

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

May 23, 2014 Vol. 41 No. 21

www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

Charles of Arabia: The British Monarchy, Saudis, 9/11
With Obama Sinking, What Will London Do Next?
China Rail: Girdling the Globe with a Tramway of Iron

**What It Will Take Mankind
To Get to a World Without War**



Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: *Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.,
Antony Papert, Gerald Rose, Dennis Small,
Nancy Spannaus, Jeffrey Steinberg, William
Wertz*

Editor: *Nancy Spannaus*

Managing Editors: *Bonnie James, Susan Welsh*

Technology Editor: *Marsha Freeman*

Book Editor: *Katherine Notley*

Graphics Editor: *Alan Yue*

Photo Editor: *Stuart Lewis*

Circulation Manager: *Stanley Ezrol*

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Counterintelligence: *Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele
Steinberg*

Economics: *John Hoefle, Marcia Merry Baker,
Paul Gallagher*

History: *Anton Chaitkin*

Ibero-America: *Dennis Small*

Russia and Eastern Europe: *Rachel Douglas*

United States: *Debra Freeman*

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Bogotá: *Javier Almarino*

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: eirms@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, Calz de los Gallos 39 interior 2,
Col Plutarco E Calles,
Del. Miguel Hidalgo, CP 11350,
Mexico, DF. Tel 5318-2301, 6306-8363, 6306-8361

Copyright: ©2014 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 Editors

This issue of EIR Online proceeds from Lyndon LaRouche's evaluation, in his May 16 webcast, that we have entered a transitional period, in which Obama is slated to fade from the scene, and the basis for a new era of global prosperity can be established (*Feature*). Of particular significance in this period, is LaRouche's highlighting of the potential roles of former President Bill Clinton and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, especially in light of comments made by the former President in Washington May 14. We recommend that you study this webcast closely for guidance as to how a successful transition can be organized, including LaRouche's four-point program.

Several other developments coming together to shape a hopeful future are also featured. Under *Economics*, we highlight more on the Chinese Silk Road perspective, which now includes the Bering Strait tunnel. Under *International*, we provide our expert analysis of the Indian elections, which hold promise for further development of Asian economic cooperation. On the U.S. side, Jeffrey Steinberg reviews the progress of moves to finally get Obama out of office, and we give you a first-hand view of how Senate candidate Keshia Rogers is preparing the shock that could move us more rapidly into the post-Obama era.

The obstacle to these hopeful dynamics, of course, remains the British financial empire, led by its Satanic Queen. Our feature on the long-term relationship between her son and presumptive heir Prince Charles and the terrorist-supporting Saudi kingdom will give you a surprising insight into some of the operations of that empire, and reinforce our assertion that it is the British Empire itself which is the great evil that must be destroyed, if mankind is to survive.

In that light, we should note that, as we go to print, the British monarchy has once more opened attacks on organizations associated with Lyndon LaRouche, both in Germany and the United States. In a statement issued May 20, LaRouche stated that these attacks signal that the Queen and the British Empire are now going to attack LaRouche directly, and that the next stage of world war is now beginning. The assaults, which include sabotage of websites and preposterous legal charges, show hysteria on the part of the monarchy against the role LaRouche and his associates are playing—as in 1999, when a British magazine carried a cover feature with a picture of LaRouche next to the title “Shut This Man's Mouth,” and quoted unnamed British sources claiming the monarchy was determined to do so.

Indeed, this Empire is on the skids, and ripe to be destroyed.

Cover This Week

From the top down: U.S. and Russian crewmembers in the Spacelab module aboard the Space Shuttle Atlantis, in 1995. The American and Russian flags are displayed above.



NASA

4 LaRouche Webcast: What It Will Take Mankind To Get to a World Without War

Lyndon LaRouche's May 16 webcast, in which he offers sometimes surprising answers to questions, such as: "What are your thoughts on what kind of Presidency you would envision under Hillary Clinton?"; Kesha Rogers asks how to develop the ability among our fellow citizens to think, not just for today, but for the future; "How can we imagine the future, in which the United States is integrated into the high-technology, high energy-flux-density development, that's now beginning in Eurasia?"; and, "What is the strategic significance of the replacement of science with mathematics," given that the universe is a developing, changing system?

16 Appendix: Bill Clinton Poses a Critical Issue

An excerpt from the former President's May 14 interview with Gwen Ifill on PBS-TV.

International

18 With Obama Sinking, What Will London Do Next?

With President Obama facing challenges to his legitimacy on every front, from Congressional hearings on Benghazi to Russian President Putin's checkmate of the attempt to get a war going in Ukraine, the question of impeachment looms large, as does the blowout of the London-Wall Street imperial financial system. So, what's next?

20 Indian Elections: Young Voters Demand Development, Elect Modi

India's Prime Minister-elect Narendra Modi has an overwhelming mandate to bring real economic development to this nation of 1.3 billion, following elections which saw unprecedented participation by young voters. But will he be able to deliver?

24 A Fundamental Law: Blueprint for a European Government Under Imperial Rule

A scheme to bring in the final phase of a Euro-dictatorship, eliminating whatever shards of sovereignty might still exist among the nations of Europe, is being put in place, while nobody is looking.

25 Spinelli, Bertelsmann: Tools of the Empire

Economics

27 **China High-Speed Rail: Girdling the Globe with a Tramway of Iron**

China's "going-out strategy" of spanning the Earth with high-speed rail is a rebirth of the idea of Lincoln's Transcontinental Railroad, and Russia's Trans-Siberian Railway. Not one, but two Iron Silk Roads are envisioned, inclusive of the long-dreamed-for Bering Strait crossing.

30 **Finally, a Bering Strait Tunnel?**

32 **Globalization Makes You Sick! WHO Warns of Drug-Resistant Bacteria**

The World Health Organization (WHO) released an alarming report in April about the increase of drug-resistant pathogens, documenting that cases have been registered in 36 countries, where antibiotics no longer have any effect.

National

34 **Rogers Campaign Organizes for a Post-Obama Future**

On the eve of the May 27 Texas Democratic primary runoff against a Wall Street-made millionaire, LaRouche Democrat Kesha Rogers is breaking all the politics-as-usual rules, and striking a chord with voters.

37 **VA Scandal Spotlights Bush/Obama Killer Takedown of Medical Capacity**

Behind the shocking headlines about corruption at the Veterans Administration, is the reality that it is the Bush-Cheney-Obama illegal wars of the past decade, combined with the destruction of medical care for all Americans, including our veterans, that is responsible for the atrocious situation at the VA.

Counterintelligence

41 **Charles of Arabia: The British Monarchy, Saudi Arabia, and 9/11**

The incestuous relationship between Saudi Kingdom and the British Monarchy, as one extended British Empire, and its role in the case of terrorism, including 9/11, is examined, with a spotlight on two aspects of the 9/11 attack which have not been adequately exposed until now: first, the close personal relationship between the British and Saudi royal families; and second, the role of a consortium of Saudi banks and charitable organizations in providing financial and logistical support to the al-Qaeda terrorist network. In this issue, we publish the first of two parts of this report.

Editorial

49 **Memorial Day 2014: 'Our Unfinished Work'**

LAROUCHE WEBCAST

What It Will Take Mankind To Get to a World Without War

Lyndon LaRouche's regular Friday evening webcast of May 16, 2014 was hosted by Matthew Ogden and Megan Beets. It can be viewed at <http://larouchepac.com/node/30797>.

Matthew Ogden: I would like to begin with our first question. This is from an institutional contact: “Mr. LaRouche, there are obviously many very pressing and immediate issues that you are concerned with—from the trans-Atlantic financial and economic crisis, to the ongoing events in Ukraine and other flashpoints for possible war. But we want to get your thoughts on a future pending situation. As you well know, Hillary Clinton is seriously contemplating a run for the Democratic Party’s Presidential nomination for 2016. If she does decide to run, she will have a serious chance of winning both the nomination and the general election. Our question is speculative, but we are anxious to get to know your thoughts on what kind of Presidency you would envision under Hillary Clinton.”


Lyndon LaRouche: Well, there’s more to it than this. This is a complex question. It can be made simple, but in the nature of things now, where we’re in a transitional phase, this introduces a new phase of consideration among the other two. The first phase is, we’re now still in the Obama phase. The Obama phase really is not connected to what will happen next. But in the meantime, the question of getting rid of Obama is on the

table. Bill Clinton has made a statement, a very carefully formulated statement, which would, in effect, create a situation under which Hillary Clinton could become President, but Bill Clinton himself would be the key figure for back-up, which would organize everything which would make that feasible. Because Hillary is not a very strong person in these matters, and she’s also been shaken by her experience inside the Federal government since then. But Bill is thinking obviously of the fact that—two things.

First, the situation of the Presidency is not coming up as something for this month, or two months from now or so forth. This is down the line. The immediate situation is, we’re on the verge of two wars. One war is the now becoming, not really quite a joke war. That was an operation which was done inside Ukraine, an operation which was assigned to Obama, and Obama couldn’t handle it. Putin was too effective and too smart to accept any traps, and any steps which he didn’t have to take. And also, Obama’s involved himself with supporting a Nazi organization in Ukraine. On top of that, Obama’s war in Europe can not work; does not work.

So therefore, the whole thing that’s going on in Europe today in the present form, has nothing to do with the future war which is coming down the line. This is much trickier.

The issue is, if Obama fails, as he is failing, the question is, how soon he’s going to be dumped. Now



LPAC-TV

Lyndon LaRouche, at the May 16 webcast.

there are about four aspects to Obama's present situation where he could be dumped on those grounds alone. In fact, he's on the way to be dumped. But you also have involved people who have to be dumped around him. Some of them are well known, the whole bog of witches, these various kinds of witches. I was thinking of some famous Greek tragedies in which the witches play a key part in being very destructive. And I would say Obama is surrounded by these types of witches; of Democratic Party and Republican Party backgrounds. So this thing is a total mess.

But nonetheless, the question is, how are we going to not only prevent a general war throughout the planet, which would be a thermonuclear war from which very few people would survive, if it were to occur. In the meantime, pure confusion in a situation like this is dangerous.

Now, there's a timing factor. And the timing factor is very important, because very soon, under the present policies of London and Wall Street, there will be a bail-in attempt. A bail-in attempt, run in the London-New York City, etc., area, would blow up the entire economy. Because in one short moment, a bail-in surge, coming through London and going through New York City, would shut down the means of existence of a major part of the U.S. population virtually overnight. There would be no solution.

Now certain things have to happen to prevent these two things from actually happening; from Obama caus-

ing some kind of disaster. And Obama is ready to be dumped. I would say it may take a few weeks, a few months to dump him, but he's in the process of being dumped. If the leadership of the Democratic Party—we know who in San Francisco we're talking about—if that leadership gets enough support and goes to work against Obama, they could tend to bring him down quickly. They'd put him under such pressure he'd be brought down. The Democratic Party would not be excluded from dealing with an impeachment drive. The Republican Party could not handle the whole thing themselves. And if we're going to dump him, we have to dump him effectively before the bail-in collapse comes on.

In the meantime, the British Empire, which is another collection of witches and bitches, is actually Satanic. To understand this, when you understand the British Empire, as opposed to some of the satellite entities which are under the arm

of the British Empire, but the British Empire itself, including the current Queen, her spouse so-called, and her son, are really purely Satanic evil. Their intention is to reduce the human population from what had been recently 7 billion people to less than 1 billion people. That's their intention; that is what is called a Zeusian policy, in terms of Greek drama. Now the Zeus of the Greek drama of that subject, actually has the name of Satan. This figure called Satan, by that name, was the standard of the Roman Empire. The Roman Empire was a Satanic association; the mass killings of Christians and others, the way this was done and so forth, shows you were dealing with a real Satan. The Roman Empire was a collection of Satans.

The model of the British Empire, during the latter part of the period of the American Revolution, that model is also Satanic. The British monarchy today, as a monarchy, is Satanic in its expressed nature. It is not a charge that it has something Satanic about it; the British Empire, the Queen's system—the Queen, her husband, her son, and so forth—they are literally Satanic. Their policy is literally Satanic. The Dutch element associated with the British Empire is also Satanic. So, we know what we're up against; we're up against a Satanic force, which is concentrated in the monarchy, the British monarchy as an imperial monarchy, a direct copy in practice, an explicit copy of the Roman Empire, which was a Satanic formation. This Satanic formation wants to destroy the Earth. It will take great risks in starting

even a thermonuclear war to try to bring down the population of Earth; and bring it down, as the Queen has specified, to less than 1 billion people from the recent 7 billion people. That's the intention. This is a Satanic intention; it has the same meaning as Zeus. Zeus is Satan; the same thing. The same idea, the same function, the same characteristic. The Queen, the British monarchy is a Satanic organization.

All right, we're in the United States. Forget Obama. Obama is something to be thrown away. He's in the garbage bucket, but we'd like to get rid of him sooner. But in the meantime, he's not running this war, or the future war; it's a new war. The war is based on trying to invoke the United States' resources, to put them at the disposal of the British Empire.

A United States, under the command of the British Empire, would then be an instrument capable of launching a thermonuclear war and possibly surviving the war itself. If the United States does not join Satan and Satan's little mercenary, Obama, then the possibility of a war changes. The nature of the possibility changes. Under those conditions, the British Empire is a disaster.

Now, this brings in another factor. In the middle of this whole process, we have a process in terms of the international financial system, from Europe and the whole trans-Atlantic region implicitly, but especially Britain and what it controls in terms of Europe and also the U.S. economy. Britain and the United States are trapped into the threat of a bail-in process. A bail-in process, hitting the British Empire and Wall Street simultaneously, would blow out the entire trans-Atlantic economy, which would mean money would no longer exist, because of the kind of panic of the kind of inflation built into the system.

So therefore, anyone who is thinking about the future, has to say "All right, there are two wars we have to consider." One is the war that doesn't work; it's a nasty war, it's a dangerous war, it's a war of the Nazi government of Ukraine. The government of Ukraine is essentially a continuation of the Nazi system as it was organized by the same entities under Adolf Hitler. And it also kills Jews; it also kills others in the same way, the



U.S. State Department/Michael Gross

Under certain conditions, which LaRouche specifies, Hillary Rodham Clinton could be a successful President. Here, she is sworn in as Secretary of State, with husband Bill holding the Bible, Jan. 21, 2009.

same exact same form. But this can be kept under control. The danger is, if this is not dealt with effectively, and if we allow the second phase to come in, where the British Empire says okay, scrap Obama. And the scrapping of Obama is in process. All that's happening is that people are trying to *delay* the expulsion of Obama from office. That's the danger point. But if we have Glass-Steagall in place before this, if we have the Alexander Hamilton reforms which I've specified, if we have those things in place, we can protect the United States against a collapse. Without that, we can not protect the United States from a collapse.

Now, a change is occurring, which is partly helped by what's happening in Texas with the campaign of our candidate for Senate, [Kesha Rogers]. She's having a successful upsurge, which threatens that she will be the next victor in this race [the Democratic primary election is May 27—ed.]. It's highly likely, unless something goes wrong. She's capable of doing it. And also once you sink Obama—three-quarters of the population of the United States *hates* Obama—once he begins to fall, his authority tumbles, then we're in a position to do two things. We'll shift the entire party structure to the Democratic Party; the Democratic Party will take over the onrush of the new party, and many Republicans will desert the Republican cause and join the Democratic Party instead. That's the goal.

Now, what you need is a mechanism to quickly put into place a Presidency, a Democratic Presidency to replace the Obama Presidency, which means also the Vice President—or the president of vices, as the case may be. Under those circumstances, Hillary Clinton—who has certain virtues, but she is not temperamentally or otherwise able to set up a campaign machine which would actually unfoolishly take over as the Presidency. She, by herself, as an isolated independent candidate in her own right, would not be successful. However, if Bill Clinton set something up effectively, under the circumstances I've described, then her character as a candidate for the Presidency is looking for a potential Vice President. Now, Bill is not going to be that Vice President, but Bill is going to be the key figure who makes her Presidency and a Vice President actually a feasible operation. And this is very interesting.

Step 1: Glass-Steagall

Bill's approach to this has been carefully architected [see *Appendix*]. He went through his whole history on the way Glass-Steagall was overthrown. He did not overthrow Glass-Steagall. He was put in a very—he could not have won the fight himself on Glass-Steagall, so, he gave in and hoped that by his giving in, nothing worse than that would happen.

But Dodd-Frank came in; or Dudd-Frank if you prefer. Barney Frank, or Dirty Barnacles, or whatever you call him. They set into motion the Wall Street-London operation which bankrupted the United States. Now the United States banking system is hopelessly bankrupt; it's ready for a deep plunge. We could do something about that! Bill has indicated the problem, in what he's said so far, but it requires something more. And that's where my thinking comes in, because we have to do this.

I have a four-phase policy, which includes Glass-Steagall. Glass-Steagall is a great contribution to a solution. It's the original Franklin Roosevelt Glass-Steagall. But there are other things that are required.

First of all, the United States financial system as a whole is hopelessly bankrupt; it could never be saved. If we don't have a reform, which is to actually reform the whole system of banking. That would mean taking every bank in the United States—the large ones, the small ones, the fringe ones, and so forth—and putting them under a general reorganization plan. The plan would be the plan designed by Alexander Hamilton, on the principle of national banking. The inherent problem

of the United States in this term, has been a result of the assassination of Alexander Hamilton. As Secretary of Treasury, Hamilton provided four programmatic statements to provide for that, with all the things he said otherwise in the course of the campaign before that.

These steps would mean that all banks in the United States would be put immediately under an emergency scrutiny, and they would be assessed for what the worthwhile assets are of those banks; the things which are not worthwhile assets will be scrapped. In other words, all worthless assets will be stripped out of the banking system. Only the valid potential in assets will be protected. They will be protected, as banks, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

This is exactly what Abraham Lincoln did, in establishing the greenbacks, which defeated the British control of the Confederacy. That will work.

Step 2: A Credit System

That, however, is not enough, because here we have a bankrupt country, with masses of unemployment, hopeless health-care conditions, all these kinds of things. So, once we create a new banking system, we have to energize the revised banking system. How many of these banks that are now existing, have viability, viability that is valid? But we don't have the monetary system flow, to make those banks function.

So, therefore, we have to have a backup for the banking system, to provide credit to go through the national employment process and production process, which will then energize the potentiality of these reformed banks, now under national government regulation.

Step 3: Cancel 'Green' Policies

That's not enough. We then have to add to that, a high energy-flux-density program for promotion of two categories of things: specifically, food, and production as we know it today. Real production, not crap, not this stuff, but real jobs, producing real goods, foods, and so forth.

But, that's not enough. Because the United States has fallen way behind. There has been no net progress, per capita, in the economy of the United States since John F. Kennedy. John F. Kennedy's assassination *terminated* the net economic progress in the U.S. labor force. And the key thing there, was also not only the lack of progress, but also the collapse, resulting from the milking of the economy by the Wall Street crowd.



Creative Commons/Rosalee Yagihara

People who support the green policy, says LaRouche, are “intrinsicly evil; they may not know they’re evil, but if they’re green, they are evil, because they’re destroying their fellow creatures, they’re destroying fellow human beings, they’re destroying society.” Shown, a greenie demonstration in Vancouver, Canada, May 2013.

Which means we have to have a special funding for major high-technology projects. Cancel all the green policy! All green policies in the United States must be immediately cancelled, and reversed! They must *cease* to be in effect! Because without that, you cannot save the United States economy. The whole green policy must go down the ditch, and not come up again.

Therefore, if we go to a high-technology program, higher energy-flux density per capita, and so forth, that is the driver which the Federal government must finance, as a Federal long-term project investment.

The programs will address the problem of water. Water in North America is in a disastrous position, below the immediate top states of the United States. Mexico’s in the same situation. This is going to be a major challenge. There are technologies¹ which we’ve been discussing this past week and earlier, projects which will give us indications of how we can manage the stratosphere, which has the greatest stream of water, above Earth—not on Earth, but above Earth. If we can learn these techniques for using this and managing it, we can develop the water projects [against the droughts] which are about to destroy the Western States of the

United States. We can save them, But we need to develop these projects.

Step 4: A Fusion Economy

All of these projects require *high energy-flux density production*, which means you’re operating under a *thermonuclear fusion driver-program*, as a driver-program for the sources of energy for the entire U.S. economy and its neighbors.

You have to consider each of these things I’ve already discussed. If you don’t take these all into account, you’ll not have a solution for the threatened breakdown-crisis of the U.S. economy. The breakdown of the economy means also a chain-reaction collapse of a bail-in style, which catches the entire U.S. population

without any resources for recovery, and causes a mass death of the U.S. population. Therefore, we must do this *now!*

So, we have to throw this bum out [Obama] of office, throw out the whole gang, and go to emergency structures which go to these four points which I’ve laid out. We have to have an interim change in government which goes to a Franklin Roosevelt kind of recovery act, in which you pull together the elements which must be pulled together, to create viable security for the continuation of the U.S. economy.

Then, in the course of having done that, say, probably two years from now, when the next election for President comes, then if she [Hillary Clinton] is in place, and if the apparatus which I’ve described is being brought into place, then even with the shortfalls she has in coping with the challenge of being President, she could become a successful President, provided she has a Vice President who’s also a strong support; that Bill is operating behind the scenes, as an advisor, to help the whole process; and that we pull together a Democratic Party, and others, who will volunteer for that intention.

That way, we could save the United States. And that’s the best shot we have available. And Bill Clinton, therefore, does become a very significant *potential* factor, in saving the existence of the United States.

1. See video at <http://larouche.com/node/30782>

Kesha Rogers: Going for Victory

Ogden: Let me ask a question from Kesha Rogers. She is a candidate for United States Senate in the state of Texas, and she's running in a hotly contested Democratic Primary runoff election, which is coming up one week from this coming Tuesday, so in about ten days. She says:

"Hello, Lyn! We are now in the final stretch of my campaign for the U.S. Senate. Everything that the enemy has thrown at me so far, has backfired on them. The Democratic and Republican Parties in Texas, under their current leaderships, are continuing to stick with their losing strategies, with the Democrats' endorsement of a rapidly sinking candidate for U.S. Senate, David Alameel, and their continued apologies for Obama, while the Bush-league Republican John Cornyn is out there backing Obama, for war with Russia.

"I have continued to put forth a real, scientific solution, to address the crisis confronting Texas, and more people are starting to move in response. People are inspired that someone without deep pockets can have an impact and wage a fight. But the majority still don't really understand what victory means. They haven't yet developed the ability to see and define this moment in our lives, as acting not just for today, for an 'election,' but for the future. I'd like you to give some thoughts on this matter."

LaRouche: Okay. Kesha obviously has great potential for winning. The greatest problem she has is the corruption in the Republican and Democratic Party leaderships. Because the Democratic Party is trying to pretend she doesn't exist, and "Mr. Animal" wasn't too good at dealing with that, and the Republican candidate is a *real nut*. I mean the guy wanted to go to war with Russia; this is clinical insanity! I don't think Texans have gotten that insane yet! So I think if she can beat this Animal-cracker, I think that she has an honest right to gain the vote needed for her election.

The problem then comes—two things. She, as she knows, is faced by a Texas favorite sport, called "Steal the Votes." If you can't win the election honestly, steal



KeshaRogers.com

A reporter in Brownsville, Texas, interviews LaRouche Democrat Kesha Rogers, who is running for the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senate, against multimillionaire David "Animal" Alameel, the candidate of the Obamacrats.

the votes, burn the ballot boxes, and so forth.

Now, Alameel's failures—or Animal, if you prefer—his failures, and the scandals against him, have weakened him significantly as an influence. At the same time, there has been an accelerating cascade of support for her. It was based largely in the Texas Hispanic population, which had not been active, because they'd been discouraged; they were the discouraged Democratic Party group. And what she's done in the process of the campaign has strengthened, and mobilized, and moralized, people who otherwise had given up, and thought the cause was hopeless. They now have been convinced that the cause is not hopeless.

Now she has a stiff fight. She could win honestly in this election: A little over week from now, she may have won. The problem is not only the Republican Party, the problem is Alameel—and he's on the down side.

We also have a reflected situation in San Francisco, where we have a House of Representatives candidate there, [Michael Steger]. He's quite capable, and he's doing an excellent job, and finds that the opportunities for doing an excellent job are there.

So, given the crises the United States faces, we're in a situation where, at this moment, Kesha's campaign for Senate from the state of Texas is a real factor in the national political scene, such that, if she wins this election, *she could cause an overturn of the trends throughout the national voting system*. Because, you remem-

ber, three-quarters of the citizens of the United States *hate* Barack Obama! And it's only negative factors that discourage them from expressing that view *positively* for any candidate. Any candidate, such as Kesha, who takes off in a large state, as a leading candidate for the U.S. Senate, with ties to the situation west of the Mississippi, ties to the similar problems in the second-largest state in the United States, California—you're going to change the politics of the United States overnight.

All it takes is, for example, a certain qualified member of the Senate, a leader of the faction in the Senate that is out for the scalp of the culpable people around Obama; a person like that, with those qualifications, coming on the scene, to tear Obama apart, for the crimes he's committed; combining that with Kesha's success, would overturn the present situation in the United States by itself, not by one push with a fist, but by lighting the firecracker, lighting the fuse that will set it off.

In other words, you're at a point where the American population in general is ready to suddenly make a surge, to overturn what they seem to have submitted to until now. The hopelessness of their condition of life, especially in health care and employment, and similar things this year, so far, and this *impossible* condition they live under, which gets worse and worse, week by week, by the new votes and new measures [Obama] takes, this thing is actually ready to be overturned, *by the people of the United States, themselves!* And Kesha is one of the lightning rods, the chief lightning rod, at the moment, who can set into motion the things that overturn what needs to be overturned.

Obama's on the Skids

Ogden: Let me elaborate a little bit on the point you made about the collapse of Obama, and then, I want to ask a second question.

You've stated that Obama's on the skids, and it's a question of *when* he goes down, not *if*. There are four intersecting triggers right now: You've got the process around the Benghazi investigation, and the House is scheduled to begin work on this, this coming Monday. You've got several Democrats who are now coming out in support of this: the former Deputy Director of the



MichaelSteger.us

Michael Steger campaigns for Congress in North Beach, Calif., March 2014. He and Kesha Rogers are running coordinated campaigns, with a focus on the drought crisis that is ravaging both states.

CIA, Michael Morell; [former Director of the CIA] Leon Panetta; several Democratic Congressmen; Pat Caddell, who's a leading Democratic pollster, said that Benghazi is the biggest cover-up since Watergate.

Second, you've got what you were just referring to, the fight between Dianne Feinstein in the Senate and the White House on the Bush-Cheney torture program—and the CIA is now attempting to delay the release of this official Senate investigative report.

You've got the continuing cover-up by Obama of the Anglo-Saudi hand behind the 9/11 attacks and the documents related to that, including the documents in Florida from the FBI, but also the 28 classified pages of the Joint Congressional Inquiry Report.

And also you've got the ongoing revelations by Glenn Greenwald and Edward Snowden. Interestingly, this week, in answer to a question from Jason Ross [of the LaRouchePAC Science Team], on behalf of former Congressman Neil Gallagher from New Jersey, Greenwald compared the NSA domestic surveillance program to the targeting of political dissidents inside the United States by the FBI of J. Edgar Hoover. And he promised that the next big revelation that he releases, the next big story is going to be absolutely explosive, on how the NSA targets Americans whom they consider to be political threats within the United States.

So this is a constellation of several processes under way...

Great Projects

I want to ask another question.

This week we've seen quite a few of developments from Eurasia, along the lines of programs that you have advocated for decades. Not only do we have [Chinese President] Xi Jinping calling for the New Silk Road, but we've also seen a lot of very serious developments for the extension of a World Land-Bridge to Africa, agreements that have been signed in Africa for high-speed rail for major cities there; and also a serious discussion of the extension of this across the Bering Strait into North America. There are also

tests, experimental work under way, for evacuated-tube maglev trains that can run, potentially, at speeds far greater than the speed of sound, at 1,800 miles per hour—why not? And then we know that there's work ongoing in China on the prospective use of helium-3 mined from the Moon for fusion power.

At the same time, you have Academician Sergei Glazyev in Russia, talking about the adoption of a state credit system for high-technology development in Russia. Glazyev gave an interview this week, to a leading Russian financial news publication, saying that Russia needs to provide national credit in the form of long-term loans for the development of advanced manufacturing, stressing that credit used for investment into the real sector and modernization of a nation's scientific and technological potential, is inherently anti-inflationary, as opposed to money that's simply given away to banks for the purposes of speculation.

You've said a lot this evening already, on greenbacks, on the Lincoln program, on your four-step program for the United States, and on the prospective demise of the Obama Presidency. My question is, how can we imagine the future, in which the United States is integrated into this high-technology, high energy-flux-density development, that's now beginning in Eurasia?

FIGURE 1



LPAC

LaRouche: I'm loaded for bear on that one!

The very fact that the British Empire, and it *is* the British Empire: The greatest single part of the populated land-areas, and the specific corresponding water areas, for the whole planet, is controlled by the British Empire, by the Queen, herself. Now, sometimes, they call them different sections, or something, as if they were some innocent partners; but these are the slaves of the Queen. So, if the Queen cannot, at this point, control the entire planet under conditions of a breakdown crisis, which would wipe out most of the human population, even by a breakdown crisis, let alone a thermonuclear war, then the chance for humanity are very poor. The chances for the existence of humanity are very much in doubt.

However, if the United States does *not* support the British Empire, in the British Empire's intention to conduct a global thermonuclear war—in other words, if the United States, as leading generals and so forth have made clear, the United States is not about to support the British Empire, in a thermonuclear war! And the only war that could be, would be a thermonuclear war! If the United States does not support that British Empire thermonuclear war program, then the British can't pull it off, because the opposition would be too great. So the

British Empire will die, the *finest thing that could happen to humanity right now!*

Get rid of the British monarchy! I'm not talking about Britain, Ireland, so forth—they're nations. But this [Empire] is not a nation. This is a Satanic organization! And as I said here, the British system is intrinsically *Satanic*. It's based on the Roman Empire, which was a Satanic system, explicitly; and Zeus is only a cover name, for Satan. The British Empire is a Satanic phenomenon, modelled on the Roman Empire, and the Dutch attachments to the British Empire. So therefore, if we bring down the Empire's power, then we have produced a condition on the planet, in which general warfare as we have known it heretofore, becomes very quickly a *non-possibility*.

Then the question becomes, you have to take great projects, which have international implications because of the vast poverty of the planet. You have to have what we call development projects, which extend through large underdeveloped areas, like these great railroad systems, fast railroad systems. We have to build a connection in which we say, the world is composed of groups of sovereign nation-states. Their sovereignty is located in the fact that their culture gives them special qualifications, of the need to understand each other, in terms of the functioning of that part of the world.

However, the system of nations must be coordinated, vast projects of cooperation, throughout the planet, and also to save the existence of humanity by preventing and destroying the threat of asteroids, which could destroy much of the planet, or in certain cases, could destroy the entire human population of the planet.

So therefore, these are the prospects, which means we are going to very high thermonuclear productivity. That will work. So what we should be looking for is that. Because given the conditions of life in the world, we have to go to a high energy-flux-density program throughout the planet: This means thermonuclear fusion-plus; it means we're going to be dragging in some of the helium-3 we have on the Moon. We're going to start bringing it down to Earth, to enhance the potential of thermonuclear fusion. We will be using these extraordinarily high-powered driver programs, which will probably take 20, 30 years to do, but nonetheless, we're making progress. So we will then be able, under those conditions, to actually address efficiently, the problems such as the asteroids, which might extinguish the human species, which obviously should be one of our primary concerns.

But we will bring the planet together, where the nations of planet will be free of warfare—except as police actions, to regulate things that are totally in disorder, where something goes haywire, like putting out a fire. But war as we have known it, as a phenomenon on Earth, will then, if we can solve this problem, *be excluded from the agenda, henceforth*.

Necessary actions, largely in nearby space, and beyond, or control of climates, vast control of climates throughout the planet as a whole; improving the conditions of Earth, as such, within the Solar System: These will be the great endeavors. We're on the edge of entering that age, if we can get through the immediate situation before us! End this threat of general warfare—it can be done—and start to bring the nations into coordination along this conception. The human population is composed of peoples who have a cultural affinity to working with each other, and that the nations which are so constructed, must be in harmony with one another, or be brought into harmony, repeatedly, with one another. Which means that great projects, of global magnitude and implication, are the proper destiny, for the organization of the future of Earth, as a habitation, now.

Science vs. Mathematics

Megan Beets: The next question was sent in by Ben Deniston, of the LaRouchePAC Science Team, and he asks:

“Hello, Lyn. I'd like to get your thoughts on the strategic significance of the replacement of science with mathematics. To put it simply, replacing scientific thinking with mathematics shackles and constrains the minds of seemingly intelligent thinkers, training people to think in terms of fixed systems, and preventing them from being able to think about change per se.

“Take the case of our recent discussions about the water crisis: This is an example of the effects of mathematics on thinking. We do not necessarily know exactly what the Sun is going to do over the coming years. We do have at least four different lines of evidence, showing that the Sun is weakening, and will likely continue to weaken, in a way which, some say, has not been seen for hundreds of years. Evidence indicates that these types of dramatic solar change are associated with major fluctuations in the Earth's climate system, such as strong variations in the climate of the American West, which can fluctuate between mega-droughts, much longer and more intense than anything we've experienced; to mega-floods, covering the Central Valley

of California with many feet of water.

“These types of changes obviously have an effect on the water systems upon which mankind has come to depend. If we had built the North American Water and Power Alliance [NAWAPA] project in the 1960s, we’d obviously be in a much, much better situation to handle these dramatic fluctuations. Because NAWAPA was blocked, the crisis is drastically worse, but even so, we would still, today, be faced with the need to deal with the larger changes which were *not* being considered when NAWAPA was designed. We must look to higher-order solutions, such as managing and controlling the flows of water vapor in the atmosphere, which determine the feasibility of NAWAPA, or any other river diversion project.

“But I think there’s a larger point here. This is the reality of living in a developing, changing universe. The Earth and the Solar System are not fixed, static systems. Mankind’s only demonstrated capability to ensure its own prolonged survival, is the capability of creative progress, per se. This is not any specific level of progress, not a specific state of society or project. It is the process of progress itself, of responding to a changing situation by developing new solutions. The substance is the process of developing, not the given solution developed.

“I think many people have difficulty with this distinction. Is this ultimately an expression of the destruction of science, for the sake of mathematics? And can you elaborate the strategic significance of this shift?”

LaRouche: Yes. Well, I would put the emphasis, in terms of the descriptive aspect of the question, on one more concentrated point:

We need to start at the beginning, on the question of the green policy. The green policy is the key to understanding the difference between Satan and Christianity,



Marie Curie (1867-1934), the scientist who discovered radium. Chemistry, said LaRouche, “is man’s sacred power to develop mankind itself, to a higher, more powerful species, in our present domain, and in facing the challenge whereby the Solar System and beyond is going to come to us, and say, ‘Do this.’”

for example: because the principle of the green policy is intrinsically Satanic. Now, what is the essential principle, in human practice, which from the standpoint of that, defines evil? Don’t talk about bad things, and so forth, talk about *evil*. What do we call *evil*? We will call evil, the British Empire; we call evil, the Roman Empire. And we find, throughout the world, spots of cannibalism of human beings, and things like that.

So, what we have are diseases of the human species, morally terminal diseases of the human species. No society should be allowed to perform these kinds of actions. We must *civilize* the human population. Because if they have green policies, they are *evil*, they are evil in fact.

Now, what does this mean? What makes a human being not evil? Or what *should* make them not evil, beforehand? That the human mind is based

on the increase of the productive powers of labor, is one way of putting it. But how does this function? What’s different about mankind, that differentiates man from an evil person? What is it, that’s not evil? We have behavior by animals which is evil, by human standards, but we don’t worry about that too much, because we know they’re not human. But, when human beings become like beasts, and use human will and capabilities and tools [to do evil things], then you have evil.

So the whole question comes to the principle of chemistry; not chemistry as a bunch of formulas of cookbooks. Anyone who cooks food for the first time, knows that the *idea* of cooking does not necessarily produce an edible meal. So the question is, what is the characteristic of a human being who meets *human* qualifications, rather than the standard of animal qualifications? The human being is able to express *changing the future*. It’s just like the first hypothetical, civilized man, who probably was first known in some place like South

Africa, and who did the remarkable thing, the exceptional thing, that no animal would ever do: to cook its own food at night. No animal will willingly cook its own food at night.

The cooking of food has to be looked in terms of what the implications are of the cooking of food by fire. It means that you're increasing the energy-flux density in terms of the characteristics of the species. We call this "chemistry."

Mankind which is not progressing in that way is a denatured mankind! A degenerate mankind! Mankind's destiny and commitment, is always to life of the human species, to a higher level of existence, to gain power to control dangerous asteroids, for example.

Now, our understanding of chemistry as we used it in schools, during the course of the latter part of the 19th Century, and into the 20th Century, is now rather crude, by comparison with what we know about chemistry now. We've gone beyond anything that the Table of Elements ever accounted for. We're now going way beyond that! We're now going to thermonuclear and super-thermonuclear processes. We're looking at the way in which the Sun operates.

Chemistry meant that mankind will use his knowledge of the increase of energy-flux density, as a product of the *behavior* of the human individual in human society. That's what this is all about. What do the Zeusians, the Satanic people do? The Satanic people say, "Go to lower forms of life": *the green policy!* The green policy is a specifically *Satanic policy*. The people who propose a green policy, are specifically *Satanic people*. Because a healthy form of the human species is to develop the higher levels of intellectual behavior, more productive behavior. That's what the issue is.

So therefore, the way you have to attack this; first of all, you have to *eliminate the green policy*. And to treat the green policy as equivalent to mass murder through cannibalism, because that's what it's doing in effect. We want to cook the inedible, that's very bad, that's terrible: so we eliminate the inedible factor. And now people are judged by the degree to which they become, in each generation, superior in capability and power, to

the previous generation. That is the human principle.

The cannibal, for example, is abhorrent for just that reason. Primitive people are problematic, acutely problematic, because of their incompetence. They lack the means to take of themselves. They get diseases they shouldn't have, or should be able to cure. Methods of sanitation are available to them, but they don't know how to use them and don't build them. They become desperate, because of the blocks, to the ability to solve their problems of population growth and things of that sort.


Whereas the truly human being, is a creative being, who is always struggling to do better intellectually, in terms of the productive powers of mankind. That's humanity. People who oppose that, the green policy, are intrinsically *evil*; they may not know they're evil, but if they're green, they are evil, because they're destroying their fellow creatures, they're destroying fellow human beings, they're destroying society.

And that is the actual core, because the history of mankind is the increase of the energy-flux density, which is expressed productively in the development and advancement of the technologies used by mankind, *is the intrinsic nature of mankind*. Mankind which is not progressing in that way is a *denatured* mankind! A degenerate mankind! Mankind's destiny and commitment, is always to life of the human species, to a higher level of existence, to gain power to control dangerous asteroids, for example; to deal with the crises that threaten mankind.

The Sun is dying, in a sense, right now—in a dying period; it may recover some time later, but then, the Sun is merely a solar body going through the galaxy. It's being bounced around in its trip through the galaxy. We don't know what the survival potential of the Sun is going to be for us, and we depend upon the Solar System. We don't control it all, particularly now. But the time is coming, we're going to *inevitably* have to deal with that case.

And mankind is actually a *creative being* in the true sense, as no known animal species is. Mankind is, in a sense, a sacred person, inherently sacred, constantly dedicated to the purpose of a higher mission of achievement, by the human species, for whatever missions are assigned to it, by the challenges created within the Solar System and beyond.

That is morality! That is a *true definition* of human morality. We set a different standard for dogs, cats, and so forth—and skunks! But, the problem here, is when



NASA/JPL-Caltech/MSSS

Mankind must look to its future mission in the Solar System and beyond. Shown is a panorama of images taken from the Curiosity Mars rover.

you reduce man to becoming like cattle, like the pigs you slaughter to eat, as the cannibals do, slaughtering people because they don't like them! Denuding the human population of its talents and skills—that is a crime against humanity, for which they rot in Hell forever, for committing that kind of crime!

Our commitment is to the principle which is implicit in the uniquely remarkable characteristic of the human species, which is like no other species presently known to us. It is the only truly creative species, creative by will, in all the living things that we know. It is also a force, and will become increasingly a force if we do our job; mankind will do more and more to manage, to improve Earth, beyond what Earth itself can do for itself. Mankind is going to take the area beyond Earth itself, where the asteroids roam; we're going to bring these creatures—we're not going to destroy them—we're going to bring them under order! We're going to shape their trajectories, so they won't be hitting us. We will look at these things, we will tame them, with the powers we shall acquire: we shall mine these asteroids, for any scarce minerals and so forth that are needed, for the purposes of man's mission within the Solar System.

We have to have an understanding and adoption of that morality. Of the morality of true meaning of chem-

istry. And chemistry is what? Is it a natural product? Well, in a sense. But chemistry is man's sacred power to develop mankind itself, through self-development, to a higher, more powerful species, in our present domain, and in facing the challenge whereby the Solar System and beyond is going to come to us, and say, "Do this." And, if we're good, we will find ourselves miraculously able to do, exactly, those previously impossible, good things. This is called creativity: This is the true destiny of mankind.

You know, when people die, for example, this is a very frightening thing for most people. It's frightening, because the loss of someone you love and appreciate, is actually an injury to you on the one hand, but you say, "Everyone dies." Then, what's the meaning of this process of life and death in the human species? It's

not like the animal, because the human being, if they're doing what human beings should do, are always, in each generation, becoming more powerful, a unit in terms of the progress of mankind, to higher levels than before.

So the life and death of a person is not a tragic process, if those persons involved, are actually contributing to the advancement of the characteristic of the human species, within the Solar System and beyond. The meaning of life lies in the discovery of higher principles, higher energy-flux densities, greater power of mankind as an individual, to conquer problems which were previously impossible. Training young people, so that in the educational process, each becomes wiser and more powerful in effect, than the previous generation. So the life and generation, and the death of a person or people, *should be* joyful! Because the termination of life contains within it, the promise of a greater achievement of the human species, than before.

We have to get through all these conventions that we throw around, the fears that we show, and recognize that the human species is a really, truly *sacred* species, in its own innate nature. It's the only species of that type, with which we have become personally acquainted, in our experience so far. We would hope, for meetings, of a higher level.

Bill Clinton Poses A Critical Issue

The following transcript is excerpted from an interview given by former President Clinton with PBS's Gwen Ifill at the Peterson Foundation on May 14, 2014. It is provided here as the necessary context for LaRouche's webcast discussion.

Gwen Ifill: One of the other conversations we're having in Washington is re-litigating the financial collapse in 2009, in part, because of Tim Geithner's new book. And one of the questions people raise, is whether in your administration, you didn't create policies that allowed deregulation to go too far?

Bill Clinton: Well, I think the answer to that is, by and large, no, but in one case, yes. Let me tell you exactly what I mean by that: Nobody has identified a single financial institution that failed, not one, because of the repeal of Glass-Steagall—not one. Lehman Brothers was an investment bank; Bear Stearns was an investment bank. The non-diversified banks themselves, if you look at what happened in the years afterward, they were more likely to fail than the diversified ones. Canada got through the financial crash, probably better than any other country: They *always* had unified banking between investment and commercial banks. What did they have that we didn't? More adequate capital requirements, more adequate oversight.

So, if I had known that basically, we would see the end of banking and SEC oversight, after I left office, would I have signed it? Probably not. Would it have passed? Absolutely.

Let me remind you, that bill passed 90-8, in the Senate. Ted Kennedy voted for it, Pat Leahy voted for it, Jay Rockefeller voted for it. I mean—and in fairness to them, that's because Federal Reserve rulings, unno-

ticed by anybody in America, had abolished the wall between investment and commercial banking, long before the bill passed. All the bill did was to let Citibank write insurance.

I mean, really, as a practical matter, it made it clearer, and easier, and less hassle for financial institutions to do that. So, I don't think that had anything to do with it.

However, at the end of my term, a bill passed, with a provision stuck in at the end—again it passed with an overwhelming bipartisan majority, so if I had vetoed it, it would have immediately been overridden—that basically precluded the Commodities Futures Trading Commission, and anybody else, from regulating financial derivatives. And I thought it was a mistake at the time. We

had a great argument, Alan Greenspan and I did, about it. I'll never forget, he said, "But all these people, they have to have \$100 million, they don't need—." My argument was, we ought to trade financial derivatives on the same basis that we trade agricultural derivatives.

If you think derivatives are bad, per se, look at your dinner twice, tonight. We couldn't bring in a farm crop in America without derivatives. But the agricultural derivatives are traded in an open exchange, with adequate capital requirements to sustain the loss that you risk; *and*, there—this is not practical in financial terms, I suppose—either one side of the trade at least, has to have some stake in agriculture, has to have some skin in the

game. That's what I think the law should be.

And, at the end of my term, if I had it to do again, I'd veto the bill—even though they would have passed it over my veto in a heartbeat—just in the hope that these financial derivatives, which then were something like \$100 trillion—whatever they were—a lot, but not very much in the context. By the time that the crash occurred, they were seven times as large as they were on the day I left office. And I wish I'd vetoed that, just to start the debate. Even though it wouldn't have changed the law, it would have been a good thing, to make people think about it.

This Dodd-Frank bill, thanks to former Senator [Blanche] Lincoln's amendment, tried to put the regulation of financial derivatives back on the table. That needs to be done, and I regret that [it was defeated—



UN/Eskinder Debebe

ed.]. But otherwise, getting rid of Glass-Steagall didn't have anything to do with the crash, and I don't think would have prohibited it from happening, if I had vetoed the bill, and let them override it. But just don't forget, it passed with 90% of both houses. Everybody acts like I sat in the closets and sort of hitched up things, "What can I do for Wall Street today?" [laughter] This thing had quite a head of steam. *And*, there was no evidence that there was any problem with it.

Finance Has Gotten Too Big

Ifill: Do you think that the rhetoric—as someone who was elected as a centrist Democrat—do you think that the anti-Wall Street rhetoric is running too hot now?

Clinton: Not exactly, but, I think—here's what the problem is: It's okay to say that too much of our growth has been concentrated in finance. I believe that. I've been saying that for well over a decade. Why? Because finance is an intermediary function in society, so if too much income is generated in any country from finance, as a percentage of the whole, that by definition means that more money's being made from trading, and less money is being made from investments. And you can see, that has happened. And I personally believe that's not particularly healthy, which is why I want to see this investment bank set up.

But I think that, what the government has been doing—it's interesting in the last few years, underneath all the rhetoric, it's actually now continuing to pursue cases it took years to analyze, and going after specific examples of alleged wrongdoing, and trying to resolve them. That's what I think should be done. But I don't think it's a bad thing that America has efficient capital markets, and that we can aggregate capital and spend it well.

I think what has happened, going all the way [back], starting in the '70s, is that, finance has come to occupy too big a percentage of our overall GDP growth, and we devoted too much income-generating activity to trading, as opposed to investment that creates new businesses and new jobs. And we need to figure out how to tweak that.

I realize it's almost irresistible to have a villain. There doubtless are some and have been, but by and large, if you were running one of these operations and that's where the money was, and your job is to make as much money as you could, you'd probably do it. We should change the oversight, change the rules, and change the incentives, and you will get the desired results, I believe.

Ifill: Which sounds like changing the structure. But our economy is so different from the 1990s now, I wonder if that difference is driven by its structure, or whether it's driven by the politics which underpin the structure and make the solutions difficult to attain?

Clinton: Both. Let me be very explicit: When I went to law school, 40 years ago... If you go back to the '70s, we were still taught corporate law as we had been, my predecessors had been, in the '30s: That corporations were creatures of the state, enjoyed certain legal benefits, including immunity, and in return for that acquired certain obligations, to their shareholders, to their employees, to their customers, and to the communities of which they were a part, more or less in equal balance. The globalization of the economy, *and* other changes, and a relentless effort to create these changes, began in the '70s, a process which continues to the present day, which says a corporation owes way more to its shareholders, and therefore managers should be compensated based on how the shareholders do, than even to its customers, much less its employees and the communities of which they're a part. And if you don't like it, you're just a troglodyte, and not part of the global economy.

So, I notice there's this activist investor going after Dow Chemical, because he wants to be paid within a year, and he wants them to sell off an otherwise highly profitable and critical part of the company, because it takes five years or more to build a chemical plant, and he doesn't think the precious investors ought to wait there. Until recent times, we'd have said, "Well, take your money and invest it in some other company." You don't have a right to break down a critical part of the American, and indeed, the international economic system.

So, I think that this goes beyond political parties and tax policies. It goes to the very heart of this, and some people in American legal circles, now, and economic circles, are trying to get us to revisit this, and at least think public policy ought to favor corporations that recognize multiple obligations and not just trading. That predated the advent of supply-side economics, which, as all of you know, I think triggered all of this debt problem we're dealing with today.

But, I think that we need a balanced growth strategy. We're in trouble; before the financial crash, almost all of our growth had come from housing, finance, and consumer spending, in the first decade. And it wouldn't generate enough jobs: It just generated maxed out credit cards and stagnant incomes....

With Obama Sinking, What Will London Do Next?

by Jeffrey Steinberg

May 20—Provocations against Russia by NATO, led by the Obama Administration, are escalating day by day, as the May 25 date of the election in Ukraine approaches. But, despite the pile-up of sanctions, continuous NATO exercises, and the deployment of U.S. Aegis-equipped destroyers into the Black Sea, President Putin has persisted in a policy of de-escalation and diplomacy, seeking dialogue with the Europeans and the U.S., if at all possible.

What Putin knows is that what is at stake in the so-called Ukraine crisis, is not a local power grab, but the determination of the global British financial empire to force Russia to surrender its sovereignty, using the threat of the United States going to thermonuclear war, if necessary.

But such war must be avoided, if humanity is to survive.

A similar point of view is increasingly visible in Germany, where opposition to the NATO/British/Obama confrontation tactics is strengthening. Not only have leading industrial circles in Germany stepped forward to oppose the sanctions policy of the European Union and Washington, but top political figures are explicitly denoting the threat such a stance represents. Last week's interview by former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt with the mass daily *Bildzeitung* exemplified this opposition.

In the first part of the interview, Schmidt, aged 94, described the European Commission, the U.S., and

Russia as acting like "sleepwalkers" following the script of 1914. In the second, he was clearer as to who was to blame, opposing sanctions against Russia on grounds that they will only escalate the situation "and in the end we will have a war with weapons." He added: "I do not think that Putin wants a war. And Europe should do everything to reorient Russia in this direction, instead of blathering about the Third World War like the government in Kiev and many in the entourage of U.S. President Obama."

The question is therefore: What is to be done about Obama, and, most importantly, the British royals for whom he is a mere stooge?

Obama in Big Trouble

The House of Representatives returns to Washington this week, and one of the first orders of business will be to convene the Select Committee on Benghazi. The White House is trying desperately to discredit the probe, even considering ordering a Democratic Party boycott of the panel, to give it a strictly partisan color.

But some members of the Obama Cabinet, including Secretary of State John Kerry and Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel—both veterans of the U.S. Senate—have argued that it would be a violation of the Constitution for Democrats to boycott a committee that was voted up by the full House. Leading Democrats, including former CIA Director and Clinton White

House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, have argued also that the Democrats must fully participate. Lacy Clay (D-Mo.), a leading member of the Congressional Black Caucus, has insisted on Democratic participation, arguing that the designated chair of the panel, Rep. Trey Gowdy (R-S.C.), is a man of integrity who works closely with Democrats and will genuinely pursue the truth.

The split between the President and some top Congressional Democrats extends to the Senate as well, where Dianne Feinstein (Calif.), Chair of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, is in an ongoing war with the White House and the CIA over their efforts to stall the release of the unclassified report on the CIA's torture program during the Bush-Cheney years after 9/11. Last week, the Department of Justice filed papers in Federal Court, demanding a further delay in the release of the document, arguing that there will be a terrorist backlash when it is released, threatening the lives of Americans abroad, and of close U.S. allies who assisted in the renditions/torture program. CIA Director John Brennan, a close Obama confidant, is in the crosshairs on both the torture revelations and the Benghazi account.

Obama is also highly vulnerable, as are the British stooges in Europe, due to their sponsorship of the neo-Nazis in the Kiev government. A May 15 article in the French magazine [Paris Match](#), published an exposé of the role of the Nazi "Right Sector" in killings in Eastern Ukraine. Under the title "Revelations on the Krasnoarmeysk Killing," *Paris Match* describes the murder of two unarmed civilians in Krasnoarmeysk, in the Donetsk Region, who were trying to vote in the May 11 referendum. Journalist Alfred de Montesquiou acknowledges that his story lends credibility to Russian charges about the fascists in Kiev. Even fuller documentation of these fascists, and their British patrons, appeared in *EIR*, May 16, 2014.

The strategic implications of Obama's downfall have been highlighted in recent comments by Lyndon LaRouche. If Obama is impeached in the coming weeks for the array of his Constitutional violations, this will create big problems for his British masters. If Obama is severely crippled by the scandals, it means that London's ability to steer Obama into a head-on confrontation with Russia and/or China is greatly weakened. One cannot rule out that the British would even assist in pushing Obama out of office, if his demise could fur-

ther their interests in provoking a strategic confrontation.

Stalemated by Putin

LaRouche emphasized that there are two factors driving the danger of general war today. The first, the "dog and pony" factor, is the crisis-spots that have been activated in recent months—from Ukraine to the South China Sea conflict between Vietnam and China to the East China Sea conflict between Japan and China. However, the fact that President Putin has masterfully evaded the war traps in Ukraine and that the top U.S. military brass, led by Gen. Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have insisted that there is no military option for solving the present complex global instability, makes these provocations difficult to manipulate into a general war trigger.

This means that the British will have to face the choice of provoking an incident to instigate a general war confrontation or confront the imminent blowout of their trans-Atlantic financial system. Within days after the May 22-25 European parliamentary elections, it is expected that the European Central Bank and other EU institutions will have to launch hyperinflationary quantitative easing—and possibly a bail-in. This alone could be the trigger for a systemic crash. It is this crisis that is driving London to look for any pretext to "change the subject" by instigating a war that would almost inevitably lead to a thermonuclear war of extinction.

The collapse of Obama and the imminent blowout of the London-Wall Street financial system are driving the existential crisis for the British imperial system. LaRouche has called for the immediate impeachment of Obama and the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall. By simultaneously removing British tool Obama and wiping out Wall Street by reinstating Glass-Steagall, the potential for the British to provoke a world war is eliminated and the conditions are set up for global economic recovery, starting in the United States.

If the U.S. were to move in such a sane direction, wiping out the Wall Street-London control, leading European nations would follow immediately. Given a sudden shift in the United States, they would lead Europe in the same direction, aligning the trans-Atlantic region with the trans-Pacific region, where great projects of economic development are already at the top of the agenda.

Indian Elections: Young Voters Demand Development, Elect Modi

by Ramtanu Maitra

May 18—India’s six-week-long parliamentary elections, during which a record 530 million people voted, brought to power in New Delhi the Bharatiya Janata Party-led National Democratic Alliance (NDA) to power in New Delhi. The Ruling United Progressive Alliance (UPA), led by the Congress Party, suffered a crushing defeat. The victory was dictated primarily by India’s youth, as 50% of voters were under 28 years of age. It is they who demanded economic development to be the core issue and found their answer in the BJP’s leader and prime minister-elect, Narendra Modi. He has been chief minister of the middle-sized western state of Gujarat since 2001.

The poll outcome was not a surprise. The UPA’s ten-year uninterrupted reign had spawned unprecedented corruption, high inflation, and a widening disparity between the majority of the population who are poor and the middle class. This disconnect was aided by an indecisive leadership which eventually amounted to non-accountability for the problems plaguing the nation. But the UPA leaders—in essence, the Congress leaders—did not want to address the issues that involve every Indian, instead harping during the campaign on the tired mantra of secularism, stability, and the party’s glorious past.

The Congress Party had never made economic development an issue, except in the 1980 parliamentary elections, when the late Mrs. Indira Gandhi coined the slogan “*Garibi Hatao*” (Remove Poverty) as the centerpiece of her election campaign. In personal interactions with Congress politicians and pro-Congress politicians over the years, this author came to realize that the Congress Party, never willing to go off the beaten path, was simply afraid to make development a campaign issue and considered it a non-starter. They failed to acknowledge that India’s demography has changed completely (it is expected to be the youngest country in the world by 2020, with a median age of 29), and that what young people are demanding is a leader who will promote development.

Drubbing of the Congress Party

To begin with, in a country where the gap between the average age of political leaders and citizens is one of the world’s widest, Narendra Modi will be the first prime minister born after India gained independence in 1947. It is not simply that Modi made “development only” his slogan, and pushed aside communal issues as irrelevant for the campaign; he also had the background to satisfy the youth. Under his stewardship, the economy of Gujarat has nearly tripled in size. He also has a reputation for decisiveness, getting things done, rooting out corruption, stimulating investment, and slashing through the bureaucratic red tape. He offers red carpet and not red tape, he explains to investors.¹

Modi is the hands-down favorite of business executives who frequently rank Gujarat as among the easiest states in India in which to set up business. Gujarat is one of the few places in India where there is an uninterrupted electricity and water supply, and its roads are the envy of Indians from other states. In addition, Modi is an workaholic and a formidable orator and politician. As one Indian business leader remarked, Modi’s administration will be extraordinarily effective if it is managed as well as his election campaign was.

The sins of the UPA and young voters’ eagerness to elect a leader who delivers what he promises, resulted in a landslide victory. There are 543 seats in India’s parliament and any party or alliance that achieves the magic number 272 is called on to form the government. The last time a single party crossed the magic number line was in 1984, following Mrs. Gandhi’s assassination. Since then, cobbled-together alliances have been in power in New Delhi.

This time around, the BJP secured 285 seats (or, including its pre-poll allies that formed the NDA: 339) reducing the Congress Party to its worst ever tally of 46 (with its pre-poll allies, the UPA: 59). As a Delhi-based

1. Krishnadev Calamur, “Narendra Modi: From Humble Start to India’s Likely Prime Minister,” NPR, May 16, 2014.



Narendra Modi's Photostream

Narendra Modi campaigning in Maharashtra state, March 24, 2014. He promised to build roads, airports, ports, bullet trains, and 100 modern cities, and the nation's youthful electorate responded.

analyst pointed out, “in every nook and cranny of the nation, he [Modi] was the harbinger of hope to people crushed under price rises and corruption; families starving at unemployment and utter lack of opportunity; the indifference and callousness of rulers; and above all, the sense of national drift towards the abyss.”

Not surprisingly, the results vindicated the claims and expectations of Modi and his trusted lieutenant, Amit Shah, in Uttar Pradesh, the largest Indian state with 80 parliamentary seats, of which the BJP won an astounding 71. Thus, the party won all the seats in Gujarat (26/26), Rajasthan (25/25), Delhi (7/7), Goa (2/2), Himachal Pradesh (4/4), Uttarakhand (5/5), and did exceedingly well in Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand, Bihar, Karnataka, Seemandhra, and Arunachal Pradesh. The Congress failed to get to first base in 12 States and 5 Union Territories—a deafening commentary on the leadership of its so-called first family.²

Historic Election

This was a historic election for many reasons. To begin with, it is the first in which the winning party, pushing aside issues of caste and religion, concentrated its campaign on development and won big. On the campaign trail, Modi, relying upon his experience with young people in Gujarat, talked of “development only.” He promised to build roads, airports, ports, bullet trains,

2. Sandhya Jain, “Narendra Modi: One Man Revolution,” Niti Central, May 16, 2014.

and 100 modern cities, if he were to become India’s leader. Even where the BJP did not have strong organizational infrastructure, young voters cast their ballots for the BJP candidate.

It is also historic because a major part of the Indian political arena has long been bounded by the political barbed wire of caste and religious communalism. But this time, the cages flew open. In Uttar Pradesh (UP), for instance, where a very large portion of India’s Muslims reside, the BJP won 71 of the 80 seats, including a significant chunk of Muslim votes. Also in that state, two major political parties that have taken turns running state affairs in recent years, are based entirely on caste.

In the recent elections, one drew a blank, while the other managed to win only 4 of the 80 seats.

What To Expect

That the UPA has been cast aside is no surprise, since under its rule the Indian economy has gone steadily backward. That is particularly disturbing, since India is adjacent to China, a nation of almost equal population, which has developed a huge production capacity. India-China trade is growing at a rapid clip, but the trade imbalance favors China more and more, simply because the UPA undermined India’s manufacturing sector and the employment that came with it. The failure to strengthen the manufacturing sector will be a serious impediment to broadening India-China bilateral relations in the future. Unless the disparity between the two countries is decreased significantly in the coming years, the region will remain unstable, and mischief-makers from both West and East will continue to undermine this crucial bilateral relationship.³

Since the 1990s, India’s agricultural and manufacturing sectors have languished, while so-called knowledge-based, high-end information services have grown.

In the case of the manufacturing sector, a major reason for its decline is the glaring failure of the UPA governments to develop power and transportation infrastructure commensurate to the needs of a growing economy of 1.3 billion people. Since the IT industry is

3. Arun Maira, “Pulling Manufacturing Out of the Rut,” *The Hindu*, Sept. 19, 2013.

FIGURE 1
India's States and Union Territories



www.texample.net

far less dependent on infrastructure for its operations than manufacturing is, it did not have to contend with this impediment.

Unlike outgoing Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, a weak man whose economic failures reflect his training in the World Bank in his early days, and who allowed himself to be yanked around by the Congress Party bosses, Modi is tough and works very independently. There is no doubt that Modi will step in as India's new leader at a daunting period. But there is also no doubt that he will enjoy support from the vast majority of Indians in addressing the urgent issues before the country with vision and determination—provided he does the necessary political work and lays out his objectives in clear language.

Foreign Affairs

It is expected that Modi will be looking east and north for his foreign policy initiatives: notably to Japan, China, and South Korea. He has developed strong investment-related links with Japan, which has invested more in the middle-sized Indian state of Gujarat than in any other state of India.

An Indian analyst, Brahma Chellaney, identifying Modi's close links with Japan, and with Prime Minister Shinzo Abe in particular, compared the two men recently, saying that Modi's election victory reflects Indians' desire for a dynamic, assertive leader to revitalize their country's economy and security. Like Abe, Modi is expected to focus on reviving India's economic fortunes while bolstering its defenses and its strategic partnerships with like-minded states, thereby promoting regional stability and blocking the rise of a Sino-centric Asia. The 63-year-old Modi mirrors Abe's soft nationalism, market-oriented economics, and "new Asianism," seeking close ties with Asian democracies to create a web of interlocking strategic partnerships.

Following his visit to Japan last year, Modi told top bureaucrats that he wished to attract to Gujarat at least 50 new projects by Japanese companies over the next five years.

Apparently Chellaney is off the mark in evaluating Modi's view of China. He has visited China four times and, according to a consultant who traveled with him, Modi is enamored with the place. There is little doubt that Modi will move forward quickly, seeking investment from, and in, China. He will be at the July BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) summit in Brazil, perhaps his first overseas visit as India's prime minister, where he will meet Chinese President Xi Jinping. At the same time, Modi is a security-oriented politician who made some tough statements during his campaign, which made clear that he will not

make territorial concessions in the India-China border dispute.

China's response to Modi has always been positive. "China is willing to make joint efforts with the new Indian government, maintain high-level exchanges, deepen cooperation in all areas, and bring the China-India strategic partnership to new heights," Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesperson Hua Chunying told reporters in Beijing, in response to a question on the BJP's election victory. The Chinese media has been making positive projections about future prospects of bilateral ties under a Modi government.

Stephen P. Cohen, Senior Fellow at the India Project at the Brookings Institution, said on April 30, days before election results became available, at a panel discussion where Indian Ambassador to the United States S. Jaishankar was present, "The big change that I see—we all thought Modi would transform India's economy. I think that's true if there is a Modi government. That is going to give him more muscle and leverage in foreign policy. And the key country is China, plus Japan and South Korea. Modi has a close relationship with China, Japan, and South Korea, and a bad relationship with the U.S. He is going to expand this into a strategic advantage for India. That is, he is going to use the economic relationship with East Asia, especially China, to enhance India's power elsewhere. The original Nehruvian dream to make India among the top five or six countries of the world—I think he is going to implement that."

Financial Issues

It is too early to develop a conclusive view of what Modi's stance will be on financial issues. To begin with, he is very pro-investment and keen on developing India's infrastructure. India's central bank, the Reserve Bank of India (RBI), is now governed by Raghuram Rajan, whose prime objective in recent months has been to slow down the rate of inflation. He was appointed by the now-ousted UPA, which had every reason, particularly from its own electoral viewpoint, to curb inflation.


Rajan also considers high inflation a serious threat to India's economic gains of recent years. Eight months ago, when Rajan took over as head of the RBI, the rupee was in a free fall, speculators were betting on a debt crisis, and economists buzzed about India becoming the first BRIC nation to have its credit rating cut to "junk."

Rajan has halted the downward slide and is now battling inflation by slowly squeezing the money supply. He has raised borrowing costs three times to 8%. The moves were partly aimed at stabilizing the rupee after it plunged to record lows, but he is also trying to rid the \$1.8 trillion economy of the chronic inflation that exacerbates poverty, damages competitiveness, and inhibits foreign direct investment.⁴

But some media outlets have reported that several top BJP functionaries are unhappy with Rajan, because of policy differences on the trade-off between growth and inflation goals. Rajan, as a highly acclaimed economist, has written extensively about the need to strike the right balance. And there is nothing in Modi's pronouncements to indicate that he does not recognize the political danger of inflation. The two will bring different perspectives, but share the common goal of growth and employment, while keeping inflation low.⁵

4. William Pesek, "Indian Banker Has Hardest Job in Economics," Bloomberg, May 15, 2014.

5. J. Shivakumar and Inder Sud, "A Raghuram Rajan-Narendra Modi Team Can Be Good News for India," Firstpost Politics, May 12, 2014.



**THE
EURASIAN
LAND-BRIDGE**

**'The New Silk Road'—Locomotive
For Worldwide Economic Development**

An EIR Special Report

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

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

Blueprint for a European Government Under Imperial Rule

by Claudio Celani

May 15—The aim of the Empire faction in Europe has long been to set up a full-fledged European government with total control over national fiscal and budget systems. The major obstacle to that scheme has been the German Constitutional Court. To remove that obstacle, a convention is to be convoked in the Spring of 2015 to draft a new EU Treaty to replace the current Lisbon Treaty.

To that end, the Spinelli Group/Bertelsmann Foundation has launched a proposal, called “A Fundamental Law,” which has a good chance of being adopted, given the influence that its authors have on European affairs (the Bertelsmann Foundation has shaped many key social reforms, and economic and foreign policies in Germany, for instance, the infamous Hartz IV reforms).¹

The text, issued in October 2013, has received little attention so far, as it can only be obtained by purchase. However, policymakers, legal experts, and citizens are urgently needed to pay attention, and to mobilize against it. If national parliaments, political parties, and the citizens of Europe behave as they have in the case of the current European Treaties, which have been approved without any real information and discussion, in a few months, representative democracy in Europe will be as good as extirpated, and the rule of law an abstract proposition.

As two of its sponsors, Andrew Duff and Guy Verhofstadt (the latter being the leading candidate of the

1. The Hartz IV “reforms”—a brutal austerity program aimed primarily at lowering unemployment and pension benefits—were enacted in 2004.



The website of the Spinelli Group trumpets the role of Guy Verhofstadt (second from right) in the bloody coup in Kiev. The photo is from the Maidan, at the start of U.S.-EU-backed putsch.

European Liberals in the May 25 European Parliamentary elections), make very clear, the new Fundamental Law aims at constitutionalizing a supranational form of government which will have absolute power over taxation, finances, and economic policies in Europe, exclusively in the interests of the bankrupt global financial system.

The new Fundamental Law turns the EU Commission into a real government in a system “in which the Commission initiates laws which are then enacted jointly by the European Parliament, representing the citizens, and the Council, representing the states.” The Commission gets full “responsibility for the overall po-

litical direction of the Union” back from governments. “The Court of Justice gains the attributes of a supreme court.”

An End to National Sovereignty

The introduction to the 309-page text refers to what the authors consider the main shortcomings of the current EU supranational constitution, the Lisbon Treaty, a.k.a. the “European Treaty”: When it came to forcing governments to implement brutal budget cuts, in order to maintain fiscal capacity to bail out the bankrupt banks, national constitutional courts were an impediment. This was the case, for instance, with the automatic budget-slashing and supranational budget-control mechanism called the Fiscal Compact, or the just-approved European Banking Union, with its unlimited power for

bail-in, i.e., looting depositors’ money and pooling resources in a transnational bank bailout fund.

These new treaties have been signed in substantial violation of the European Treaty, the current Fundamental Law, which forbids a transfer union, and preserves “power of last instance” for national parliaments over budget matters. Thus, in order to give the new mechanisms a legal basis, they have been disciplined by extra-EU, traditional intergovernmental treaties. It is as if the EU had an *à la carte* system of law: EU Law (supranational, or federal law) for certain things, and intergovernmental treaties for other things. The legislative process in the EU since the Lisbon Treaty (adopted December 2009) has been such, that some critics have remarked: “The only certain thing in EU Law is that EU law is not certain.”

Ergo, the need was felt to solve the problem

Spinelli, Bertelsmann: Tools of the Empire

The Spinelli Group is a key interface of the political, media, and outright feudal forces which created the Ukrainian mess on behalf of the British Empire. Inspired by the ideas of Altiero Spinelli, a former Italian Communist Party member and founder of the European Federalist Movement, the Spinelli Group (SG) membership reads like a Who’s Who of the promoters of a European superstate.

SG initiator **Guy Verhofstadt**, together with SG member **Elmar Brok**, was one of the most active promoters of the coup in Kiev. On the evening of Feb. 20, just hours before the Nazi coup took place, Verhofstadt was on the Maidan addressing the crowd. A [video](#) posted on the SG website shows him promising a visa-free regime for all Ukrainians.

Verhofstadt, the leading candidate of the European Liberals for the European Parliament elections (and for EU Commission President), in a recent article, explains that the post-bipolar world will be characterized by several blocs, one being Europe; this he calls “the coming age of empires,” the title of a book he wrote. So, Europe as an empire.

In fact, Verhofstadt is a puppet of the monarchy, and his SG has two main partnerships: the **King**

Baudouin Foundation and the Bertelsmann Foundation. The former was established by the late Belgian King Baudouin, who became famous when, at the ceremony of independence for Congo in 1960, he praised Belgian colonialism. The KBF in turn, has a strategic partnership with the “independent” European Policy Center, run by an Oxford-trained, Romanian former minister, former EU Commissioner, and eco-zombie, **Megleva Kuneva**.

It has a huge advisory board, including **Petro Poroshenko**, the current “front runner” in the May 25 so-called Kiev elections. Another member is NATO Secretary General **Anders Fogh Rasmussen**.

As for the Bertelsmann Foundation, its influence on German economic, social, and foreign policy is proverbial, for instance in shaping the infamous Hartz IV reforms. Former Bertelsmann official and Spinelli Group member Elmar Brok, the outgoing chairman of the European Parliament Foreign Policy Committee, is arguably the most visible pro-Maidan activist in EU countries. He has gone there countless times, including on Feb. 20, when he was part of German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier’s delegation in the negotiations with later-ousted President Viktor Yanukovich.

As a posting on the [BüSo website](#) notes, an investigative committee concluded in 2002 that Bertelsmann was the largest publishing house servicing the Wehrmacht under the Third Reich.

through revising the Treaty in a way that ultimately disarms both national parliaments and constitutional courts.

As the Spinelli-Bertelsmann authors confess: “Pressure from the judiciary will also spur the treaty revision exercise—not least from the German Federal Constitutional Court in Karlsruhe, worried about the democratic legitimacy of the European project and the incursion of the Union into areas of law, notably on taxation, which have previously been subject to the exclusive realm of national parliaments.”

And a Financial Dictatorship


“The main innovation of the Fundamental Law . . . is the installation of an economic government of the fiscal union. . . . The government of the Union’s financial and economic policies is based on the European Commission which will acquire a treasury facility for the borrowing and lending of funds. A new post of Treasury minister is created with the job of stabilizing the Union’s economy and allocating its resources. Since economic policy reforms by the member states impact upon the rest of the Union, national plans must be discussed and coordinated *ex ante* [before the event—ed.]”

Toward a New Council of Florence

‘On the Peace of Faith’ and Other Works by Nicolaus of Cusa

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

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



\$15

plus \$3.50 shipping and handling

Schiller Institute, Inc.

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

The new Fundamental Law establishes that the Commission (with fewer members, i.e., not all EU member-nations represented) will be the Executive and the Parliament, while the European Council (i.e., governments) will be the legislative body.

Anyone who has ever been at the European Parliament knows that the idea of having the EP function as a representative legislative body is a farce. The EP, by definition, can be neither representative, nor can it legislate. The Spinelli-Bertelsmann Law claims that the problem of representation will be solved by electing a portion of the EP from “transnational lists” by “a pan-European constituency.” It does not say, however, how large this portion will be, among the 750 Members of the European Parliament. Furthermore, “the Commission retains its right to initiate EU laws.”

Europarlament approval is essential for all laws, but a only simple majority is required for passage. Since member countries are represented with reverse proportionality to population size (Malta has five representatives), it is quite easy to legislate against the interests of one major country.

The Fundamental Law provides, in Article 200, a system of direct taxation for the new system of government. It establishes, however, that the EU government must respect the same deficit/debt parameters as established in Protocol 10 of the European Treaty (3% deficit, 60% debt to GDP).

The new supranational government can levy direct and indirect taxes in all branches. Article 202 reads: “The European Parliament and Council, acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure, may adopt measures concerning the taxation of turnover, excise duties and other forms of indirect taxation, as well as the taxation of companies, natural persons and other forms of direct taxation for the benefit of the Union.”

Among the other items:

- The ordinary legislative procedure is widely expanded, i.e., without need for approval by national parliaments;
- Treaty changes must not be subject to “rigid unanimity,” i.e., the Fundamental Law can be changed even if some member-states are against;
- “Wider powers for European Central Bank,” i.e., unlimited powers of monetary expansion;
- National sovereign debts are to be put in one single pot and managed under fascist Troika-like policies.

CHINA HIGH-SPEED RAIL

Girdling the Globe With a Tramway of Iron

by William Jones

May 14—The just-concluded visit to Africa by Chinese Premier Li Keqiang, with its promise of the construction of new rail lines on the transportation-starved continent, underlines the grand development strategy elaborated by China, utilizing its growing expertise in rail construction, in particular, high-speed rail construction, in order to connect the world.

This had been the perspective of the leading political forces in our own nation more than 150 years ago. The creation of the Transcontinental Railroad, initiated by Abraham Lincoln, and completed shortly after his untimely death in 1865, had welded together the vast expanse of the American West in a single line of communication. This served as a model for similar rail projects in Europe and the Middle East.

The Trans-Siberian Railroad, begun in the 1880s and completed in 1913, and the Berlin-to-Baghdad Railway, sabotaged by the British in their attempt to undermine the Continental powers, followed in the wake of the U.S. Transcontinental. Brig. Gen. Joshua T. Owen, a veteran of the American Civil War, speaking at a dinner in Philadelphia in 1869, organized by American System economist Henry Carey in honor of Andrew Curtin, who had just been appointed U.S. envoy to Russia, urged the Tsar to begin construction on a Trans-Siberian railroad, effectively “girdling the globe with a tramway of iron.”

In the 1870s, there were attempts to create a Trans-Hemispheric Railroad from Alaska to Patagonia, but these never reached fruition. The firing of German Chancellor

Otto von Bismarck by the German Kaiser in 1890, and the subsequent rush to war in the European capitals, which began years prior to the Great War of 1914-18, put an end to that vision. It has now been taken up by the Chinese leadership, with particular emphasis on the latest developments in mass-transportation technology, high-speed rail and magnetically levitated (maglev) trains.

China Ready To Span the Bering Strait

This “railroad strategy” is fundamental to the program of the two Silk Roads announced last year by Chinese President Xi Jinping: the Silk Road Economic Belt, traversing Central Asia to Europe, and the Maritime Silk Road, stretching through Southeast Asia. Most recently, China has also expressed a keen interest in getting involved in the Russian project of building a tunnel under the Bering Strait, bringing Eurasia and North America together in one expansive rail network. The Bering Strait tunnel project, which has been promoted for decades by *EIR*,¹ was also the subject of a conference in Germany in 2007, organized by the Schiller Institute, where representatives from both Russia and the United States involved in the Bering Strait project, made presentations.²

1. See: Benjamin Deniston, “The Pacific Development Corridor: Maglev Across the Bering Strait,” *EIR*, Sept. 13, 2013, and many other articles at www.larouchepub.com.

2. See: Schiller Institute Conference, “The Eurasian Land-Bridge Becomes a Reality!” Sept. 15-16, 2007, Kiedrich, Germany, at www.schillerinstitute.com.



The concept for China's worldwide Iron Silk Road is based on Lincoln's Transcontinental Railroad, and Russia's Trans-Siberian. The Bering Strait crossing, shown here in an artist's conception, will realize the centuries-old dream of linking Asia and North America.

Speaking to the *Beijing Times* on May 8, Academician Wang Mengshu, from the Chinese Academy of Engineering, indicated that the Bering Strait tunnel was also encompassed in China's high-speed rail plans. "Right now, we are already in discussions" on the Bering Strait, Wang said. "Russia has already been thinking about this for many years." Using high-speed rail technology, Wang said, a passenger could make the trip between China and North America in two days.

Wang is not just any commentator. A highly regarded professor of engineering since 1964, he has played a key role in, and made numerous contributions, to many of China's major construction projects, including rail, tunnel, and subway construction. He has also advised on the construction of China's South-to-North water-transfer project. Wang has long been the chief proponent of China becoming the leading producer of high-speed rail. In 2011, he was nominated as the Science Person of the Year, and is also a member of the National People's Congress.

In an interview last year, Wang told reporters that China now is clearly ahead in high-speed rail technology. "When people talk of watches, they think of Switzerland," Meng said. "When they think of small electronics, they think Japan. When they think of space,

they think of America, and talking of machinery, they think of Germany. Now when they think of high-speed rail, China becomes the name brand."

A High-Speed Silk Road

In the interview, Wang also announced China's "going out" strategy for high-speed rail. "High-speed rail will certainly have to "go out" Wang said: namely, with one high-speed line to the southwest, one to the northwest, and one to the northeast. A high-speed rail is also being proposed for the Central Asian Silk Road, and there are considerations for extending high-speed rail to Iran for both passenger and


oil transport, Wang said.

In his more recent interview with *Beijing Times*, Wang explained the role of high-speed rail in the development of the Silk Road Economic Belt. He noted four primary directions for Chinese lines: 1) a Eurasian line with two branches, one going through Kazakhstan and another entering China at the border with Russia at Manzhouli, and proceeding east to Khabarovsk; 2) a Central Asian line, starting from Urumqi and proceeding through Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Iran, and Turkey, and, from there on to Germany; 3) a Pan-Asian line starting from Kunming and proceeding through Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, and Malaysia, and ending at Singapore; and 4) a line going to the northeast through China and into Siberia, linking up with the planned Bering Strait tunnel, which would connect Russia's Chukotka peninsula with Alaska.

There are still ongoing discussions with Russia regarding which gauge would be used for the lines traversing Russian territory; China wants to build their lines using the narrower international gauge rather than the broader Russian gauge.

Wang indicated in the *Beijing Times* interview that work is proceeding apace on the Chinese section of the first two lines, and that the overseas sections are still

FIGURE 1
China's 'Going-Out' Strategy for High-Speed Rail



The map indicates the key points on the projected four main lines of China's Silk Road Economic Belt: 1) a Eurasian line; 2) a Central Asian line; 3) a Pan-Asian line; and 4) a China-Siberia line linking up with the planned Bering Strait tunnel, to Alaska.

under discussion. Construction has already begun on the Pan-Asian line, on a railway tunnel from China to Myanmar. A Siberian line still has to be negotiated with Russia, but Wang thinks that China is prepared to help finance and build the tunnel under the Bering Strait, as well. Wang feels that resolving the issues involved in this construction would also provide the basis for the construction a tunnel between China's coastal Fujian province and Taiwan.

Wang went on to underline the importance of China becoming the leading producer of high-speed rail. First, he said, we can exchange our high-speed rail invest-

ment for the energy resources available in many of the transit countries. In the case of Myanmar, which is not an energy producer, the rail construction could be exchanged for its potash, Wang said. Secondly, "the project provides the outlet for Chinese engineers to play the key role in the surveying, design, and construction of the roads, and allows them to train personnel in the recipient countries. Even now there is a regular train which departs from Zhengzhou carrying exploration equipment and technical personnel destined for Central Europe and other regions on the rail line," Wang said.

A Hamiltonian Credit System

The project is not without its challenges, Wang admits. One involves its financing. Although China has extensive financial reserves, the size of the project far outstrips China's ability to finance it on its own. China's proposal for the establishment of an Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank might be a step in the right direction, but it would require that other nations put up their own capital as well.

More to the point, these types of infrastructure projects require a return to the notion of a Hamiltonian credit system rather than a monetary system. And this then raises the question of the urgent need for dealing with the out-of-control international financial system in which such "investment" is taking place. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, in her discussions with Chinese scholars on a visit to China last February, underlined that, if the projects associated with the Silk Road Economic Belt were to succeed, it was absolutely necessary to establish a

Hamiltonian state-generated credit system and to bankrupt the monetarist casino economy of Wall Street through the reestablishment of Glass-Steagall legislation.³

Secondly, Wang noted the need for the countries in the region to develop an expedited system for customs and border crossings. If lengthy border procedures remain a bottleneck delaying traffic, the very purpose of the high-speed rail system is defeated.

Returning to the “going out” strategy, Wang stated that China clearly possesses the capability and the technology. But the international situation is complicated, and the speed of travel is still relatively slow. Moving the project abroad requires negotiations, assurances that it will be beneficial for us and that it will also help to spur other industries.” Thirdly, Wang indicated, there are still the major problems involved in traversing some of the difficult terrain encountered when bridging the Eurasian continent with high-speed rail.

But the directionality of the Chinese program is clear. In addition to the conventional high-speed rail, which China has effectively mastered, it is also proceeding to take the next step with the development of a commercial maglev traffic. Researchers at the Applied Superconductivity Laboratory of Southwest Jiaotong University are developing a maglev train prototype to run inside an evacuated tube which could potentially reach supersonic speeds up to 1,800 miles per hour. The limit to the speed of a maglev system is not the maglev technology itself, but the aerodynamic drag the vehicle encounters at high speeds. The Chinese evacuated-tube design lowers the atmospheric pressure inside to 10 times less than normal atmospheric pressure. The researchers successfully tested their vehicle in a 40-foot diameter closed circular loop.

Although high-speed rail and magnetically levitated trains were developed in the United States in the 1970s, with the first maglev line having been built in Germany, it has been left to China to move the ball forward. For this, they are to be lauded. And it should be a signal to the rest of the world that they must quickly abandon the rampant “green” ideology, which has taken root in the West since the assassination of President Kennedy, and return to those policies of scientific and technological progress which served us so well, and which now are the only hope for bringing mankind out of the economic misery in which the great mass of humanity now finds itself.

3. See: “Helga Zepp-LaRouche on Chinese TV: Silk Road Lady on the Potential for a 21st-Century Peace Order,” *EIR*, April 25, 2014.

Finally, a Bering Strait Tunnel?

May 17—The inclusion of the Bering Strait Tunnel in an outline of China’s plans for global rail development in the state-run *Beijing Times* on May 8 has again put that long-standing project on the international agenda. U.S. rail expert Hal Cooper, who has been a long-term advocate of the project, told *Ria Novosti* in the wake of that announcement that the Chinese action means that the project “will never be swept under the rug again.”

The proposal for a rail link from Siberia to Alaska across the Bering Strait has been mooted since the time of Abraham Lincoln (see *EIR*, May 2, 2007), but the idea went through a renaissance beginning with the work of the Schiller Institute in the early 1990s, when Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche embarked on their campaign for a World Land-Bridge of development corridors. Both LaRouches have conceived of the project both as a spur to global economic development and a means of war avoidance through cooperation among key nations such as the United States, Russia, and China, all of which are needed to realize such a project.

2007 Nodal Point

2007 was a breakthrough year for the project, featuring a number of high-profile conferences and decisions that spotlighted the tunnel project.

At an April 10 meeting on rail transport, chaired by President Vladimir Putin, Vladimir Yakunin, head of the state-owned company Russian Railways, laid out construction of the 3,500-km rail line from the right bank of the Lena River to the Bering Strait, as a significant task. That line would later be included as one of strategic importance for the future, in the Russian Railways Strategy for Rail Development in the Russian Federation to 2030, published in July 2007.

Russian proponents of the Bering Strait project conducted a publicity drive around an April 23 conference titled “Megaprojects of Russia’s East: Intercontinental Eurasia-America Link via the Bering Strait.” This was organized by the Council for the Study of Productive Forces (SOPS), a joint institution of the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Russian government’s Eco-

nomics Ministry (MERT). Co-sponsors were the Economics Ministry itself, the Russian Ministry of Transport, Russian Railways, and several regional governments in Siberia and the Russian Far East.

On April 16, the late Academician Alexander Granberg, then head of the SOPS, explained in an interview how the project fit into the Russian leadership's vision of the development of transportation infrastructure as essential for uplifting Russia's huge outlying regions.

Then on April 18, at a pre-event press conference held by the SOPS project working group, SOPS Vice-Chairman Victor Razbegin, also of the MERT Industrial Research department, grabbed headlines in the Russian media with his huge map of the proposed \$65 billion multi-modal Bering Strait tunnel from Russia to Alaska, with its associated long-distance rail and power lines.

At the conference itself, high-level Russian participants were joined by speakers from South Korea, Japan, and the United States.

In the opening session, two American contributions put forward the idea that great development projects are the path, leading away from war. These were the remarks by the late Governor of Alaska and U.S. Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel, a strong backer of the Bering Strait tunnel project; and Lyndon LaRouche's article, "The World's Political Map Changes: Mendeleev Would Have Agreed." The article by LaRouche, requested by conference organizers for publication in connection with the event, was read to the meeting.

Granberg told the conference that the next step would be design and feasibility studies for the 6,000-km rail-road-pipeline-power corridor from Yakutsk in Eastern Siberia to Fort Nelson, Canada, including a 100-km tunnel under the Bering Strait.

At the end of the conference, April 25, the participants issued an "Appeal from the participants of the international conference on an Intercontinental Eurasia-America Transport Link via the Bering Strait, to the heads of state and governments of Russia, the U.S.A., Canada, South Korea, Japan, China, and the EU member-states." Along with the Appeal, the participants at the April Moscow conference sent a draft Memorandum of Cooperation, proposing that those nations endorse the project and consider financing feasibility studies for the Bering Strait project at the June 6-8, 2007 G-8 summit in Heiligendamm, Germany. The studies, they said, could have been completed by 2010.

Global Support

While the issue was not known to have been taken up at the G-8 summit, high-profile organizing continued. Among the highlights was the Schiller Institute's Sept. 15 conference in Kiedrich, Germany, which in addition to the LaRouches, featured speakers from around the world, including an impressive delegation of Russian scholars and political leaders.

Among them were Prof. Stanislav Menshikov of the Russian Academy of Sciences; Razbegin; and Dr. Sergei Cherkasov and Academician Dmitri Rundqvist, both of the Vernadsky State Geological Museum; and Hal Cooper. The prospects for the Bering Strait rail tunnel as part of the global land-bridge were highlighted.

The Russians have also kept the project on the radar screen, although the global financial crisis and the geopolitics in the West have erected major barriers to it being able to go ahead. The Russians again attempted to place the project on the international agenda, at the November 2010 G20 summit in South Korea. Russian Federation Council member Aslambek Aslakhanov, formerly an advisor to President Putin, told Novosti of the critical role of this project for the industrial development of *the entire region*, by linking four continents.

Also in 2010, the Chinese interest in the project was demonstrated when the Grand Prize for innovation at the Shanghai World Expo-2010 went to the Bering Strait Tunnel project, submitted by Russia's SOPS. Razbegin was on hand to receive the award for this "intercontinental multimodal transport tunnel" design.

New Prospects

China's renewed public attention to the Bering Strait project has come virtually on the eve of Putin's May 20-21, 2014 visit to Beijing, where new levels of economic cooperation are expected to be discussed, and certain agreements, such as on natural gas, which have been under negotiation for some time, are expected to be consolidated.

Will these two leaders of the Eurasian world, who have been pursuing high-technology economic development, in stark contrast to the United States and Western Europe, take the occasion to publicly offer to the U.S., and others, cooperation on the Bering Strait mega-project? Given the utterly bankrupt condition of the trans-Atlantic system, the time for such a renewed offer is more than right.

Globalization Makes You Sick! WHO Warns of Drug-Resistant Bacteria

by Caroline Hartmann

WIESBADEN, Germany, May 16—The World Health Organization (WHO) released an alarming report in April about the increase of drug-resistant pathogens. It documents that cases have been registered in 36 countries, where antibiotics no longer have any effect. The WHO warns that it is only a matter of time before this resistance spreads worldwide, and details how bacteria are withstanding the “massive” attack against them by antibiotics. These include *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, a pathogen that can cause deadly lung infections, especially in hospital patients; the *E. coli* bacterium, which causes common urinary tract infections; and especially, the multiple-resistant bacterium that is being found in hospitals, MRSA (Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus Aureus*).

If these widespread pathogens reach the urinary tract, lungs, or open wounds, they can be life-threatening. Although the report also covers drug resistance in the broader sense, as in HIV and malaria therapy, its focus is on antibiotics.

The situation is particularly disastrous in Germany. Scientists working with Matthias Hermann, Medical Director of the Institute for Medical Microbiology and Infection Control at the Saarland University Hospitals, have recently determined the prevalence of patients with MRSA during a four-week period in one of the 24 acute care hospitals in the state of Saarland. Of more than 20,000 patients studied, 436 were carriers of the pathogen, the scientists reported in the journal [Plos One](#).

WHO Assistant Secretary-General Keiji Fukuda, in his introduction to the WHO report, warns of a “post-antibiotic era,” in which common infections and minor



Wikimedia Commons/Kounosu

The Dharavi slum in Mumbai, India, where drug-resistant tuberculosis has broken out. Solving the larger global crisis of poverty and globalization is the prerequisite to dealing with public health problems.

injuries could once again mean a death sentence, and says that, as long as there is no change in the current use of antibiotics, “step by step, we will lose the benefits of these drugs. The consequences will be devastating.”

The Robert Koch Institute (RKI) in Berlin, scientists at the Hamburg Academy of Sciences, and the National Academy of Sciences (Leopoldina) in Halle have been warning for years about the increase of antibiotic-resistant germs. The RKI has established a system for monitoring the occurrence and the spread of drug-resistant infectious agents (the system is known as ARS, Antibiotic Resistance Surveillance Germany), as a kind of early warning system for new types of antibiotic resistance. A national reference center was also set up at the Ruhr University in Bochum, where further analyses will be made, for example, of bacteria such as the so-

called gram-negative hospital pathogens. Contrary to the WHO, the RKI came to the conclusion that “further spread of multi-resistant pathogens can be prevented, through targeted measures of hospital hygiene and antibiotic treatment tailored to the drug-resistance in the particular locality.”

The fears expressed in the WHO report are certainly justified; however, some of the WHO’s conclusions are questionable, such as, that use of antibiotics should be limited. Other important causes of the problem are not being addressed at all, such as globalization, food price speculation, the massive expansion of ethanol production—which means the destruction of food production in poor countries—as well as the increase in poverty in the industrialized states, which is not to be underestimated. The continuing outbreak of new or hitherto eliminated viral infections, including polio and measles, is not being sufficiently addressed. And the ebola epidemic in Guinea shows dramatically what is actually lacking, because the leading pharmaceutical companies are not interested in developing a vaccine for this most dangerous and highly contagious disease. Supposedly experts say that “a project like this is not profitable for the companies” (*Rheinische Post*, April 9, 2014).

Research Is at a Standstill

The WHO report ignores a very important and undeniable fact regarding antibiotic use, which is that, along with the beginning of globalization and market liberalization, the emergence of “green” fanaticism, and the decisions not to pursue basic research, e.g., in the nuclear field, an even more obvious decision detrimental to human welfare was made, resulting in the failure to discover any new antibiotic for over 30 years!

Prof. Jörg Hacker, the president of the National Academy of Sciences (Leopoldina), made this point very clearly at the beginning of last year. He is the co-author of an article, “Antibiotics Research: Problems and Prospects,” published in January 2013 by the Acad-


emy of Sciences in Hamburg and Leopoldina, which has eight recommendations for how to prevent the further spread of drug-resistance, including why urgently needed antibiotics have to be developed. In an interview with the daily *Die Welt* in January 2013, he said that the problem could be handled, but that the failure to develop new antibiotics for more than 30 years means that things have been irresponsibly brought to a standstill.

It is useful to recall in this context how the discovery of highly effective antibiotics occurred in the first place. It began with the discovery that a dye could be made from ordinary tar (i.e., carbon), which could successfully treat pestilential diseases such as malaria. In 1882, Robert Koch used a methylene blue dye to identify the tuberculosis pathogen, and it was subsequently recognized that bacteria could be stained. Such toxic dyes could also destroy bacteria without harming the infected individuals. Koch’s collaborator Paul

Ehrlich (not to be confused with the genocidalist Paul R. Ehrlich, today), in 1910, developed salvarsan, a compound that destroys the pathogen that causes syphilis, with only minor side effects for the patient, as well as the serum germanin used against sleeping sickness, and the world-famous aspirin. These are naturally extracted or synthesized substances that man has been using for over 200 years, and that have saved millions of lives. And it is a slap in the face of every patient, when today’s Paul Ehrlich Foundation announces that “every unnecessary antibiotic encourages the development of resistance.”

A half-truth is also a lie!

The bottom line: For the past 30 years, protecting human health has ceased to be a priority. The WHO’s calls for access to clean water and sanitation around the world are absolutely right, but the whole discussion of drug resistance should be considered a warning sign that we must change worldwide economic policy as soon as possible, in the direction of development and the common good. Otherwise, we will permanently lose the ability to combat deadly pathogens and viruses.



A scanning electron micrograph of MRSA bacteria. This pathogen, which is sometimes found in hospitals, is especially virulent.

Rogers Campaign Organizes For a Post-Obama Future

by Harley Schlanger

May 19—When Kesha Rogers announced her decision last December to run for the U.S. Senate in Texas, she said a major goal of her campaign would be to “change the subject,” from the usual banalities and hot-button issues, to a serious dialogue over how to move the United States into the future. While this goes against the practical, business-as-usual approach which dominates electoral politics in the the country, based on appealing to “popular opinion,” Rogers, a LaRouche Democrat, emphasized from the beginning, that it has been adherence to such pragmatism, which has placed our nation in existential danger.

Now, on the eve of her May 27 primary runoff against millionaire David Alameel, it is the voters who face the test. Rogers has done what she promised, and she has the potential to win, in what would be a dramatic shock to the U.S. political system, especially the Obama Democrats, and would create openings to solve the real problems that face the United States and the world. The question is whether enough Texans will come out and fight for their future, by voting for her.

Offering an Opportunity

“I intend, with my campaign, to give Texas voters an opportunity to connect the best tradition of Texas politics—the anti-Wall Street, pro-growth, future-oriented tradition of FDR/JFK Democrats, exemplified by Wright Patman, Ralph Yarborough, and Henry B. Gonzalez, among others—with the quality of bold thinking needed today,” Rogers said when she embarked on her

campaign. She added that Texas voters have tuned out of politics, largely due to the failure of candidates to provide actual leadership, by challenging citizens to take personal responsibility for the future, rather than whining about how “you can’t do anything.”

This attitude, she said, is disastrous, as we are facing a crisis which requires immediate action. She identified the leading components of this crisis as the danger of a thermonuclear World War III, which could result from Obama’s British Empire-directed fascist regime change in Ukraine and confrontational approach to China, the hyperinflationary collapse of the trans-Atlantic financial system, and the devastating drought threatening food production in Texas and California. In her campaign, she has insisted that there are solutions, but these exist only to the extent that leadership is asserted, to explain the interrelated cause of these crises—the genocidal “final solution” adopted by the British Empire, when faced with its impending collapse—and to rally support for a post-Obama era in the United States.

However, to accomplish this, there must be a break from recent trends in U.S. politics, and that is what differentiates her campaign from any other in the 2014 mid-term elections.

Despite running against one opponent who spent over \$4 million in the primary, and a corrupt state party apparatus, supplemented by an Obama-run team of election wiseguys in “Battleground Texas,” who engaged in a non-stop attacks against Rogers and efforts to demoralize potential voters, she finished second in a



EIRNS/Gabriela Carr

Keshia Rogers, candidate for the Democratic nomination for Senate from Texas, has remoralized voters and changed the subject from the usual drivel of the leaders of both parties.

five-person race, while holding Alameel below 50%, forcing a runoff. Rogers has conducted a statewide campaign, aimed at activating both former Democrats and new voters, to shake them out of their demoralization and lethargy, and come out to vote.

Impeach Obama!

At the heart of Rogers' program is the drive to impeach President Obama, given his dangerous, repeated violations of the U.S. Constitution. As long as he remains in office, she said, there is no chance that members of Congress, in either party, will break with the Wall Street-dominated "party system." Wall Street has asserted total control over the White House, as part of the City of London banks, during both the Bush and Obama administrations, and this is why no one, in either party, has yet moved for impeachment.

However, this is changing, both in Texas and nationally, in part due to the relentless campaign of Rogers, and her success in forcing a runoff. The leading issue of contention between her and Alameel, is the impeachment of Obama, as her opponent has had nothing to say, in the e-mails and mailings sent to "loyal" Democrats—i.e., those still supporting Obama—other than that Democrats should not vote for Keshia, because she wants to impeach the President. He is actually aiding

Rogers, by identifying her as the anti-Obama candidate in the race!

While the Alameel campaign in Texas is clinging to Obama as a drowning man grabs an anchor, the climate for impeachment has increased dramatically nationwide. The vote to establish a House investigative committee to look into the repeated lies from the administration on Benghazi is but one example. While this was undertaken by Republicans, Democrats have begun to realize that support for the Obama Presidency not only threatens the immediate future of the party, but also of the nation, and some in the House and Senate are now challenging Obama, on matters such as the coverup of Dick Cheney's torture policy, NSA spying, and continued bailouts and protection of the too-big-to-fail banks.

The Alameel campaign is taking a huge risk in its attacks on Rogers on the question of Obama, as the President is highly unpopular in Texas among voters in both parties. Rogers' victories in Democratic Congressional primaries in the 22nd C.D. in 2010 and 2012, in which her opponents chose to attack her on this issue, showed that more than 50% who voted in the party primary support the removal of Obama. For this reason, the Alameel campaign has concluded that the only way to defeat Rogers is to appeal to the dwindling number of Obama loyalist zombies in the party, while lowering the

number of voters, including doing everything possible to obscure the fact that there is even a runoff.

In response, the Rogers campaign has launched an aggressive policy of outreach, statewide, with two leaflets for mass distribution, supplemented by radio ads, rallies with banners over heavily trafficked freeways, and impromptu “meet-ups.” The goal is to reactivate the many former Democrats who have been voting Republican, not because of any virtues of Republican candidates, but out of anger and frustration toward Obama, and disgust at the absurdity of the party promoting a millionaire, Alameel, who made his money from a deal with a Wall Street hedge fund, pretending that he will take on Wall Street.

The Post-Obama Era

The most powerful aspect of the Rogers campaign has been its activation of many former or lapsed Democrats, who are excited by the prospect of reviving the pro-growth, anti-greenie traditions of the party. This has been discovered by campaign workings organizing among rural and blue collar Democrats, as well as urban African-American and Hispanic Democrats. A recent tour by Rogers, to the Rio Grande Valley (RGV) and to San Antonio, brought into the open both the potential, and the problem.

In the RGV, there has been a significant erosion of support for Democrats, as many second-level leaders are enraged that they are considered, by the party inner circle, as automatic voters for “acceptable” Democratic candidates. The effort by the Cameron County (Brownsville) Democratic chair Amber Medina to exclude Rogers from campaign events led to a sharp blast by a prominent blogger in the *Brownsville Voice*, which accused the Medina and state party chairman Gilbert Hinojosa, who is from Brownsville, of treating the RGV like a “plantation,” on which they can tell people how to vote, and employing mafia methods to stay in power.

A similar response has been evident in San Antonio, where the county chairman has functioned as a bagman for Alameel, who has said repeatedly that he will spend “whatever it takes” to win. Ads are running in the city on a Spanish-language radio station, in which a prominent activist, Henry Rodriguez, endorses Rogers, accusing Alameel of trying to “buy votes.” In the ad, Rodriguez states, “We are not for sale,” while chiding Alameel for his refusal to debate Rogers.

In Rodriguez’s case, as with many of those who fall into the category which Franklin Roosevelt called the

“forgotten man,” they are inspired by Rogers’ willingness to engage them in discussion, to challenge both what they think and how they think, and to push them to take up “big ideas.” During the campaign, Rogers sponsored two joint town hall meetings with LaRouche Democrat Michael Steger, who is running for Congress in California, which focused on overcoming the drought, through not just funding of major water projects—which is essential—but also moving into frontier areas of science, including atmospheric dynamics, and the need for massive upgrading of energy production, beginning with bringing thermonuclear fusion on line.

In many of the events she has held, participants find themselves fascinated by this kind of discussion, especially those who initially decided to attend because they wish to see Obama impeached. What Rogers has introduced into the campaign is the idea that impeaching Obama is only the beginning, and what is required is a total change in thinking, to enter into the post-Obama era. From daily organizing activities, and these kinds of meetings, the campaign has recruited over 250 people committed to bringing voters to the polls.

At the same time, Battleground Texas, with no shortage of funds, and the “expertise” of Obama operatives, has been struggling to attract activists, to back the candidates endorsed by the state party, such as Alameel, as acknowledged in an article in the May 16 *New York Times*. The article quotes various officials lamenting how difficult it is to bring Texas Democrats to the polls.

With no message other than “stick with Obama,” and a candidate such as Alameel, with a long history of funding Republicans, as well as well-publicized ethics charges, including covering up for sexual harassment by employees at his dental clinics (see last week’s *EIR*)—who is discovering again that he cannot buy an election—the strategy of the Democrats is voter suppression, and fraud. Prominent Democrats have warned the Rogers campaign of the likelihood that, in a close election, vote fraud should be expected, both through use of phony mail-in ballots, and Hinojosa-controlled operatives in south Texas and the Rio Grande Valley. While the prospect of electoral victory for Rogers depends on how many of the forgotten men and women in Texas overcome their submission to the corruption of both parties, and cast ballots, she has already won a bigger victory. Through her persistent, inspiring leadership, the subject has been changed from the usual banal drivel of money-driven consultants and pollsters, to the great horizon that will be opened by the coming end of the Obama era.

VA Scandal Spotlights Bush/Obama Killer Takedown of Medical Capacity

by Carl Osgood

May 17—New charges have come to the fore that wait-times for visits and treatment in parts of the Veterans Affairs medical system are far longer than its stated goal of 14 days; records are being falsified; and deaths have resulted. In fact, these recent charges come atop a pattern going back years, associated with the deliberate contraction of the U.S. military and veteran medical system begun under George W. Bush, and continued under Barack Obama. All the while, the Bush/Obama administrations have sent millions of young men and women to Iraq, Afghanistan, Africa, and elsewhere to face danger, disability, and death, on behalf of London's war policy. Now, the VA medical system cannot provide timely care for the 6.5 million active enrollees. The process is directly parallel to the 2010 Affordable Care Act, in which you sign up, then don't get care.

What's called for is the removal of Obama from office and this British Empire killing policy from our government. Some are calling for sacking Gen. Eric Shinseki, Secretary of the VA, former Army Chief of Staff, and a fervent advocate for the veterans; Shinseki himself has recently suspended three top VA officials in Phoenix, Ariz. He has commissioned a VA Inspector General investigation and an internal audit of the appointing system throughout the VA medical system. But, it's Obama, the London flunky-in-charge, who is responsible for the killer policy.

A Long-Term Policy

The dramatic contraction in the network of U.S. military base and Veterans Affairs facilities saw two big waves of closures of infrastructure, with a net loss of capacity, that while the Cheney/Bush/Obama war machine was in full gear, grinding up millions of lives.

BRAC: 2005 saw the initiation of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's Base Realignment and Closing process, which resulted in the selective closure and/or sell-off of 33 major sites and 775 smaller installations,

several of which were associated with medical capacity: Walter Reed Army Medical Center, located on prime Washington, D.C. real estate, was closed; several other facilities, notably the Air Force's Wilford Hall Medical Center at Lackland AFB, Texas, were realigned to reduce capacity.

CARES: In 2004, the CARES—Capital Asset Alignment for Advanced Services—was initiated by the Bush-Cheney Veterans Affairs Department. The PriceWaterhouse accounting firm was hired to list which facilities in the VA national grid—154 hospitals, 900 clinics, and 200 other facilities—would be targets for sell-off to capitalize on the “real estate potential” for each medical campus. Many VA hospitals were prime downtown real estate sites. CARES was implemented, with drastic losses in the national VA grid.

Thousands of VA staff and services are reliable, life-saving, and respected. But under Obama, the *policy at the top is to cause harm and destruction*. Treatments considered not cost effective, and health facilities considered “excessive” are being shut down for the whole population under Obamacare, and the VA is no exception.

Among the latest reports are the following.

Arizona. A whistleblower, Dr. Sam Foote, charged, in a report first posted by CNN on April 24, that at the Phoenix Veterans Medical Center, the management had a secret list of between 1,400 and 1,600 vets awaiting appointments—some for many months, while a fake list was forwarded to Congressional overseers and others in Washington, which fraudulently showed that the facility had been making appointments within the 14-day period. Foote estimates that at least 40 veterans died while waiting to see a primary care physician.

Even before the Phoenix story broke, the VA had admitted that at least 23 patients had died of gastrointestinal cancer, and dozens of others were injured, all because of delays in getting appointments.

Texas. Another whistleblower, Dr. Richard Krug-

man, charged that in the VA Health Care System in Harlingen, colonoscopies have been delayed, to the point of risking Stage 4 cancer. “That was done because of dollars and cents. For the VA, they have to be bleeding out of their rectum before they would authorize a colonoscopy. That was the standard of care,” he told the May 12 *Washington Examiner*. Krugman reckons as many as 15,000 veterans were affected by this policy; many have likely died. If they didn’t die in a VA hospital—the nearest one often being a four-hour drive away—they don’t show up on VA records, Dr. Krugman reported.

Nationwide. In December 2012, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report based on its review of four VA facilities—

Washington, D.C.; Harrison, Mont.; Dayton, Ohio; and Los Angeles, Calif. The report found that schedulers at these four facilities had been sidestepping the electronic appointment system, by tracking appointments on paper and failing to enter them into the electronic system, until they were within the 14-day window. Numerous reports on the problem date back to at least the year 2000, and it hasn’t been solved.

On May 8, the House Veterans Affairs Committee voted to subpoena e-mail correspondence and other material from the VA relating to delayed appointments and secret waiting lists. Committee chairman Jeff Miller (R-Fla.) indicated that the committee had been seeking this material since April 24, but had received no response from the VA. “The last few weeks have been a model of VA stonewalling which precipitated the need for this subpoena,” he said.

The DOD Is Doing the Same Thing

While the VA scandal has been splashed across the front pages, the Defense Department, which is supposed to be working closely with the VA to smooth the transition process of service members from active duty to veteran status, stands accused of its own misconduct. Robert Alvarez and Georg-Andreas Pogány, two veterans’ advocates (and both veterans themselves) based in Denver, filed a lawsuit on May 12, charging Army officials at Fort Carson, Colo. with unreasonably barring



Veterans Affairs Secretary Gen. Eric Shinseki is taking the heat from Congress (as seen here May 15, being grilled by a Senate committee) for the scandal at the VA, but it’s the Obama Administration’s killer austerity policy that has gutted medical care for both the military and civilian population.

them from access to their clients—soldiers facing adverse discharges for medical and psychological reasons—and falsifying their medical records to give them less than honorable discharges, a status which denies them post-discharge medical benefits from the DoD and the VA.

Alvarez and Pogány are the COO and CEO, respectively, of the Uniformed Services Justice and Advocacy Group (USJAG), and have been providing investigative, forensic, and advocacy services to soldiers facing administrative and judicial proceedings, and assisting them in securing their service-connected benefits. This includes obtaining accurate diagnoses and disability ratings so that they may receive health-care benefits after discharge from military service. The majority of their clients suffer from acute mental illness from traumatic brain injury (TBI) and/or post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and so are often not fully capable of understanding the proceedings to which they’re subjected.

According to the lawsuit, Alvarez and Pogány began identifying a pattern whereby the Army was increasing its use of administrative discharge procedures to expel soldiers for misconduct when, in reality, their misconduct stemmed from TBI, PTSD, or other injuries (including addiction to medications that were prescribed to them). When Alvarez and Pogány came into conflict with Fort Carson officials over


these cases, they reported the disputes to the Office of the Army Surgeon General, the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, and to the relevant Congressional Committees; they also requested Army investigations of physicians and commanders at Fort Carson who were interfering with their clients' medical evaluation and treatment.

On Nov. 5, 2012, the two USJAG officers were barred from access to Fort Carson, and thus were denied access to many of their clients, to medical and other officials on the post whom they needed to interact with in order to gain information about their clients' cases, and to court martial and other legal proceedings involving their clients. Col.

David Grosso, the garrison commander at Fort Carson, claimed that they were "disruptive to the good order and discipline of the installation," though no evidence was ever produced to substantiate that charge.

According to the complaint, Alvarez and Pogány were then falsely accused of deceitful conduct, the accusations were an effort to undermine the work they were doing for soldiers who were facing a less than honorable characterization of their service and the ensuing loss of benefits. Though the complaint doesn't explicitly say so, the restriction of the two veterans' advocates from access to their clients potentially poses great harm to those soldiers. If a soldier cannot gain access to psychological and medical services that he needs as a result of his military service, he *is likely to be at greater risk of committing suicide*, a risk that otherwise might be mitigated or prevented altogether.

The lead defendant in the lawsuit is Lt. Gen. Joseph Anderson, who was the commander of Fort Carson in 2012, before he was reassigned to Fort Bragg in 2013 as the commander of the XVIII Airborne Corps. Anderson is currently in Afghanistan, serving as the ISAF Joint Commander, second only to ISAF Commander Gen. Joseph Dunford. Sinclair was the defendant, Anderson the convening authority. The judge found Anderson had exercised unlawful command influence. Before he left Fort Bragg, Anderson was accused of exercising unlawful command influence in the sexual assault case against Brig. Gen. Jeffrey Sinclair, by the military judge in that case.



While there has been intense media coverage of the VA scandal, most have failed to examine the past decade's takedown of veterans' health care, as the Cheney-Bush-Obama war machine ground up millions of lives.

Pogány told *EIR* in a phone conversation on May 14, that the purpose of this Army behavior, which he characterized as "reprehensible" and "criminal," is to get rid of these soldiers, and to deny them their benefits. He said this goes back to at least 2011, but really 2006. Pogány does not make any allegations with respect to cases that he has not worked on, but he noted that the Army is under tremendous pressure to slash its budget, and to get rid of people. Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel and other senior leaders of the department have made it clear that personnel and health-care costs are their number one target for meeting the budgetary targets, stemming from the budget sequestration and related shenanigans. Weapons programs are protected, but, "If you get rid of individuals, no one will connect the dots," Pogány said.

The Army is on track to eliminate 30,000 soldiers from the VA system between now and the end of fiscal year 2015. To do this, they're going after the "low hanging fruit," first, that is, those who are psychologically compromised. If they're discharged under less than honorable conditions, thus becoming ineligible for benefits, it "saves" the government money. Individuals who are at risk of violent behavior, ranging from spousal and child abuse to homicide and suicide, are dumped into the civilian population without access to treatment, where then local authorities have to deal with the consequences.

This danger is exacerbated by the U.S. economy's decline, which means an overwhelming number of these soldiers cannot find decent jobs.

Shinseki Testifies

On May 15, Shinseki went before the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee to answer questions about the appointments scandal and about VA health care in general. The members of the committee were unified in their outrage at allegations that veterans may be dying because they're unable to access the VA health-care system.

"[W]ith the numerous GAO, IG, and Office of Medical Inspector reports that have been released, VA senior leadership, including the Secretary, should have been aware that VA was facing a national scheduling crisis," said Sen. Richard Burr (R-N.C.). "VA's leadership has either failed to connect the dots or failed to address this ongoing crisis which has resulted in patient harm and in patient death."

Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.) noted that the allegations from Phoenix are not new issues. "They are deep, system-wide problems and they grow more concerning every day," she said, and pointed to a long series of IG and GAO reports dating back to 2000, showing problems with the appointment system, and the resulting lengthy waiting periods, especially for mental-health appointments. "Clearly, this problem has gone on far

too long," she said. "It is unfortunate that these leadership failures have dramatically shaken many veterans' confidence in this system."

Committee chairman Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) was more cautious, urging members and the public to avoid a rush to judgment, but in his questioning of Shinseki, he was clearly irritated by what Burr and Murray both pointed to, that the problem of waiting times for appointments has been around a long time, has been repeatedly cited by various investigations, and yet it hasn't gotten any better.

All the Senators, however, ignored the real cause of the problem: the toleration of a President and an economic policy which throws human beings on the scrapheap as a matter of policy, while succoring the financial sector which has driven the physical economy into the ground. To meet the needs of veterans, and all other vulnerable members of society, that economy must be rebuilt, wars stopped, and scientific progress put back at the center of national policy. If that priority is not addressed, the killing will continue, and get worse.

cjosgood@att.net

REVIVE GLASS-STEAGALL NOW!



"The point is, we need Glass-Steagall immediately. We need it because that's our only insurance to save the nation... Get Glass-Steagall in, and we can work our way to solve the other things that need to be cleaned up. If we don't get Glass-Steagall in first, we're in a mess!"

—Lyndon LaRouche, Feb. 11, 2013



LaRouchePAC is now leading a nationwide effort to push through legislation for Glass-Steagall (www.larouchepac.com).

WATCH the [LaRouchePAC video](#):

'Glass-Steagall: Signing a Revolution'

SUBSCRIBE to EIR Online

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

toll-free: **1-800-278-3135** e-mail: fulfullment@larouchepub.com

CHARLES OF ARABIA

The British Monarchy, Saudi Arabia, and 9/11

by Richard Freeman and William F. Wertz, Jr.

May 15—In a webcast on Oct. 26, 2012, Lyndon LaRouche emphasized that the Saudi Kingdom and the British Empire are one and the same institution—one extended British Empire. This is emphatically also the case when it comes to terrorism, and specifically to 9/11. As *EIR* has documented, the black ops slush fund employed by the Saudis, and in particular, by Prince Bandar bin Sultan, in supporting al-Qaeda, was derived from the arms deal, known as Al-Yamamah, beginning in 1985, between the British company BAE and the Saudi Ministry of Defense and Aviation.

However, there are two aspects of the 9/11 attack which have not been adequately exposed to the public to date. First, the direct relationship between the British Royal Family and the Saudi Royal Household; and second, the top-down interface between a consortium of Saudi banks and charitable organizations which have been identified as the financial-logistical infrastructure of the al-Qaeda terrorist network (see below).

These two additional features will be presented in two parts, beginning with this article documenting the close relationship of Prince Charles, as the designated



Prince Charles of Arabia, shown here in Riyadh with his close friends in the Saudi royal family, joining in the ritual "Sword Dance," based on ancient Bedouin traditions.

YouTube

representative of the British Royal Family, to the current Saudi Monarchy.

A Pending Day in Court

During the course of last year, two U.S. Federal Court decisions cleared the way for the 9/11 families to pursue court cases against the perpetrators of the attacks. On April 16, 2013, a decision was rendered that reinstated the case against 12 Saudi individuals, 9 of whom are Saudi charity officials who held top positions in Saudi institutions, and who are alleged by the plaintiffs to have



Presidential Press and Information Office



Creative Commons



Charles' closest collaborators among the Saudi royals are Prince Turki bin Faisal (left), Prince Bandar bin Sultan, (center), and Prince Mohammed bin Faisal. All are key in the British-Saudi-al-Qaeda nexus.

Charles's closest collaborators are:

Prince Bandar bin Sultan bin Abdulaziz al Saud (married to Princess Haifa, who is the sister of Prince Turki bin Faisal and Prince Mohammed bin Faisal), Saudi Ambassador to the U.S., 1983-2005; Secretary-General of the Saudi National Security Council, 2005 to the present; and head of Saudi Intelligence from July 2012 until recently;

Prince Turki bin Faisal bin Abdulaziz al Saud, Director-General of Saudi Intelligence, 1979-2001; Saudi Ambassador to the U.K., 2003-05;

Saudi Ambassador to the U.S., 2005-06;

Prince Mohammed bin Faisal bin Abdulaziz al Saud (brother of Prince Turki and of Princess Haifa), head of the Dar Al-Maal Al-Islami Trust (DMI) banking group, which has been linked to al-Qaeda financing, according to a report prepared in 2002 for the president of the UN Security Council by Jean-Charles Brisard.

Prince Charles has been placed by the Queen at the head of British-Saudi Empire terror machine, utilizing relationships he has developed over more than a quarter of a century, at least since his first state visit to Saudi Arabia in 1986.

The Prince, born in 1948, invested with numerous noble titles (Prince of Wales, Duke of Cornwall, Duke of Rothesay, Earl of Carrick, etc.), and a family estate worth many billions, has handled some of the filthiest assignments for the Anglo-Dutch Empire. Charles has been protected by his carefully constructed public image as a plant-loving environmentalist—he talks to them—and as somewhat dotty. But there is a real thug behind that veneer:

Charles plays a leading role in arming Saudi Arabia. He was pivotal during the 1990s in concluding contracts for Al-Yamamah II, the second phase of the BAE-British arms-for-Saudi-oil deal, originally contracted in 1985 by Prince Bandar which, as *EIR* has documented, set up a slush fund to finance international terror. During his tenth state visit to Saudi Arabia on Feb 17-19, 2014—he has also undertaken many private visits—Charles finalized the massive Al-Salam arms deal, by which British defense firm BAE Systems is selling 72 Eurofighter Typhoons to Saudi Arabia.

In 2012, Charles became the first royal patron of all three main British intelligence services: the Secret Intelligence Service (MI6), Security Service (MI5), and Communications Headquarters (GCHQ-Cheltenham).

taken concrete actions to assist in the 9/11 attacks.

Then, on Dec. 19, 2013, a Federal Court decision allowed the plaintiffs to pursue the case against the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia itself and the Saudi High Commission for Relief of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In April 2014, a Federal judge in Florida ordered the FBI to provide plaintiffs in a Freedom of Information Act suit with documents on a Saudi cell in Sarasota, which is believed to have provided support to several of the 9/11 terrorists, including the ostensible ringleader Mohammed Atta.

In the U.S. Congress, a resolution (Resolution 428) has been introduced with bipartisan support insisting that a 28-page chapter of the Joint Congressional Inquiry on 9/11, which discusses Saudi Arabian financial support for the terrorists, be declassified.

The picture presented in this, and a subsequent article, is meant to encourage this investigation, and to give it a dimension which it has thus far lacked.

Prince Charles

Contrary to popular opinion, the British Empire does still exist. In many respects, it is more global, more powerful, and more vicious than during its heyday in the 18th and 19th centuries. Moreover, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which was effectively created by the British Empire between 1901 and 1932, is a critical extension of that Empire. Abdulaziz ibn Saud, who became Saudi monarch in 1932, was on the British payroll for more than a decade. For the last three decades, the member of the British Royal Family who has been Empress Elizabeth II's chief executive officer, working directly with the Saudi royal household, and with the key Saudi personalities implicated in creating al-Qaeda and in supporting 9/11, has been Prince Charles. Among

Charles is at the forefront of Queen Elizabeth's drive, through starvation, disease, war, and murder, to reduce the world's population from its present 7 billion persons to 1 billion. According to Charles' semi-official biography, *The Prince of Wales* by Jonathan Dimbleby, the Prince held a two-day international seminar, on board the royal yacht *Britannia*, which set the agenda for the 1992 Rio Earth Summit. The summit launched the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)'s campaign promoting the genocidal hoax of anthropomorphic global warming, as the vehicle to shut down industry and civilization.

On Charles' website (<http://www.princeofwales.gov.uk/>), he promotes Paul Ehrlich's 1968 book, *The Population Bomb*, which called for slashing the world's population to 1.5 billion.

According to the book *Saudi Babylon*, by Mark Hollingsworth, there was a meeting in April 2003 at the headquarters of New Scotland Yard, between top British anti-terrorism officials, and lawyers for the families of the victims of the 9/11 massacre. The lawyers and families were pressing for Britain's official agencies to investigate claims of Saudi financing of international terror-

ism. A member of the British Special Branch forces told Hollingsworth that Prince Charles' "relationships with prominent members of the House of Saud created serious problems and obstacles" to that investigation.

The Cranwell Connection

Another critical aspect of Charles' background, particularly in respect to his relationship with Prince Bandar, that both are graduates of RAF Cranwell, the elite training school for British Royal Air Force officers. Senior U.S. intelligence officials deeply involved in the ongoing investigation into the 9/11 attacks and the deeper issue of the Anglo-Saudi Al-Yamamah project believe that Bandar was recruited as a British intelligence asset during his training at Cranwell.

In March 1967, Bandar enrolled at Cranwell; Charles enrolled March 8, 1971. William Simpson, in his biography of Prince Bandar, *The Prince: The Secret Story of the World's Most Intriguing Royal, Prince Bandar bin Sultan*, describes Bandar's two-and-a-half year immersion at Cranwell as a formative period in his life, during which time he became a dedicated anglophile. Although the two princes attended at different

Prince Charles' Faisal Family Network

As the chief organizer for British-Saudi international terrorism, Prince Charles works through many factions of the Saudi Royal Family, but he has a deeply rooted institutional relationship with one faction in particular, the Faisal family clan. The Faisal clan, out of the hundreds of princely families in Saudi Arabia, is one of the most powerful and evil royal family clans, and one of the wealthiest families in Saudi Arabia. It operates as a single integrated unit, and plays a pivotal role in setting policy for the Saudi Kingdom. Its members are the children of King Faisal bin Abdulaziz al Saud (r. 1964-75).

The members of the clan include:


- Prince Turki bin Faisal al Saud: head of Saudi Intelligence, 1979-2001.
- Prince Bandar bin Sultan (married into the clan through his wife Princess Haifa bint Faisal al Saud): Saudi Ambassador to the United States, 1983-2005;

architect of Al-Yamamah arms for oil deal.

- Prince Mohammad bin Faisal al Saud: head of the DMI banking group.
- Prince Saud bin Faisal al Saud: Foreign Minister (1975-present). A member of the Faisal family has held the office of Saudi Arabian Foreign Minister since the Saudi Arabian state was created by the British in 1932. This office is effectively a Faisal family fiefdom.
- Prince Khalid bin Faisal al Saud: former Governor of Makkah province, which includes the holy cities of Mecca and Medina; currently Minister of Education.

Prince Charles has a strong working relationship with each of these members of the Faisal family, but more importantly, with the Faisal clan as a whole. In 1967, Anglo-Dutch Empress Elizabeth II cemented this institutional relationship when she and King Faisal held a series of strategic meetings during the King's visit to England. During the 1980s and subsequently, Elizabeth dispatched her son Charles to collaborate with the children of King Faisal.

Richard Freeman



Creative Commons



Prince Charles and several of his Saudi pals attended RAF Cranwell, an elite school in Britain for training Royal Air Force officers. Sir Richard Johns (right) was their flying instructor. He was later appointed Aide de-Camp to the Queen at Windsor Castle.

times, shared an instructor, Sir Richard Johns, and their common experience at RAF Cranwell as pilots was a critical aspect of their later close relationship. Two other members of the Faisal clan were classmates of Bandar at Cranwell: a brother of Princess Haifa; and Prince Muqrin bin Abdulazziz al Saud, head of Saudi Intelligence from 2005-12, who has now been designated the second crown prince of Saudi Arabia.

The relationship among Charles, Bandar, Princess Haifa's brother, and Muqrin, as RAF-trained pilots, may not be insignificant in respect to 9/11. Bandar's brother Prince Khalid bin Sultan was also commander of the Saudi Air Force during the first Gulf War. Also note the role of the Saudi aviation company Dallah Avco in supporting the 9/11 operation.

Simpson further writes: "In December 1972, Bandar married Princess Haifa, daughter of Saudi Arabia's ruler, King Faisal. In recalling how they met, Haifa explained, 'Bandar was with my brother at RAF Cranwell. My brother had talked about him to me, and about me to him; this was in 1966. From that time on, for some reason or other I had a feeling that this was the man I was going to marry.'"

As to the relationship between Charles and Bandar, Simpson reports: "While Bandar has enjoyed firm friendship with many world leaders, he holds Baroness Margaret Thatcher in particularly high esteem. Equally,

his friendship with Prince Charles is also very close, and Charles extended a personal invitation to Bandar to his wedding to Camilla Parker Bowles in April 2005. [Charles invited only eight foreign royals, among them, Prince Turki and his wife, and Prince Bandar bin Sultan—ed.]. The Princes' friendship can be traced back to their experiences of Cranwell (Charles was also training at Cranwell) and Charles's fascination with Islam."

Charles' biographer Dimpleby writes: "Squadron leader Richard Johns, later Air Marshall, was the Prince's instructor from September 1970 to August 1971. During the 1990-91 war on Iraq (Operation Desert Storm) Johns, by then Vice Air Marshall, was one of three directors of the British war command."

According to Simpson, Bandar was the most important person in the Saudi Kingdom coordinating the war effort. Furthermore, Bandar's brother, Prince Khalid bin Sultan, the commander of the Saudi Air Force, was made Commander of the Joint Forces, which meant he shared equal rank and responsibility with U.S. Gen. Norman Schwartzkopf, and the commander of British troops during the war. As a result, Bandar and his brother Khalid worked directly with Johns during this period, consolidating their relationship. After the first Gulf War, Johns was promoted to Air Marshall in 1993; made chief of the Air Staff in 1997; that same year, he was appointed Air Aide-de-Camp to Queen Elizabeth;

and in 2000, upon retiring as Chief of the Air Staff, Johns was appointed Constable and Governor of Windsor Castle, where he resided from 2000-08. The latter position put him at the right hand of Queen Elizabeth, with whom he met and/or consulted regularly.

The picture which now emerges is that of the close relationship between the top echelon of the Faisal clan and the House of Windsor, involving British intelligence and Saudi intelligence, and the British and Saudi Royal Air Forces, mediated by Prince Charles and Prince Bandar, in particular.

The Anglo-Saudi 9/11 Nexus

Now we shall look more closely at the collaboration between Prince Charles and the Saudi Royal family suspected of orchestrating 9/11. One of the organizations which Prince Charles operates is the Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies (OCIS), created at Magdalen College, Oxford University, in 1985. According to the May 10, 2012 *Oxford Times*, Charles has been an enthusiastic supporter of the Centre since its founding.

In 1993, Charles became the patron of the OCIS and effectively took it over. It is referred to in the press at times as Charles' OCIS.

One of the co-founders of the OCIS is Abdullah Omar Naseef, who is named in the court case brought by the families of the victims of 9/11 for his role in supporting the hijackers. He also founded and chaired the Rabita Trust, and served as Secretary General of the Muslim World League (MWL), 1983-93, during the height of Anglo-American backing for the Afghan mujahideen in their war against the Soviet Union. The MWL was founded in the 1960s, when leading figures in the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood took refuge in Saudi Arabia, after the Nasser regime crackdown. The international revolutionary mission of the Muslim Brotherhood was merged with the Wahhabi branch of Islam to form the basis for a global jihadist recruitment drive. The MWL was at the very center of the formation of the global jihad appara-

tus that is at the heart of global terrorism to this day.

In the early 1980s, Naseef co-created the Maktab al-Khidamat, which was the backbone organization of the Arab-Afghani mujahideen in Afghanistan, which in 1989, changed its name to al-Qaeda, and, according to the 9/11 families' suit, knowingly provided financial support to al-Qaeda through the MWL, Rabita, and the International Islamic Relief Organization (IIRO).

Naseef currently chairs the Board of Trustees of Prince Charles' OCIS, and has been the Prince's confidant for two decades.

Abul-Hasan Ali al-Nadwi was another co-founder of the OCIS and its chairman from its inception in 1985, through the late 1990s—during which time Charles was its patron. In 1962, Nadwi was a founding board member of the MWL.

Another member of the Board of Trustees of Charles' OCIS from 1985 until 2006, was Yusuf al-Qaradawi, the Qatar-based spiritual leader of the Muslim Brotherhood. It was Qaradawi who issued the fatwa to overthrow and assassinate Libya's Muammar Qaddafi and Syria's Bashir al-Assad. In July 2012, he threatened the assassination of Egyptian leader Gen. Abdel Fattah al-Sisi.

In 1990, Prince Bandar, then Saudi Ambassador to the United States, contributed an estimated \$13-\$24.4 million to the OCIS; at that time, he was collecting \$100 million per year in fees from the Al-Yamamah deal. In 1997, Bandar persuaded then-Saudi King Fahd to make a \$32.4 million contribution from the Kingdom to the OCIS. The contribution, according to the May 30, 1997 *Financial Times*, was made at a private dinner with Prince Charles in England, with Bandar chosen as the person to announce the gift.

Other principally Islamic nations and individuals, including Qatar and Kuwait, contributed approximately \$70 million to Charles' Centre, including funds from the family of Osama bin Laden. Prince Turki is a member of the Board of Trustees of the OCIS and also chairs the OCIS Strategy Advisory Committee.



Saudi Government

Abdullah Omar Naseef, a co-founder of Prince Charles' Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies (OCIS), is named in the court case brought by the 9/11 families, for his role in supporting the hijackers.



Creative Commons/Nmkuttiady

A former member of the Board of Charles' OCIS is Yusuf al-Qaradawi, the Qatar-based spiritual leader of the Muslim Brotherhood. Qaradawi issued the fatwas to overthrow and assassinate Qaddafi and Syria's Assad.

In May 2012, Queen Elizabeth II herself granted the OCIS a Royal Charter in honor of its 25th anniversary. At the time, Naseef, a man being sued by the families of the victims of 9/11, stated: “This is very good news. This shows that the British government, the Queen, and the whole state are very much aware that the Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies is doing very well to make relations between the Islamic world and the Western world closer and to bring Islam and its role in the international arena.”

The bin Laden family has endowed the Mohammed bin Laden chair at Prince Charles’ OCIS, named after the father of Osama bin Laden.

In addition to the collaboration among Charles, Bandar, and Turki in the OCIS, they also work together in another intelligence front, the Prince Charles Visual Islamic and Traditional Arts Department (VITA). Charles recruited Prince Turki to join VITA, and then appointed him chairman, where he served from the early- to mid-1990s until at least 2006. In 2004, Charles set up the Centennial Fund, whose Chairman of the Board of Trustees is Prince Abdulaziz bin Abdullah; Abdulaziz is Deputy Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia, and the person in Riyadh tasked to arm and direct Wahhabi terrorists operating in Syria.

Turki, Bandar, al-Qaeda, and 9/11

In 1979, Prince Turki was appointed Director-General of Saudi Arabia’s General Intelligence Directorate. He remained in that position until Sept. 1, 2001, just ten days before 9/11. Turki personally recruited Osama bin Laden to become a jihadi, and to use his large financial resources to set up a network, the Maktab al-Khidamat, which became al-Qaeda.

According to Khudi.pak, a Pakistani website: “Usama Bin Ladin met the head of the Saudi security service, Prince Turki bin Faisal Ibn Abdelaziz in 1978. Bin Laden had begun to associate with Islamic radicals who played on his feelings of inner religious crisis and growing isolation from his family to lead him towards becoming an extremist. He was introduced to local members of the Muslim Brotherhood, who only drove Usama further towards extremism.

“In 1979 Usama Bin Ladin went to Prince Turki for advice after he became infuriated by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Following Prince Turki’s sugges-



Osama bin Laden was recruited by Prince Turki to become a jihadi and to use his substantial financial resources to set up the Maktab al-Khidamat network, which became al-Qaeda.

tion that Bin Ladin use his financial assets to aid the Afghan resistance, Usama traveled to neighboring Pakistan to wage jihad on the Soviet Union.”

In an interview in 2002, Prince Turki stated, “In 1980, when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, we in the Kingdom, with the United States, initiated a program of countering the Soviet invasion and helping the Mujahideen to repel the Soviets. I was directly involved in that situation.”

An article in the March 1, 2003 *Observer* reported that lawyers for 11 relatives of 9/11 victims served legal papers on Prince Turki, which state, according to the *Observer*: “Based on sworn testimony from a Taliban intelligence chief called Mullah Kakshar, they allege that Turki arranged for donations to be made directly to al-Qaeda and bin Laden by a group of wealthy Saudi businessmen.”

Author Gerald Posner in his book *Why America Slept* reported that Abu Zubaydah, a leading al-Qaeda operative, was captured by CIA agents on March 28, 2002 at a safe house in Pakistan. CIA agents administered sodium pentothal, and Zubaydah revealed that directions and funds for al-Qaeda came from Saudi Arabia and Saudi Intelligence chief Prince Turki. Zubaydah said that he had been a participant in a 1998 meeting in Khadahar, Afghanistan with Prince Turki, Pakistani ISI intelligence officials, and Taliban leaders, in which Turki promised more Saudi aid would flow to the Taliban. Zubaydah provided the names and phone numbers

of the Saudis who transmitted the money and directions from Turki, and the names checked out, according to Posner.

In his book *The Big Bamboozle: 9/11 and the War on Terror*, author Philip Marshall, a veteran airline pilot, contended that the Saudi 9/11 pilots needed advanced training, beyond what they received on small aircraft, to fly the Boeing jets they hijacked, training which he believes they received with the aid of Prince Turki.

Marshall points out that four of the future hijackers traveled to Las Vegas, and that these four became the pilots of the four planes used on 9/11. He concludes that they must have received training somewhere between Las Vegas and Tucson, Ariz. Marshall then reports that Prince Turki and his entourage were in the United States prior to, and on Sept. 11, 2001. Tucked in the back of the 9/11 Commission's report (and later deleted) was an account of three separate chartered airliners carrying about 100 Arab men (mostly Saudis) from Las Vegas on overnight trans-Atlantic flights, beginning on Sept. 19.

Marshall elaborates on this report. He says that Turki was near Las Vegas in the months leading up to 9/11, during the time that all the hijackers had made trips there. In the week after the attack, there were at least five chartered flights carrying high-ranking Saudi officials which flew out of Las Vegas, Newark, Boston, and Washington. The chartered departures from Las Vegas the following: a flight to Geneva on Sept. 19, with 69 passengers, including 46 Saudis; one bound for England with 18 Saudis on Sept. 20; and, on Sept. 23, a flight to Paris, on which only 34 passengers were listed, out of a capacity of nearly 400. On that flight was Prince Turki. Marshall makes the point that Turki's large entourage in the U.S. in the Summer of 2001 provided a perfect opportunity to get the needed Saudi Boeing flight instructors into the country, and out again after the attacks without anyone interviewing them.

While Turki, as head of Saudi Intelligence and Osama bin Laden's handler, is suspected of playing a commanding



U.S. Department of Defense

Author Gerald Posner reported that Abu Zubaydah, a top al-Qaeda operative, was captured by CIA agents in 2002 in Pakistan, where he was administered sodium pentothal, and revealed that directions and funds for al-Qaeda came from Saudi Arabia and Saudi Intelligence chief Prince Turki.

role in 9/11, Prince Bandar played the critical role inside the United States itself, as Ambassador from 1983-2005. It was Turki and Prince Sultan (Bandar's father and Defense Minister), who, in 1978, helped bring Bandar into a position of power in Washington. At that time, they were negotiating Saudi Arabia's purchase of 50 F-15 fighters from the United States. William Simpson, Bandar's biographer, writes: "Assisting Prince Turki bin Faisal, Bandar quickly made his mark in Washington. He quickly became very close to the Bush family, to the point of being called Bandar Bush by the Bush family itself."

In the late 1970s, when George H.W. Bush was head of the CIA, Bandar worked with Turki in support of what later became al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. Then, as the architect of the 1985 Al-Yamamah arms-for-oil barter deal between Britain and Saudi Arabia, Bandar gained control of a huge offshore slush fund for covert operations.

During the 1980s, when the U.S. Congress cut off funding for the Contra operation in Nicaragua, it was Prince Bandar who supplied the funding, at the request of then-Vice President George H.W. Bush.

Evidence of Bandar's involvement in 9/11 is further reinforced by the disclosure that his wife, Princess Haifa, the sister of Prince Turki, passed between \$51,000 and \$73,000 to Saudi intelligence operative Omar al-Bayoumi, which money in turn was used to help establish the first two 9/11 Saudi hijackers to arrive in the U.S., Nawaf al-Hazmi and Khalid al-Mihdhar, in San Diego, Calif.



Creative Commons

Saudi intelligence operative Omar al-Bayoumi received \$51,000-73,000 from Prince Bandar's wife, Princess Haifa; the money was used to establish the first two 9/11 Saudi hijackers to arrive in the U.S.

Prince Mohammed bin Faisal and Prince Charles

The second article in this two-part series will focus on the Saudi consortium of seven banks run by Prince Mohammed bin Faisal and the associated network of charities that were designed to provide financial and logistical support for al-Qaeda. For the purposes of this first installment, we will merely identify the close relationship of Prince Charles and Prince Mohammed bin Faisal.

In November 2001, Prince Mohammed and Prince Charles headed the com-

mittee that raised the money to construct the London Muslim Centre, which was a physical addition to the Muslim Brotherhood-controlled East London Mosque, which has a trust called the East London Mosque Trust. In a history of itself, the Trust wrote: “On the 23rd of November 2001, His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales and His Royal Highness Prince Mohamed bin Faisal laid the foundation stone of the London Muslim Centre as part of a ceremony to launch the construction project.”

The mosque is known to be a center of Wahhabism and of the Islamist group Jamaat-e-Islami (JI). The U.K. Department of Communities and Local Government released a statement on Feb. 28, 2013 saying that the current Secretary General of the Muslim Council of Britain is the chair of the East London Mosque, the key institution for the Bangladeshi wing JI in the U.K.

The collaboration between Princes Charles and Mohammed includes the fact that Yusuf al-Qaradawi was a member of the Board of Trustees of Charles’ Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies at the same time that he was an executive of some of Mohammad bin Faisal’s banks. Specifically, Qaradawi served as the “Sharia advisor” of the DMI banking group, from about the time of its founding in 1981 until 1994. During this same time period, Qaradawi was also a founder and principal stockholder of the al-Taqwa Bank, and served as the al-Taqwa Bank’s Sharia advisor. Thus, Qaradawi was a shared asset of Prince Charles and Prince Mohammed.

Mohammed Galeb Kalje Zouaydi, according to Agence France Presse on Sept. 20, 2002, was the accountant for the Faisal branch of the Saudi Royal Family, including Prince Mohammed bin Faisal and Prince Turki bin Faisal. According to French investigator Jean-Charles Brisard, Zouaydi was considered to be one of the major funders of the al-Qaeda network in Europe. On April 23, 2002, authorities in Spain arrested and charged Zouaydi, whom they alleged was a key al-Qaeda financier.

The May 6, 2002 *Chicago Tribune* reported that according to Spanish authorities, financier Zouaydi had ties to the cell in Germany that carried out the Sept. 11 attacks. In short, Prince Mohammed and Prince Turki’s accountant, Zouaydi, was funneling money to al-Qaeda around the world.

Finally, there is the connection between Prince Mohammed bin Faisal and Saleh Abdullah Kamel the founder of the Dallah al-Baraka banking group. In his book, *Preachers of Hate: Islam and the War on America*, Kenneth Timmerman provides a capsule profile of

Kamel: “Born in Mecca in 1941, Sheik Saleh Abdallah Kamel became an adviser to the Saudi Ministry of Finance and a business partner of Prince Mohammed bin Faisal bin Abdulaziz, son of former King Faisal.”

Dallah Avco, the Saudi aviation company, is a subsidiary of Kamel’s Dallah al-Baraka bank. Dallah Avco is being sued by the families of the victims of 9/11. According to the suit, the company provided a “ghost job” to Saudi Intelligence operative Omar al-Bayoumi. Moreover, plaintiffs assert that Dallah Avco was aware of Bayoumi’s activities in the United States, as illustrated by the fact that senior officials of Dallah Avco quickly squelched internal inquiries from Bayoumi’s immediate supervisor concerning the nature and propriety of his employment with the company. The Saudi Ministry of Defense and Aviation threatened to cut off contracts to Dallah if they dismissed Bayoumi.

Bayoumi received a monthly payment of up to \$3,000 from Kamel’s Dallah Avco as payment for a project in Saudi Arabia, even though Bayoumi was living in San Diego. At the time of the payments, Bayoumi and another Saudi, Osama Basnan, were bankrolling the two lead 9/11 hijackers with the Dallah funds, and the direct payments from Prince Bandar and Princess Haifa.

The 28-page chapter from the Joint Congressional Inquiry into 9/11—which Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama have suppressed to this day—contains a detailed account of both the Bandar and Dallah Aviation bankrolling of the San Diego al-Qaeda cell, according to former Sen. Bob Graham (D-Fla.), who chaired the Joint Inquiry, and wrote about the experience in his 2004 book *Intelligence Matters*.

Further Reading

“Scandal of the Century Rocks British Crown and the City,” *EIR*, June 22, 2007

“Will BAE Scandal of the Century Bring Down Dick Cheney?” *EIR*, June 29, 2007

“Prince Bandar and 9/11,” *EIR*, June 29, 2007

“Exposed: British ‘BAE’ Hand Behind Terror,” *EIR*, June 26, 2009

“Saudi Bankrolling of al-Qaeda Well Known to U.S. Government,” *EIR*, Sept. 27, 2013

“Who Is Prince Bandar?” *EIR*, Oct. 11, 2013

For additional coverage: www.larouchepub.com

Editorial

Memorial Day 2014: ‘Our Unfinished Work’

From its inception in May 1868, Memorial Day was not devoted so much to the recently ended Civil War, but to commemoration of the commitment to the Republic for which so many gave their lives. While remembering those who gave the ultimate sacrifice, the nation vowed to preserve its most sacred principles into the future, for the benefit of not only the widows and orphans, but of generations to come.

Lyndon LaRouche has recommended we do the same today, dedicating ourselves to creating a truly human future for all mankind.

Among those who lost their lives in that British-instigated war was America’s greatest leader, President Abraham Lincoln. Although he did not die directly in battle, the assassin who brought him down was deployed on behalf of the Empire which had been attempting to destroy the American Republic ever since its victory in the War on Independence. In killing Lincoln, the Empire calculated that it was killing the one individual who, representing a spirit of reconciliation and compassion, could heal the nation, and make it strong.

Indeed, the British calculated well, for it took nearly three generations, 67 years, for the United States to elect another President with a comparable depth and nobility of character to bring the nation together, and lead the country onto a path of extraordinary progress. That, of course, was Franklin Roosevelt, whose leadership was crucial to saving us from fascism, at home and abroad.

But it is the poet Lincoln who best expressed for the ages, the appropriate spirit of Memorial Day, even before the war ended. Dedicating the battlefield at Gettysburg in 1863, he evoked the fundamental principles of the American Republic,

which have been worth dying for throughout its life—up until today. In celebrating our veterans, we would do best to grasp that spirit, and spread it among our fellow citizens, even as we seek to create the conditions in which men no longer slaughter each other in war.

“Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.


“Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

“But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online



EIR Online gives subscribers one of the most valuable publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today. Through this publication and the sharp interventions of the LaRouche Movement, we are changing politics worldwide, day by day.

EIR Online

EIR Online includes the entire magazine in PDF form, plus up-to-the-minute world news.



I would like to subscribe to **EIR Online**

(e-mail address must be provided.)

- \$360 for one year
 - \$180 for six months
 - \$120 for four months
 - \$90 for three months
 - \$60 for two months
- Send information on receiving **EIR** by mail.

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

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

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

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail _____

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
 Discover Am Ex

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____