

# How a Concert of Sovereign Nations Can End the Global Economic Collapse

Lyndon LaRouche gave a major economics address to the Chamber of Commerce of Turkey's capital, Ankara, on June 16. The subject was the world financial-economic crisis, and Turkey's situation within it, as well as LaRouche's personal role as Presidential candidate and leader, in solving that crisis.

Here too, the participants' questions to LaRouche are paraphrased, while his answers are given in full.

Thank you all. Thank you, Mr. President, very much. I think I can assure you, from the reports I have received from Europe, and indirectly from the United States, that partly because of the international connections of some Turkish television, what I had to say at night, here, on Saturday night, has been broadcast into Europe and into the United States. . . . I've had reports from Germany, in particular, and from the United States, among Turkish-speaking people there, who are elated about my being here. It reassures them, that somebody still cares about what they're concerned about.

Now, what I shall try to do, is to—in a compact way, not answering all questions, but I'm prepared to answer those that come up—what the situation of Turkey is, as I see it now, in respect to the current crisis with emphasis on the crisis of the world economy and the world financial system.

We're now at the end of the system. That is, as some of you know, or recall, who are younger—that at the end of the last war, the United States emerged as virtually the only world power. We had the highest rate of productivity in physical terms, per capita, of any nation of the world. In the immediate period, the first 15-20 years, of the post-war period, the monetary system which had been designed by President Roosevelt, the so-called "Bretton Woods system," brought prosperity and growth to many countries of the world. We continued to be a great nation, despite all the mistakes we made—and we made some bad ones.

## IMF Usury and U.S. Parasitism

But then, about the time of the assassination of President Kennedy, a fundamental change occurred in the United States. We changed our national character, from having been the world's leading producer-society, in terms of per-capita physical output, to becoming increasingly a consumerist parasite upon the world. This parasitical role, which began to



Before a painting of Turkey's national founder Kemal Atatürk, American Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche speaks to a packed meeting of the Ankara Chamber of Commerce (ATO) on June 16.

emerge about 1966-68, was consolidated under President Nixon, during the years 1971-1972, with a sweeping change in the world monetary system. As a result of that, the United States, Britain, and a few others took over the world monetary system, and used the world monetary system, the floating-exchange-rate system, to loot the world.

If you go into a country, from London, the London speculative market, you organize a speculators' run against the currency of Argentina, of Mexico, or some other country—or India, as was done in 1967, against India. Then, you threaten to crash the currency of that country. Then someone says to that country, "Why don't you call in the International Monetary Fund or World Bank? They will help you out!" The International Monetary Fund or World Bank says, to that country, "Drop the value of your currency. Devalue your currency."

And the country says, "Fine. That means that we'll pay our debts in our currency, as before. Right?"

"Nooo! You will not pay your debts in your currency! You will pay your debts in dollars! We will take your old debts. We'll reclassify them as dollar debts, and you will now pay in dollars."

And thus, you have a situation, for example, in Central and South America: That, in point of fact, morally, no country of South America owes any money to anyone on account of its honest debt: They've more than paid every debt they had, as of 1972-72. They have only the artificial debt, dictated to them, by the IMF and World Bank. No money was paid to them. They received no value for this debt; it was a postal mark.

In similar ways, they would dictate to countries what the prices of their exports would be; what their import/export policies would be. They would tell them to sell valuable industries, to certain preferred companies, which were preferred by the IMF. The riches of the world were robbed, especially of the poorer countries, by IMF methods.

Then, we came along to a later point: 1989-1991. The Soviet system collapsed. And the Anglo-Americans said, "No! We run the world! There is no other superpower! The world must do, as we tell them. We are the power to rule the world forever." Now, some people thought that was wrong, even in the United States, until recently. Even Bush—the father of the present incumbent of the empty chair, in the White House—was not willing to go along with his Defense Secretary Cheney and others, the people that are called "neo-conservatives," in continuing the war in Iraq; or going toward a war policy of nuclear preventive war against nations of the world, including those without any nuclear weapons! Bush said, "No." Scowcroft said, "No." And Cheney sat there, grumpily, and saying, "Wait, until I get my chance!"

Then came Clinton. Now, Clinton was probably the most intelligent President we've had since Roosevelt; or perhaps Kennedy (we never really had a chance to really try Kennedy out; they killed him, too soon). But, Bill—whom I liked, and still do—while he's got a great mind, tends to compromise too much, to my liking. And, he was compromised, by somebody putting something in the basement of the White House. But, Bill was a fine fellow; I still like him; he's still useful. I think he's useful for the cause of peace and for some other things. But, I wouldn't put him up front as a soldier. I'd put him back there, somewhere else, probably tending the wounded or something like that he'd be good at; or encouraging them.

But, then what happened is: With an operation in place, Bill ended two terms as President, and they put two fools up to run for President that year, the year 2000. One fool was just as ignorant and incompetent as the other one. One could spell, the other could not. One could read a map, the other could not. But, they were both fools. And either one becoming President would leave the country open to a non-leadership, which would get us into a war we didn't want, very soon.

### The Sept. 11, 2001 Reichstag Fire

So, when you create a vacuum in power, when the parties are weak and disoriented and corrupted, then, at that time, you can have what happened to us in the United States: on Sept. 11, 2001. Through a provocation, like the Reichstag

Fire in Germany in 1933, a dictatorship was established in the United States, on the presumption that someone outside, from the Muslim world, a bunch of amateurs had captured planes and attacked two towers in New York City and the Pentagon—none of which is true. What happened immediately is: Cheney, who had been sleeping there, awaiting his chance, since 1991-1992, when the other Bush, and Scowcroft and Co. had forbidden his going ahead with this policy, suddenly marched out in the evening of Sept. 11, 2001, and said, "Here it is! We're going to war!"

Now, President Bush is not the most intelligent man we've ever had in the White House, and that's a rather ingenuous statement. But, he was easily managed, and by December of the year 2001, he was going into his State of the Union speech, talking about an "axis of evil." An "axis of evil" is a plan for a war against the world. It's a war of intimidation, using nuclear weapons and terrifying the world to the point, "If you don't obey us, we'll hit you with nuclear weapons, and we'll destroy you in other ways! We are the Empire! We run the world! You do as we tell you, or we kill you!" That's Cheney's policy. And, that was said, specifically.

When you say, you're going after the Muslim world, as a target; as you list a few other nations beside it, including, implicitly China, as well as North Korea; then you're talking about world conquest, using the threat of actually using nuclear weapons in preventive warfare for world empire!

I explained the reasons for this a number of times; it's the same reason that Hitler was put into power, by a combination of New York and London bankers, back in 1933: When a great financial-monetary crisis occurs, that leading bankers can not control by conventional means, they think of creating a dictatorship, which they control, to do the dirty work which will ensure their power, no matter what else happens to their monetary-financial system. And that's what's happened.

But, this is being done by a tiny group—you would call it, for example in some parts of the world, you'd call it a "junta." And then, a few names, a couple dozen names, are key to this junta—no more! But, they're backed by powerful financier interests, and they're backed by a vacuum in the opposition party, my party, the Democratic Party, where a bunch of right-wing thieves, organized-crime types, actually control the Democratic Party machine top-down. And, the result of that: The party organization, that is, the elected officials in the party, those who are any good, have tended to show more cowardice than courage in dealing with the issues confronting it, up until recently.

We now have a change: that's the optimistic side. After the completion of the initial phase of hostilities, in the Iraq War—so-called Iraq War, which is really going on now; it's getting more intense now than it was before—and will continue to do so, under present management! There's no bottom to this war. There is no exit. This is "Vietnam in the Desert"; and something worse—as we see also in Afghanistan, where the situation is becoming worse as time passes.



By the time LaRouche gave his Ankara public speech, widespread television interviews and print-media coverage of his earlier presentations were out in Turkey and abroad. This CNN-Turk interview was conducted on June 13.

So people decided to fight. We had people who were fighting. We had people in the U.S. military, as I think many of you may know, among your acquaintances: Army generals, retired and serving; Marine Corps generals, retired and serving; large sections of the civilian apparatus in the U.S. Department of Defense, associated with the military; others; diplomats of long standing; members of the intelligence community, of long standing. That is, influential layers, within government, which constitute the power of strategic policymaking of the United States, within the Executive branch, had shared essentially the views that I had, on the question of the Iraq War.

But a small junta from the top pre-empted the use of powers of the President—through a President who probably doesn't know which way to the front door or back door—and thus, through the President's mouth, imposed these commands, which led to this war, which every competent military figure said, "No!" So, we're at war.

### Can the U.S. Get Rid of Its Junta?

The question, therefore, is: Can this problem be overcome, within the institutions of the United States? Because every other part of the world is absolutely terrified; maybe not terrified immediately of what will happen to it—China still shows a certain amount of independence; not that much, but a great deal. Countries in Europe are fearful. They're terrified by the United States. They're afraid to fight, unless they're really pushed. Where's the initiative going to come from, to clean up this mess, inside the U.S. government?

My view has been, it had to be from inside the U.S. government. And for those of us, who understand how our Constitutional government works, the question was, "How do we get

rid of this junta, and prevent the things it's trying to do, within the framework of our Constitutional institutions?"

Now, the normal procedure would be—the Constitution of the United States was very carefully framed: The founders of our republic decided to create a great Executive power. All essential Executive functions are concentrated in the Presidency of the United States, a Presidency which is headed by an elected President. Now, the President himself does not always control the Presidency. Often the Presidency will control the President—fortunately, because we've had some dumb Presidents, from time to time. In those cases, the institutions of the Presidency, which exert a powerful influence on the President's decision-making, find ways to control the President. (As every chief executive knows, the bureaucrats will try to control him. And the Presidential bureaucracy of the Presidency, will make a lot of effort, usually, to control the President. And most Presidents will tell you about that.)

But, in this case, the normal way, in which we would deal with this problem, would be to have the opposition, in the Congress—especially in the Senate—use their Constitutional powers of "advice and consent" to act as a check on out-of-control impulses by an incumbent President. What the problem was, is that the Democratic Party, which is the nominal opposition, is dominated top-down, presently, by organized crime. We're going to change that. But, it's dominated by that: right-wing organized crime, typified by Lieberman, the former Vice Presidential candidate, still a Senator.

So, nobody would challenge the President on illegal decisions, unconstitutional decisions. The Constitution is explicit in its terms, and the discussions around the Constitution's framing, originally, are also very explicit: We knew, that in

creating a powerful Executive as our form of government (as opposed to a parliamentary government), there was a danger that some President would use those powers, the way George III of England used his executive powers against the people in the Americas, in that time. And therefore, we provided the qualification of “advice and consent” in a procedure for going to war, to prevent a President of the United States from being a runaway organizer of war. Now, the President has the authority to direct the military, to continue in response to an attack, under rules of engagement. But to continue a war, beyond the limits of rules of engagement, is still unlawful. It is also unlawful, and specifically specified, by our laws, that an official of the United States government, who lies to the institutions; who lies to induce the institutions to go to a war, premised on lies, has committed a crime, an impeachable offense, tantamount to high treason. Such a liar, such an offender, in the case of the Iraq War, is Vice President Cheney. Others as well.

Therefore, my effort has been, and that of others, has been to move toward impeachment of those who are responsible for the lies, specific lies, which induced the Congress to tolerate the President’s push to war. Such action, in conformity with our Constitution, is the form of action which could save our Constitutional institutions, and not result in some mess. And it has to be done, immediately.

The process is under way. I was involved in prompting it, with our discussions with some Senators. But, some Senators and others have begun to move, and they moved in the direction of the impeachment of some officials of the crowd around Cheney, or of Cheney himself, in the government. Or, inducing Cheney to resign, as Nixon resigned, to avoid the embarrassment of being impeached. Let him out, if he gets out. But take his chicken-hawks with him.

So therefore, there could be a change. I think that change should be sought. I think it’s indispensable, because I don’t think that other nations of the world, even together, would have the stamina to force down the President of the United States, at this time. They just don’t have the knowledge, they don’t have the stamina.

Therefore, we in the United States, have one singular responsibility: That, while we know that most parts of the world are opposed to that Iraq War; most are opposed to this policy; most are opposed to the economic policies that go with it: That these nations do not have the will, to force those measures through by themselves. Therefore, I take it as the responsibility of my United States, to take certain actions, which will encourage the nations of Europe, and others, to do something about this international financial mess.

### Put the Old System in Bankruptcy

I believe the following, also: I know that the international monetary-financial system, the present IMF system, is doomed. It can not survive. There is no trick, that can keep this thing going much longer. We are facing the greatest financial

collapse in all history, right now. What day will it happen? You don’t know, because they’re continuing to pump inflationary money in, hyperinflationary money, to try to postpone the crisis, yet one more day. Week by week, day by day, the money’s being pumped in; the money’s being printed, to try to keep the system alive. So, we don’t know when the bubble is going to pop, but it’s a bubble, and it’s going to pop. You can not go down, to about 1% or 0% interest rate issued, of monetary aggregate, or debts related to monetary aggregate, and not have, under the present conditions, a hyperinflation, which will be comparable to what happened to Germany, between July and October of 1923. That’s where we are.

The system is going to go bankrupt. We can not prevent the system from going bankrupt; that’s impossible to avoid. But we could, using the authority of a concert of governments, the same concert of governments, or type of concert of governments, which created the initial Bretton Woods monetary system; or, it changed the monetary system during 1971-72: The same authority of sovereign nation-states, conspiring together, can walk in on the IMF and World Bank, and say, “Gentlemen, you are being put through bankruptcy reorganization. You are bankrupt!” Because, in point of fact, the international monetary system, which is based on the central banking systems of the world, is bankrupt. The banks in it, are bankrupt. Citicorp is bankrupt! J.P. Morgan Chase Manhattan is bankrupt! Every leading bank of the United States, is hopelessly bankrupt! Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae are about to blow up. The international credit derivatives market is about to blow up. They’re bankrupt.

The banks of Europe are generally bankrupt, too. Therefore, the central banking systems are bankrupt. Don’t worry about Turkey’s financial problems: They’ve got bigger ones! Yours are just proportionally more painful, for you!

Therefore, the authority of governments, as sovereign nation-states, as the sovereign nation-states of the world, can act in concert to say, “We are going to create a new world monetary-financial system—now! Turning on a dime! We are going to take the central banking systems of the world, into receivership, by joint action of sovereign governments.” Each government will take the banking system of its nation into receivership, for reorganization. And, the system, as a whole, will do two things: It will take the whole system into bankruptcy, reorganize it, as a fixed-exchange-rate system; that’s what has to be done. Because you can not generate long-term credit—25- to 50-year credit, which we need, as I’ll indicate to you—without a low[-interest], fixed-rate monetary system. It will probably have to be gold-reserve denominated, as was done with the original Bretton Woods system. We may be talking about the equivalent of 1,200 euros per troy ounce, in order to have enough credit in the gold system, to maintain a fixed-exchange monetary system.

We’re going to have to create vast amounts of credit, and this is what I’m going to concentrate on here, where it comes to the question of what’s Turkey’s perspective in this kind of



The Ankara Chamber presented LaRouche with a gold “Atatürk” medal following his presentation.

process—if we get to the point, where governments agree, to do that.

### The Moves Toward a New System

Now, first of all, who is going to do that? Who is committed to moving in that direction? Well, we have Tremonti, the super-economics minister of Italy, who has made certain proposals, in that direction. I have my friends in the Italian government, and also in the Senate and Chamber of Deputies, who have resolved to support my motion for a New Bretton Woods system—that is, a return to the original Bretton Woods design of an international monetary system. We have the proposal for a European Development Bank, outside the limits of the so-called Maastricht system, which would create long-term credit, for large-scale infrastructure projects.

We have some other interesting things: China and India, which are the largest exports markets for Germany—and Germany, of course, is the key of the Western European system; if Germany goes under, the whole kit and caboodle goes under. Therefore, if we can expand the exports from Western Europe, including Germany, into developing Asian markets, which are the largest markets in the world—we’re talking about more than 1.3 billion Chinese; we’re talking about more than 1 billion Indians; we’re talking about hundreds of millions of people in Southeast Asia, with their large Mekong development project now being moved forward.

We have large-scale projects in China, infrastructure projects, the largest in the world. Some in progress, some opening up. A geographic transformation in the internal territory of China, is in progress. If we get through—and this week, we

have some good news: Our friends in South Korea have pushed through that rail link across the Demilitarized Zone; it’s now open. We have to put some more rail track on it, to connect the Demilitarized Zone to the rail lines, leading to Rotterdam, by way of the Siberian route, and by way of the so-called Silk Road route, which also involves Iran.

So, we have the opportunity for one of the greatest projects in history, today. Consider the territory of Eurasia—total Eurasia: Now, look within it, at Central Asia and Northern Asia. Central Asia and Northern Asia, which are relatively undeveloped areas of the world, contain one of the largest sources of mineral resources, for the future of humanity, sitting to the north, generally, of the populations of China, India, Southeast Asia, and so forth. This is one of the greatest mineral resources for all Eurasia, undeveloped, almost unreachable, for lack of development, for lack of population. We have to move water from the River Ob, down toward Central Asia, toward Lake Aral, to bring Lake Aral back, for example. We have to bring water from the eastern part of Siberia, near Irkutsk, and bring that down, too. We have to have the largest water-resource management projects in history, done within a short period of time, of 25 to 50 years.

We have to build large, mass-transit systems, which can transport goods from Rotterdam to Pusan, on the tip of Korea, and into Japan: faster, quicker, and cheaper than by boat. Because every time you’re moving freight through a territory, in general, you are stimulating economic growth in that territory, and therefore, in effect, a good mass-transit system costs you nothing to transport goods: Because what you generate, as income, that you would otherwise not receive, along the

route of such a transportation development corridor, is itself a net profit. These are the kinds of projects.

Now, we have in Western Europe, we have a concentration of what used to be called engineering capability, scientific and engineering capability. We have populations which, in part, are still skilled in skilled manufacture of high-technology goods. We have, in China, some people who have skills; there is some improvement in that department in China. You have scientific capabilities in India, Japan, and so forth.

### Turkey's Role in the Eurasian Land-Bridge

So, we have, not only a market for the export of European finished goods into Asia, but we also have a reciprocal market, in which technologies being developed in Asia come toward Europe, and technologies being developed in Europe flow toward Asia. So, the products of the world begin to show the reflection of incorporating these various technologies, which are being shared among various countries, as they're developed.

We're talking about long-term projects, at 1-2% credit, 25-year contracts, 50-year contracts, trade agreements among nations; and through these mechanisms, plus the mechanisms of states, through international treaty agreements, we can create the mass of credit needed to organize the greatest economic recovery the world has ever known.

In that process, you know where Turkey lies: Turkey lies between the Balkans, which Turkey is familiar with, historically, and Iraq/Iran. High-speed routes across Anatolia, toward Iran, under peaceful conditions, are Turkey's route of self-development internally, and also routes to China, and routes to India, if we can get the pacification along the way.

We have the greatest potential in the world, in many respects. We have high-temperature gas-cooled reactors. These gas-cooled reactors are much better than petroleum, especially for inland areas, where you don't want to transport petroleum over the long distances; it's costly and difficult to handle, and unreliable these days. If you have high-temperature gas-cooled reactors, say in the 120-200 MW range, then you can generate hydrogen-based fuels locally in areas of high-temperature gas-cooled reactor operation. You are no longer dependent upon burning so-called fossil fuels as a source of power. It's a transformation in efficiency of society. So, under these conditions, these long-term agreements are possible.

The function of the United States should be, to catalyze, by its assent, its cooperation: To catalyze what is already in development with certain circles in Italy, within the government of France, in the government circles of Germany; other government circles in Europe; in Russia, certain forces in Russia; in Korea; in Japan; in China; in Southeast Asia; in India. We are now moving toward a Eurasian development orientation, among sovereign nation-states, which agree on common interests, common funding programs, and so forth. The United States' function must be, above all, to give its

blessing and encouragement, and participation to those negotiations, which must establish the new system, that this implies.

That's there. Why is it going to happen? Why will it probably happen? Because the world has no alternative. There's no way, that you could make limited reforms, in the present monetary-financial system, and survive. The world is bankrupt. The amount of financial derivatives outstanding—especially the irregular ones—on the world market today, is such that the debts which were associated with financial derivatives, and trafficking in them, could never be paid, under the present conditions. If you try to find a way to reorganize the payment of those kinds of debts, you will cease to exist.

And therefore, the world is coming at the edge of a breakdown crisis—not a depression, but a general breakdown crisis, which is going to force the issue, among nations: Are we willing to take the hard step, of creating a new monetary system, representing the successful experience with the original Bretton Woods system, on a world scale. Except, this time, the United States can not sponsor the world system by itself. The United States is bankrupt. It does not have the means, as it had before, to finance, to back up, and to guarantee a world system, a world monetary system. There must be a concert of nations, which plays the role today, which the United States played in organizing the world recovery of the late 1940s-1950s. That's where we are.

### Not Cheaper Labor, But More Skilled Labor

So, the characteristic of the economy, that is so created, will be, not the export of finished goods—that will occur, but that will not be the characteristic of economy. We have another problem in the world: Go to India. Go to China. Go to Southeast Asia. Talk about increasing the productive powers of labor significantly, on this scale, in those parts of the world. You have parts of India that have high degrees of skill in science; but, you also have a large population, which is living on the verge of desperation, uneducated, poor, incapable of defending themselves in terms of modern technology. China has a similar problem, which it's addressing. It's a transformation of China, to move populations from the concentrated areas where they live in marginal poverty—successfully, but marginally—into new cities, new centers, inland; by moving water north, by moving water in toward the interior of Asia, to develop the interior of China with new cities, and new technologies, to raise the level of production of the people of China over two generations, which means, approximately 50 years. China thinks in terms of two generations, and that's one good part about China: They don't think about next year; they think two generations ahead. And, that's the way we should all think.

Now, under those conditions—the basic problem of society, under these kind of conditions, is the fact that we have many poor people, who lack the technology to be productive, in the degree we require, in these kinds of large-scale develop-

ments. There are too many poor people. Now, the solution is not to kill them off. The solution is to educate them. The solution is to give them the opportunities, the conditions, under which the productive powers of labor over two successive generations can accelerate, as has been done in some parts of the world, already.

Therefore, the premium is not on cheap wages. The premium is on developing a standard of living, which is consistent with a population which is developing high degrees of skill, technologies, and so forth. And also, motivation: a sense of history. In many parts of the poor among the world, they have no sense of history! They have a sense of their local experience. The world, as a whole, befuddles them. They don't know their place in the world. They don't have a sense of national mission. If they have a sense of caring for their children and grandchildren, or the immediate neighbors, that's a sense of mission.

So, we have to change the world. We have to change the world in a way which goes with the continued production of improved technologies, with higher rates of scientific progress, and the spill-over of these sciences into new technologies, being developed within the pores of society.

So, what we will be exporting, from one to another, will not be just finished goods: What we'll be exporting is our technologies. We'll be sharing and selling our technologies to one another, in order to incorporate these shared technologies in the products we produce. In that way, we shall be driving the productive powers of labor at the highest rate. This means a lot more emphasis on research and development. This means a heavy emphasis on changes in the educational system, in this direction.

### Man's Capacity for Discovery

It means we no longer tolerate in the world, the idea that large masses of humanity shall be sustained in the way a farmer cares for cattle. We have to tap into that characteristic of man, which distinguishes man from the animal: the ability of man, to discover those unseen principles, those unseen physical principles, which lie outside our sense-perception—principles like gravity, other principles. And that quality of man which enables us to increase our species population, from an original potential, perhaps, of about 3 million individuals living on the planet at one time—the potential of a higher ape—to the 6 billion or more, living today. We have to increase man's potential; the main object of economy, should be the development of man, as man. Man as a creature distinct from the beast.

And, if we do that, I'm confident we can win. My job, as a Presidential candidate—and fortunately I have a relatively leading position now, in aspiration of that office, not because of my talent, but because of the lack of nerve and will and guts, among my rivals—my job is to persuade my nation, above all, to do this, to play this part: To create a community of sovereign nation-state republics on this planet, as the only

form of organization of humanity on this planet. My job is to orient my people in the United States, toward playing this kind of role, in the world. My job is to talk with you, to talk with people in each of these countries, to share with you what my intentions and visions are, and to hear what you have to say, so that we together, through that kind of dialogue, can begin to resolve the difficult subjects that we have to debate among ourselves, in order to bring this new kind of order into being: an order of community of nations, in which each nation is perfectly sovereign; no supra-government, but a community of nations, operating on a set of common principles, on which we must come to agreement. Not a utopia, just a set of principles, based on the simple concept of what is the difference between man and an animal.

Thank you.

---

## Questions and Dialogue with LaRouche

---

**Q:** What are the intentions of the United States in Iran? The questioner has a strong belief that the United States will attempt to establish a military route, to be followed by a petroleum route, between the Basra Gulf and the Caspian area. To establish this route, Iran must somehow be aligned in the direction of petroleum politics in the Middle East. Do you share the above opinion?

**LaRouche:** No, one has to understand a central character of this junta in the United States. You have to understand, that they are clinically insane. People keep trying to find rational explanations for their behavior. They're not rational; they're mad. Madder than Hitler. Their one intention is [interrupted by applause]—Their intention is, to crush all opposition, to their personal, perpetual world rule. This is just like the Nazis at the end phase.

This is the concept—this military policy—these are only lackeys. These are fools. Wolfowitz is a fool! He was recruited by a Trotskyist, to become a fascist. That's his history! Albert Wohlstetter, a Trotskyist follower of a person who used to work for the Wall Street Journal, trained Wolfowitz in the school of a fascist, Leo Strauss, at the University of Chicago. The whole kit and caboodle of these guys are a pack of ex-Trotskyists and other things, who have become fascists! These people are not the power; they are the pawns of power. And what they represent, as lackeys, is a group of financial interests, who are not thinking in terms of profit: They're thinking in terms of stealing! If you can steal well enough, you don't need a profit! And, they're out to steal everything in sight, every asset in the world. But, it is not a profit motive. . . . This is a stealing motive! You don't have to earn a profit—you steal it!

So, what are they out to do? They're out to terrify the world, and to destroy the world, to the point, that—as we were

talking about this earlier, about this idea of: Why is Alan Greenspan, of the Federal Reserve System, dropping the interest rate of monetary emission now, the way he is? Greenspan is going toward a 0% overnight lending rate of monetary emission, as Japan was when it was printing yen, which were then being converted overnight to dollars, to flood the U.S. market. It's hyper-inflationary monetary emission!

Now, what would happen, because suckers believe in the stock market — I don't believe in the stock market. No thinking businessman believes in the stock market. He worries about it, but he doesn't believe in it. He knows it's a swindle [applause]. What happens: The stock market is a so-called "shareholder market"; it's a John Law bubble (I think some of you know what a "John Law bubble" was, in the early 18th Century). So, Greenspan, and Sandy Weill of Citigroup, and so forth, are out to create a gigantic John Law bubble, in the short term! What is the purpose of the John Law bubble? You have a lot of people who are afraid of losing money, losing financial assets. If you drive the markets up in some things, if they're foolish, simple stock market investors, they will rush to invest their money in those markets that they think are going up.

Now, what happens, then, if you turn around — after lending money at between 0 and 1%, to flood the market with monetary aggregate — what happens, if you suddenly raise the interest rate, the discount rate, to 7%, or 10%? Who goes bankrupt? This is the greatest sucker-play in world history! Which is being played out of New York City, by places like Citigroup and J.P. Morgan Chase Manhattan — and, by the head of the Federal Reserve System.

So, this is the way they think. What happens in that case? In that case, if you're successful enough in that, without exposing it — that's the swindle; if you succeed in doing that, you will shut down most of the banks and businesses in the world! You will wipe out most of the insurance companies! Look at the credit-insurance risk factor: This would wipe out virtually every insurance company in the world. This would wipe out virtually every bank in the world; most corporations, whose stock value depends, to some degree or other, upon these so-called stock market "shareholder" valuations. The biggest swindle ever dreamed of: a John Law bubble on a gigantic scale.

This is the way they think! That's the way, that the people behind the Wolfowitzes and Cheneys think. Look at Halliburton! What is Halliburton? It's not a corporation! It's a stealing enterprise! What is Bechtel? It used to be an engineering firm. It's now a thieving operation!

So, that's the point: They're trying to establish imperial world power. They will steal everything in sight. But, they're not trying to control shareholding investments: They're trying to control steal-holding investment! They'll steal every asset, every national asset, that they can find, if they think they can market it. They'll forfeit the future. They'll pay nothing for it.

So, this idea that they have a motivation, to get the oil — Yes, they'll steal it, if they can, but that's not their motive. Their motive is to force Russia into a confrontation on Iran. This is happening right now, on the issue of the International Atomic Energy Agency's certifications of Iran's performance with the rules of the game. We now see, from the United States, operated by the usual types I know very well — the intelligence types — are orchestrating a limited student revolt inside Iran. Now, I could talk about that, but that wouldn't go into the details, how that works. But, they're running it. Why? It's an operation; it's what we call, in the U.S., a "dog and pony show": It's being set up through the media, to try to create the pretext, for a U.S. intervention in Iran! What's the purpose? It's a showdown with Russia. What's the purpose? A showdown with India. What's the purpose? A showdown with China.

So, you're dealing with someone, who's prepared to use nuclear warheads for preventive war, to teach you a lesson of obedience! Look, Wolfowitz came here, and said, "You're going to learn a terrible lesson, for not going along into the Iraq War, when we demanded that you do it." That's their mentality! And they are only the dogs, reflecting whistling of their master, who're these financial interests.

So, that's my opinion. [loud applause]

### 'Will They Kill You?'

Q: You talk about the world going bankrupt, and other aspects of the strategic crisis. Have you received threats for what you say and do? Do you think you could end up like Christ?

LaRouche: Look, I've been through this kind of thing many times. I've been faced with threats, really serious threats, before. For example, in 1973, the Department of Justice of the United States employed the Communist Party USA to have me assassinated — and I have the document. In 1986, friends of George Bush, Sr. sent 400 people to the place where I lived, and were prepared to assassinate me. And only President Reagan's orders, "Get that thing shut down!" saved my life. During the same period, Gorbachov ordered my assassination, publicly, in the Soviet press. And, he meant it!

I've been there many times.

You know, you have to think like a soldier. When you talk about Atatürk, I understand, because of my own experience — not only the trivial military experience I had during the last world war — but, I understood what he went through. That he was sitting on a situation, first in the Dardanelles war, where the Australians were climbing the cliffs, afterward, and he showed a certain quality of command. Then, he was in a situation after that, with the Sykes-Picot forces about to destroy Turkey, with operations involving the British going into — aimed at Iraq; with the question of Syria; with the question of the Soviet Union, being formed on the border, in the Caucasus area. And he made certain decisions.

Now, one can admire these decisions from the outside, as





LaRouche's visit was also crowded with private meetings with political and intellectual figures; though this one, with former Turkish Prime Minister Necmettin Erbakan (seated at left in photo) was found and covered by the Turkish press (below).

a Turkish patriot. I can admire them from the inside of the kind of person who has been through analogous situations, of historic decisions, when you knew your life was on the line, because you were saying what you thought had to be said.

Now, my view is a view which I think, that any person who has a spiritual insight, would understand: We are all mortal. We will all die, sooner or later. Therefore, we have to think of our mortal life, as a gift given to us, temporarily. The question is: What do we do with that mortal life, for the sake of our immortality? Therefore, if we put our life on the line at risk, if we think that we have to, because we would defame our immortality by not making that decision, we will make that decision.

And, that's my view of Atatürk: Is that, I've lived through, because of my own experience, I can see, in studying his life, particularly in these crises, and knowing what was going on with Sykes-Picot, that he made crucial decisions of courage, which created the modern Turkey as an institution, because the people associated with him participated in that decision, that courageous decision; and that gave Turkey the ability to withstand what it's had to live through, in ups and downs over the years since.

Yes, I can get killed. But, my best defense, is to make sure that it costs them a great deal.

### Defense of National Sovereignty

Q: Thank you for your defense of the nation-state. The Republican Robert Strausz-Hupé, who was Ambassador to Turkey, wants to divide the nation-state. How can we pre-



vent this?

LaRouche: Well, I can only share with you the fact that we—Let's take the case of Turkey and the United States. Let's take the case of you and me, Turkey and the United States—to make it concrete. All right. Now, why should Turkey be sovereign? Why shouldn't Turkey join the United States? For a very simple reason. It's a reason which many people don't understand, or they haven't thought about it. What's the importance of Turkey? I know, with my friends, with whom I've been visiting here, we've discussed this philosophically, and I know some of the history of the region; and they have also studied their part of the region. All right, what do we have?

We have a history of the region, which, in a sense, goes

back to the Hittites; goes back earlier, to other things of a similar nature. It goes back to the influence of the culture we came into, in Persia. It has to do with the Seljuk, in southern Persia, moving in through the Arab world; moving up and becoming the Seljuk Turks, and the Persian culture influence. So, embodied in this, as typified by the influence of Persian poetry on the language, on the thought of the people. A language can not be understood by a dictionary. A language is the way that's used to communicate ideas, which lie beyond sense-perception. If a people is to be sovereign, and not animals, not cattle, they must share that language-culture, with its embedded connotations, the ironies, as typified by poetic imagery. It is through that language, that the people can deliberate, and decide what they, as a people, really believe, and intend to do.

Therefore, we must have nations, which are constituted on the basis of culture, and think of language, not just as a language—not a dictionary language—but as embodied in expressing a culture. And Turkey is an example of one of many kinds of cultures, which are developed out of this complex of influences, which have defined a culture, called "Turkish culture" today.

The United States, similarly. We're a melting-pot country, and therefore I'm very conscious of its principles. There is no typical American. There are Turkish-Americans; there are Spanish-Americans from all parts of the world; there are African-Americans: We're an immigrant nation. We have no typical American. The typical American is an atypical American, who is a product of many different kinds of national influxes into our country.

But we have developed, in a sense, a core culture, which is based not only on a fixed culture, but on a sense of adaptation to an immigrant population. The idea of assimilating people from all over the world, into our culture. We sometimes do a bad job of it. But, those of us who understand, understand it. That's our culture.

France has a culture. I find it difficult to deal with sometimes, but it's a culture I deal with. Italy has a culture. Germany has a culture. Russia has a culture. China, India. We are dealing with these cultures in various parts of the world—because I am sort of an international traveller, international thinker.

Therefore, my concern is, we are different peoples of different cultures, but we ultimately must find a common purpose. But, we must find the common purpose through the expression of each with the culture we have. We must present our ideas, from our culture, to other people, in their own culture. And, we must come to an agreement. The basic agreement, I think is the essential one: It is the conception of man. We live in a heathen world, a heathen world in the sense that the idea of man in the image of the Creator is not a popular idea in most of the planet—not, at least, a clear idea. Therefore, we do not value man, as different from the animal. The problem in humanity, is that for too long, most people have been treated as virtual human cattle, by other people.

Therefore, we have to fight, if we're going to have peace and progress on this planet, we have to fight for the rights—the human quality of the individual. We can only do that, by addressing that part of the individual, which is not merely ideas expressed by dictionary words, but who has a mind, which is associated with poetic creation of ideas, concerning things beyond sight, beyond vision. And therefore, we are going to perfect humanity, and bring it to maturity. When we establish this kind of relation among peoples—my function, as a figure of the United States, is to fight for that kind of world, in which that is the relation among states.

Q: Wolfowitz wanted Turkey to apologize for its behavior in the Iraq War. What is your view?

LaRouche: A broadcast, which came from here, at night—a two- or three-hour broadcast, which was relayed from here—it's all over the world. Everyone knows what I say. Everyone in Washington is having fits about it, or laughing about it. The military are probably laughing. The Defense Department higher officials are probably screaming. Cheney is extremely upset.

Now, my view is, in this matter: I don't think the Turkish government has to say anything to Mr. Wolfowitz. I think, as an American in Turkey, I have said it, and the Turks can laugh—I mean, laugh to the degree that they think they should laugh. Because it's been said: This was a crime. It's a shame of the United States, what this guy did here. It's shameful! It's an embarrassment to the United States, and therefore—[interrupted by applause].

### A 'Satanic' Motivation

Q: Thank you for your speech. I am a student. The American system is based on stealing, but what is the motivation for the stealing? Is it that, after 9/11, as Bush said, this is a new crusade? From our viewpoint we see it this way.

LaRouche: I could go on at length on this.

There is a quality in mankind, which is legitimately called "Satanic." And, I'm referring to Wolfowitz and the people associated with him—I have used explicitly the term "Satanic." For example, there is a certain nature of man, and some people fail as human beings. That is, they do things that are bad, but they still remain human in their orientation. There are certain people, who act out of hatred of mankind. For example, an axe-murderer, who goes around slaughtering children for the pleasure of slaughtering children. This man is Satanic.

What you have in this crowd—I know them. I know them psychologically very well, the Wolfowitzes and so forth: They are explicitly Satanic. They have a professor, who died in 1973: Leo Strauss, who was a Jew in Germany, who was a fascist, a Nazi, but he could not join the Nazi Party, because he was Jewish. Therefore, he went to the United States and practiced Nazism from the University of Chicago, and he gave you Wolfowitz; he gave you similar people.

I know their mentality. They've written books about this.



The candidate with his wife, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, whose international work has been so crucial to the development of the Eurasian Land-Bridge strategy and the dialogue of cultures connected to it, that she is known in some countries as “the Silk Road lady.”

This mentality is explicitly Satanic. Their idea of stealing, has nothing to do with the typical American. It’s a junta. It’s a small group of people, uncharacteristic of the American people—bad or good. And, that’s our problem.

The problem is, we as a nation—here we are, supposedly the most powerful nation on the planet in military power; and we are taken over by a few dozen people, forming a junta, running the U.S. government with an idiot President! And I say “idiot President” advisedly: The poor man’s an idiot! I’m there to defend and protect him—because he is the President. But, I have to know he’s an idiot, in order to protect him professionally. You have to know what the idiot’s going to do, in order to protect him.

These people are Satanic. And, once you recognize that, then you have a clearer image of what we have to do about it. It’s not an American problem. It is an American problem, because somebody stuck him on us! These people came from Europe. The influences came from Europe. So, it’s a European culture problem—like Nazism. We have to deal with it. And, I have found myself appointed to deal with it. It’s my job! I’ve done the best I could. I need help in the United States; I’m getting some. I’m getting help from people who used to be my adversaries—like Brent Scowcroft—used to be my adversary. But, Brent Scowcroft, right now, is in a sense, allied with me; we don’t happen to have any formal alliance. He’s doing something I approve of; and I’m doing something he approves of. We’re out to get this thing uprooted from the government. If we do, we’ll have different roles.

But, then, we will have a new set of problems: Instead of this mess, the threat of general war, we’re going to have the

threat of dealing with this financial-monetary crisis, which ultimately, is as dangerous as a war. But I believe that if we mobilize humanity around the task of solving—with positive measures, toward solving the world financial crisis, economic crisis—the positive motivation for good deeds is the best way to debate policy. Sometimes, we have to fight about negative things, in a negative way. We regret that we have to do so, like going to war. We should always regret having to go to war. Sometimes we have to.

What we prefer, is to solve problems, by presenting solutions, and organizing people around solutions, to problems which, if corrected, may lead to a brighter future for humanity to come.

### A Proper Mission for the UN

**Q:** You talk about establishing a new world order. What is the role of the UN Security Council in this? Right now, it is running the world.

**LaRouche:** Well, the United Nations, recently, has not been the worst offender. And the United Nations Security Council didn’t do too badly, if you got Blair out of there, and if Bush were not pushing the policy he was.

The United Nations, I think, should be limited in its function to a forum; especially on the question of war and peace, it’s extremely useful to avoid war. The more we study war, the more we understand the importance of trying to avoid it, by finding solutions, which are not war.

The big problem in the UN, which you explicitly are talking about, is it has never been an efficient forum, for the nations in general. And there should be modifications and improvements, which make the UN a more efficient forum. I

think of it, not as a world government, but as a diplomatic forum; a super-diplomatic forum, where any nation can go in, and have a hearing on its concerns. And, with the support of other nations, and their support, find some urgent diplomatic pressure for remedy of that problem.

Otherwise, I'm not too much worried about the UN. I think the tendency to make it a world government, which was intended by Bertrand Russell, was evil. That hasn't happened. I thought what was done in the Security Council to resist the proposal by the United States on war, was useful, and I commend them for it, especially the Foreign Minister of France, who I thought made a brilliant presentation on that subject in the Security Council proceedings.

But, I admit the other side.

I'll give you an example of this, concretely, which pertains to countries like Turkey. In 1975, I was instrumental, among a number of people, in pushing a proposed reform to be adopted at the Non-Aligned Nations meeting in 1976, in Sri Lanka. That proposal—as presented by a friend of mine, Fred Wills, who was then the Foreign Minister of Guyana—was adopted by the entire Colombo conference. Fred went to [the UN in] New York, and presented a resolution. Nothing was done about it. Every country which subscribed to that resolution, was violently suppressed by threats, at that time. That was the time we lost the opportunity for reforms, for more equitable arrangements in response to

the changes in the monetary system. And the world went down since then. And every country has suffered, to one degree or another, from that.

So therefore, I would say, that is a case of the failure of the United Nations Organization. And I would think that reforms which go to that purpose—where the United Nations should have become a forum, on the discussion of the Sri Lanka resolution, Colombo resolution, on a just, new world economic order, it didn't. That, in my view, is the crime of omission of the United Nations. And I think the United Nations should be, shall we say, a much more democratic institution, with that kind of mission-orientation.

### Oil Is Not the Issue

**Q:** I want to express my sincere wishes that you succeed in gaining the Presidency. My question is: Were the Afghan and Iraq wars petroleum wars?

**LaRouche:** No, no. It is not. These people will steal petroleum. To understand that, you've got to go back to the history of this tendency in European history. It goes back to Napoleon Bonaparte. Napoleon Bonaparte was a bandit and thief. After 1806, in particular, after winning the Jena-Auerstedt battle, he went through Europe to steal. Now, what he would steal, things he could cart off from all countries that he raided, like a bandit. He would then sell what he had stolen at discount prices, to certain banking groups, who would buy what he had stolen, this stolen property. These bandit groups, which were associated with Napoleon, at the beginning of the 19th Century, are the core group of bankers, which gave you Napoleon III in France; which gave you Mussolini in Italy; which gave you Hitler in Germany; Franco in Spain; and the Vichy government in France. These are the same people. They're doing the same thing.

Yes. And I'm pressing hard to get to the Cheney—or Halliburton—stealing. For me, the fact that he's trying to steal oil (not too successfully right now), is another piece of evidence against him, to bring about either his impeachment or resignation. But, the purpose of the war was not to steal oil: It was to steal everything. Because the war is aimed at every part of Asia.

Look, we were talking privately, before coming out here; we were talking about a certain mineral resource in Turkey; and the plan by some people in the United States to steal that—that valuable mineral resource, which is of Turkish rights. They will steal everything! If they can. And we have to be alert. Don't worry so much about that oil—that is a problem for Turkey, now, because Turkey was getting oil from Iraq and so forth, and that was a problem—but think about everything. They're out to steal everything, in every part of the world.

And, what we have to do is not oppose them for stealing oil: We have to eliminate them. Because, if you leave them, it's like putting a fox in the chicken coop. You're not going to have any chickens. And, they'll take anything else, as well.

## Electronic Intelligence Weekly

# EIW

An online almanac from the publishers of **EIR**

### Electronic Intelligence Weekly

gives subscribers online the same economic analysis that has made *EIR* one of the most valued publications for policymakers, and established LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world.



EIR Contributing Editor, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Issued every Monday, *EIW* includes:

- Lyndon LaRouche's economic and strategic analyses;
- Charting of the world economic crisis;
- Critical developments ignored by "mainstream" media.

**\$360** per year      Two-month trial, **\$60**

For more information:

Call **1-888-347-3258** (toll-free)

VISIT ONLINE:

**[www.larouchepub.com/eiw](http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw)**