
LaRouche Istanbul Keynote

‘Eurasia: New Key for Global Development and Peace’

One highlight of Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche’s June 13-17 visit to Turkey was the conference, “Eurasia: New Key for Global Development and Peace,” co-sponsored by Yarin monthly and the Cultural Affairs Department of the Istanbul Municipality. It was held in Istanbul on June 14, as media coverage of LaRouche’s arrival press conference the previous day was already focussed on his candidacy and his call for the impeachment of Vice President Dick Cheney and the removal of the American “neo-cons” from power. It was followed, late that night, by LaRouche’s three-hour interview on the “Ceviz Kabugu” political discussion program of A-TV, watched by Turks all over the world.

The Istanbul conference focussed on the future of the world’s collapsed economy. Here is LaRouche’s keynote; it was introduced by A. Altay Unaltay of the Yarin Editorial Board. Two economics professors from Istanbul universities followed with comments on the keynote, and there were then general questions from the audience of more than 400, ranging from representatives of government ministries, to university students.

These questions are given below only as brief paraphrases—not exact translations from the Turkish—but LaRouche’s answers are given in full.

Dr. Unaltay: Lyndon LaRouche’s name appeared in the ’70s and ’80s of the 20th Century as a one of a controversial political character. The controversies on him start with his efforts to stop the international drug trafficking; or his contribution to President Reagan’s SDI (nick-named the “Star Wars Project”); and they have continued until now. His long-term economic assessments draw the focus of attention on him in today’s crisis-stricken world.

Beginning in 1948, LaRouche objected to tendencies of virtualization and dehumanization in economics, made possible by “cybernetic” techniques developed by Norbert Wiener and John von Neumann. He, in contrast, developed his own brand of “physical economics,” on foundations laid by Gottfried Leibniz (1671-1716), and later developed by Bernhard Riemann in 1852.

Among his long-term economic forecasts is his warning dated 1959-60, that the Bretton Woods System was doomed, if the United States proceeded with politics based on the Truman-Eisenhower doctrines. This prophecy was fulfilled on

15 August 1971. His second great forecast is the end phase crisis of the global economy, if great powers proceed with monetary politics. The sequence of crisis since the October 1987 Wall Street breakdown gives him a right to speak.

The foundations of the LaRouche world economic order are: economic relationships on the basis of sovereign nation-states, where financier-dominated processes originating from London are abolished; a rejection of dogmas proposed by Haileybury’s and other positivist “free trade” schools; and a “regulated economics” in tune with the “American System tradition.” In a sense he observes an uncompromisable contradiction, between the interests of the one party of farmers, industry entrepreneurs and laborers, and that of the other party of the financial oligarchy, exploiting national economy by means of finance and usury.

Lyndon LaRouche is a U.S. Presidential candidate of the Democratic Party for 2004.

LaRouche: Since I am standing for the position of the U.S. President, I shall stand here.

I want to focus primarily on the situation that confronts Turkey, both in dangers, and opportunities, in the present world economic and strategic situation.

I shall begin by referring to an address I gave shortly before the inauguration of the present President of the United States, in January of 2001. I was then an announced candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination for 2004, but I made some observations about what was going to happen in the intervening period, especially in the years immediately ahead. And I said that since the President of the United States was not a particularly intelligent person, he was going to follow certain economic policies, which would mean that the already unravelling world monetary-financial system, and the U.S. economy, would continue to unravel at an accelerating rate, during 2001 and 2002. Which they’ve done.

But I also said, in this kind of crisis, one must look back, to 1928-1933, and the effect on Germany, in particular, of the great economic crisis of that period. And during that time, a [grouping] centered in London, but with financial backing from New York circles, adopted Adolf Hitler as their project. Their intent was to bring Adolf Hitler to power, in order to prevent a natural, or democratic, response to the great financial collapse which was then already in process.



U.S. Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche meets the Turkish press on his arrival at Istanbul, June 13. His candidacy and the subject of his visit—his Eurasian Land-Bridge strategy for the current world economic crisis—received wide coverage in Turkey. The visit was sponsored by Yarin political monthly, which has regularly published LaRouche's writings.

At the end of 1932, Hitler's party was defeated, in an election campaign. As a result of the defeat of Hitler, a Chancellor was appointed, von Schleicher, of Germany, who was not a bad Chancellor.

But the Nazi Party leaders, such as Goebbels and Hitler, threatened to commit suicide, because the Nazi Party was bankrupt. Then, the London bankers—headed by the former head of the Bank of England, Montagu Norman, backed by New York financiers—financed the recovery of the Nazi Party. And then on the 28th of January of 1933, von Schleicher was dismissed, by blackmail pressure on President von Hindenburg. And on the 30th of January, 1933, Hitler was appointed Chancellor by Hindenburg.

The following month, the Reichstag was burned down; which was used to make Hitler, who was then a joke, as a political figure, suddenly the dictator of Germany. And the fate of the world, from that point on, until the end of the war, was determined by that sequence of events.

The 9/11 Inflection Point Today

The danger was, in the year 2001, and again today, the danger was and is, that a group of financial circles, of the Venetian *fondi* model—typified by those who were behind Hitler then, behind Vichy France, behind Mussolini in Italy, behind Franco in Spain—that these small groups of bankers, who are strongly represented in the New York market, and who are very powerful influences there; that these groups would try a Hitler-style solution, this time trying to use the nuclear power of the United States to establish a total world monetary-economic dictatorship of the planet, through some kind of coup, modelled on the Hitler precedent. I said, we must expect that to happen; that's a likely prospect.

That is what happened on Sept. 11, 2001. For those who



were military experts, who know security systems, and know also the security system of the United States, there was no possibility that some bunch of Saudi students, could have seized planes, and done what was done on Sept. 11, 2001. The United States security system is complicated. To run four aircraft; to abduct these aircraft on schedule, in the same blow; to deploy and coordinate the deployment of these four aircraft in different parts of the United States, so that the movements of the aircraft would coincide with a sequence in which the first aircraft would strike and the second one would then respond to that, by making a turn to make the second strike, and so forth and so on, and finally, into the Pentagon; this could not happen, inside the United States, without inside knowledge and coordination.

Now, why was that done? It was done to bring Cheney to power in the United States, the Vice President, It was not done by George Bush; I don't think he even knows what an aircraft is—he was trained on one, but I'm not sure he knows. And Cheney immediately came forth, on Sept. 11, and the following day, Sept. 12th, with a proposal for war based on policies which he had presented in 1991, when they had been rejected by the previous Bush Administration; which he had presented

again in 1996, and which were his standing program.

So, it's obvious that the reaction to 2001, September 11, was this. Now, it took time to get the President of the United States conditioned to accept Cheney's program. The acceptance was certified in a State of the Union address in January of 2002, in which the Cheney program was presented as the "Axis of Evil" element in the address of the President of the United States on that day.

That is what is operating.

This problem is a group of, as I said, of financiers. They're not known as major banks. They're the kinds of people who control banks from behind the scenes, wealthy financial circles, who are running exactly this kind of policy for no purpose but to use nuclear weapons—including the so-called mini-nukes—to use them against countries which have no nuclear weapons. And to find pretexts for doing so. Their general objective is not to target Iraq, or merely to target Islamic nations, though that is their prime target; their intention is to create a geo-political condition under which, what I will outline as the alternative to this kind of policy, could not occur.

Revival of the World Economy

The potentiality for the revival of the world economy today, lies, as I shall indicate, in Eurasia. The potentialities of Eurasia. If you start enough wars in Eurasia, so there is no coordination, or no *possible* coordination among the principal nations of Eurasia, then there will be no recovery of the world economy, in a meaningful sense. Therefore the issue is really today, as it was in 1933, when Franklin Roosevelt was about to be inaugurated as the President of the United States: Which road will we take? Will we take the road which is typified by what happened in Germany with Hitler? Or the road which is typified by what happened in the United States with the election, and the subsequent inauguration, of President Roosevelt?

Will we, in short, do what was proposed in Germany in 1931, at a secret conference of the Friedrich List Gesellschaft, in Berlin? Where a leading economist of Germany, Dr. Wilhelm Lautenbach, presented a proposal, and said, "We can not use fiscal austerity to balance budgets under conditions of depression. Rather we must use straight state credit, focussed on large-scale infrastructure projects, as the way of increasing employment, increasing production, and therefore launching a recovery through this kind of fostered growth."

Roosevelt did that for the United States. Lautenbach and his circles in Germany *had intended* to do that, but did not do it, because of the Hitler coup. We intend to do that in the United States, and other countries intend to move in that direction, as I shall indicate. The question is today: Which shall prevail?

We're now in a process where I, and others, in the United States—not all my friends, not my collaborators, but people who happen to have views that coincide with mine on this

issue—are moving to impeach, potentially, the Vice President of the United States, Dick Cheney, Mr. Wolfowitz, Mr. Rumsfeld, Mr. Bolton of the State Department, Mr. Wurmser of the State Department, and Mr. Libby of the office of the Vice President, and so forth and so on—to clean out this nest of so-called neo-conservatives, many of whom have Trotskyist backgrounds; to clean them out of government, and just simply put, shall we say, more normal people into those positions of government, under which the institutions of government can function in a normal way.

Under those conditions, I'm convinced from what I know now, that in conditions of crisis, the United States—after such an impeachment cleanout of this nest of rascals, as we call them—that the United States will tend to respond in a healthy way, to the onrush of the present world financial-monetary-economic crisis. And therefore, we can have the equivalent of a Roosevelt alternative to a depression, as opposed to the Hitler alternative expressed by World War II, and the things associated with that.

So, therefore, in that sense, I'm optimistic.

How the System Became Bankrupt

What's the situation?

Mankind often is insane. That is, governments, powerful institutions, will sometimes adopt absolutely insane policies. But because of the inertia of previous states of the economy, because of the blindness of people to what's happening to them, because people tend to think, often, in the short term, not the long term, idiocy can go on for a long time, before public opinion and institutions react and recognize it has been idiocy.

That was the case in the United States during much of the early part of the 20th Century. The assassination of William McKinley was a disaster for the future of the United States, and much of the rest of the world. The post-Wilson governments in the United States—especially Coolidge and Hoover—were an absolute disaster for the United States, a period of mass insanity. Then we had a Great Depression, not only because of bad U.S. policy, but bad policies in Europe.

So the question was: Do we go into the pit, or are we snapped back to our senses by the shock of discovering we've been in error? Do governments and others realize we have to make a change, recognize we've been wrong, and correct our errors, and go on with some kind of a program toward recovery?

That has often been the history of European civilization and civilization in general. Failure, failure, failure. But nonetheless, if we look at it from the standpoint of history, the past 2 million years, the potential of mankind, were mankind an ape, would have been about 3 or 4 million living individuals on the planet. We now have over 6 billion human individuals living on this planet. Despite all the crises which have occurred, this represents a power for accomplishment, and development, and growth and progress of the human species.



The “Ceviz Kabuğu” political program interviewed LaRouche for three hours. The show is widely watched by Turks all over the world, and he generated excitement and respect with his blunt challenge to bring down the neo-cons who’ve grabbed power in the United States. “Wolfowitz and Perle won’t dare come back here after that,” said one observer.

Therefore, as a human species, we should be inherently optimistic, that within us lie the mental powers, and the spiritual powers, to respond to the challenge of crisis, to develop solutions. And so therefore, I tell people, the first thing to have, in a time of crisis, is to revive your optimism. Because it’s that spirit of optimism about humanity which may encourage you to find the ingenuity within yourselves, to recognize the error, and correct it.

Today, as since approximately 1964, the United States and Britain led the world, Europe, in general, the Americas, into a disaster. We emerged from World War II, the United States, as the leading productive power on this planet. We were the greatest productive power per capita this planet had ever seen. Much of this had developed under Roosevelt’s leadership of recovery, and building for the war. We—working with Europe and with other countries, other parts of the world—we helped to rebuild the post-war economy of the world, in many parts. Until the middle of the 1960s.

Then we became insane. We turned toward a post-industrial society, or the so-called “’68er” phenomenon. We turned against progress—we turned to crazy ideas; and ideas which dominate many of the people who are 50 or 60 years of age today, who dominate the leading institutions of Europe and the Americas. They’re in there; they have crazy ideas.

But this came to the point that, as a result of steps taken then, as a result of the 1971-72 crashing of the Bretton Woods fixed-exchange-rate system, the world today is largely bank-

rupt. The international monetary system is essentially bankrupt. The Federal Reserve System of the United States is bankrupt. Except for backing by the government. The banks, the leading banks—like Citigroup, like Chase Manhattan, or J.P. Morgan-Chase Manhattan—these institutions are essentially bankrupt. The same condition exists throughout the banking systems of Europe. The banking system of Japan is bankrupt. The debts which are outstanding today in the world, on a world scale, could never be repaid, by present trends in the world economy. The system is bankrupt.

Carry Out Bankruptcy Reorganization

What do we do? Under those conditions, there’s only one thing you can do. The same thing you do with any bankrupt entity if it’s essential, and certainly governments are essential, nations are essential. You can not eliminate nations because they’re bankrupt. You can not eliminate governments of nations because they’re bankrupt. Therefore, what you must do, is you must have governments put the bankrupt part of the system into bankruptcy reorganization, in the same way you would with a useful bankrupt firm.

The firm is essential. The institution is essential. It must continue to function. Pensions must be paid. Employment must be continued. Growth must occur. But the system is bankrupt.

Therefore, the state must use its power of government, its sense of absolute sovereignty as a nation, to put whatever is bankrupt, into bankruptcy reorganization, to keep necessary banks open, to keep employment going, salaries paid, pensions paid, necessary things happening. And find a way to build the growth to repair the damage caused by the bankruptcies.

The same thing you’d do with a firm you needed, which had gone bankrupt.

But in this case, it’s the world system that is bankrupt. So, the option for a solution is to have the world, or much of it, agree, through their governments, to put these bankrupt elements of the present world monetary financial system into bankruptcy reorganization, into receivership under government control. Either the control of the relevant individual government, or the control of a concert of governments, in case of international institutions.

Look to Eurasia

If we’re willing to do that, the following can occur. Germany, Western Europe, as you may know, is bankrupt. That is, the current amount of earnings of Western Europe, is not capable of maintaining the Western European economies, nations, in functioning conditions. However, Europe has a func-



The American candidate in discussion with some of the more than 400 who attended his Istanbul conference on June 14. "We are much closer to victory than most of you believe, on the issue of stopping this war, and stopping this war process," he told them.

tion. If we look across Eurasia, we see that function. We have China, estimated at 1.3 billion people, and growing. We have India, a billion people. Hundreds of millions of people in Southeast Asia. Korea, Japan, Iran. The vast areas of Central and North Asia, which include Kazakhstan, the states of Central Asia, and the tundra region of northern Siberia, of Russia.

This contains the largest concentration of mineral resources on this planet, largely in the central and northern part of Eurasia. It contains the largest concentration of population on this planet, and some of the most sparsely populated regions as well.

Now, China is growing. China is growing through large infrastructure projects, the largest water projects in the world. The highest-level railroad in the world. The greatest movement of water from South China to North China, into Xinjiang, to transform these barren areas into areas of habitation and growth. India and China are considering a great project. The Brahmaputra River, one of the great rivers of the world, pours down from Tibet, in a steep declivity, into Assam, down toward Bangladesh and the Bay of Bengal. One of the greatest hydroelectric projects of this world is now being considered, inside Tibetan China, now, in cooperation with India.

We have vast projects of moving water, from the Ob [River] of Russia, into Central Asia, to bring back the Aral Sea, and other areas. Similar projects throughout the area.

So, here we have Europe, which is a font of ability to produce useful technology, now becoming engaged with its largest markets, in Eurasia, which are in China, and India. And China, the fastest-growing market. You have parts of Europe, where business is still functioning, are looking for

exports in this part of the world.

So, therefore, if we can make the kinds of agreements, among nations, that are required, we can make 25- to 50-year agreements among the various parts of Eurasia; 25- to 50-year long-term agreements among governments, on general credit and policy agreements, on currency. We can issue credit, at 1-2% long-term interest, which can finance large projects. These projects, these large-scale infrastructure investments, will drive the rest of the economy. Europe will recover.

We can, among other things, rebuild the shattered Balkans, which is the key of the relation between Turkey and Europe—the Balkans region. If we can bring peace in the Middle East, by suppressing the war of Israel against the Palestinians, and bring peace there, and introduce large-scale water projects there, we can build peace there.

If we can build this, and do the same thing with Central and South America, with the United States, we can fix Africa.

So, we're at a point of despair, but a point also of opportunity, in which large-scale agreements among the nations of Eurasia—putting bankrupt parts of the world into bankruptcy reorganization, creating gigantic masses of credit at low-interest rates, agreeing on long-term projects, and cooperation on long-term projects—can open up for humanity for the next two generations, the greatest period of growth and prosperity in all human existence.

So we have the choice, between the two.

The question is: How do we bridge the gap, between the two? What agreements do we make?

Well, my proposal has been severalfold.

A Community of Principle

Several concrete steps that have to be taken, jointly by a number of governments, which are necessary to start a general economic recovery. My view is that these proposals, if adopted, will create the political optimism and the sense of unity, required to overcome the threats to the security of the world today. That if we establish institutional agreements among states, on these kinds of projects, we will have the power and commitment among governments, that the kind of threat we've seen recently, as in Iraq and elsewhere, will go away, and will not return.

We've come to a point in history, when we can not eliminate defense. We can not eliminate the requirement for large-scale defense capabilities in nations, but we can eliminate the possibility of anything but strategic defense as a military policy. We can build military institutions which make a contribution to engineering, which is the traditional peacetime function of military institutions. We can do these things.

And under these conditions, we will have entered a period from which we will emerge, not as—war as we've thought about it in the past, will no longer exist. In which the relations among states will be increasingly a community of principle among what are respectively, perfectly sovereign nation-states, but united in cooperation by certain principles.

Now, here's what some of the guidelines are.

We had a good system, back in the 1950s, the Bretton Woods System, established on the initiative of Roosevelt, in 1944. That system worked. It was a fixed-exchange-rate system, with a gold reserve basis. It was based on protectionist programs, to ensure that long-term agreements could be honored, through protectionist arrangements on trade, and tariffs, and so forth. That worked.

In 1964, we began to tear that apart, in the United States and the United Kingdom. We went toward a consumer society, rather than being the greatest productive power on this planet. Similar things were done in the United Kingdom. We became disgusting. We became like the Roman Empire, producing less and less at home, and using our imperial power to *steal*, by force and power, from other countries, whatever we wished, at whatever prices we wished to pay. We regulated the currency values of other countries, by various kinds of manipulations, and thus could get their goods as cheaply as we pleased. And we rotted away, at home.

We extended this rot, as a so-called post-industrial society ideology, in the "68" phenomenon, in Western Europe, in Japan, and elsewhere. We destroyed the impulse of civilization to reproduce and improve itself. So therefore, now that we're paying the price, of these follies of these past 40-odd years, the first thing to do is to go back, and say, "What worked before 1964, was successful. It wasn't perfect. There were many errors. But it worked. So, let us, as a first step, return from the foolishness we've done, to do what worked before, as a model for the approach to take now." Because we need quick agreements. The system is bankrupt; we must act immediately.

We can not go into ten-year-long debates about what the policy should be. We must act immediately. We have an emergency!

Then, there are some other things we must do, in addition to creating new credit under the new system.

Build Development Corridors

We must build, in Eurasia, the devices by means of which we can unify the continent of Eurasia, in the way needed. Now the obvious thing, in former times, was the model of the United States in the middle 19th Century, where we build railroads quickly, which unified the Pacific and Atlantic coasts of the United States. And those railroads were used for the internal development of the areas of the United States which had been undeveloped. These were not simply rail connections, these were development corridors, along which agriculture boomed—this kind of thing. So that happened.

We need it now in a new form. We can transport goods, technically, at high speed, by rail, from Rotterdam to Pusan, in Korea, far more rapidly *and more cheaply* than by ship. Because when you run a corridor of development, and a transport route as a corridor development, every mile along that route becomes an area that is generating wealth. And the wealth you generate as a result of having that railroad system, or that transportation system, is far greater than the cost of creating and maintaining it.

So, actually, a high-speed transportation system of that type costs the nation nothing, because it causes the production of more wealth than it costs.

Now, if we do that, we would go across Eurasia, with several routes: a northern route, a middle route, a southern route, and a far southern route. These would not be simply rail lines; they would be development corridors, which would be high-speed transportation. We would be using things like magnetic levitation, in the fairly near future, for high-speed transport—we're talking about 300 kilometers an hour, that sort of speed. We would accompany that with the development of new urban centers, which would be industrial, agricultural complexes, along the routes of this travel. We would have large-scale water systems. We would have large-scale power generating and distribution systems built into it, largely nuclear power, developed along these routes.

So these routes would be development areas. Now in these development areas—including, say, Central Asia—a shortage of water. We'll move water from the Ob River, south. It now flows into the Arctic. A lot of it we'll move south into the area of the Aral Sea. We have water also in the northern part, the eastern part of Asia. We can move that water south too. So Central Asia can now become an area of general economic and population development.

We can also—we have the techniques, which we have to develop, but we have them—for using the tundra area, under which large mineral resources lie, as an area which we can develop, in ways to be able to exploit the natural resources in

become feasible. Fear, is the greatest danger to the people of this planet today. The governments' fear of a dictatorship being exerted by a nuclear United States, is the greatest single threat to humanity today.

Now, you can not solve the problem by eliminating the United States. You can't ignore the United States. Because the other nations of the world are not prepared to make the kinds of initiatives—even if they felt free to do so—or effect the kind of cooperation, which is needed to bring about the kinds of changes I've indicated. You would tend to get anarchy.

Therefore, the solution is, from my standpoint, is to change the disposition of the United States, the government of the United States. I think that we are a heartbeat, so to speak, away from that. Our problem is not George W. Bush. He is a problem, but he is not our problem. The problem is a small cabal, typified by the Vice President, by Rumsfeld, by Wolfowitz and other notables, who are essentially merely lackeys, overpaid lackeys, who are working for some financial interests behind the scenes, like the financial interests that orchestrated the Hitler coup in Germany in 1933.

If we deal with that—and I am moving for that impeachment of Cheney and others, to bring this about—if we succeed in that, then we will have an option: the option of meeting together, to make rational decisions; rational decisions based on the understanding that we must come to *common* decisions. Perhaps not all nations, but the majority of leading nations must come to certain common decisions, very quickly, about reorganizing the international monetary system, and replacing it with something like, in many respects, what we had in the 1950s. Under those conditions, we will survive. And if we learn to cooperate with a new monetary system, a reformed monetary system, in that sense, then we will develop the habits, as a community of nations, of meeting together, making decisions under which I think this planet will survive. And that's what I'm trying to do.

And I leave it now to the comments, and to the questions you might have. I'll take them, as they come.

Commentary on LaRouche Keynote

Dr. Numan Kurtulmas, Faculty of Economics, Istanbul University:

I wish there were even more people here, to hear this important message. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States became the only power, and the neo-cons think they can dominate economic, financial, and political affairs. But reasonable people like Mr. LaRouche are opposed to this. After 9/11, the U.S. neo-cons wanted to dominate the political scene, but as LaRouche has said, 9/11 could not possibly have been organized by a small terrorist group. The

neo-cons have made Muslims the enemy image. LaRouche has said that the real danger is fear of the largest nuclear power. Since Mr. Bush is not very intelligent, the neo-cons are using the nuclear force of the United States to create a major threat to the world.

The candidate, LaRouche, has made another important point: China and India, with their 2.5 billion population, represent a new power center, and they have economic projects also with Russia. LaRouche has emphasized the role of the nation-state. With our policies, we looked forward to the establishment of a new world economic order, but after 9/11, the U.S. administration opposed it.

Another important point LaRouche has brought up, is the U.S. economic crisis: The United States is producing less and importing more, like the Roman Empire. American capitalism invested in other countries—where labor is cheaper—but U.S. production decreased.

As for the regional situation, we knew what would happen with a war against Iraq, that the Middle East map would be changed, but how to cope? Turkey is one of the most challenged nations. We know we have to push for integration, for common projects, for example, in water. Our foreign policy used to be focussed on water. We are for Black Sea cooperation, and cooperation within the Organization of Islamic Conference, and with the European Union. LaRouche said that the United States poses a threat. We can start an initiative in the region: We, Turkey, with our know-how and historical background, can be an advisor to the United States.

There are two possibilities: Either the gap in income distribution, the inequality, in the United States and Europe continues, and conventional wars turn into regional nuclear wars; or, the United States must set up a meaningful relation with Asia and Africa, which is also in the interests of the West. If the United States wants such relations, it must start with Turkey. There are 1.5 billion Muslims; Turkey, with its development, with its relations to the Arab and Islamic world, especially its relations to northern Islam, can be the driver and the leader.

We must make LaRouche's voice heard.

Prof. Dr. Mahir Kaynak, Faculty of Economics, Gazi University, Ankara:

I agree with Mr. LaRouche about 9/11, that it was an internal affair.

The problem is the potential financial crisis, which is different from 1929; then it was a domestic crisis, today it is global. The U.S. foreign trade deficit is serious; it is importing but not exporting. The United States is the most heavily indebted country in the world. If the United States goes bankrupt, Japan will be so poor that people will have to eat grass. The entire economic structure is intertwined. One speaks of public investment and military spending, of increasing demand. But these measures won't help.

The United States wants military hegemony, not for oil

or because of the war on terrorism. As for Turkey's role, it is supposed to be a partner in American adventures, as the United States wants. Turkey objects. Or Turkey can help America build its military dominance, in order to prevent war.

The alliance of Turkey and the United States may delay a financial crisis. One radical problem that must be solved is the relations between the United States and Europe. If Japan and Europe sell their dollar holdings, this could lead to a collapse. A dollar millionaire today will become nothing overnight.

I do not think the problem can be solved with a New Bretton Woods. If central banks and the Federal Reserve are in the government system, then they are responsible for monetary policy. Though there are existing problems they are not solving, like the long-term U.S. debts. We need a monetary reform, with fixed exchange rates, but not the gold standard.

Dr. Unaltay, Yarin: Mr. LaRouche, would you like to respond?

LaRouche Intervention in Response to Comments

LaRouche: A short comment. . . . The key thing is, there is no such thing as a natural price of anything. By price, we mean the money price. There is no natural money price.

Money is an idiot. Did you ever have a discussion with a currency note? Did you ever try to find out what a currency note thought? Money is an idiot. It doesn't determine anything.

How do we run these things?

Well, in the U.S. Constitution, when we use it, the only power to create money is the U.S. Federal government. It's created by the Executive branch of government, with the consent of the Congress. No other kind of money is allowed. There is no central banking system allowed under the U.S. system. The problem that causes confusion, is, European banking systems are generally central banking systems, which means they are controlled by private interests, which have a concession from the government. Often these private interests overthrow governments, the governments of Europe. The European, Anglo-Dutch model of liberal systems, is such a base. The problem: Marx's system is tied to this liberal system devised by people like Jeremy Bentham and so forth, back at the end of the 18th Century. So, it's 18th-Century British imperial methods which lead to capitalism of the type described.

Under a protectionist system, of the United States, and under the nationalist system of economy generally, the way we deal with money is we regulate the way it's circulated; we regulate the borrowing costs; we regulate prices; in such a way as to ensure that those things that are essential to society

will prosper, and those things which are parasitical and wasteful, will suffer, relatively.

We also rig prices to guarantee that when we assure citizens that they should invest in a certain area on the long term, that the government will support that and defend them, in the opportunity to make that kind of investment. So, actually, we don't regulate the individual profit, but rather we regulate the conditions under which profit may be earned. which includes prices. We regulate the conditions for long-term credit at low interest rates, especially for basic economic infrastructure projects, and to encourage investors in capital-intensive industrial investment, and agricultural investment.

The same thing applies—to get the enormity of the present crisis.

On the last comment—that Turkey could cooperate with the United States, and a general, comprehensive reform, a radical reform, would not be necessary—not true.

You have to get the magnitude of something—so-called financial derivatives. The amount of financial derivatives, of immediate short-term debt, in the world today, is beyond the means of the entire world ever to pay the borrowing charges on this debt. For example, we are about to have a collapse of the international financial derivatives market in several places: the insurance derivatives, especially credit derivatives; real estate, mortgage-backed securities derivatives; and other things. The system is about to blow out. There is no way to *arrange* present debts. Most debts will simply cease to exist. That is, most obligations will simply cease to exist. Stock exchange values will be wiped out.

The only thing that will keep something up, is government regulation, to freeze and reorganize debt on some kind of a rational basis.

So, we are going to face the problem, maybe this week. Maybe next week. Maybe a month from now, maybe two months from now. We are going to face a total disintegration of the existing international monetary-financial system, unless we intervene beforehand, to prevent it. For that purpose we're going to have to have a fixed-exchange-rate system, without which you can not generate, under conditions of crisis, 1-2% simple interest loans. Without 1-2% simple interest loans, you can not generate large masses of credit, of the type needed for reconstruction. Therefore, these drastic measures are going to have to be taken.

As far as relations between the United States and Turkey, I don't worry too much about it, as long as I get to be President.

Questions and Dialogue with LaRouche

The Nature of the U.S. System

Q: I am a CPA. The real problem with the United States is the fear in the world, fear used to rule the world. In order

the eliminate this fear, can other countries do something against the United States? Or should it occur from inside the United States? What about the militia movement: What is it?

LaRouche: There is no movement, as such, in the United States, which could deal with this problem.

The U.S. system is, constitutionally, a Presidential system. Which means the power to act—executive action, and immediate action—comes only from within the Executive branch of government, as a part of the Presidency.

Now, many of us are a part of the Presidency. Some are officially employees or officials of the Federal government. Others of us are associated with the Presidency—not that we’re paid by the Presidency, but that we walk in and out, and discuss with people, policymaking; and we play a part in shaping the policy thinking of the institutions of the Presidency.

Now the way it works is this. We have a political process, in which the aspirations of the people, as expressed by the people, should get response from, chiefly, two places. From the Presidency, as an institution—not just the President himself, but the Presidency, the larger body—secondly, from the Legislative branch, especially of the Federal government, which makes the laws.

Generally, what has to happen, is that the Executive must act, often under temporary, immediate, emergency action; but the Presidency must not continue that action without the approval of the Legislature. For example: in war. The war powers of the Presidency are very limited by the Constitution. However, if the United States is attacked, the military of the United States, under the President’s order, can act on the basis of so-called rules of engagement—short-term actions to deal with the immediate problem. But any longer-term military action, as in a declaration of war, to continue conducting it, must be approved by the Legislature.

So therefore, now we have a situation: Take the concrete reality. The militia movement is not significant. It was actually a government-planted operation. But there *are* people revolting against the conditions of life in the United States, which is why I have the support I have; which, relative to the other fellows, is fairly large.

But the way it happens is: Here we are. Those of us who are associated with the Executive branch or the Legislative branch of government, partisans. The people are expressing a problem. It is our job to try to communicate back to the people, what the problem is, and to solicit their understanding in the process, of what the problem is. Then our problem is to initiate an action around which the people can rally, indicating their pleasure or displeasure. We then act. We act in the Executive branch; or we act in the Legislative branch for the necessary laws.

That’s generally the way our system works, and that’s the way it will work now. What we’re doing right now, is that some of us associated with the Executive branch—with the support, recently, of some from the Legislative branch, espe-

cially the Senate—have acted to launch a process aimed at the impeachment of the neo-con apparatus presently inside the U.S. government. That is the only thing existing in the world today, which could prevent Hell. Because there is no combination of nations in the world otherwise, at the present time, which is willing to act in ways—or *could* act effectively in ways—which would prevent a neo-con-dominated U.S. government from plunging this world, presently, into Hell.

We have already crossed the Rubicon. We are already in Hell. World War III in Eurasia is already ongoing. There was not an Iraq war; there is a continuing Iraq war. There was not an Afghanistan war; there is a continuing Afghanistan war. There’s already an onset of a war with Iran, being run covertly, as a covert operation, from the United States, in Iran right now! You see it on the television screens here. That is not a spontaneous student movement. That is a U.S.-run destabilization of Iran, trying to set up the conditions for a war. The situation in North Korea; other situations I know of; we are now *inside* World War III. It is not something that we could prevent from happening. We’re there.

Now that it has started, can we stop it now? Only from inside the United States. Only by persuading the government of the United States to stop the war. Nothing else will work.

We inside the United States, who are committed to stop the war, are now enjoying some modest degree of success. We have not won. But we are enjoying enough success to encourage us to do more. We’re not telling you, “Go home, go hide.” We’re saying, “The war is ongoing; we think we can stop it; by the impeachment process or things like that, we can bring it to a halt.”

That’s your only hope. Because World War III has already started. The question is: Can we stop it after it’s started? And can we persuade the United States’ President to stop it? That’s the only way it will stop. Or, you have to impeach him. And we’re doing it. We’re not aiming for the impeachment of President Bush; we’re aiming for the impeachment of those advisors whose influence upon him has induced him to start this war. And we hope that our pressures, and his success in putting a lid on Sharon and Sharon’s war, that we can shift the world correlation of forces, and thus bring about a resolution of these things, and call the war off.

Q: As you said, the United States and Europe are bankrupt, so much so, that it is having an impact on all of humanity. These [wars of] conquest want to impoverish other countries. This is demeaning and leads to a reaction. Inside the United States, there appears to be a religious ascendancy. Can the United States use the religious factor, or is there a secret policy here? What about the Catholics?

LaRouche: Well, the Pope is not a problem. The fear that the Pope is organizing anything inside the United States in this direction, is a mistake—not true.

You have some very dangerous religious cults in the world. And in the United States, we have one, which origi-



*Another television interview:
“The financial system is
coming down. We potentially
have these financier interests,
behind the Kissingers, the
Brzezinskis, the neo-cons—we
potentially have them by the
throat.”*

nates in Britain; it’s Protestant in nature; it’s called Evangelical Protestant. And it was started by these strange revivalist cults. These people believe that God was standing in the northern part of Mesopotamia when He created the universe. They believe that they have a God-instructed right to bring about the establishment of a Zionist world government. They hate Jews, but they like Zionism. And these people are crazy.

There’s a famous American novel by Sinclair Lewis, called *Elmer Gantry*, which describes rather precisely what this mentality is. This fellow DeLay of Texas, the Congressman, is typical of this. These people are the hard-core base of the Zionist operation in the United States. That is, the Zionist operations in the United States on behalf of the Sharon faction in Israel, are run through U.S. gangsters—who finance it—but they’re supported by anti-Semitic, anti-Jewish, Protestant religious cults of this lunatic variety.

The thing you emphasized which is true, is that Nazis, like Leo Strauss—a Jew himself, but who was a Nazi; who had to leave Germany, because he couldn’t make a career in the German Nazi Party; so he went to the United States. And he is the leader, the intellectual leader, of the neo-cons. He’s dead now; but he is the spiritual father of the neo-cons.

This fellow emphasized in his writings, the teaching that religion should be used as an instrument of terror and warfare, as a way of manipulating populations. That is going on. It is going on, largely, from a small minority inside the United States, who are supporters of Zionism, but who are themselves anti-Semitic and anti-Jewish. These crazy so-called Zionist Armageddon cults. And that is what’s going on.

Otherwise, no; this is not the problem. The problem is a

purely political: Let me remind you what the neo-cons are. Most of them are ex-Trotskyists; or recruited by ex-Trotskyists. Trotskyist fascists, and so forth, mixed up with all this stuff, in this very small group of people. You don’t have a mass movement, a mass-based attempt to take over the U.S. government. You have a small group of people, who by maneuvering in a very special way, have taken control, temporarily, of the U.S. government; and are controlling it like a small Nazi gang. And that’s what the problem is.

If you eliminate this small minority, there is no mass movement behind them. You eliminate this small minority, and you have no problem. And what we’re going to do, is eliminate the power of that very small minority which is controlling the U.S. government today.

Q: Before the Iraq war, there were mass protests worldwide. There was an impact also on the American population, against American imperialism. [Professor] Kaynak said Turkey should help the Americans. I think this is a very dangerous idea—to have imperialism continue and let Turkey feed on it.

LaRouche: Remember, the United States was created by Europeans at a time that Europe could not create a sovereign nation-state of a modern form. Many Europeans collaborated, and the United States was intended to be the model republic for establishing a series of republics in Europe. That was prevented by the French Jacobin insurrection in France, which was organized from London, to prevent France from becoming a republic under the constitution designed, specifically, by Bailly and Lafayette. But, from that time on, the United States was considered the model republic to establish a *com-*

munty of sovereign nation-state republics on this planet. That was the function.

For historical reasons, in most cases that has not succeeded. We do not have a single true republic in Europe today. What we have are parliamentary systems which are modified or reformed feudal systems, which are controlled by central banking systems. So that's where the misunderstanding is.

The problem is this: The United States functions—in my conception, in my intention—the United States President has a sacred responsibility to defend the cause for which it was created. That was, to set up a global system, in which mankind was finally freed from the condition in which most people were treated as human cattle, in virtually every society and every culture to date. It is to get the freedom and development of the human individual in the form of states that can do that.

My sacred responsibility is to take the power that the United States has—not as a military power, not as an imperial financial power, but as a political leadership power—to tell the rest of the nations to *stop* being slaves, and to stand up, and be sovereign republics, and *join me* in creating a new order of a system of perfectly sovereign nation-state republics, united and governed by only one common principle: the principle of the general welfare of nations.

Therefore, my task as President is to *free* other nations from imperialism, not to perpetuate a new one. What you're referring to, or describing, is the British liberal imperialist method—I abhor that. Though we have a lot of liberal imperialists inside the United States.

Professor Kaynak [to the questioner]: Your question seems to indicate that you prefer war. What if the United States goes against Iran? Do you think you can stop it?

Q: What are the conditions in the United States? Are they revolutionary?

LaRouche: There are certain cases in history, under which that kind of action has to be taken by somebody. Those are highly exceptional conditions. And now, I think it's moot, because it's not necessary.

We have, now, we have the support from those forces for what I'm proposing—that is, their action, our joint action, which I think is sufficient to change the situation, as I've indicated today. That is, to end the danger, to end this war, right now.

We have the forces to do that. It's going to be a political fight to get these forces to act, within the framework of the Constitution, as they should, now. I don't think we'll get to the point that we have to even consider the other alternative, which would be hell. But I think we're close to it. I think people here tend—as I get from the feel of the discussion—people are much too pessimistic about this. We are much closer to victory than most of you believe, on this issue of stopping this war, and stopping this war process. I can assure you of that, because I'm close to it. I can't guarantee the success, and I will do whatever is necessary in the process.

But we're *close* to it. Join me in helping to bring that result about. To realize the benefit of that result.

We're close to success in stopping the war. What we need help on is the following: We need help on the basis of discussion, largely discussion. There has to be open international discussion on the kinds of issues I've posed here today. These can not be simply implemented. *They must be discussed*. My job is to get the discussion, force the discussion, and get that discussion. But we're going to have to quickly come to some kind of agreement on the agenda I indicated. But it will have to be a voluntary agreement; not one imposed by the United States.

Q: After World War I, Turkey fought a war of liberation against United Kingdom policies. You should start a war of liberation [against British policy]. Thank you.

LaRouche: The point is, I have studied over years the case of Kemal Atatürk, who is one of the figures of that period I admire. And his policy of strategic defense, which is not just military; it's also diplomatic: What he did in respect to Syria; what he did in respect to the Soviet Union—these actions were the actions of a true leader. And Turkey was created, had the good fortune to be created under the leadership of a genius, who was a courageous soldier, a great statesman, who created the republic, in a sense—not by himself, but by leading it properly. And Sykes-Picot, which was a French-British scheme for scrambling the Middle East, failed in large degree because of his genius, in the way he responded, using the concept of *strategic defense*, not just killing. He was a fierce fighter, and he demanded fierce fighting qualities of his troops. But he was not a blind killer. He was a man who said, "We must win this war," as he demonstrated against the British expeditionary forces, Australians, in the battle he fought during the previous war.

Two Traditions in America

Q: You have come to Istanbul as a herald of peace. As a human being, and as a Turk, I am pleased to hear what you have to say. Ankara may be the capital of Turkey, but Istanbul is the capital for Eurasia, it is the connecting link between Europe, Asia, and Africa. The future lies in Eurasia. As heirs of the [Ottoman] empire, we have a responsibility to help people.

My question is: In the 19th Century, De Toqueville, in a book, wrote that the United States would never be able to solve the problem with the black population. But I see Colin Powell in office. Was the writer wrong? Or is something changing? In the 1960s, the administrations were WASP, but now they are being replaced by the new Americans. Are there Catholics in the Administration? If it is not politically incorrect to ask, may I ask if you are Catholic?

LaRouche: Well no, I don't happen to be a Catholic. I happen to be an admirer of this Pope, but not a Catholic.

But, on the other thing: De Toqueville was completely

wrong. He is much talked about, but he didn't understand the United States. We have, in the United States' history, we have two currents, through 1763. That is, remember, in 1763, the British monarchy moved to crush the 13 colonies in North America. At that point, under the leadership of Benjamin Franklin, with support from Europe, the United States started a war of resistance, in effect, a mobilization against the British monarchy, and for the independence of a new republic. This, the division occurred between those in the United States who were close to the British East India Company—they became known as the American Tories—and a group of patriots.

So the United States has always been divided between two traditionally relatively powerful factions. One: the American patriotic tradition, for which I speak, which you don't hear much about in Europe these days. The other: the American Tory tradition, typified by the *New York Times*; typified by the *Washington Post*, and so forth and so on. And by the neo-cons, the worst type of this sort.

So, we fought hard to be free of slavery. We have won the fight against slavery, under the leadership of one of my great predecessors, Abraham Lincoln. I've associated with the fight against the continuation of that today. For example, the black legislators' group and related groups are one of my principal constituencies. You're right that there is a change in the social composition of the United States. We now have more of Hispanic origin, combined with African-American origins, than others, essentially. One of the largest single groups, ethnically, in the United States.

However, the United States must be understood as principally a melting-pot nation. It is not a nation founded by one group of people. It was, from the beginning, from many nationalities; no one. It represents the Americas; it represents the world—the Asian population is immense. We are a true melting-pot nation, and in general, we are *happy* to be a melting-pot nation. We have a large Islamic minority in the United States—a very large one—coming from the Arab world, and other parts of the Islamic world.

So that's our character.

We still, however, have the American Tory tradition, which, like the British, tends to be racist. And we do not generally have, as a nation, we do not have these kinds of chauvinistic tendencies. The Catholic faction is not really a problem. Catholics are a small minority in the United States—they're divided. There're two groups of Catholics in the United States: one, which supports the Pope; and one which opposes him. Both pretend to be, equally, Catholics. And they're completely opposite. The Pope is against the war. The others, who belong to this other crazy group of nominal Catholics, are for the war. And they attack the Pope openly, with the help of John Bolton of the State Department, in *Rome itself*, on that issue.

So, we are not, essentially, as a people—I would just refer, just to conclude this: I wrote a paper—as an appendix to my paper on foreign policy, United States foreign policy, my

foreign policy ["A World of Sovereign Nation-States," *EIR* May 16]—on the question of church and state ["The Roles of Church and State," *EIR*, May 16]. I do not believe that the United States government, or any concert of governments, should intervene on religious questions, as such.

However, there is one basis on which we do have to intervene on a moral basis. The question is: Do we accept the fact that man is not an ape, that man is not a beast? Do we accept the fact that what we call the "soul"—we mean the power of man which no animal has, to recognize universal principles, which are provable, which exist beyond the power of sense perception. And on that accountability, on that account, man is different from the beasts. Man is sacred. The human individual is sacred, and therefore, rather than trying to deal with the ecumenical issue by dictating solutions among Muslim, Jew, and Christian, for example, my view is: We have to agree on what we agree upon. We agree on the notion of spirituality, as the nature of man. That's man's essential spiritual immortality in the mortal life. Therefore, we must treat our fellow creatures as spiritual creatures, primarily, and mortal creatures, second, as the best people treat themselves.

Therefore, we must agree that our laws must always be in accord with that principle of the sacredness of human life, and the spirituality of the human individual as having its practical significance in the way we honor those who came before us, who gave us our existence, and we honor and benefit those who come after us.

Therefore, we must, in that sense, as Plato puts it in the mouth of Socrates, in *The Republic*—the term *agapē*—which is translated in Christianity, variously, as "general welfare, common good," today. We must, therefore, accept the principle of that common good, defined by the spirituality of the essence of the individual, as being *natural law*. And therefore, all governments must agree, in their internal affairs, in their affairs with one another: We respect the *sacredness*, the spiritual sacredness of the human individual. And we do nothing which violates our respect for that sacredness.

The Essence of Physical Economy

Q: I am a student. I wanted to go to the United States to take my master's degree, but postponed it because of Bush. If you get elected, I may reconsider.

Regarding the economic bomb about to explode, what is your solution, as President? When Clinton was in Istanbul, he said Turkey had an important role. What is your view?

LaRouche: Bill Clinton is a very nice person. He's probably the most intelligent President we've had for some time in the United States. I have had a certain kind of association with him during the period of his Presidency and since. And I like the fellow. (But, I don't always like his taste in women. But that's a different matter. It's not important to me.) But he tends to compromise too much, politically. I hope he would improve on that now that he's out of the Presidency; I would hope that he would play a contributing role—and I think he

will—in the effort we’re making to deal with this neo-con problem. He is actually making a contribution and an effort in that direction.

But, on understanding economics, Bill is not too sharp. He may be learning something from me eventually; but he’s a slow learner, when it comes to economics. He’s too tied to his liberal friends sometimes, doesn’t want to understand economics.

The solution is here. The solution—again, I’ve written a great deal on this. Economics, the way I go at it, is not a simple subject. You really have to re-learn everything you thought you knew in university economics in order to understand a real economy.

A real economy, as I indicated in reply to a question earlier this afternoon here, is *physical*; it is not *money*. You see the problem is, you have a problem: The individual who contributes to progress—that individual is a sovereign mind. Did you ever think the thoughts directly that someone was thinking next to you? You can’t. You can express your thought, and find ways to confirm that what you think is what they think. But you can not simply communicate what’s going on inside a human mind, directly.

And the same thing is true of great discoveries, inventions, ingenuity. We rely, as much as possible, on the *freedom of the individual* to make contributions to society. This includes economic contributions, such as the sovereign farmer, running a farm; economic contributions such as, especially, small business which is privately owned. We try to encourage it as much as possible.

Therefore, we do not try to run the government in some kind of super-Soviet system, where the government runs everything. Rather, we try to create the *conditions, the pre-conditions* under which those who are producing can prosper, whether economically, in ideas, or whatever else they contribute to society.

To do that, we have to create a medium of exchange, of economic value, by which these minds can collaborate in a common way. For that purpose, we create and regulate money. We take taxes. We give subsidies. We regulate trade, to give a fair chance to every individual to contribute to society, and to protect those things which are valuable to us.

So therefore, we have to start from the *physical* process, and the physical process is little understood. It’s my specialty, but it’s little understood still today. Even though many people admire what I do, they don’t replicate *what* I do. And that is: to understand what we mean by the ability of the human mind to generate an increased physical power over the universe, in the sense of a universal physical principle.

Therefore, economics has to be understood that way.

For example, let’s take the case of technology-sharing. There is no such thing as natural profit in an economy. It doesn’t exist. There’s no way in which human beings, if they were animals—there’s no way in which monkeys create

profit; there’s no way in which gorillas create profit. I’ve never seen a horse generate a profit. Someone has taken a profit out of a horse, but never put one in. Only a human being, by discovering principles, and applying them, and cooperating in applying them, can increase the productive powers of labor, beyond the cost of producing the individual who does that.

Therefore, it is the *improvement of the mind, the development of the mind of the individual which should be the center of the economy*: the ability of the mind to generate ideas, and use ideas which increase the productive powers of people generally, by which we increase our power over nature. That must be economy. That’s where we put the solution.

And that’s what Bill Clinton doesn’t understand. Bill Clinton and other liberals, and so forth, think that random selections of ideas—or some guy under the floorboards of society—a little green man, who’s casting dice—can determine whether one person is rich and the other person is poor. I don’t believe it. And Bill does.

The U.S. Role in Eurasia

Q: Why do you say that it is necessary for the United States to be part of Eurasia? Do you mean in terms of technology transfer, or geopolitics, or because others can not lead? The United States is outside Eurasia, and we saw the Afghan war.

LaRouche: The Afghanistan war was a project which was used as a pretext for inducing Europe, out of so-called sympathy for the United States after 9/11—to induce Europe to contribute its resources to putting in place, around Iraq, the material means needed for the war against Iraq. That was the only reason for the Afghanistan war.

Afghanistan, of course, is a much worse mess now, than it was before the United States went in. Iraq is a much worse mess today—and it will be under the continued administration of Bremer—than it was before the war. The worst thing that was done.

Now, the issue here is: The United States is, organically, an integral part of Asia. The United States orientation toward Asia began during the 19th Century. It was the United States which reformed Japan to make Japan an industrial power. It was made directly under the influence of Henry C. Carey, in the 1870s, when the great reform, economic reform of Japan occurred. Modern Japan is largely a reflection, since the Second World War, of what was put into place under MacArthur. New institutions of Japan were fostered by the United States, and these institutions have very close, integral relationships, economically, in physical economy, and otherwise, with the United States.

Korea, especially South Korea, is an integral, an extension of cultural sharing and economic ties to the United States. China, is today, the single largest factor in U.S. foreign trade, even despite the collapse of the level of U.S. trade to China

now. And it will continue to be. India has always been associated closely with the United States, as well as with Britain.

The United States is also integral to the Americas. The agro-industrial structure of every major part of the Americas, down to Cape Horn, are integral to the development of the United States.

So therefore, the United States—not everything is fake. The United States represents an estimated 25% of the world product, apart from its financial contribution. You can not ignore the United States. The world could not function isolated from the United States, under present conditions. Maybe under some future hypothetical conditions, it could, but not now.

Therefore, the other countries of the world, as I've worked with them, *can not* come to an agreement by which they could survive, without U.S. participation. They can't do it. There are many reasons for this—ideological and other reasons. There are habits, and other reasons.

I find that my intervention—for example, as in the question of Eurasia—my interventions, especially since the late/middle 1990s, in Eurasia, were key in the promotion of what Primakov proposed as the Strategic Triangle of Russia, China, and India. That operation is now in place. We recently had a conference again in Bangalore, in India, on that area, that subject. It's going forward. I'm dealing today, through my representative in Korea, I'm dealing with the Korean situation. And with the situation in Japan, the situation in China.

What I'm doing, I'm able to do, not only because I'm an individual intellect, but because I'm recognized as representing a side of the United States which people in these parts of the world want to deal with. And therefore, my job is to represent that, and to try to bring the United States into conformity with what they expect of the United States through me. So when I say I'm committed to something for the United States, I intend to make it happen. When I talk about cooperation with the United States, *I'm taking about what I intend, personally, shall happen*. Not some abstract "what the United States must do."

I'm out to defeat the faction in the United States which is responsible for these policies of which we've complained here. They're wrong. They're wrong for the United States; they're wrong for the world; they're wrong for the future of humanity. Therefore, they must be changed. I'm proposing that we make a *peaceful* revolution against the current war.

The Neo-Cons and the Utopians

Q: I am from *Zaman* newspaper. We're talking about Eurasia, but we always return to America. With the mentality of Brzezinski and Kissinger taking hold, is there any mass basis for this? What can you say about the assassination of Kennedy?

What is the level of support for Lyndon LaRouche in the population?



Compared to President John F. Kennedy, who is widely admired in Turkey, LaRouche said Kennedy "was the last President who might have defeated this process. The problem is, he came into government, and was killed so soon. . . . And it's been assured that nobody would become a President after that who would return the United States to the tradition of Franklin Roosevelt."

LaRouche: Okay. Our level of support: Right now, I am, in terms of the number of financial supporters for my candidacy in the United States, as of the last official record, the leading [Democratic] candidate among ten. And that has caused some problems among some other people. But I think that'll work out fine.

The Kennedy assassination was the product of an operation done by a group which is tied to the neo-cons. That's why you don't joke about neo-cons. They're silly, but you don't joke about them. It's like, if your brother-in-law gave birth to a crocodile, you wouldn't joke about it.

Kennedy was killed to make way for what became known as the Vietnam War. The Vietnam War was the most notable effort to change the official U.S. military-strategic policy into the direction we see reflected in the Iraq war recently here, and in other wars.

This was a fight by a group which was identified by Eisenhower, inadequately, as the "military-industrial complex."

These are the neo-cons. This is the group that's organized around what's called the "revolution in military affairs," which you see operational in the policies of Rumsfeld & Company now. Rumsfeld was, from the 1970s on, together with Cheney, a key proponent of the revolution in military affairs, which is actually an attempt—which didn't start with Rumsfeld—to reform the U.S. military in the order of the *Nazi International Waffen SS*.

What you saw in Iraq, in terms of the incompetence of the troops—19- to 20-year-old troops—they were trained in video point-and-shoot games. They're not soldiers. They're video-game players doing it on the battlefield. That's why they're so incompetent in dealing with the situation they're dealing with. They're picked up off the streets and trained as point-and-shoot killers, *on military video games*, which get a high accuracy for point-and-shoot accuracy. The cheapest way to train someone to kill efficiently.

So, this is our situation. We have this element in the United States, which are called the Utopians. They've been there; they were brought into existence by H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell from England. Bertrand Russell was the inventor of preventive nuclear warfare. H.G. Wells was the author of the concept of using nuclear weapons as a weapon of terror to force nations to give up their national sovereignty, and become part of world government, or under world government. These are the ideas you're dealing with. This is

what I've fought most of my life.

Now, where do you get Brzezinski and Kissinger from?

You had a degenerate from Tennessee who was, spiritually, a follower of H.G. Wells, and a representative of the tradition of the Confederacy—the pro-slavery tradition: William Yandell Elliott, Professor William Yandell Elliott of Harvard University, Department of Government. This man trained a great number of people, sort of like Leo Strauss in Chicago. He trained a great number of people, including Brzezinski and Kissinger, who were his trained puppets. And he and a group, including Rockefeller interests and other interests, financed these people, stuck them into government. So that we had a transformation of our government under a Kissinger Administration, which is otherwise known as a Nixon-Bush Administration, which was a Kissinger Administration, followed by a Carter Administration, which was really a Brzezinski Administration.

Kissinger is personally the American who is most important in a connection with Ariel Sharon in Israel. Kissinger and Sharon *steal* together. Or they did steal together. We caught them at it.

So this is a special breed, which comes out of the British Commonwealth, the British monarchy. There's an important part of the so-called American Tory faction in the United States, who represent those *financier interests*, such as Lazard Frères, and similar types of groups, which were connected to Vichy in France; they were connected to Adolf Hitler in Germany; to Franco in Spain; and so forth. These people, these financial interests, have used people like Kissinger, Brzezinski, as well as these neo-cons we've referred to repeatedly here—have used them as instruments to represent the interests, or perceived interests of powerful, behind-the-scenes financier groups of the type like Conrad Black's press, or Rupert Murdoch's press, other kinds of media. And this is used as a social-control mechanism.

Kennedy was the last President who might have defeated this process. The problem is he came into government, and was killed so soon, that he did not fully yet understand what he was up against, until about the time he was killed. And then they killed him. And it's been assured that *nobody* would become a President after that who would return the United States to the tradition of Franklin Roosevelt.

That's why I've had problems, for only that reason. I've had up to 25% of the vote, supporting vote, at various times in my career, for President. But it never happened, because of the intervention.

Now the time has come! Now the time has come, in which these guys have shot their load. The system is coming down. The financial system is coming down. We potentially have these financier interests, behind the Kissingers, the Brzezinskis, the neo-cons—we potentially have them by the throat. And, ladies and gentlemen, I propose that, now that we have them by the throat: *Don't let them go!*

Now, Are You Ready To Learn Economics?



The economy is crashing, as LaRouche warned. What should you do now?

Read this book and find out.

\$10

Shipping and handling: \$4.00 for first book, \$.50 each additional book. Virginia residents add 4.5% sales tax.

We accept MasterCard, Visa, Discover, American Express.

ORDER NOW FROM

Ben Franklin Booksellers

P.O. Box 1707 Leesburg, VA 20177

1-800-453-4108 toll free

or 1-703-777-3661

www.benfranklinbooks.com

e-mail: benfranklinbooks@mediasoft.net