a British operation: He was doing things the British hated, and he was eliminated for that reason.

And his successor Johnson was a scared bunny. And Johnson admitted it. Johnson said, they're going to get me next if I do anything of the sort that Kennedy was doing. So, Johnson went along with the war, which Kennedy was preventing. And that's why Kennedy was killed, because he was preventing what the British intended, the long Indo-China War. And Kennedy was acting under the advice of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who laid down a policy which Kennedy had supported, and it was the same policy as Eisenhower's policy.

So, we were drawn into ten years of a long war, from which we have never returned, the Indo-China War.

So, therefore, we have inside us, in the United States, we have an Anglophile—you might call it British lovers, or Queen lovers or something—which has always been toward the British side, and trying to destroy the United States, just the same way that the British organized the Confederacy to destroy the United States. And every other kind of treason.

You can say that George W. Bush, if he had the brains to be traitor, would be a traitor. And this creep we have as President now—I'm not sure he was actually honestly elected. I'm not sure he had the honest votes. I certainly know that the financing of his campaign, which was *by* the British Empire—he was put into power by the British Empire. He's controlled by the British Empire. He's our enemy from within, but he's clinically insane.

So, therefore, we should remove him from office under those conditions: that he's clinically insane. Once he's out of office, I can assure you, from what I know, even though we have a mass of cowardly members of Congress—and some of them are cowardly because they're frightened, and they are legitimately frightened—but, we get rid of this guy, out of office; put him in some safe place where he's not harmed, because we don't want that complication in this thing. Under that case, we, the United States, will find that we have natural allies, in nations *including* Russia, and *including* China, cooperation with India, and other nations. We can turn this thing around immediately, because the American people are ready to be turned around right now.

Yes, they're scared. Yes, they're afraid to do things. Yes, this, yes that. It's all true. But it's those of us who are *not* scared—that is, not scared enough to quit, which is why I'm in that category—if we're back in position, and the American people know that they've got *us* as

leaders, not this bunch, then we can make it.

We will find natural allies, not only in Europe, in general, but in Russia—the door is open. In China, the door is open. Japan, the door is open. India, the door is open. We will create immediately, such a bloc of cooperation among leading nations of the world, that this evil that threatens us now, can be removed from us.

Now I don't know all the details of the plans, but I know the plan. That's my business. I know the plan. And we get this man out of office, this fake President out of office, this insane man, who doesn't belong in office! He's nuts, he's insane, criminally insane. Get him out of office, and let the right people in the United States take charge, as they should. Get some guts back into members of our Congress, and we're on the road to recovery.

Because of the shock of what's happened to us—we've come so close to virtual extermination of civilization, we're scared enough—I think we're willing to change.

Natural Alliances

Oyang Teng: I'd like to follow up on this concept of natural alliances. I think it's useful to remember that your first Presidential campaign was done as an effort to stop thermonuclear war with the Soviet Union, under the Trilateral Commission around Jimmy Carter, at that time, around 1976. In the years following that, you proposed what became known, and adopted by President Reagan, as the Strategic Defense Initiative for war avoidance, but uniquely, war avoidance driven by a strategic understanding of the principles of physical economy: the idea that by investing jointly, and mutually, in front-end technologies, as a science-driver policy, that you would actually raise the technological and cultural level of both the United States and the Soviet Union; that you would shift the entire strategic posture of the world. You would create, in effect, a new world.

Today, we find ourselves in a somewhat parallel situation, only it's now coming from the Russian side—the proposal for what's being called the Strategic Defense of Earth—an elaboration of your original SDI, which calls for expanding the protective umbrella to include not just missile defense, but also defense against extraterrestrial threats. Again, it contains within it the

Friday 30 December 2011

Dmitry Medvedev 'interested' in anti-ballistic missiles proposal

This online supplement is produced and published by Rossiyskaya Gazeta (Russia), which takes sole responsibility for the content.



Star Wars revisited: Strategic Defence of Earth echoes Reagan's SDI plan Photo: AP

Alexander Gabuyev, Kommersant

2:48PM GMT 31 Oct 2011

A new anti-ballistic missiles proposal promises protection from asteroid strikes as well as missiles, according to Russia's ambassador to Nato.

Share:   

Recommend

Tweet: 2

Kommersant

*Russia's proposal for a Strategic Defense of Earth, reviving the LaRouche/Reagan SDI proposal of the 1980s, is intended not only as a missile defense system, but a protection from extraterrestrial threats as well. Shown: coverage of the Russian proposal in **Kommersant** online, Oct. 31, 2011.*

seeds of the same sort of physical economic revolution that you had explicitly designed within the SDI.

So, I'd like you to just elaborate on what is, what should be, the natural alliance, particularly based on these kinds of physical economic considerations, of the United States with these large Asian and Eurasian nations, and Russia in particular.

LaRouche: The first thing you have to take into account is that what was true in the 1970s, already, was that, with the existence of nuclear arsenals of the type we had then, and the delivery capabilities that existed at that time—that the idea of a new world war at that time, in the '70s, was clinically insane.

Now, that threat continued. There was a massive British effort to shut that down, to shut down what we had planned as the Strategic Defense alliance. Nonetheless, the problems continued. The danger of nuclear weapons, and thermonuclear weapons, increased. And if they exist, and war exists among major nations, those weapons are going to be *used!* And similar kinds of

weapons—biological weapons and so forth, the whole kit and kaboodle.

So therefore, we've come to a period of life, in which it is no longer possible to allow general warfare to occur on this planet. Now, with thermonuclear capabilities, and related capabilities which exist, it is no longer feasible to tolerate general warfare on this planet. Which means that the long legacy, the oligarchical legacy of great warfare, must come to an end.

At the same time, we're entering a new kind of problem. It's an old problem, but it's a new one for us. We've now reached the point that we must, for example, reach Mars; a manned landing and development on Mars is now a signal of the end of warfare on this planet. Not because it's going to cause the end of warfare, but it means a change in the way we think, of the necessary type.

We know now that the Solar System, which is a part of the galaxy, is entering an arm of the galaxy which is going to become extremely dangerous for human life. That is, the degree of radiation, density of radiation, and types of radiation we have to expect in the area we're getting into now, is a threat to us.

What we have to do, is we have to actually begin to get some colonization, particularly on Mars—Mars is the most important case—in which we start to build up defenses against this problem. Not a warfare problem, but a natural problem. And that's the point we've come to.

So, this becomes now our new destiny. We have to think differently. We don't want to think any more about war. Yes, we want nation-states, because national cultures are important. Human culture and its development in the language-cultures, and so forth, these are things we have to defend and preserve. And we have to have national sovereignty. Otherwise, we really don't have democracy, without sovereignty.

So therefore, our direction has to change to a science-driver program, away from this Green nonsense, which is going to kill us. That means we're going to have to go to Mars. We're going to have to do the things that enable us to put people, live human people, staying alive, on Mars. And that's going to be part of our job in building up the defenses within the Solar System and beyond, which are necessary to deal with this galactic threat; which we will be able to deal with, with scientific progress.

We have to end zero growth. Because the only way we can continue to defend human life's existence on

this planet now, with the increasing density of radiation which the Solar System, including Earth, is going to experience in the galaxy, the arm of the galaxy we're entering now, is to develop the highest possible technology, which will enable us to maintain and develop the defenses of human life within the Solar System itself, against this development that's coming from the galactic source.

So therefore, our orientation has to be a new orientation for mankind, for the human species, which must *include* things like the colonization of Mars. Now it's going to be a tricky thing, but with a higher technology, we can do it. So therefore, we have to go to higher objectives, new objectives, to replace the old business of warfare.

How Does Man's Mind Work?

Ogden: Well, I think it's very provocative that you said that a colonization of Mars program will indicate the end of wars on Earth because of the change of the way that man thinks about man. And you've just issued a new report, called "Reflections on Nicholas of Cusa" [*EIR*, Dec. 23, 2011], and in that report, in the context of the collapse of the Roman imperial system, with the Dark Age of the 14th Century, you have one mind, the mind of Nicholas of Cusa [in the 15th Century], addressing this very question: the way that man thinks of man. And so many of the pathologies that we have associated with the existentialism of today, come from a location of identity within the five senses, both in terms of what's happening, and also in terms of our situation in time, so-called, in terms of our experience of the "today."

And I was wondering if you can say a little bit more about the role of a Nicholas of Cusa in the context of the Dark Age that we're experiencing today?

LaRouche: Well, the problem is, we are so accustomed to certain conventional ideas about man and similar kinds of things, scientific kinds of things, that we fail to realize that what we call our sense perceptions, are really not what they're cracked up to be. And therefore, we have to come to a new understanding about how the human mind works.

I'm working on this, particularly this. This is my lifelong project right now. And this does lend itself to exactly solving these kinds of problems. It's going to be a fundamental change in the way people think about themselves, and about society, but it's the natural way they should come to think about this thing.

Therefore, we've come to a time of crisis in which the alternative to the crisis itself, pushes us in the direction of thinking about, how does man's mind work? How is man capable of understanding the universe in such a way that we're capable of using our minds, to develop the technologies, and the method of using those technologies, which we need now?

The time has come for mankind to grow up, get out of childhood, and come into the role of man, as man in the Solar System, man dealing with the galaxy which we inhabit, and looking beyond that, to other galaxies. Because we know now that it's possible for mankind to become a significant force in this galaxy and beyond, and the colonization of Mars, which is a feasible project for undertaking; it will come step-by-step—accelerating—but that project will mean a new future for mankind. And instead of playing with these old toys of war and stupidity, spend a little more effort on the future of mankind.

And Cusa would love that.

Principle, Not Party

Teng: Lyn, I'd like to ask a question pertaining to the field strategy for this war against the British Empire. We have a slate of six candidates, Congressional candidates for Federal office, and you had mentioned in a recent national webcast address, that we're way past the time where party politics has any meaning, and any effectiveness. You had laid out a strategy for a bipartisan alternative, in a context of getting rid of this current President, through Constitutional means.

You had put that forward not as some kind of electoral strategy, but really, as a necessary step to allow people to actually deal with universal principles. To be able to discuss policy at the level of principle, rather than party.

So, I was hoping maybe you could speak to that perspective, in the context of our fight to free the country from this blight called Obama.

LaRouche: Actually, partisan politics has always been a dubious prospect in our history. The idea that



LPAC-TV

"If someone's running for national office—say, as a Senator or Congressman," LaRouche advised, "he [or she] should be concerned with a policy question which defines the partisanship, not have the partisanship come first, and the intention second." Here, LaRouche Democratic candidate for Congress in New Jersey, Diane Sare, campaigns to dump Obama, Dec. 22, 2011.

there are questions of ideas, differing ideas and that sort of thing, is not the problem. What the problem is, when you make a ritual, sort of a cult-like thing, of political parties, which *have no principle*. They have slogans. They have habits. But there is no principle.

The question is: I will line up with this guy, in order to screw this guy. And that's what party politics has come to.

Now, I'm not against party politics; I'm against unprincipled party politics. I think where there's a clear issue of principle in terms of national policy, within the framework of our Constitutional intention, but within that framework, as opposed to the Confederacy's idea, fine! You have people who ally, in a form of partisanship, on issues which they think they must present. But the unprincipled thing of saying, "Well, what is going to be our principle this year, for this election campaign?" This is nonsense. And, you know, Democrats and Republicans—it's really not a moral set of categories. It's more opportunist than moral.

So, therefore, the problem we dealt with in terms of this election campaign season, was to say that running as candidates on the name of a party ticket is not the way politics should be run. Divisions in politics should go on the basis of principles, not these kinds of party tickets. And not these inventions.

So, therefore, if someone's running for national office—say, as a Senator or Congressman—he should be concerned with a policy question which *defines* the partisanship, not have the partisanship come first, and the intention second. First must come the intention. And if people are working on the intention, then they're going to concentrate on trying to realize the intention.

Of course, there are things like sectional problems, and sectional partisanship is not a bad thing necessarily, if it's done in the proper form. But the way we were treating party, as such, as the principle, rather than principle as the basis for party, is what the mistake is. And at this point, we have a lot of good Republicans and a lot of good Democrats out there, in terms of partisanship. They are perfectly good people. *But!* What we get now, is, now partisanship then becomes the game. And it comes in state politics, on the national level, state and national politics and so forth, and this is absolutely ridiculous! There is no principle!

Therefore, the citizen does not know what a principle is, in terms of party vote. They vote party, not principle! And what should happen is, principle should control party. If there's a difference in principle, that is, national principle, there's a difference in party, and the party principle is a way of fighting out these differences.

But an unprincipled sort of politics, an unprincipled kind of partisanship, is proving itself to be extremely destructive! The most recent election was an absolute abomination! *There was absolutely no principle worth calling a principle in the whole shebang!* You may have had people, as individual politicians, who had principle, and a respectable principle.

My view is simply that, today, in this coming year's general election, principle, not party, must dominate. And therefore, those who are members of parties should vote the principle, and vote the principle of the ticket, not the partisanship, as such.

Ogden: And I think the cross-party principle is absolutely clear, right now. I mean, you have Hitler in the White House, you have this bill that was just passed in

the name of the Defense Authorization Act, which is a Hitler Enabling Act, for Barack Obama. Anybody, an American citizen, now, can be grabbed off the street, and imprisoned without trial—"disappeared."

So, I think the principle is quite clear, around which both parties have to come together. And I think, in terms of a conclusion for what we are gathered here today, for what you stated in the beginning: that there is no option to avoid thermonuclear war, perhaps even before Christmas, or in the week between Christmas and the New Year, unless we remove Barack Obama from office. That's the point that people have to come away with.

And I think if people are willing to join us in our mobilization this weekend, we have material on the website, we have a [leaflet](#) that can be printed out, distributed; we have currently, a mobilization happening on five continents, on this planet, which we're covering on this website.

So, you can stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](#). We're going to be on watch and we'll be in full mobilization. So, I'd like to thank you all for watching, and stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](#).



LPAC-TV Weekly Report

Each Wednesday afternoon, Lyndon LaRouche sits down with LPAC-TV Weekly Report host John Hoefle and two guests from the "Basement" scientific team and/or the LaRouchePAC editorial staff, for an in-depth discussion of the most important issues of the week, be they political, economic, strategic, or scientific.

www.larouchepac.com