

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

December 17, 2010 Vol. 37, No. 49 www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

The Cultural Imperative of Russian-American Cooperation
Sovereignty Trumps the Euro: Irish and Germans Must Act
Saudi Arabia's Terror: What Hillary Clinton Knows

**LaRouche on 'Science's Next New
Undertaking: What Makes Sense?'**



Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.,

Antony Papert, Gerald Rose, Dennis Small,

Edward Spannaus, Nancy Spannaus, Jeffrey

Steinberg, William Wertz

Editor: Nancy Spannaus

Managing Editors: Bonnie James, Susan Welsh

Science Editor: Marjorie Mazel Hecht

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

Law: Edward Spannaus

Russia and Eastern Europe: Rachel Douglas

United States: Debra Freeman

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Bogotá: Javier Almaria

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: Hussein Askary

United Nations, N.Y.C.: Leni Rubinstein

Washington, D.C.: William Jones

Wiesbaden: Göran Haglund

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirns@larouche.pub.com

www.larouche.pub.com

www.larouche.pub.com/ei

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., 709-A 8th St. SE,
Washington, D.C. 20003.
(703) 777-9451

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach
1611, D-65006 Wiesbaden, Germany;
Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany
Tel: 49-611-73650
Homepage: <http://www.eirna.com>
e-mail: eirna@eirna.com
Director: Georg Neudekker

Montreal, Canada: 514-855-1699

Denmark: EIR - Danmark, Sankt Knuds Vej 11,
basement left, DK-1903 Frederiksberg, Denmark.
Tel.: +45 35 43 60 40, Fax: +45 35 43 87 57. e-mail:
eirdk@hotmail.com.

Mexico City: EIR, Ave Morelos #60-A, Col Barrio
de San Andres, Del. Azcapotzalco, CP 02240,
Mexico, DF. Tel: 5318-2301, 1163-9734, 1163-9735.

Copyright: ©2010 EIR News Service. All rights
reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without
permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement
#40683579

Postmaster: Send all address changes to EIR, P.O.
Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

EIR

From the Managing Editor

Times such as those we are now living through, call for heavy ideas—including ideas expressed through Classical art and science. We have chosen to illustrate Lyndon LaRouche's *Feature* article, "Science's Next New Undertaking: What Makes Sense?" with the image of a Classical string quartet. Why? In this breakthrough piece, LaRouche enters an area little examined or understood, which he intends, along with his young collaborators of the Basement Team, to investigate, namely, the "gap" represented by "the domain of . . . those additional sensory powers which are expressed within the ranges of cosmic radiation. . . ." In this realm are found those uniquely human creative powers, including "the creative artistic faculties of the greatest Classical poets, painters, sculptors, and musicians, whose ironical spirit informs the competent practice of discovery within the domains of physical science."

An illuminating example of the type of investigation required can be found among the topics explored in our *Strategy* section: "A Russian Dialogue with LaRouche and Friends: The Cultural Imperative of Russian-American Cooperation." This seminar features LaRouche, his Russian interlocutor, the historian and editor Alexander Nagorny, along with *EIR* specialists and young people from LPAC-TV and the Basement Team. The wide-ranging dialogue cannot be summed up in a few words: I urge you to take the time to enjoy the full discussion.

In *World News* you will find coverage of some of the most important recent and ongoing developments around the globe: In "Sovereignty Trumps the Euro; Irish and Germans Must Act," *EIR* Editor Nancy Spannaus tracks the continuing disintegration of the Euro-System, and the growing resistance, especially in Ireland, to the EU-IMF dictatorship. The stunning revelations (but, not to *EIR* readers!) in the Wikileaks documents concerning the role of the Saudis in funding international terrorism, are analyzed by Counterintelligence Editor Jeffrey Steinberg, in "Saudi Arabia's Terror: What Hillary Clinton Knows." From Europe, we report on a "Breakthrough in Switzerland: New Gotthard Rail Tunnel Completed." And, a legal victory for the LaRouche movement, is covered in "Abuse of Court Cited: Federal Judge Tosses Out Kronberg Case."



Cover This Week

*The Cuarteto
Ensemble
Clásico,
performing in
Mexicali, Baja
California,
October 1998.*



EIRNS

4 Science's Next New Undertaking: What Makes Sense?

By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. LaRouche follows his recent series of reports on the subject of human creativity, with the second, or intermediate phase, viz., “certain functions of the human mind which are beyond the scope of what have been customarily treated, heretofore, as sense-perception as such, functions which are, despite temporary hesitations, the subject of those capabilities which reach far beyond the potential of any known living species other than mankind.” These include those additional sensory powers expressed within the ranges of cosmic radiation—for example, the ability of migratory birds, through such extended powers of sense-perception, to follow features of the electromagnetic field to far-distant destinations. The “Basement Team” is investigating such phenomena, and much more.

Strategy

27 A Russian Dialogue with LaRouche & Friends: The Cultural Imperative of Russian-American Cooperation

A Nov. 7 seminar in Northern Virginia, including Lyndon LaRouche; Russian historian and journalist Alexander Nagorny; Prof. Clifford Kirakofe; *EIR* editors, and leaders of the LaRouche Youth Movement, the Basement Team, and LPAC-TV. The wide-ranging discussion provides a starting point for LaRouche's proposed Four Power Alliance, on the model of the Peace of Westphalia, as the solution to the present global crisis, now past the point of reform, as the international monetary system implodes. Among the specific projects discussed to bring about a worldwide economic recovery from the 40-year destruction wrought by the British imperial Inter-Alpha system were: NAWAPA; the Bering Strait Rail-Tunnel; the Transaqua project in Africa; and colonization of the Moon and Mars.

World News

63 Sovereignty Trumps the Euro; Irish and Germans Must Act

Nancy Spannaus examines the upsurge of resistance, centered on Ireland, to the fascist policies pushed by the EU and the IMF, on behalf of the Rothschild/Inter-Alpha Group. While reading the “trend-lines” in the financial press might convince you that Ireland will cave in, that is far from certain; Germany and France are also moving closer to dumping the euro.

65 Saudi Arabia’s Terror: What Hillary Clinton Knows

Recent revelations by Wikileaks and the London *Guardian* confirm what *EIR* has long reported, and what Secretary of State Clinton knows: that the Saudis are deeply involved in international terrorism, including the 9/11 attacks in Washington and New York City.

68 Breakthrough in Switzerland: New Gotthard Rail Tunnel Completed

The drilling of the longest rail tunnel in the world was completed Oct. 15, in Switzerland, allowing for completion of a new 57-km tunnel for high-speed rail, scheduled to open in 2017.

70 Abuse of Court Cited: Federal Judge Tosses Out Kronberg Case

On Dec. 7, Federal District Judge Anthony Trenga dismissed Marielle Kronberg’s lawsuit against Lyndon LaRouche, LaRouchePAC, and others, citing the “bad faith” of Kronberg and/or her attorney and their abuse of the Federal legal system.

Editorial

72 A New Reality Emerging

SCIENCE'S NEXT NEW UNDERTAKING:

What Makes Sense?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

November 30, 2010

In my “The Present Fall of the House of Windsor,”¹ I had brought to the point of a conditional conclusion, a series of reports on the subject of the definition of human creativity. I have now reached the point of presenting a certain quality of summation of that project, a development which clears the way for my associates’ taking control over the continuation of this project.

Now, I first turn your attention to the second phase of those reports on this same project, a phase which may be characterized as being intermediate, rather than one reaching what will be the intended, final objective of my own report here, that of defining human creativity as such. After that second phase of my role here has been completed, I shall conclude this report with the presentation of a statement on the subject of what shall be the objective for the third, and final phase of my outline here.

Our subject throughout this series of projects in the Basement so far, has been human creativity as such. That subject-matter is lodged, in fact, within certain functions of the human mind which are beyond the scope of what have been customarily treated, heretofore, as sense-perception as such, functions which are, despite temporary hesitations, the subject of those capabilities which reach far beyond the potential of any known living species other than mankind.

So, on that account, our work has now so reached a second phase in this present study, that at a point prior to the more ambitious goal which I shall address later in this report, of defining human creativity as such. The point of presenting this second phase, is that we must now include attention to specific types of universally principled functions which have remained, so far, usually overlooked in their role as actual features of the often neglected,

1. **EIR**, Dec. 3, 2010 (http://www.larouchepub.com/lar/2010/3747fall_windsor.html) or La-RouchePAC (<http://larouchepac.com/node/16619>).



State of New Jersey/Gary Lehman



USGS

Looking beyond mere “sense perception,” we find such phenomena as the ability of migratory birds to follow features of the electromagnetic field, an aspect of cosmic radiation. Shown: migrating snow geese at Brigantine, N.J.; the routes of satellite-tagged Bar-tailed Godwits, migrating north from New Zealand.

higher order of the totality of the functions of sense-perception.

So, when we shall have come to the matter of redefining “creativity” itself in those improved terms of situational reference, it shall then be our turn to deal with a different quality of question, this time under the same heading of “specifically human creativity,” rather than as an extension of the domain of what are merely variations within the actually, or implicitly sensible experience of mere pleasure or pain, which mankind shares, in significant part, with the impact of animal biology.

Nonetheless, since “creativity” does not exist, ontologically, within the realm of what have been defined, heretofore, as even a broadened apprehension of sense-perceptual functions as such, we shall come to the later point in this discussion within which we are challenged to take up a fresh, expanded view of the question: Where do the creative powers of the specifically human quality of mental activity lie?

Thus, in summary, we are confronted with three categories of direct, or indirect human experience: 1.) What is traditionally regarded as the subject of human sense-experience; 2.) An intermediate domain, which recognizes qualities of sense-experience which can be recognized in domains much broader than conventional notions of sense-perception; 3.) The known domain whose characteristic is the role of specifically human creative powers of insight and innovation.

In earlier reports on this subject, the emphasis had been placed on the crucial importance of the second,

middle ground, that of sensible experiences beyond the category of the five heretofore “conventional” notions of sense-perception, including the prominent role of the added experience expressed by aid of the role of scientific instruments.

Now, in this present report, our attention is focused on the domain of a middle stage of our obligatory investigations, a stage which is represented by the seeking out of the subject of those additional sensory powers which are expressed within the ranges of cosmic radiation, which now includes what are both useful and tolerable for both human and other forms of life, but are, nonetheless, not yet the voluntary expressions of specifically human creative powers.²

Although these extended powers of sense-perception, include, for example, the special senses expressed as being employed through the design of migratory birds, the extended categories of sense-perceptions, such as those of such birds, do represent an intermedi-

2. I.e., a domain of cosmic radiation whose existence requires attention to a realm of what is efficiently sensed as effects, but have a comparable function, for the human mind itself, as distinct from the merely ordinary notions of the range of functions of sense-experience coincident with merely animal-like behavior apparently included often within human behavior. This includes the effects considered below, as produced by relevant domains of what may be now classed as cosmic radiation. Kepler’s emphasis on the sensed experiences which define methods of crucial scientific experiment, as expressed by his uniquely original discovery of the principle of gravitation, is typical. Einstein’s notion of the universe as “finite, but not bounded,” expresses this general notion. See further treatment of this topic, below.

ate quality of types, which all share the quality of the intermediate quality lying between what might be regarded as presently accepted notions of sense-perception and the cognitive powers unique to the human species among known species of living organisms. Next, comes creativity in and of itself.

It is my function in this report, to identify the mission which this indicated set of steps implies, the mission which other members of the team will, chiefly, carry out.

In Introduction: A Brief Review

In this report, we will have divided the categories of human knowledgeable experience among three types, as follows.

1. Presently still conventional notions of sense-perception.
2. Cosmic radiation other than ordinary sense-perception.
3. Creativity: the powers of the mind per se.

In opening the consideration of this added, intermediate dimension between ordinary sense-perception and the discussion of the discoverable location of the foundations of human creativity, it were fitting to preface this introduction by suggesting the reader's own attention to a relevant process of published discussions between Max Planck and Wolfgang Köhler, as their views are to be considered by situating them in respect to the vantage-point of the concluding, third section of Bernhard Riemann's 1854 habilitation dissertation.

Those suggested matters should be addressed from the standpoint of the related developments associated with the work of Academician V.I. Vernadsky and his followers, that in their investigation of the special principles of living processes generally, and human creativity most emphatically.

From that just stated brief glimpse, onward, the point is, that our approach must emphasize the broader standpoint of *cosmic radiation*, as distinct from the presently more conventional, but ontologically defective, notions of space and time as such. Those are conventional outlooks which are regarded, mistakenly, as being virtually the presumed "ontological underbelly" of what might be otherwise considered as merely "wave functions within space." For our part, we situ-

ate the immediate part of the discussion of the manifest principles upon which human creativity acts. In this way, we must situate the matter, this time, in terms of the corrected form located within the ontological framework of cosmic radiation, rather than the misleading notion of wave-functions within an implied ontological notion of an "elementary domain" of a "space" which is presumed to be ontologically independent of "time" as such. With that correction, we are prepared to reconsider the relevant features of what have been called "wave functions" more competently.

We must emphasize an extremely important warning. The lawful processes which correspond to the role of living processes, can not be treated by the same standard as non-living processes, and, the specifically noëtic processes of the human mind can not be treated as if they were "merely" living processes. That warning of mine merely echoes Riemannian precautions which have been employed in a specific way by V.I. Vernadsky, respecting the lithosphere, biosphere, and noösphere.

Also, we must approach already known, and, also, other discoverable features of animal sense-functions as situated, ontologically, in a universe defined as the role of singularities which are to be located as lying, ontologically, within an elementary universal domain of cosmic radiation.

All that I have said in this Introduction, up to the present point, is to be read as reflecting what must be adopted as the view of a universal Creator whose image is reflected in the creative powers of the individual human mind, as compared with a lower aspect of the phase of the universe limited to the otherwise living, and non-living features of the universe. In other words, we will have rejected the intellectually fatal error in method, of attempting *to build up to* an image of mankind which is often, wrongly, systemically presumed to be derived from the ontologically, systemically reductionist presumptions inferred by beginning one's study with images adduced from examples of the beasts, or of even non-living domains.³

The first step in this report, is to examine the extension of animal, and also certain relevant features of

3. Just as man is superior to the lower species of existence, so man must find his own existence as an expression of that superior agency which has generated a mankind distinctively superior to that of the beasts. "The clockmaker has a maker."

human “sense perception” which lie “outside” that range of the habituated notion of the so-called, “five traditional” qualities of sense-perceptions among human beings. Typically, as some of my associates have emphasized, this means attention to such evidence as the already somewhat richly documented evidence bearing on such cases as the ability of migratory birds, and other fauna, to “follow,” at least often, relevant features of the electromagnetic field to their successful arrival at some implicitly intended, targeted destination, as in recurring seasonal migrations. Members of “the basement team” have already emphasized related phenomena in the matter of “what really makes some presumed pathogens” actually dangerous, sometimes, but not always, to human health: a distinction which overlaps the related matters of cosmic radiation.

Then, there is the matter of creativity as such.

The feature of such studies which will bear on a subsequent recasting of the treatment of the subject of human creativity as such, is what is already implicitly clear, in my preceding publications on the subject of human creativity: the point is, that the reality which is accessible to the notion of an ontological, rather than merely descriptive quality of human creativity as such, can not be defined in terms of the ontological presumptions of customary sense-perception. I would emphasize here, the treatment, as by Bernhard Riemann, as in the third section of his habilitation dissertation: efficient universal principles are located, ontologically, in those attributable ranges which lie beyond the reach of human sense-perception, within both the respective domains of the very small and very large.⁴

That summary outline properly defines a kind of

4. These considerations bring into play the ontological implications associated by Lejeune Dirichlet and Bernhard Riemann with the revolutionary quality of ontological implications for physics of the contributions of Niels H. Abel, as contrasted to the views of the Augustin Cauchy who plagiarized and corrupted the work of Abel in a most shameless fashion. After the attention to Abel’s work by Dirichlet and Riemann, there was no competent argument for a formally mathematical physics, rather than the mathematics subsumed by attention to the universal principles expressed by a competent physics. I refer to the frauds associated with the followers of Ernst Mach and, then, the associates of Bertrand Russell, as within Russell’s part, apart from Whitehead, in the **Principia Mathematica**, and in Russell’s frauds against science during the 1920s and beyond. Actual modern science lies essentially within the principled terms of such followers of Leibniz, the leading mathematician of the late 17th and 18th Centuries, as Abraham Kästner, Gauss, Dirichlet, Riemann and Weber, and of followers of Riemann such as Max Planck, Albert Einstein, and V.I. Vernadsky.

“gap” lying between the non-knowledge gained from within the bounds of sense-perception, when sense-perception is considered merely as such, or, the better view attained when we also consider the difference between such improved views on the matter of perceptions (the second category defined for the purposes of this present report), and the higher-ranking actuality of an ontologically higher domain of objects of attention which exist only as in a genuinely human discovery and deploying of discovered universal,

We must shift the notion of reality, from the notion of discrete objects as such, into a process of sense-perception which is in accord, functionally, with the practical effect of the function of sense-perceptions, including those aspects of the function which lie beyond the conventional notion of the implications of what have been, heretofore, standard definitions of the sense-perceptions.

physically efficient principles. There are principles which exist, as such notions for us, only as creations of the noëtic powers of the human mind (i.e., Vernadsky’s Noösphere). These are the powers whose expression is also properly associated with Classical artistic composition.

To restate the argument presented in this introduction so far, consider this.

We must shift the notion of reality, from the notion of discrete objects as such, into a process of sense-perception which is in accord, functionally, with the practical effect of the function of sense-perceptions, including those aspects of the function which lie beyond the conventional notion of the implications of what have been, heretofore, standard definitions of the sense-perceptions. We must proceed, thence, into the indispensable, higher standpoint from which an ironical notion is expressed, memorably, by the ghosts in **Spukschloss in Spessart**⁵: “the important thing, is the effect.” The Platonic outlook of: “The footprint we are considering has had a maker.”

In this approach, both in the present phase of the

5. A 1960 German comedy film.

writings on this intermediate stage of the exploration of human creativity as such, and beyond to human creativity as such, we are traveling along a course of investigation and related practice, in which *creativity as such* (our third category) is the attributable, ultimately higher expression of the principle of our universe. One could say, that creativity as such, belongs uniquely to the process of continuing creation by the Creator of the universe, a process which we, as mortals, are properly, and peculiarly destined to express. It is an expression, as embodied in the effect of the discovery of universal, characteristically anti-entropic principles, which distinguishes the actually moral person from the hominid virtual beast who recognizes no obligation to *the service of the empyreal intention of universal creativity per se*.

The target of our ongoing process of discoveries bearing on the function of specifically human creativity, has a secure direction and objective, but is nonetheless, for us appropriately humble folk, a pioneering venture in the course of which we must consider successive layers of comprehension of discovered principles. Such invoking of the higher powers of creativity, is the comprehension which wise men and women had called “science,” as in progress from a critical treatment of sense-perception, to those higher powers of the mind beyond what is presently considered the elements of sense-perception, and into the domain of the identity of the human individual’s immortal, assigned duty to be creative eternally.

However, we must now add a qualification to the conclusion of this present introduction. The power of creativity does not lie in deductive method, not with mathematics, not deductive methods, but, rather, those creative powers associated with true Classical-artistic modes of composition.

I. From Sense-Perception, To Beyond

We must begin the statement of our case for a science of human progress here, as being necessarily situated in a social process, that situated within the practice of particular nations and groups of nations.

This is no diversion from the scientific subjects referenced in this and similar reports. Mankind is not merely a specimen which happens to have been located on Earth; mankind is the ruling form of influence inherent in the specifically voluntary capabilities represented by the creative powers of the human intellect. It is the farmer, not the rooster, who reigns over the hen house. It is the human farmer who reigns over that whose fate mankind willfully determines. Government is properly given over to the governing principle of human creative scientific practice of societies and of the human and other species which are the subjects of those societies. This means the inclusion of the creative artistic faculties of the greatest Classical poets, painters, sculptors, and musicians, whose ironical spirit informs the competent practice of discovery within the domains of physical science.



“It is the farmer, not the rooster, who reigns over the hen house. It is the human farmer who reigns over that whose fate mankind willfully determines.” Shown: Peter Bruegel the Elder, “Landscape, with the Fall of Icarus” (1558).

Although the name of “science” is often misused to suggest that some higher authority, such as government, controls the destiny of mankind, such beliefs fail to consider the processes which create and shape competent systems of government. That is the matter which I must first address, here, in this present chapter of the report.

For example. The slave, who accepts slavery, blames his fate on some mysterious forces shaping his destiny. He believes almost *a-priori* in the virtual inevitability of his condition of slavery, because the power to which he attributes his servile condition has made him, or her, a species of slave, and this is therefore regarded by him as the supreme power to which he must submit, or, in the alternative, resist. He does not yet grasp the notion that he has a maker which is his, or her true creator, and which reigns, ultimately, above ordinary political or comparable authorities.

Hamilton’s Case

Take the crucially important case of the original Secretary of the Treasury of our United States, Alexander Hamilton, whose achievements must be studied for the purpose that we might know how the outcome of human behavior as over man’s territory, is determined by the intentions of the human will.

It ought to have become the prevalent knowledge of adult citizens of our United States, for example, that the fundamental, systemic differences between the constitutional design of our own constitutional republic and the systems of, for example, Europe, are the product of a principle which had existed in European culture, but was of a properly higher order of authority in the scheme of things, than any European system. It should have been the case, more generally, that government ought to be attributable to the intention of the Creator for mankind, as the leaders of our United States’ struggle for our peculiar kind of sovereignty, had sought to enshrine this in the evolving search for perfection in our Constitutional system, a perfection in the agreement between the ordering in our affairs and the implied intention of those natural laws of the universe which recognize the distinction of man from a mere object of a governmental system.

Take into account the true genius of Alexander Hamilton in pin-pointing the crucial principle of national banking whose application rescued the young United States from imminent disaster, and compelled the central conception expressed as our Federal Constitution. Grasp

exactly the fashion in which Hamilton reached directly to a higher principle of creativity, that he might define a solution which could not have been secured through attempted interpretations of the alleged “wisdom” of the political systems of Europe at that time.⁶

As long as the banks existing among the separate authorities of the former colonies were state-chartered banks, the burden of carried forward war-debt, doomed the young United States. Hamilton solved this predicament by two interdependent steps which provided the entire basis for the establishment of the U.S. Federal Constitution. One was the creation of the Federal constitutional form of government; the second crucial measure, which demanded the creation of such a form of constitutional government, was to virtually outlaw a monetary system, by establishing the principle of a credit system.

The ability of the United States to copy the successful precedent of the role of the Pinetree Shilling under the original charter of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, was the expression of a principle of credit, rather than a monetarist doctrine, a principle on which the then much-envied success of the Massachusetts colony depended. It was the British intervention to suppress that system of credit, which ruined the economy of Massachusetts under the British tyranny of William of Orange, et al.

The Benjamin Franklin who was familiar with that legacy of the Winthrops and Mathers, had projected the role of a “paper currency” in the principled likeness of the Pinetree Shilling. This connection was considered by Hamilton to the included essential effect of prompting the original design of our Federal Constitution.

Hamilton was confronted with the fact that the payment of the debts left over from fighting the war for freedom, could not be extracted from the past or present. Only the credit-worthiness of the United States sought in the outcome of its own future, could serve as a commercial quality of the negotiable, future physical wealth on which all of the successful policy-shaping of the United States has properly depended to the present time. Every deviation from that principle of a credit-system, to the swamp which is a monetarist system, has been a national disaster, as the very worst has been experienced in the United States, to this effect, under

6. See Nancy Spannaus, “A Matter of Principle: Alexander Hamilton’s Economics Created Our Constitution,” *EIR*, Dec. 10, 2010, on Hamilton’s role (http://www.larouche.org/other/2010/3748hamilton_constitution.html).



Benjamin Franklin (1707-90)—philosopher, scientist, inventor, printer, musician, economist, and statesman, took up the legacy of the Winthrops and Mathers, in promoting a paper currency, on the model of the Massachusetts Pinetree Shilling.

Presidents such as Andrew Jackson, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Calvin Coolidge, and, worst of all, George W. Bush, Jr. and Barack Obama.

As Hamilton would continue to emphasize, both as Secretary of the Treasury, and later, that credit of a nation is to be secured, uniquely, through the increase of future physical wealth in public improvements of basic economic infrastructure and advances in the physical form of increasing capital intensity of investments in basic economic infrastructure and by science-driven increases in the equivalent of capitalized energy-flux density, which have afforded nations a source of redeemable credit which will be capable of outweighing the burden of debt incurred.

Competent economic policy is essentially a policy of fundamental scientific progress in principle, which is expressed, in net effect, in the increasing physical capital-intensity of public works and capital-intensive investments in the processes of both production and conditions of personal life of the citizens and their households. The essential point to be emphasized on this account, is that it is the physical law of the universe, a universe rooted in the required, continuing, anti-entropic principle of the creation of continually higher

states of energy-flux density in the universe, which is the expression of the relevant principle of universal law of physical existence of mankind on which competent designs of the processes of government must depend.

Such is the key principle underlying the matters of physical science which are being considered here.

Truth, such as that of scientific principles, is not found in any mere mathematical formula. It is found in those same kinds of principles which lie within the same arrangement as Johannes Kepler's unique discovery of the principle of universal gravitation.

The Error To Be Rejected

Consider the situation of relevant nations presently.

Most people, especially those who imagine themselves to be very clever, are so deeply pre-occupied with thinking of themselves in such a fashion as by merely a desire for the appearance of cleverness, that their admiration of what they might esteem as their own clevernesses, is, really, often, essentially, a matter of mere sophistries. The sophistries are considered by such persons as being virtually a substitute for what are those discoverable principles on whose reign the fate of not merely entire nations, but even civilization at large, now, most urgently depends.

I understand, but deplore such behavior among such ostensibly clever persons, as among certain members of the present U.S. Congress; but, it is behavior which is not merely entirely alien to the true meaning of science, but to the bare notion of truth itself, and, is, also, an opponent of the means on which the present existence of nations and peoples of this planet now absolutely depends. The error blamed by me, here, is reliance on such self-satisfying cleverness which would lead to nothing so much as merely "clever" behavior, which is really an expression of arts of sophistry whose strategic outcome would be the hoisting of civilization globally, as "by its own petard."

Such has been that smug confidence in the "cleverness" of a British empire, whose overly self-esteemed prowess often rules over the gulled nations of our planet, a feat which that adversary accomplishes by destroying the very foundations on which the continued existence of civilization as a whole presently depends.

In the presently known history of mankind, European history in particular, such self-esteemed “cleverness” in “getting my own way,” becomes, from time to time, the recipe for another new dark age of, this present time, all mankind. That is exactly the direction in which current European sophistry is leading itself, and also the cultures of the planet, presently.

Such sophistry as that which, like the doctrine of those priests of Delphi who led the culture of the ancient Greece, who had acquired the potentials of the highest degree of cleverness of the civilization of their time, potentials by means of which they led their nation to its destruction under the influence of the self-deluding faith in the sophistical, self-esteemed cleverness at cheating, as by the professional poisoner, Aristotle. Such are the fellows who, in perennial fashion, repeatedly outwit no one, in the end, as much as they do themselves.

Truth always lies in the higher order of processes which can be expressed in terms of that which is immediately experienced. “The clock has a maker,” one whose expression is the yearning for a higher order of existence than what we experience in our sense-perceptions of ourselves.

We, in the degree that we know ourselves as reflections of sense-impressions, present ourselves with what are merely shadows of the powers which are expressed as the creative powers assigned to mankind. We name the substance which has cast the shadow, as our sense-perception of our selves. We too quickly forget that the origin of our practical capabilities as a species, expresses a shadow of what the human species is, a shadow which reflects an ontologically higher order of existence than the shadow which reality casts upon the domain of mere sense-perception.

There is one additional, most crucial point to be added at this juncture:

The creative powers of mankind are specific to the sovereign individual personality. These powers can not be conveyed simply by a “connecting medium;” but, such discoveries can, nonetheless, be replicated as echoed within the creative processes of other individuals. Shadows thus appear to admire shadows. This is



“Truth always lies in the higher order of processes which can be expressed in terms of that which is immediately experienced. ‘The clock has a maker,’ one whose expression is the yearning for a higher order of existence than what we experience in our sense-perceptions of ourselves.” Painting: “The Village Clockmaker,” by Abbott Fuller Graves.

done by a means fairly identified as “provocation,” as the successful development of insight into Classical poetry, or the work of Johann Sebastian Bach, or the role of Classical irony in Classical poetry and drama, illustrates the appropriate types of means to be employed.

Thus, the rightness of opinion is not a secretion of some number of individual persons, such as a majority; rather, the development of the majority’s acceptance of the experience of discovering true and higher principles, is the only likely source of the relative fitness of a culture or a nation to survive. Concurrence in some leading opinion, merely because it has been regarded as leading opinion, has often been, as in the case of the Hitler rally, the very worst standard of authority in ideas of policy in any society.

True sovereignty lies not in popular opinion, and usually popular opinion has been dangerously wrong; true sovereignty lies in the creative powers of the individual human mind. Only the irony of truthful individual science and Classical poetry, are to be regarded as the paragons of the shaping of nations’ policy.

These considerations just emphasized in that manner, are key for our understanding of the varieties of great follies to which mankind has shown itself to be prone. To wit:

‘I Sense an Evil Empire!’

From time to time, as presently, the lusts of empire, such as those of that actual British empire which recently rules over the political systems of such as the present government of our United States up to this time, express their belief in the kind of sophistry which has brought the British empire and its dupes, especially the inhabitants of the trans-Atlantic region as a whole, to the presently ongoing plunge into a new planet-wide “new dark age,” unless we suddenly, and radically, change from our presently wicked, British-led ways.

In the end, the infamous, Eighteenth-century Lord Shelburne had been shown, in today’s dark light, as having been, in the end, Edward Gibbon’s dupe. The British empire’s past role as crafted in service of the intention to become a new world Roman empire has, so, now entered its own end-phase, meaning a presently, immediately threatened, very deep and much prolonged dark age for any civilization based on Gibbon’s suggested model to Lord Shelburne, “Julian the Apostate,” for a future Rome.⁷

The current, revised form of that British Empire was established in 1971, when it was projected as being the immediate replacement for the fixed-exchange-rate system which had been established by U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt at the time of the 1944 Bretton Woods conference. That Franklin Roosevelt design had been wrecked under the nominal authority of President Richard Nixon, in 1971, at the same time that the British empire had created the opening for Lord Jacob Rothschild’s launching of the supranational swindle known since as the presently crashing Inter-Alpha Group.

This latter group, launched at that time, had later



Creative Commons

The lusts of empire, such as those of the present British Empire, which now rules over the government of the United States, have brought the inhabitants of the trans-Atlantic region as a whole, to the ongoing plunge into a planet-wide “new dark age.” Even the British royals themselves obviously can’t stand to look at each other.

reached the stage of controlling what my associates and I have estimated as reaching the level of about 70% of the world’s hyper-inflationary expansion of its monetarist efflux. That world empire, sometimes referred to, ironically, as “The BRIC,” is now crashing down upon itself, because of the present world British Empire’s own fatal instincts for self-extinction, as if the British were like the desperately hungry races of monetarist Dinosaurs who, in an eruption of monetarist greed, might have eaten the last of one another’s formerly fertile eggs.

The peculiar relevance of both the existence and the present doom of that Inter-Alpha Group, to the subject which I have posed with this present report so far, is that the well-being of the nations and peoples of this planet, that more or less absolutely, presently hangs on the hope of a relatively immediate termination of what is termed an implicitly Nietzschean (e.g., fascist) “Post-Westphalian System,” a “post-Westphalian system” like the fascist system of Dick Armey or of Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, whose mere continued existence would, unless uprooted now, foredoom all of the decent human life of this planet, the trans-Atlantic region first, and the subsequent collapse of the world

7. Cf. biographical references to the family of Jacques Necker, and the family’s relationship to Edward Gibbon in J. Christopher Herold, *Mistress to an Age: A Life of Madame de Stael* (1958). Cf. Gibbon’s ironical treatment of “Julian the Pagan.” Contrary to Gibbon’s advice, Julian is the proposed model for the present arrival at the end-phase of the British empire, not its hope of virtual immortality.

market, that to such a degree that the leading Asian nations would be pulled down, too.

Such a catastrophic development as that presently, already ongoing breakdown of the presently hegemonic world system, demands attention to the matter of defining a choice of relatively immediate means which would, by inherent design, provoke an urgently needed, physical-economic recovery of the greater part of the world's present national economies.

What is presently wanted, and that most urgently, is a launching of a general recovery of leading national economies according to certain physical-economic designs for economic recovery rates sufficient both to halt the collapse, and, also, to initiate an accelerating general, physical-economic recovery.

To define such a recovery, we must begin by defining the disease which requires the presently urgent, specific antidote.

The British Empire: A Disease

The present disease of global civilization is what is, in fact, the present, British world empire: as virtually every patriotic Irishman would presently agree. However, the existence of that Anglo-Dutch concoction better known as the British empire, has obtained its presently diseased characteristics as an heritage of its maker, which was the variety of Venetian monetarist-imperialist system cast in the likeness of a Paolo Sarpi who is typical of the would-be modern makers of evil empires presently.

Such "makers," are exemplified, as the outcome of a potentially fatal disease which might be traced to the present time in globally extended European cultures, through the accounts in the Homeric account of the Siege of Troy, as also expressed, by the Peloponnesian War which allowed ancient Greece to destroy the Persian empire, but which has never since become a victor in the expanse of Mediterranean-centered imperial monetarist systems which were to be inherited by Mediterranean maritime vengery. Greece was by-passed, again and again, like the princess who never found her prince, while such as the Anglo-Dutch monetarist, neo-Aristotelean (Sarpian) system has dominated the world as a whole, since the onset of the A.D. 1756-63 "Seven Years War" and since the victory of the Venetian principle incarnate in the Anglo-Dutch monetarist-imperialist financial system.

The only successful alternative proffered to what was becoming the British world empire of the Eigh-

teenth Century and beyond, has been the successes achieved, from time to time, by the effect of the birth of what was to become our Federal Republic of the United States. Nations have their values, but without an alternative to the British empire's role today, the virtue of a nation is trapped, like a legendary Malaysian monkey, by its own hope of a future on this planet.

Since that time, since approximately the 1781 defeat of the British under Cornwallis, when that the young United States had first achieved true sovereignty, all of the principal accomplishments in promotion of the general welfare of trans-Atlantic nations have been either directly, or indirectly the result of the influence which the United States inherited from the combination of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth and the establishment of the Massachusetts Bay Colony under its original English royal charter.

The revocation of that charter, was a radiating consequence of the folly of James II, such as the Bloody Assizes, an effect compounded by the rapacious cruelties of William of Orange. However, the achievements of the original Massachusetts Bay Colony continued their life as the seeds from which the United States' emergence as a potent republic has emerged, even by rising like dragon's teeth from times when it had seemed to be on its deathbed, as, most notably today, through the great achievements under such as Presidents Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

That principle of recovery exists still today, as a principle expressed most succinctly in the founding of the U.S. Federal Constitution on the basis of the genius of Alexander Hamilton in crafting the successful design of a national banking system of commercial banks, a credit system, not a monetary system, in opposition to the inherent follies represented, to the present day, by the monetarist follies which remain, so far, those of European systems not yet freed from the lure of the relics of the Venetian and still earlier feudalist designs.

Sarpi & the Modernist Error

Now, continuing this chapter's account of the crucial role of politics in the practice of physical science, for much, even a prevalence of what passes for physical science, even in universities and comparable authorities, it should be clear to well educated circles from throughout this planet, that what is often labeled "science," is a political football kicked more than once too often. The sundry, usually irrational, doctrines of political opportunism are, more than ever, today, allegedly

“scientific” dogmas whose origin is nothing other than “pure political opportunism.”

The most notable contemporary case of political lying in the misused name of “science,” is that of the World Wildlife Fund, which was jointly launched by the consort of the British Queen, in concert with a since-deceased former Nazi and consort of the Netherlands Queen, Prince Bernhard; a truly delicious duo. The policy of the World Wildlife Fund expresses the identical intention of the Adolf Hitler regime’s mass-murderous “useless eaters” program. The actual motive of the cult to which Prince Philip adheres, is illustrated most vividly by the promotion of the inherently wasteful and destructive policy of both Hitler-like “population control” and the explicit policy which Aeschylus’ **Prometheus** Trilogy portrays as the denial of access to the use of “fire” by the Olympian Zeus’s class of “gods.”

This has been a policy which, in real-life fact, was the same oligarchical principle illustrated by the agreement on a world-wide “oligarchical principle” agreed upon as a proposed doctrine of world empire, by the circles of King Philip of Macedon and the Achaemenid emperor. The policy of all notable adherents of that same “oligarchical principle,” such as the doctrine of genocidal modes of population control by the Roman Empire and the so-called “green movement” today, are prime illustrations of the role of politics in a kind of pseudo-science once attributable to the cults of the Babylonian priesthood.⁸

Comparably, while the original development of what became the United States of America itself, had been supplied by, chiefly, English-speaking and Dutch colonists seeking to build a new culture in North America, It was assisted by an operation associated with France’s science-driving author of great projects, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, as with his role in the promotion of Gottfried Leibniz’s cause and the French colonization of what became Quebec.

Meanwhile, the great achievements of the North American colonists relative to those who remained behind in Europe, was that Europe was afflicted by the

burden of the oligarchical tradition of the governing institutions over the Europeans of the same cultural origins left behind in Europe. The burden of feudal and related social-political reigning institutions in Europe, has prevented most cultures of Europe from achieving the same degree of political-economic freedom which the emigrants from the same cultures in Europe developed within North America. The history of immigration into the United States during the period of the U.S. Civil War, as in the tradition of Ellis Island until changes following World War I, demonstrates the same principle which has been demonstrated by the Massachusetts Bay Colony until the time of the British revocation of the colony’s original royal charter. Our Federal Constitution’s principle, when contrasted with the persistence of the still passionately monetarist culture of Europe, typifies the opposite side of the same pattern today. The notable cases of the English, Scottish, Irish, and German patterns of immigration into the United States proffer the clearest of the relatively simplest examples; the case of the Italian immigration proves the same point, but the legacy of the impoverished Mezzogiorno makes for an only slightly more complicated demonstration of the same principle.

It is the systems of political and scientific culture, not populist considerations otherwise, which are the principal sources of crafting of the moral, scientific, and related cultural paradigms of nations. A somewhat different case is to be found in the Argentinian blend of Spanish, German, and Italian immigration.

It was the paradigmatic impact of the expressed motivation of the original Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay developments under the exemplary leadership of the Winthrops and Mathers, which set into place the science-driver orientation fostered, first, in Massachusetts, and later Pennsylvania, as the specific case of the life of Benjamin Franklin typifies a specifically American cultural paradigm-matrix for the deep background of the culture of the United States. It is a liberating change in cultural paradigm, which is the principal source of the great advances in the original cultures of a people. It is the opportunities for the influence of a relatively small number of influentials, relative to the cultural tradition of the mass, which has always been the spark for the great achievements of a people.

Unfortunately, the opposite is also relevant. No better illustration of that sort of misfortune exists, than the impact of a mass-murderous lunatic of the same general type of defective personality as the Emperor

8. Typical of this was the decline of the culture of Sumer, a once notable, but later degenerated culture of what had been a non-Semitic, Indian Ocean settlement by a maritime culture of the region of lower Mesopotamia, from a “bow tenure” system of free farmers, to its descent to a system of peasantry, and, then slavery. The ruin of Sumer through the salination promoted by this cultural degeneration preceded developments of such degenerate forms as Babylon later.



Library of Congress

The great waves of immigration to America's shores were driven by the desire to flee from the oppression of the feudal-like institutions, which have prevented most cultures of Europe from achieving the same degree of political-economic freedom which the European emigrants developed within North America. Shown: Mulberry Street in New York City's "Little Italy," ca. 1900.

Nero or an Adolf Hitler, a type which has also proven, lately, as most disastrous for a United States now suffering the burden of a sick personality, President Barack Obama, today. However, going back to Europe's mid-Sixteenth Century, the cases of two figures, England's Henry VIII and Venice's Paolo Sarpi, provide the most notable sources of the influence of sheer evil in modern history today. What is fairly described as Henry VIII's passion for "getting a head in marriage," provides a paradigm for study of all these and comparable cases. The most notable of these cases for the purposes of historical studies of modern European civilization today, are those of the common imprint of the effects of Henry VIII and Paolo Sarpi.

I now refer to the crucial matter of the interlocking implications of the single specific case of that pair, as "the Sarpi syndrome," otherwise experienced today as "the afterbirth of British Liberalism."

The Origin of the Sarpi Syndrome

The civilization of medieval Europe had collapsed in the great plunge into the "new dark age" of the Four-

teenth Century. The recovery of Europe from that catastrophe was centered in crucial developments such as the rise of Jeanne d'Arc and the Florentine Renaissance centered on the great ecumenical Council of Florence. From amid the latter, Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa emerged to become the central intellectual figure associated with not only the great scientific, cultural, and religious reforms of that century, but as the author of the policy which sent Christopher Columbus to unleash the colonization of the Americas.⁹

This Renaissance, heralded by such outstanding benchmarks as the figures of Jeanne d'Arc, by the great ecumenical Council of Florence, and by the rise of the leadership of France's Louis XI, constituted an awesome

threat to the search for the resumption of ancient power by the essentially evil, monetarist powers of Venice. Compare the inspiring case of Louis XI's reforms with the policies of his follower, England's Henry VII. The resurgence of a contrary, Venetian power, which passed through two distinct, successive phases over the course of the Fifteenth Century, assumed the initial form of the rise of the power of the Venetian oligarchy's Habsburg tools, which included the Habsburg occupation of the marriage beds of the Spanish monarchy. The Inquisition and its progeny, the launching of what would become the great European religious warfare of 1492-1648, was set into motion, thus.

The sheer horror of an already ongoing religious warfare passed into a worse phase with the successive stages of the Venetian orchestration of the lunacy of England's King Henry VIII, which set the pattern for what would be transformed by the role of a new factor

9. Compare the intention of Dante Alighieri's **De Monarchia** with that of Cusa's **Concordancia Catholica**, for example.

in the ongoing escalation of a pattern of Europe-wide religious warfare, the role of the “New Venetian” factor of Paolo Sarpi and his follower and professional charlatan Galileo, the Sarpi who was the father (legitimate, or not) of both modern British Liberalism and the infamous “Thirty Years War” whose earlier phase was treated by Friedrich Schiller’s **Wallenstein** Trilogy.

It was not quite that simple. Some highlights of the history of the 1492-1648 developments, are indispensable for even as much as a fair insight into that entire interval of history and its echoes in the history of civilization on our planet since that time, still today.

The phenomenon of pure evil which came to be represented by Henry VIII, had already begun with the arrival of a leading Venetian spy-master, Francesco Zorzi, in England for service to Henry in the capacity of the king’s marriage counsellor. Heads soon began to roll in England itself; the decapitation of Sir Thomas More was a fatal blow against all hope of a European peace at that time. A cabal which included a Venetian agent, and pretender to the British throne, Cardinal Pole, Thomas Cromwell, and other Venice-controlled scamps, turned the divorce of Henry from his Spanish Habsburg wife, into a general escalation of the religious warfare throughout Europe. A single madman, Henry VIII, not much dissimilar in pathological qualities of personality from the pathetic cases of the Roman Emperor Nero or President Barack Obama today, triggered the greatest bloody horror in European history of that time.

However, there was a highly significant, later added development in that modern period: the reaction to the rising importance of the genius of Niccolò Machiavelli.

Machiavelli vs. Aristotle

The troubles of that time included the war of the Papacy against the sovereignty of the Republic of Florence. Out of this, an important, but not top-ranking Florentine official of credentials related to those of such heirs of Nicholas of Cusa as Leonardo da Vinci, Niccolò Machiavelli, emerged to become the leading strategic thinker of Sixteenth-century Europe. Machiavelli’s influence as the virtual founder of modern military strategy, fostered the design of forms of resistance to the Habsburg tyranny which obstructed and drained the efforts of the Habsburgs, a frustration leading into the stubborn, but, speaking practically, failed Council of Trent.

The influence of the Aristotelean dogma on the



Wikimedia Commons

Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527), a collaborator of Cusa-follower Leonardo da Vinci, became the leading strategic thinker of early Sixteenth-Century Europe, and the founder of modern military strategy. This 16th-Century portrait of Machiavelli, by Santi di Tito.

Habsburg party, created the relative strategic stalemate which emerged as the opportunity for takeover of some degree of the continuing religious warfare of Europe by the nominally Protestant side: the shift of the center of imperial leadership from the region of Europe’s Mediterranean, to the Anglo-Dutch Liberal north. From the accession of England’s James I, as successor to the Tudor regime, Sarpi, operating largely through his modern sophist protégé, Galileo, the enemy of Johannes Kepler, and Galileo accessories such as Thomas Hobbes, set the evolving pattern which has been continued under the English and British monarchies, and later empire, to the present day.

The characteristic of that imperial legacy, still today, is the ideology of Paolo Sarpi, as encapsulated in its expression as the British Liberalism associated, still today, with the 1759 **Theory of Moral Sentiments** of the Adam Smith who was that quirky version of an “Old Adam” who must still be considered as qualified to be

counted among any real-life Satan's notably Liberal offspring, still today.

On the account of a deeply underlying background, there was nothing essentially original in the content of the dogma of Adam Smith's prescription for modern British and related Liberalism, which persists today as the echo of the code of Paolo Sarpi. Below the surface, the inherent nastiness of British Liberalism is Aristotelean, as Bertrand Russell is emphatic on this point. That said, Adam Smith, like the Physiocrats who preceded him and whom he liberally plagiarized, was, in all essential features, a devotee of the dogma of Sarpi.¹⁰ The British Museum's Karl Marx, for example, had been trained, as if in the fashion of a captive within a zoo, who virtually worshiped Adam Smith and copied the Physiocrat François Quesnay's *Tableau Economique* as a central feature of British spy Frederick Engels' shaping of Marx's own appreciation of Adam Smith.¹¹

As I have emphasized in sundry published locations, Smith's copying of the specific dogma of Paolo Sarpi, is to be located in Smith's own 1759 **Theory of Moral Sentiments**, rather than the more frequently referenced 1776 anti-American tract of hatred against the United States, his **Wealth of Nations**. The exact doctrine of Sarpi is more clearly evident in Smith's earlier, 1759 work, which drew him into Lord Shelburne's active sponsorship.

The essential point to be underscored here, is that all Anglo-Dutch Liberalism is derived from the same Sarpian matrix which is presented with lurid transparency in Smith's own advocacy of what became the modern British imperialist ideology associated with Lord Shelburne's role in crafting the British empire. Smith's own argument in his **Theory of Moral Sentiments**, presents us with the innermost core of the belief-system of British imperial-

ism's place in the imperialist's human zoo, through to the present day.

Marx as Myth

When one takes into account, the actual role of Karl Marx and Marxism, Marx had become a creation of the Foreign Office of Britain's Lord Palmerston and Palmerston's Giuseppe Mazzini-led "Young Europe" operations. Notably, there is the case of the so-called "First International" which was organized under Mazzini's personal direction in a London meeting at which Mazzini appointed the Karl Marx attending that event as the designated leader of what would become known as "The First Communist International" division of Lord Palmerston's political "zoo."

That fact forces sane minds to recognize that such so-called social movements have two aspects. The first such, is the management of the specimens in each category of the inmates of the collective political "zoo," and the second aspect lies in the motives of the inmates relegated to the care of the relevant set of captives in Palmerston's zoo-like arrangements among putatively adversarial sets of captivated specimens. The actually fascist variety of explicitly "creative-destructionist" ideology deployed under the nominally anarchoid auspices of what many observers regard as a "Dirty Dick" Armeey, presently, illustrates the existence of a wider variety of victims of such so-called "ideologies" traceable to such precedents as "Palmerston's Zoo."

Just like the animals in a well-organized real-life zoo, the captives of each nominal socio-political variety of contending "species," have a residue of their native impulses, but, there is also the matter of "feeding time."

There are two, interlocked, but contrasting aspects of each variety of specimens assembled to play the stage-like role of one among a contending variety of such inmates of that particular labeled species of the zoo's politically captive specimens. The most crucial irony is, that the inmates of each category of politically captive inmates of such a "political-intelligence" category of dupes, have, at the same time, a character which does not necessarily coincide with the outlook assigned to them by the zoo's keepers, just as the captive types of a real-life zoological garden have an also underlying impulse corresponding to root impulses of each group's own species. There is usually a set of contrary impulses between the behavior of the zoo "animals" as induced by the captors, and the behavioral impulses of the same "animals"

10. Adam Smith, who was assigned by Lord Shelburne to spy against French and North American English-speaking targets, lifted entire sections of the Physiocrat A.R.J. Turgot's yet to be published manuscript for his own published writings.

11. The true Frederick Engels came to the fore during his late years of the 1890s, when Fabian Society circles relied upon Engels to recruit Alexander Helphand (aka "Parvus") of "Permanent War, Permanent Revolution" notoriety, to the British intelligence service. Marx himself had served as a controlled asset of the head of the British intelligence services Lord Palmerston under the sponsorship of the Young Europe organization. There are numerous "delicious" and also pitiable ironies in that neck of the woods. Lacking any true principles, the Liberal doctrinaires relied on "connectos" for their rhetoric, where access to principles was denied such foolish Sarpians as themselves.

left to roam as if in the wild.¹² The current crop of the ideological captives of Dick Arme y is only typical of the “zoo-animal like,” even seemingly robotic behavior induced by the keepers of that present division of the political zoo.

Often, the chains of slavery are willingly borne, even generations later, as “our culture,” or, according to a related kind of tradition in servitude, “our heritage.”

There could be no competent view of the attributable inmates of the nominally “socialist” quarter of Palmerston’s Zoo, which does not take into account the distinction of “biological” types from an induced behavior comparable to that assigned by the circus management to the actions of the performing acts in a circus.

The differences between the nominal Aristoteleans and the nominally modern Liberal followers of Paolo Sarpi, are of this specific general type. The appropriate name of the category of zoo-likeness in ancient through modern society, is “imperialism,” a deeply embedded habit of virtual captivity by imperialist supra-national organizations, such as proposals for a seemingly denationalized “European Union” today. Each category of inmate of the imperial, or imperial-like, political zoo, bears its assigned specific “colors” into the mutual fray which provides the relevant amusement and profit to the managers of “the league” which is a cage-like “empire” of captive nationalities. The folly of sportsman-like team-spirit, has induced each among the teams to give away their natural sovereignties. I, as an old man, have “been there,” repeatedly, in those past times when such realities tended to be more readily understood among the well-educated, than among today’s younger generations.

What are called “imperialist wars” belong to this



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

“Mankind is free of the grip of such zoo-like forms of human bestiality only when the idea of patriotic national self-interest is tempered by regard for the common interests and common concerns of all mankind.” Shown: Ayn Rand acolyte Dick Arme y and his Mazzinian zoo-like Tea Party followers, at a rally in Washington Sept. 12, 2010.

category of sociological studies in mass behavioral traits.

Mankind is free of the grip of such zoo-like forms of human bestiality only when the idea of patriotic national self-interest is tempered by regard for the common interests and common concerns of all mankind. That was recognized as by a system of organized common interest, as had been intended for the post-World War II times, by then President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The American system, typified by President Franklin Roosevelt’s dedication, that instead of that revival of the old, evil British imperialism which, still today, holds those keys to our own republic, which, on the occasion of the death of Franklin Roosevelt, the disgusting Wall Street asset and President Harry S Truman had handed to the otherwise rendered almost harmless, if surly, old imperialist, Winston Churchill.

It is not our cause which is the issue, but those who hold the keys to the old imperialist tradition typified by the present captivity of the currently installed U.S. government, the keys to the slave-system of the world rule by British imperialism over the money-worshipping, intellectually enslaved nations of the planet, today. Today’s world empire, is Sarpi’s world system.

12. Yet, even then, the acquired habits of captivity often linger, like habituated chains of servitude, over the course of generations yet to come.

Today's British Imperialist System

The specific characteristic of today's present, 1971-2010 phase of British imperialism, is the expression of the Sarpian, post-Aristotelean Liberalism, which is typified, in turn, by the lust to install a so-called "post-Westphalian" world system, a virtual Sarpian system, now. Thus, we have today's awful reality of a vast, cancerously booming mass of worthless, hyper-inflationary debt, a system of debt whose only notable precedent is the 1923 collapse of the captive Weimar, Germany economy. That legacy has now, for the moment, taken over the United States, the American hemisphere generally, and most of the Eurasian world outside China, India and a few other Asian states. Even the latter are sorely afflicted by the lunacy which, since September 2007, has dominated the generality of the system world-wide.

Without the virtually treasonous abortion, which had occurred under President Harry S Truman, which was the abortion of what had been President Franklin Roosevelt's post-war intentions, the long journey of decades during which the British empire was brought back into world power, would not have been possible.

Thus, the point which must be emphasized here, in the context which I have defined in opening this present report, is that the physical-economic processes of this entire planet are shaped by the imposition of a dominant expression of the human political and related will. It is not the economic system as such, which more or less "magically" reigns in the market-place. It is the imposition of expressions of a sometimes cancerous, governing-as-lawful authority which delimits the political availability of the choices which a truly self-interested national government would desire.

There is no economic "magic of the market-place." There must be, instead, an understanding of those principles of a science of physical economy which properly regulate the effects of a process of economy as a physical science, if the political will of nations is to be brought into accord with the adducible principles of a healthy form of physical economy, rather than the present monetarist system.

That sets before us here a principle which is typified by the decision of the administration of President Franklin Roosevelt to launch the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and to unleash the potential of the power of nuclear fission, not only for war, but to increase the available rises in energy-flux density of sources of power on which the survival of civilization for future generations already, then, had begun to depend.

Therefore, there can be no physical science of economy, nor any present practice of economy, today, without mass projects such as that typified by the NAWAPA design needed to reverse the presently accelerating general breakdown-crisis of the United States itself.

Science—real science—after all, is the informing of the human will with the advances in knowledgeable practice whose benefits are measurable in terms of upward leaps in the usable energy-flux density of the powers supplied to the business of not only progress, but for the very survival of mankind.

Hence, now that we have met that political obligation in this present chapter, we are freed to return now to competent physical science as such, in that political, cultural light.

II. On the Subject of Cosmic Radiation

In my earlier publications on the subject of sense-perception, I had warned that sense-perceptions were not reality, but are no better than the shadows experienced as if they had been cast by reality. When we apply that particular wisdom to our awareness of the distinction of shadows from the reality which casts those shadows, the presumption of a simple correspondence between sense-perceptions and a search for an appropriate sense-certainty, ceases to exist. The most significant fact about such paradoxes, is the fact that, actually, universal principles of nature are not expressed by the mere shadows we recognize as sense-perceptions.

That distinction was clarified by, first, Johannes Kepler's uniquely original discovery of the universal physical principle of gravitation, as in his chapter on "The Harmonies of the Worlds," as that discovery, by Kepler, was clarified in an important step further by Albert Einstein's reading of Kepler's accomplishment as defining a finite, but not bounded, universe.

With the recognition of those implications of that Kepler-Einstein view of the universe, we are no longer obliged to burden ourselves with a naive, and intrinsically groundless presumption, the presumption that the images cast as sense-perceptions are something other than the shadow imposed upon the attempted reading of reality by the light of the mere sense-perceptual apparatus employed. This same issue is most powerfully represented by the third section of Bernhard Riemann's habilitation dissertation, where sci-



Library of Congress

"If we treat experiences of sense-perception as being shadows cast by some unseen reality ... our attention is turned to the evidence of cases such as that of the celebrated Helen Keller, which warn us that a realm of five attributed human senses, is not the essential means on which the human mind should rely to steer efficient interventions into whatever the real world might be. ..." Helen Keller, who was blind, deaf, and mute since childhood, is pictured here, "listening" to music played on the piano.

ence sheds the encumbrance of mere mathematics, for the sake of a competent physics. In the very large, as the very small, the metrics of sense-perception can no longer claim authority over the principles which reside, essentially, in what Riemann points to as those extremes of our universe.

Indeed, it is in nothing as much as those same extremes, in which the crucial determination of the principles of the universe at large must be sought, if the notion of universal laws is to be fulfilled.

I have already, repeatedly emphasized the evidence, that there is a crucial distinction between knowledge of a literal reading of what are generally classified as sense-perceptions, and the reality which underlies the experiences of our agencies of sense-perception.

I have emphasized, on this account, that if we treat experiences of sense-perception as being shadows cast by some unseen reality, as a now rich harvest of "scientific instruments" suggests, our attention is turned to the evidence of cases such as that of the celebrated Helen Keller, which warn us that a realm of five attributed human senses, is not the essential means on which the

human mind should rely to steer efficient interventions into whatever the real world might be, that apart from a presumed direct and unique reality linking the world around us into the fruits of sense-perception as such. For example, could a person blind from birth, gain knowledge of the real world which can be, ultimately, as reliable, in effect, as an idea of the real world around us had been by one with ordinary use of the five preferred senses?

More precisely, our manifest ability, as in physical science, to intervene efficiently to such effect as to be able to discover previously unrecognized, but available, efficient means for producing qualitative types of indirectly steered effects, as by means of that unseen agency controlled by our will, should prompt us to regard the powers of sense-perception as more limited in their authority respecting our efficient knowledge

of the order of matters in the real world, than the authority of the person relying, as Riemann did, on knowledge of the "invisible" principles which science is able to employ to produce those powerful effects on our experience which are not accessible by means of any other, earlier recognized forms of intent.

Reflections on the generality of this evidence from such sources as experimental effects generated willfully through the agency of discovered physical principles, as Kepler did, urge us to regard sense-impressions as the shadows which an unseen cause in the domain of reality has cast as our manifest power to change experienced "nature." Our given senses are essentially instruments, like other laboratory instruments, by means of which a higher agency, called "mind," adduces the needed interpretation of the experimental evidence secured through the equivalent of laboratory instruments.

Further reflections in that same general direction, show us that sense-certainty and the efficient functioning of an actual individual's human mind offer no actual embodiment of a common identity. There is no common identity between the action and the identity of the

shadow which the action had apparently cast.

From the primitive roots of such relatively raw reflections, we are well advised to proceed directly, from there, to the notions which Bernhard Riemann pointed out in the third section of his celebrated, June 19, 1854, Göttingen habilitation dissertation. From that moment onwards, a competent physical-scientific practice premises the notion of a proof of physical principle on those domains of the extremely large and extremely small, the which are to be secured through relevant such proofs of the nature of a general physical principle.

Unfortunately, the fact is, that the notion of the ontology of a provable universal physical principle has been widely ignored among the modern reductionist followers of the respective cults of Ernst Mach, earlier, as also its successor, the Cambridge School of systems analysis of Bertrand Russell's which is echoed by the quirky Laxenberg, Austria International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), or, in one alternative, by the milder error of Göttingen's manifoldly frustrated mathematician, David Hilbert. Belief in the non-sense of such as that of Bertrand Russell has been the most vicious among the modern enemies of actual scientific progress on mankind's behalf.

All of these and related considerations must be referenced to the domain of a science of physical economy, where the ultimate practical test of the notions of physical science, is to be found. First, there is God, then, there is mankind, and then, on a lower rank of experimental authority, lies everything else.

So, it has been said, that, "Nothing is constant, but change." "We never pass through the same water of the stream twice." The commonplace, literal rendering of Heraclitus' apparent aphorism, as known to us presently, may not be as rigorous a formulation as could be desired; but, the gist of the expressed intention rendered is true enough. Plato's **Parmenides** makes the cited excerpt from Heraclitus clearer, as if to spite the rascally reductionist G.W.F. Hegel, who did not understand the matter at all. All of the worthy treatments in this topical area of discussions, most clearly that of Plato, among the ancients, locate the essential feature of universal realities within the domain of a principle of change tantamount to a principle of universal creativity. That principle, reflects the only ontological reality underlying a competent science of our universe.

That much said, to tease thoughts into a certain direction: go now to the core of the particular subject of this present chapter.

On the Subject of the Mind as Such

In my earlier published writings of this series on the subject of human creativity, I have emphasized the evidence that the actual human mind, is not an expression of a system of sense-perceptual notions, but, rather that the actual human mind exists, ontologically, as if "outside" the domain of sense-perception as such. Valid ontological ideas respecting our universe, are found only from outside the domain of mere sense-perception. In mere sense perception, we see the shadows cast upon the wall, as the Apostle Paul writes in the celebrated Chapter, **I Corinthians 13**:

For, now, we see as in a mirror, darkly; but, then, face to face; now I know in part . . .

When we read modern renderings of that Testament, we today are inclined to attribute the relative stupidity in the use of popular language-habits today, wrongly. That is to be said in respect to the use of language of the ancient Classical Greek among the speakers of a far more literate language influenced by the Classical Greek whose influence was still persisting, even if in somewhat tattered condition, among the scholarly minds of the users of Classical Greek at that time.

To precisely that latter point, consider the damnation of Aristotle decreed by the great scholar and friend of the Apostle Peter in that time, the Philo identified as "of Alexandria," or identified otherwise as Philo Judaeus, who composed a devastatingly perfect indictment of the absurd theology of Aristotle. That was the Aristotle of the "God is dead" notion, a notion faithfully copied from Aristotle by the modern fascist-in-fact Friedrich Nietzsche, progenitor of the Delphic Habsburg school of fascist "creative destruction" of Werner Sombart and Peter Schumpeter, and of the present-day continuation of that tradition in the lunatic contemporary policies and practice of the inner circles of both U.S. President Barack Obama and the current rash of "Dick Arney Ants" of contemporary post-November 2010 American fascism.

Contrary to the pathetic theology of "the beyond," which is spread among many professed religious folk presently, the quality of creativity which is specific to the efficient immortality of the mortal human personality, is not something relegated to "another universe," but is an expression of the essential immortality specific to once-living human personalities, as dwelling within a real universe of the Creator. A universe which



“That quality of immortality which is specific to the human personality, is what is experienced as typified in its expression as true discoveries of universal physical principles, and as the ontological root of scientific creativity in the domain of imagination known as Classical artistic metaphor.” Shown: Rembrandt portrays himself as St. Paul (1661).

subsumes our perception of the potential immortality of those creative powers and created true conceptions, which exist only in the human mind, from among all known living species.

That quality of immortality which is specific to the human personality, is what is experienced as typified in its expression as true discoveries of universal physical principles, and as the ontological root of scientific creativity in the domain of imagination known as Classical artistic metaphor. This is demonstrated, for any competent scientific mind, by the immortality of those kinds of ideas which correspond to the discovery of a true universal principle of physical science, and of that quality of a true Classical artistic metaphor which supplies

the substance of the medium of Classical artistic modes of scientific discovery of universal physical principles. These are principles which live on as efficient principles of the organization of mankind’s advances even long after the mortal husk of the discoverer were long gone. So spoke the Apostle Paul.

That same line of thought is met in such ancient locations as the **Prometheus** Trilogy of Aeschylus.

There, within that Trilogy, Aeschylus continues the manner of the Homeric epics, in defining social processes described in terms of a contrast between the so-called “gods” of Olympus and the “mere mortals” over which the Olympians pretended to reign. Such foul manners of those Olympians were characteristic of the doctrines of those Delphic swine, the apologists for the cults of Apollo and Dionysus, for whose dogma the idea of human immortality lies in the rubbish-bin of dead souls. Hence, Philo’s just denunciation of the swindler known as Aristotle.

Yet, given that much said here this far, I am not preaching theology, but presenting a summation of the evidence of the role of the distinctively human creative powers existing as the potential unique to the human mind among all presently known living creatures. It is called “the human soul,” as expressed in fine fashion by the greatest Classical

composers and scientists known to our civilization. The image of “God” is not a theological fiction; it is the essence of our knowledge of that ordering of Creation in the universe which is actually knowable, as least potentially, for mankind.

That much said on this matter thus far, the essential fact to be considered on that matter, is that mankind has a mission, which is best known to us as the implicit equivalent of the practice of great Classical art and physical-scientific progress, as in the progress by the most able minds, minds whose best fruits are those harvested from the fields of humanity. Exactly where that pathway of progress may ultimately lead us, in terms of concrete results of changes, is not yet certain; but, the

fact of that direction is a clear fact, and there is, for now, no better tool to employ. As the Apostle Paul emphasizes in that referenced location, some important matters have yet to be made known to us; but, we have access to sufficient knowledge of truth to be guided into the direction in which we must proceed.

‘On Cosmic Radiation’

These immediately foregoing considerations lead our discussion directly into the subject of “cosmic radiation.” The following argument is crucial.

The notion of the existence of space, as a notion derived from blind faith in the presumed ontological certainties of blind sense-perception, is a production of the assumption that what are actually the mere shadows cast as sense-perception, might be the actuality of physical reality. On this account, one of the most persistent sources of ontological crisis within physical science still today, is the fallacy of every attempt to impose a notion of “space” which is a notion peculiar to the mere shadow-land of sense-perception, a notion which depends, in turn, on such expressions of physical-scientific progress as the notion of the existence of “empty space” lying within the distance separating points on an hypothetical line connecting any pair of attributably sensed objects.

That, in and of itself, poses the question: “What if that which is not sensed for itself, so-called ‘empty space,’ does not actually exist, after all?” The relevant actual evidence is, that the known universe is richly saturated with a wide and wild range of multifarious radiations, some of relatively local origin within the immediate vicinity of Earth, some specific to the galaxy whose fringe our Solar system inhabits, some of ostensibly inter-galactic specificity. There are also expressions of a universe of cosmic radiation which are, variously, hostile to life-forms, others not directly tolerable among known living processes, and others specific to life-forms as such. All of this, insofar as notable authorities have reported on such matters, is focused on the experience of life on Earth, and on what we know presently of mankind’s historically increasing trend of impact on shaping the cosmos we inhabit.

There is no known authority for the presumption, that there is any presently conceivable part of the universe which this rich plethora of cosmic radiation does not densely inhabit. What then, of “empty space”? Aspects of cosmic radiation reported up to the most recent

of available reporting, define what are estimated to be singularities of universally extended cosmic effects, evidence which impels us to regard the universe we inhabit accordingly.

This matter of present concern touches immediately on the ontological paradoxes rather famously referenced by Albert Einstein, as also by the provocative notion of a fine-structure constant as frequently referenced, most notably, by our esteemed colleague of the Fusion Energy Foundation, the late Professor Robert J. Moon of Chicago University. These considerations coincide with the implications of paradoxes associated with the achievements of Albert Einstein which mark out the notion of a physical space-time, rather than space and time. To sum up this matter in broad-brush terms, the implication of these considerations is the growing inclination among relevant circles to a view of the periodic table of chemistry as situated in the singularities of cosmic radiation in physical space-time, rather than a physics of space and time.

That correction is forced upon us most prominently, now, by the impact of the role of cosmic radiation in the ranges of living processes, and in the modes in which living processes may be protected in some organized way from hostile radiation. The Russian school of the late V.I. Vernadsky and its associates in the matters specific to the domain of living processes, is a matter of special relevance on this account. Yet, the very special aspects of that latter domain only excite our interest in broader matters all the more.

One of the most notable sets of implications which this subject of cosmic radiation provokes for us today, is the relevant role of expressions of cosmic radiation which must be properly appreciated as enlarging the repertoire of human sense-perception to a degree far beyond the customary, relatively arbitrary presumption of a virtually sacred “five senses.”

One expression of this specific irony appears in the concluding paragraphs of Percy Bysshe Shelley’s **A Defence of Poetry**.

Whereas, there are numerous functions of cosmic radiation, such as the use of tuned radiation as the means by which migratory birds may be efficiently oriented for arrival at their seasonal destinations, in which electro-magnetic cosmic radiation is a category of sense-perception by animals; there are mass effects of kindred characteristics in human behavior, as Shelley emphasizes the evidence of such powers of communication in the conclusion of his **A Defence of Poetry**.

Similarly, beyond the role of cosmic radiation as a form of a function of effectively witting, or unwitting communication among animal species, as among plants, too, such aspects of the spectrum of such radiations do have the effect of behavior-shaping communications among persons, that under various specific circumstances. It appears, that what may rightly pass for a seemingly silent form of communication in society, are expressions of what can only be “channels” of the spectra of cosmic radiation which are functioning, in effect, as channels of ostensibly “silent communication” among persons.¹³

Such communications play a known part in the developed experience of capable psychoanalysts and related specialists in human behavioral sciences. All among us who have found themselves with exceptionally well developed forms of fairly reliable skills, at special moments, in sensing this domain, are strongly affected by awareness of such influences in certain kinds of settings, especially when the psychological setting is especially sensed as “tense” in a relevant fashion, just as Shelley responded to such actualities in his **A Defence of Poetry**, and as John Keats expressed this function most vividly in his famous Ode respecting his experience of the viewing of a Grecian Urn. All great Classical drama, when competently composed and performed, falls into the same general category of special implications.

Without some access to that broader medium, competent psychoanalysis were scarcely possible. In the meanwhile, the eerie experience of “mass effects” reflecting a similar kind of “communication” which is ostensibly radiated through media other than ordinary notions of sense-perception, is a significant aspect of human behavior generally.

Often, what are esteemed as mysterious powers of insight in respect to experience of social processes of the type which I have just referenced, are less a reflection of what may be classed as “I.Q.,” but, are the effect of the development of an expanded quality of sensorium expressed by a medium of cosmic radiation external to the so-called “ordinary” sensorium, as in such

cases as Classical artistic composition.

My general observations respecting the scope of the extended domain of communications which I have described in this chapter thus far, bear upon the broader implications of the general category of cosmic radiation. The proper effect of attention to such broader considerations, is to shift the emphasis from the tendency to locate personal identity within the bounds of sense-perception, toward the act of locating one’s personal identity in the awareness of oneself as being the observer of those aspects of human behavior which free the mind and its intentions from the boisterous demands of a shrieking pseudo-creature embodied in the pain and pleasure of what are merely personal sense-perceptual passions, instead of formation of the conception of efficiently universal principles.

III. The Human Identity: Two Types of Mind

The distinction which I have just stressed, in the closing section of the preceding chapter, is a distinction between one person’s trusting belief in sense-certainty, and, on the other hand, the creative personality’s emphasis on the higher authority of those forms of ironical composition centered upon the Classical principle of artistic irony, as for the case of Classical modes of expression of metaphor. Whatever criticism might be attempted against the authority of the late William Empson’s **Seven Types of Ambiguity**, the implications of his argument are aimed in a direction which is true not only for Classical artistic modes of artistic composition, but are, wittingly so valued as either intended or not, a reflection of the same principle of the human mind expressed in the validated discoveries of physical-scientific principle of the greatest of our scientists.

This connection was worked through virtually to exhaustion, by the two successive sections of Kepler’s pedagogy leading into his stated discovery of the universal principle of gravitation. The detailed presentation of the details of Kepler’s latter discovery by my associates remains unique for its precision and related authority among available treatments of the matter known so far, today.

Kepler was remorseless in the exhaustive examination of the peculiarities of human sense-perception, prior to his explicit presentation of his uniquely original

13. The digitalization of the performance, transmission and recording of Classical-musical performances, is typical of the ruses by which the higher faculties of the human mind have been eliminated from essential media of human communication. The policies and practices promoted by means such as the Congress for Cultural Freedom, are typical of the virtually Satanic practices deployed to degrade the mind and morals of the post-World War II generations.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

"It was not the choice of Obama which has doomed our United States to its terrible suffering now; what doomed us to suffer all this, was the failure to put the moustache on that President, when it might have been done. The evidence, and it was conclusive evidence, as I presented it in fact, and in detail, and I was never shown to have been wrong on this account at any time since April 11, 2009."

discovery of the principle of universal gravitation. The outcome of that carefulness in the course of the discovery, was a principle of gravitation which is defined, not by a mathematical measurement according to a single category of sense-perception, but, rather, the demonstration of an ironical contrast of two opposing notions of sense-perception in approaching the phenomena measured. Hence, Albert Einstein's reference to Kepler's unique quality of genius on this account, stating that Kepler's discovery echoed the fact that the universe is finite, but not externally bounded.

Thus, the most significantly systemic importance of the Kepler-Einstein treatment of a universal principle of gravitation, is the demonstration that sense-perceptions as such do not represent the actual principles of universal lawfulness in the universe. This means that sense-perceptions are no better than shadows of the actual principles of action in the universe. This, in turn, defines an ontological contrast of sense-impressions between the related principled phenomena and the universe as knowable to the human mind.

The significance of that ontological distinction's expression by the mechanical recitation of a spoken stanza of English poetry, and the setting of the same organized set of words as uttered in a bel-canto defined expression of the meaning of the same stanza, tends to illustrate the

kind of qualitative distinction to be borne in mind. The difference is, essentially, letting one's typewriter do the talking, and the use of the human voice to convey the irony embodied within the poetic statement.

To mark that thought, consider the differences to be considered between, on the one side:

"To be, or not to be?"

And on the other, the correction:

"To be?"

"Or,

"Not

"To be?"

"That"

"Is

"The question."

Then, after completing the list of options:

"... And,

"Thus,

"conscience doth make cowards

of us all ..."

and, in closing;

"With this regard, their currents turn awry."

Does that not remind us of the behavior of the next session of the U.S. House of Representatives, following the most recent general biannual election?

It is not the words which contain the relevant meaning; it is the paradoxical features of the entirety of that soliloquy, which defines it as a single unit of a literally physical sensation of an actual thought, a thought which represents, within the expression of its bounds, not a flow of words, but a self-bounded unit of action, an action which shapes, remorselessly, step, by step, what must be experienced by the audience, not as words, but the experience within each of them of a physical action within each member of that audience, has experienced as the binary form of sequences, come, come as like an unceasing beating of funeral drums, one beat following another, to form a physical sensation, each a single beat of a death-march of physical transformation of the speaker, throughout, from beginning to close. It is a rehearsal for his grave.

Thence, the awful consequence flows, drum-beat, by drum-beat, like a death march. A rhythmic sense of horror which flows from that soliloquy as a unit of action, a unit of action which unleashes the fate which

will be reached in the closing awful moments of that drama in its entirety. Denmark is no more, and a woeful Norway shall now relive Denmark's error. For either, death was not an error; it was the life which had been lived, which would be, yet again, the waste.

What more remains to be said? For those who hear playwright Shakespeare's voice across the space since, it is a foretaste of the doom of the house of Stuart, and, unless we and our nations are suddenly wiser now than they have been of late, it is the death-march of us all. That drama is not Shakespeare's folly, but like Friedrich Schiller's warning against those fools who heed not the Peace of Westphalia, Friedrich Schiller's forewarning in **Wallenstein**, like Shakespeare's **Hamlet**, of what might become the folly which might become your own.


The tragic error is never a mistake as such, but, rather the wont to continue the folly which a nation, or set of nations was bequeathed before the moment the drama was put on the stage. The tragedy was never the action of any individual figure, but what that society had done to doom itself, before it had been brought on stage. The tragedy of the United States, was, that the Democratic Party's 1944 convention, like a whore, had

brought the Wall Street disease called Truman on its Presidential stage.

What, then, can be said of those who would not put the moustache on Barack Obama, now?

The folly which earns the name of "tragedy" is never the consequence of a single act, in and of itself. This species of development belongs to those actions, even an individual action whose crucial content is located in either the effect of choosing the wrong turn in the highway, or the failure to recognize the need to turn back to the junction, to find the proper way. It was not the choice of Obama which has doomed our United States to its terrible suffering now; what doomed us to suffer all this, was the failure to put the moustache on that President, when it might have been done. The evidence, and it was conclusive evidence, as I presented it in fact, and in detail, and I was never shown to have been wrong on this account at any time since April 11, 2009. Many, many have already died on that account, and vastly many more are threatened so now. Indeed, our nation might soon cease to exist.

The real issue always lies in a choice of a state of mind.




FIDELIO

Journal of Poetry, Science, and Statecraft

From the first issue, dated Winter 1992, featuring Lyndon LaRouche on "The Science of Music: The Solution to Plato's Paradox of 'The One and the Many,'" to the final issue of Spring/Summer 2006, a "Symposium on Edgar Allan Poe and the Spirit of the American Revolution," *Fidelio* magazine gave voice to the Schiller Institute's intention to create a new Golden Renaissance.

The title of the magazine, is taken from Beethoven's great opera, which celebrates the struggle for political freedom over tyranny. *Fidelio* was founded at the time that LaRouche and several of his close associates were unjustly imprisoned, as was the opera's Florestan, whose character was based on the American Revolutionary hero, the French General, Marquis de Lafayette.

Each issue of *Fidelio*, throughout its 14-year lifespan, remained faithful to its initial commitment, and offered original writings by LaRouche and his associates, on matters of, what the poet Percy Byssche Shelley identified as, "profound and impassioned conceptions respecting man and nature."



Back issues are now available for purchase through the Schiller Institute website:


<http://www.schillerinstitute.org>, and www.larouchepub.com. Please consult the websites for prices and availability.

A RUSSIAN DIALOGUE WITH LAROCHE AND FRIENDS

The Cultural Imperative of Russian-American Cooperation

*The seminar excerpted here took place Sunday, Nov. 7, 2010, in northern Virginia. Participants in the discussion included Lyndon LaRouche; historian Alexander Nagorny, deputy editor of the Russian weekly **Zavtra**; Clifford Kiracofe, professor at the Virginia Military Institute and Washington and Lee University; Jeffrey Steinberg and Rachel Douglas of **EIR**; former U.S. Democratic Congressional candidate in Texas Kesha Rogers and Rogers' chief of staff, Ian Overton; former candidate for the Democratic nomination for Congress in Massachusetts Rachel Brown; Matthew Ogden and Anna Shavin of LPAC-TV; and Michael Kirsch, Michelle Lerner, Peter Martinson, and Meghan Rouillard of the LaRouchePAC Basement Team. References to "yesterday" are related to Lyndon LaRouche's webcast of Nov. 6 (**EIR**, Nov. 26, 2010, <http://tiny.cc/233v3>).*

Alexander Nagorny: There are so many subjects I



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis



LPAC-TV

Russian editor and historian Alexander Nagorny (left) and Lyndon LaRouche were two of the principal interlocutors in this round-table strategic discussion.

would like to touch upon, but I would start with a very simple phrase: that we're entering a very dangerous period of history, both for Russia, and the United States and Europe. And the events are pending, although it may take one year, or maybe three or four or five years, before a certain turning point in history takes place.

In this situation, I would say that it is no accident

that we are meeting on the 7th of November. It's the day of the Bolshevik Revolution in October 1917. The Bolshevik Revolution, at that time, was very much unexpected for people everywhere, but, still, it played a very big role in the later events.

Of course, it would be much better if the historic process developed gradually, without wars, revolutions, and things like that. But unfortunately, it's impossible, mainly due to the fact that many people may have some limited viewpoints, and, one way or another, direct their [activity], producing conditions for social change in a very revolutionary way.

Let me then, after this brief statement, say a few words about how I see the situation, and I will try to concentrate also on the political situation in Russia, how it develops right now.

In my view, of course, the central role in world history is played by the United States. And the events in other countries or in other continents are defined by the events which are taking place in Washington, D.C., and especially in the crazy heads of certain Washingtonian creatures.

In our analysis, the financial and economic crisis which started two years ago was not actually the crisis, it was just the preliminary thunderclap. And the real crisis is just pending. It is interconnected with the actions which are taken by the Federal Reserve System and, to a certain extent, by the financial establishment of the current administration. For us, it was rather unexpected that the infusion of \$5 trillion into the American economy to support the major banks didn't produce hyperinflation, so far. But we understand the Federal Reserve System has a rather strict mechanism, and it can keep this money within the banking system. But, sooner or later, this will go into the economy, and we will see certain very important consequences.

And this, of course, is interconnected with the political situation, as it develops, and especially with those election campaign directions, which was repeated by Mr. LaRouche yesterday [in his Nov. 6 webcast]. Of course, these results don't change anything, right now. But, at the same time, we see that Obama is a very critical condition, together with the Democrats and the Republicans; they don't produce an alternative to that.

As events come closer and closer to the Presidential elections, there will be more and more impulses for the administration to take some external adventurist steps, so to speak. And, as we see it, there are two tactical chains of events.

One is connected with probably this or that kind of invasion against Iran.

And the second point, which is more strategic, is a struggle against China, the P.R.C., as the most efficient and quickly developing country. As I mentioned, generally, I don't know whether Mr. LaRouche was behind the Chinese leadership, but nevertheless, many recipes they are using, both in terms of combining the free market and central planning, as well as financial methods, resemble Mr. LaRouche's ideas. They are combining them, and the result is visible. Their development is so quick and produces such overwhelming results, that the Wall Street big guys cannot stay indifferent. So that's why the second idea we see is the attempt to encircle China by different conflict points. And the Chinese leadership will understand that, and of course, they are preparing for some kind of direct or indirect confrontation with the United States. But, so far, this confrontation is developing within adjacent areas, such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, and probably, very soon, we will see the clash of interests in Central Asia, in the post-Soviet space. We also cannot overlook the unrelenting struggle in the world financial sphere.

A Dangerous Game

And now, I'd like to transfer my short speech to Russian events, what's happening in Russia. In Russia, as we all know, there is a duumvirate ruling the country between Mr. Medvedev and Mr. Putin. Some people say that there is an acute struggle between them, the struggle for the next Presidential term. Others say that it's nothing more than a show, and that Mr. Putin is ruling the situation, and Medvedev is just a stooge for certain things. Strange as it may seem, the situation is neither the first that I indicated, nor the second. Because it has both elements: from the first thing, and from the other.

Of course, Medvedev very much depends on Putin, but, at the same time, he is surrounded by powerful oligarchical groups, who are fed up with Mr. Putin. Secondly, of course, contacts which took place between Mr. Medvedev and Obama produced a very powerful support from the Obama Administration toward Mr. Medvedev, in terms of a second term, saying, "Go ahead, we will support." If you read the American or European newspapers, it's very obvious that the number one task is to exclude Mr. Putin from the political scene, from the political picture.

On the other hand, they are meeting together, and



Russian Presidential Press and Information Office

Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin (left) and President Dmitri Medvedev at the Kremlin, June 2, 2010. A drive is on, steered from London, to oust Putin, and both leaders are surrounded by pro-British oligarchs.

the basic, more important questions are solved mainly by Putin and his team, which concentrates on financial and economic matters. Strategic and international issues, I think, if they are not very important, Medvedev decides by himself; but if there is something very crucial, it is created in consultation with Putin.

But the final line is approaching, and what I expect is that there will be very important pressure on Mr. Putin, to yield the position, and go away, not participate in the forthcoming Presidential elections. What instruments are used? There are different psychological ones, through the press, the international press, and, of course, through the financial leverage which mainly the British financial alliances have.

I think that Mr. Putin is not acceptable to them, because, as I figure, he plays a more or less independent role. Besides, he doesn't allow the yielding of certain positions, beyond certain lines. And this line is, first of all, territorial integrity. Secondly, Putin concentrated in his hands tremendous financial wealth, because he is controlling certain oligarchic groups, and, besides, he is cutting 10% from every profit, from big operations, to his own account—not his personal account, but the account of the state-controlled financial assets.

Thirdly, Putin is playing a geopolitical game between China and the United States and Europe, and trying to establish some kind of independent position for the Russian Federation. The most illustrative exam-

ple here may be the situation with the Customs Union, which is right now arranged by [Academician] Sergei Glazyev. The situation with the Customs Union is not a simple one, since it has powerful enemies both inside and outside the Russian Federation. We have witnessed many negative events around it, lately. It makes us ask, "What's going on here? Why this quarrel with [Belarus President Alexander] Lukashenka, and things like that?"

An informed source told me recently, "You understand that the Customs Union and the Unified Economic Space is entirely the idea of Mr. Putin. He invented it in his own head, although he's not a very high economic thinker, but still, it was his invention. And this invention was absolutely unexpected for such financial people as [Finance Minister and Deputy Prime Minister Alexei] Kudrin, [Anatoly] Chubais, and others, but they had to accept it, because it was already placed on the table. And these people from different political sections started to sabotage it, under the carpet." This line is not acceptable to them, and that's why there is pressure to oust Mr. Putin. Whether it will happen or not, nobody knows, because what kind of, say, blackmail documents they will use, nobody knows.

And, on the other hand, it is more or less clear, right now, how this movement to oust Putin will develop. It will be connected, I think, with the [Mikhail] Khodorkovsky case. In December, or in January, we may expect that Dmitri Medvedev will pardon Khodorkovsky. As soon as he's out of prison, he becomes a very important political figure, and that will be a very negative situation for [Deputy Prime Minister Igor] Sechin and other people around Putin. And I think that through this campaign—the anti-Putin campaign will be developing in Russia very quickly—probably the approach to Putin from international circles will be "bad policeman/good policeman." The bad policeman will tell him that, "You will follow Mr. Milosevic, if you don't accept our proposals." And the good policeman will tell him that, "Well, we may appoint you the head of the International Olympic Committee or another very important position. You'll be accepted in all high circles in Europe and the States, and you will enjoy life," and things like that.

I don't know whether he will accept this nonsense, but who knows?

Besides, in my view, we are witnessing a very dangerous game, by Medvedev's team, in terms of creating a new kind of relationship with NATO. The point is that everything is being done to show, that Russia is being incorporated into the NATO alliance, or creating an alliance with that alliance. If, in Lisbon, at the end of November, there will be such a proclamation, or some issue of documents, or signing of them, then the political alignment between major players will change. Because the Chinese will not accept this situation, and they will have to restructure their military and economic plan in terms of their borders. At least, the last 20 years, they didn't put any troops along the Russian borders and they were very friendly, proposing credits, work force, giant projects, and things like that. And if this thing is signed, then they may, if not change the situation and their line, make certain decisions that will move Russia and China apart. And Russia, in this situation, will find itself in a more subjugated position, towards the military alliance.

Potential for Conflict and War

Another example is the situation with the drug struggle, which is also used in the same direction. Approximately two weeks ago, it was announced that there was a joint operation—Russian-American operation—on the border of Pakistan, against some drug dealers. On the surface, it's very good. But, in reality, it was not a joint operation, because there were only two persons from the Russian Embassy there. And, secondly, as soon as Russian participation is obvious, then it is possible, say, for the Saudis, who are controlling, to a certain extent, the *mujahids*, to say, "You see! The Russians are again in Afghanistan. Let us step up operations in Caucasus." And in the Caucasus, the situation is actually developing very negatively. There are terrorist attacks or blows every day. Every day. Dagestan is in a very precarious situation. And this will give a legal justification. But that won't change anything in terms of the drug situation, and drug traffic. Drug traffic should be stopped by different methods, first and foremost, by very severe measures domestically.

So, all those events, which I enumerated, show that there is a very powerful movement to create new conflicts between different nations, which will produce chaos, at first on a regional level.

For example, one may easily imagine that if Obama

wants to stay President, he might create some kind of a provocation. Not him, personally, but some security elements, units, like 9/11. Maybe in Europe. And then America will have to strike back, and then a regional conflict develops, and he gets reelected. It's possible, although of course it's not a *fait accompli*. But still this possibility exists. There exist also other scenarios for how to start the war in the area of Iran. And, at the same time, we have a very precarious situation in Pakistan, and in Afghanistan, with the spreading of military activities to Central Asia, and to the Caucasus.

And lastly, one remark concerning the U.S. domestic situation and medium-range events. The average American, at present, hates Obama and his team, which has shown an unbreakable link with the Wall Street/British-oriented guys. This leads to a Sarah Palin-type next President, who will make the overall situation a real debacle in every respect, with a high probability of overall war. Unless we stop them. That's my vision.

Thank you very much.

The Crisis Is Now

Lyndon LaRouche: I have a different perspective. I mean the facts that you represent as factors are obvious. The issue is, what's the timetable of events? What's the driver of overall events? There is a global process, which is more powerful than any national process, or any pair of nations involved in this. First of all, the entire world monetary-financial system is about to disintegrate. And, under present conditions, there's nothing that can stop that, on present policy.

Nagorny: Maybe reform? Other reforms?

LaRouche: No. No reform. No reform. It'll be the way it was dealt with, yesterday. Because the solution, if it comes, will come from the United States. And you saw, yesterday, what we're up against: We're up against a really fascist movement, in the name of the Republican faction. And what they're threatening to do, as Bill Clinton laid out yesterday, in his remarks. If that occurs, then you have the inevitable collapse of civilization, globally, very soon, in which the schemes of various governmental forces in the world will not control it. Because the world is essentially bankrupt.

Now, the most stable part of the world, right now, politically, is China and India. Now, they both have tremendous problems, internally. China has adopted a policy, among the many policies of China; as you know, there are many different policies going on at the same

time, and many different commitments. But the essential thing is the question of the currency. The Chinese will defend their currency, and defend it on a basis of a fixed-exchange-rate demand. They will take measures to that degree. And this role of China is absolutely crucial for any salvation from this mess, because if China does not do that, then the whole world goes to Hell, very rapidly.

We're talking about weeks and months, we're not talking about years, because the entire world system is bankrupt.

For example, in Russia, the big problem is the influence of the Inter-Alpha Group, which, since 1971, has become the leading force in the world, as a financial force; it's the British Empire, really. But it's also the partnership between the British and the Saudis. Most of the troubles we've had, instability, are run in the old Sykes-Picot region. They're run through the Saudis, now. The Saudis are the key factor in chaos in this whole region, including the entire Islamic world. You have a Turkey factor, which is different, and contrary to that, and some other things. But this thing is ready to blow.


Right now, the likelihood is a complete, chain-reaction collapse, and disintegration of the world monetary-financial system. It's more than ripe right now. And what this Republican faction is proposing, for these negotiations to occur in the coming weeks, in the interim period, guarantees a total collapse. If they try this [budget-]cutting process, they are going to introduce a factor of social instability in the United States—explosive!

Now, the British are in a similar faction. The British have nothing. Their system, they call the BRIC.¹ And the problem that we see in Russia, is the influence, around Medvedev, in particular, of this BRIC thing. What this is, is the Bertrand Russell International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, a group that I know very well. And they're stupid, they have no competence whatsoever, no economic competence, at all. This whole thing about going with this research center—Skolkovo. It's nonsense. It's idiocy! And the problem is that the Medvedev factor, so far, in terms of international economic and financial policy, has been idiotic. Because there's no economy! And the key problem in Russia is, essentially, from a long-term standpoint, and

really, now, in the short term, is: What happened to the Russian economy? The Russian economy was destroyed, systematically and deliberately, as part of this whole process of crushing Germany, crushing Poland, crushing the whole area. And unless there's some regrouping of productive power, physical productive power, the nation can not be held together. It will disintegrate.

And now, you have, on top of that, a collapse of the financial system. And since the power Medvedev is having, is largely this international financial power, if the financial system goes, he's got nothing! The weak part is, that he's not investing anything significantly, in physical production. And the key thing to Russia, as to the United States, as to Western Europe, right now, is a collapse of physical production, real physical values. We have a world food shortage, we have collapses of everything.

So, we're in a very short-term thing, and, right now, the situation in the United States is ready to trigger a general chain-reaction collapse internationally. And the reason I spoke so harshly to Clinton, and so forth, yes-



This English translation of the work of Russia's authoritative economist, Stanislav Menshikov presents a critical analysis of the complex economic processes in Russia over the last 15 years.

Available through EIR

Order by calling 1-800-278-3135, or at the EIR online store, at www.larouchepub.com.

\$30 plus \$4.00 for shipping and handling

1. The Brazil-Russia-India-China grouping was founded, on the initiative of Goldman Sachs, to wreck the potential for a Four-Power alliance of the last three countries with the United States, against the British Empire.

terday, was precisely that. The idea of a special kind of negotiation, step by step, step by step, with this Republican thing, doesn't work!

A Generational Problem

And it's a problem, here, with the generation that's in power. You have different generations in U.S. history. You have my generation and the older generation, which I shared, in my youth and young adulthood. Then you have the

Baby-Boomer generation, those who were born after 1945-1946, that generation. They are essentially, largely, nonfunctional. They have some economic capability, some professional capabilities among them, but, intellectually, they are not a generation that you'd want to fight a war. They have no capability of sustained struggle for anything. They're frightened, they withdraw. Some of them have good ideas, good impulses, but they're weak; they have no structure.

I came from a generation that fought a world war! And I know all the imperfections I knew from that war, and I knew what the strengths were. Nations meant something then. And, coming out of the war, the victory over the Nazis was something, it meant something. And we went through that: One-third of the entire adult labor force, male labor force of the United States, was involved in warfare, for a period of '41 to '45.

The generation that came afterward, remember, is crushed. It was crushed by what we call McCarthyism. It was actually Trumanism. Here was the United States, which had come out of a depression, under the leadership of Roosevelt, from a very deep depression; it was a systematic organization. Now, once the war was ended, and as it was ending, what was behind Truman was committed to destroy that morality, that outlook of the American population, of my generation. And they used methods of intimidation, methods of persecution, to break a whole generation of people: the people who were most successful, financially, as a stratum, in that generation, that was my generation, who got the better jobs, who had security clearances to get better jobs, who would generally have homes, where other people might not have homes, because they didn't have security clearance. And, therefore, everything that had been



McCarthyism and Trumanism crushed the U.S. generation that had survived the war. Here, Army counsel Joseph N. Welch confronts Sen. Joe McCarthy (right), June 9, 1954: "Have you no sense of decency, sir? At long last, have you left no sense of decency?"

represented by the Roosevelt revolution, in the United States, was crushed.

The children who were born to these people, as you saw in the 68ers: the 68er explosion was an expression of the degeneration of a youth generation, which were largely the children which went to the best universities. Because they got into the best universities, usually, because their parents were corrupt, that is, morally corrupt. And they showed it!

Now, we have a generation which is alienated in a different way. The young people, as our young people, have a different experience. It's very difficult for them to coordinate, and sustain coordination around a mission-orientation. They like projects. They'll go from one project to another project. But a coherent strategic outlook, which a healthy nation has, is a strategic outlook: a common sense of what the purpose of the nation is, and that you have to unify around the purpose of that nation, if you're going to get anything done. And we don't have that!

So, now we have a very fragile society. We have a society which has lost the morality, which my generation knew, coming out of World War II. We knew what a war was. And we knew, also, that all these wars we fought after that, were fake wars, organized by the British, as a way of destroying the United States's influence, and making the United States, again, a mere puppet of the British system, which is what's happened to it now, largely.

So, you have a very weak world. You see it in Russia, the effect. A whole generation has been wiped out, that had a certain strength. It had a certain sense of moral strength.

Nagorny: You know, as strange as it may seem, you

are telling the same thing which we are observing in Russia. Because in Russia we see, for the last 25 years, an attempt to ruin the psychology of people through TV, through some sports, from everything that—it should be suppressed. But, strange as it may seem, the latest polls showed that the major answers are the same as 30 years ago. People may answer positively about the history of the country; they support the idea of integration and consolidation, rather than separation; the common effort, together, and the common cause, which is absolutely a blow against the liberal values.

LaRouche: Yes!

Nagorny: And I think it's the same thing in America, no?

LaRouche: No, it's an older generation. We've much [inaud.] been destroyed. See, the point in Russia: What happened, with the collapse of the Wall, was that there was a breakdown, and the nation was raped from the exterior. So that what you have—I mean, I went to the great Ordzhonikidze machine-tool factory in Moscow [in 1994], before they shut it down. And I looked at these people, and the people working at the machine tools, still then. Many of them were older people, obviously weakened by the conditions they had lived through, through the wartime period. You could see, physically, they had suffered from the wartime period. They had stayed at their machine tools and had done their work. They had been the force that had organized the weapons to defend Moscow! The same people! So therefore, they have a sense that the outsiders did it to them.

Nagorny: Yes, you're right.

LaRouche: In the case of Western Europe, especially—and to some degree in Germany, there's a similar thing, because of the war. But, in the United States and Western Europe? No, same thing: a complete loss of essential morality. That is, the morality of a people knowing that it has an interest it must defend. In Russia, the case is the denial of access to that. But in the United States, as we see, and with the Green movement, so-called, in Germany.

Now, the Green movement is a product of Nazism. It's a generation skipped, but the people—remember, Hitler was Green, in the 1920s. And Göring was Green. And they were “creative destructionists,” it was their philosophy. They mobilized for war, as a destructive force, but they were *anti-technology*, *anti-science*, and it was actually the German military which forced Hitler to do scientific development, like elements of the space program, the rockets program, and so forth. But, for the



EIRNS/James Rea

An anti-nuclear demonstration in Dannenberg, Germany, Nov. 6, 2010 (note the “radiation” symbol painted on this girl’s face). The Green ideology represents “a complete loss of essential morality,” said LaRouche.

Nazis, no! The Nazi ideology was destruction, creative destruction, in the extreme. So you have the Green generation. The Green uproar in Germany is a product of moral degeneration which goes back to the grandparents’ generation, who were the Greenies, the fascist Greenies, of the 1920s. And that’s what you’re seeing with the anti-nuclear movement in Germany.

So, you have differentiations in this thing, but the overall problem is, the planet as a whole has a very poor morality, compared to what we had in European civilization, before going into World War I. That was really destructive. But now, the instincts of my generation, or the generation that’s older than me, essentially, is lost in the United States. And my biggest problem, in organizing in the United States, is the fact that I’m dealing with a defective influence in the population, even among my own associates. Because they suffer from the effect of this corruption.

I mean, in my generation, you have a mission, like a military assignment. You’re a soldier, okay, you have a

mission: What's your mission? Okay, here's your mission. You find your place in the mission. That's your job. You're committed to it. You have a sense of mission! Today's generation does not have a sense of mission. It has a sense, "Well, I feel like this. I feel like that. I feel like doing this, now; I feel like doing that, now." So you don't have this sense, a sense of a unity of purpose.

The other side of it is, the older generation would think in terms of grandchildren. You're suffering, your typical population, you're going through suffering, through hardship, you're trying to rise up in society, you're trying to perform a mission which makes your life seem worthwhile to you, because you're doing something good for the society. You take pride in who you are, what your instincts are. Lost, now. People see the future in terms of their expected experience in life. The older generation, those who are healthy, would see the future in what their generation is going to produce for the future, and take pride in what they're going to create for the future. The grandfather would say to the grandchildren: "See what I'm doing for you. Here's what you're going to do with this. Here's your future. I'm giving you a future! Look at this thing we've done. We built this! You're going to build something." So you have this sense of mission.

And the moral problem is a lack—no matter what you call moral, formally, in terms of behavior; that's not morality. Morality is intention. Morality is conviction, that you are human and not an animal. Animals die. That's the end. Human beings must not die that way. They will die physically, but they won't die, because they will have had a mission, which they're committed to, and they will look upon what they're doing while they're alive, as a contribution to the future of society. They have a sense of immortality, that there is something immortal about their mission in life. And that's what you need, to build a nation, is a sense of the future. And all the greatest cultures we've had in known history have that characteristic. The forces of culture are that, the culture that's fit to survive. And the danger right now, is we have a population which can fight, but I wouldn't trust them too much. Because they won't stick to it; they'll go off and run to something else.

So, this unity of mission is lacking. And it's only with great effort that we are able to sustain anything like that in the United States. It doesn't come naturally.



The three Congressional campaigns by young LaRouche Democrats in the Nov. 2, 2010 election demonstrated the "unity of mission" that can be extremely effective in changing the United States, LaRouche said.

It comes because you push it.

And that's what happened when we did these [LaRouchePAC Congressional] campaigns. I said "three campaigns," because, with three campaigns, we could do the right job: that is, to set a pattern for the future. With many, diverse campaigns, we'd have a mess. So, we had three campaigns which we concentrated on; they concentrated on themselves, with a national mission. So, now, what we've done, in terms of the election campaign, we have established a sense of mission, in which we participated, and that means we have a potential for doing something with the future. And we're going in that way.

The problem is, most of society doesn't have that. And therefore, those who have a sense of mission must mobilize to sort of batter the people around them into adopting a sense of mission. Like the way I dealt with Clinton's crowd, yesterday. Bill's probably the bright-

est politician we've had, at least since Kennedy, and certainly since Roosevelt. But you see where he's soft, and his people are soft. They're dealing with this guy—the Republicans are going to come in with a purely fascist program, threaten to shut down the government for the time being, until the inauguration of the next term comes in, and impose a fascist program on the United States. Now, Clinton's tendency is to try to negotiate with this process. He opposed it! He hates it! His people hate it. But, I say: "You can not negotiate with them. You have to crush them. You have to figure out how to crush them. Because they're fascists!"

The 'Post-Industrial' Shift

Nagorny: One more question: Certain liberal figures in my country, and in the States, as I see it, are actually saying that, "Of course, there are different structural disproportions in American economy and finances. But all those disproportions will be solved through the scientific progress and new breakthroughs in science and technology, creating new products. That's why it's quite logical that the United States and Russia actually pushed away the production lines, but they will, America will, come with a new technological level, and make new technologies, even in terms of energy."

LaRouche: That's the policy of "creative destruction." That's Nietzsche, that's Schumpeter.

Nagorny: The idea that the electric car will help to solve the problem.

LaRouche: Scientifically, it's idiocy. It's incompetent! What we're doing is using windmills, solar collectors. Take the energy-flux density of a windmill, the energy-flux density of a solar collector: This is insanity! The whole policy is destruction! You got this from the British creative destruction policy. Nietzsche was the first, in his creative destruction. Then you had Sombart: creative destruction. He was not a Nazi, but he was a Nazi fellow-traveller. Then you had Schumpeter, who was actually a Nazi, but he's an English Nazi. And this Schumpeter kind of thinking, "creative destruction," is what the policy is!

The policy goes back, in history, to Aeschylus, through the *Prometheus* trilogy: to control people by making them stupid, because if a population is well-educated, intellectually developed, culturally developed, then they will not be slaves. If they're stupid, helpless, don't know what to do, then a ruling class can control them. If they're a proud people, then they can work as a proud people, within the framework of their culture.

Now, what we're doing, is we are actually destroying the ability to sustain human life. We are on a track now, physically, in physical economy, where the potential population-density will drop from 6.9 billion now, to 2, or less! We're on that track, right now. And there's no recovery from this. Once this starts, there's no recovery from it, because the dynamic of this will mean the total destruction of the planet. So, what we're in, right now, we're on the edge of this crisis. And that's why I fought so hard with Bill. They've *got* to understand, sometimes you can not compromise.

Now, in the former time, that meant something, because that meant, you were not going to give in. If you're not going to give in, that might mean war. You say, "Okay, you want war, you get war." In that point, you have a check.

Nagorny: Yes, but even if, say, a very good, talented, powerful U.S. President, a figure will come and become American President, don't you think that he will be surrounded by so many circumstances, that he can do—?

LaRouche: Only if he wants to. If a man is a President of the United States, under our Constitution and its tradition, in that case, the President is a very powerful figure, and such things will not work, against him. Roosevelt is a typical case of that. Abraham Lincoln was a case like that. John Quincy Adams was a case like that.

Nagorny: But society is much more complex right now, than 30 or 40 years ago.

LaRouche: It's more complicated, because it's more stupid. There's no intellectual coherence in society. Look at the fads, look at entertainment, cultural fads.

Nagorny: That was exactly on my tongue! Franklin Delano Roosevelt, he didn't have such an important and powerful enemy as Hollywood, in the '30s, as Hollywood is playing right now in the role of forging psychology and intellectual quality.


LaRouche: Not Hollywood; it's Facebook.

Nagorny: Facebook, Hollywood—

LaRouche: These kinds of phenomena, which are social engineering policies to turn people into animals: they destroy them. But it's part of the culture. How is this possible? It's only possible, because people have no purpose in living. We used to have it: You had a career, you had a profession, you had a sense of a family you're creating, a community you're creating, your sense of participation. What do people discuss? I mean, in former times, people would discuss, like ordinary families: The men in the family would go off and meet together and

FIGURE 1

Proposed Route of the Bering Strait Railroad and Tunnel



Hal Cooper, Jr., president, Cooper Consulting Co.

This map is from the "Project Implementation Plan for the Alaska-Chukotka Railway Pipeline and Communications Corridor Through the Bering Strait Intercontinental Interhemispheric Railroad Utility and Pipeline Tunnel Project," presented to Vladimir Yakunin, president of Russian Railways, by Hal B.H. Cooper, Jr., president of Cooper Consulting Co.

talk about the job, talk about their work. Talk about the different kinds of work they were doing, talk about the problems that they had with the place where they were working. Their minds were focused on their—oh, they were focused on other things, but this was typical—they were focused on their mission in life.

The problem of this generation is, these young people have no sense of mission in life. They have no purpose in living. They're now trying to find entertainment, as a substitute for a purpose in life. That's the weakness.

Organizing for NAWAPA

And right now, what we have, in organizing around the NAWAPA,² we find that we have older people, who

2. The North American Water and Power Alliance, first proposed in

are highly skilled professionals, engineers, and so forth. Their reaction is immediately responsive. We actually have, in the United States, the potential of organizing the NAWAPA project. This would be greatest project that mankind has ever undertaken. It would mean a complete change in the climate of the planet, because of the extent. This would mean going into the Bering Strait tunnel and railroad track. This would mean northern Russia, northern Siberia, which has riches in it, which can be developed, which are desperately needed by China and other countries to the south.

1964 by the Ralph M. Parsons Co., was never implemented. It would bring the abundant water of Alaska and western Canada southward, to the Great American Desert, including Mexico, and other areas of great need. See <http://www.larouchepac.com/infrastructure> for a large selection of videos, including specialist interviews.

If Siberia is organized, as a machine, which some of the Vernadsky State Geological Museum people know how to do, to take this area, which is a really tough area to work with, but understanding how to make it work, with the aid of nuclear power. Russia, Siberia has now a great mission to perform for a couple of generations to come, in terms of the development of Asia as a whole.

And you have, then, the Arctic area. The Arctic area is a very significant area, which has never been really developed. People look at it. It's one of the crucial things which we're working on. This is one of the great challenges, develop the Arctic. If you look at it from the standpoint of the Solar System, rather than just the planet itself, you realize how important the Arctic is, what its significance is, within the galaxy, things like that.

And so, we have people who are capable of responding, still, to that kind of mission-orientation. And you have people who have skills, who are unemployed. You have the former auto industry. People have been laid off, they're still there. The whole area's destroyed.

Our estimate is, we can actually get 4 million jobs created by a state funding, on a credit system, a state funding of this project. It would take a half-century to complete, 30 years to a half-century to complete. But it would mean a revolution, it would change the climate, it would change a lot of things.

So, what we have is the best possibility of mission-orientations, which are tantamount to war, fighting a great war. But this is a different kind of war. It's a war of creation, as opposed to creative destruction. We can do that. But you *have* to do it! It's the only answer.

Nagorny: Yes, but in this case, there should be another, a different American President. There should be a different President in Russia, at least.

LaRouche: I think if you get a decent American President—and the only place you can do it from is the United States—you can deal with other things. Because, you know, I have some peculiar dealings with China, and I have a sense of some things about China, and what they respond to, particularly on the question of the value of their currency, a stable currency, which is what they require. And they will fight, to defend a stable currency. They will not be peaceful about this. And they will have a close relationship with India on this. So you have 1.4 billion people in China, 1.1 billion more in India, with a tremendous number of very poor people. These nations can not survive without a

high rate of gain in technological progress. They'll be smothered by the lack of progress, by the backwardness.

Then you have other parts of Asia. South Korea will play a very important role if we have a development program. They're a small nation, but they have very important technological capabilities. Japan, with all its weaknesses, will play into that. It's the only chance it has, and it's especially interested in North Asia, as an area in which to invest its activities.

So, we have the potential. My view is, we have to fight this thing now. Because if we lose the United States, if a fascist regime actually takes over the United States, I don't think this planet can survive, not for a long time to come. And therefore, my view is, we've got to change this situation in the White House. The present President is clinically insane. There's a law against a clinically insane President being President, continuing to be President. The important thing is to force the issue, and get this guy out.

And he's totally a British puppet. To the extent he's anything, he's insane.

Nagorny: Do you think he will stay in office until the end of the office, or—?

LaRouche: I think he'll be dead before the end of the office! Because he's got the profile of Nero and Hitler, and they both ended their career by dying, by suicide. This mental type is one which is headed to a suicide. And as long as he is President, when you consider the tremendous powers of the U.S. Presidency, those powers can control forces for evil or for good, like we saw with the case of Roosevelt, on the other side, or Abraham Lincoln, earlier.

I think the only hope for the planet, is to get forces from various nations, which understand this, to realize that they have to cooperate, for a common end, of sovereign nations, united to a common purpose, to a common end.

Nagorny: Actually, if there is a change in the White House, it will be much easier to achieve changes in Moscow, positive changes.

LaRouche: Absolutely. Because, instantly, if Bill Clinton's friends were to replace Obama, a Clinton-Putin collaboration would erupt immediately.

Nagorny: And such persons as Kudrin, [Arkady] Dvorkovich, will disappear, because they are actually formulating the financial and economic policies.

LaRouche: I don't know. You see, a case like Kudrin, he's doing what his opportunities are. Because of a longer association with Putin, he might decide to

change his stripes. He might be a certain kind of opportunist, a technician, who shifts his loyalties according to the way the wind is blowing.

Nagorny: Yes, I think so.

A Question of Real Leadership

LaRouche: But generally, that's a very important factor in history, is to get the wind going in the right direction, and get some of the people who are sensitive to wind directions to change their attitude—to choose a different career, or a little different mission-orientation. It's leadership! I mean, real leadership. You have to create a situation where you have real leaders, who get up in the morning, determining what the mission is for today, and talk to one another, and decide on common missions for common ends.

Nagorny: But so far, the G20 doesn't produce any constructive results; it's just blah, blah, blah.

LaRouche: No. It's a mess.

Well, look at the case. Take France, and you've got this crazy little animal, who is the President of France. In Germany, you have a mess. And the worst part of the mess is not from the top, it's from the bottom. It's from the Greenies. That's the worst problem. In Italy, you have a problem, North and South Italy are dividing more and more; but you have some people in Northern Italy who are responsive, and are technologically capable. But it's a mess. And that's what you have.

You have some things, traces in the Balkans. The Balkans have certain potentiality. They could be developed if they get some peace long enough, and get some development.

Nagorny: Turkey is developing very constructively.

LaRouche: Turkey will. Turkey, if you shift back to the Atatürk direction, Turkey can do something. That's the good thing in Turkey, is Atatürk.³ And his legacy is very important: I mean, he's the one that made the peace with Syria, negotiated with Lenin, took the borders of Turkey, and said, "This is us. We are not Arabs, we do not own Arabs any more." The Arabs are independent, and the negotiation of the treaty with Syria did that. Syria, to this day, has a special characteristic because of the agreement between Atatürk and Syria: still that legacy. It may not be the best thing in the world, but it certain is useful.

3. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, founder of the Republic of Turkey, and its first President, 1923-30.

Nagorny: And what is your vision about Iran, and its future?

LaRouche: Iran can also be handled. You have a real crisis now, but the whole area is orchestrated by the British. The whole Islamic world is under very heavy control by British intelligence, the real British intelligence. The usual kinds of operations that people overlook: the drug operation, for example.

Now, the advantage in Iran, is Iran *hates* the drug problem. So they're a positive factor as a nation, in terms of drugs. They're against the drug traffic. And they are not Sunni. Now, usually this Shi'a/Sunni division is not a happy thing to have around, because there's a lot of nasty conflict, with many potentials. *But!* If the Sunni world is dominated by corruption, which is controlled largely by the Saudis, who are about as corrupt as you can find on this planet, then a Shi'a nation may give you a little bit of an option for the conflict. Therefore, you have a Sunni/Shi'a division, and you can understand exactly how the Sunni works, and how the Shi'a works, in that particular area, particular when this crazy thing was set up for the Soviet involvement in Afghanistan, completely a Saudi-run—British-controlled, Saudi-run—operation, using [Zbigniew] Brzezinski from the United States, as a way of setting this into motion.

So, if you understand these things, then you can take advantage of the fact that people have certain hesitations to go with certain other people, and you can talk to them, and try and negotiate a relationship of cooperation, which is good in itself. And if they find themselves in an operation and agreements which are good for them, they're more likely to be peaceful.

Nagorny: And do you think it is possible that the next President would realistically withdraw from Afghanistan?

LaRouche: Well, realistically, I've been saying that, right now, the possibility of a shift in the Presidency, in the United States, is centered around Bill Clinton, which is a minority position, but it's the only one that exists of that type, right now. And there are people within the Democratic Party, and there are people in the Republican Party, who do respect him. And he has matured considerably, from when he was President. When he was President, he was not a man who was an up-front leader. He was a leader, in the sense of doing things from behind the scenes, steering things, approving things, which were generally good. A



HillaryClinton.com/Barbara Kinney

Hillary and Bill Clinton on the campaign trail, April 2008, Pittsburgh, Pa. LaRouche said that the Clintons represent the potential for genuine U.S.-Russia cooperation.

few mistakes, here and there, but generally good. Now, he's come more and more into the idea of an initiator of programs. He's hesitant on this, but I don't worry about that, because I'm an initiator, anyway.

Nagorny: But, according to the American Constitution, is it possible, or no?

LaRouche: It is possible, technically, but that's a far reach. The point is, he's got a wife. He's got something in reserve. And she has actually, going into a position for which she was not really prepared—she wanted to be President, and she was qualified to run. But she, in office as Secretary of State, she's had a lot of experience, and gotten the feel of how to handle the Federal government. She was a participant in the atmosphere of the Federal government before, but she was not really a person to seize the reins of the Federal government. The Federal Presidency is a very tough thing to deal with, unless you understand it. And she has come, now, to understand it—with great pain, in the process of discovering it!

Nagorny: But generally speaking, you know, there should be really drastic changes in American approaches, and even in theory. Because, the IMF should be reconstructed, or maybe even dismantled.

LaRouche: No, we don't need the IMF. It's a mess now. What we need is really to get back to a fixed-exchange-rate system. Go back to that, because the prob-

lem is, we're operating on monetary systems. As long as we're functioning on monetarist systems, then we're prisoners of an international, effective imperial system, an imperial system of money, which is what monetarism always has been. If you have national credit systems, based on a national currency, and you also have a fixed-exchange-rate agreement among national systems, which means you're looking for two generations, three decades, four decades, for a future, so you have stability; therefore, you can have investment, under a fixed exchange rate, at very low interest rates, 1%, 1.5%, for a long-term investment.

Nagorny: A little bit more.

LaRouche: No, you don't need it.

You don't need more. Because the idea is, if you have a stabilized currency, you don't need more.

Infrastructure for Global Development

Clifford Kiracofe:

What you're talking about is large public investment.

LaRouche: Yes, public investment. The private thing is another matter. But it is the public infrastructure which is most important.

I've defined this more precisely, recently: You have to think in terms of a platform. Now, the original platform of European civilization was transoceanic, a maritime system. With Charlemagne, we went to another system. The system was still maritime, but based on a riparian system, with the use of canals to connect rivers. This opened the way for highways, for railroads. So the railroad revolution was a revolution.

All these things required a certain technology, in terms of energy-flux density. That is, you have to measure power in energy-flux density, not in calories. Be-



Clifford Kiracofe

cause it's a physical conception, a physical measure.

So, you have to build a platform. And the platform is largely located in what we would call public works. Public works, not the way some nations define them, but public works, in the sense of rail systems, power systems, public sanitation systems, these kinds of things. And also, to maintain a level of energy-flux density. That is, what is the power commanded by the individual at the point of production? Which is all located in this infrastructure.

So, what you need to do is have a system, which is not dependent upon some independent investor, with money, coming along and investing in this project. You have to have a state-controlled system, among nations.

Nagorny: And how about money emission?

LaRouche: A fixed-exchange-rate credit system, just like Roosevelt had, a fixed-exchange-rate system. It's when the fixed-exchange-rate system was cancelled that we got into this whole phase of this mess.

Nagorny: As far as I remember, in Europe, there was a certain fixed exchange, in the '70s, I guess.

LaRouche: Yes, it was the Roosevelt system. It was an extension of the fixed-exchange-rate system into Europe.

Nagorny: And it was dismantled by—

Jeffrey Steinberg: [George] Soros busted it up in '92.

LaRouche: You see, you have to go to figures like Presidents. You have to look at President Charles de Gaulle. Now, Charles de Gaulle's problem was he was an anti-fascist, and France was a fascist nation. That's how the Wehrmacht conquered France, because there were so many fascists in the French government; they just arranged all the things so that a superior French



UN Photo



Earl Bertrand Russell in London, 1962 (top), and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchov brandishing his shoe at the UN, 1960. Russell was a key British controller of the Soviet leader, and Russell's circles remain highly influential in Russia today.

force was defeated by a numerically inferior Wehrmacht, because it was corrupt as hell. And de Gaulle came back as the minority party, which was patriotic. And his second time, his second Presidency, as the Fifth Republic, he showed himself.

Now, de Gaulle's program was tremendous! It was the right program, and he was actually the right leader at that time.

British Manipulation of the Soviets

But Khrushchov was a British agent, of Bertrand Russell.

Nagorny: You know, generally speaking, you don't have to be a conscious agent. You can be conducted and ruled, just pulling the strings, knowing your psychology, and things like that.

LaRouche: Khrushchov may have going a couple of things going in his mind, but remember, he turned a couple of times

in his political history, from one thing to the other. He made a number of jumps at that time.

Nagorny: The most interesting situation, of course, is connected with his report to the 20th Congress [of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in 1956]. Of course, from the legal point of view, it was an absolutely illegal thing. Because in the Party, you have to discuss the documents with your colleagues; then put it to a vote, and then produce it to the Congress. And this was a kind of a coup d'état. All of a sudden, after the Congress is over, people are assembled, and he starts to read the report.

Then, the question, who actually wrote it? Because Khrushchov was a person with a very powerful will, but he was not very much a literate person—

LaRouche: It was the British!

Nagorny: —and, actually, there were three persons who were writing it. Comrade [Otto] Kuusinen, Mr. [Pyotr] Pospelov, and the third one, Boris Ponomaryov.

The three of them were preparing this report, and they, one way or another, convinced him that, in producing this report, actually, he would be smashing all the competitive figures around him. So he was doing it, thinking about his own interests.

LaRouche: You'll be very interested in this, then. First of all, Khrushchov advertised his relationship to British intelligence, as publicly and intentionally, by sending four representatives to the Bertrand Russell meeting of World Parliamentarians for World Government [in 1955]. That's when the official strategic coordination with British intelligence occurred. Now, this is also part of the same package with Russell, of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, in Laxenburg, Austria, which is a strong influence on Medvedev, today. That same crowd. They're great for this "money" thing, but no concrete investment. Money, abstract. It's the Pirates of the Caribbean who are controlling Russia, from the Caribbean, largely!

So, this thing was started then. But even before, there was an antecedent, which is a very hairy one. Stalin was off and on, on a lot of questions, but he was very strong on Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt. And he was committed to the survival of Roosevelt. He was committed to avoidance of war, after defeating the Nazis. And he was for the agreement with Roosevelt, on the Soviet Union and China. These were the three things which were key to the Roosevelt policy for the post-war period: not to worry about too many details about the internal structure of societies as such, but to build a system to end imperialism, and particularly to end British imperialism, which had dominated the planet in the previous period.

So, now, Stalin flipped back and forth on this, because he was enraged, at the same time, by the sense of betrayal, in the sense that everybody had been betrayed by the death of Franklin Roosevelt.

Roosevelt's Death: A Disaster for the World

So, what happened: Now you had, Eisenhower is now becoming President. And Eisenhower, like Douglas MacArthur, was committed to the same strategic policy as Roosevelt, as was the minority of the leadership of the OSS [Office of Strategic Services]. "Wild Bill" Donovan, the OSS.

So, these factors in U.S. intelligence, in the U.S. institutions associated with the Presidency—very important, is the Presidency—they were committed to "no conflict, no war conflict with Russia, or the Soviet



Library of Congress

Roosevelt and Stalin in Tehran, 1943. Roosevelt was committed to cooperation with the Soviet Union after the war. He told Secretary of State Edward Stettinius on Jan. 5, 1945: "It is my desire that every effort be made to continue the full and uninterrupted flow of supplies to the U.S.S.R." FDR died three months later, and his policy was wrecked by President Truman and the British.

Union, or China." The Roosevelt commitment was, to have a peaceful collaboration, which could evolve constructively, with the idea that technological progress, progress in the economy, would be the weapon through which improving of the cultural characteristics of nations could occur. But the main thing was to prevent the British from reconstituting their empire.

Now, this point was approaching, and Eisenhower was now going to become President of the United States. So the institutions of the United States reacted.

And you had an incident which occurred, also with Khrushchov's visit to Paris, for the Eisenhower-de Gaulle meeting [May 1960], right? A crucial point, which occurs twice in this part of history. And you remember what Eisenhower did, as President, in terms of the Suez crisis. He brought down the British prime minister.

Nagorny: Yes, I remember.

LaRouche: So that Eisenhower was a servant of the institutions of the United States, like Douglas MacArthur, and like some other people, who were essentially servants of the institutions. But, their ability to act was

based on the permission they had, to take certain actions, a permission which had to come, essentially, from the institution of the Presidency. So, whoever controlled the institution of the Presidency, would control this process. Now, you're approaching a point—the United States has just gone through the McCarthy period. Or rather, the British policy has been the preventive bombing of the Soviet Union, nuclear bombing: Bertrand Russell.

That policy had continued until the Soviet Union had developed a capable nuclear arsenal, before the United States had had a deployable one, except for a couple of pieces of junk. At that point, this collapsed. That was the end of Truman. Truman was going for a war against the Soviet Union.

Nagorny: But at that time, I think there were few warheads.

LaRouche: No, but it was still very effective. The Soviet nuclear program, weapons program, was sufficiently effective, to prevent the Russell idea of a preemptive attack from occurring.

Now, you have Eisenhower coming in. Eisenhower is coming in as a continuation of the Presidency, with people from the OSS, as from the military and so forth, who are part of the institutions of Presidency, or tied to it; if they're not members of the Presidency, they're tied to it by profession, by commitment, by emotion, and everything else. So, now it becomes: We have a policy. The previous President, who has been entrusted with the powers of the Presidency, is a sonuvabitch, an evil sonuvabitch, a fascist. Truman was really a fascist.

So, now, a new President Eisenhower. Eisenhower as President can make negotiations. He did, as in Korea. He orchestrated it, in the process of becoming President, this new era. That was the danger from the British standpoint. Ah! Stalin is going to make another move, to reconcile with the United States under a new President, and get rid of the Truman process.

Suddenly, miraculously, Stalin dies! And then, at a later point in this process, Khrushchov sends four personal representatives, to meet with Russell, in Russell's World Parliamentarians for World Government, and that's where the deal was cut.

Then you get the Paris conference, de Gaulle, Eisenhower—now President—and, now Khrushchov. Khrushchov just blows the thing up.

Now, the same thing happened again, with Kennedy, because Kennedy was also recognized as having this affinity. Kennedy was close, actually, to people like

Eisenhower, and especially to Douglas MacArthur, in terms of policy advisor. So, the continuity is, again, we're now going to have a peaceful arrangement, we're going to solve the problem. All right, what happens? The British organize the missile crisis—with Khrushchov. Then after this, the Central Committee tells Mr. Khrushchov to "go away." So, Brezhnev comes into the process.

Then Brezhnev has a problem, because his age catches up with him, very uncomfortably, and the Soviet Union has a problem.

The Fight Around the SDI

Nagorny: But, you know, Brezhnev was not, in effect, in command after his stroke, which took place in 1977, '78.

LaRouche: Exactly. You had an interim invisible government, of officials.

Nagorny: Actually, it was the big troika: [Yuri] Andropov, [Dmitri] Ustinov, and [Andrei] Gromyko, who were taking over.

LaRouche: So you had an interim government, which was a synthetic government, Soviet government, composed of these officials, while Brezhnev was not mentally in too good shape. They acted in his name, on his behalf, because they were looking for stability. It was a crisis, in fact, and it was in this process that the shift came in the following year.

So, in this process, this is what we had! And so, therefore the history was, as I said before, you had this breakout, and by that time, you had something left. You had another incident of the same type.

I had proposed what became known as the SDI. It was named that by people around Reagan, but it was my initiative. I created it, on the basis of several things that I was doing, including the scientific work.

When Reagan had been elected, and was about to become inaugurated as President, I got a message from a general officer, a Soviet officer in the United Nations, who sent me a message, and said, "How we can get to talk to the new President?" The Soviet interests. And so, I sent a letter to the White House, recommending that the White House accept this proposal for a discussion with this Soviet general, or whoever he was going to name as coming.

So, since I had already designed what became known as the SDI, I got this message back from the White House: "We're confused. It's very interesting; we're confused." So, the thing was transferred to the

National Security Council. And so, I was suitably sworn in—not actually sworn in, but technically, just to make things look good—and so, I ran the operation, and pulled scientists and others together for the SDI, and Reagan then, of course, endorsed it.

Andropov went the other way.

Now, this was possible, because you had people from the leadership of the OSS, and other military institutions of the United States, who agreed with me on this proposal. And, therefore, we had also a number of leading general officers from Germany, from France, and a few from Italy, as well, and from other places. So, we had an international commitment, which is, again, the same legacy, as the legacy of Franklin Roosevelt, the same legacy that you saw expressed by Eisenhower's role in becoming President, and what happened with the death of Stalin. You had the same thing, the problem with Khrushchov, same problem, same issue came up with the Paris meeting, of de Gaulle, Eisenhower, and Khrushchov. You had the same thing, a couple of times later. You had it again with what I experienced with the SDI. And we had a possibility of reviving the SDI. Reagan went for it, but then, Gorbachov went the other way, and Gorbachov was at that point very British, and he was operating on the British stage.

So, what happened is, that the people who represented that active legacy, from the World War II period, died out of old age. Except for a few, and they're pretty old, like me.

So, that is what the *real* thing is. There are processes in history, which today's generation has trouble understanding, because people today think in terms that, experience comes between birth and death of the individual. Whereas, my knowledge of social processes, the continuity of society, among *human* beings, as opposed to animals, is cultural. It's the transmission from one generation to another of ideas, which then may bear fruit in a future generation, or later generation. And that's the way things really work, in a good society, in a good situation in society. Because you have ideas, which are deeply embedded within the institutions of the nation.

Nagorny: Yes, but there are such institutions as Hollywood, which are not controlled, even by the President.

LaRouche: They're controlled by London. Hollywood is a house of prostitution, run from London.

Nagorny: But they're actually inducing the deterioration of morals and psychology of the people.

Kiracofe: It's the Frankfurt School concept.

LaRouche: But it's, actually, against the Presidency. It's a weak institution. The U.S. Presidency, when functioning, is a strong institution which can cope and deal with that. They can change a cultural trend. And a smart Presidency will do that.

Transmission of Cultural Principles

Matthew Ogden: One example, I think, is just important as a case in point. I was involved in helping to coordinate


Rachel Brown's and Kesha Rogers' Congressional campaigns. And what we did with Rachel Brown in Massachusetts, was, we shaped her entire campaign around something: We made a video, entitled "The Two Massachusetts." And we brought to the surface a sense of historical patriotism that lies



Matthew Ogden

in the people of Massachusetts, going all the way back to 1630, when the first colonies were formed in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. And these were the foundations of the ideas of the credit system, the Glass-Steagall, but these were formed with Cotton Mather and with John Winthrop, and it's something which is in the blood of people, in that area of the country. And that's something that Rachel saw very clearly, in terms of the response that she got to her campaign, from people who might not even be conscious that this is what their history necessarily is. I think it's a good proof of principle of the way that things work here.

LaRouche: Part of the problem is, that we live in a society which has a very reductionist ideology, and people have lost sight of the fact that there are cultural principles which are implicitly embedded in society, even explicitly embedded in society. And these cultural principles are not mortal, in the sense that the human being, individually, is mortal. But certain cultural tendencies, certain cultural commitments, are transmitted from successive generations. And essentially, in putting nations together in cooperation, you have to look at the cultural depths of many successive generations of those people, and you have to find a way of bringing those cultural tendencies into cooperation, not just individuals into cooperation. If you want a secure treaty agree-



*The Russian Navy arrives in New York harbor, to support the Union in the U.S. Civil War. The headlines are from the *New York Herald*, Sept. 29 and Oct. 2, 1863.*

ment, you want a secure partnership among nations, you have to bring the cultural trends in those nations into agreement, that is, into cooperative agreement. Then it works. Because then, real moral trust can occur. Without that kind of thing, real deep, moral trust can not occur; you get only incidental or coincidental kinds of cooperation, which becomes highly unstable, because they're easily unstabilized.

You know, like the relations with Russia, historically. The relationship of the United States to Russia is located in the 18th Century, is located in—well, actually, through the middle of the century, through the League of Armed Neutrality. Russia played a key role in that business, in Europe. So then, you had incidents. You had incidents in the early 19th Century. You had, around the U.S. Civil War, the Russian fleet protected New York and San Francisco. And it had a commitment from the Tsar to defend those things against the British operation. You had other things like that which occurred.

You had, also, a close relationship with Bismarck and the Tsar—two Tsars, actually. And the second one, Nicholas, got weak, and then the British were able to manipulate them.

Michael Kirsch: You also had Cassius Clay, the diplomat, under Lincoln. He taught American System economics in the Cabinet of Alexander II.

LaRouche: So, what you have, is the thing which I

count on, is the unity and cooperation among cultures. And you try to enrich the culture that you're dealing with, and you find a cultural bond among different cultures. And those bonds, which are deeply embedded in part of the population as a whole of these respective peoples, is the securest basis for solving problems which may arise among those nations.

Kiracofe: But, Lyn, also, the cultures are under attack, as you've pointed out in the past, by our friends in the Frankfurt School, and others, who are systematically attacking cultures, to prevent just what you're saying.

LaRouche: I usually refer to Aeschylus in this, the Aeschylus drama, to get a sense of the depth of the cultural history of European civilization. When you see this relationship, you have a sense that it is culture which is the fundamental bond among peoples. And it's those things you have to go to, and enrich,

and strengthen. And then you have a real, an immortal understanding, as opposed to a simple mortal one.

Nagorny: A very difficult situation exists in the cultural exchanges, right now, because if you take the Russian political spectrum of opinions, you will see that the pro-American segment of the elite is mainly ultra-liberal oriented, such as Chubais. And, you know, they are trying to insert the worst things from the United States onto the Russian territory. And that's why the reflective impulse of the public opinion is becoming anti-American. And how to cut off this kind of interaction, it's not—

LaRouche: We have this especially from George H.W. Bush. Clinton was an interim on this one, and the relations with Russia were not bad with Clinton; this shows even today. But then you have George W. Bush, Jr. for eight years, and you have this idiot clown, this fascist clown, who is now President of the United States, and you have the influence of the British on U.S. policy. You have the corruption of neighboring countries of Russia, as in Poland, as in Germany, as in France—France is a little more resistant—and that's what the problem is. You have created, you've introduced a bad cultural factor which has a cultural effect, and the only way to correct that is to reestablish roots in that, which was understood in U.S.-Russian relationships back in

the 18th Century and 19th Century, repeatedly, up until the outbreak of war. And if the United States had not gone to war, on the side of Britain, in what's called the First World War, it would have remained that way. It's when the President of the United States was assassinated, and the Vice President was a pig, and the United States, therefore, got involved on the British side in the First World War, is when all the hell broke loose: There could not have occurred, the First World War, except for the death of—

Rachel Douglas: He's talking about the McKinley assassination, the shift to Anglophilia in the U.S. institutions.

Kiracofe: The shifting of the United States toward a more pro-British position.

LaRouche: I mean, the President was a British agent! Wilson was a British agent! Coolidge was a British agent. Hoover was a British agent.

Kiracofe: Colonel House was a British agent.

LaRouche: Roosevelt was a shift back. So you had, from McKinley to [Franklin] Roosevelt, a gap in American history. And what Roosevelt did, Roosevelt's approach was to go back, and to restore the tradition of his ancestor, Isaac Roosevelt, who formed the Bank of New York, who was a close associate of Alexander Hamilton.

So, we have these shifts constantly, which always is what I'm sensitive to, these cultural shifts, which are the most important. Because they don't deal with mortal, physical individuals. They deal with something which is transmitted from generation to generation as a cultural transmission. It's associated with the use of a language, with its literature, its music, and so forth. And scientific culture. And, for example, you have in Russia, today, you have among people who are rather aged, right now, as I am, you have people from the Vernadsky Institute and people like that, who represent a long history of Russian culture in the form of scientific and related culture. It's these factors, cultural factors, which are the most enduring, for the good, or for the bad.

Kirsch: How many people do you know, in Russia, who know that Adam Smith is a fraud?

Nagorny: Oh, not many. Not many, definitely. Because those who actually study American history, I would say, that even among them, you will find maybe four or five persons, who would penetrate into that depth of things. Generally, they go very superficially, looking through some textbooks, and simplified history

things. And it's a very, I would say, illogical picture among Russian historians who approach American history. Because some of them are, as I said, liberals, and they're trying to take up all the things in a positive light, and especially from the liberal viewpoint. And the others, they are trying to analyze it mainly with a negative light.

Kirsch: The errors of the free market, or something.

Nagorny: Well, because of different explanations. But, generally, I would say that right now, there are good Russian historians which conduct research in American history, especially on the Presidents.

Kirsch: But they're not involved in the policymaking of the Russian government.

Nagorny: No, no.

An Anti-Free-Trade Impulse in Russia

Douglas: I have a related question, because there's kind of a pattern, but it's more isolated incidents, which actually speak to what Michael raised—just in the recent years. Looking for people in Russia who are anti-neo-liberal, but are *not* brainwashed to be totally anti-American, you see certain things.

Nagorny: That's the question, actually, which I raised, also.

Douglas: Here's the things I'm thinking of, and I want to know whether these things that I mention, you see as accidental, flash-in-the-pan, or are they really a pattern.

About six or seven years ago, Valeri Fadeyev, the editor of *Expert*, published a book, which was simply translations of the economic writings of Friedrich List, the collaborator of Mathew and Henry Carey, really the American System in Europe; List, [Dmitri] Mendeleyev, and [Sergei] Witte. Mendeleyev, of course, was in an intense discussion with the Americans on anti-British, anti-free trade economic policy, and was known as much as an anti-free-trader, as he was as a chemist.

Fadeyev published this book with an introduction—



Rachel Douglas

I translated it, and we put it in *EIR*⁴—saying, “This is the missing school of thought in the Russian economic policy deliberations.”

Second, there was an article in a magazine, by Alexander Fomenko.⁵ He wrote, about four or five years ago, an article on “the natural alliance which nobody ever talks about, namely the friendship between United States and Russia.” And he brought out things: not only the Lincoln-Alexander alliance, but other things that are even controversial for Russia, and were at the time, like on the question of the purchase of Alaska. He brought out how, historically, the people in Russia who negotiated this purchase with [U.S. Secretary of State William] Seward, defended themselves against the charge of sellout, by arguing that, “No, this was very good, because the important thing was to box in the British, and for reasons of economic development and proximity,” said these Russian advocates of the deal,

4. Rachel Douglas, “Russian Editor: Revive National System of Political Economy,” *EIR*, July 1, 2005, <http://tiny.cc/54suh>.

5. Konstantin Cherenmykh and Rachel Douglas, “Russians Look at Strategic Meaning of Historical Alliance with U.S.A.,” *EIR*, June 8, 2007, <http://tiny.cc/8ypcr>.

“America would be in a better position to do that from Alaska than Russia could, and then we could move on to cooperation, including on the Pacific Rim.”

Then there was the actual conference held at MGIMO [Moscow State Institute of International Relations], on the 125th anniversary of Roosevelt’s birth.⁶ This was 2007, where even [former President Putin’s chief of staff Vladislav] Surkov was speaking. And the cynics were saying, “Oh, this is all just because they want to play up FDR, because Putin wants a third term, and FDR had four terms.” But if you read the content of the speeches given there, these were not superficial speeches, in terms of the appreciation of what Roosevelt’s economic policy had been, as a fight against the monetarists. So that was a third incident.

And then, you have things which, as you have indicated, might have some joking element in them, from Dr. [Igor] Panarin, but are also very interesting: namely, when Panarin writes his scenarios about the U.S. breaking up, he often says, “The force attacking the United States is the British, just as the force attacking Russia is the British. Maybe we would put Gorbachov on trial retrospectively as a British agent”—these kinds of things.

Not to mention, of course, the [2007] Bering Strait conference⁷ itself, which the late Academician [Alexander] Granberg held, [Victor] Razbegin from the SOPS⁸ held, in which there was really the sense that you would build this tunnel, as a matter of mutual interest for the development of both countries.

How do you see those views as being organized?

Nagorny: I know people whom you enumerated. I would put, also, Vladimir Pechatnov onto this list, and some others working in different institutes.

You know, among Russian historians and politologists, you wouldn’t find outspoken anti-Americanism, per se. But, at the same time, anti-Americanism will appear, because of the domestic discussion, or domestic conflict, between liberals and non-liberals. If we characterize people which you mentioned, Fadeyev right now is rather important person in the establishment, heading a special discussion forum, and, at the same

6. Rachel Douglas, “Franklin Roosevelt in Post-Soviet Russia,” *EIR*, Feb. 23, 2007, <http://tiny.cc/ksbpa>.


7. See Rachel Douglas, “Megaprojects of Russia’s East: A Trans-Continental Eurasia-America Transport Link via the Bering Strait,” *EIR*, May 4, 2007, <http://tiny.cc/448zx>.

8. Russian Academy of Sciences Council for the Study of Productive Forces.

GENOCIDE


RUSSIA AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

Russia in the 1990s: “The rate of annual population loss has been more than double the rate of loss during the period of Stalinist repression and mass famine in the first half of the 1930s . . . There has been nothing like this in the thousand-year history of Russia.”
—Sergei Glazyev



Paperback, with a preface by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

\$20 Order #ER 2267



Economist Dr. Sergei Glazyev was Minister of Foreign Economic Relations in Boris Yeltsin’s first cabinet, and was the only member of the government to resign in protest of the abolition of Parliament in 1993.

ORDER FROM
EIR News Service, Inc.
P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
Order by phone, toll-free: **800-278-3135**
OR order online at **www.larouchepub.com**
Shipping and handling: \$4.00 for first book, \$1.00 for each additional book.
Virginia residents add 5% sales tax. We accept Visa or MasterCard.

time, he is the head of some institute, along with his position, editor-in-chief for *Expert*. But you have to understand that Fadeyev is not a person who is producing the policy line. He is a PR and propaganda person, who is used by the Kremlin liberals, to keep harnessed public opinion.

Alexander Fomenko, he's a bright person, who served as a member of parliament in the Glazyev faction. And he speaks several languages and he's a very knowledgeable historian. He is, in his political position, a supporter of monarchy. And he is closely communicating with former Roman families in Europe, and with the Bourbon family, who have rather sharp anti-British sentiments, historically, because they consider that the French Revolution was arranged entirely as a British diversion, attack against the French, France's state.

LaRouche: Against the United States, also.

Kiracofe: Punishing the French for supporting us.

Empires and Revolutions

Nagorny: But I think that revolutions, of course, can be supported by certain foreign parties and powers, but, at the same time, they develop by themselves, because there are conditions for that. Of course, this or that can use these conditions, but still, it's not a concocted thing, you know?

LaRouche: Look at it from the standpoint of empire, the real conception of empire. I know the problem we run into is the fact that most people don't have a competent conception of empire. Ironically, one of the few people, historians, who had a conception of empire was Rosa Luxemburg, and all her contemporaries were wrong. She defined empire as based on international loans, that is she was referring to a monetarist system, and whoever controls the monetarist system can control the currencies and welfare of the world. And so, this was the issue at that time.

The other side of the issue was, of course, the American issue. The British were against the Americans, the American Revolution; the Americans were the threat to the British. So, therefore, once the international railway systems were developed, then you had the so-called geopolitical conflict, between the United States, on the one hand, the nations of Eurasia on the other hand, against the British. And the British handled that, by organizing wars among the nations of continental Europe.

And in these cases, the wars and the revolutions that followed—for example, take the case of Frederick Engels, who always was a British agent. So-called

“Parvus” was his personal creation. He deployed Parvus into Germany; he also organized the arms business which Parvus was operating on, which was run together with the Young Turk movement, which Parvus was a part of. And the point was, the policy of the British was Parvus's policy! Permanent war/permanent revolution, which he drew Trotsky into, in terms of the 1905 Revolution, or the late part of the 1905 Revolution. It was Parvus who sold him on that thing: permanent war/permanent revolution.

This was typical. The British, beginning with the Napoleonic Wars, but even earlier: The British Empire was established as an empire, in the war, in 1763, the Peace of Paris, which set all the nations of Europe, except the Dutch and the British, into war among each other. So you had a Seven Years War, which involved everybody, ruined Europe, and had the specific, later purpose, when it was done again, of getting the United States isolated, totally, by aid of the Napoleonic Wars. The Napoleonic Wars were essentially what was used to destroy the United States. Because the United States had an alliance with Spain, had an alliance with France, and had an alliance with the League of Armed Neutrality under Catherine. All of these nations were destroyed! By British direction, orchestration of the Napoleonic Wars.

Kiracofe: And with World War I, the British get rid of the Russian Empire, the Austrian, and the Turkish.

LaRouche: And Bismarck understood this thing clearly. Bismarck had a secret agreement with the Russian Tsar, and the secret agreement was, if the Emperor of Germany were to decide to ally himself with the Emperor of Austria, the Habsburg, in a Balkan war, that Bismarck guaranteed to the Tsar that Germany would not support the Austrians in a Balkan war. And for that reason, in particular, the British organized the discharge of Bismarck, and what became known as war, of the 20th Century, became possible; beginning with the first war, with the war of Japan against China, a new war against China; then the war against Korea, and against Russia, up through 1905 and beyond.

So, most of the revolutions, in this whole period, have been organized by empires. Now, you look back in history, you go back to the Roman Empire, the Roman method of rule was by getting—

Nagorny: Barbarians fighting against each other.

LaRouche: Destroying nations.

Nagorny: But, you know what happened to the Roman Empire?

LaRouche: Exactly. So, the history has always been

Prime Minister Putin has the advantage of a coalition of disparate forces, but also becomes its prisoner, LaRouche said. The coalition includes the hard-core monetarists shown here.



©WEF/swiss-image.ch/Sebastian Derungs
Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister Alexei Kudrin



©WEF/swiss-image.ch/Michael Würtenberg
Aluminum tycoon Oleg Deripaska

Privatizer Anatoly Chubais



Creative Commons/Jürg Volmer

Presidential advisor on economics Arkady Dvorkovich



©WEF/swiss-image.ch/Monika Flückiger



that the imperial system, which has always been based in European history on a monetarist system, and whatever power was a supranational power, controlled the monetarist system, could regulate the monetarist system, could control the forces of nations, and put them against each other. And that's still the case today.

So, that's the nature of the beast: that we are living in a situation where people believe in money. They believe that money represents wealth—which is idiocy! Money does not represent wealth! Wealth represents the productive forces in society. That's wealth. It's not money! We have this idiot [Sen.-elect Rand Paul], these Republicans, who just announced their program. They're idiots! They're nasty idiots, they're snake-like, poisonous idiots, but they're idiots!

Nagorny: Generally, right now, we see that China is the single nation which actually is absolutely independent in its economic decisions. And although there is a very strong pressure against the yuan, with revaluation

of the yuan, but nothing actually comes out of it.

LaRouche: Well, what comes out, is now coming out, as also with India. You had a qualitative shift, as Russia has become less significant, under the Medvedev Presidency. It was much more significant under Putin.

Where Cooperation Can Emerge

Nagorny: You know, our problem is that Putin is not very much different from Medvedev. He's better, of course; he has some more sober ideas. But at the same time, for some unknown reason, he is absolutely in line with Mr. Kudrin, number one position. We

do not understand how and why, he is suppressing the money supply in Russia.

LaRouche: May I suggest what the problem is? The problem is, you have Putin, who is obviously a nationalist, by his own personal instinct; he's a Russian nationalist. But his power lies in a confederation of confused forces, by which certain methods of corruption and other methods are used, manipulation. So, you have a man who represents the embodiment of this power, which he controls. But the power he holds is contingent upon playing these other elements, which are essentially disparate elements. So he becomes now, a prisoner: At the same time that he has the advantage of the coalition, he becomes a prisoner of this coalition of disparate forces.

And from my reading of some things I've seen, the possibility of close cooperation between Bill Clinton and Putin is a strong possibility. However, for the moment, because of these complications, nothing much is coming of it, at the present moment. There was a venture made in that direction, but the thing was, too soon, too soon.

Steinberg: The thing that struck me on that, when

Alexander Nagorny was going through this profile of the way that the Khodorkovsky operation is about to be potentially used to bring down Putin, I think that it's not so much what he is, but looking—also from the British vantage-point—at what we're up to, what the Clinton crowd are up to, and others in the U.S., the potentiality for that renewal of that combination is enough of a threat to prompt this whole Jacob Rothschild British crowd to want to make a decisive move now against Putin.

LaRouche: It's more than that, Jeff. The point is you've got: The significance here, strategically, is Russia, China, and India. That's the crucial strategic point. And the question of how the United States relates to that partnership around Russia, China, and India.

Kiracofe: In a Westphalian format.

LaRouche: Absolutely. It's the only possible solution, strategically, for this situation.


The Imperial Game

Now, the purpose is not to promote Medvedev against Putin. The purpose is, is to prevent Russia from having a government which can hold itself together on the basis of a principle—then it [London] becomes totally vulnerable.

Nagorny: Yes, because if Medvedev wins this kind of competition, of course, he's too weak to keep the territories together, control different forces, and we will see, of course, the process of separation: separation economically, financially, politically, because the oligarchs wouldn't care anything about Mr. Medvedev. The regional leaders also will think their own and will play their own game.

Kiracofe: Brzezinski has already said that he wants to separate Siberia out.

Nagorny: You see, generally, the game is very intricate, as my friends, specialists on China, say, that Brzezinski and company suggested to China the "G2" formula, saying, "America and China will decide everything, everyone, the rest of the gang may go to Hell." But the Chinese, they rejected this idea in a very rude form. Then, after that happened, China finds itself



Zbigniew Brzezinski's crazed geopolitical worldview, as published in the journal of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, September-October 1997. The map on the right shows Russia chopped up into several "confederated" states.

in a very vulnerable position, and now it feels different pressures from different directions. And the demand, in terms of the currency revaluation, is one of these pressures.

LaRouche: They can't accept it, the Chinese can not accept it.

Nagorny: No. Same as the thing with this Nobel Prize winner, and other things, spy scandals.

Kiracofe: Islamic activity in the Uighur zone.

Nagorny: They are pressed, and as we understand this idea of a union, an alliance with [the NATO] alliance, the United States is prepared to pressure the Chinese, saying that, "You see? Russia and the old Europe created some kind of a formal alliance, and now NATO is on your borders. So let us better return back to the G2 formula, and think how to divide Siberia." Something like that—a simplified version, of course.

LaRouche: That's exactly what Medvedev's policy is on this negotiation, on the treaty negotiation on weapons. That's the intent from the European side.

Nagorny: You see, I can't understand how Medvedev could attain this position, because he's too weak, but he's being supported from different sides to go further.

LaRouche: What about the Pirates of the Caribbean? That's the control mechanism.

Nagorny: So, what happens next, nobody knows. But, for example, his visit to the Kurile Islands, is also very interesting, because they understand that they should pass Medvedev off as some kind of Russian nationalist, very patriotic, no territories to Europe, of course, in anticipation of the Presidential campaign.

Steinberg: So, you think it was a domestic political ploy.

War Against the British Faction in the U.S.

Kirsch: You see the way, in Lyn's webcast yesterday, the way he started out was: We have to understand our own history. Where does the power of the nation-state come from? And you can see with Rand Paul and these fanatic, fascist Republicans, who all push the magic of the marketplace, that somehow you'll get an excretion



Michael Kirsch

through the flow of buying and selling that will generate some product, right? That this is gripping not only the Russian leadership, but it's this unspoken thing, throughout, I think, everything, is the lack of understanding the power of what is a sovereign nation-state—and how it's antithetical to some external monetary group, that says, "Here's the value of money," or some external market—which generates progress.

Kiracofe: There's always been a British faction here. That British faction never went away, after our Revolution. It's still here. So you have London Republicans and London Democrats, and then you have patriotic ones. So, your liberals over there, so-called, neo-liberals, are meeting with the London faction of our people here. They're not meeting with the real nationalists.

Kirsch: And that's why I asked you about Adam Smith. It was because, we can see: The whole theme of Lyn's webcast yesterday was understanding what the powers of a republic are, in terms of the currency, but also, in terms of the economy. You would never get some something like NAWAPA, via different companies somehow building a new rail system, or somehow building a nuclear power plant. There has to be some idea which guides the economy.

Kesha Rogers: I think, going back to this conception, I realized during the campaigns, this idea that the only solution, the real solution is going to come from the United States, is critical. Because what we represented is—as Lyn pointed out—a mission-orientation for the entire world, that has been lost sight of. And what you were bringing up earlier, about this type of objective liberal mentality that people are taking on, that there's no conception of truth: I mean, this is what's

destroying the thinking in the population. And so, you think about how dangerous it is, where, in the United States, you have this monetarist view of economics. And we see the dirty operations of it, on both sides of the aisle, especially during the campaigns.

What we fought against, Rachel Brown and myself, with calling for the immediate removal of President Obama, because this guy is a psycho, and what he represents is the British imperial and London financial interests. And so, you can recognize why people like [Rep.] Barney Frank, on the Democratic side, and people like my opponent [Rep. Pete Olson] on the Republican side, both can sort of unite, because they represent the same interest. And what we said, is, the only way you're going to stop this, is to get this insane President out, and to implement a Glass-Steagall banking reorganization. And that hasn't really come up in the discussion. Because there's no way you're going to stop this economic collapse without the implementation of Glass-Steagall in the United States.

And it dawned on me, as we were in the webcast, yesterday, that Lyn made the very critical point, that you have these Republicans coming in. I'll just say this: The incumbent that I ran against in the election for U.S. Congress in the 22nd District, was the liaison, the lackey to Phil Gramm! Who destroyed Glass-Steagall in '99. And when I was running in the election, I said, "Okay, well,



LPAC-TV

Kesha Rogers campaigns in Houston, Oct. 16, 2010. Her Congressional campaign put the impeachment of Obama front and center.

I'm running against this guy," I said, "He's not a threat, he's just like some . . . he's not even articulate! He can't talk!" But when I had the opportunity to sit down in a chair next to him, I said, "Oh, wow, this guy *is* dangerous." He seems like he's not dangerous, because he couldn't really express his ideas so well, but at the same time, when he started talking about the corruption of government, getting rid of all of these government organizations, how government needs to be out of people's lives. He praises the free market, he believes. . . . I mean, this is a guy who—I think he was taught magic—

Kiracofe: It's the destruction of the state! The goal is the destruction of the state. Actually, it was a book called *The State* by a Frankfurt School guy in the 1920s, [Lassa] Oppenheim, and that book is the basis of Bill Buckley and some of these other conservatives. It's an attack on the *state*.

Americans, as Lyn explains, we're very proud of our institutions. And so, as Americans, we're very proud of our Congress, and our institutions. But, what the right wing has done, has imported, under these libertarian ideas, supposedly, an attack on the state, as the state. But we *are* the state: It's a republic! So, it's an attack on republican principles.

Rogers: Right. And if you don't get people to think in terms of the idea of commitment to nation and not commitment to party, as Lyn brought up, I mean, you're going to have a complete—. Because, it is true: Obama was already talking about shutting various social programs, shutting down Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and so forth, and this is exactly what the Republicans want, so it's just a smooth transition for them. And it's all a part of the monetarist view, instead of, as you said, commitment to a republic, commitment to nation-state.

And so, what our three campaigns represented, here in the United States, was the only direction and potential toward a real solution to the type of thinking that has degenerated and corrupted the population, into thinking, "Okay, you can actually just have your objective view; there's no commitment to truth. The view can only be that of, okay, money is what rules the world." And, I mean, that's taken over the political view, or the economic view, in almost every other nation, because the U.S. has been the model of that—or, should I say, the British Empire, and their view of monetarism.

And so, this question of Adam Smith becomes very critical, because that's what's corrupted economic policy throughout the entire planet. And I think what

we have represented in these three campaigns is that, unless there's a shift from the United States, and you can actually have a driver, and leadership, which can challenge both sides—the Republicans, Democrats, or whoever you are—that the only solution comes from this commitment to patriotism; and patriotism being, not a commitment to parties, but a commitment to the principles of nation. That should be the model for the rest of the world.

Because if you can't get Obama out, then you can have corruption in leadership, controlled by the British all across the board. And so you'll see this domino effect, which is very important.

Nagorny: But it could take a rather long period of time, to win people to this side. And the critical events may take place rather quickly, as LaRouche was saying, and actually we will anticipate that the events, dramatic events are approaching. But of course, dramatic events, they may give a new impulse for clarification.

And what do you think about this leakage of the documents, from WikiLeaks?

Kiracofe: You know, there was opposition to both of those wars, from the very beginning. And really, if you look at the Iraq War—I had some experience on the Iraq War—if you look at the Iraq War, the intelligence community, and military professionals, and diplomats were opposed to the Iraq War. It's a politicians' war, basically on behalf of London. So there are institutions that are opposing this imperial policy.

Nagorny: But do you think that some remote person in Scandinavia could crack the cipher, and penetrate to the secret documents? What is the political sense of these leakages?

Steinberg: Well, it was intended to create a certain embarrassment. The first set of leaks were clearly aimed at creating a lot of embarrassment of the U.S. mishandling of the Pakistan-Afghanistan situation, and putting certain things out in terms of corruption by [Afghan President Hamid] Karzai. And then the second set of documents were focussed on Iraq. But these are very raw, these are raw field reports. These are documents that were at the level of Secret, not Top Secret, or anything higher. They were basically field reports from tactical deployments.

I think the real issue is: What was the intent of the leaks, and then the big media barrage around them? It was intended to basically further destabilize the situa-

tions in two war fronts, where the sane people in the United States want us to get the hell out of both of them. There's no reason for maintaining a continued military presence, the way we have it in Afghanistan, and there's no reason whatsoever for retaining 50,000 troops for the long haul in Iraq.



Jeffrey Steinberg

So, this created, in a certain sense, more of a disruption and a distraction. Because the real, the decisive fight is around the Obama question, is around the Glass-Steagall issue, and whether or not we're going to reestablish a functioning Presidency in the U.S. If that happens, it's a very clear, specific group of people, who are going to take the reins of power back, through perfectly Constitutional means, and under those circumstances, we are in a situation, where the next strategic logic is going to be to develop this Four Powers [U.S.A., Russia, China, and India] cooperation. It'll completely transform the strategic landscape very quickly.

You get Glass-Steagall through, in the United States, and that's something that can, in fact, be accomplished, during the immediate weeks ahead, in the lame-duck session of Congress. I mean, that was the purpose of Lyn's very, very tough message yesterday, to a general audience, but also a very specific audience, of people who were asking for Lyn's guidance on how to proceed over the immediate days ahead. There are some very, very heady decisions, that certain very specific people are going to have to make, which will determine whether or not we end this Obama Presidency under the right circumstances. And so, there was a universal audience, privileged to a very high-level, semi-private discussion. And that dynamic is now going to play out over the next several days.

And the thing that Lyn said the day before the election was, don't draw any conclusions from the numbers. We knew in advance what the outcome of the elections, more or less, was going to be. The issue was, how were people going to react, in the few days afterwards? How was that going to be presented at the webcast, yesterday? And what's going to happen as a result of the dialogue that occurred yesterday? That's, right now, the most crucial strategic process playing out, over the next

week, ten days, whatever. And that's going to have an enormous impact on events that haven't yet happened. And that's going to really make a determination, precisely because, as you just said a moment ago, we are in a period, where events in the short term, are going to have such a decisive impact, because of the nature of the global disintegration process now under way, that those kinds of things, are going to be looked back on as real turning points in history.

That's where we are right now.

Kiracofe: There's also, that, as Lyn points out, with the resignation issue, Nixon resigned. The Republicans and others went: He didn't have support in the House of Representatives; there was that whole trial going on. So, Nixon realized, even Republicans were turning against him, so he had to pull out. Watergate trial. And Agnew resigned. And [Lyndon] Johnson wouldn't stand for re-election, right?

So, what Lyn is suggesting, it's perfectly logical in terms of domestic American politics. Other seated Presidents, or people who aspired to be President again, pull back and resigned, or did not run.

Steinberg: This is also where the British factor comes to play very prominently. There were clearly certain people in the upper echelons of the Democratic Party side of the establishment, in 1968, who realized that it was essential to put Robert Kennedy in as President, and made the move against Johnson, with the idea of the succession to Kennedy, who would have won the Presidency in '68 by a landslide. So there was an attempt, internally, within the United States, to correct the mistake, the horrible blunder that Johnson made with the British guns pointed to the back of his head, after [John] Kennedy was killed, of going into Vietnam. The Robert Kennedy move in '68 would have been a significant effort, to put things back on a certain track, even after we had gotten into this Vietnam mess. And the British stepped in and had Robert Kennedy assassinated, along with Martin Luther King, without which you would not have had Nixon in the Presidency.

So, this British factor, any time you ever take your eye off of it, you're doing it at great risk, if you're involved in serious global politics. And I think that's why understanding the historical foundations, is crucial.

We were talking, just on the way over here, about the fact that with Obama and the Rand Paul-type Republicans, you've got a perfect marriage of two British networks: the Martin Van Buren Democrats and the

Austrian School Republicans. So, if you understand the background of that history, you see that we're living through a continuing fight against the British intervention into the U.S. political scene.

Kiracofe: Also, I have to definitely emphasize what Lyn said about fascism. This is extremely important, because, in the United States, the attack on FDR in the 1930s, was by a very powerful network of industrialists and bankers, Wall Street people and big business. And they organized an organization, the American Liberty League, and that organization was independent of the Democrats *and* the Republicans. It was an independent power-center. And they launched a massive attack on the Roosevelt Administration. After World War II, that organization, in various ways, has reconstructed itself. So, on the Republican side, the current "right-wing" quote/unquote Republicans basically feed back into a pre-World War II fascist, avowedly fascist, powerful American network, which is what Lyn is referring to about American fascism. So it's a very real, and historic problem we have here.

The public doesn't perceive it, because, as Jeff pointed out, the right-wing Republicans are using the Austrian School—rhetoric? I don't know how you want to say it, but it's really fascism, but it's being packaged as libertarianism, or "against the state." So it's being packaged in a way without using maybe Mussolini's terms, or Hitler's terms. It's being packaged in a way.

Michelle Lerner: But the attack on Franklin Roosevelt is still very explicit by them.

Kiracofe: *Very* explicit, that one is, yes! And that's their sort of talisman.

Steinberg: And by Obama.

Kiracofe: They're kind of cute, because they'll attack FDR, and they'll try to use the Austrian School, rather than attacking FDR like they did in the '30s, and praising Mussolini, or even Hitler, for that matter. So they learned their lesson about how to do it, but the attack is the same attack, definitely, absolutely.

Nagorny: But at the same time, you know, to dismantle this system, one has to struggle with such colossal structures as Goldman Sachs, and others.

LaRouche: But sometimes, the point is, the bigger they are, the harder they fall.

Study the Lessons of History

One can't use simplistic thinking to deal with these kinds of problems. You've got to really understand the

process. And you've got to use history. You've got to understand "secret things," so-called, which are lying there in the population, which influence them. People always like to read newspaper headlines, and often they become brainwashed by believing newspaper headlines. But, this distracts attention from what may be the real process.

You know, out there, while they're talking about this fight about politicians, you've got a population out there which is desperate, and enraged. And these fascists, like [Rand] Paul's crowd, *don't know what they're dealing with!* You can get a bloody street battle in the United States, *very violent* street battles in the United States, against these fascists. And it'll come perfectly spontaneously: It'll come as a mass strike. We're on the threshold of a mass-strike explosion against these fascists.

And that, then, becomes another factor: Then, what, when you have a mass-strike movement, how do you consolidate the mass-strike movement as a stable movement, as a stable political process? And that's where the art of politics comes in: It's how do you get stability, when you have a riotous, revolutionary situation? And often, people have failed to solve that problem.

We're on the verge, if this does not go through, the first phase is, they get through, they get the Democrats to capitulate, and they try the blackmail. That will lead to an explosion in the population. The explosion in the population can bring that down. But how do you calm things down afterward? With what institutional methods do you calm things down?

In other words, you eliminate the evil force, destroy it, make it immune. You've got to put a force back in, which is capable of being government, and reuniting the people. That's been done, but it's something that does not happen spontaneously. It happens because you think about it.

Ian Overton: That reminds me of some of the things you've been saying, in the paper you wrote, on the need to maybe stop looking at psychology from the standpoint of an individual, but to look at psychology from the standpoint of long historical processes, like a Percy Shelley psychology. We've been talking about a lot of different individuals who've taken up positions of authority, and their lack of moral caliber, and ability to handle crises such as this. I think that there's a direct relationship between the moral failures of leaders in society, and their disconnect from these long historical processes that shape and move people. Because they

live and think from the standpoint of, “I was born, I exist, I die, I cease to exist,” they’re unable to comprehend or tap into, and move and shape these long historical processes.

LaRouche: And that’s the issue of leadership. That, the true leader in society is not the so-called leader. The true leader in society is the person who has a higher understanding, of how the mind works, and speaks from that standpoint; because the ordinary people don’t have that conception, they’re responsive to it. That’s the distinction. That’s why I wrote this whole series of papers on this subject, not only because of science—primarily it was a scientific motive. *But!* The key thing is that you have to have a higher understanding than is popular, about how the human mind works. Most people don’t even have a beginning of knowing how it works. But those of us who are taking responsibility for leadership, have to. Otherwise, we’re not competent.

NAWAPA and the Vernadsky Tradition

Kirsch: I can add one thing that I’ve been thinking about the past few days, of how to address the sudden mass-strike that you’re referring to. Because, there was some footage we had on our website of major protests in Europe of the budget cuts going on there. And the question is how you speak to that kind of rage, with something that would move them into an orderly group? Well, I thought back to the way in which we presented the image on our website of the NAWAPA project, because Mr. LaRouche told us that we had to put some kind of image that would move people, rather than just a formal, “Here’s the way out the depression,” right? But something that speaks to a different aspect of their mind.

We had a response because of both the detail of the proposal—we used this engineering report that had already been done—and the way we presented it with the 3-D image. We got a certain response from people, that we hadn’t had—from my memory in this movement—of people watching a video and saying, “Omigosh! This is fantastic!” All kinds of these different groups, and corporations, and so forth.


Now, I consider, we’re dealing with this radical fascist movement of people who think that there should be “hard currency,” no government, no government currency, no government promotion of anything, and just this radical free market. And you have, then, the response to the blowup of the currency, the collapse of the value of our currency, and massive budget cutting, as Lyn has said, the cut-off of unemployment benefits.

When you get this kind of reaction, you can’t speak to those kind of people with, “Here’s why free trade sucks,” or, “Here’s why you need a National Bank.”

And so, I’ve been thinking that the same success we had in presenting an idea around NAWAPA, in the way that we’ve done, and the follow-up that we’ve had in discussions, if [we did] something similar, of being able to speak to people, and presenting something similar around the American System economics, and around, really, essentially that. Essentially what Lyn did yesterday: building a seamless presentation of “How do you pay for NAWAPA?” And that’s the way that he responded to a lot of these guys saying, “We’ve got to know how we’re going to pay for the recovery.” Or, “How do we know we have the credit as a nation? How do we know we don’t have to borrow from some private bank? How do we know we manifest, as government, our current credit and we don’t have to balance our budget?” That’s insane. We don’t have to kill our people. We have the power as a nation.

So, I would just put that forward as the way I’ve been thinking in the last few days, is if we can achieve something which is not a formula, not a formal description, but something that has that kind of an idea, that’s what we would need.

Lerner: I think the key thing with the presentation of the NAWAPA has actually been the concept of the platform, that Lyn had developed. I was thinking about this yesterday, because the questions were more detailed around fiscal things. That seems to me like it’s more of a fear response, not to look at the deeper implications of what the NAWAPA program is.



Michelle Lerner

What I mean by that is really taking up the challenge of how [Russian scientist V.I.] Vernadsky viewed the development of the species over hundreds of thousands of years, and not thinking in terms of everything that’s happening right now, but thinking in terms of a shift to the higher platform. To be able to do that, you have to put it in a context of the history of the development of these platforms.

I think that concept was really what Lyn was driving

for, when he intervened on the way that we were dealing with the problem of economics prior to taking up NAWAPA—but I think that that's what gets at this question of mission, and successive generations. I think that that has to continue to be the focus. And it's also very appropriate.

Interestingly, from the standpoint of Russia, there is the tradition of Vernadsky. And I think that there's still problems in the way that it's understood. And I think that's more what we actually have to go for, and take Lyn's advancement of Vernadsky's work and present it as that.

LaRouche: Well, that's it. You see in Russia, you see in the history of the fight between, say, Oparin and Vernadsky, in that period, even though it was only one paper in that time, and you see that Oparin represents complete destruction. It's completely British agent, essentially. [J.B.S.] Haldane and company. Then you look at Vernadsky, the way Vernadsky thinks. And what's the most important thing about the way Vernadsky thinks, the way he thinks about mankind, life and so forth. This is unique: It's one of the great contributions to all modern science, is that. It's not merely his achievements, as application. It's the way he thinks. And the point has been, that it's to try to get that concept put in a form that can be understood for what it is, which means you have to get into this question of the difference between man and the beast. The human mind is capable of creativity, in the sense that no beast is capable of creativity.

All species are creative, inherently. But they are not consciously, willfully creative. In the evolution of species, the species are creative. All animal life is creative. The universe is creative. The galaxy is creative. But what is consciously, willfully creative, as such, per se? It's a quality of the human mind which is unique to the human mind, and it's not something that happens inside the skull, as such. It's something that happens in society. It's individuated. And when you think in terms of cosmic radiation, as opposed to a periodic table, it becomes very clear. When you think of the universe as cosmic radiation, which is what it is, then it's clear.

Therefore, in dealing with a mass of people, you have to bring in principles. Now, the problem is, if you try to be too practical, in order to appeal to what they think they understand, you won't do the job. Because you're not communicating to them in a way which will affect them on the question of principle, the way Shelley writes about in the *Defence of Poetry*. There's this higher layer.

And what we try to do, is exactly that. You see the effect, for example: when we released this video, on NAWAPA, and we held back on publicizing it, till we had the whole thing programmed for presentation. We put it out, and the response was electric: electric among professionals who are competent to understand what we were presenting. The response was immediate, and unique.

Now, what that typified, is people who are actually creative, in the way they think. And you have a number of people who are specialists of all kinds, who have been involved, and associated with projects which involve different kinds of mental skills, different kinds of professional mental skills; and when you bring people together, with different mental skills, or development of skills, together for a common project, and they have to integrate that project, which involves different ways of conceptualizing, according to their profession, and you're putting the elements of this profession, interacting, to create an effect which does not exist in *any part* of this assembly of people, but exists only in the inter-relationships among the group as a whole. And that's what happened.

We got an immediate thing, which he [Michael Kirsch] got, with his response from the whole group of specialists: we took specialists who were, you know, from my age-group or slightly younger, and they understood it that way. They could cooperate, they could talk to each other, different professions, who were all integral to this kind of project. And then we would find, there was a common action among them, which rose above the skill which was specific to any one of them. And they would interact, and they would joyfully interact, as his friends, on this thing he's done a few times, this program—they interact, beautifully! And it's like a transformation of these people, from being specialists in their own niche, and suddenly they become super-specialists. They become involved in each other's scientific specialty. And they become problem-solving geniuses, just by getting them together and talking to them!

And we got some of this same kind of quality. For example, the Vernadsky Institute [State Geological Museum] in Moscow. You get the same kind of thing from these people. They react exactly like that, when we had these conferences we participated in, with them. They react like that! And we get real, creative, scientific thinkers, particularly, though, in the Vernadsky tradition in Russia, or anyplace else. And this is a special kind of chemistry of the mind, which does not exist in normal university activity otherwise.



EIRNS

LaRouchePAC held this conference in Pasadena, Calif. on Dec. 4, 2010. At the podium are (left to right) hydrological engineer Dr. Howard Chang, LPAC's MyHua Steger, and LPAC's Cody Jones. The conference typified the lively collaboration among specialists who have joined the fight for NAWAPA.



EIRNS

Development project designer Wayne Voelz (left) and LPAC's Oyang Teng.

Kiracofe: And you can bring the public behind that. We've already had, for example, after World War II, under Eisenhower, we had a very large highway project, for our interstate highways, or a St. Lawrence Seaway project, which was a very large project in those days. So, you can bring in the public along with you, in some of these very large projects.

LaRouche: That's where the platform concept comes in. Because, in order to go to NAWAPA, what're we doing—we're taking a very large project. Conceptually, in one sense, it's very easy to understand. It's composed of these elements. Each one of these elements is completely comprehensible. But what's important is the interaction among these elements, that you're combining.



EIRNS

Nuclear engineer Dewitt Moss (right) and Lloyd Crask, professor of construction management at Fresno State University.

The Arctic Is Part of the Plan

Then you get into the effect on the Arctic. You trace this out to the way in which the potential, which we're organizing—we're organizing something to do this NAWAPA project. We're taking things we know. We're taking a potential. And we start to look at the potential, and we're now looking at the origin of life, and the development of life forms in the Arctic, and all these other kinds of questions which come in as mental stimuli, which you have to think about, on the impact of what you're doing. I mean, right now, the NAWAPA project, the whole Arctic project, which has been a long, mysterious thing, incomplete. This area is now open to us, conceptually. If we do this project, when we get up into Alaska, and into the Canadian thing, and into Russia, and start to look at the development of the potential of the Arctic, and the characteristics of the Arctic as distinct from other parts of the planet, you have a revolution, immediately—which we're running into.

Nagorny: But the Arctic could be not only common ground, but it may be a zone of conflicts. But, actually, right now, it is developing as a conflicting zone.

LaRouche: Therefore, we have to get the cooperation going. And the key thing is to get this project going, and then get the Bering Strait tunnel and rail put together. And you get the mission-orientation in Siberia, in Russian Siberia, for the development of the mineral resources of that area,

which can only be dealt with, with the thinking of the Vernadsky approach. Because, when you're dealing with this kind of territory, this is not just Earth territory. It's much more complicated.

Nagorny: In Russia, the Arctic is mainly supervised by Mr. [Arthur] Chilingarov, who used to work as Vice Speaker of the Duma, but I think right now, he's simply a chairman of the Committee for Northern Territories. But he arranged several very interesting initiatives,

which were unheard of in the '90s. For example, actually, he's a scholar, an Arctic scholar, and he spent much time researching things in Arctic stations during the Soviet times. But right now, he managed to arrange the expedition to the Northern Pole, and in a bathyscaph, they went down to the basin of the ocean, and put a Russian flag there. It made quite, you know, an outcry.

LaRouche: Actually, there are only a few nations, which really have efficient access to the Arctic. It's a territorial issue. You have Denmark, for example.

Nagorny: Denmark and Canada.

LaRouche: Alaska, Russia, three chiefly.

Nagorny: Great Britain.

LaRouche: Let them behave themselves.

Douglas: The Arctic Forum⁹ in Moscow was limited to the five which actually have an Arctic littoral.

LaRouche: See, what we're dealing with, having fun with, in our Basement researches, which she [Lerner] is involved in this, on some of this biological stuff, we're dealing with life forms, the characteristic of life forms, and the history of life forms, which is unique! It's just an area of research that's unique! I mean, the history of unicell life forms, and what the relationship is to the Arctic, as a very specific area, with specific characteristics. Now, if you want to do something in that area, you want to function there, you've got to know what you're doing!

So, when we do these kinds of projects, we are opening up entirely new areas of thinking. And like the recent video, the second program we did on this—


Ogden: "The Extraterrestrial Imperative."¹⁰

LaRouche: When we look at the functional relationship, which is portrayed in that program, between what's happening on Earth, and the cycles of life and so forth on Earth, and you take the relationship of that to the galaxy, the 60-million-year-long cycle, and the galactic cycle, you look at the question of which life forms have evolved on Earth, under what kind of conditions, variable conditions....

9. "The Arctic: Territory of Dialogue," Moscow, Sept. 22-23, 2010. 1010.<http://www.larouchepac.com/cosmicrays>

FIGURE 2

Long-Wave Pattern of Biodiversity




LPAC-TV videograb

FIGURE 3

Biodiversity: Long and Even Longer Waves

(Top, 62-Million-Year Cycle; Bottom, 140-Million-Year Cycle)



LPAC-TV videograb

Ogden: What we demonstrated is that in the large, in terms of increases in biodiversity and changes in predominant species, what sort of species is predominant on the planet; but also in terms of in the small, in terms of metabolism, life cycles, in the single organism—these are all dependent on a supra-galactical interaction of cosmic radiation. You have two interacting cycles, one 64-million-year cycle, and one 130-million-year cycle (**Figures 2 and 3**), where, on one hand, the Solar System, in orbiting around the galaxy, is going above and underneath the galaxy plane, so it's being exposed to more radiation on one side than on the other; and then, in the other, it's during this circulation around the galaxy, it's entering in and out of the spiral arms of the galaxy, where you have a greater or lesser density of this cosmic radiation. So everything we see in the small,

here, on planet Earth, is a product of these huge, supra-Solar System-wide cycles.

LaRouche: And the effect is, mostly, interestingly, concentrated on the Arctic. Because of the characteristic of this region of the Earth's existence. So, plant life, or unicell life—

Nagorny: I remember, when I was teaching at the University of Washington, in 1993—well, my presentation of materials was not accepted very favorably, by the university. And all of a sudden, they suggested that I conduct seminars with Navy officers. I was very much surprised, I said, “Okay, let's go.” And I had two groups. In one group, I had six young officers, around 30-35, mainly from the Intelligence Directorate of the Pacific Navy. And I gave them lectures about Russia, about political systems in the Pacific Rim countries. And then, after two months, I decided to give them some task, to prepare a paper. And everyone was free to choose anything.

So two of them chose a very interesting subject. One, a lady of 32, who was deputy intelligence department, aerial control, she took a subject, the North Arctic route around Siberia as the future key for the control of the Pacific. And she wrote a very good paper, by the way! And the second paper on the same subject was by a young person, but he was analyzing economic and political consequences of the melting climate conditions at the Northern Pole.

So, the interest is there, in the Arctic and Siberia, and it was actually not accidental. I think that they had a piece of advice from other people, to choose that kind of subject. And this interest will develop, it's absolutely clear.

And, if we have a second wave of real crisis, of course, such projects as NAWAPA, such as an Arctic route for the trade and exploration, will be key for the future of the mankind, and especially such countries as the United States, Russia, and so on and so forth.

But, in my view, you know, development of such projects takes time, whereas, we don't have time. Because the things will start happening, maybe next year. You were saying about weeks, even! In my view, it is months, maybe half a year, something like that. But both six months, or several weeks, it's a very short period of time.

LaRouche: Actually, in this case, it opens up much more nicely. First of all, the NAWAPA itself, as a project, begins to open it up, immediately, once you get into it. Once you get into this Arctic area; NAWAPA is actu-

ally Arctic fringe. And you get into that area, and if you start to get the tunnel-bridge, the railroad bridge, between Siberia and Alaska, you've opened up the whole area. I mean, that's immediately; the physical economic possibilities of actual exploration come there as a by-product of simply doing the project, because you're touching that area. And what we were doing—what she [Meghan Rouillard] has been doing, in particular, with the biological work on this, which she's done a good part of the report on this—what you've been working on in this biological project. There's a whole area of investigation, you can start to get into right now. All of it is highly relevant. You just have to simply find people you're going to pull together, to move this forward.

If we start the NAWAPA project, we will immediately have a change in the politics of the United States. Whenever the agreement is made, to do that—.

A New Platform of Civilization

Nagorny: There should be a political will.

LaRouche: There will be, because, the point is, when you take what we have left, of our scientific engineering capability in the United States, and think of the fact we've got vast unemployment, including, we probably have about 40 million people who could be employed, in the combination of NAWAPA, and rail and maglev systems development, and also supporting supplies, vendors to the project. We start this in motion.

Then you think in terms of byproducts, as you do when you start to tear up territory, large projects: You dig things out of the ground, that you didn't know were there before. You come into processes that you didn't know were there before. So, you always have an immediate byproduct, an experimental byproduct, whenever you make big changes in the Earth's surface, you discover things. Or when you go into the Arctic waters, you find things about life, you didn't think existed before, anomalies.

So, immediately, you're doing that, and people are beginning to *think* in those terms. So, you're on the road to an accelerated rate, because you've come to what I call, a new platform. A project like this raises the platform level of civilization, in the same way that the introduction of transcontinental railways, was a change in the platform of civilization. The so-called, famous geopolitical shift. And that's what this will do. The changes in the weather, changes in patterns, by the implementation of NAWAPA, will, from the beginning, pose these questions.

And when you start putting people together—. You know, what we had, the experience in World War II, going into the war. The kinds of experimental work we did, as a byproduct of nuclear and other research, much research, and new technologies, immediately—this is a matter of years! You're not talking decades, you're talking about years! You've got people going at this two or three years, you can create new branches of applied science!

Nagorny: You know, strange as it may seem, I heard about the idea for a tunnel between Alaska and Chukotka, not from Mr. LaRouche. In 1979, I was sent to the BAM, the Baikal-Amur Railway, because there was such a practice, that people from the Academy of Science should go and meet people in the remote areas, and instruct them, what's going on. It's kind of a supporting information activity. And I flew to, first Irkutsk, then to another city, and by bus, I went along the Baikal-Amur Railway construction line. And usually I gave two lectures per day, and went over to another village or local construction site. And all of a sudden, on the third stop, during the third lecture, after I finished, some workers who were making the longest tunnel, they started saying, "Soon we will finish it. We have only a year and a half to work here. How about the tunnel to the United States!" I said, "Where, from here?" They said, "No! From Chukotka to Alaska."

LaRouche: Once you get into these areas, you take the talent we have, and our concern was: Take the talent we have in the United States, what's left of the labor force; take the highly skilled labor force, engineering and so forth. That's your spearhead in the project. Now, you have people who are skilled in other professions. We have, the auto industry was almost shut down in the United States. We still have the people who have the level of skill, of engineering, in the auto industry, machine-tool design and things like that. They're still there. We have aircraft design; it's the same thing! You have people, you know, naval design; same thing. So you bring these people into a project, a single project, and the project becomes a big thinking machine. Because by putting together, with a single task-orientation, a variety of different scientific and related skills, the automatic result is that you begin to get a fertility of ideas, a fertility of thinking, as we got in World War II, in launching it. There was a real fertility of thinking that was unleashed.

So, I think the immediate effects, the psychological effects, by the fact of putting 4 million people to work,

now, who are unemployed in a nation that has collapsed—on the basis of a credit system, which we know how to do, we can do it!—results in a transformation in the way of thinking, of national thinking. You probably can think of the same thing in Russia, where revolutions occurred in projects, where intellectual collaboration was generated by a project which otherwise would have seemed impossible.

Kirsch: One thing on that is, we want to put on our website all these five videos that are talked about—people who are speaking on: What would this look like for the country? How would we do this? What can we do? What kind of technologies aren't being used? How would this impact...? And people in Europe, machinists, who are doing these big tunnels, people in Russia who are working in the Arctic, scientists up there, Russian industrialists—on our website, speaking about these things. So, they have a forum, which then other people can watch, and say, "Ah! Okay, I can see this discussion's going." At some point they say, "Oh, okay, I support this."

LaRouche: You need to establish a higher platform. So, you take projects which are largely related to infrastructure, high-technology changes in infrastructure. You have now raised the platform of technology on which you're functioning. This increases the productive powers of labor of everyone who participates in that higher platform, and that's the way to get the kind of revolution we need in economy, to get the world back in shape, from the desperate condition we're in. So, you need a collaboration, you need inspiration, you need projects which actually force that question.

Kirsch: We saw, with the space program, certain companies that were making some kind of metal, some kind of steel; now, people in the company are sitting down with these scientists and saying, "Well, we need this kind of metal." And whole new industries then open up, and whole new scientific branches to study how to make these new things open up. And so, when you're looking at NAWAPA, you're talking about *every single layer* in all of the historically scientific groups, who will have to be brought to the table, all of the people who still know how to build anything in the United States, who are about to go extinct, sitting back at the table. And you know—two things: One, as he was referencing earlier, this would bring back a bridge between the generations. Right now, you have a cut: The Baby-Boomer generation—they lost any sense of the future,

and any sense of building something for the future. So there has to be a bridge between the new generation and the older.

And secondly, is that, on NAWAPA, because it's a *new* idea, it's not just, "We need some new rail, or we need a new power plant, or we need a dam," but because it's fundamentally something which is a new concept, and it has a challenge, that is, something we've never conquered before, I think that's what evokes, then, the discussion that would have never taken place in a former system.

Ogden: I was talking to a Russian acquaintance about NAWAPA and the Bering Strait crossing, and he said: "Your idea is brilliant. But in the Russian mentality, the first question will be, 'Where is the cash?'" He thought the only way the Bering Strait tunnel could get funded, would be to package it for Gazprom to fund, as a continuation of Prime Minister Putin's sea-floor gas pipeline projects to Germany, and to Turkey. He said, "You could attract attention by demanding a pipeline to Alaska, even though Alaska itself has a lot of gas—it doesn't matter. They are drilling for gas on Sakhalin Island. That way, Gazprom could accept it, and they have the money. By hooking people on the pipeline idea, you could put in the bridge," he said.

Kirsch: Yes, people say, "Where is the cash?" The way I'd respond to that, is: "*What* is cash?" Because, two things: One, you're never going to get anything like this, by just one company saying, "This is profitable for us." But it's profitable, in the real sense of profit, in that it will have a long-term increase for the whole population, in its technology capacity.

LaRouche: Especially employment.

Kirsch: If you look at NAWAPA—the North American Water and Power Alliance—the price tag they said, back in 1964, if you want to look at it in dollars: \$100 billion. How much has it cost us, the fact that we never built it? Many, many, many times. It actually will be free, in the long term. But with a sovereign government here, now, we don't have to—there's no fixed amount of money. Putin said, two years ago—this is 2008, when the bailouts were going on—he said: We, here, in Russia, the difference between us and the United States, is we can't just print money. We have to have a fixed amount. We have to sell our resources to raise it.

The video we put on our website, "Continental Implications," we have, in collaboration with people

who've done the feasibility studies. I mean, that is one of the things to buck the British transoceanic reliance on oil, is, China, shipping Alaskan coal to China; Russia-U.S.

The big fraud of Karl Marx-Adam Smith, is that private property is something that exists, private companies. But without the government, without a republic or a government, you didn't have any private ownership of anything, even your own self. There were ruling nobilities, the banking families, and there's nothing to guarantee private property without a government. So we do have private companies in the United States, we do promote private ingenuity. But, the government is what guarantees the wealth of any currency or company.

If we can get some patriots from the United States to do what he [LaRouche] said yesterday, we won't need to go looking for money.

LaRouche: What will work is if you get cooperation among nations, different nations, in this area, this area of potential cooperation, it will flourish. There's no question about it.

Douglas: And the SOPS design for the Bering Strait tunnel is a multimodal tunnel, including gas pipelines.

Ogden: The guy I was discussing with kept coming back to, "You have to find a source of money."

Douglas: But, you know what? We actually created the Transcontinental Railroad, by the state creating credit, by having a credit system, and not a money system. And Witte did the same thing in Russia, by a government credit system, not a money system.

Kirsch: This is actually why I raised Adam Smith, because the state—the *nation*-state, is what creates money. And what Lyndon LaRouche was just saying earlier today, that is important to understand, about Adam Smith, is that there was a Seven Years War, and at the end of that war, Britain came out with India, Canada, the East Indies, and a big global empire. But they couldn't have their military troops to occupy all those places. So they had to come up with a way of, "How do we get these colonies to still be colonies, and yet, we don't need to be there!" And that is exactly what an external source of the value of money comes from. And Adam Smith went to France, wrote his economic doctrine, and left out the power of the nation-state to do anything to provide for itself, and also develop its own sovereign manufacturing for itself, as well.

LaRouche: You can do it. With national credit, you can do it. You don't need money, you need national credit.

What Will It Take To Move People?

Nagorny: Well, in my view, we have discussed many interesting topics, and they are multi-sided, from international relations, history, economics, psychology, morality, philosophy. It's a very complex approach, and I think it paves the way to some kind of an agenda for the future.

But, in my modest understanding, this idea could grasp masses, only after a second wave of crisis. Because otherwise, people won't be very active. They won't be very much interested. They should be pressed by the circumstances.

LaRouche: Well, the United States population is desperate. They're now desperate, increasingly so. Entire communities, entire states, are absolutely desperate. So the motivation is there.


Nagorny: Yes, but the elite.

LaRouche: We know how to deal with the elite. I mean, we've been at history a long time, been working at history a long time. We have done things which have made the enemy very unhappy. If you can make the enemy very unhappy, that means you're probably doing something good.

No, you can do it! The United States is the one nation which can be mobilized most readily for this kind of purpose, because it's embedded in our multi-generational tradition. It's there. And what we got on the response, when we launched the NAWAPA project, again, once we had prepared it and presented it, where we do this mapping, the global mapping of the project, once we presented that—BOOM! You open up all kinds of areas. And it happened immediately, it happened very quickly, once we prepared.

Nagorny: As a state? Or...?

LaRouche: Well, as a national project. All it takes is, our system of government, the U.S. American system, is entirely based, in principle, constitutionally, on a credit system, not a monetary system. Therefore, if we can, on the cases of uttering credit, if we can generate a growth of actual, physical income, net physical income, from the process of giving credit for this development, we, in our system of government, can immediately explode, as Roosevelt did, in the 1930s, we can



LaRouchePac

"If you can put shovels in the dirt, next week," said LaRouche, "and employ people, in something which is productive, in the United States, as long as you don't have interference against you from the U.S. government, you can succeed. That's what Roosevelt did. We can do it, again."

explode the productivity of the nation.

So, we don't have to have any favorable conditions. All we have to do, is have the desire of a large part of the population for employment, for productive employment, for some kind of security. And the American population *will*, even now, will respond to that. If you can promise, if you can say, "We can put shovels in the dirt, on work projects, next week," the American citizen will respond, especially now. Because they have almost nothing. They still have their skills, they still have their productive capacity. We have a whole section of young people who have no skills whatever, but in the middle group, in the middle age groups, income groups, we still have people who have skills. If you can put shovels in the dirt, next week, and employ people, in something

which is productive, in the United States, as long as you don't have interference *against* you from the U.S. government, you can succeed. That's what Roosevelt did. We can do it, again.

Our system is especially designed for this kind of purpose. We've done it repeatedly, despite bad periods, bad Presidents, bad things. All we have to do, is have that: The American people will go for it. Particularly, if they're hungry and they want jobs. And we have states—whole Federal states in the United States are bankrupt, right now! So all these guys who are talking about power, about their system, about their free-trade system, and so forth, it's *bunk*! The whole system they're talking about is already as good as dead!

And we, who have this other policy, our policy, is the only policy which can *live*! These guys, their system is dead! We can operate, we know how to operate on a system of credit. We create state credit; if the state credit is going, on the average, for something that will pay for itself, in terms of benefits to society, we can do it, indefinitely! Until we run out of people to put to work.

That's our capability, that's our specific capability in our Constitution. But we need a Presidency, which will actually activate that part of our Constitution. And what we need, is actually unifying projects.

See, the advantage of NAWAPA: Just imagine this thing: We're taking this large project, which goes over the largest area of any project that mankind has ever undertaken. And the implication is, starting this project means, when we go through the Darien Gap, we're going all the way through South America, as well as North America. If we do that, and we connect to Russia, with Siberia, by the Alaskan—we build that route, well, what does that do? That opens up the whole area of Siberia, for the actual developing of a *system* which, in the condition of that soil, that weather condition, you can actually start to open up the development of mining in that area, because you have a way of developing it. You have China, which is desperately hungry for mineral resources it doesn't have—all kinds of things—we have them.

So therefore, now we have a means, a mechanism, for mining, and for developing communities, which are part of this mining process. No problem! It's a lot of work, a lot of sweat, a lot of danger, the usual problems of pioneering. But this means, that we now are integrating the interests of China with the function of Russia as a supplier of something that China desperately needs.

An Agreement Among Nations

We have an alliance with India, where the alliance on nuclear power, and going to fusion, is already an agreement, it's already a principle. So, we have that. For example, going to the thorium reactors, which is India's requirement: They need thorium reactors, because of the problems they have with the poor. You need local, small thorium reactors, which will actually be the basis for getting some kind of civilization to about two-thirds or one-half of the Indian population. They desperately need it. The situation in all Southeast Asia is very similar.

So, these things are inherently profitable, by any objective standards, because we very rapidly increase the productive powers of labor. We raise existence to a higher economic level, physical economic level. And that's all we have to do.

But we need an agreement among nations, at least some nations, which will agree to cooperate on the basis of this, as being a common-interest project.

Now, we take the Transaqua in Africa: It's the only chance for Africa, is Transaqua. I mean, that's the key project. Prevent Sudan from being split up; get the Transaqua program, bring back Lake Chad, with the Congo waters.

This is the future! If you connect these areas with rail systems, or magnetic levitation systems, which we can do, now, you can take all continents, except Australia, and you can integrate them, in one continuous system of mass transportation and a conveyor belt concept of economy.

It's the necessary mission of mankind, and this mission, with its implications, means, this is the next step to space. Two generations of this, of progress in this direction, and we will be ready to go to Mars. We will, in that process, we will have developed the technology to deal with the challenge of a Mars landing. And then, the human race is now off to the races.

That's where you must go, mankind must go, for the future of mankind. And you can not do it by one thing; you've got to have a cooperation among different cultures, which cooperate to a common end. It's elementary. And I'm confident, if we get rid of this Presidency, and get one in that functions, under the conditions of desperation right now, you can mobilize the majority of American people to support it.

But if we don't do that, the American people will become desperate, this country will go to Hell, and the planet will go to Hell.

Steinberg: Easy choice!

Sovereignty Trumps the Euro; Irish and Germans Must Act

by Nancy Spannaus

Dec. 14—Prospects are not looking good for Lord Jacob Rothschild's Inter-Alpha Group during this crucial December week. Desperate for hundreds of billions more in bailout money, to cover over their essential bankruptcy, this conglomerate of banks, at the center of the British global financial system, is insisting on two acts of capitulation: first, that the Irish Parliament sign over its sovereignty on Dec. 15, by approving a murderous Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the EU and the IMF; and second, that the remaining solvent nations of Europe, mainly Germany, agree to provide unlimited backing for those bailouts during the EU heads of state meeting Dec. 16-17.

According to "trend-lines" cited in the financial press, the Irish capitulation is sure to happen, but even savvy bankers know better than to count on that. With each passing day, the surge of Irish nationalism is growing, and the two victories which the Quisling lame-duck government of Brian Cowen has delivered so far, are just as likely to provoke resistance in the Dec. 15 vote, as the contrary.

Even more problematic for Inter-Alpha is the adamant refusal of the German government to kowtow to demands that it expand its role as the piggy-bank of the European bankers. A fierce battle has erupted over a formal proposal from Euro-Group President Jean-Claude Juncker, that all Eurozone states adopt responsibility for a new category of "euro-bonds," which would back the bankrupt banks. German Chancellor

Angela Merkel has strongly rebuffed this proposal, as the attempt to loot German coffers, that it is.

These raging battles are feeding an atmosphere of widespread angst, in which one financial pundit after the other is predicting a blowout of the euro, and even a possible return to national currencies such as the deutschemark, by year's end. Such a blowout would call the question on the essential policy choice before the entire North Atlantic region: replacement of the Inter-Alpha system with a global Glass-Steagall and fixed-exchange-rate system based on sovereign national governments, or a chaotic slide into a New Dark Age.

The Irish Threat

An Irish rejection of the diktat being imposed upon it by the European Union and the IMF, in order to bail out the private, Inter-Alpha controlled banks, is increasingly a real and present danger for the British imperial plan. A "no" vote at any time, or a fall of the government, blows up the game.

True, the Irish government has so far been able to engineer two votes in favor of the "stringent" conditions being imposed upon it by the Memorandum of Understanding that the EU institutions are demanding. By outright bribery of two independent parliamentarians, and other less obvious measures, the Cowen government has squeezed out a bare majority for two elements of the MOU, including dramatic cuts in social

welfare provisions, and a cut in the minimum wage.

But each vote has in fact further energized the opposition, which is committed to defending the nation. This was particularly the case with the vote on cutting the minimum wage, which occurred on the same day that the bailed-out Allied Irish Bank, a member of the Inter-Alpha Group, provided hundreds of thousands of euros in bonuses for a large number of its senior bankers. Outrage was immediately expressed throughout the country.

Leading the opposition is the Sinn Féin party, led by Gerry Adams. Adams, who is expected to be elected to the Irish Dail (parliament) in the next election round, on Dec. 11 issued a call for a mobilization to defeat the MOU in the Dec. 15 vote. Those who “value Irish sovereignty” should vote against the deal, he said, and then we can have a general election to vote in a government that has a mandate from the people to proceed in their best interests.

The fighting spirit of Sinn Féin will be absolutely essential in the coming days, in the face of the Third World conditions which are being imposed upon Ireland. Charity workers from the St. Vincent de Paul Society, a charitable organization, are reporting children rooting through garbage bins in search of food in the city of Kilkenny. There are also reports of families totally dependent upon social welfare for food, but without enough money to pay for their housing or electricity and heat.

Germans Revolt

Meanwhile, on the continent, it is Germany that is resisting the latest supranational bailout schemes by the London-centered financial apparatus. Momentum toward breaking free of the euro trap was already growing when Euro-Group President Juncker last week proposed a new system of “euro-bonds,” which would saddle all the Eurozone nations with joint debt liability. De facto, that



Creative Commons/William Murphy

Rage has been growing in Ireland at the government's slashing of living standards to bail out the banks. The vote to cut the minimum wage was a particularly harsh blow. Here, a demonstration on Nov. 19, 2010.

would put the major burden on the most solvent nations, of which there are only six in Europe now—the largest being Germany.

Chancellor Merkel immediately rejected the plan, only to come under a rather unusual verbal attack by Juncker. As tensions rose, Merkel was defended by an array of political leaders in Germany. French President Nicolas Sarkozy also offered qualified support.

Opponents of the EU bailout plan already have a challenge to the system before the German Constitutional Court, a ruling on which is not expected until Spring. In addition, the German media is full of discussion of a potential return to the deutsche-mark, a policy which the La-Rouche movement in Germany has made a *cause célèbre* over the better part of a decade.

Some of the most prominent German critics have turned to media abroad, to rally support for their views and encourage others to take the issue to their own constitutional courts. Constitutional law expert Karl Albrecht Schachtschneider, for example,

presented his arguments against the Lisbon Treaty and the euro system in an interview with the German-language newspaper of Prague, the *Prager Zeitung*, where he also forecast the collapse of the euro. And economist Wilhelm Hankel was interviewed on BBC and in *O Globo*, Brazil's leading news daily.

Meanwhile, in Germany, a very prominent name has joined the battle against the euro: Patrick Adenauer, the grandson of Germany's famous postwar Chancellor Konrad Adenauer (in office 1949-63). Patrick Adenauer is one of the 50 entrepreneurs from the small and medium-sized industrial sector (*Mittelstand*), who filed a constitutional challenge on Dec. 5, along with a call for an injunction to prevent the German government from spending a single taxpayer euro for a bailout of the banks of Ireland, before the court has ruled on the main case.

Saudi Arabia's Terror: What Hillary Clinton Knows

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Dec. 14—Soon after being sworn in as Secretary of State, and just months after the deadly terrorist assault on the Indian city of Mumbai (Nov. 26, 2008), Hillary Clinton established an inter-agency task force with the Treasury Department to identify and disrupt terrorist funding conduits. The Interagency Illicit Finance Task Force (IFTF) was placed under the control of Richard Holbrooke, the special Envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, and chaired by Assistant Secretary of Treasury David Cohen, the top aide to Treasury Enforcement chief Stuart Levey. According to a Dec. 30, 2009 secret State Department memo, recently made public by Wikileaks and the *Guardian* newspaper, “The IFTF’s activities are a vital component of the USG’s Afghanistan and Pakistan (Af/Pak) strategy dedicated to disrupting illicit finance flows between the Gulf countries and Afghanistan and Pakistan.”

The December 2009 document, circulated to U.S. diplomatic posts throughout Southwest and South Asia, was issued in preparation for a visit by Holbrooke and Levey to Saudi Arabia, the U.A.E., Kuwait, Qatar, and Pakistan, to press for further cooperation in the crackdown on terror funding. In the section of the memo dedicated to Saudi Arabia, there was little attempt to conceal the fact that the Saudis were stonewalling:

“While the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) takes seriously the threat of terrorism within Saudi Arabia, it has been an ongoing challenge to persuade Saudi officials to treat terrorist financing emanating from Saudi Arabia as a strategic priority.” While acknowledging some limited recent cooperation, as the result of intense U.S. pressure, the document bluntly continued, “Still, donors in Saudi Arabia still constitute the most significant source of funding to Sunni terrorist groups worldwide.

“(S/NF) The USG engages regularly with the Saudi



U.S. State Department/Michael Gross

Soon after the November 2008 Mumbai bombings, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton established a task force to identify and disrupt terrorist funding conduits. Among the chief targets for investigation was the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Government on terrorist financing. The establishment in 2008 of a Treasury attaché office presence in Riyadh contributes to robust interaction and information sharing on the issue. *Despite this presence, however, more needs to be done since Saudi Arabia remains a critical financial support base for al-Qa'ida, the Taliban, LeT, and other terrorist groups, including Hamas, which probably raise millions of dollars annually from Saudi sources, often during Hajj and Ramadan. In contrast to the increasingly aggressive efforts to disrupt al-Qa'ida's access to funds from Saudi sources, Riyadh has taken only limited action to disrupt fundraising for the UN 1267-listed Taliban and LeT-groups that are also aligned with al-Qa'ida and focused on undermining stability in Afghanistan and Pakistan.*” (emphasis in original)

The cable was signed by Secretary of State Clinton.

An earlier State Department cable, dated Aug. 10, 2009, documented fundraising operations in Saudi Arabia by the Pakistan-based group Lashkar-e-Tayyiba (LeT), the organization that carried out the deadly Mumbai attack. Prepared in opposition to an LeT front group's petition to be removed from a United Nations sanctions list, the State Department cable demonstrated that U.S. government intelligence agencies had established a detailed map of LeT operations in Saudi Arabia: "The Community assesses that LT [LeT], a Pakistan-based terrorist group, uses the JUD (Jamaat-ud-Dawah) name as an alias. JUD is a religious, educational and humanitarian organization that the Community assesses provides cover and protection for LT's militant activities in Pakistan. LT and JUD share many senior leaders; LT falls under the authority of JUD leader Hafiz Muhammad Saeed; and JUD supports and facilitates LT's violent activities. LT and JUD stem from the same original organization, Markaz-ud-Dawawal-Irshad (MDI) that was founded around 1986 and for which LT served as its armed, militant wing. MDI was renamed JUD in December 2001. LT was declared a terrorist organization in January 2002, and MDI publicly divested itself of the LT at that time. LT transferred most of its assets and personnel under the newly formed JUD.... *In December 2005, an official of Idara Khidmat-e-Khalq forwarded JUD donation receipts to a probably LT front company in Saudi Arabia, where an LT financial official may have been closely associated with the general manager.... To demonstrate results to donors, JUD would finance the cost of building a new school or upgrading facilities at a madrassa, but would inflate the cost to siphon money to LT.*" (emphasis in original)

A Jan. 11, 2010 State Department cable detailed a Dec. 13, 2009 briefing by Treasury Department Acting Assistant Secretary of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, Howard Mendelsohn, to senior officials of the Saudi intelligence organization, Mabathith, concerning Taliban fundraising in Saudi Arabia. "During the course of the multi-hour intelligence exchange session, GRPO and Treasury analysts walked through the previously shared intelligence, which suggested that Taliban-related financial officials have visited Saudi Arabia in order to raise funds.... Mendelsohn stated that senior Taliban officials travel to Saudi Arabia to discuss reconciliation issues, but said they also conduct fundrais-

ing activities while in the Kingdom.... Treasury analysts provided information on XXXXXXXXXXXX three senior Taliban officials who have made multiple fundraising visits to Saudi Arabia, according to U.S. intelligence. (NOTE: Information available to the USG and shared for this exchange included telephone numbers, e-mail addresses, and passport information for cross-checking against Saudi customs databases. END NOTE.) Mabathith was not familiar with the individuals and pledged to follow up on the identifying information provided by GRPO and Treasury. GRPO and Treasury analysts also shared names and phone numbers of multiple Taliban and Haqqani associates known either to reside in or travel to Saudi Arabia.... Mendelsohn also raised USG concerns about Pakistan-based extremist group Jamaat al-Dawa al-Quran wa al-Sunna (JDQ) and its involvement in attacks against coalition forces in Afghanistan. GRPO and Treasury passed names and other identifying information of suspected Saudi Arabia-based JDQ donors and affiliates."

Outright Collusion

A senior U.S. intelligence official, deeply involved in the probe of Saudi government protection of Sunni terrorist groups, used much more blunt language to describe the situation. "The reality is far worse than the picture presented in the diplomatic cables. There is no real Saudi cooperation. Even after the Saudis passed laws against money laundering in the Kingdom, they have done absolutely nothing. The issue is fundamentalism. The Saudis are the main patrons of Sunni fundamentalism, and they only draw the line when organizations like al-Qa'ida target the Saudi royal family. We know the story, but we are dependent on Saudi oil, and on Saudi purchases of U.S. military equipment. They literally have us over a barrel."

Asked about the implications of this Saudi support for Sunni terrorism on the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Towers and the Pentagon, the source, who spoke on condition of anonymity, rolled his eyes. "Ask the Bush White House people. I know personally of 15 U.S. intelligence reports on the bin Laden family that were sealed by President Bush shortly after 9/11. Remember that the first planes allowed to fly over U.S. airspace after the 9/11 attacks carried members of the bin Laden family and other top Saudis out of the country."

The source also pointed to a 28-page chapter, prepared for the Joint Congressional Panel on the 9/11 at-



White House/Eric Draper

When asked about the possible connections between the Saudi support for terrorism and 9/11, a senior U.S. intelligence official said: "Ask the Bush White House people." Shown, then-President George W. Bush meets with Saudi Prince Bandar at the Crawford, Texas ranch, August 2002.

tacks, which was also put under Bush White House lock-and-key, where it remains to this day. That chapter dealt with then-Saudi Ambassador Prince Bandar bin-Sultan's funding of two of the 9/11 hijackers, through Saudi Embassy accounts at Riggs National Bank.

The source continued, "The coverup was unbelievable. The two 9/11 hijackers living in San Diego, the same two that received the payments from Prince Bandar and his wife, ostensibly for medical care, were living in the home of a Saudi man who was an FBI informant. When Senate investigators tried to interview the man, the Bureau blocked any contact. When a Saudi intelligence officer who hosted the two 9/11 hijackers, from the moment they arrived on the West Coast a year before the attacks, was interviewed by the 9/11 Commission investigators in Saudi Arabia, Saudi intelligence minders were in the room. The interrogation went nowhere."

Al-Yamamah

The Saudis' partner in the funding and protecting of Sunni terrorists worldwide are the British, and one key mechanism for that collusion is the longstanding Anglo-Saudi arms-for-oil barter scheme called Al-Yamamah (the dove, in Arabic).¹ Beginning in 1986, Prince Bandar

brokered a deal with the British government and the British weapons cartel, BAE Systems, to provide fighter jets, radar, training, and logistical and spare parts support to the Saudi Air Force. Saudi Arabia paid for the military package with crude oil, which BAE promptly sold on the international spot market. In the course of the deal, an estimated \$100 billion in excess funds were siphoned into offshore accounts, to finance black operations worldwide, including the sponsorship of the Afghan mujahideen organizations, then fighting the Soviet Red Army occupation of Afghanistan.

According to the recently leaked State Department documents, al-Qaeda, Taliban, and LeT are all still receiving Saudi funding, just as they were funded during the height of the mujahideen operations through the BAE-Al-Yamamah

secret funds. As the Aug. 10, 2009 State Department cable reported on LeT fundraising operations in Saudi Arabia: "Lashkar-e-Tayyiba and Jamaat-ud-Dawa are part of the same organization, originally called Markaz-ud-Dawawal-Irshad (MDI), that was founded by Hafiz Muhammed Saeed and other faculty at the University of Engineering and Technology in Lahore in 1986. MDI was established with funding from donors in the Middle East and set up camps to prepare its personnel to fight the Soviets in Afghanistan. MDI reorganized after the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989, creating LT as its paramilitary wing to fight in the Indian-controlled districts of Jammu and Kashmir."

What is clear from the 39 pages of State Department cables, leaked to the media, is that the U.S. knows, chapter and verse, just how deeply the Saudi regime is involved in supporting and protecting Sunni terrorists around the globe, including the 9/11 hijackers, al-Qaeda, and the LeT terrorists behind Mumbai.

It is time for the truth to come out, and one appropriate starting point would be the 28-page chapter from the Joint Congressional 9/11 probe. With the release of the State Department cables, it is no longer a secret that the Saudi regime is deeply involved with terrorist networks that are, to this day, targeting Americans, whether in Afghanistan, India, or right here at home. There are no legitimate national security reasons to hide crucial evidence about the events of Sept. 11, 2001.

1. See Jeffrey Steinberg, "Will BAE Scandal of Century Bring Down Dick Cheney?" *EIR*, June 29, 2007 (<http://tiny.cc/0xa22>).

New Gotthard Rail Tunnel Completed

by Andrew Spannaus

Milan, Dec. 10—On Oct. 15, 2010, the drilling of the longest rail tunnel in the world was completed, in central Switzerland, beneath the village of Sedrun. The final section was broken through by a massive drilling machine, connecting the two sections of the tunnel, dug from each side, starting in 1996. This will allow for the completion of a new 57-km (35-mile) tunnel for high-speed passenger and freight rail. The tunnel is scheduled to open for traffic in 2017, after the installation of the rail systems and all the accessory and safety services.

The breakthrough was celebrated as a milestone toward the construction of a high-speed rail network for Europe and beyond; it also represents an example of the type of long-term thinking about infrastructure and economics that is woefully lacking in the political discourse in the United States and many other countries at this time. In fact, the potential for launching a series of massive infrastructure projects that can change the very nature of the global economy is obvious; what is lacking is the political will to do so, a step that requires dumping the anti-progress policies of recent decades, which have culminated in the destruction of the physical economy through the creation of speculative financial bubbles that survive only by pillaging what's left of production and vital services.

The completion of the Gotthard Tunnel also has direct relevance to the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA) project which the LaRouche movement is now moving to revive in the United States, both as a technological feat, and an act of political determination to create long-term benefit.

Breaching the Mountains

To understand the significance of the new Gotthard Tunnel, look at a topographical map of Europe (**Figure 1**). The Alps form a natural barrier separating Italy and the Mediterranean from Northern Europe; the massive mountain range running through Switzerland and Austria forces roads and rail lines to wind through mountains and numerous smaller tunnels, slowing down transport considerably. The time needed for passenger traffic by car or train gives you an idea of the obstacle: It takes approximately seven hours to get from Milan, in Northern Italy, to Frankfurt, in central Germany, by car (if you're lucky and there's no construction work or tourist traffic), and over eight hours by train.

High-speed trains now run on most major corridors in Europe, but the Alps block the creation of an integrated North-South high-speed rail system, leading to large numbers of commercial trucks on the roads—an inefficient form of transport to which industrialized countries still cling fiercely, with enormous costs in

FIGURE 1



This topographical map of Switzerland and the surrounding countries gives an idea of the problems presented by the mountainous terrain in developing transport networks.

terms of traffic, pollution, and safety. For passengers, the solution has been to use air travel, but for freight, the situation has been getting worse for years.

The Swiss approach to the problem has been to tax everyone who passes through the country, and to use that money for the creation of infrastructure. Indeed, the amount of transport infrastructure per capita in Switzerland is significant, given the mountainous terrain, and its position as a corridor between northern and southern Europe. The Swiss have decided that it is imperative to reduce the number of trucks passing over their highways. Thus, the decision to build the new tunnel.

This project is called the “new” Gotthard Tunnel because it is the second major tunnel under the St. Gotthard Mountains, which rise to around 7,000 feet. There are currently two tunnels under the Gotthard pass, a 16-km single-bore, two-lane automobile passage completed in 1980, and a 15-km rail tunnel nearby, opened way back in 1882. As noted above, the problem is the huge amount of freight that continuously passes through the tunnel. In 2001, a collision between two trucks led to a fire in which 11 people died; the tunnel was closed for two months.

The situation on other corridors is even worse. The tunnel between France and Italy under Mont Blanc, Europe’s highest mountain, was originally designed for about 450,000 vehicles per year, while it is now used by almost 2 million. In 1999, a truck fire there led to a disaster with 39 deaths.

The new tunnel is double-bore, with the twin bores 40 meters apart, and an additional 96 km of accessory tunnels for safety, ventilation, and connections. In order to dig the tunnel, tremendous boring machines, nicknamed “Sissi,” 450 meters long and 9.5 meters wide, were assembled; they perform various functions automatically, immediately after breaking through the rock, such as the initial stabilization of the tunnel walls.

The machines have removed 24 million metric tons of material since beginning work, which is coordinated by the Swiss company AlpTransit, a wholly owned subsidiary of the Swiss Federal Railways. The public railway company contracts out the work to a number of consortia, including engineering and construction com-



Creative Commons/Cooper.ch

This photo of interior of the western tube of Gotthard Base Tunnel, at Wye Junction, was taken on Sept. 16, 2006.

panies principally from Germany and Italy, but with the participation of expertise and manpower from Austria, France, and numerous other countries. Over 2,000 people are working directly on the project, many of whom live in one of the nine temporary villages constructed near the work sites.

In a visit to the work site of the new Gotthard Tunnel organized by the Foreign Press Association in Milan, in which this author participated, the public relations manager for the project said that the goal is to shift at least 50% of truck traffic onto the rail system once the new tunnel opens. This is to be achieved through a series of incentives, primarily based on increased taxes on road traffic. While the Swiss are optimistic that this will be effective, it is likely that, to achieve the preferred goal of eliminating through traffic on Switzerland’s highway system, stronger measures will be necessary, including some mandatory requirements.

Creating a Network

To be truly effective, though, the new Gotthard Tunnel must be part of a European-wide effort to jumpstart the entire continent’s infrastructure network. There are numerous projects in the surrounding countries that need to be initiated to make that happen. These involve the upgrading of rail lines in Germany, Italy, and France, to bring them up to the standard set by the new line.

These projects have been delayed due to financial and political problems.

In Germany, for example, the connection from Basel (Switzerland) to Karlsruhe (Germany) has been the subject of 172,000 (!) legal actions presented by citizens' associations. In Italy, the new Turin-Lyon line, part of "Corridor 5," which is planned to stretch through to eastern Europe, has been blocked by protests that aim to stop any new infrastructure in the name of the environment.

The reality is that such projects would bring a major improvement in terms of reduced road traffic and air quality, but the "Nimby" ("not in my backyard") propensities of local citizens are easily played on by national and international groupings who aim to block any public investment that could lead to true economic growth. Similar problems exist for numerous other connections in Northern Italy, without which the new Swiss passage risks creating a massive bottleneck at the tunnel's southern tip.

The other major excuse behind the delays is financial. First of all, the Swiss attitude toward the necessity of infrastructure is marked by a significant difference with that of other European countries. Although financial considerations have delayed some projects in Switzerland as well, it quickly becomes evident that the country's non-participation in the euro system makes quite a difference. Priorities are set, and projects are initiated with a decades-long perspective of the country's needs.

Elsewhere, work is slowed down or abandoned, because it "costs too much." The budget constraints set by the European Union, and enforced by the speculative markets, allow only anemic progress on isolated projects, and are often treated as a drain on resources for other needs. Numerous areas are neglected because infrastructure is constructed in a piecemeal manner, as there is no credit policy that allows for separating such costs from the state's current accounts, and considering such work as an investment that will drive economic growth immediately and in the future.

As the Swiss have reminded us, many decades after the great projects that transformed entire sections of the United States (such as the TVA and the Hoover Dam), the impediment to large-scale infrastructure is not technical, or even financial. To the contrary, any society which hopes to survive must necessarily adopt a long-term vision for upgrading its central nervous and circulatory systems. The only impediment lies in the thinking of the institutions and the population, stifled for too long by an ideology antithetical to the progress that is necessary for our future.

Abuse of Court Cited

Federal Judge Tosses Out Kronberg Case

Dec. 8—On Dec. 7, 2010, U.S. District Judge Anthony Trenga of the Eastern District of Virginia Federal court dismissed Marielle Kronberg's lawsuit against Lyndon LaRouche, LaRouchePAC, and others, citing the "bad faith" of Kronberg and/or her attorney and their abuse of the Federal legal system. In doing so, Judge Trenga endorsed the Nov. 9 recommendation of Magistrate Judge Martin Anderson.

Kronberg brought her lawsuit, charging LaRouche et al. with defamation and violation of her civil rights, in August of 2009, in coordination with the British intelligence assets responsible for the ongoing legal hoax, known as the case of the British student Jeremiah Duggan. The Duggan case is presently the subject of a coroner's inquest in London, concerning the suicide of Jeremiah Duggan, at a conference in Wiesbaden, Germany in 2003. The Duggan hoax has been continuously resuscitated by British intelligence, despite the fact that a Feb. 4, 2010 declaration of the highest court of Germany held that its central allegations are fraudulent, and that the initial 2003 determination of suicide was correct.

The British Empire views LaRouche personally, and his proposal for a global Glass-Steagall, as an existential threat to the empire, and proposes instead, to drive the world into a new dark age through endless bailouts of their worthless financial paper. See "The Mighty Wurlitzer" press release (<http://larouchepac.com/node/16722>).

Unable to find an attorney willing to prosecute what the court record now shows to be a completely frivolous and baseless lawsuit, Kronberg hired John Markham, the lead prosecutor of LaRouche and others during the infamous U.S. LaRouche prosecutions of 1984-88, and a former member of the avowedly satanic Process Church of the Final Judgment. Markham has otherwise represented British asset Ahmad Chalabi, who provided much of the fake intelligence for the Iraq War, as a private attorney. Judge Trenga disqualified Markham from further participation in the Kron-

berg case on April 9, stating that confidential information he had access to while a prosecutor gave him an unfair advantage in the case, and that his appearance on behalf of Kronberg would offend the public's sense of propriety.

Discovery in the case has revealed that its primary motivation was to shut down the LaRouche political movement. Kronberg's efforts to raise funds for her case led with the fact that LaRouche's former prosecutor, Markham, would be handling it, and that it would be tried in the Eastern District of Virginia, which had previously convicted LaRouche in an infamous prosecution. In a 400-page submission accompanying their Motion To Dismiss, defendants demonstrated, "that Kronberg's lawsuit is totally without foundation and was filed not for any legitimate reason, but rather for publicity and harassment as part of Kronberg's long-standing personal vendetta against Lyndon LaRouche and other Defendants in this matter"—an issue which will be revisited immediately, should she choose to refile the case.

In his decision, Magistrate Anderson pointed out that as soon as Markham was disqualified, Kronberg and/or her attorney, John Bond, began a course of "non-compliance and complete disregard of the Federal rules and court orders which was 'flagrant.'" "Prospective plaintiffs should not be given the impression that defendants' or the court's time is at their disposal and a litigant should not be able to pick up where he or she left off after disappearing from a case for weeks or months and failing to prosecute discovery diligently."

Kronberg attempted to blame her failures to comply with multiple Federal court orders on the negligence of John Bond, who became lead counsel after Markham was disqualified. The Magistrate noted, however, that "there is evidence before the court . . . that indicates that plaintiff herself selectively participated in discovery and thus bears some personal responsibility for the failure to prosecute the case."

Anderson took particular note of the fact that Kronberg and/or Bond, having identified some 9,000 e-mails responsive to defendants' discovery requests, failed to turn them over, and failed to provide complete answers to defendants' interrogatories, despite court orders to do so. That failure continues to this date. Instead of complying with the court's orders, Kronberg served defendants with her own discovery requests.

Defendants contend that Kronberg's e-mails and complete and truthful interrogatory answers, would



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

John Markham

subject her and her attorneys to sanctions for filing the frivolous case for harassment purposes, and reveal the complete interrelationship of the case to the British intelligence-led Duggan hoax.

Anderson noted that, "serving discovery requests on defendants while refusing or neglecting to comply with the court's discovery Orders is indicative of bad faith, however, it is not clear what role plaintiff herself played in drafting these interrogatories." Because of unclarity concerning the full culpability of Kronberg, Anderson recommended to Trenga that the case be dismissed without prejudice, or, if not, that Kronberg and/or Bond pay defendants' legal fees for the discovery period.

Since Anderson stated that the only thing preventing the dismissal of the case with prejudice was a firm determination of Kronberg's full role in the flagrant stonewalling, the LaRouche defendants sought discovery of Kronberg's post-disqualification communications with both John Markham and John Bond. In documents produced after Anderson ruled, it became clear that Markham had continued to participate in the case after he was disqualified, including helping Kronberg draft the statement that she made in her appearance before Judge Anderson, which asked that Markham be allowed to continue to represent her. Kronberg's current lawyer, James Delsordo, even suggested that Markham could be a paralegal in the case for him, despite Judge Trenga's order.

By dismissing the case, Trenga avoided these issues because they were now "moot."

A New Reality Emerging

As we approach this Christmas season, we find that it is increasingly difficult for most people, especially in the trans-Atlantic region, to maintain a sense of fight and optimism about the future. Nothing has been done by our leaders to assure us that we are not headed for accelerated disintegration of every aspect of civilized life, such as we already see in the staggering growth of poverty, homelessness, suicide, violence, and other horrors. It would appear that we could only find hope by seeking to ignore reality, and looking for a stroke of magic, somehow, someday.

Yet, to take that approach, is to ignore the very tools which are in our hands to immediately reverse this crisis, tools which have been given to us as a result of our God-given creative powers of mind, as human beings.

As Lyndon LaRouche emphasizes once again in the Feature in this issue, man's very nature is to strive for development and discovery. The crises we face are due to the fact that that quality of our nature has been suppressed by a global oligarchy determined to turn the world's population into its slaves. Think of Aeschylus' presentation of Zeus' persecution of Prometheus, because the latter brought fire and knowledge to the human race, and you get the idea.

So, what right do we have to be optimistic in this period of history?

First, that oligarchy, which has had increasing global power since Franklin Roosevelt's death, is terribly weak, bankrupt, in fact. It can be easily defeated if nations combine around the right solution.

Second, there is a significant quotient of nations who are already actively resisting that London-centered oligarchy's drive for world domination. Most of those nations are in the Pacific

region. China and India, for example, are leading an aggressive effort for nuclear energy, which they recognize to be the absolute requirement if they are to provide for their huge populations. Working with them, are a host of smaller nations, as well as Russia, which, although still crippled by the grip of the London financial parasites, is oriented to joining in the nuclear renaissance.

Third, there exists a plan for global development based on knowable scientific principles, a plan which has been developed over decades by economic scientist LaRouche and his political movement. LaRouche's outline of how Glass-Steagall, a new fixed-exchange-rate system among nations, and the extended NAWAPA program will work, is not a fantastic dream, or an incalculable risk. It is based on principles which LaRouche has used to become the best economic forecaster of our age, provable principles that have advanced mankind in the past, and can do so again.

Powerful nations such as China, India, and Russia are effectively poised to sign on to LaRouche's plan. All that remains is to bring the United States into line as well.


Those who are pessimistic about making this shift in the United States are ignoring these realities. They are indulging in self-pity, or depression, at a time that a radical positive change is within reach. The future lies in *our* hands, and our minds.

History is full of examples of victories which resulted, only because individuals decided to buck the trend, and make what seemed impossible work—as our own George Washington showed at Trenton in 1776. Fighters like Washington gave us the opportunities we have today. But it's up to us to drop the pessimism, and seize them.

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 Youth Movement, we are changing politics in Washington, day by day.

EIR Online

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



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

(e-mail address must be provided.)

☐ \$360 for one year

☐ \$180 for six months

☐ \$120 for four months

☐ \$90 for three months

☐ \$60 for two months

☐ Send information on receiving **EIR** by mail.

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

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

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

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail address _____

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to

EIR News Service Inc.

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Please charge my ☐ MasterCard ☐ Visa

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____