

LaRouche State of the Union Presents Solution to Crisis

by Anita Gallagher

Lyndon LaRouche, the American economist and statesman running for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 2004, presented his “State of the Union” address on Jan. 28 in Washington, D.C.—an address which history should record as the toughest, yet most optimistic address ever made to a nation on the verge of destruction.

LaRouche delivered his “State of the Union,” as the “acting President” of what its former friends around the world call “the true United States”; the historical “exception” founded by a Leibnizian conspiracy as a sovereign republic, opposed to the bestial notion of empire, which is the actual motivation of the faction pushing for an Iraq war. LaRouche concluded his speech just four hours before President George W. Bush commenced his. LaRouche insisted that the utopian drive to get Bush to attack Iraq can be stopped, while Bush himself encouraged it. LaRouche demonstrated that the current financial system is finished, and outlined economic recovery measures of the type Franklin Roosevelt used to save America from fascism in the 1930s; Bush ignored the collapse of the financial system, and that of America’s real economy, making his speech “dead on arrival,” as LaRouche put it, and as various Senators had already described the President’s “stimulus package.”

LaRouche outlined forceful action to stop AIDS from wiping out nations in Africa, in response to a question; namely, that the United States must act immediately to get generic life-prolonging drugs to anyone medically qualified to dispense them in any part of the world, while the poverty that is the breeding ground for AIDS is overcome through infrastructure and development. Bush inserted an AIDS initiative to supply drugs to Africa at the last minute in his speech, in what the *New York Times* of Jan. 29 called the only new and interesting thing in it. In fact, a White House team

was assigned to monitor LaRouche’s afternoon address to do “damage control,” according to qualified sources. The AIDS initiative, not in the early afternoon draft of the Bush speech, was inserted to this purpose, the sources say. This is a demonstration of precisely the effect LaRouche designed his speech to have; as he told an audience in India recently, “I am optimistic that my policies will be adopted in the United States, because the alternatives won’t work.”

LaRouche’s Time Has Come

LaRouche’s live audience exceeded 250 people, and packed the house on one of Washington’s busiest days. Nineteen diplomats representing 16 nations attended, spanning the Mideast, Far East, Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, and Ibero-America. The speech was watched and/or listened to live on nearly 800 web connections, besides group meetings held around the audio/video Internet broadcast, from Detroit, Michigan to Lima, Peru. Representatives attended from associations of state legislators, Mideast policy associations, American Muslim organizations, the Nation of Islam, Congressional staff, and community, ethnic, and political activists, and three press representatives. LaRouche youth movement recruits counted for more than 20% of the total live attendance.

LaRouche’s address, which follows, was a thorough-composed overview of what he calls “the present as current history,” which lasted for two and one-half hours, with an hour and one-half of questions. It covered four major areas: 1) the causes and nature of the present economic crisis; 2) the emergency measures which must be taken now; 3) the global strategic conflicts which overlap this economic crisis; and 4) the urgent measures needed to correct the current panic-driven notions of “Homeland Defense.”



Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche: "I am optimistic that my policies will be adopted in the United States, because the alternatives won't work."

LaRouche used the occasion to call for firing Lewis Libby, Vice President Dick Cheney's chief of staff and chief national security aide. Libby is a principal player in the current push for an Iraq war, and was key in pushing the plan the first time around, in 1990 under Bush "41," for the United States to use its "sole superpower" status to launch pre-emptive war against any nation that could become a threat. Libby is otherwise the lawyer for the notorious fugitive financier Marc Rich, associated with Russian "Mafiya" interests and American organized crime-linked figures, who disrupted the Labor Party's support in the Jan. 28 Israeli election, to throw victory to butcher Ariel Sharon.

A military representative from Ibero-America volunteered afterward, "I'm impressed. . . . [LaRouche] is a real statesman. The fact that an American said the things he said, is amazing. He is so honest. How soon can you get me his speech? I want to understand everything he said, and he said some things I didn't know."

There was immediate demand for the speech from many attendees, both to study it, and to get it to others. The LaRouche in 2004 campaign will produce a videotape of the speech and nine questions and answers which followed, as well as 5 million pamphlets. As always, the full text and audio are available on www.larouchein2004.com. More than 400 people downloaded the speech in the first eight hours it was posted on the website. More than 150 e-mail questions to the Presidential pre-candidate were received during the speech itself.

An Eastern European military representative said, "If the system is at an end, we should rethink everything." An American businessman with contacts in the Mideast lamented that the speech was "very good, but too few people are listening." He perked up and offered to help the campaign, when told that the LaRouche youth movement was invading every state

capital to get support for LaRouche.

City of London financial expert Stephen J. Lewis commented that LaRouche's speech was "very good, and quite persuasive as well. It will strike a lot of chords with Americans. It was good he addressed, so directly, that America, in recent years, had become so hated, because intelligent Americans wonder why this is so."

The questions from Washington insiders reflect LaRouche's decades-long influence on the policies of Presidents. A member of a task force on "the new financial architecture" which had reported to Clinton Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, asked LaRouche to settle the group's "constant debate" on the

differences among the Federal Reserve, an independent central banking system, and a national bank.

The first two systems come from the oligarchical slime-mold most truthfully identified as "Venice," LaRouche said, and were repudiated by the American Constitution, which for the first time made a government truly sovereign, with no agency outside that government—like a central bank—able to dictate policies to government. European governments never achieved that perfect sovereignty implied in the American Constitution. Today every banking system in the world is bankrupt, except probably those of China and India, LaRouche said, and "the Federal government is morally responsible to put this banking system into bankruptcy reorganization, by the Federal government. At that point, the Federal Reserve system and all its assets come under the management of the U.S. Department of the Treasury. In effect, the U.S. Department of the Treasury sets up a facility within it, which becomes the national banking system, which actually runs the Federal Reserve System, and all the banking system of the United States."

A Democratic elected official asked LaRouche to speak directly to his constituents, "because I really can't convince them, as to why they should not simply oppose overthrowing this President says and does." The executive powers of the government lie in the Presidency as an institution, LaRouche replied, "not in the sitting person of the President . . . when I say I'm going to get George Bush out of this mess, I'm not trying to save him. I'm trying to save the United States. . . . There is no other way to do it in this two-year period."

As fitting, youth had the last word, asking LaRouche to explain why one person can make a difference at this time: "I guess what I'm really asking is: 'What is the soul?'" For LaRouche's answer, about *your* role, think through your concept of the soul, then turn to the transcript which follows.