

agree that the only efficient authority, the only moral authority, of government, of sovereign government, is its efficient commitment to promote the general welfare of *all* of its people, and their posterity. And to engage with one another, as nations, in promoting the common welfare of us all.

On that basis, if we take a long view, of the great financial mess around us, we're going to have to put things into bankruptcy reorganization. We're going to have to wipe out this and that; we're going to have to manage to make sure people don't go hungry. We're going to have to keep firms going, communities functioning, all of those kinds of things you do in a crisis like this. And it's going to take us 25 years, of long-term, steady investment in infrastructure, in new industries, in improved technologies, and in trade, to build up the kind of world which we want to build. A world we bequeath to those children who will come to adulthood 25 years from now. And we as grandparents, or great-grandparents, can take satisfaction, that what we're doing today, is for that purpose. And we can look forward into the future, and see the happy faces of those who will bless us for what we've done.

We will live, we will survive. It'll be tough times, but we'll make it. And take that attitude.

## The Constitutional Questions

Now, what I want to read to you just briefly is this prepared statement, on the constitutional question. And I've written it in this form, to be precise, so that this can be properly placed before relevant institutions, particularly in the United States. It's as follows:

Two constitutional questions are posed to us at this juncture. Considering the present circumstances, in which this election-crisis has erupted, does the U.S. have both the right, and the obligation, to pause now for calm, sane, and sober reflection, during these weeks the Electoral College is being prepared: to consider the implications of that present danger both to the very existence of our constitutional republic and the welfare of the world at large? Have we the national will, as well as the constitutional right, to consider thus the causes of that vast corruption which permeated the process leading into the Presidential election-crisis of Nov. 7th?

My reading of the intent of the framers of the U.S. Constitution, my reading of the circumstances of the choice of Thomas Jefferson over Aaron Burr, the selection of President John Quincy Adams, and the Tilden-Hayes crisis, indicates that we have not only precisely that right, and also that solemn obligation, to the founders of our republic, to our Constitution, and to our posterity, and to the world within which we have exerted great power, to use the means which our Constitution has prepared for like contingencies, to ensure the continued existence of our republic according to that solemn, constitutional intent to promote the general welfare, that commitment to the common good, upon which the very existence of our republic was premised.

Thank you.

---

## Questions & Answers

---

*LaRouche's seminar was attended by some 115 people, including diplomatic representatives, trade unionists, religious leaders, and the media. Questions were asked by many of those present, as well as by people calling in from cities around the world. The following is a selection of the discussion.*

### The American Electoral Crisis

**Adviser to the Ukrainian Parliament:** Mr. LaRouche, in a recently broadcast television show called *Tishden*, "The Week," one of the best-known Ukrainian political observers said that the American democracy, which has been proven valid repeatedly in history, and which is an eternal example for the rest of the world, now finds itself in a dead-end street, because of the ongoing electoral crisis. Do you agree with this? Could you please comment?

**LaRouche:** Yes, I'll just refer to what I said briefly before, as the best way of getting at it.

Leading people in Europe, who frequently travel to high-level places in Washington or New York, know this very well, and it frightens them because they know it. They know, that the fascist mob, based on the Southern Strategy, this alliance I referred to of Dixiecrats and Carpetbaggers, has taken over the United States, and is extremely dangerous. They also know that the people who called this monster into being, just like Montagu Norman called Hitler into being in Germany, that those people are no longer in control of this mob which they created. It's like the famous story of the Rabbi of Prague, whose wife, when the Rabbi went on a trip, his wife tried to do magic tricks, and created a Golem. And this Golem was going to help her do the housework, and he destroyed the house. And the Rabbi came back and turned the whole thing off.

And what we have in Wall Street, is a bunch of dumb people, who, like the wife of the Rabbi of Prague, created a Golem. This Golem is called the Southern Strategy, the alliance of suburbanites and fascists and whatnot, and racists, and this crowd is out of control. And because Wall Street has not got a competent hand on the world economy, and because this mob has taken over, our system of government is corrupted, top to bottom, by the presence of this monster. And Europeans are *terrified*, of the idea that the United States, as a superpower, should be taken over by this Golem, this bunch of hooligans, typified by a guy who is, at very best, a Ku Klux Klan freak, fellow-traveller, Trent Lott, the Republican head of the Senate. Who is a part of this package of Ku Klux Klanners, who met with Nixon back in 1966, and so forth, in Mississippi, who followed the Southern Strategy. When you realize that you're talking about right-wingers, and you've got genuine fascists of this type, in the United States, in both the Republican and Democratic party, and that the Bush



*LaRouche Presidential campaign workers at the Texas Democratic Party State Convention, June 9, 2000, organizing to reverse Al Gore's theft of LaRouche's votes in the Arkansas primary.*

candidacy, and the Gore candidacy, are both based on the control of the party system by these types, then you realize what the problem of democracy is in the United States.

And thus, I would ask our friends abroad, to have some compassionate insight to the mess we have to clean up here. And that when they find that the United States does bad things, maybe they should take that into account, and not hold us all to account for it, because we're suffering from it, too. Maybe we should just get together, and combine forces, to get rid of that monster.

### **Voting Rights Violations *Before* Election Day**

**Debra Freeman:** We also have a question, Lyn, from the staff of the United States Congressional Black Caucus. They actually have two questions. One is directly on the election, the other is on the question of the global financial system.

On the election, the question is: "There are allegations of serious violations of the Voting Rights Act committed prior to last Tuesday's election. Is there any way that this can be addressed now? It does not seem that the Electoral College procedure provides for this. Is it conceivable that the President form a high-level bipartisan commission, to investigate the very question of the legitimacy of what occurred *prior to* last Tuesday?"

**LaRouche:** It may be necessary to do, in the form of just that. Let me take this first, and then get the second question.

It may be necessary to do just that. Remember, that was done in the Tilden-Hayes case, back in the 1870s, in which the President supported the formation of a commission to investigate the questions of vote fraud and vote irregularities

in that national Presidential election. Something of that sort is needed.

Now, we should not think of the Electoral College as a rubber stamp for the candidates; it is not. In half the states, it is supposedly semi-controlled by the candidates, in commitment, but in the other half of the states, it is *not*. So, if the Electoral College is aware, or made aware, of the fact that the hoax is not a question of cheating by somebody in some election—the cheating on both sides is enormous.

For example, in the case of my campaign in the state of Arkansas, for the Presidential nomination, 23% of the vote was *openly* stolen from me, *openly!* After counted and cast, by Al Gore. And similar things happened elsewhere. When you see that kind of operation in the primary process, and in the general election, you don't say you're going to take a case to court and prove the election went one way or the other. If you wanted to conduct an inquiry into this election, I don't think it would take less than *years* to get to the bottom of the level of the corruption run by the two contending corrupt people, and their machines. The corruption in this election was beyond belief. I don't think there's one or two, or five or ten, little cases of investigation of this county or that county, that's going to get to the bottom of the mess.

However, if the Electoral College is persuaded that it is the victim of a hoax, not on the basis of who chose the members of the Electoral College, but if it is convinced, in its *conscience*, that the American people and the Electoral College system are the victim of an electoral *hoax*, involving the partisans of both candidates, and the hoax is so dirty and so messy nobody can clean it up in fair time, by January 20th, then it is the duty

of the Electoral College to make its own independent decision about who the next President should be! That would mean, in my view, that the Electoral College can select a candidate as President, who is *neither* Al Gore or George Bush. And if that is not the case in the Electoral College, it is true in the Congress. If the mess goes into the Congress without a clear Electoral College decision, then the mess goes into the Congress, and the Congress has much broader explicit ability to select a President.

So, we have not yet determined, by vote or anything else, who the next President will be. Counting the votes will not tell you who the next President is going to be! You have to take into account the corruption, the mass of the corruption.

What if you know the whole election is so corrupt, you can't *do* anything with it in time to select a President? Then you have to do something else. Because you must preserve the Constitution and representative government. If you *don't* do that —. Imagine if you elect either of these bums. What happens? Nobody in the world will have any respect for a United States who's elected as a President, somebody who qualifies, in the opinion of the leading European press, of being a petty comic-opera dictator of a banana republic! And that's the way that a Bush or Gore Administration will be viewed by the world as a whole.

Do you want the United States prisoner to that kind of a reputation for a sitting President? For four years, until you can impeach him? So, therefore, is it now the responsibility, as our Constitution provides, that we set reflective stages of the process, which is a process of review, by responsible agencies, of any error that was made in the proceeding step. Who must, with due process, and due haste, as well, proceed to find a solution. I say — insist — back up, organize. The decision must not be made in the courts by all these squabbles about this vote, or that vote. You'll never get to the bottom of it that quickly. Instead, insist that the Electoral College do a good job. And if it can't handle the job, pass it to the Congress, as the law prescribes. And work on the Congress, and the Electoral College, to insure that they take into account everything they should.

Now, obviously, all the evidence, like the fraud against me, the open vote-stealing by Al Gore — openly, shamelessly — and all these other things show, that the moral turpitude which pervades both candidacies —, you want to impeach a President on charges of moral turpitude? Why not get rid of him before you put him in there, if you've got the evidence? And that's the first question. I think that's the way to go.

## Toward a New, Just Financial System

**Freeman:** Their second question, Lyn: "Mr. LaRouche, you've repeatedly called on President Clinton to take steps to initiate the formation of a new, more just financial system. My question to you is in two parts: If President Clinton should fail to take such action, during the remainder of his term, can

Congress initiate such a process? And on the other side, in the event that President Clinton does move in the direction, could a Republican Congress block him, or is it in his power to do it without them?"

**LaRouche:** What I'm doing today, and why this is an international press conference, in effect, is because, at this point, largely because of the onrushing financial crisis, and because the world is horrified by the spectacle of what happened in the election on Nov. 7, and before, that none of the above candidates have any credibility as President of the United States. To put them in charge of the United States, is to drag the United States down into the pit, simply by doing so. You have Presidents who command no respect in the nation. Remember, people voted for them — not *for* them; they voted *against* the other guy. They voted for the lesser evil, and they got evil. They can now reconsider that.

The reason I'm doing this, is, in this process, I've acquired a considerable amount of intellectual influence and credit, in high-level circles, as well as others, throughout the world. Many people will tend to agree with many of the things I say, but none of them so far, have put forward what I've outlined to you today: the indications of general solution, which is feasible, and practical, and based upon precedent, by which we ought to address this general problem of international crisis, and related things.

It is my hope that by my doing this — and I see nobody else who is presently situated to do what I'm doing right now — that my doing this will cause people to begin to move. I think that most of the serious politicians in the Congress and elsewhere in the United States, will not really privately disagree with much of what I've had to say. They know it's true. Everybody in top circles in the United States, knows what I've said about the Southern Strategy, is absolutely true, that is, in both parties. That the Presidents and Wall Street and everything else, are now political prisoners of the Southern Strategy, a fascist, Nazi-like movement. And they would like to get rid of it.

So, I'm doing what I can to inspire that action, and I'm taking the spear on this. You know, what I've said tonight, has put my life in the cross-hairs. But I'm 78 years old; I'm probably ten years younger in terms of biological condition and so forth, but it's kind of risky. But, since that's the kind of business I'm in, I take those kinds of risks; that goes with the job, as they say.

So, I think that what we have to do is realize, that you can not get a real satisfactory solution to this crisis, unless you engage the United States with Europe, and if you can do that, to engage the United States in cooperation with groups like the ASEAN-Plus-3, Russia, and people in Africa, people in Central and South America: In that case, we can do the job.

To do the job without enlisting the office of the President of the United States, is extremely difficult. As far as Bill Clinton is concerned, between now and January 20th, if you could get a movement among some Congressmen, which



*German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder (left) and Russian President Vladimir Putin. President Clinton should back their 20-year oil-for-technology agreements, as a step toward returning the world economic system to sanity.*

were capable of pushing such an initiative, I think Bill Clinton would join it. And you wouldn't have a problem.

Bill Clinton, you remember, in September of 1998, made a speech in New York City, in which he indicated his readiness to consider reforms of the international financial system. I think that *personally*, he's not averse to such things, if he thinks he's got the backing. He's a very political guy, as some of you may have observed. And with the signs of adequate backing, and if he didn't think they were going to shoot him on the following morning, I think he might do it.

And therefore, I would say, don't ignore the Congress. But don't count on the Congress as an institution to do the job. You can count on people in the Congress to set a fire under the President, a supporting fire, as they say, under the President—like supporting fire under a mule you want to get off his butt. That might work. And that's very good idea. And I think the possibilities are considerable, especially as this crisis gets worse. It's not going to get any better. People who are still clamoring, "Well, my man should get elected, I don't want Bush elected, I don't want Gore elected"; that kind of thing is going to die out. And people are going to get the idea, fighting for either candidate's cause, is not a worthy, profitable cause. We've got to take other courses of action. And I think putting pressure on institutions, in the Congress and elsewhere, to set a fire under the President, under President Clinton, to do what he can do in this direction—and if we could get echoes of this from people in Asia, South and Central America, but particularly Asia, Russia, and western Europe, I think we could pull it off.

Now, the President is going to be meeting at about this time, with the President of Russia. There's an agreement that

has been reached, initiated through Germany and Russia, between the Chancellor of Germany, Gerhard Schröder, and Putin, Vladimir Putin, the President of Russia. This agreement provides for a 20-year cooperation of oil-for-technology exchanges between Russia and western Europe. This agreement has been extended under the auspices of the President of the European Commission, Prodi, to include other European nations. This can follow very quickly the type of agreement that was made by some signators in the 1920s, called the Rapallo Pact, in which certain Europeans had entered into an agreement with the minister of Russia, Chicherin, to this kind of cooperation: technology for Russian exports.

This is a very sound project from the standpoint of Russia's interests at this time, and from the standpoint of western Europe in particular. It is important to the United States that such agreement is being reached, because the United States' trade relations with Europe are crucial for the United States itself. A healthy Europe is essential to the United States.

Under those conditions, Japan, Korea, China, the ASEAN-Plus-3 group, in general, would be in a position to cooperate. So we might, by this route, and by pressure and thinking in those directions, we might bring into being, quite feasibly, the circumstances by which we can pull this off. And I think we should watch very closely what the discussion between the two Presidents, Putin and Clinton, is, in this immediate time frame. A good discussion between them, on this kind of issue—economic cooperation—could be a very important added factor, in light of the existing discussions among Russia, China, Japan, Korea, and so forth in that area, and India, and so forth.

So, I think the possibilities are great. The idea of a 25-year global long-term credit agreement, among a group of nations, of swaps for technology, and raw materials and so forth, around the world, this kind of agreement is a very viable agreement; it's the one thing that can work to get the world out of the present financial crisis.

### **The U.S. Role in Africa**

**African diplomat:** Good afternoon. Dr. LaRouche, thank you very much, indeed, for the lecture. It's quite obvious that the American election has somewhat altered the scenario, not only immediately, but in the near future. I'm very much interested to know, how you see the world political and economic system, and the role that the United States can play, in the next two years, following these elections, with particular reference to Africa, in terms of debt and AIDS, and democratization, and also with particular reference to the Middle East. Thank you.

**LaRouche:** I think—as you're experienced, you know

something about these things—that sometimes you take a principle, and you try to find the practical road of least resistance to get the thing in operation. Now, in this case, in the case of Africa in particular, from my own experience in doing studies, and plans, and proposals for development of Africa, and looking back to it, I see that what President Franklin Roosevelt threatened Churchill with, on African development, in his meeting with Churchill at Casablanca, is a place at which to start. Why? First of all, this is the policy of a President of the United States, who is one of its authentic heroes, President Franklin Roosevelt. Secondly, the time has come when the anti-Roosevelt slanders—Roosevelt-haters are about to get a big slap in the face from reality, and therefore, a U.S. population, particularly the lower 80%, who are suffering as much as they are, will encourage a return to the policies of Franklin Roosevelt, saying, “He got us out of the Depression. These guys put us back in one. We’re going back to his policies.” And therefore, in that light, the American people, in that condition, will tend to have confidence in the kind of policies for which we can cite a precedent from the policies of the United States, the Roosevelt Presidency.

And therefore, what I would do, is, I would simply say, what the United States should think of, in cooperation with its partners, in various parts of the world—Africa’s major problem, as we discussed this, the major problem is the lack of basic economic infrastructure. That is, we need, for example, as I said many years ago: From Dakar to Djibouti and Port Sudan, we need a corridor, an East-West corridor of modern transportation, water management; that such a route would be crucial along the Sahel region area, for bringing back that whole section of Africa, into the conditions for very significant rates of the development of agriculture and other things. We need similar things from North-South, and so forth. I think that these questions of power, of large-scale power systems, large-scale transportation systems, large-scale water-management systems, and so forth, that these things—

And remember also, that we had another problem, which relates to this right now; it’s an added problem, the problem of epidemic disease: As a result of the conditions, which the past years’ U.S. and other policy, IMF policy, has imposed on Africa, we have turned Africa into the breeding place, for the spread of new types, as well as old types, of pandemics and epidemics. The entire planet, as the recent CIA and National Security Council reports indicate, the United States itself is now threatened by a major strategic threat from the spread of pandemic and epidemic disease. The greatest concentration of this disease, is, naturally, in the poorest area, especially in the tropical disease belt of Africa, in the wake of wars and devastation of other kinds, and poverty. And therefore, we have to realize, that not only are we going in to help Africa, by helping with support with grants and other ways, to support Africa, so that Africa is able to undertake these large-scale infrastructure projects, which it desperately needs, as a precondition for any successful economic development, as Roo-

sevelt indicated in the Casablanca address. But we must also recognize, that the frontier, the world frontier for fighting against the spread of a deadly—strategically deadly—spread of epidemic and pandemic disease, *is in Africa*.

If we understand our own best self-interest, *right here in the United States and Europe, we are going to get on those fighting lines, mobilize the forces to fight the disease where it comes from*. That’s, I think, the way to approach it.

## How To Revive the Mideast Peace Process

**Freeman:** Lyn, the next question is from *Esam Elborei Albayan* newspaper, in the United Arab Emirates.

**Q:** Hello, Mr. LaRouche. The current crisis, obviously, will be reflected on the credibility of the next President, whoever he is. There’s an idea circulating that Bill Clinton probably will continue his intermediation in the Middle East, even under a new administration. A new President will be susceptible to blackmail from pressure groups in the United States, because he will start with a situation, that is, that reflects a lack of credibility. How do you think the situation in the Middle East will evolve under such a vacuum of the influence of the United States?

**LaRouche:** Well, let’s say that President Clinton made a great mistake in handling the Camp David discussions with Ehud Barak and Chairman Arafat: that he did the one thing, he make the one mistake, which spoiled everything else. There had been progress in the discussions, along the lines of the Oslo Accord. There was a sentiment among many of us, that the murder of Rabin should not be rewarded, by giving in to the policies for which Rabin’s murderers had fought. We could not let Rabin’s murderers dictate the policy of the world, and the United States in particular.

Now, it’s true that Prime Minister Barak had gotten himself into a difficult situation, in which he himself was under death threat from the same people that had killed Rabin, many of whom are based in the United States, and are found among those associated with the influence of Edgar Bronfman, the man who backed [East German dictator Erich] Honecker in the last years of Honecker’s career—a failed effort.

But, the point is, despite the fact that Barak may have excuses, in the fact that he was acting as he did under *death threat* from the forces associated with Sharon, but also from the forces associated with the hard core of the Dixiecrats in the United States. The basic problem with the so-called Temple Mount phenomenon, the attempt to take back the holy places in Jerusalem, and give them over to these fanatics: This does not come from Jews! There may be Jewish factions—nominally Jewish factions—who tend to be rallied into this, but the threat comes from certain American fundamentalist Protestants, who are organized around this idea of an Armageddon. They want to have the Battle of Armageddon now, so they don’t have to pay their rent next month, or something. These kinds of fanatics, these dangerous fanatics are typical of the racist element in the United States, the Southern Strategy

types, the Dixiecrat types. We know them: the Falwells, the Robertsons, these loose-geese fanatics all over the place, are dangerous.

Thus, the problem here, is, the United States can not act as an “honest broker” in the Middle East. The United States, and the President of the United States, must never become an honest broker. The President must be President of the United States, and represent the fundamental interests of the United States in any negotiation in which he deals.

Now it happens that the fundamental interest of the United States, in the Middle East, is peace. And the fundamental interest of the United States in peace in the Middle East, is development. Because, look, for example, in the Palestine area now: You have less water available in the aquifers than there are people existing. How the devil can you divide the land? It’s the water that’s the problem. There’s not enough water! People are moving in from Brooklyn, and elsewhere, into new settlements. The Palestinians wish to return to their homeland. Where’s the water? *Where’s the water?* The Middle East has lots of land. But look at it. Fly in a plane over it, as you know it well. Desert, desert, desert! Where’s the water?

We have the ability to make the water. We have the technologies to produce masses of water, to turn the desert into—to make it bloom. If we create that kind of optimism, then we can have peace, or a basis for peace.

The interest of the United States, is to say: We’ve had—from the time of the Grand Mufti, who was a British agent, with Nazi clothes—we’ve had a state of warfare which did not previously exist among Jews and Arabs in the Middle

East. It didn’t exist. This state of warfare, has gone on, for how many years? It’s gone on since World War II, as an active state of warfare. It has never really stopped. We’ve had interruptions, but it’s gotten worse now than it ever was before, because of these fanatics, who are loose, the fanatics who killed Rabin, and who have threatened to kill Barak, if he didn’t do what Sharon wanted.

What we need is peace. We need peace, as we needed peace in Europe during the period of the Thirty Years War.

The interests of the United States, is to force peace, in a situation dominated by what is recognizably *religious warfare*. In the case of religious warfare, the one mistake you never make, is, you never make the possession of holy places, a matter of political negotiation. The holy places must be left *intact. Untouched.* Untouched by political power. The only thing the politicians must do, is, they must work to insure access to the holy places. They must never *touch* them. They must never claim to *own them*, or *manage them*. As long as you insist that the holy places must be part of the negotiation in a Middle East agreement, *you are fomenting war.*

And that’s exactly what happened.

When President Clinton made the mistake of trying to act as an honest broker, instead of President of the United States, and took an otherwise workable agreement, as an interim agreement, negotiated that, then *added to that, the insanity, of bringing a political negotiation over the holy places into the discussion, the whole thing blew up.* And we now have a full-blown, potential religious war developing in the Middle East.

The solution to that, is not, how do you force a peace on



*President Clinton meets with Prime Minister Barak and President Arafat at Camp David, July 25, 2000. “In the case of religious warfare, the one mistake you never make, is you never make the possession of holy places, a matter of political negotiation. The holy places must be left intact. Untouched. Untouched by political power.”*



*“The threat comes from certain American Fundamentalist Protestants, who are organized around this idea of an Armageddon. They want to have the Battle of Armageddon now, so they don’t have to pay their rent next month, or something.” Here: a demonstration by the Promise Keepers in Washington, D.C.*

the Middle East? The solution in this, is for the United States to act as a sovereign nation. And what Clinton is — he represents a sovereign nation; what’s out there in the wings trying to get in, does not necessarily represent that. But, what Clinton should do, if he wants to bring peace, as a first step—you can’t guarantee you’re going to get peace by any action, but you have to take the position, which the United States *itself* should take, which is the first step toward bringing peace. And that is, President Clinton should say, he made a big mistake, by opening his big, fat mouth about the holy places, and for blaming Arafat for breaking up the negotiations, because Arafat did what he had to do. *Arafat could not live ten minutes*, if he had agreed to that condition, demanded by Barak, and supported by Clinton. Religious war would have been inevitable, as the immediate outcome of it. Worse than what we have now. By Arafat rejecting that demand, he may have postponed the full-scale outbreak of religious war.

We, of the United States, must take the position, that the precedent by which we overcame religious war, which was tearing us apart for a century and a half in Europe, including the Thirty Years War, that we must use the lesson of the way we stopped religious war in Europe, and say that is in the interest of the Arabs and the Israelis, as it was of the Europeans in 1648. We must recognize, that from the standpoint of modern international law, that the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, is the standard of international law, which is in the vital interests of the United States. And the United States President, despite Henry Kissinger’s objections, *must* say that the Treaty of Westphalia is the terms. We want peace. We want each to walk away from the negotiations, equally as sure of the

sovereignty of their people, and the right to prosperity. No recriminations. No retributions. No compensation. We just do the right thing, to give each people a way to live to the future, so that their children will not be living still, with the hatreds of the past. And that was the rule of the Treaty of Westphalia.

The United States should use its good offices, and can obtain the support of Europeans and others, in that thing, to offer to the parties in the Middle East, an offer they can not refuse, an offer based on *our commitment* to the same principles of the Treaty of Westphalia, which brought to an end, the horror of nearly a century and a half of religious warfare in modern Europe.

That’s the only approach that I think can be taken as a policy. Of course, there’s much more to discuss. We can discuss many things, but I think that’s the core of the answer.

### **The Role of the Electoral College**

**Q:** My question, Mr. LaRouche, is, if indeed the Electoral College has been appointed by people we don’t know, and we consider it a hoax, why would you advocate holding on to the Electoral College?

**LaRouche:** Because the Constitution provides for it. If you try to reinvent the Constitution impromptu, on the basis of a specific issue at a specific time, you’re going to unleash a pack of cats and dogs, which you can’t get back out of the picture.

Now, I know that some people are desperately saying, “We don’t want George Bush for President; therefore, we’ve got to support this idea of ‘the majority must rule.’ ” We don’t know who the majority is! The corruption of this election campaign was so filthy, nobody knows who won anything. The popular vote doesn’t count, the electoral vote doesn’t count, etc. So what you have to do, is, try to get the Electoral College—which is created for this purpose, under the Constitution—get it induced to make an honest decision, based on the conscience of the members, or the majority of the members.

If the Electoral College can not make that decision, then the Congress has to make it.

Now, if you try to get out of that track, and go to some crooked court, and try to get a crooked judge to give you a crooked decision in your favor, what are you going to get? You’re going to say, “Where is the law? Where is the Constitution?” When you go, and try to get Justice Scalia to recognize the Constitution, you already have an almost-impossible chore on your hands. This guy is against human beings, he’s

for shareholder value. His decisions don't make any sense, but he makes them, and they cause a lot of trouble. Rehnquist doesn't understand what Scalia's decisions are, so what are you going to do talking to him for? He's too dumb.

So, the point is, we do not want to start gambling, opening a gambling hall, with the U.S. Constitution. What we must do is make the Constitution work. *Make it work*. Because, if you go the other route, then you turn around tomorrow, and when you try to get a constitutional defense, and uphold constitutional law, you haven't got a chance in the world. And once you begin to get that kind of fight, and once someone says the whole thing was illegal to begin with — . What if, for example, you get Gore nominated, designated by the Electoral College, and Gore goes up to be sworn in; and Chief Justice Rehnquist is standing there, and refuses to swear him in, because the whole election was a fraud? And can prove that the selection of Gore was done by a method which violates the Constitution? What are you going to do?

So the problem in this case, is, don't go for what you think the cheap-shot debaters' tricks are. And that's the tendency of the American people, when they say, "vote for the lesser evil," and they get the evil, every time, either way the vote goes, as they got in this election: They got evil. And Gore is a racist, even if he pretends not to be, but I know better. Why did he vote for repudiating the Voting Rights Act of 1965? But he did it. He got the court to go along with it—a Bush court, Sentelle—to go along with doing that, on his initiative. The man's a racist.

So what's the difference between him and George Bush? Gore's intelligent enough to know that he is a racist. Bush is too dumb to know it. What's the difference?

So, I say: What we have to do is, we've got to stop being beggars at the back door of the White House, like slaves. We've got to go in the front door, and say, "We are in charge of the joint; we are the citizens." And you're going to find that, as the financial crisis hits, we're going to find a lot more who'll go with us. The problem, is that this country needs leadership; people who say, "I'm tired of the lesser evil."

Remember the whole thing about [Socialist Party Presidential candidate Eugene] Debs? Now, I've got a lot of things to say against Debs. But Debs, when he ran for President in the 1890s, said, "It is better to vote for what you want, and lose, than to vote for what you don't want, and win." And we, the American people, have got to get off our butts, and stop being the lower 80%; stop being the fieldhands, begging for favors from the back door of the slavemaster!

We've got to assert our rights. Look who voted for Gore: African-Americans, labor people, and so forth—not one of them likes anything that Gore represents. They just thought Bush was the greater evil. And if these same people had not made the mistake, of selling themselves to — . Of course, the Justice Department blackmail helped a good deal, otherwise they wouldn't have gone for Gore in the first place. But, if we'd gotten together, and defended our interests, instead of trying to find the lesser evil, the power that we represent—

just those two constituencies, labor and African-Americans, represent a core of political power among the lower 80% of the population, which has the power to mobilize the nation, and determine its policies. And we've got to give up this idea of field hands, slaves, going begging at the back door of the slavemaster's plantation, and trying to find out which door opens to the lesser evil. Instead, we've got to find someone who represents *us*. And then we'll win.

And when the people get the idea that we're out to win, and we get the majority together to do it, at least a reasonable sample of that majority, we're going to start winning. Every crisis is the golden opportunity to seize, to make that fundamental change, when people no longer believe in corrupt institutions, and they're ready to consider looking for something else instead.

This is our great opportunity!

And those people who are on the state level, whether as elected political officials, or as influentials on the state level, who represent the grassroots leaders of the nation: These are the people to whom I would appeal and I have confidence in. We can do it, if you guys will stop playing lesser-evil games, and start fighting for what *we* want, instead of the lesser evil. Then we won't get evil! We'll get something else, instead. We may lose, but at least, we'll set a precedent, a precedent of courage and honor, through which someone who will come after us, will redeem the nation.

## The Coming Collapse of the Dollar

**Egyptian journalist:** Will the coming collapse of the dollar be beneficial to other currencies like the euro, or will it lead to the collapse of all currencies? What will the effect of the dollar crash be, on the economies of the Third World? And what's your advice to Third World countries, as they face this crisis?

**LaRouche:** First of all, the collapse of the dollar will be a catastrophe for everyone. It should have been prevented, but it's coming, and it's now here. My estimate is, that no one can know how far the collapse will go, because there is a certain element of pure fantasy in this whole business, anyway. But, to talk about a 40% collapse of the U.S. dollar over a fairly short period of time, some time in the very near future—could be next week, could be this week, that sort of thing could start, at any moment; you're already getting signs of it right now. The turbulences on the financial markets right now portend the preconditions for a very rapid, sudden collapse of the dollar.

When it goes down, it will go down big; it will flop; it will crash. And a 40% relative devaluation of the dollar is a very likely prospect to think about. No one can predict how far it will go, but you've got to think in those terms, to make a policy for dealing with it.

The collapse of the dollar will immediately — . See, people think that everything is trade relations, and trade has very little to do with anything these days. Everything is financial speculation.



What will happen with the collapse of the dollar will be a number of things. First of all, not only is every leading bank in Europe, in particular, and Japan, the United States, bankrupt. But the central banking systems, including the Federal Reserve System of the United States, the central reserve systems of Europe, Japan, and other nations, are bankrupt.

You face a situation, in which the only way to prevent chaos, is for the U.S. government—in the case of the Federal Reserve System—to take the Federal Reserve System, which is a government-chartered private organization of merchant bankers, and take it into receivership, into bankruptcy receivership. In other words, the United States government has to direct—and the President, the Executive Branch, and the Congress together have to collaborate in taking over the Federal Reserve System; putting it through bankruptcy reorganization, for the purpose of defending the U.S. economy, its functioning, lines of credit to communities and other things like that; and to protect the U.S. dollar itself. Which means that things like the derivatives—which they say is \$100 trillion, but which is maybe closer, in total globally, with the off-the-counter stuff, to \$400 trillion in soft paper around the world: Most of that should be wiped off the books immediately!

You see, as a famous man said of the 1929 crash: What collapsed was only paper. The essence of this crisis is, that what is collapsing is paper! You could burn the paper. You could write it off. You can declare it worthless. But that is not the economy. The economy is people. The economy is infrastructure. The economy is production. The economy is essential services. The economy is the functions of government. Our concern, is to save the economy, which is not money—we have to have a stable currency—but to save the institutions which are *real* economy: people, families, schools, farms, factories, modes of transportation, health services, essential services. We must keep those functioning. That's the real economy.

What happens if a corporation continues to produce what it produced yesterday, but its stock value has collapsed to 10% of what it was the day before yesterday? Is that a catastrophe? It's a financial catastrophe for those who are stockholders; but it's not a catastrophe for the economy. The economy is the *real things* on which life depends, and the maintenance of life depends. The economy is not money. The economy is not paper. It is not shareholder values. It is the things which are needed to sustain life and sustain the economy, and the civil order, and the development of the population.

Therefore, under the rule of the general welfare, which very few people today understand as a principle of natural and international law, the function of the government in the bankruptcy of the Federal Reserve System—which is now, presently bankrupt, I can assure you; it's more bankrupt than you can imagine—under those conditions (and Alan Greenspan, essentially, might be called the Cowardly Lion of Wall Street), under those conditions, you freeze everything that is not essential. You keep families functioning; you keep the

local stores functioning; you keep the local police chief, the local fire chief, and all these people, functioning. You keep people employed, as much as possible. And you set out to create expanded employment in useful things.

And that's what we're going to have to do.

So, the question then comes: The collapse of financial values is meaningless, in this period. A vast collapse. Look, we have over \$400 trillion of debt out there, against about \$42 trillion of total GDP of the world, as a whole! *You can't collect!* What you can't collect, you've got to write off. And you write off the things that are least important, and that means derivatives; that means short-term financial speculation; that means a lot of so-called shareholder value, get written off, because we must save the people, the economy and the nation.

If we agree on that, and if the nations in Europe, the United States, the ASEAN-Plus-3 nations and so forth, agree on that, then we shall survive, and we shall prosper! Because by getting *rid* of the cancer, the rest of us can grow. The question here is not a financial or economic question as such; it's a *political* question. It's a moral question. If the government decides that we're going to save the people, rather than the shareholders, we'll save the people. If they decide to save the shareholders rather than the people, which is what Gore and Bush are both *sworn* to do—to save the shareholders, not the people—then the people are going to suffer. The economy will collapse. Chaos will exist.

So, that's the big question.

So, if as nations, as in the case of Egypt, if we can get a regional agreement within the Arab world, for example, on development, if that agreement touches into Africa, if we can bring that agreement into congruence with agreements with the ASEAN-Plus-3 with India, with Europe, with Russia, Japan, the United States as such, then we shall all do very well. Simply because we decided to cooperate, on the basis of protecting the people and the economies, and the integrity of the nations and development, rather than protecting the shareholders.

But, whatever happens, whether they try to defend the shareholders or not, the shareholders are doomed. There's nothing you can do for the shareholders. They'll just have to eat their losses, and live like the rest of us, and normal people.

## Who Is Destroying Democracy?

**Patricio Ricketts, Peruvian journalist:** All right, Mr. LaRouche. Months ago, the Peruvian elections were seriously disturbed, as you recall, and finally objected to by the Organization of American States, as well as the American Embassy, supported by Canada and the European Community, the so-called "U.S. Protectorate," to quote Raymond Aron. To be sure, the show of Washington finance, non-governmental organizations, did their job. One of them, Transparencia, got a million dollars to model the election, with the excuse of observing it. The Carter Center and the Democrats made a similar effort. Finally, the American government and its or-



Asks Peruvian journalist Patricio Ricketts: “How is it, that the country which reached the Moon, cannot count votes? Have we reached the cybernetic era in order to rely on manual counting of votes?”

chestra came to the conclusion: The Peruvian elections were below the minimal world standards.

Now that we can observe with amusement the American elections, we Peruvians ask ourselves, if the United States will be able to reach at least our poor mark, below those famous standards, provided someone is able to find them anywhere in the world.

In this country, 80% of the citizens entitled to vote, that means absolutely everybody above 18, did vote. What was the American electoral participation, and therefore, is now the Presidential democratic representation? In this country, votes were immediately counted by the citizens elected at random to manage the electoral sites. Their results were registered in acts in front of party representatives; and then went into an Internet page, all the 90,000 documents, so that every citizen could check the official counting of the electoral documents. The State Department, the CIA, the Organization of American States in Washington, and anyone, in any possible place on Earth, could verify the results, and check the votes, act by act, for each of the 1,227 candidates for the Presidency and Congress.

So far, no one has been able—no one, *no one*—has been able to demonstrate that the official counting was incorrect. And nevertheless, the U.S. government objected to the results, decided they were substandard.

Now we ask, when are we going to see credible results of the American election? And what about the famous stan-

dards? How is it, that the country which reached the Moon, cannot count votes? Have we reached the cybernetic era in order to rely on manual counting of votes?

Let me quote, Mr. LaRouche, a sentence of Pachacutec, the wisest of the Incas. “If a fellow,” he said, “cannot count the knots of the *quipus* (their accounting system), and pretends to reach the stars, he deserves a laugh.” I would like to hear your comments, Mr. LaRouche. Thank you.

**LaRouche:** First of all, you have to start with two facts, two sets of facts.

One is, that in 1989-1990, the alliance of George Bush, then President, with Margaret Thatcher of the United Kingdom, then Prime Minister, created what they imagined to be a world empire, an English-speaking world empire, Anglo-American world empire. As I said earlier in my remarks, today, this reduced the status of France, Germany, Italy and so forth, to satrapies. So that what you have now, is a parody of not only East Germany—and you might consider Bush and Gore as the Honecker and Mielke of the United States, two characters in East Germany who were being supported heavily by Edgar Bronfman when the East German government fell apart.

What we’re dealing with is an empire, the United States, the Anglo-American empire, as defined by George Bush and Margaret Thatcher and others, at the end phase of its existence. You’re at the point at which the empire is collapsing in on itself, because the oppression by the central force upon the periphery, is causing the periphery either to crumble, and thus disintegrate as assets of the empire, or to turn upon the empire itself.

Now, in the case of Peru, these two things are to be considered: First of all, the idea that this was democratic or anything else—there was no democracy whatsoever in anything the United States did in that process. None. The whole claim there was democracy is a fraud.

But then you look a little bit closer: What is the “democracy”? Carter is an exponent, and an agent, of the Southern Strategy, the Dixiecrat-Carpetbagger alliance. The Carter Presidency was the inauguration of the takeover of the Democratic Party by the basically racist, Carpetbagger-Dixiecrat alliance. Carter doesn’t know what democracy is. Why do they call it a Carter Committee for democracy? Because he’s still studying, trying to find out what it’s about, and has not yet discovered. He thought it was an early-on version of George W. Bush.

Transparencia is a personal asset of the Royal Consort of the United Kingdom, Prince Philip. Prince Philip is the head of Transparency International. Now you realize that anyone that is a monarch, an absolute monarch in a sense, one hereditary monarch, is not exactly a paragon of democratic institutions. There may be some decent monarchs in history, but that institution is not necessarily one qualified to judge from experience, to explain what democracy is.

So, you look earlier at the case of Italy, 1992 on. Transparency International was represented by the yacht *Britannia*, of

the Queen of England, which was parked off the coast of Italy, which gave marching orders to a bunch of Italian politicians who were agents of the British monarchy, who then collapsed the existing system of democratic government of Italy, in an operation called "Clean Hands." They washed their hands in the blood of their victims. And they slaughtered and destroyed the political system of Italy, which has not been able to regain control over its own sovereign affairs since.

Is that democracy? So, if you say, these guys call themselves democracy, but they're pirates.

You take a step back further. What is Project Democracy? Project Democracy was founded, as a project, in 1975-76, by crazy Zbigniew Brzezinski, the man who was the controller of the Carter Presidency. He was typical of the forces which took the Democratic Party over, for the Southern Strategy! Huntington, the agent of Brzezinski, wrote a paper on the "Crisis of Democracy." This paper on the crisis of democracy, which was intended to create a system under which the two Southern Strategy organizations, that is, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, would together control the political party system of the United States, through what was called Project Democracy, the National Endowment for Democracy, which runs both parties from the top.

So, what you have is essentially a fascist organization, so defined as fascist by its Mussolini-like commitment to shareholder and slaveholder traditions, imposed upon the system of government of the United States, in the party system. Agents of that party system, typified by that desperado Carter himself, go down to Peru, and say, "You do not please us in Project Democracy. You're not democrats, the way Project Democracy defines it. Well, you don't have any black slaves down there! You don't have any slaveholder tradition, to speak of, that you honor. You don't have a shareholder decision — you don't have a bunch of fascists running the country! Therefore, you're not democratic!"

When you eliminate this word-play, and say: What is the content of Project Democracy, what is the democratic system of the United States, what is this cesspool of corruption called the recent election, Presidential election? Put this all together, and what we're dealing with, which I'm sure you understand, is a question not of fact, or law, but of power. Power as a substitute for law. We watched in Ibero-America. We've watched George Bush in Panama. We watched the United States State Department backing the drug-pushing dictatorship inside Colombia. We saw what happened to the destruction of all sovereignty of Ecuador. We see what's being done, now, in adjoining countries. We see the destruction of one nation and economy after another, throughout all of Ibero-America.

This is democracy?

The question is, it's a misunderstanding about the definition of words.

Now, the question is, is how do you defeat this? Well, you don't defeat it by appealing to courts of law, because the judge is a crook. You don't complain about the lack of democracy

by going to a fascist judge. You have to change the judge. You have to change the correlation of forces.

A nation like Peru understands, as a relatively small and vulnerable nation, that it depends upon some system of law among states, which is based on rational grounds, on the grounds of the general welfare, the grounds of the common good. Therefore, a country like Peru *needs* a rational system of international relations, based on clear and honest rules of law, for behavior among nations.

The United States has become a lawless dictatorship, in the tradition of the Roman Empire at its end-phase. So, you've got to eliminate the empire. We're now at the point that the empire is about to collapse, and the smart victims of the empire, at that point, always get together and say, "Let's restore the kind of system which was promised by Franklin Roosevelt, and his 'Good Neighbor' policy, which was promised by John Kennedy, before he was killed, and his policy for the Americas, and start right there." All we need is an honest President of the United States, who is not under the control, and not terrified by the bullets aimed at the nape of his neck, by the fascists, the way Bill Clinton is. If Bill Clinton did not have the gun-sights of the people behind this fascist gang, aimed at the back of his neck, he would behave as a different President than he's behaved as so far.

So, take the gun out of the hands of those people who've got the gun-sights aimed on the nape of his neck, and his child's neck, and he might behave differently.

So, the point is, those of us who have power, or don't have power, must have among ourselves, an understanding of these problems. We must have an understanding of our need to cooperate around the ideas of the kind of world, based on what John Quincy Adams called a community of principle, among perfectly sovereign nation-states. A group of nations which has agreed to defend the sovereignty of each by all. No tampering with the sovereignty of a nation. And to agree to a principle of the general welfare, otherwise called the common good, by which we each seek to govern our own internal affairs, and by which we seek to promote the common good among us.

That's all that we need, and we have to make that revolution now.

Because obviously, as you see in the case of Peru, as you saw in the case of Ecuador, as we see in the case of Colombia, which we see in the case of Panama, and so forth, we see that there is no hope, for any of the nations, of Central and South America, in even the relatively short term. There's no trick, there's no way in which any hope can be brought, *unless the power can be brought to bear, to bring back a cause for hope.*

And we who understand that, like you in your position, I in mine, we must do what we can together, to bring that *coalition of power together*, to bring this world back into some semblance of order, to establish, finally, a community of principle among self-respecting and mutually-respecting, sovereign nation-states.

That's the only solution to this mess.