

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

April 11, 2008 Vol. 35 No. 15 www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

The British Empire's Economic Suicide Club
Can Dick Cheney's War Against Iran Be Avoided?
LaRouche on the Subject of Principle: Project 'Genesis'

The British Empire Has Us on The Path to World War III



SUBSCRIBE TO EIR ONLINE

The Banking System Has Already Collapsed!



“There is no possibility of a non-collapse of the present financial system—none! It's finished, *now!*”

—Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., webcast, July 25, 2007

Unless the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act “is enacted as a first order of business of the 110th Congress in September [2007], many millions of Americans will be evicted from their homes.... The foreclosure tsunami is occurring, not as a result of a mere housing or mortgage crisis, but a disintegration of the entire global financial system.”

—EIR Editorial, Aug. 31, 2007

“My view of the economy is that the fundamentals are strong.”

—President George W. Bush, Dec. 20, 2007

EIR Online's Subscribers Know What Is Really Going On.... Do You?

To subscribe:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw Call 1-800-278-3135 (toll-free)

See back cover for subscription rates

Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Antony
Papert, Gerald Rose, Dennis Small, Edward
Spannaus, Nancy Spannaus, Jeffrey Steinberg,
William Wertz

Editor: Nancy Spannaus

Managing Editor: Susan Welsh

Assistant Managing Editor: Bonnie James

Science Editor: Marjorie Mazel Hecht

Technology Editor: Marsha Freeman

Book Editor: Katherine Notley

Photo Editor: Stuart Lewis

Circulation Manager: Stanley Ezrol

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Counterintelligence: Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele
Steinberg

Economics: Marcia Merry Baker, Paul Gallagher

History: Anton Chaitkin

Ibero-America: Dennis Small

Law: Edward Spannaus

Russia and Eastern Europe:

Rachel Douglas

United States: Debra Freeman

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Bogotá: Javier Almaro

Berlin: Rainer Apel

Copenhagen: Tom Gillesberg

Houston: Harley Schlanger

Lima: Sara Madueño

Melbourne: Robert Barwick

Mexico City: Rubén Cota Meza

New Delhi: Ramtanu Maïtra

Paris: Christine Bierre

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

Washington, D.C.: William Jones

Wiesbaden: Göran Haglund

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirms@larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Webmaster: John Sigerson

Assistant Webmaster: George Hollis

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly (50
issues), by EIR News Service, Inc., 729 15th St. N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20005.
(703) 777-9451

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach
1611, D-65006 Wiesbaden, Germany;
Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany
Tel: 49-611-73650

Homepage: <http://www.eirna.com>

e-mail: eirna@eirna.com

Director: Georg Neudekker

Montreal, Canada: 514-855-1699

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

Mexico: EIR, Manual Ma. Contreras #100,
Despacho 8, Col. San Rafael, CP 06470, Mexico, DF.
Tel.: 2453-2852, 2453-2853.

Copyright: ©2008 EIR News Service. All rights
reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without
permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement #40683579

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

EIR

From the Assistant Managing Editor

Is it possible that the most important events taking place in the world today are invisible to you? Compare what is being offered up by the news media as coverage of “current events,” with what is actually happening, as we present it in these pages, and you will see that virtually everything you are being told is a lie.

The biggest lies consist of what is *not* said: that there is a global drive on by the British empire for a new world war. That this war is already “live” is revealed by Helga Zepp-LaRouche in our *Feature*, “Do We Really Want a Third World War?” From Russia, to China, to Southwest Asia, to Argentina, to Zimbabwe—seemingly disparate parts of the world—we see the British hand: Look at the way Tibet is being used as a battering ram against China; examine the role of the Uighurs, and of the controllers of the Dalai Lama, including the Nazi pedigree of those networks. Look also at the vicious attempt by the British to recolonize the nation of Zimbabwe, which has been subjected to brutal economic warfare, leaving the country afflicted with Weimar levels of hyperinflation.

Underlying all, is the reality of the deepening global financial and economic disintegration, spurring the oligarchy’s desperate moves. Perhaps nowhere do the lies fall thicker and faster than in the economic sphere. As John Hoefle writes in *Economics*, “The British Empire’s Economic Suicide Club,” a theatrical farce was on display during hearings of the Senate Banking Committee, where everyone in that chamber played their parts to perfection, while the real drama—a bailout of world-historic proportions of the financial elites—is already taking place on the world stage.

Has the world gone completely mad? Not yet. See Lyndon LaRouche’s “Project ‘Genesis,’” in *Science*, where he shines a light into the darkness overtaking us, and demonstrates that by “tuning” our actions to cohere with the principles that govern the universe, we can solve any problem.

As Einstein wrote in 1930, “In anxious and uncertain times like ours, when it is difficult to find pleasure in humanity and the course of human affairs, it is particularly consoling to think of the serene greatness of a Kepler. . . .

“Kepler had to discover a way of bringing order into this chaos.”



Cover This Week

U.S. Marines arrive in Afghanistan, March 2008, for deployment under NATO command.



U.S. Marine Corps/Staff Sgt. Robert Piper

4 Lining Up for the Countdown: Do We Really Want a Third World War?

The April 2-3 NATO summit in Bucharest was held to transform NATO into an imperial global organization. If a totally different policy is not placed on the agenda, a new world war looms, which threatens to become even more horrendous than the world wars of the 20th Century. Helga Zepp-LaRouche reports.

8 The Uighurs: Britain's Double-Edged Razor To Cut Up China and Beyond

13 British Use Tibet Networks for War on China—Again

17 British Destabilization of Zimbabwe: One Part of Global Chaos 'Great Game'

18 Zimbabwe UN Ambassador Destabilizes BBC Anchor

19 Why This Assault on Mugabe?

Economics

20 The British Empire's Economic Suicide Club

The supposed regulators of the U.S. economy and the lawmakers have no idea why the world financial system collapsed, judging from a Senate Banking Committee hearing on the subject of financial market turmoil. And everyone concurred that the illegal bailout of the already dead system is the right thing to do.

22 Argentine President Defies British Empire

International

- 24 Can Dick Cheney's War Against Iran Be Avoided?**
Vice President Dick Cheney's trip to Southwest Asia left Iraq-Iran and Israel-Palestine teetering on the brink of full-scale confrontations, including discussions of possible imminent attacks on Iran and Syria. Lyndon LaRouche warned that it would be an error to think that the impetus for expanded global irregular warfare could be contained by making local agreements.
- 26 Opponents of 'Lisbon Monster' Take to the Streets**
The European Union's Lisbon Treaty would strip member nations of any vestige of national sovereignty.
- 27 Treaty Would Deprive Nations of Veto Right**
An interview with Harry van Bommel.
- 29 Gianni: Lisbon Treaty Is 'Anti-Democratic'**
Alfonso Gianni is Undersecretary to the Economic Development Ministry in Italy's outgoing government.
- 30 From Our Archives: Gore's Racist Assault Against Malaysia**

National

- 32 California Democratic Convention: LaRouche Youth Bring Reality, Provide Leadership to Party**
The LaRouche Youth Movement, some of whose members were delegates to the convention, and others elected to official party positions, provoked many well-meaning, but ignorant and impotent Democrats to reflect on the best tradition of the party, that of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and its leading advocate today, Lyndon LaRouche.
- 35 National News**

Science

- 36 The Subject of Principle: Project 'Genesis'**
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. proceeds from a discussion of "Collective Evolution and the Genetic Code," by biologists Kalin Vetsigian, Carl Woese, and Nigel Goldenfeld, to consider important issues of epistemology which have been implicitly posed by their work. To get to the heart of it, start with V.I. Vernadsky's conception of the *Noösphere*.
- 44 Einstein on Kepler**
- 45 Kepler on Aristotle's Sabotage of Astronomy**
- 53 Fermat and Least-Time: Descartes Did Not See the Light**

Interviews

- 27 Harry van Bommel**
Mr. van Bommel is a member of the Parliament of the Netherlands, and the foreign policy specialist of the Socialist Party, which is the country's third largest party and is currently leading the opposition in Parliament.

Editorial

- 56 World War III Has Begun!**

LINING UP FOR THE COUNTDOWN

Do We Really Want A Third World War?

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche is the chairwoman of the BüSo (Civil Rights Solidarity) party in Germany. This article was translated from German.

Whoever had the idea of holding the “GröNaGiaZ” (Greatest NATO Summit of All Time),¹ in the modern and super-ugly Tower of Babel in Bucharest, which, at 330,000 square meters, is the second-largest building in the world after the Pentagon, must have a macabre sense of humor. Indeed, the monstrous building—about 3,000 official delegates and an equal number of journalists only required one-third of the gigantic structure for the summit—was built according to the wishes of the megalomaniacal dictator Nicolae Ceausescu, who was, however, overthrown and executed before the structure could be inaugurated. According to unconfirmed rumors, it was the old, established PR firm Dracula Ltd., which took charge of the whole organization of the mega-events, from promotion and decoration, to catering (especially the excellent drinks), and including the graphic design of the famed fire-writing on the wall at the gala dinner in commemoration of Belshazzar and his Romanian successor.

But irony aside: The April 2-3 NATO summit in Bucharest, which was supposed to transform NATO essentially into an imperial global organization, is only one element of a breathtaking escalation of the strategic situation. Behind the scenes of the daily escalating financial collapse, the financier oligarchy of the British empire is trying to throw the principal opponents of the Anglo-American empire into chaos. Thus

we have the orchestrated and violent campaign against China, as well as the unrelenting British campaign against Russia, and Putin personally, and the attempt to bring Zimbabwe back under colonial control. It is therefore evident, that the geostrategy behind this global policy of provocation is being carried out regardless of the consequences—or is even intended to build up an enormous factor of rage against London and Washington, among countries such as China, Russia, India, and others. If a totally different policy is not placed on the agenda, a new world war looms, which threatens to become even more horrendous than the world wars of the 20th Century.

At the NATO summit in Bucharest, the entire imperial agenda was supported by all the NATO members, with the exception of the issue of admitting Georgia and Ukraine, “at this point in time.” Thus the admission of Croatia and Albania, and the French reintegration into NATO; the stationing of anti-missile defense systems and radar installations in Poland and the Czech Republic; the reinforcement of NATO troops in Afghanistan by 700 French soldiers; the integration of NATO’s military structure with the EU, according to the directives of the Lisbon Treaty; and—according to unconfirmed media reports—behind the scenes, also debate and agreement on a new strategy paper that would include “preventive conflict avoidance” around the world, as the five retired chiefs of general staffs envisage.²

A look at the map leaves no doubt that NATO membership for Georgia and Ukraine, as an expression of the encirclement strategy against Russia, as well as the missile defense systems

1. During the Nazi period, people spoke (privately, of course) about the “Gröfaz”—an acronym for the “Grösste Führer Aller Zeiten” (Greatest Leader of All Time), i.e., Hitler.

2. See Helga Zepp-LaRouche, “No to Europe as an Empire! The Militarization of the EU Must Be Stopped,” *EIR*, March 21, 2008.



White House/Eric Draper

The real agenda in Bucharest was for the financier oligarchy of the British empire—and its American lackeys—to advance its plans to throw its principal opponents into chaos and war. Here, British Prime Minister Gordon Brown and President George Bush at the NATO Summit, April 3, 2008.

in Poland and the Czech Republic, massively violates the security interests of Russia. Russia has warned in advance of “catastrophic consequences” from these developments. Eight NATO members states, among them Germany and France, spoke out against the absorption of Georgia and Ukraine. And although Bush knew about the negative views of these eight, during his visit to Kiev two days before the Bucharest Summit, he promised the early absorption of Ukraine into NATO. Chancellor Angela Merkel, who, in the opinion of Spiegel Online has molted into a “crafty player in the NATO area,” apparently persuaded President Bush to come to a compromise, so that the two countries would come in “not at this time.” Ms. Rice made clear what this “compromise” is worth in a press briefing, where she said that it was only “a question of when, not if” these two nations would enter NATO.

President Putin clarified the Russian point of view on these matters in an hour-long press conference in Bucharest, where he stressed that the establishment of a powerful military bloc on Russia’s borders would be understood as a direct threat to its national security. Declarations that this doesn’t represent a threat, would not be sufficient, especially as this has already been heard before every expansion. Putin accused NATO of not dispelling unclarities about the future role of the alliance, such as the intent of becoming a worldwide player that dominates the territory of its member states.

Despite these clear words, Mrs.

Merkel commented that NATO was not aimed against anyone, especially not against Russia.


This brushing aside of the opposition to this policy, and of the policy of constantly raising the pressure, highlights the evil intentions of the strategy behind this policy. Russia and, in another respect, China, will be provoked and put under pressure until they reach the limit of what they can tolerate, and then take pre-calculated reactions—which the Empire faction has already taken into account. U.S. Vice President Cheney publicly formulated the policy years ago, that the U.S. should never allow a nation, or a group of nations, to come close to the economic and military might of the United States.

Exactly at the point in time when the American financial crisis has escalated into a depression for the real economy, the London *Economist*, in a 14-page special feature on the future of American foreign policy, describes, on the one side, the decline of the United States, and, on the other side, Russia and, above all, China as the great rivals in the 21st Century. Other reports from different investment houses merely vary in specifying when China, and soon after, India, will have overtaken the United States, at least in the economic aspect.

The same *Economist*, on Feb. 3, 2007, had begun a series of articles with the title “Britannia Redux,” in which they raised the claim that the time when Great Britain was the “sick man of Europe,” is over, and London, through globalization,



NATO



White House/Eric Draper

Despite the opposition of eight NATO members and Russia, Ukraine and Georgia are not being admitted to NATO “at this point in time”; but Condoleezza Rice assures us that the question is not whether, but when. Left: Ukrainian President Victor Yushchenko with NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer. Right: Georgian President Mikheil Saakashvili with President Bush. Both photos are from the Bucharest summit.

is again the rightful headquarters of power. According to this view, the fact that around 80% of all hedge funds have their headquarters in the Cayman Islands, and therefore in the British Commonwealth, definitely played an essential role.

You could add a long list of further details showing that the British empire has decided to come out of this systemic crisis as the dominant factor, and thus to incorporate both the United States and continental Europe, forced into the EU corset, as vassals of the empire. The strategic partnership among Russia, China, and India is supposed to be destroyed, and each of these nations, after they have been isolated and entangled in territorial conflicts, will be smashed.

War Scenarios in London's 'Sunday Times'

If you need still another piece of proof for this analysis, then you can find it in an astounding article in the March 30 London *Sunday Times*, with the title "Tibet Is One Thing, But India and China Tensions Spell Greater Disaster." The author first praises the "genial" maneuvers of George W. Bush to draw India onto the side of the United States (which, in India, has been seen, just the opposite, as massive pressure and geopolitical manipulation). Then he describes the tensions between China and India over the Indian state of Arunachal Pradesh, just south of Tibet (Figure 1), where China also has a claim, and over Aksai Chin, a thinly populated region on the high plateau of the Himalayas, northeast of Kashmir, on which India has a claim. But for China, Aksai Chin is very important, because it is building the world's highest highway, which will make travel from Tibet to Xinjiang much faster than would be possible along the northern route. The author is quiet about the fact that it is precisely these border questions which China and India have consciously laid to rest over recent years.

Now Arunachal Pradesh and Aksai Chin, just like Tibet and Kashmir, are part of those regions over which Great Britain exerted control at the end of its rule over India, precisely in order to have room for ethnic and territorial manipulation. London followed the same policy with the Sykes-Picot Treaty for the partition of Southwest Asia, and the Trianon Treaty for the Balkans, always according to the idea of fomenting hundred-year-old ethnic conflicts for the benefit of the Empire.

The *Sunday Times* now elaborates a scenario according to which, after the death of the Dalai Lama, who is now 73 years old, there would be differences between the Chinese central government and the Tibetan exiles over who would be the authentic incarnation of the new Dalai Lama. China, according to the *Sunday Times*, would crack down hard against the insurgents. But—here the writer lets the cat out of the bag—if the Chinese government had been weakened as a result of an economic collapse, and unrest spreads throughout China, then it would be more difficult for them to crack down against the Tibetans. India, in a further development, could then advocate an international troop intervention, either sending in troops itself, or offering exile in Arunachal Pradesh. (In reality, the Indian foreign minister has already warned the Dalai Lama

that he can only remain in India as a religious exile, but not as a political leader.)

If China, as a result of the U.S. crisis, falls deeper into crisis, and would react to the greatest unrest since 1989 with a reinforcement of its national control, this would raise tensions with Japan. If the death of the Dalai Lama were to coincide with the death of Kim Jong-il of North Korea, Japan would have added reasons to rearm; under these conditions, tensions would grow among China, Japan, and the U.S., and there could be a military exchange of blows over Taiwan. Then the *Sunday Times* writes: "The warm glow of the 2008 Beijing Olympics would be remembered only through a thick smog of tension."

It's Not Only Theory

Many aspects of these insane scenarios, in the best tradition of the geopolitics of Karl Haushofer, Lord Milner, and Sir Halford Mackinder, are already operational. The destabilization of China's western province of Xinjiang, by Uighurs trained as terrorists in Pakistan, is in full swing. There is also already unrest in Sichuan province. The plan, which lies behind the whole campaign against China, is no less than breaking away a hostile Muslim state in Xinjiang, creating a Greater Tibet, and reducing China to a relatively small territory. There are similar scenarios for India, which are aimed at conflicts among Hindus, Sikhs, Muslims, Tamils, and so forth.

When French President Nicolas Sarkozy, during the French-British summit in London at the end of March, invoked not only the Entente Cordiale of the last century, but also the colonialist tradition of the European powers, as an asset for Europe's role in the world today, this was by no means only nostalgia. Behind the British campaign against Zimbabwe's President Robert Mugabe lies no less than the intention to reverse the independence of what used to be called Southern Rhodesia. There is also no doubt that the "former" colonial powers are savagely determined to break the extensive agreements in Africa by China, and secondarily Russia, to import raw materials and build up infrastructure and industrial capacity in return.

Furthermore, there are ambitious efforts to make British Prime Minister Gordon Brown, under the Queen of England, into the foreign minister of the Commonwealth, to which 53 nations and 16 so-called "realms" belong. In addition, Brown and Sarkozy have already proposed Tony Blair as the first president of the European Union, who would then, according to the Lisbon Treaty, be elected for a term of two and a half years. If one then notes the networking of the EU and NATO, which are already undertaking common military missions in the Balkans, on the Lebanese coast, and, in the case of the EU, also in Darfur, what picture then emerges? If it should be revealed, that the NATO Summit in Bucharest really came together around the strategy paper of the five generals for global preventive strikes and the first use of nuclear weapons, which could not be clearly confirmed at the time of this writing, then

FIGURE 1



The British plan for China is to break away a hostile Muslim state in Xinjiang, create a Greater Tibet, and split off other ethnic regions, reducing China to a relatively small territory (see map p.16). Tensions between India and China over the Indian state of Arunachal Pradesh, where China also has a claim, also come into play. (Shown on the map is also the new railroad from Xining to Lhasa in Tibet, the world's highest railway, and a magnificent project for the development of Tibet.)

Source: EIRNS.

the world finds itself on a short track toward World War III.

Whether Mrs. Merkel understands it or not, we are experiencing right now, a global alignment of an order of battle for a coming world war, in which the British empire, with its vassals, the U.S.A. and continental Europe, with the help of the militarized EU dictatorship and NATO, will be launched against Asia, especially against Russia, China, and India. The fire-writing on the wall could be read in Bucharest.

The British Motive

If you are looking to express the reasons for the current monstrous crisis, you would declare that the British empire, the primary author for this climactic world crisis, is acting out of utter desperation and insanity. During the whole period since the successful breakthrough of the Allied forces in 1944 in Normandy, the Anglo-Dutch financial powers, who wear the facade of the British monarchy in a certain way, like a Venetian mask, have had only one burning wish. They saw as their long-term strategic orientation, to root out the post-war plans of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who died at a most unfortunate time in 1945, and to corrupt the United States from the inside, in order to finally eliminate not only any recollection of the legacy of the American Revolution, the American victory over the Confederate puppets of Lord Palmerston, and the brilliant victory of President Roosevelt, but also to end politics in the tradition of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia in the whole world.

For the Anglo-Dutch financial oligarchy and their accom-

plishes in the American establishment, this means, above all, to expunge the American System of economy, with the help of which the U.S. became the greatest economic power that has ever existed.

Today, this British oligarchical intention has almost been realized. The current world financial system has been destroyed to such a degree, that the collapse of the global financial system and real economy, which has been escalating since August 2007, finds itself on the edge of a situation which could only be compared to the Dark Age, which was unleashed by the bankruptcy of the Venetian Lombard League.

The greatest fear which the British empire has about its current war plans against Africa and Asia, lies in the fact that precisely these actions could bring the United States to the point of reviving the policy of FDR, as occurred in 1932-33. Britain's dilemma lies in the fact that the speed, extent, and depth of the current global financial crisis does not permit the powers of the British empire to hesitate. London's impulse, and that of the powers tied to it, is that they have to act now, regardless of the risks. Thus, we find ourselves in a situation where we either defeat the monster now, or the British scenarios, which are already in motion, will drive the whole planet into ruin, and plunge the British empire, along with the rest of the world, into the abyss.

It is high time to put on the agenda, in opposition to this, cooperation among Russia, China, India, and the United States, in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the New Deal, and a New Bretton Woods.

The Uighurs: Britain's Double-Edged Razor To Cut Up China and Beyond

by Ramtanu Maitra

On March 7, two Chinese Uighurs, travelling on China Southern airline flight CZ6901, were taken off the plane at Lanzhou and taken into custody for trying to blow up the plane. The incident indicated the activation of disgruntled Uighurs by Britain, to create chaos within China and disrupt its final preparations for the Beijing Olympics. Three days later, demonstrations against China began in Lhasa, Tibet. After three days of relatively peaceful demonstrations, Tibetan rioters took control and set fire to shops owned by ethnic Chinese, burning many of them alive.

Protests spread from Tibet into three neighboring provinces on March 16, as Tibetans continued to defy a Chinese government crackdown. Angry demonstrations broke out in Tibetan communities in Sichuan, Qinghai, and Gansu provinces. Beijing said it had collected enough evidence to state that the demonstrations were planned, and they were planned to be violent.

U.S. intelligence-funded Radio Free Asia reported subsequently that several hundred Uighurs had staged a demonstration in Khotan, in Xinjiang province, to protest against limits on the wearing of headscarves by Muslim women, and to demand the release of political prisoners and an end to the torture of Uighurs. Fu Chao, an official with the Khotan Regional Administrative Office, said that the protest involved people who wanted to establish an Islamic nation and to separate Xinjiang from China. The Uighurs, who are a dominant ethnic group in Xinjiang, are Muslims.

On April 1, the *Washington Post* published an op-ed by Uighur dissident Rebiya Kadeer, based in the United States and president of the Uighur American Association, expressing her desire to show "solidarity with the Tibetan people and support their legitimate aspirations for genuine autonomy." She reminded fellow Uighurs of February 1997, when "thousands of Uighurs demanding equality, religious freedom and an end to repression by the government peacefully protested in the Ghulja region of East Turkestan, an area designated the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region by the Chinese government. Armed paramilitary police confronted the unarmed demonstrators and bystanders, killing dozens on the spot, including women and young children. In the aftermath of the protest, thousands of Uighurs were detained on suspicion of participating in the demon-

stration. Tragically, hundreds of Uighurs were executed."

What emerged from the March 9 incident and the April 1 op-ed by Kadeer, were two sides of the same coin used by the British controllers of many radicalized Muslims, to create chaos and confusion, and even secessionism against nations, for geopolitical reasons. The Uighurs, now caught in that British meat grinder, will be deployed to disrupt the Beijing Olympics and provoke China to take repressive actions.

Uighurs Became British Pawns

Although the Uighurs have been re-activated by the British at a time when the Olympic torch was being brought to China from Athens for the Olympics in August, the plan to use them to contain China and to implode it from inside was conceived a long time ago.

British colonial policy toward the Muslim world has long been formulated by Bernard Lewis. The British-born Lewis, now at Princeton University, started his career as an intelligence officer and has remained in bed with British intelligence ever since. Avowedly anti-Russia and pro-Israel, Lewis reaped a rich harvest among U.S. academia and policymakers. He brought President Jimmy Carter's virulently anti-Russian National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, into his fold in the 1980s, and made the U.S. neo-conservatives, led by Vice President Dick Cheney, dance to his tune on the Middle East in 2001. In between, he penned dozens of books and was taken seriously as a historian. But Lewis is what he always was: a British intelligence officer who is manipulating the Muslims to exert British control over resource-rich Arabia and Central Asia, and undermine sovereign nation-states.

The Uighurs became pawns in the hands of the British, the master chessmen who began re-arranging Arabia, the Maghreb nations in North Africa, and lands situated in the Mesopotamian plain in the early part of the last century. They used one Arabian tribe against another, one Muslim sect against another, and it became evident to Muslim leaders that Britain was the maker and breaker of nations. It was that way when Britain was the powerful colonial power, and it is the same even today when Britain is not. Although Britain is no longer capable of winning any war by itself, it has co-opted the Americans to finance such projects and do the dirty work, while undermining the American purpose and national interest.



Creative Commons/Henry Chen

The railroad from Xining to Lhasa (in Tibet) is one of the infrastructure projects launched by China to develop its backward western regions. It crosses the "Roof of the World," the Kunlun Shan mountain ranges. The world's steepest and highest railway, it has more than 960 km of track laid at altitudes over 13,000 feet.

Britain's use of the Uighurs can be understood from that historical perspective alone.

The origins of the Uighur people may be traced back to the Uyghur khanate of the 700s A.D. The khanate broke away from the Turkic Empire and settled across the Tian Shan Mountains, in the area of the modern-day Chinese cities of Urumchi and Tarpan. In 1932, a local Uighur warlord, who turned out to be a downright rascal, reclaimed semi-autonomy during China's Qing dynasty. The mess created by this warlord resulted in widespread rebellion in 1933, and brought into the rebellious group various ethnic varieties of Chinese who lived there at that time. The short-lived and ill-administered rule of the warlord ended with takeover by a military commander. According to some observers, this commander survived with blessing of the Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin until 1944, when he was finally replaced by a Kuomintang (KMT) governor for Xinjiang province.

The KMT retained control of the south until the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) Liberation of 1949, when the KMT governor surrendered, leaving the Uighur leaders as the CCP's only rival for power in Xinjiang. Following a July 1949 meeting in Ghulja with a representative from the new People's Republic of China (P.R.C.), the Uighur leadership was invited to Beijing for further consultation. Reports indicate that the plane carrying the Uighur leaders crashed en route on Sept. 3, 1949, killing all aboard. The People's Liberation Army (PLA) had already moved in, taking control of northern Xinjiang.

The arrival of the CCP led to the departure of many thousands of Uighurs who had the dream and principal motivation of "pan-Turkism"—re-creation of a band of Turkic-speaking

states, stretching across Central Asia from the homeland of Ankara to Xinjiang. Although many thousands of Uighurs left China, about 8.5 million still live in Xinjiang and elsewhere in China. It is not clear how many live outside China, but most live in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakstan, on China's western borders. Most Uighurs who dream of setting up "Uighuristan" are highly vulnerable to the manipulations by the British, who promise to help realize their hopes, but instead, use them as geopolitical pawns to join hands with other dissident ethnic groups in the area, to weaken China, Central Asian Muslim nations, and countries situated on the southern tier of Russia.

Chinese Development Efforts

One of China's weakest flanks is its western region. Thinly populated and jutting into an area dominated by people who are Muslim by religion and products of an entirely different culture than the Chinese of eastern China, western China remains culturally, politically, and militarily highly vulnerable. It became evident to Chinese policymakers during the 1980s, that to emerge as a global power, the country must first work toward reducing the territorial vulnerability of the western region. With the Soviet Union in its death throes at that time, Beijing had to ensure that China's territorial integrity in the west and southwest were not violated by the new forces emerging in the region.

In 1999, the Chinese government announced its official plan to develop western China. Its goal is to try to achieve a satisfactory level of economic development there in a five- to ten-year time-frame, and to establish a "new western China" by the middle of the 21st Century.


China's western region includes 11 provinces, autonomous regions, and municipalities under the direct administration of the central government: Shaanxi, Qinghai, Sichuan, Yunnan, Guizhou, Ningxia, Xinjiang, Inner Mongolia, Gansu, Tibet, and Chongqing. The region covers 5.4 million square kilometers, 57% of the country's land area, and has a population of 285 million people, 23% of the total population of the nation. More than half of the country's identified natural resources are in the western region.

The "Go West" strategy was announced at the 16th Party Congress, as Interfax news agency reported in 2005. The policy objective is often simplistically depicted as China's interest to pursue both Russian and Central Asian energy sources. But the strategy is actually more complex. It is to ensure population settlement in the West, and thus reduce the territorial vulnerability of western China, and also build up a long-term base for a productive workforce—a prerequisite for making significant inroads into the region's oil and gas fields, and exploring its other natural resources.

Broadly speaking, China projected three infrastructural requirements in its process of strengthening western China and integrating it with the neighboring regions. First is the Karakoram Highway (KKH), built to link China to Pakistan; second, the Gwadar port, to link China-Pakistan to the Persian Gulf and Central Asia; and third, a road across the Kulma Pass, to link southwest Xinjiang with the old Soviet trans-Pamir military highway. The first two projects were elaborated and pursued in the context of China's Pakistan policy. Though not as directly relevant to the present discussion, linking up Tajikistan and China by means of a road through the Kulma Pass is an important Chinese initiative in its own right.

The border between China and Tajikistan, then a part of the Soviet Union, had been sealed tightly for almost a century during the Soviet era. But now, trade is growing, and the opening of the Kulma Pass brings real possibilities to a remote and undeveloped region. The Kulma Pass must be one of the highest trading routes on Earth, set as it is among the towering peaks of the Pamir Mountains, more than 4,000 meters high. The effect of opening the Kulma Pass in 2004 was visible almost immediately. Within days, the bazaars of Tajikistan were full of Chinese-made clothes, shoes, and household goods. Before the pass was opened, these wares had to be trucked into Tajikistan via neighboring Kyrgyzstan. The pass also opens up the opportunity to the Tajiks to reach the Karakoram highway, which winds down to Pakistan, and to the ports on its southern coast.

The success of Beijing's plan to develop the western part of the country is evident now. The Russians, for instance, have concluded that western China is now a place worthy of investment. The Russian oil-giant Gazprom announced in 2007 that it would begin planning for two oil and gas pipelines to western China. In addition, China has begun looking at the Caspian basin area for procuring supplementary energy supplies.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

British intelligence hand Bernard Lewis shaped the strategy of manipulating Muslims to exert British control over Southwest and Central Asia.

But, piping oil and gas from the Caspian Sea area, and Central Asia as a whole, is only one aspect of China's western strategy. Central Asia allegedly possesses considerable mineral reserves. Besides gold, uranium, and silver, reserves of such important minerals as aluminum, copper, zinc, and lead are reported. It also has small reserves of rare minerals such as tungsten and molybdenum. All these minerals, and more, are crucial for China's fast-developing industrial sector, which also includes its military hardware.

How Britain Strikes Back

These developments posed a "serious problem" to Britain, which wanted to contain China in the west and Russia in the north, and maintain control over the Muslim nations that own the oil and gas fields of Middle East and Central Asia. The Uighurs were uneasy about China's western development plan, since it would disrupt their "way of life" and lead to their integration with the Han and other Chinese ethnic groups who would be involved in the western China development plan. This is the hook used by the British to create a militant Uighur community, ready to pick up arms against China.

The way the British work the dissident Uighurs against the Chinese is like a two-edged razor. What is visible to one and all is the gentle face of Uighur individuals such as businesswoman *cum* human rights activist Rebiya Kadeer, or the humane pleas of Uighur individuals such as Enver Tohti in the U.K. These individuals "point out" that human right violations against the Uighurs in Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region (XUAR) by Beijing were committed in China's drive to develop and "occupy" western China, and settle the area with Han Chinese. The key in this part of the British modus operandi is to keep the ethnic identity of Uighurs intact, by ap-

FIGURE 1



peeling to the world against “sinofication” of the XUAR. It is not much different than London’s strategy in directing the Tibetans against China in Tibet, Gansu, and a few other provinces where Chinese-Tibetans reside.

This side of the razor is provided by Amnesty International, which is infested by British intelligence-MI6, in particular. Amnesty International issued a 24-page report in 2007 on the “policies of the Chinese government” towards the Uighurs in the XUAR. The document dwelt on China’s “crack-down” against organized religion as part of Beijing’s communist ethos, and tried to establish its view that China has seized upon the 9/11 events to persecute the Uighur Muslims and label them as “terrorists.” The report stressed that the Uighurs are a persecuted Muslim community that has been ignored far too long.

However, Amnesty’s authors chose to ignore the fact that the Uighurs are not the only Muslims in China; the Hui Muslims are also a recognized minority of several millions, and minorities of Tajiks, Kyrgyz, and Kazaks are to be found in Xinjiang. Two percent of China’s population is Muslim—a deceptively small statistic, until one realizes that in a country of 1.2 billion, that amounts to a total of 24 million, of which the Uighurs constitute about 8.5 million

British intelligence’s promotion of the “Uighur cause” has intensified animosity between the Uighurs and Beijing. Tensions are also exacerbated by the fact that much wealthier Han enterprises exercise a monopoly on most of the area’s scarce resources. In other words, China’s plan to develop western China has created a new situation in Xinjiang, to which some Uighurs find it difficult to adjust. British intelligence is using Uighurs inside Xinjiang, with the help of Uighur dissidents abroad, to keep the pot boiling. Britain is hoping that China will come down on the Uighurs with a hammer, providing London an opportunity to organize internationally to move ahead with censure against Beijing, or to extract concessions

from Beijing elsewhere.

The other edge of London’s razor is provided by the Uighur terrorists operating from the undefined borders of Pakistan and Afghanistan, and the rocky terrains of Central Asia. High-level Indian and Pakistani security analysts have pointed out from time to time the presence of Uighur terrorists in Pakistan’s Pushtun tribal belt. Now and then one comes across references to the finding of bodies of Uighurs and Tajiks, in addition to bodies of Uzbeks and Pushuns. There was at least one identification of a Uighur who was killed, and there are refer-

ences to some Uighurs and Tajiks acting as the junior partners of the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan and the Islamic Jihad Union. Uighurs could be found working for the CIA-funded Radio Liberty in Germany, organizing against China on Tibet.

During the 1980s, the Pakistani military’s training of Uighurs from Xinjiang, to fight the Soviets in Afghanistan, became an irritant in Sino-Pakistani relations. When the Taliban seized power in Afghanistan in the mid-1990s, with the full backing of Pakistan’s military, China became apprehensive about Pakistan turning into a catalyst for an Islamic revival in its troubled western region.

Since the centerpiece of China’s western China development plan is to connect the Karakoram Highway in the north to the Persian Gulf in the south, through Pakistan’s Pushtun belt and Balochistan, Britain has succeeded in evoking anti-Chinese anger among the Balochs. In this context, an Indian analyst pointed out that there are two groups of Uighur militants. One group, like the Balochs, is fighting for independence for the Uighur homeland. It is not pan-Islamic and does not accept the ideology of al-Qaeda. Another group is pan-Islamic and has accepted the leadership of al-Qaeda in the International Islamic Front (IIF). The move is for cooperation between the Balochs and those Uighurs who are fighting for independence but reject al-Qaeda. Both these underground groups have been infiltrated by British intelligence, among others.

British Foot-Soldiers in Central Asia

Writing for the *Jamestown Foundation Journal* (Vol. 2, No. 4), analyst Stephen Ulph, in his article “Londonistan,” seemed intrigued by that fact that scores of violent Islamic movements remain anchored in London. He wrote: London “is also a center for Islamist politics. You could say that London has become, for the exponents of radical Islam, the

most important city in the Middle East. A framework of lenient asylum laws has allowed the development of the largest and most overt concentration of Islamist political activists since Taliban-ruled Afghanistan. Just ask the French, whose exasperation with the indulgent toleration afforded to Algerian Islamic activists led them to dub the city dismissively as *‘l’antechambre de l’Afghanistan.’* They certainly have a point. Many of bin Laden’s fatwas [religious edicts] were actually first publicized in London. In fact, the United Kingdom in general seems to differ from other European states in the degree to which it became a spiritual and communications hub for the jihad movement. . . .”¹

Ulph does not, however, ask why it is that London remains an “Aladdin’s Cave,” chock-full of Islamic radical dissidents. Britain is no longer a military power of substance. To be an almost-equal partner in the Atlantic Alliance, Britain has two important ingredients to offer to the United States: first, its ability to undo the Middle East, North Africa, Central Asia, and parts of the Indian subcontinent through the use of people living in London’s Aladdin’s Cave; and second, its control of world currency movements through the City of London.


The old British colonial establishment, with Bernard Lewis as its mentor to manipulate the aggressively stupid American elite and bickering Muslims, appears to have set in motion events that would unleash endless bloodshed in Central Asia. The Uighur militants, now full-fledged terrorists, fit into this scene like fish in water. London’s objective is to keep both China and Russia under an open-ended threat. At this point, there is no one who can better serve this “Lewis Doctrine” than Muslims nurtured in Britain—the Hizb ut-Tahrir.

Banned in parts of Europe and in many Muslim countries, Hizb ut-Tahrir quickly worked out where to set up its home. It is headquartered in London, but also has a strong organizational presence in Birmingham, Liverpool, and Bradford.

Multicultural Britain welcomed Syrian-born cleric Omar Bakri Mohammed, who had been expelled from Saudi Arabia. Although portrayed as non-violent by British authorities, Bakri’s links to Osama bin Laden are widely known. Excerpts of a letter to Bakri from bin Laden, sent by fax from Afghanistan in the Summer of 1998, were published in the *Los Angeles Times*. Bakri later released what he called bin Laden’s four specific objectives for a jihad against the United States: “Bring down their airliners. Prevent the safe passage of their ships. Occupy their embassies. Force the closure of their companies and banks.” In Britain, under the umbrellas provided by British intelligence, Hizb ut-Tahrir preaches its extremist ideology to huge crowds. The *Guardian* reported on the group’s 2003 annual conference in Birmingham, which attracted 8,000 people—“by far the most for a Muslim organization.”

In the early 1990s in Britain, the National Union of Students tried to ban the group from campuses, describing it as

FIGURE 2
Insurgents’ Destination: The Fergana Valley



“the single biggest extremist threat in the U.K.” Today, Hizb ut-Tahrir is stronger than ever, recruiting new members from among middle class Muslims attending university.

The Ferghana Valley

For years, Central Asian governments have pointed to the Ferghana Valley [Figure 2] as a hotbed of Muslim extremists aiming to set up an Islamic state in the region. Largely ethnically Uzbek, the valley is split among Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan, in a confused patchwork of Soviet-era borders that often leaves enclaves of one country surrounded by the territory of another. In general, Uzbekistan holds the valley floor, Tajikistan holds its narrow mouth, and Kyrgyzstan holds the high ground. Though the valley mouth is narrow, the valley itself is vast, at 22,000 square kilometers (8,500 square miles). The Pamir and Tian Shan mountains that rise above it are only dimly visible, but they are the main source of the water for the valley.

During the Soviet era, the valley was a major center of cotton and silk production, and the hills above are covered by walnut forests. The valley also has some oil and gas. That scene today has not changed much. What has changed significantly since the 1990s, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, is the former Soviet Union’s integration with the “free world”; and that process has made Central Asia economically decrepit and turned it into a hotbed of transnational Islamic militants, controlled and funded by outside forces. Recently, the Kyrgyz media reported that personnel of the country’s border control services said that the illegal entry of foreign nationals and individuals without any citizenship into Kyrgyzstan was on the rise. What is important to note is that these militants were not parachuted out of airplanes: They are coming through Afghanistan and Pakistan.

1. *EIR* exposed this years ago. See, for example, Jeffrey Steinberg et al., “Levy Sanctions on Britain for Harboring Terrorists!” *EIR*, April 4, 1997.

It could very well be a ticking time bomb for India, China, and Russia.

Apart from various Islamic preachers, two major Islamic groups function in the fertile Ferghana Valley. The common objective of these groups is to change the regimes in Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan. These are the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) and the Hizb ut-Tehrir. Many trained terrorists among the Uighurs, Chechens, Uzbeks, and other ethnic militias work directly under these two main groups.

While the IMU openly thrives on violence, the Hizb ut-Tehrir is strongly promoted by the United Kingdom as peaceful. But records indicate that the IMU and the Hizb ut-Tehrir work hand-in-hand. Most of the IMU recruits are from the Hizb ut-Tehrir, according to Rohan Gunaratna, an expert on world terrorist outfits. Gunaratna claims that Khaled Sheikh Muhammad, the alleged mastermind of the Sept. 11, 2001, terror attacks in the United States, and Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the Jordanian who was active until he was killed last year, in the Iraqi insurgency against U.S. occupying forces, were both once members of the Hizb ut-Tehrir.

The relationship between the Taliban and the IMU pre-dates Sept. 11. In September 1996, after the Taliban had captured the Afghan capital, Kabul, Juma Namangani and Tahir Yuldashev—long-time adversaries of President Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan—held a press conference in the city to announce the formation of the IMU. Namangani, who had served as a Soviet paratrooper in Afghanistan in the 1980s, became the group's leader (or amir), and Yuldashev its military commander. Their aim was to topple Karimov and turn Uzbekistan, and ultimately the whole of Central Asia, into an Islamic state. The Taliban provided them with a place for shelter, and training and plotting against Karimov. It is also said that Yuldashev developed contact with Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan, and the two became supportive of each other. Namangani was killed in an explosion in 2001, but Yuldashev is still very much around the Pushtun belt in Pakistan.

As one Indian analyst pointed out, Osh and Jalalabad, the cities that spearheaded the regime change in Kyrgyzstan, are Hizb ut-Tehrir strongholds. The Hizb ut-Tehrir is making huge gains in a belt stretching from the Ferghana provinces of Namangan, Andijan, and Kokand (contiguous to Osh and Jalalabad) to the adjacent Penjekent Valley (Uzbekistan) and Khojent (Tajikistan).

Ria Novosti quoted Russia's Federal Security Service director, Nikolai Patrushev, on March 31, 2008: "There have been repeated attempts by the international terrorist organizations Hizb ut-Tahrir al-Islami and the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan to move their operations to the territory of the Russian Federation, including the Urals region."

Russia had earlier identified Hizb ut-Tehrir links to radical Islamist groups in Chechnya. And the Hizb ut-Tehrir has been placed on a list of banned organizations by the country's Supreme Court.

British Use Tibet Networks for War On China—Again

by Mike Billington

Once again, the British have played their Tibet Card, unleashing a carefully orchestrated, racist riot in Lhasa, and cranking out lies and anti-China hysteria through their global media empire. This is not the first time Tibet has figured in a British war plan against China. In 1932, as the world was descending into Hell after the collapse of the world financial system—just as it is today—the British provoked chaos across Eurasia. Hitler's rise to power was financed by the Bank of England's Montagu Norman and his friends in the Bush and Harriman families in the United States, with the intention of instigating a war between the Nazis and the Soviet Union, expecting them to bleed each other to death. Meanwhile, Japan was instigated by London and its J.P. Morgan interests in New York to move into Manchuria, with the aim of seizing the wealth of China for the Anglo-Japanese alliance, while threatening the Soviets from the East, and ending the hated Republic of China, founded under the leadership of the great champion of the American System, Sun Yat Sen.

To aid in that Japanese invasion of China—which officially launched World War II—the British activated their Tibetan assets as a second front, sending Tibetan troops against the forces of the Chinese Republic in southwest China, aimed at grabbing new pieces of China for an expanded "Greater Tibet." As the British-edited *China Year Book* stated in that year, the British-armed Tibetan operation was well on its way to being "restored to its ancient boundry."

Then, as today, the British also activated their assets in Western China among the Islamic Uighur population, to cut even more chunks out of the Republic of China, for an entity they called Eastern Turkestan (see accompanying article).

The British have never hidden their alliance and ideological agreement with the Nazis in their Tibet operations—neither before World War II, nor afterwards. In the 1930s, Tibet was under the direction of a senior officer of the Raj in India, Hugh Richardson, who had come to Tibet in 1932 to attempt to coerce the Chinese to give up their historic claim to Tibet as an integral part of China, and to give up more areas of China to Greater Tibet. He stayed in Lhasa, performing essentially the same function as the British Resident in an Indian state, providing weapons and direction to the local authorities, under the direction of the 13th Dalai Lama, who preceded the current Dalai Lama.

A Nazi Waffen SS delegation was deployed to Tibet by Heinrich Himmler in 1939, headed by Ernst Schaefer, intending to establish relations with the land reputed in Nazi lore to be the true source of the pure Aryan race. One member of the expedition, Bruno Beger, was an ethnologist, who was measuring skulls and body parts, attempting to prove the biological ties between the Tibetans and the Nazis. He befriended the Regent for the young 14th Dalai Lama, and later became a lifelong friend of the Dalai Lama himself. He also became a convicted war criminal, for his later work on Jews in the Nazi concentration camps, trying to find a biological means for determining Jewish origin.

British consul Hugh Richardson had to be a bit careful with these kindred spirits; Britain was, after all, on the brink of war with Germany after the Führer turned against his British sponsors, and especially after the Hitler-Stalin Pact in September 1939. Richardson kept his distance at the time, but after that nasty little war with the Nazis was over, Richardson and Beger became the best of friends again.

So also did Richardson befriend SS officer Heinrich Harrer, made famous by the Hollywood glorification of his book *Seven Years in Tibet* in 1997. Harrer arrived in Tibet in 1944, living intimately with Richardson and the Dalai Lama, only leaving, with Richardson, when the Chinese returned to Tibet after the 1949 Chinese revolution. Both Harrer and Beger were members in good standing in the Tibet Society, founded by Richardson in 1959 to lead the campaign against China's sovereignty over Tibet. In 1994, the three of them held a grand reunion with the Dalai Lama, pledging their continued support for the independence of Tibet. A video of the Dalai Lama meeting his old friend Harrer in recent years, chatting about the good old days, is readily available on YouTube.

Thus it should be no surprise to read reports and see films showing that the Tibetan gangs who have just rampaged through Lhasa took a page from the Nazi pogroms, marking those shops and homes owned by ethnic Tibetans with white flags, and trashing and burning all others, regardless of the innocent people trapped inside. The films were provided by the Chinese, but were also confirmed by James Miles, the journalist for the London *Economist*, who was in Lhasa during the week of the riots.

As Miles wrote: "What I saw was calculated targeted violence against an ethnic group, or, I should say, two ethnic groups, primarily ethnic Han Chinese living in Lhasa, but also



The 14th Dalai Lama (right) and former SS officer Heinrich Harrer, who is glorified in the Hollywood movie "Seven Years in Tibet." Harrer (d. 2006) was among those who led the campaign against China on behalf of the British imperial war drive.

members of the Muslim Hui minority in Lhasa." The rioters, Miles said, "marked those businesses that they knew to be Tibetan-owned with white traditional scarves. Those businesses were left intact. Almost every single other across a wide swathe of the city ... was either burned, looted, destroyed, smashed into, the property therein hauled out into the streets, piled up, burned. It was an extraordinary outpouring of ethnic violence of a most unpleasant nature to watch, which surprised some Tibetans watching it."

Miles also reported that the police did virtually nothing for several days, waited for the riot to run itself out, and only then moved in to secure the streets, "when they felt safe I think that there would not be massive bloodshed."

Despite this coverage, the world press constantly repeats the mantra that the Chinese kept the press out of Tibet during the riots, and that the Chinese must be held responsible for the violence. Those, like U.S. Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi, who travelled to visit the Dalai Lama after the riots, and lied that the slaughter of Han Chinese and Hui Chinese Muslims in Lhasa was the result of "Chinese oppression," must be asked: Why are you serving the racist British Empire?

Tibetan 'Traditional Culture'

What is the Tibetan "traditional culture" which the Chinese are accused of destroying, and which the British (and the Nazis) admire so dearly? Before 1950, approximately 2 million Tibetans, about one-fourth of the population, entered the monkhood. The majority of those who were not monks were



Reichsführer SS Heinrich Himmler deployed a Waffen SS delegation to Tibet in 1939, intending to establish relations with the land the Nazis believed was the source of the pure Aryan race. Here, Adolf Hitler and Himmler review Waffen SS troops.

herdsmen or peasants, working as serfs on land owned by the government or by one of the thousands of monasteries. There was nearly total illiteracy among the peasantry, and even in the monkhood. Wooden plows and yaks were the only technology used by the peasants, who otherwise relied on brute-force labor; until the 20th Century, there were no wheeled vehicles in the country. Justice was at the whim of the nobility and the Dalai Lama, as there was no organized system of courts. Polyandry, where a wife was shared among all the brothers of a family, was common.

The British encouraged the Tibetans to prevent economic development, and that not even a single road should be built into Tibet. They wanted Tibet to be a buffer between the Raj in India and China, but, even more, to retain its “traditional culture,” as a Shangri-la, the Valhalla of the Nazis. When the Chinese came in, with development, schools, hospitals, and roads, Richardson cried that, “a heavy curtain has descended upon Tibet, a state of cultural degeneration to which this whole people has now been reduced.” China has also rebuilt the major monasteries and, since the Cultural Revolution of the 1960s, does not restrict traditional religious practices.

When challenged on the fact that China has helped Tibetans emerge from the dark ages, Richardson expressed the classic, racist colonial view: “Apologists may point to claims of material and mechanical progress, but even if these benefits ever reach the Tibetan population, the fact remains they were not sought by the Tibetan people themselves, and represent the total negation of Tibetan civilization and culture.”

British Outsourcing to the U.S.

When the Chinese returned to Tibet in 1950, Richardson left for London, where he continued sponsoring Tibetan military insurrections (with help from the CIA), while training up-and-coming British colonial agents at Cambridge (among them, Michael Aris, who married Burma’s Aung San Suu Kyi, now the British-controlled asset in Myanmar/Burma). The Dalai Lama fled to India during a failed revolt in 1959, but the British and the CIA continued providing military training for Tibetans in exile through the 1960s and beyond.

When the U.S. establishment of relations with China in 1974, and formal recognition in 1979, ended the covert military operations, the “Tibet Card” was transformed into a “human rights” campaign. President Carter issued the Dalai Lama his first visa to the United States in 1979, and a nest of members of Congress began fawning over “His Holiness the

Dalai Lama.” During the 1980s, a number of covert operations were “privatized” to the semi-government National Endowment for Democracy (NED), carrying out “regime change” through political subversion rather than military invasion.

In 1988, Tibet House was set up in New York by Hollywood’s Richard Gere and Robert Thurman, the Columbia University professor who is considered the reigning “expert” on Tibet since the death of Hugh Richardson. The next year, the same crew set up the International Campaign for Tibet (ICT), which has become the command center for anti-China operations using the Tibet Card. To understand the nature of this British creation, consider Thurman’s pedigree:

Thurman was a 68er who dropped out of Harvard to marry oil heiress Christoph de Menil. When the marriage fell apart, he wandered around India on a motorcycle, ending up spending several years with the Dalai Lama, and becoming the first Westerner to be ordained as a Tantric Buddhist monk. When he returned to the United State a few years later, to become a spokesman for the Dalai Lama, he met the wife of acid-freak Timothy Leary, renounced his robes, and married her as soon as her divorce came through. He went on to become a professor at Columbia University, and the leading liar before the Congress and similar dens of corruption around the world, on behalf of the Dalai Lama and against China. His daughter Uma (imagine her childhood!) is a sex-goddess movie star, now making slasher films.

The ICT receives about \$5 million in donations annually, and works in close coordination with the World Wide Fund for Nature, the green fascist movement created by the British

FIGURE 1
'Greater Tibet'



The British view of "Greater Tibet," as demanded by the Dalai Lama's representatives in negotiations with Beijing. In addition to Tibet, they demand autonomy over all of Qinghai Province, half of Sichuan, and pieces of Gansu and Yunnan provinces.

and Dutch royal families, which deploys millions of dollars internationally on behalf of the effort to revive the Empire. Also in league with the ICT is Amnesty International, the British intelligence network deployed against nations targeted by the Anglo-Dutch financial oligarchy.

Although some operational control has been outsourced to the Americans, London is still running the show. Exemplary of this was the 1995 proposal published in the New York Council on Foreign Relations journal, *Foreign Affairs*, called "China's Changing Shape," by Gerald Segal, the Director of Studies at London's International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), a leading British Imperial think tank. The map which he presents reduces China to about one-half its current size, with the rest divided up between the independent states of Greater Tibet, East Turkestan, Mongolia, and Manchuria. Not surprisingly, the home page of the ICT website prominently features precisely such a map, and the Dalai Lama clique insists that Tibet be considered as this larger piece of China in their negotiations with Beijing.

The Current Turmoil

The racist explosion in Lhasa on March 14 was not spontaneous. In the early 1990s, ICT board member Mark Handelman arranged for 1,000 children of the Tibetans in the Dalai Lama circles in India to receive special compensation for visas to the United States. Among them was Tsewang Rigzin, who lived in the U.S. for over 12 years, became a citizen, and worked in the local offices of the Tibetan Youth Congress, set up by the Dalai Lama's supporters in

Dharamsala, India, in the 1970s. Rigzin was in close communication with the ICT in the United States.

In August of 2007, Rigzin returned to Dharamsala, and was elected to head the Youth Congress. He immediately began campaigning for a march from Dharamsala to Tibet on the March 10 anniversary of the Dalai Lama's flight from Tibet. Such overt political activity is explicitly forbidden by the conditions agreed upon between the Indian government and the Dalai Lama, for his residence in India. Rigzin then set up the Tibetan People's Uprising Organization with four other exile groups, which openly opposed the pledge of non-violence professed by the Dalai Lama, and called for an international boycott of the Beijing Olympics—something which the Dalai Lama has refused to do. Thus, a classic British intelligence "hard cop-soft cop" dichotomy was set up, and was played by the world press who serve the British imperial plans.

The Chinese have provided proof that the Youth Congress, while professing a distance from the Dalai Lama himself, extensively organized for demonstrations and rioting in cities in Tibet, China, and around the world, for March 10 and the following days. Their "march on Tibet" from Dharamsala was quickly stopped by the Indian authorities, but when the race riots broke out on March 14, the violence spread across China and the region, coordinated by the Youth Congress networks. Although there appear to have been no rioters killed in Lhasa, there may have been several dozen killed in other Chinese cities.

The British War Plan

The target of convenience for the British war plan against China is the Summer Olympics in Beijing. The carrying of the Olympic Torch around the world provides a series of high-profile events for the ICT to mobilize demonstrations and disruptions. But the Olympics are incidental—the British war plan is driven by the pace of economic disintegration descending on the world economy in the wake of the collapse of the world financial system in the Summer of 2007. The primary targets are the major powers of Eurasia—China, Russia, and India—not because of their power in itself, but because the primary danger in the eyes of the Anglo-Dutch financial interests is an FDR-style alliance of the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India, against the emerging fascist order. This is the driving force behind the British campaign to drag the U.S. into an Atlantic alliance against Asia, a danger that must be exposed and destroyed.

British Destabilization of Zimbabwe: One Part of Global Chaos ‘Great Game’

by Portia Tarumbwa Strid, LaRouche Youth Movement

The British have forgiven Zimbabwe for its liberation war and independence just as little as they have forgiven the U.S.A. for the American Revolution. The stakes at the end of the 18th Century were the loss of their most prized possession, the jewel in the crown of the British Empire, which then became the greatest threat to British colonial rule everywhere: The United States of America under Abraham Lincoln, and then Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Today, however, the “Great Game” of British world domination through globalization is breaking down, with the collapse of the global financial system. For the “Empah,” this means falling back on traditional methods of spreading chaos to precipitate the destruction of sovereign nation-states.

Zimbabwe, under the courageous leadership of the freedom-fighter, Robert Mugabe, became a *bête noir* for the British—to be ruthlessly forced to its knees economically, as a warning to all African nations that aspire to true independence from the crippling conditionalities of the genocidal International Monetary Fund system.

Having been in the vise-grip of international sanctions for almost ten years, as punishment for the long-overdue land reform program to reverse the colonial era’s unequal distribution of land along racial lines, the economy of Zimbabwe has ground to a halt.

By 2000, the IMF had managed to lure Zimbabwe into a hopeless debt trap; then it turned off the money-tap by suspending all loans and credit lines to the country. One year later, the U.S. Congress, at the behest of the British, passed a law forbidding all international financial institutions to have anything to do with Zimbabwe, except when collecting on its debts. This bit of colonial retribution was dubbed the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001.

Among the consequences of this policy have been a record inflation rate of more than 100,000%, widespread shortages of basic commodities, and the breakdown of basic infrastructure. This has forced the average life-expectancy down from 48 years to 37 years in less than a decade! The racist myth of inefficient black farmers running down the once-blooming economy in the sub-Saharan country is exposed as an outright lie.

But the British strategy leading up to the March 29 joint Presidential and parliamentary elections—the first time they coincided in Zimbabwean history—was to force a protest vote against the government because of the horrifying economic conditions Zimbabweans face day in and day out.

The Media Propaganda Machine

Even before the last vote was cast, the British media propaganda machine was churning out spectacular rumors.

Counting was hardly under way when the British government, according to the *Telegraph*, had already reported that the opposition party MDC (Movement for Democratic Change) would win the elections. The Minister of State in the British Foreign Office, Lord Mark Malloch-Brown, declared, “It is quite likely President Mugabe has lost, despite the massive pre-election day cheating.” This was followed by a threat that if Mugabe should win, then the opposition would instigate riots, such as recently occurred in Kenya.

In a blatant provocation of the government, the opposition then declared victory 24 hours after the elections, without any



“The Rhodes Colossus,” an editorial cartoon dating from 1892, depicts the racist, British imperialist Cecil Rhodes claiming all of Africa as his private reserve.

results having been released by the Zimbabwean Electoral Commission.

Over the coming days, the election results trickled in at a painstakingly slow rate—a situation that had been anticipated, and was attributed to the logistical difficulties created by an economy in severe crisis. The media jumped on this, too, and ran daily stories accusing the government of having rigged the results.

The European Union summit of foreign ministers joined the bandwagon in an eager effort to kiss British ass, and denounced the “delay” of election results, with the Slovenian representative declaring, “If Mugabe continues, there will be a coup d’état.” This, despite the fact that the European Union

itself is denying most peoples of Europe the right to vote in referenda on the Lisbon Treaty, which would override the democratic institutions of the nation-state!

Wild speculations made it into the headlines, such as “Mugabe to step down in Zimbabwe” (CNN). The story alleged that South Africa had brokered a deal to have Morgan Tsvangirai, leader of the British-funded MDC, to “switch places” with President Mugabe.

Soon the television networks and newspapers changed their story, saying that the opposition denied ever being in talks with the government, and would wait until the election results were announced. Renewed speculation was cooked up, with headlines announcing that there was now to be a run-

Zimbabwe UN Ambassador Destabilizes BBC Anchor

Ambassador Boniface Chidyausiku was interviewed April 3 by BBC. Instead of the ambassador being thrown off balance by all the lying propaganda being spread about the Zimbabwean elections, it was the BBC reporter who was destabilized.

BBC: It does look, doesn't it, Mr. Chidyausiku, as if the Mugabe era is over.

Chidyausiku: Don't write him off.

BBC: Do you think he'll go on, and fight the second round?

Chidyausiku: That's what is the provision in our Constitution: that if one person fails to get 50% plus 1, there is a runoff. So I think if that comes up, he will accept the challenge.

BBC: Despite the fact that he no longer has control of parliament?

Chidyausiku: Well, that's neither here nor there. The control of parliament: I think there's an assumption here, that you've been combining the seats won by MDC/Tsvangirai and the other MDC that broke away from Tsvangirai, as one homogeneous party. That's an assumption that cannot be substantiated.

BBC: What was it, do you think, that turned the people of your country so strongly against Mr. Mugabe?

Chidyausiku: We've had an assault on our economy, and that has affected our people, and this is the result of that

assault on our economy.

BBC: So, you think Mr. Mugabe is the victim of imperial suppression, do you?

Chidyausiku: That's correct. You said it.

BBC: Are you serious?... Are you hearing me, Mr. Chidyausiku? Are you actually seriously saying that he is the victim of external agencies bringing pressure to bear on the economy of Zimbabwe?

Chidyausiku: Exactly. The economy of Zimbabwe, since 2000, has not had any balance of payments support from any quarter. And the various difficulties we have had in sourcing balance of payments support from the international financial institutions has had a very disastrous effect on our economy.... This all comes after the Land Reform Act of 2000. If you read any wire, any story coming from Zimbabwe, every journalist makes a reference to the Land Reform program.

BBC: Look, whatever the causality, he has not got the resounding majority that he not only thought he would get, but he told us he would get. Is there anything for him to do now, but just to go?

Chidyausiku: To go away? I mean, he has unfinished business. The fact that the people have suffered, because of the economic hardship that been opposed on us. Surely, if there is a chance for him to redeem that, and correct that situation, he has a right to do that.

BBC: Is there any other country that would give him refuge if he decided to leave Zimbabwe, do you think?

Chidyausiku: He is not going anywhere. He was born, bred in Zimbabwe, was imprisoned in Zimbabwe, and he will die in Zimbabwe. He has stated many times, that he has no intention of ever leaving that country.

off, since it was suddenly likely that neither leading candidate had reached the required minimum of 51% of the vote. Never mind that the MDC had earlier released its own “results,” saying that Tsvangirai had received more than 60% of the vote.

At this point, the head of the British House of Commons stated that the United Kingdom was “ready to step up support,” together with the international community, if “they [the people of Zimbabwe] should have their democratic election respected and recognized” or rather, if the MDC opposition leader were to come into office.

Then the blatant attempt to recolonize the country was stated openly by British Foreign Minister David Miliband, who expressed his hope that Zimbabwe would return to the thorny bosom of the British Empire. “I really hope, first that a new government in Zimbabwe would join the Commonwealth, and second that the Commonwealth will give them a warm accolade,” he said.

British Prime Minister Gordon Brown, together with the IMF, has now prepared a £1 billion lure, if Mugabe is ousted—a package rife with conditionalities that Mugabe dared to refuse nine years ago, determined not to give up the country’s sovereignty.

The Solution for Africa

Sovereignty is the biggest threat to any empire—be it the sovereignty of a nation, or the sovereignty of the human mind. That is why the mass media, today in the hands of the international financial oligarchy, is a tool of evil. The case of China is also telling in this respect, especially considering the deep British resentment of the the Chinese for their investment in infrastructure in Africa.

Lyndon LaRouche characterized this recently, saying, “The British are committing fraud on a gross level internationally. No support should be given to the British on any of these issues, China or Africa, because the British are the perpetrators of crime in this case. Therefore, they have no right to have any recognition on these matters.”

The British were so freaked out about the possibility of more Chinese intervention, sabotaging the Brits’ well-laid plans for genocide in Africa, that Prime Minister Brown boycotted the December 2007 Europe-Africa Summit in Portugal, to protest the insistence of most African leaders on the presence of Mugabe.

Most African patriots realize that the plight of Zimbabwe is central to the tragedy of Africa, because they understand that the question of land reforms is a burning issue, a time-bomb ready to explode at any moment, as food, energy shortages, and inflation provoke riots across the continent.

The suffering which the immoral IMF system has inflicted on Africa and Asia is coming home to roost in Europe and the United States. The same financial oligarchy that has been rapping the Third World is committed to eliminating the influence of all sovereign nation-states, especially the United

States, with its tradition of rising up against British imperialism at critical moments in history.

Therefore, all who care about Africa, or consider themselves patriots, must defend the cause of Zimbabwe by fighting for President Roosevelt’s dream of a new, just world financial system, in which all nations cooperate based on the principle of the Treaty of Westphalia—the benefit of the other.

This means ending technological apartheid. This means nuclear energy for Africa. This means upgrading agricultural output with mass production of the fourth-generation nuclear reactor, the Pebble Bed Modular Reactor, already being built in South Africa. This would transform the famine-ravaged continent into the bread basket of the world. It will only be possible if the British are kicked out of Africa!

Why This Assault On Mugabe?

Dr. Simbi Mubako, the Ambassador of Zimbabwe to the United States, addressed a Schiller Institute conference on Feb. 16, 2002. He pointed out that, in addition to Zimbabwe’s land reform, President Robert Mugabe was singled out for sending troops to the Democratic Republic of Congo (D.R.C.), to help defend that country from invasion by Rwanda and Uganda. Mubako stated:

“The D.R.C. appealed to SADC [the Southern African Development Community] for help; SADC agreed to send troops from Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Angola. The invading forces were checkmated, and the plan to overthrow the government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, was foiled....

“In 1999, after our diplomatic quarrels with Britain had started, our annual application to the IMF was vetoed.... The reason given, was that Zimbabwe—which had sent troops to the Democratic Republic of Congo—was too poor to involve itself in the war in the D.R.C.; and therefore, they should be denied any further funds, so that they could not indulge in those kind of adventures.

“Yet, at the same time—in fact, on the same day—Rwanda and Uganda had their applications approved by the IMF. These two countries also have troops in the D.R.C.; they are the aggressors; and both countries are actually poorer than Zimbabwe. Yet, they received, and continue to receive, loans and grants from the Bretton Woods institutions, while Zimbabwe is quarantined.”

The British Empire's Economic Suicide Club

by John Hoefle

It was, as such spectacles often are, both amusing and disturbing. The amusement came from the soap-opera-like nature of the proceedings, with a cast including the sleazy victim, the pious sharpie, the regulators who saw nothing amiss until the very end, and the lawmakers who do nothing, pompously. The disturbing aspect was the utter cluelessness of nearly everyone in the cast, fawning over their failed system while the world crumbles around them.

The spectacle was the April 3, 2008, hearing of the U.S. Senate Banking Committee, chaired by Connecticut Democrat Chris Dodd, on the subject of financial market turmoil. The testimony was provided by officials from the Fed, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), the Treasury, J.P. Morgan Chase, and Bear Stearns. The hearing itself was a dog-and-pony show, designed to allow all the players to posture and spin, with softball questions and self-serving answers before the cameras, while the real action occurs behind closed doors.

The consensus presented by the hearing was, that bailing out the financial system is the right thing to do, that preserving it is necessary and proper. Implicit in all the discussion was the idea that the system is undergoing a temporary episode of turmoil from which it will rebound, because it is, as we all know, fundamentally sound. All we need to do is hang on, take reasonable actions, and the system will recover. We'll probably even turn a profit on the bailout, after the markets roar back!

The whole thing is a lie, a self-serving product of delusion and deception designed to provide cover for a bailout of world-historic proportions. We have entered the era of open government bailouts of the banks, with Bear Stearns (and J.P. Morgan Chase) just the beginning. In doing so, we are com-

mitting economic suicide. The idea of bailing out the banks is actually a trap, a trap set by the imperial bankers to transfer their losses to the governments, and thereby bankrupt and destroy the nations, paving the way for a return of the British Empire. That's the plan the empire has cooked up, but the empire is just as crazy as the bankers, and just as ignorant of the science of economics. Neither the bailout nor the trap will succeed, with both sides joining what is, in effect, the British Empire's economic suicide club.

Denial

The level of denial among the bankers was shown by the testimony of Alan Schwartz, the CEO of Bear Stearns. Schwartz painted himself and Bear Stearns as victims who were unfairly destroyed by "unfounded rumors and attendant speculation." "You could never get the facts out as fast as the rumors," he complained. "It looked like there were people that wanted to induce panic." Asked if Bear bore any responsibility for its demise, Schwartz replied, "I just simply have not been able to come up with anything, even with the benefit of hindsight."

"There was, simply put, a run on the bank," Schwartz declared, a message that was repeated throughout the hearing. The nice thing about the "run" line, is that it basically absolves everyone—from the bank to the regulators—of responsibility for Bear's demise, and sweeps all those pesky questions about the bank's sleazy activities under the rug.

SEC Commissioner Chris Cox played his own version of "not my fault," insisting that, "at all times, the firm had a capital cushion well above what is required to meet supervisory standards." The failure of such a well-capitalized firm, with its "high quality collateral," was "an unprece-

mented occurrence,” he postured. The SEC, it should be noted, is the primary regulator of investment banks.

Tim Geithner, the head of the New York Fed, said he was informed on March 13 that Bear was broke and would have to file for bankruptcy the next morning. Had that happened, he testified, “the result would be a greater probability of widespread insolvencies, severe and protracted damage to the financial system, and, ultimately, to the economy as a whole. This is not theoretical risk, and it is not something that the market can solve on its own.” The Fed’s actions, which involved handing Bear \$30 billion, and helping to arrange a takeover by J.P. Morgan Chase, “helped reduce the risk of systemic damage to the financial system,” Geithner insisted.

Treasury Under Secretary Robert Steel, like his boss Henry Paulson, a former Goldman Sachs banker, retailed the same basic line, saying that the failure of Bear “would have caused financial disruptions beyond Wall Street.” Meanwhile, Fed chief Ben Bernanke babbled about the “possibility” of a recession, and a contraction in the economy in the first half.

Nowhere in any of this is there even a glimmer of comprehension that the global financial system collapsed last year when the Bear Stearns hedge funds collapsed, that Bear has been a zombie ever since, and that the system itself is disintegrating before our very eyes. Neither is there even a glimmer of comprehension that the bailout process which “everybody” agrees is necessary, is the worst possible response to the crisis.

Blueprint for Disaster

What the bankers are doing is insane, but not without its own twisted logic. Treasury Secretary Paulson, the President’s Working Group, and the bankers know they are bankrupt and cannot survive without a bailout, and the only pockets deep enough belong to the governments. But while they are desperate for government assistance, they do not want governments messing in their affairs; international finance, they insist, must be above mere governments in order to be effective.

This is the essence of Treasury’s “Blueprint for a Modernized Financial Regulatory Structure,” released by Paulson on March 31. It would create for the United States a regulatory system based on the British model, reducing the control by Federal and state governments over the banking system, while expanding the already unconstitutional power of the Federal Reserve to engage in bailouts. It would bring the investment banks under the protection of the Fed, and eliminate the barriers to commercial corporations owning banks, and vice versa.

The advocates of the blueprint claim that our outmoded 1930s-style regulatory system is the problem, a position which conveniently overlooks the way in which nearly every regulatory protection enacted by FDR has been sys-

tematically repealed, amended out of existence, or simply ignored. There is no effective regulation of the financial markets these days, as the events of the past year glaringly show.

The claim that regulation is the issue is a red herring. The real issue here is the drive by the Anglo-Dutch Liberal financial system to eliminate the nation-state system as a rival for world power. As ineffective as our government has been in defending the interests of the citizenry, the Empire still considers it an obstacle—which should give some insight into what they have planned.

Treasury is hardly alone in pushing for bailouts. The Bank for International Settlements’ Financial Stability Forum has produced an “options” paper for discussion among central banks and governments, which sets out a series of “hypothetical” steps for governments to give the banks money and buy their bad assets. The head of the IMF, Dominique Strauss-Kahn, suggested that France bail out its banks along the model of the 1990s bailout of *Crédit Lyonnais*.

These actions speak louder than words. The banking system is bankrupt, and the banks plan to save themselves by stealing from the public. Regulations must be eliminated because they are an obstacle to that theft. Which is, of course, why FDR enacted them in the first place.

It’s the British

Just as regulation is a false issue, so is the “financial crisis.” The real issue is the British Empire’s intention to destroy the nation-state system and return the world to an ancient, and evil, imperial rule. The financial bubble, far from being an indicator of America’s strength, was actually a way of inducing the United States to commit suicide. We were induced to dismantle the most powerful industrial economy in the world and turn our country into a giant casino, precisely so that it would collapse. Now that collapse is upon us, and we are being told that we must give up what remains of our sovereignty in order to save our money.

The great danger is that, in attempting to save a financial system which has already died, we destroy the nation. The central banks have already made trillions of dollars of loans into the banking system since this crisis began, and the amounts are escalating. The result is hyperinflation, and we are already on the way to a Weimar Germany-style blowout which will destroy the dollar, the United States’ economy, and the United States itself. In the chaos that follows, the oligarchy will step in and take over, in their time-dishonored tradition.

Our enemy is not a nation, but an oligarchic system centered in the City of London, with satellite cities worldwide, including New York, Frankfurt, Paris, Tokyo, Hong Kong, and others. This is the system which the United States was created to defeat, and still can, if we ignore the siren calls of the bankers and return to the Constitution. Money is just a tool, but humanity is priceless.

Argentine President Defies British Empire

by Cynthia R. Rush

In early March, the British Empire attempted to unleash a “lovely little war” between Colombia and Ecuador as a means of sabotaging regional integration and the nascent consolidation of the Bank of the South. When some adept regional diplomacy, led by Brazil, defused that option, at least for the time being, the City of London quickly shifted its sights to Argentina, intending to blow up that country through the vehicle of an orchestrated “agricultural producers” strike, to destabilize—even overthrow—the government of President Cristina Fernández de Kirchner.

The Argentine President, like her husband and predecessor in office, Néstor Kirchner, has been a pivotal leader in the fight for regional integration and the creation of new independent financing mechanisms, through the informal club of Ibero-American Presidents. British machinations around Colombia, Ecuador, and Venezuela have already turned attention away from that regional agenda, and a destabilization of Argentina would be a further blow to the process.

The City of London’s agent in Argentina is the Rural Society, a bastion of British liberalism representing the landed oligarchy which thinks that Argentina’s greatest mistake was aspiring to be an industrialized nation rather than remaining as Britain’s “plantation.” It was the Rural Society that backed José Martínez de Hoz, the finance minister of the 1976-83 military dictatorship, when he dismantled Argentina’s traditional family farm-based agriculture through the brutal application of London and Wall Street’s free-market and deregulation policies.

And why not? After all, de Hoz’s great-great grandfather, José Martínez de Hoz founded the Rural Society in 1866, and great-grandson “Joe,” as he is known to his friends, served as the Society’s president from 1945-1950. As the junta’s finance minister, beginning in 1976, Joe was heard to complain that Argentina’s “huge internal consumption of food” was an obstacle to larger agricultural exports. Let the “market” decide everything, he argued—even if people starve. While he quintupled Argentina’s foreign debt, de Hoz spent his time in office dismantling state-run regulatory agencies that protected the nation’s productive apparatus.

The “democratic” regime of Carlos Menem and his finance minister Domingo Cavallo, that followed in the 1990s, finished off Argentine agriculture by continuing de Hoz’s policies. This opened the door for the grain cartels, hedge funds, and speculators who control the lucrative soy monoculture which dominates the country today. Many smaller farmers who managed to survive Cavallo’s axe, subsequently caught the “soy fever,” convinced by the large landowners and their business partners



President Cristina Fernández de Kirchner

that soy cultivation was proof of “modernization,” while food production for human consumption was “backward.”

This explains how many small producers ended up in league with their erstwhile enemy, the Rural Society.

Curbing Soy Production

On March 12, the Rural Society joined with three other agricultural organizations—the Argentine Agrarian Federation (FAA), Coninagro, and Rural Confederations (CRA)—to impose a lockout of all agricultural markets, ostensibly in opposition to the announcement made a day earlier by Finance Minister Martín Lousteau, that taxes on exports of soybean and sunflower seeds would be increased from 35% to 45%, applied on a sliding scale.

Lousteau explained that the tax was necessary to prevent soaring international commodity prices from being passed on to the internal market, and to ensure a more equitable income distribution. He added that such measures were necessary to curb the soy monoculture that has displaced other more traditional food crops, and endangered the population’s diet. This is the first such step the state has taken to address the issue of soy monoculture since 1995, and although a modest one, it is being welcomed by nationalists.

The finance minister was adamant that without the export taxes, local inflation would be far higher. But if it were up to the soybean producers, he said, “there would be no taxes at all, and if the soy price were to go to \$10,000 a ton, they’d keep the profits and only produce soybeans.” The Argentine government doesn’t share this selfish view, he added, and like it or not, “the state’s duty is to be the arbiter of the general welfare.”

President Fernández later pointed out that production of wheat, corn, and beef has declined because farmers are attracted to soybeans’ high profitability. The tax policy is not “anti-

soybean,” she said, but “pro-Argentina.” People need real food.

The producers weren’t interested. They set up roadblocks to prevent trucks transporting food and cattle from reaching markets, causing shortages around the country. Millions of tons of food rotted on trucks and had to be thrown out. Unable to obtain feed for their animals, poultry and dairy farmers were forced to destroy them. The shortages affected schools and hospitals, while some businesses, dependent on agriculture, started to fire personnel.

A Political Strike

The producers were confident they could blackmail the government into retracting the higher taxes in the name of “justice” and fairness, claiming they were being “persecuted” by high taxes. While the local media attacked the President as “arrogant” and “authoritarian,” Buenos Aires Mayor Mauricio Macri, who shares the feudal outlook of New York City Mayor Michael “Mussolini” Bloomberg, vociferously proclaimed their support for “the farmers.”

At several demonstrations called during the lockout, members of the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) arrived, in the company of none other than the Queen of England herself, who anxiously called out for her friends in the Rural Society, as well as de Hoz and his oligarchic allies.

Given the pedigree of the strike supporters, Fernández was right to proclaim, in a feisty March 27 speech before a large group of supporters, that this is a *political* strike. It has nothing to do with export taxes, she said, and everything to do with the “economic model” she has adopted, based on a policy of social inclusion, more just income distribution, and expanding economic development. She explained that her government will always take into account the interests of small producers. But in an obvious reference to the oligarchical interests behind the strike, she pointedly added “Let’s tell the truth... Behind the small producers are hidden the interests of those large *pools* which think the state wants to steal all their profits.”

Fernández expressed her willingness to negotiate, but “not with a gun to my head.” The producers must end the strike, along with their “extortion against the people,” for there to be any meaningful dialogue. While insisting she would keep the export taxes in place, two days later, she announced a package of measures specifically addressing the needs of smaller producers, including subsidies for transportation, and automatic tax rebates. The producers responded that these measures were “insufficient.”

‘I Shall Not Betray You’

In the midst of the strike, Argentina observed the 26th anniversary of the March 24, 1976 military coup, whose economic destruction and military brutality is still seared into the national memory.

On April 1, speaking before an estimated 350,000 supporters gathered at the historic Plaza de Mayo across from the Presidential Palace, the combative President publicly associ-

ated the organizers of the ongoing agro strike with the events leading up to that 1976 coup.

Remember what happened in February of 1976, she told the crowd of trade unionists, politicians and leaders of social organizations. “There was also an [agricultural] bosses lock-out” against then-President Isabel Perón. “The same organizations which today boast of their ability to deprive people of food, also organized a lockout in February of 1976. One month later, we had the most terrible coup d’état, the most terrible tragedy we Argentines have ever suffered.”

During the 21 days of the current lockout, Kirchner continued, “I have once again seen the face of the past”—those who defended and abetted the actions of the 1976-83 military dictatorship—“who apparently wish to return.” But rest assured, she said. “That past which seeks to return today, won’t be allowed to do so, because Argentina has changed, the world has changed, and we have also changed.” It was during Argentina’s terrible past, Fernández said, that reactionary forces “often divided us through artificial confrontations, which they again try today to so crudely repeat.”

The Argentine President’s message was unmistakable: the oligarchic interests behind the strike want her out of the way. “I know there is a personal price to pay, when one chooses to side with the people ... and with a more just and fair society,” she said. “But I have the conviction, the strength, and the courage to fulfill the mandate conferred on me by the Argentine people. I shall not betray you.”

The following day, which was the 26th anniversary of Argentina’s 1982 retaking of the Malvinas Islands in the South Atlantic, which led to a brief war with Great Britain, the producer organizations announced that they would suspend the strike for 30 days. In a joint statement, their leaders indicated a desire to contribute “proposals, listen to explanations, and seek solutions together.” They also apologized to the Argentine people for having caused food shortages, while warning that should acceptable solutions not be forthcoming, they would resume the lockout.

There are reports that divisions among them had forced the producers to make this decision before they lost any more support.

As she addressed a group of veterans of the 1982 Malvinas War, in which Argentina was defeated, President Fernández reminded her audience that the country had suffered defeats prior to 1982. “On another April 2, but in 1976, we Argentines were presented with an economic program [by Martínez de Hoz], which caused the destruction of our country, and fundamentally, of our culture, a culture based on work, on effort, on production, on building ourselves as a Nation, on the power of our Republic and our Nation.”

It is very difficult for any nation in this position to win military battles, she said. But she firmly stated that Argentines will continue to build a country that is strong and respected in the world, “so that our voice will be heard in all fora denouncing the shame of a colonial enclave in the 21st Century.”

Can Dick Cheney's War Against Iran Be Avoided?

by Carl Osgood

In the British empire's desperate global drive for war and chaos, driven by the breakdown of their bankrupt financial system, Southwest Asia is no exception. The late-March visit by Vice President Dick Cheney to the region followed the British script to a tee, and left Iraq-Iran and Israel-Palestine teetering on the brink of full-scale confrontations, including discussions of possible near-term attacks on Iran and Syria. Cheney, a brute who merely carries out the wishes of his British masters, is determined to get a war against Iran before the Bush Administration leaves office, regardless of the heavy opposition, particularly within the U.S. military.

Thus it is not surprising that Cheney gave his blessing, if not orders, for the Nouri al-Maliki government in Iraq to launch what could have been a suicidal assault against the Mahdi Army of Moqtadar al-Sadr in the formerly British-occupied city of Basra, setting off an explosion of violence beyond what had been seen in that nation for a year. It didn't take long for it to become clear that the Iraqi puppet government was losing, and that even renewed U.S. and British military actions couldn't stop the rapid spread of deadly chaos throughout the region.

In the face of this disaster, there has been a unification of common interest among nations in Asia—including Pakistan, India, China, and Russia—to attempt to cool out the crisis; in effect, to run out the clock until the Bush Administration leaves office. It is in this context that the Iranians acted to negotiate a ceasefire between the rival Shi'ite factions—in the holy city of Qom, no less—and put the war on hold.

But, as Lyndon LaRouche has stressed, it would be a potentially deadly strategic error to believe that the impetus for expanded global irregular warfare could be contained by making local agreements. The British empire's strategic determination is to make it impossible for any nation-states, and par-

ticularly the Eurasian bloc of Russia, China, and India, to survive the ongoing financial blowout intact, and that mission can only be stopped by taking direct aim at the empire, not its local pawns.

U.S. Military Decides To Act

One week before Gen. David Petraeus, the top U.S. military commander in Iraq, and Ryan Crocker, U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, are set to testify on the situation in that tortured country, Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman Joseph Biden (D-Del.) began a series of hearings to set the stage for that testimony. *EIR's* sources emphasize that the impetus for these hearings, which featured explosive attacks on the Cheney/neo-con war clique, came from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who have garnered support, all the way up to Defense Secretary Robert Gates, for their view that an expansion of the war in Southwest Asia, a war which has already destroyed the military, must be stopped.

Biden's first hearing, on April 2, brought in three well-known retired generals, Gen. Barry McCaffrey, Lt. Gen. William Odom, and Maj. Gen. Robert Scales, as well as Michelle Flournoy, a former Pentagon official during the Clinton years, and now the president of the Center for a New American Security, a Democratic-leaning think-tank established in Washington last year. Though not in full agreement with each other, McCaffrey and Odom were particularly stark in their assessments of the situation on the ground in Iraq. But it was only towards the end of the hearing that the responsibility of the Congress and of the institution of the military was brought out.

The Army Is Unravelling

McCaffrey began his opening statement by asking, "How did we end up in this mess?" After praising the current senior

civilian and military leadership in the Pentagon, McCaffrey declared that the Maliki government “is completely dysfunctional. There’s not a province in Iraq where the central government dominates.” The Iraqi government is not only incompetent, but it is rife with corruption as well.


McCaffrey noted, “We’ve run the Army to the wall and they’re still out there,” because of the quality of its people, but “it’s starting to unravel.” McCaffrey noted the testimony of Vice Chief of Staff of the Army Gen. Richard Cody to the Senate Armed Services Committee, the day before. The five-brigade surge into Iraq, last year, Cody said, “took all the stroke out of the shock absorber for the United States Army,” by leaving no reserve available for other contingencies. The Air Force and the Navy, McCaffrey said, are not in much better shape. One result of the lack of manpower in the military services, has been the huge reliance on contractors. “Without contractors,” McCaffrey said, “the war grinds to a halt.” He concluded that because there’s no political support to sustain the national security policy of the current administration, “we’re coming out of Iraq. The only question is, whether it’ll take one year or three.”

Change Policy on Iran

General Odom was even more pessimistic. “The surge,” he said, “is prolonging instability, not creating conditions for unity as the president claims.” He said that while violence has come down over the last few months, there is credible evidence that the political situation is “far more fragmented.” Maliki’s assault on Basra, against his political competitors “is a political setback, not a political solution. Such is the result of the surge tactic.” Equally disturbing, Odom said, is the steady violence in the Mosul area, with tensions among Kurds, Arabs, and Turkomen. “A showdown over control of the oil fields there surely awaits us.”

Odom refuted the notion that al-Qaeda will take over Iraq if U.S. forces leave. He pointed out that everybody in Iraq hates them, and “The Sunnis will soon destroy al-Qaeda if we leave Iraq.” The Kurds don’t allow them in the North, and the Shi’ites, like the Iranians, “detest” them. One can understand why, when one takes note of their public diplomacy campaign over the past year or so on Internet blogs, in which they implore the United States to bomb and invade Iran “and destroy this apostate regime.”

As an aside, Odom added that “it gives me pause to learn that our Vice President and some members of the Senate are aligned with al-Qaeda on spreading the war to Iran.” Interest-



Lt. Gen. William Odom (ret.): “The surge is prolonging instability, not creating conditions for unity as the President claims.”

ingly, no members of the committee took up Odom on this point.

Finally, Odom called for a quick withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq and a change in policy towards Iran. A sensible strategy to withdraw rapidly in good order is the “only step” that “can break the paralysis now gripping U.S. strategy in the region,” he said. “The next step is to choose a new aim, regional stability, not meaningless victory in Iraq,” he said, which goal “requires revising our policy toward Iran.” Just abandoning the regime change policy on Iran “could prompt Iran to lessen its support to Taliban groups in Afghanistan,” Odom said. “Iran detests the Taliban and supports them only because they will kill more Americans in Afghanistan as retaliation in event of a U.S. attack on Iran.” Iran’s policy in Iraq would have to change as the United

States withdraws because “it cannot want instability there.”

Congress Can Cut the Funds

The docility of Congress in the face of the Bush Administration’s war policy was not raised during the hearing until near the end. Sen. George Voinovich (R-Ohio), after enumerating the costs, in both physical and fiscal terms, asked the witnesses what the U.S. Senate should do.

Odom replied by noting that Congress has two important powers, the budget and impeachment. “You could just refuse to pass a bill” funding the war, he said. “If you want to bring this to a halt, it’s in the power of this Congress,” to do that. McCaffrey added that Congress “has been entirely missing at the debate.” He noted that the Democrats have been fearful of being labeled unpatriotic, and the Republicans “stayed with Secretary Rumsfeld when he was leading us over a cliff.” “I think it’s time for the Congress to act,” he said.

But it’s not only the Congress that has been asleep at the switch. Sen. Jim Webb (D-Va.) followed Voinovich by noting that while “the vote for this war was a very regrettable experience for this country, the greatest failure since then has been from the highest leadership (both active and retired) of the military... Too many military officers didn’t speak out.” Webb named the few who did stand up, including Odom, retired Marine Gen. Anthony Zinni, retired Marine Lt. Gen. Gregory Newbold, and former Army Chief of Staff Gen. Eric Shinseki—the latter two having been humiliated by Rumsfeld because they wouldn’t play his game. That failure, Webb said, “is the most regrettable reason we are where we are.” McCaffrey, after noting his own criticisms of Rumsfeld, agreed that “the senior military leadership has been more compliant than it should’ve been.”

Opponents of ‘Lisbon Monster’ Take to the Streets

In a countdown towards the scheduled April 9 parliamentary ratification vote on the Lisbon Treaty, dubbed by Helga Zepp-LaRouche the “Lisbon Monster,” the citizens’ initiative group Rettet Österreich (Save Austria) mobilized 10,000 people in Vienna, on March 29, to turn out in favor of a popular referendum on the Treaty.

After the crowd had marched peacefully from the Staatsoper in the center of Vienna to St. Stephen’s Cathedral, a number of university professors addressed the demonstration on the implications of the new European Union Treaty. Prof. Hans Peter Aubauer from the University of Vienna stated that the Treaty “will end democracy in Austria, the freedom of doing politics in the interests of Austrians. Decisions regarding our destiny and future will then be decided by politicians who have not been democratically legitimized, and who cannot be voted out. Because our politicians are afraid that we will not choose to get rid of democracy, they do not risk a referendum. They abolish our democracy without our approval.”

Simultaneously, LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) organizers in France, Germany, and Italy, and a number of Citizen Initiatives from the left-to-right political spectrum held similar demonstrations. The rally in Milan drew support from two national politicians, Sen. Lidia Menapace (see the March 28 *EIR*) and Alfonso Gianni, Undersecretary for Economic Development in the outgoing Prodi government (see below).

The response from the citizens met on the streets has been very strong, with hundreds of signatures being gathered every day in support of a referendum. It is precisely for this reason that the Treaty’s drafters determined to basically keep it secret, knowing that public disclosure of its destruction of national sovereignty would lead to rejection. LYM members have called their campaign “Operation Dracula,” since, as in the case of Dracula, exposing the Treaty to the light will destroy it.

Parliaments Are Capitulating

The popular action is required in the face of the near-total capitulation of the parliaments throughout Europe, seven of which have already ratified the Treaty. Despite a flurry of opposition from the conservatives in the Polish Parliament, the lower house, the Sejm, ratified the Lisbon blueprint for a European dictatorship by a vote of 384 to 56 on April 1. The government achieved this victory by throwing a bone to the opposition, an amendment asserting that “ultimately” Poland’s sovereignty will always supersede the Treaty.

Many Treaty opponents are pinning their hopes of defeating the supranational dictatorship on Ireland, which, by law, must have a referendum. As Helga Zepp-LaRouche pointed out in her interview with leading Danish Treaty opponent Jens-Peter Bonde (see the April 4 *EIR*), “Don’t you think it’s a little bit worrisome to leave the whole fate of all of Europe to Ireland?”



EIRNS/Elisabeth Neudecker

Thousands of protestors demonstrated in Vienna, Austria on March 29, calling for a popular referendum against the “Lisbon Monster.” Here, members of the German BüSo (Civil Rights Solidarity party) organize in Heidelberg against the Treaty on the same day.

There are other isolated indications of resistance, including discussion in France of attempting to reopen the matter, which the government rammed through the Parliament with dubious legality. In Germany, the ÖDP (Ecological Democratic Party) filed a lawsuit in the Constitutional Court on March 27, challenging the Treaty as being incompatible with German Basic Law (Constitution), making it the second such lawsuit, after that of Christian Democratic parliamentarian, Prof. Peter Gauweiler.

Leadership of the anti-Lisbon drive, however, falls to the LaRouche political movement, which is concentrating on mobilizing forces in every European nation to take action to stop what would be a disastrous step toward world war, as well as dictatorship. Among the anti-Treaty activities underway, is the circulation of critiques by leading opponents internationally, of which we present another here below.

Interview: Harry van Bommel

Treaty Would Deprive Nations of Veto Right

Mr. van Bommel is a member of the Parliament of the Netherlands, and the foreign policy specialist of the Socialist Party, which is the country's third party and is currently leading the opposition in Parliament. Dean Andromidas interviewed him on March 26, 2008.



Govert de Roos

EIR: I understand you were the leader of the “no” vote during the referendum of 2005 in the Netherlands, which led to the defeat of the European Constitution. Could you tell us about your party’s role in that campaign?

van Bommel: In the Netherlands we have two political groups; they are really streams, because there are more political parties on the left and the right that are against Europe federalizing at a quick speed. And of all the parties campaigning against the treaty, we were the biggest party, the best organized party. We have a long tradition of campaigning at all levels—local, national, and international. And we were able to organize all our branches throughout the country to play a role in a national campaign, first to inform the people what the

treaty was about, and second to get people out to vote, and to vote “no.” As a socialist party, people did not immediately expect us to be against this treaty, but we were able to prove that this Europe [which would result from the treaty] is the Europe that is wanted by the multinationals, who think that the market is the only way to achieve things; and we showed that this constitutional treaty was a neo-liberal product in itself, leading to an undemocratic superstate, leading to a militarizing Europe, and a Europe where especially the smaller states have far less of a role to play. Those arguments, all together, made many people interested in what the treaty was about, and gave them the opportunity to get more information. More information in many instances leads to a “no,” when it comes to European treaties.

We were the only party on the left [opposing the treaty]. On the right side was Wilders,¹ who is now in the news with his film. He was very much against the treaty, because it would give Turkey, after accession to the EU, more influence in Europe. That was one of his main reasons. Also smaller Christian parties were against the treaty, because they do not want Europe to become a federal state. And they acknowledged, just as we did, that this treaty was taking a big step towards a federal Europe.

EIR: Your party is now leading a campaign to hold a national referendum on the treaty.

van Bommel: Our activists have been trying to collect signatures. But I have to be honest, that it’s not right now at the top of the agenda of the general public in the Netherlands. Maybe that is because our government has been very successful in depoliticizing the debate on the treaty, by saying, “No, it is not a constitution anymore,” and, “We got what we wanted” and “There is not much left of the old treaty,” which is all a pack of lies. But it does give the coalition parties the possibility to kill all attempts to have a debate. Nonetheless, we will have more debate when ratification comes closer, and in order to have the political possibility of a referendum, we, together with a couple of other political parties, prepared a bill for Parliament, which will be taken up, I think, within two months or so. So we tried it at both ends; the political end and the public end, by writing articles, by having public debates, by collecting signatures.

Impact of the Financial Crisis

EIR: We are experiencing the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. We are clearly in a systemic crisis, where the collapse of the current international financial system can only be resolved through national governments establishing a new system, along the lines of the New Bretton Woods system. As the economic crisis deepens, do you think

1. The Islamophobe Geert Wilders is the leader of the Dutch Freedom Party, which has campaigned against immigration. He produced a 15-minute film, “Fitna,” which is an attack on Islam.

this will sway the public?

van Bommel: It will influence the public, because at times of financial and economic problems, the government is not trusted, because it is not able to really change the difficult position of market forces; what it can do is try to “pep talk” the people, in order to foster trust in the economy and the financial system. But in the end, that will not do the trick, and when the people find out, when governments and Europe are not able to prevent the financial markets from losing ground, that will result in general distrust. And that will have an effect on any European treaty to be decided upon, because people will even fear what it all might lead to.

EIR: In a time of economic crisis it is only the government that can intervene, as FDR intervened in the 1930s, during the Great Depression. Don't you think this is an important point to make in the campaign?

van Bommel: Yes indeed, also because this is one of the major crises we are facing today, and we don't know where it is going to stop. Your prediction, that it will in the end lead to a new system, might be true, but I cannot prove that prediction, and neither can you. But that we have a serious problem at hand is obvious to anyone, and that there are large players involved as well.

Militarization of the European Union

EIR: The Lisbon Treaty opens the way for militarizing the European Union. How do you see this?

van Bommel: Yes, that's the same as it was in the former, constitutional treaty, and it clearly shows the ambition to have a genuine European state, with a common foreign policy and army to carry out the military tasks that accompany that general foreign policy. And although we have many differences in Europe, we already see EU battle groups; we see EU military missions in the Balkans, in Afghanistan. It's not so much a risk, as it is already a *fact*, that we are following this trend of making Europe a military power parallel to NATO, looking for its own theater throughout the world, because it is not about Europe, it is about the world.

There are also the Articles about mutual assistance whenever there is a crisis. And with Europe growing larger, and accepting states that have had violence in the last ten years, and even with the Cyprus problem and other issues—when you add all this up, you see that there is a large risk, which we are enhancing by accepting this treaty. And there is almost no debate on this issue, which I regret very much, because the implication of creating EU battle groups and forcing countries to improve their military capabilities, and accepting that the EU should become a military power, should really not be done without a serious debate.


EIR: A group of five generals, former chiefs of staff in their respective armed forces, published a report on transforming NATO and EU defense policy. No sooner was this report released, than a few weeks later, EU foreign policy chief Javier Solana released an EU energy security report which is almost identical to recommendations made by the five generals' report.

van Bommel: That's true, it all fits together. Solana has a NATO background; these generals have a NATO background. So what we see is that the EU and NATO are now, in a way, growing towards each other, where the EU is offering NATO the possibility of EU forces taking over where NATO leaves the theater. That partly has to do with the crisis in NATO, where many countries are not willing to deliver what they promised or should deliver. And therefore the EU in the future might be an alternative source of forces that are not available from NATO countries.

EIR: The question becomes, who is the enemy?

van Bommel: Reading the papers of the chiefs of staff and Solana, the enemy is terrorism. The enemy might be countries that are not willing to fully cooperate with critical infrastructure projects, such as pipelines, waterways, and other important infrastructure. So a new task for NATO is seen, and in the future also for the EU forces.

EIR: Do you see this as pure adventurism?



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

Available through EIR

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

\$30 plus \$2.50 for shipping and handling

van Bommel: Yes, it is.

EIR: This is making a more dangerous world. We need cooperation among the major powers, including the U.S., Russia, China, India, and Europe.

van Bommel: It is leading to a new Cold War. That is what I said this morning, in a debate with our Secretary of Foreign Affairs. But they disagree. They say a missile defense plan in Europe is not a threat to Russia. There is no willingness to look at it from Russia's standpoint, and that leads to impossible debates, when it comes to enlarging NATO with Ukraine and Georgia. They are creating facts on the ground, so that there are no alternatives, and that we have to accept the American missile defense, and even take part in it. And force Russia to also accept that.

Prospects for the Treaty's Passage

EIR: How do you consider the prospects for de-ratification, if the treaty passes?

van Bommel: I think it is very hard to de-ratify a treaty. We haven't seen that happening with former treaties. I would much rather put it to a referendum, than rely on the possibility of de-ratifying treaties.

EIR: Can you say something more about what you see as a danger of this treaty for the Netherlands?

van Bommel: The fact that we are giving up sovereignty by handing over veto rights, accepting the qualified majority vote, is seen as something that we should have never accepted. And therefore, we feel we are betrayed by our own government, because the steps towards a federal Europe, where the position of smaller countries such as the Netherlands would be endangered, is something that they should have taken into account and they haven't. They simply accepted a treaty that is 95% the same as the old constitutional treaty, and thereby they fooled everyone who said "no," by saying it is not a constitution anymore—the flag and the hymn are out of it, there are no symbols that have to do with a federal state. So it is not just what is in the treaty; it is also what they have taken out that makes us feel betrayed.

One of our arguments is that we have enlarged Europe so quickly, that the difference between the new states and the old states, have grown so much that it would be far wiser to let the 27 [member nations of the EU] now come and grow towards a European average on many aspects—social, economical, political in the fight against corruption, etc.—and then see if we want to change the rules on how we govern Europe. As long as that is not the case, we will face many differences of opinion, and by giving up veto rights, you force countries to accept policies that many people would not otherwise have accepted. Meaning that in the future, heads of state will go home saying, "We were against it, but the majority was in favor," and thereby endangering the public support for Europe even more. So in the short term, it might seem to

be good not to have a referendum, and change the rules on how the decision-making process takes place; but in the long run, this does not help the people who want to build a strong Europe. Because no entity can survive without public support, and Europe lacks public support more than it lacks the ability to govern.

Gianni: Lisbon Treaty Is 'Anti-Democratic'

The following statement was issued on March 26, by Alfonso Gianni, Undersecretary to the Economic Development Ministry in the outgoing Prodi government, to Movimento Solidarietà, the LaRouche organization in Italy.



gruppi.camera.it
Alfonso Gianni

I would like to take this occasion to once again emphasize, as I have written and stated numerous times, my opposition and my party's (the Rifondazione Comunista) opposition to the Lisbon Treaty, because that treaty is the result of a 'marketist,' liberalist, elitist, and anti-democratic view of the process of European integration.

The Europe which we would like to see, a political entity which promotes peace, is one that must be constructed through a process in which the peoples of our continent have a voice. We cannot accept an institutional framework based on the primacy of governments over parliaments.

For these reasons, I would like to point out that during the discussion of the legislative calendar in Parliament, our group stated its opposition to placing the Treaty on the calendar during the period preceding the upcoming general elections, when the Parliament is only to deal with minor business.

Unfortunately, our Constitution does not foresee the use of a referendum for international treaties. This is the real problem: The proposal has been presented as a treaty, when it is actually a proposal for a Constitution, and a profoundly flawed one at that. Thus, the request for a referendum has been avoided.

For these reasons, it is even more necessary to spread awareness of the contents of the proposed treaty, broaden the debate, and increase the popular opposition in every country in Europe.

I wish you success in your efforts.

Alfonso Gianni

Gore's Racist Assault Against Malaysia

by Michael Billington

To anyone who is familiar with the history of Al Gore's racist, anti-development, imperialist policies toward developing nations, it comes as no surprise to find him campaigning today against the phony "threat" of global warming allegedly posed by the process of industrialization. His hatred of any developing nation that refuses to follow the orders of the Anglo-Dutch financiers' "Washington Consensus" is particularly evident in the case of Malaysia. EIR has recently learned that Gore is again interfering in Malaysian internal affairs, conspiring again with Anwar Ibrahim (a "shared asset" of Gore and Paul Wolfowitz) to bring down the majority party in Malaysia and take control himself, on behalf of his colonial sponsors. Here is a brief review of Gore's past evil deeds in Malaysia:

In November 1998, President Clinton had to skip an important meeting of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation forum (APEC) in Kuala Lumpur, because of a military crisis in the Balkans (which had been instigated by Vice President Al Gore and his pal, diplomat and investment banker Richard Holbrooke). Clinton sent Gore in his place to represent the United States. Only two months earlier, Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamad had implemented currency controls and fixed currency rates, to counter the attack on the Asian currencies by George Soros and his fellow hedge fund speculators.

Clinton had been considering what he referred to as a "new international financial architecture," which would have seen the Malaysian move towards currency controls as a possible model for developing nations to protect themselves within a new monetary framework.

However, rather than building the needed relationship between the United States and Malaysia, Gore launched a public assault on Prime Minister Mahathir, and in defense of the deposed former Finance Minister Anwar Ibrahim, who had defended the IMF's conditionalities and rejected Mahathir's sovereign controls. As Finance Minister (and Deputy Prime Minister), Anwar had implemented an "IMF austerity policy without the IMF," before Mahathir dumped him.

'We Should Fry Him'

Gore was the featured speaker at the APEC forum on Nov. 16, sharing the podium with Mahathir. Outside the conference



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Al Gore rides the circuit for his global warming fraud (here, at George Washington University in May 2007).

center, anarchists supporting Anwar were rioting in the streets, making calls to bring down the government. Claiming that Malaysia could not protect his security, Gore demanded that the hotel management shut down the air conditioning, supposedly to prevent his enemies from putting poison in the ventilation system. Then, before a sweaty audience, Gore incited the anarchists: "Democracy can give the stamp of legitimacy that reforms must have in order to be effective, and so, among nations who suffer economic crises, we continue to hear calls for democracy, calls for reform, in many languages. People power. *Reformasi*. We hear them today, right here, right now, among the brave people of Malaysia."

Trade Minister Rafidah Aziz called it "the most disgusting speech I've heard in my life," while Foreign Minister Abdullah Ahmad Badawi (now the Prime Minister) said: "Malaysia finds the incitement by the U.S. government to lawlessness by certain elements within the country, to use undemocratic means in order to overthrow a constitutionally elected government, most abhorrent. Malaysians do not take kindly to sanctimonious sermonizing from any foreign quarter, especially the United States, a country which is known to have committed gross violations of human rights."

Dr. Mahathir was more direct: "We should fry him. Al Gore does not love Malaysia nor its people. Al Gore and his government only want to manipulate and control our country."

Gore did not apologize, but told Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov (another target of Gore's intended "regime change"), "That is the American message, and I am proud to



malaysiakini.com

Anwar Ibrahim (center) meets with buddy Paul Wolfowitz (with back to camera). Anwar is working with a small group in Malaysia to oust the governing coalition.

deliver it here and anywhere I go. Moving into the 21st Century with a strong economy really requires democracy and self-government.”

Anwar’s Friends to the Rescue

Two days after the 1998 Gore tirade in Kuala Lumpur, when the *Asian Wall Street Journal* offered the jailed Anwar Ibrahim its editorial page, Anwar showed his allegiance to the international financial institutions, and to colonial policy: “Instead of pointing the finger at speculators and blaming ‘unrealistic demands’ set by international agencies acting as lenders of last resort, Asian nations would do well to put their houses in order first,” he wrote. Asian nations must end “ambitious plans for outlandish projects,” commit themselves “to wiping out corruption and nepotism,” remove tariff barriers and eradicate “subsidies, monopolies and favoritism.... So many vested interests are at stake. Unless the gale of creative destruction is unleashed on these rent-seeking and parasitic corporate activities [i.e., national industries], the Asian economy will never regain its past vigor.”

It is clear he means the “past vigor” of the colonial era, with the colonies providing raw materials and cheap labor, but certainly no “ambitious plans for outlandish projects” in their own self-interest.

A few weeks later, speculator George Soros returned the favor in a speech at Johns Hopkins University, calling for Anwar to be released, while accusing Dr. Mahathir of supporting his “cronies” at the expense of the economy, concluding: “So I think what needs to happen, is, he needs to be removed from power.”

In August 2000, when Anwar Ibrahim was convicted of corruption and sodomy after a 14-month trial, his pal Al Gore, then in the heat of his Presidential campaign against George W. Bush, took time out from his campaign to speak out against

the rule of law: “I am deeply disturbed by the verdicts handed down in Malaysia in the case of Deputy Prime Minister Anwar Ibrahim.... The show trial [he was] forced to endure mocked the international standards of justice.”

Among Friends in Washington

When Anwar was released from prison in 2004, he was greeted by his two closest allies in the West, Al Gore and Paul Wolfowitz. It was probably Wolfowitz, then at the center of running a military version of “regime change” in Iraq, who arranged for Anwar to get a position at the Johns Hopkins University School for Advanced International Studies (SAIS) in Washington, where Wolfowitz had been the dean. Anwar also got a position at St. Anthony’s College at Oxford, England, where he met with Gore, who was by this time running a hedge fund in London, Generation Investment Management. Anwar also spent time with his old friends from the British oligarchy, Chris Patten, former high lord of Hong Kong, and Gordon Brown, the current Prime Minister.

Returning to Washington, Anwar found another lucrative position working for Wolfowitz at the World Bank, imposing conditions on developing nations that reject his warped form of “democracy.” He also took on the leadership of a project promoted by Dick Cheney and his daughter Liz, for “regime change” through subversion in the Arab world, called Foundation for the Future. When Wolfowitz had to find a place to send his then-girlfriend because of a potential conflict of interest at the World Bank, Anwar took her in with open arms, turning his “anti-corruption” head the other way when Wolfowitz corruptly arranged to pay her a bloated tax-free salary on the World Bank tab. Wolfowitz was soon ousted from his post over this hypocritical stunt, although the representatives of the developing nations at the World Bank had plenty of other, more serious, reasons to throw the bum out.

In February 2006, Gore shared the stage with Anwar at the Jeddah Economic Forum in Saudi Arabia. Gore shared another position with a different Malaysian in 2007; both he and Dr. Mahathir were nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. Although Gore won, for the genocidal pack of lies in his film “An Inconvenient Truth,” the real inconvenient truth is that Gore is committed to the “Peace of the Grave” for millions of the world’s poor.

Anwar Ibrahim is back in politics in Malaysia now. He has pasted together a coalition of his own small following, with the Islamic fundamentalist party and the racial parties representing the fraction of the Chinese and Indian minorities, which refuse to work with the government coalition. Although these parties won only a third of the parliamentary seats, that is far more than the opposition has won in recent elections, and Anwar is bragging that he can “persuade” some government MPs to switch sides. Is the green fascist Al Gore part of that persuasion?

CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

LaRouche Youth Bring Reality, Provide Leadership to Party

by Harley Schlanger

Representatives of Lyndon LaRouche brought reality to the California Democratic Party state convention in San Jose March 28-30, by challenging those attending to take up the historic task of acting to reverse the greatest financial collapse and economic depression in history, as the only topic worth discussing. Members of the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM)—some of whom were delegates, others elected to official party positions—have been engaged in ongoing organizing efforts within the party in California since the inception of the LYM, in 2000.

Their presence in San Jose, both as official participants in convention proceedings from the podium, in the caucuses, and informally, in the hallways and at the Franklin Roosevelt Legacy Democratic Club table, was crucial in provoking many well-meaning, but ignorant and impotent Democrats, to reflect on the best tradition of the party, that of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and its leading advocate today, Lyndon LaRouche.

Leading Democrats involved in the Presidential campaign pointed to this kind of “kick in the ass” from the LYM as essential to take back the White House and expand Democratic majorities in the Congress in the November general election.

This intervention was necessary, as many of those who participate in “politics” in California remain strangely out of touch with the life-and-death issues facing most Americans. With the U.S. physical economy in free fall, with the Federal Reserve Bank pumping hundreds of billions of dollars a month into the disintegrating banking system, in a doomed effort to “stabilize” it, and with the so-called subprime crisis threatening hundreds of thousands of Californians with foreclosure, discussion of the economy by party leaders was subordinated to rapturous paeans to “diversity,” and self-congratulatory pats-on-the-collective-back over the continuing environmentalist lunacy, which has side-

tracked the state’s Democrats, reducing them to being a junior partner to the state’s fascist greenie governor, Arnold Schwarzenegger.

In the face of this demoralizing approach, typified by House Speaker Nancy Pelosi—who is blamed, correctly, by many rank-and-file Democrats, for the failure of the Congress to counter or reverse the policies of the Cheney-Bush Administration—the spirit of the LYM intervention can be seen in the following report submitted by LYM member Ian Overton.

He wrote that, “Looming large on the mind of every attendee was the dark specter of the illegal bailout of Bear Stearns, a fresh confirmation of LaRouche’s warning that the Anglo-Dutch Liberal ‘free-trade’ model of globalization is dead, and, unless emergency measures are taken to protect the population, they will be the ones sacrificed to bail out this corpse.”

He continued: “Yet, strangely enough, the economic crisis was not an official topic of deliberation, during the entire weekend. Thank God that the LYM was there, organizing from 8 AM to midnight, to force the issue of a return to FDR-style ‘American System’ economic policies, while mocking the official party ‘green’ leadership for passionately declaring their love of icebergs, while the Titanic sinks.”

FDR Versus Hitler

The LYM deployment addressed the economy by pointing to the 1932 nomination and election of FDR as the relevant precedent for Democrats today. The Bear Stearns bailout was on everyone’s mind, as Overton reports, but few had any conception of what it actually means. By counterposing LaRouche’s analysis—that the bailout is not an effort to “save the banking system,” since it has already crashed—to impotent populist whining about how “you can’t beat Wall



The LaRouche Youth Movement at the California Democratic Convention.

Clockwise, from top: The Franklin Roosevelt Legacy Democratic Club table attracted lots of visitors; “Arnie, the Governorator” (LYM member Allen Egre) taunts the Democrats, boasting about his power over them; political canons, and signs grabbed the attention of convention participants; Quincy O’Neal, vice-chair of the California Democratic Party African-American Caucus, addresses a panel on immigration.



Street,” LYM organizers catalyzed discussion about why only an FDR-style bank reorganization, as in 1933, can revive the economy.

This forced a deeper discussion of the nature of this election year, that what is at stake is the survival of the United States as a constitutional republic. LYM organizers lifted Democrats out of the narrow confines of the Clinton-Obama theatrics, to take up the existential threat to our republic posed by City of London financial interests today: that the same networks that backed Hitler and the Europeanwide fascist movement in the 1920s and '30s, are engaged in rigging the 2008 election. Their strategy is to use Barack Obama to knock out Hillary Clinton, knowing that Obama is unelectable, given the scandals they intend to unleash against him.

In this way, they believe they can prevent the re-emergence of an FDR-style, American System economic alternative to the fascist global order they are intent on imposing.

The danger of fascism was highlighted by the near-continuous showing at the FDR Legacy Club booth of the LYM DVD, “Firewall: In Defense of the Nation-State.” Congressmen, state legislators, and rank-and-file delegates stopped by to watch the documentary, and engage in lively dialogues with organizers.

The “FDR versus Hitler” polemic was put on the floor of the convention Saturday morning by LYM member Quincy O’Neal, who is also a member of the Los Angeles County Democratic Party Central Committee, and vice-chair of the California Democratic Party African-American Caucus. Quincy was an official speaker on a panel on immigration, representing the Caucus.

O’Neal stirred the delegates when he charged that the debate on immigration touches only the symptoms of the problem, and not the cause, which he identified as “British free-trade policies,” which “have destroyed economies and labor forces all over the world, forcing [immigrants] to abandon their countries and their families.” These “globalization policies,” he continued, “have also wrecked our own, once-productive economy, outsourcing high skilled, productive, high-paying jobs, which were the lifeblood of our African-American community.”

O’Neal then offered an alternative, based on the “great Westphalian principle of the advantage of the other,” as embodied in FDR’s “Good Neighbor” policy. Today, that would mean collaboration between the U.S. and Mexico in great projects, such as the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA), along with the PLHINO and PLIGHON water and irrigation projects in Mexico.

O’Neal’s presentation was well received, and was followed by LYM members, who participated from the floor. Among them was Cody Jones, who denounced Al Gore, who is not-so-covertly angling for the Democratic Party nomination for President. Jones blasted Gore’s phony environmentalism as part of British imperial doctrine, as an integral aspect of “globalization.”

Bill Clinton Warns of ‘Financial Meltdown’

The featured speaker on March 30 was former President Bill Clinton, who took up the economic collapse in his speech. He asked, “Why do we have all this energy” in the party? “Because we are facing a financial meltdown.” He detailed how the “foreclosure” crisis is threatening what he called “a calamity,” adding that the Bush “stimulus package” is inadequate, and that the collapse of speculative financial instruments, such as bundled mortgages, “will swamp” the effects of Bush’s program.

The Democratic Party must act to stop foreclosures, he said, as his wife Hillary has emphasized in her campaign. “I support Hillary because she has the best economic program.”

The only other speaker who addressed the economic crisis on this level was Lt. Gov. John Garamendi, who spoke of the need to again make California a center of skilled labor. Garamendi ended his speech with a quote from FDR, to emphasize his theme that we are judged as a nation by how we treat those who are less fortunate.

In these remarks, Garamendi reflected an older tradition in California, one of pride in how the state developed as an integrated agricultural-industrial economy, served by extensive public, government-backed infrastructure projects. These projects included massive irrigation and water management capabilities; high-tech ports, connected to markets by integrated transportation projects; world-class health-care capabilities, backed by top-notch, affordable public universities.

LaRouche has pointed out that this pride has been lost, as the advance of British-sponsored post-industrial, “free trade” economic policy has taken its toll. Replacing this pride is an obsession with celebrity, which is directly related to the delusion that credit is wealth, and that having access to money is a sign of “good economics.”

The poster boy for this delusion is Arnold Schwarzenegger, the son of a Nazi, who has embraced fascist economics, and is promoting the kind of brutal austerity against Californians in the lower 80% of family-income brackets that would make Hitler proud.

It is this obsession with celebrity, and the unwillingness to effectively take on its product, Schwarzenegger, which has left the Party powerless to defeat his fascist budgets. It has also enabled Nancy Pelosi—a California Democrat, run by one of Arnie’s controllers, the fascist Felix Rohatyn, a nominal Democrat who is allied with another Arnie controller, the GOP Nazi George Shultz—to smother any effort nationally to reverse the war and depression policies of the Bush Administration.

The LYM intervention in San Jose thus put the Democratic Party on notice: In this crucial election year, there is only one issue, and that is FDR versus Hitler. Many delegates and party leaders engaged in in-depth dialogues with LYM members on this topic. Will they have the courage to act, as FDR did, in the face of deadly opposition from Wall Street fascists in 1932, for the good of humanity, against the London-controlled fascists of today, such as Felix Rohatyn and Al Gore?

National News

Detroit Council Vote For HBPA Is Unanimous

The 39 Detroit City Council members on March 25 unanimously passed the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act (HBPA), a resolution to Congress which is being circulated for endorsement by the LaRouche movement.

The resolution was offered by council president Kenneth V. Cockrel, Jr. Leading up to the vote, the LaRouche Youth Movement and LaRouche PAC had presented the HBPA in meetings with council members, in public-input sessions, and by mass leafletting.

The Detroit City Council previously passed the LaRouche-authored legislative resolution for the Emergency Recovery Act, which called for retooling the automobile industry to build infrastructure.

The Michigan cities of Flint, Hamtramck, Highland Park, Melvindale, and Pontiac have already passed HBPA resolutions.

Southern State Houses Join Fight for HPBA

While Washington hasn't yet mustered the gumption to seriously deal with the financial system's meltdown and the subsumed mortgage crisis, its suicidal fantasy is losing its grip on more and more of the nation beyond the Beltway.

The Senate is entertaining a bipartisan housing bill that even the April 3 *Washington Post* belittled on its front page, and the Bush Administration's criminal actions are unintentionally being exposed by its allies: "[Treasury Secretary Hank] Paulson is doing a pretty good job of looking like he's doing something," Republican strategist John Feehery told the April 3 *International Herald Tribune*.

But in city after city, and in more and more state houses, reality is being addressed by elected officials, as they vote up resolutions calling for Congress to implement the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act (HBPA), originally drafted by American economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche

in August 2007. (For the original text of the HBPA, see the April 4 *EIR*.)

In Mississippi, the House of Representatives passed its resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 5, on March 28, by a bipartisan vote of 111 to 5, with 6 abstentions. The city council of the state capital, Jackson, has already passed the resolution.

In Alabama, the State Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 54 April 1, and has forwarded it to the Alabama House of Representatives, which passed a slightly different version the week before. The new version, co-sponsored by six Senators, notes that it will take years for the shakeout of the mortgage market to occur.

HBPA Passes Pennsylvania Lower House Committee

House Resolution 418 was voted up April 1 by the Intergovernmental Affairs Committee of the Pennsylvania State House of Representatives on a straight party-line vote of 16 Democrats to 12 Republicans. The resolution may come up for a vote on the floor of the Pennsylvania lower house as early as the week of April 7, when the legislature is in session for two days, before recessing for the April 22 Presidential primary. Supporters of the resolution are pushing for a House floor vote before the recess.

During the committee meeting, Republican minority committee chair, Rep. David Steil, was the first to speak, saying that he would vote against the resolution, claiming that there is a blizzard of bills and initiatives pending in the U.S. Congress on the matter, and that, therefore, the state legislature should defer to the Congress on it.

He was answered by a Democratic representative from Allegheny County in Western Pennsylvania, who said: "No, you are wrong. We have to do this." He pointed out how devastated the population is across the state, and especially in Western Pennsylvania. He said that action must be taken, that such action is vital, and that a strong message to that effect must be sent to Congress.

During the intense debate, a Republican representative asked how the legislation will work, and who will determine how much the inflated mortgages will be

written down, effectively suggesting that this would be a bailout.

Rep. Harold James of Philadelphia answered the first question by pointing out that the HBPA stipulates that the state governors assume the administrative responsibilities for implementing the program. He then asked Phil Valenti of the LaRouche Political Action Committee to answer the question about the writedown, and whether it constitutes a bailout.

Valenti explained that there is already a bailout going on, which is the illegal bailout of Bear Stearns, but that what the HBPA calls for is not a bailout. The mortgages will be frozen for a period of however many months or years are required to adjust the values to fair prices. Ultimately, speculative debt obligations will be written off, Valenti said, reflecting the deflation of the housing bubble. This will take time, but what we need immediately, as stipulated in the HBPA, is to put the mechanism in place to protect homeowners and banks.

Although no Republicans on the committee voted for the resolution, numerous Republicans in the state legislature support the measure, and had attempted to organize Republican committee members to vote for it.

More than 35 Pennsylvania city councils, including those of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and the capital, Harrisburg, have already passed resolutions endorsing the HBPA.

Canton Votes Up HBPA Resolution

The City Council of Canton, Ohio, a formerly industrial town south of Akron, passed a resolution March 31, calling on Congress to enact the HBPA. This is the eighth city in Ohio—the state with the third-highest number of foreclosures in the nation—to pass it.

Canton has 79,000 residents, and a foreclosure rate of 1 in every 12 households—worse than Detroit.

The Ohio cities that have already passed the HBPA include: Akron, Bedford, Bedford Heights, East Cleveland, Maple Heights, Warrensville Heights, and Youngstown.

THE SUBJECT OF PRINCIPLE

Project “Genesis”

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

March 14, 2008

Here, reference is made to the work of the circles of Carl Woese, et al., particularly to “Collective Evolution and the Genetic Code”¹ of Kalin Vetsigian, Carl Woese, and Nigel Goldenfeld of the Department of Physics and Microbiology and Institute for Genomic Biology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Ill. 61801, May 16, 2006.

*My critical contribution here is limited to certain very important issues of epistemology which have been posed implicitly by the pattern of an underlying assumption in the method employed there by Carl Woese and his associates. This present report emphasizes a return of attention to that argument of mine, which is rooted in the cognitive implications of Bernhard Riemann’s work, which I presented in my “Vernadsky & Dirichlet’s Principle,” of *Executive Intelligence Review* for June 3, 2005.*

Among those at *EIR* who continue the contested themes of issues which occupied attention among the circles of the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF) of the 1970s and 1980s, the work of Carl Woese et al. has been seen as a refreshing change of pace from the radically reductionist approaches to living processes which became popularized both during the 1930s, and more so during the post-World War II aftermaths of a certain radically empiricist influence on scientific practice. The latter has been a practice typified by what has become known as the Cambridge Systems Analysis school of the followers of not only the eccentric Ernst Mach, but, most emphatically, Bertrand Russell et al., as, for example, at the Laxenberg, Austria International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA).

The topic of this report is, that the piece by Woese et al., referenced here, with its otherwise commendable emphasis


on dynamics, errs in one important feature of *method*. It errs by seeking to argue the arguments bearing on matters of physical principle, within an implicitly hostile set of currently hegemonic statistical methods; they have apparently overlooked some essential matters of principle, principles which, however, stand outside the territory in biology staked out by them for the purpose of their report.

Therefore, my criticism here is not focussed upon the details of their reports on experimental findings within their implicitly assumed choice of sub-domain of the biology of living processes as such. My attention is focussed here on *principles which they do not bring into play*. They do not confront the problematic features which arise in any effort to build arguments in which it is presumed, implicitly or otherwise, that the role of mankind within biology, must be bounded by a certain commonplace assumption respecting statistical method of practice. It is also crucial that they omit the relevant issues of the ironical nature of the reciprocal interrelationship between, and interaction of the Biosphere and Noösphere. For my purposes, those omissions tolerate a mistaken presumption, a fallacy of composition, the assumption, which I believe is contrary to their intention, that scientific knowledge may be permitted to be built up in proofs which proceed from unproven, merely a-prioristic presumptions, such as those underlain by the persisting influence of Euclidean and Cartesian geometry upon widely employed statistical methods.

This might be mistaken by those authors for “nit-picking” by me. It is not, as the unfolding of my argument here will show.

The typical such mistaken presumption is, that the build-up of knowledge must occur, statistically, through a succession of, first, the chemistry of non-living processes, second, then continued through the domain of the Biosphere, and, thence, continued by implication, into, third, the uniquely specific *differentia* exhibited by the human species. My approach pro-

1. See www.pnas.org/cgi/content/abstract/0603780103v1.



SOHO-EIT Consortium, ESA, NASA

“Let there be light, and there was light.” For the Pythagoreans, as Kepler pointed out, “fire”—the Sun, not the Earth—was at the center of celestial rotation. Prometheus’ gift to mankind was also “fire”—access to scientific knowledge. Thus, does man obey the injunction of Genesis to transform the universe; or as V.I. Vernadsky said, the Noösphere transforms the Biosphere.

ceeds, as I show here, in the opposite direction: from the Noösphere, downward, to the Biosphere, and, thence, to, statistically, the relatively simplistic, subsumed, reductionist’s view of the Periodic Table of elements and their isotopes.²

Unfortunately, today’s prevalent use of statistical method of interpretation of evidence itself, which I challenge here, has tended to be taken in the usual practice of that profession as some magical authority over nature, the authority of that statistical mysticism inherent in *a-priori* mathematical methods, such as those of those reductionist forms of Sophistry known as Euclidean and Cartesian geometry.

Worse, today’s practice is usually dominated by that axiomatically irrationalist doctrine of modern philosophical Liberalism which is derived from the precedent of the medieval irrationalist William of Ockham. I refer, with emphasis, to the continuing, hereditary influence of the doctrine of the founder

2. Distinguishing those isotopes of the table which are tuned specifically to living processes.

of modern European Liberalism, Paolo Sarpi. This is what was established in the form of what became Anglo-Dutch Liberalism and its impact on practiced scientific method, as by Descartes, de Moivre, D’Alembert, Leonhard Euler, and Joseph Lagrange. Even worse, today’s practice is dominated by the radically positivist versions of that Liberalism, the degenerate form associated with the emergence of the successive influences on the subject by Ernst Mach and Bertrand Russell on mechanics, and by the even more radical extremes of Russell’s *Principia Mathematica*.

If there is one most crucial fact shown by science to date, it is that the universe is neither Euclidean, nor anything resembling that.³ I protest against the use of a perverted notion of what are inherently arguments premised upon presumptions of an *a-prioristic*, digital statistical consistency, arguments derived from such arbitrarily chosen ideological origins, and then employed without regard for the bias expressed by those assumptions, which, in turn, are adopted as a standard for “objectively” interpreting physical-experimental evidence. This is typified by what

is, presently, the greatest, most prevalent, single ideological barrier to academic or comparable progress in scientific thinking and in crafting economic policy today.

My Method in Physical Economy

My principled approach to the subject which I present here, addresses the fallacies inherent in the use of the inherently reductionist, so-called statistical methods, as, most emphatically, when such methods are used in treating *the subject of what is the inherently willful characteristic of that which drives human behavior*; as if the lack of those relevant distinctions respecting the role of human behavior might be an appropriate omission in any treatment of other, lower types of living processes.

3. Cf. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. “My Early Encounter With Leibniz: On Monadology,” LPAC, Jan. 22, 2008. Also in *EIR*, Feb. 2, 2008.

————— “A Strategic Economic Assessment: That Doomed & Brutish Empire,” *EIR*, March 14, 2008.

The most important feature of anything when it is first encountered, is what it is not. Thus, the effect of the omission of the Noösphere's indispensable authority for defining the subsumed Biosphere of today, is the problem which, for example, threatens the referenced line of work by Vetsigian, Woese, and Goldenfeld. On this account, I define the proper choice of method in any competent branch of practice of physical science itself, as in the special branch of physical science represented by the subject of economy, as reflecting a *willful* treatment of the relevant subject-matter from the standpoint of *willful human* behavior, on the presumption that such subjects cannot be simply predictable in categorically statistical (e.g., *a-priori*, as in Euclidean) or similar ways.⁴


Since the time of the discovery, by very ancient celestial navigators, of that power for change of the stellar universe, which is therefore the intrinsic power defining the reality within which we dwell, we must recognize that any branch of competent science, since actual science was developed out of the practice of celestial navigation, has always been *the practice of the continuing of that process of discovery; thus, there is the discovery of those principles whose process of accumulation implicitly defines the mind of the human individual*. In other words, to sum up the conclusion to which those considerations must lead us: we must proceed in today's science from the generative, Riemannian standpoint of V.I. Vernadsky's *Noösphere*, downwards, which are the true fundamentals, toward the functionally subsumed subjects of the Biosphere and inanimate nature.

So, from this standpoint, we should situate the treatment of sub-human biology, the Biosphere, under the higher authority to which it is subject, a higher authority which exists only in the relatively higher realm of the Noösphere. As I show in this report, it is those features of the Noösphere which are lacking in the Biosphere, which should be the preferred choice in defining the principles within which existence of the Biosphere is situated ontologically.

Therefore, I point to such examples of mistaken approaches, as are typified either by the denial of an efficient universal physical principle of life *per se*, as by radical positivists and their like, or, by the comparable attempt to adduce the origins of the cognitive powers specific to mankind from the biology of animal life.

Today, those who have actually grasped the higher order of meaning which permeates the specifically human process of successful discovery, know that universe to be, in principle, as Leibniz argued for a universal physical principle of least action, and as Albert Einstein, similarly, recognized the universe to be: *a dynamic, analog form of Riemannian universe, not a neo-Cartesian statistical (digital) universe*. Contrary to the hoax of the famous "Second Law" of Clausius, Grassmann, Kelvin et al., ours is a universe which exists, for our

4. Hence, the intrinsic folly in method which underlies the habitual failures of the prevalent types of economic statistical forecasters.



Russian-Ukrainian scientist Vladimir I. Vernadsky (1863-1945) defined his conception of the Noösphere in Riemannian terms: a vital correction to the work of Woese et al.

powers of discovery, as a boundlessly finite universe, *a self-contained, anti-entropic, universal process of continuing creation*—as the famous aphorism of Heracleitus claimed.

This is the same point which was *exemplified, for us in modern European civilization, as Einstein emphasized the exemplary significance of Kepler's uniquely original discovery of gravitation, by a succession of discoveries of universal principles which are, each and all, typified by Johannes Kepler's uniquely original discoveries founding the science of modern astrophysics*.⁵

Therefore, the encompassing premise in my argument bearing on the referenced aspect of the work of Woese et al., is not only located within Academician V.I. Vernadsky's uniquely original discovery of a universal physical principle known as the Biosphere, but also in Vernadsky's associated recognition of the existence of the Noösphere as being, also, a strictly dynamic, distinct universal phase-space, which is also to be defined experimentally in Riemannian terms. In addressing

5. As I have pointed out in various earlier locations, the idea of science, such as the Egyptian-Pythagorean practice of *Sphaerics*, is derived from *that notion of universal* which, as a concept, has depended upon a very long span of empirical development of calendars derived from the cumulative evidence of very many generations of development of long-ranging celestial (oceanic) navigation by maritime cultures, as under the conditions of the approximately 200,000 years during which glaciation dominated large portions of the northern hemisphere, a glaciation toward which Earth is signaling a threat to return now.

matters of living processes, the emphasis is upon the precedents of physical chemistry treated by the Riemannian method adopted by Academician V.I. Vernadsky; as I have shown successfully for a science of physical economic forecasting, which are the same Riemannian principles, of the Noösphere.

It may appear to some that the Noösphere is a product of the Biosphere. True, the Biosphere loans material to the Noösphere, and vice versa; but, it is the Noösphere which contains, and acts upon the Biosphere. It is the Noösphere which transforms the Biosphere, not only in materials, but in what the Noösphere compels the Biosphere to contain, or to produce, by both deductions and additions to the repertoire of the Biosphere's substance and action.

Thus, my own contribution to that latter array, is to be found in my premising an actual science of physical economy, the standpoint which I have employed for the special case of long-range forecasting and related purposes, since the late 1950s, on those same implications of Bernhard Riemann's argument which were first boldly stated in their core in his 1854 habilitation dissertation.⁶ My own views on the significance of Riemann's work for physical economy, views which were outgrowths of a notion—a “spark”—discovered by me to this effect in 1953, have continued to be the foundation, since that time, for my original 1950s development of a science of physical-economy, a branch of science which is in the continuing tradition of Leibniz's emphasis on dynamics, as opposed to Cartesian and related methods. This is, thus, a continuation of work of founding of a physical science of economy, as accomplished by Gottfried Leibniz over the course of his relevant work during the span of 1671-1716. This method has been the basis for what has proven to be, uniquely, a, happily, virtually faultless series, of superior quality, of long-range economic forecasts, that since the late 1950s.

The crucial, and pivotal fact on which my own discovery in this matter depends, is expressed in a specifically dynamic manner (i.e., analog: Leibniz-Riemann), as distinct from wrongly assumed digital (e.g., Euclidian-Descartes) charac-

6. The principal such distractions from this fact of Vernadsky's originality are to be found in the kinds of misguided, “fundamentalist” or kindred religious fervor, notably those forms which adopt either the dubious speculations of the “Pitldown” co-hoaxster and reductionist mystic Teilhard de Chardin, or, what are clearly recognizable elements of the ancient pagan's Delphic cult of Gaea, in seeking to bring the mighty Creator of the universe down to Earth, so to speak. Teilhard's relevant work touches, if only deceptively, upon the names of valid conceptions, that to such effect that the errors of many of his putatively more orthodox critics are worse mistakes than his own. It is in the systemic features of his applications of his conception of noësis, that the essential error of his explanations is more clearly shown. The source of the confusion lies in Teilhard's attempt to reconcile the idea of creativity with what is called, unfortunately, a “Classical” Christian doctrine, where the attractive aspects of his work appear; his attempt to reconcile that with an axiomatically reductionist (i.e., Aristotelean or quasi-Aristotelean) form of cosmogony, is the root of his confusion. Teilhard's minting of the term “Noösphere” was acknowledged by Vernadsky; Teilhard named the baby, but Vernadsky conceived and delivered it.

teristics of human potential population-density, *as, thus, absolutely distinct in effect from the concept of ecological potential population-density expressed by lower forms of life.* The human individual is potentially, uniquely capable of re-inventing the human species in a qualitatively more advanced form of functioning, through transcendental, qualitative upshifts of a Classical mode in the potential relative population-density of the human species.

Thus, the shifting dependencies of the ascending quality of economies, successively, from burning of wood, of coal, of petroleum, of nuclear-fission power, and upwards, typify characteristic, phase-space stages of successive, upward evolution of human cultures, a willfully driven, qualitative development of the species of action which does not occur in any merely ordinary living species. It is man's seizing knowledge of that “fire” which Olympian Zeus forbade be given to mankind, which defines the human species in its true distinction from all lower forms of life.⁷

In other words, the actual existence of the human species, with its characteristic form, as *dynamic*, is derived from a specific (i.e., *noëtic*) quality of the human mind, a quality which does not exist within any lower form of life (e.g., in the Biosphere). The principle of human life neither exists in lower forms of existence than that, nor can it be derived from studies of the non-human, as if “pre-human,” aspects of the Biosphere. The Biosphere generates the potential for effective action by the Noösphere; but, the realization of such potential occurs only within the Noösphere itself.

Focus upon the fact that the increase of the absolute magnitude of the proportions of the composition of the Earth's mass represented by the combined Biosphere and Noösphere, as a percentile of the total mass of our planet, when this is considered in light of the evidence that the Noösphere is expanding more rapidly than the Biosphere as such, indicates the existence of a universal physical principle, the cognitive powers of the individual human being, which is not willfully expressed in any lower form of life than the human individual.

The included point here, as it is amplified in the subsequent chapter of this report, is that the principled character of the Biosphere's function is itself transformed qualitatively by the action of the Noösphere, such that the Biosphere no longer has fixed sovereign characteristics, because those characteristics themselves are being continuously transformed by action of the Noösphere. This pertains not merely to the array of elements of which the Biosphere is composed, but to the principles which generate the selected elements, both old and newly created, of the Biosphere's evolution under the reign of the Noösphere. The evolution of isotopes, their roles, and their relative quantities, as with those of specific importance for living processes, as through the role of nuclear-fission of late, could not occur otherwise.

That distinction, is what is to be called the function of *hu-*

7. Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound*, line 7, παντέχνον πυρὸς σέλας, which Herbert Weir Smyth translates: *flashing fire, source of all arts.*

man potential relative population-density, as increased per-square centimeter of cross-section of mode of power employed, drives a (potential) per capita and per square kilometer increase of potential human occupation of a large territory (or, of a continent or of the planet as a whole). This fact is relatively obvious to even merely competent modern studies; but, the way in which this effect is generated, takes us outside the bounds of the way the topic of “scientific method” as such is usually visualized in today’s classroom and elsewhere. The crucial point to be emphasized, is: *the Noösphere is derived from a universal physical, cognitive principle of human life, a power of organization which does not exist within the species of the lower forms of life, such as the higher apes.*

The progress of the human species, relative to other species, lies in a principle which is characteristic of the human species, but not others. Therefore, rather than the “bottom upwards” habit of attempting to obtain the transition to a relatively higher cardinal state of a multi-phase-space process, such as attempted transition from abiotic to Biosphere, or Biosphere to Noösphere, we must *not* proceed in terms of the factors of the previously existing (lower) state; rather, *we must treat the “teleological” transition as effected by action as if bestowed from the higher state upon the relatively lower one* as Vernadsky emphasized the ordering of the relative mass of the abiotic, Biosphere, and Noösphere. In other words, *the form of increase of the potential relative population-density of the human population, has the (dynamic) mathematical-physical form of the pre-determination of the present potential by types of changes (as by human discovery of a higher principle) which correspond to what had been introduced as a future systemic level of potential, rather than something manifest as a statistical determination of a future state, as a consequence of a current one.*

The development of this potential in the human species, determines the effect of that upon the entire domain of the Biosphere. And, so forth, and so on.

I explain the significance of this phenomenon.

Carl Woese et al.

Therein lies the essence of my original discovery in the domain of a science of physical economy. However, my discovery is not merely that; there are much more profound implications of this, implications which should not be overlooked in an appropriate re-reading of relevant features in the identified work of Carl Woese et al.

It will be clear to those associated with the work of Carl Woese et al., that my choice of reference to their work in making the crucial point presented here, was prompted by my satisfaction with the dynamic implications of such passages in the referenced work as: “. . . Specifically, we will herein model the evolution of translation, the codon table, the constraints therein, the universality of the code, and the decoding mechanism, not as a sum of parts but as a whole. . . .” In other words, *dynamics*, as defined by Leibniz against Descartes, and, defined later, by Riemann.

So far, so good; that is consistent with Riemannian dynamics. However, the question remains here: what is the organization of the whole process of development which accounts for the efficient, *actual* generation of *qualitatively* higher orders of dynamic states—higher states on principle, such as the fact that the human being represents a higher quality of principled physical state than any lower form of life?

The idea of the need to discover a solution for that question, is readily seen to be expressed in the upward evolution, as through realized application of higher physical principles, in physical-economic processes. The latter are, of course physical-economic processes, but those examples can not be other than crucially relevant for understanding other dynamic models of living processes, or the effects of human physical-economic evolution upon the two lower phases of our planet’s internal processes.

The answer, in the case of “social” models, as distinct from the organization of behavior in the animal kingdom (as with models such as mankind living within Kepler’s astrophysics), is that *the universe is intrinsically anti-entropic*, contrary to the Clausius, Grassmann, Kelvin cult of a “second law of thermodynamics.” However, as Vernadsky’s work has forced the fundamentally principled distinctions among the abiotic, the Biosphere, and the Noösphere to our attention, there are qualitative distinctions of universal principle among those sectors of the universe to be taken into account. As the history of the changes in relative mass of abiotic, Biosphere, and Noösphere components of the upper regions of Earth show, entropy, as a phenomenon, is a subsumed expression of the superior influence, anti-entropy, within which the apparent entropy appears, and under which it must be defined. *Before there could be death, there must, first, be life.*

The conclusive argument to such effect, is located in the case of mankind’s increase of the potential relative population-density of human populations, which is accomplished only through those noëtic processes of discovery of higher order physical and kindred, Classical artistic, principles, processes which echo the process of creation typified by Johannes Kepler’s uniquely original discovery of the role of gravitation in the ordering within the Solar system.

The human being is distinguished from any animal species by the set of relationships defined as a reflection of its twofold characteristic. On the one hand, it has a body, like that of an animal; at the same time it is an absolutely different form of existence than any of the great apes, which are mammals, by the existence of a human mind which is not located within the confines of the apparent mental life of an animal. This distinguishing difference is conveniently identified as the human “spirit” or “soul,” which has none of the characteristics of any known form of animal life, except as animals develop as appendages of mankind.⁸

8. I address this, and Cusa’s treatment of the same subject, within part of chapter 2 of this report.

Yet, a naive use of the term “spirit” or “soul” not only misses the crucial point, but has promoted widespread, absurdly mystical speculations. The human “soul” is very much an efficient part of the physical universe, that in the sense of the famous *Genesis* 1, but not as the term “physical” is still customarily employed in reductionist terms of reference. That “soul” is the actual personality of the human individual, that in the sense provided by Plato. It is an expression of an efficient phase-space within the universe at large, and expresses, in the guise of the Noösphere, a human individual’s power to change that universe willfully.

The biological domain, the domain of the Biosphere, is contained within, and is subordinate to that Noösphere. This is to be understood as the expression of the Noösphere’s power to contain and modify the characteristics of the Biosphere. With mankind’s appearance, the Biosphere thus loses its independent functional characteristics (if, indeed, it ever had them); the Biosphere becomes, in every way, a phase-space contained within the Noösphere.

Therefore, we treat the subject of the Biosphere here in those terms of reference. We present the case to be argued here by the method of successive conceptual approximations.

That, so described thus far, is my subject here.

1. The Relevant Fallacy of Sense-Certainty

The crucially distinct feature of human behavior is, that, unlike animal behavior, human behavior is inherently *not* subject to the conceptual approach inhering in presently conventional ranges of today’s proffered statistical-ecological models. Nor is animal behavior ordered in a way which is independent of the effect of changes in the higher, human, reign of the Noösphere. It is also fair to say that “choices” of animal behavior are, relatively speaking, “event-driven,” where the crucially important, higher cognitive functions of actually intelligent, as distinct from “knee-jerk” practices among human beings, are concept-driven, rather than “event-driven.”⁹

Therefore, the way to design the lure for an animal, or a foolish U.S. voter, to bring about that individual’s contribution to its self-inflicted ruin, is to rely on the intended victim’s behavior being “event-driven” (e.g., “fact-driven”) as, for example, the pathetic credulities of believers in “Malthusian”

9. Concept-driven” as in recognition of a relevant principle of nature, or of current social processes. Thinking which walks in the footsteps of the discovery of universal gravitation by Kepler, Fermat’s discovery of the principle of least action, Leibniz’s uniquely original (e.g., 1676) discovery of the principle of the calculus, or Riemann’s 1854 habilitation dissertation.



Abaca/Sara Jaye Weiss

Human behavior, unlike animal behavior, is not subject to the malthusian conceptual approach inhering in Al Gore’s “Global Warming” frauds. Here, Gore addresses a UN conference on environmentalism in 2005.

models, such as the “Global Warming” hoax. Otherwise, what is typical of intelligent human behavior, especially creative-scientific or Classical-artistic behavior, is “teleologically”-driven human creative insight, in the sense of a Classical (e.g., Platonic) form of *hypothesis*.

To the extent that human populations may, at some time, seem to show relatively fixed (e.g., “traditional”) ecological potentials, apparently like those which might be attributed to be characteristic of animal populations, such as knee-jerk proposals for the fraudulent, Malthusian policies of former Vice-President Al Gore, et al.: such decadence by the Malthusians and their present-day “Global Warming” frauds, is itself evidence that the related cultural matrix of that inherently stagnating society which such frauds as Gore’s express, is inherently an abnormal (i.e., pathological) model, one specific to that half-witted trend within the relevant part of the general population.¹⁰ Whereas, a healthy organization of society is not a fixed system, but upward-evolutionary (e.g., increasing potential relative population-density), and, thus, committed to scientific, Classical-cultural, and technological progress for its own sake.

Thus, speaking parenthetically, since, as I have already

10. It is fair, and necessary to say that former Vice-President Al Gore’s “global warming” hoax, is essentially a fascist economic model in the footsteps of the Haileybury Society’s Thomas Malthus, Mussolini, and Hitler, or, the Olympian Zeus of Aeschylus’ *Prometheus Bound*, or Friedrich Nietzsche’s dogma, since the model could not be institutionalized as a national, or world system except by what are easily recognized as fascist political means. Thus, essentially, like the H.G. Wells who stated his fascist commitments openly, Wells’ accomplice, Bertrand Russell was even more frankly, rabidly fascist than a Mussolini or Hitler.

emphasized here, the Biosphere is bounded systemically by the Noösphere, the crafting of the environment through the evolution of the Noösphere, shapes the selected course of regulating both the external boundaries and internal development of the Biosphere (defines the changes in rules). This functions to the effect that the dynamic “forces of evolution” within the Biosphere, are not independent of the Noösphere; but, are themselves shaped by the development in the Noösphere.¹¹ Thus, it is essentially an error to attempt to develop a simply biological model for the Biosphere as such, even a truly dynamic one: thus making the error of assuming that the higher, controlling force of the Noösphere were not the increasingly significant source of the conditions to which the evolutionary (Riemannian) dynamic of the physical geometry of the Biosphere is subject.

For example, consider some relevant history:

The Decadent Olympian Model

In the history of the ancient through modern cultures gathered around the Mediterranean Sea, the culture of typical cases of stagnating, or degenerating societies, is typified by the model depicted by the “zero growth” policy expressed by the character of the Olympian Zeus, of Aeschylus’ *Prometheus Bound*. Under Zeus’ inhuman, tyrannical policy of zero-technological growth, the ordinary people, like the helots of Lycurgus’ Sparta, or the neo-Malthusian dupes of the U.S.A. and Europe since 1968, are forbidden access, if only ideologically, to the possibility of the gaining of knowledge of universal physical principles (e.g., “fire,” nuclear-fission power, etc.). The effects of an implicitly neo-Malthusian cultural pathology of those who can be defined ideologically as “68ers” and their dupes of younger generations, are typified by the archetypical case of Aeschylus’ account of the evil of the Olympian Zeus, an Olympus which is a model case which becomes, thus, key for understanding both the characteristic systemic-cultural problems and the origins of these problems which have been the continuing threats to civilization from within modern trans-Atlantic culture itself.

For example, in the so-called “code” of the Emperor Diocletian, who crafted the political system from which the Byzantine Empire emerged, the rich and powerful lusted and reveled, while the mass of the thus degraded population knelt, and accepted a quasi-“Malthusian” social system of what was virtually “zero technological growth.” This set the pattern for serfdom, or worse, as a system. This affected the development



Prometheus is punished by Zeus, for the “crime” of providing mankind with knowledge of universal physical principles, in violation of the Olympian “zero-growth” policy.

of the organized behavior of that society as a system. That, in turn, generated an effect, which, in turn, made the factually obvious, implicit rules for dynamic “channeling” of the *self-evolution* of the Biosphere in that phase of the planet’s life.

This model of Diocletian and his successors, was a variant of the Delphic model of Lycurgus’ Sparta. It had been, and remained a variant of what was known as the “oligarchical model,” a Delphic model which had been temporarily defeated by Alexander the Great, but was to be established, under the hegemony of the murdered Alexander’s Ptolemaic successors, up into what was to emerge later as the rise of the process leading into the process of formation of what was on the way to becoming the Roman Empire from about 200 B.C.,¹² and would be continued, in principle, in Europe and adjoining regions of west Asia under the Byzantine system, and under the still worse, successor system under the hegemony of the Venetian financier-oligarchy and its instrument the Crusading Norman chivalry.¹³

12. The deaths of the celebrated correspondents Eratosthenes and Archimedes, marked the onset of a clearly marked decline in European culture in the period beginning the Roman victory in the Second Punic War.

13. It is notably relevant, that the ancient Greek model of later European imperialist designs, is to be seen, to modern times, at the existing site of the Delphic cult of Apollo-Dionysos. Arrayed around the site of the temple itself, there are “chapels” representing the treasuries of ancient Grecian cities. Following the path downhill to the relevant nearby port location, we recognize the ancient Delphic model for not only the Lombard League of European “New Dark Age” notoriety, but the presently posed renewal of a proposed world empire of city-state usury proposed by those who, today, demand the form of globalization proposed by such creatures as that self-proclaimed, Forty-Billion-Dollar fossil, New York Mayor Bloomberg.

11. Compare the case of the displacement of marsupials by arriving mammals, as the Australian “historical” model attests. While kangaroos, for example, may persist, most of the marsupials are replaced, niche by niche, by placental types which caricature the marsupial types. Leaving such oddities as the Platypus and a certain well-known, large-pouched publisher lingering as leftovers from the set of egg-laying species.

The principal exception to that oppression, is to be seen during the reign of Charlemagne; the death of Charlemagne opened the way for the hegemony of the system of domination by (temporarily) a decadent Byzantium, and, then, later, the imperial Venetian financier-oligarchy with its chronically crusading Norman instruments.

Looking more deeply into these chronic problems of the presently continuing European form of the oligarchical model, the pro-oligarchical model of most of the reigning local governments centered on the Mediterranean, most of the time, we have the following notable points of relevant emphasis bearing on the external conditions affecting the evolution of the human parameters of the Biosphere itself.

Celestial Navigation

What became known as European culture was rooted in a widespread maritime culture dated from deep within the last great age of glaciation, so far, in the northern Hemisphere. The leading cultures emerging in the historical Mediterranean from that time, were maritime cultures, cultures whose more or less remote ancestors had (apparently seasonally) migrated across very long distances, and did so continuously over many thousands of years. The practice of navigating by study of the differentiated pattern shown by the Sun, Moon, Planets and Stars, sailing by the stars, has been the obvious root of the proper use of the term “universal,” the only valid meaning of “science,” especially as this term is to be applied to physical science, especially as this was defined for modern times by the manifold role of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa in launching the modern history of European civilization with the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, and with the prompting by Cusa’s testament, of Christopher Columbus’ famous first trans-Atlantic voyage of discovery.¹⁴

Much of the experience from that long period of glaciation and the earlier portions of its aftermath, remains to be defined. Yet, it remains increasingly clear, that the great floods and ancient rivers flowing from the melting of the glaciation correspond to a period, since about 17,000 B.C., since which the levels of the oceans had risen, by about 2000 B.C., by about 400 feet. However, what is clear about the outcome of this change, is the still visible evidence, today, of the role of



Actual science developed out of the practice of ancient celestial navigation, as the apparent motion of the stars provided ocean-voyagers with the only possible method of determining their own location. Shown is an Egyptian ship depicted in the Tomb of Menna (c. 1422-1411 B.C.).

oceanic maritime cultures in colonizing areas often fortified against the populations of the nearby interior. To be brief, here, this led into a period, during the Seventh Century B.C., when the Etruscans, Ionians, and Egypt (e.g., Cyrenaica) became allies against the tyranny of Tyre. This development, based chiefly on a renaissance in Egypt of that time, defined the process of synthesis which formed the root of European maritime culture, and the subsequent development of European civilization.

The crucially relevant point on which I am focussed in these references to such historical matters here, is that it was the trans-oceanic maritime cultures, the cultures reflected in the great discoveries of Johannes Kepler, which had discovered the secrets of celestial navigation; but, these cultures had tended to degenerate into a form of oligarchical rule over the strains of human population from inland regions.

There were, in fact, two principal strains of oligarchical culture affecting the Mediterranean from historical times. One, emphatically land-based, and principally a reflection of emerging cultures of the Asian interior, and the other, the Mediterranean-centered maritime culture. During the interval following the Peloponnesian War, during the adolescent and adult life of Alexander the Great, the two systems of oligarchical rule, the Mediterranean and Asian, were fused to form what has been the generic form of the European cultural oligarchical model of medieval and modern times, that typified by the financier-oligarchical rule of the British Empire of today.

Thus, with the late Sixteenth, and Seventeenth-Century triumph of the new Venice faction of Paolo Sarpi and his followers over the pro-Aristotelean old-Venice faction, the defeat of the continental European powers in the wars of France’s Louis XIV, through the February 1763 Peace of Paris, brought

14. It was Nicholas of Cusa’s proposal for trans-oceanic development of contacts of Europe across the Atlantic and into the Indian Oceans, which explicitly guided Christopher Columbus’s scientific knowledge of the feasibility of crossing the Atlantic. Columbus acquired this knowledge through a reading of the testament of Cusa, which was lodged with the executor of Cusa’s testament resident in Portugal at that time. Approximately two decades later, Columbus succeeded in fulfilling that intended design by Cusa.

about the emergence of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal faction of Paolo Sarpi's heritage, as the hegemonic, oligarchical form of imperial maritime culture, chiefly Anglo-Dutch Liberal financier-imperialism, of Europe and most of the world beyond, during most of the time since that point. The emergence of the U.S. Federal republic as seen in admiration for U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, from among many nations, is what is to be seen as having been the principal design for a successful challenge to Anglo-Dutch global imperialism since that time, to the present date.

The Ontological Infinitesimal

For the subject of this present report, which is essentially a matter of physical science, more than politics otherwise, the relevant pro-Classical argument can be fruitfully selected and adopted from the treatment of that kind of distinction between "naturally" and socially generated catastrophes, as proffered by Plato in his *Timaeus*. For the purpose of this present discussion, I focus attention on the effect of catastrophes induced by a failure of a society to progress in ways which, at the least, overcome the attrition inherent in any, scientifically, "zero technological growth" system, that through the qualitative advances in the scientific-technological practice on which the society's resistance to decadence always depends.

Since the developments typified in the content of the revolutionary work of Vernadsky and Einstein through, approximately, the time of their deaths during, and in the aftermath of several years during and following the 1939-1945 "World War,"¹⁵ we are properly obliged to recognize the subject-matter of "physical universe" as being represented by three distinct, but nonetheless inseparable qualities of phase-spaces: 1.) The "ordinary" abiotic, 2.) The Biosphere, and 3.) The Noösphere. Following the line of work by Academician V.I. Vernadsky, the principled physical distinctions among these phase-spaces are to be located systemically (experimentally) in their common domain, that of the practice of physical chemistry in the footsteps of those such as Louis Pasteur, D.I. Mendeleyev, William Draper Harkins and Vernadsky.¹⁶ However, the three identified phase-spaces are also interacting, and evolving *dynamically* as a set: the one shaping the conditions which shape the evolving existence of the other.

The method by which these phase-spaces are to be distin-

15. Vernadsky died in January 1945, Einstein in April 1955.

16. And also, implicitly, in that work of Max Planck which was so viciously attacked by the German and Austrian followers of the radical reductionist Ernst Mach, during the period of the 1914-1917 warfare.


Einstein on Kepler

Here are excerpts from an essay by Einstein, in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of Kepler's death. It appeared in the Frankfurter Zeitung on Nov. 9, 1930.

In anxious and uncertain times like ours, when it is difficult to find pleasure in humanity and the course of human affairs, it is particularly consoling to think of the serene greatness of a Kepler. Kepler lived in an age in which the reign of law in nature was by no means an accepted certainty. How great must his faith in a uniform law have been, to have given him the strength to devote ten years of hard and patient work to the empirical investigation of the movement of the planets and the mathematical laws of that movement, entirely on his own, supported by no one and understood by very few! . . .

One can never see where a planet really is at any given moment, but only in what direction it can be seen just then from the Earth, which is itself moving in an unknown manner around the Sun. The difficulties thus seemed practically unsurmountable.

Kepler had to discover a way of bringing order into this chaos.



Max Planck gives a medal to Albert Einstein in Berlin, June 28, 1929.

guished, is, essentially, that method of modern European science which is subsumed by the legacies of Nicholas of Cusa and Johannes Kepler. In this method, the notion of the existence of universal physical principles as defined by the common features of the method of Cusa, Johannes Kepler, Fermat, Leibniz, Riemann, et al., is only conditional, but nonetheless crucial. That distinction which I have defined in sundry locations as the principle of the *ontologically infinitesimal* character of the infinitesimal of the Leibniz calculus,¹⁷ provides a model definition of all true universal physical principles, principles such as Kepler's uniquely original discovery of universal gravitation, and Albert Einstein's related emphasis on an unbounded, but finite universe of universal physical principles.

All valid universal principles are expressed in detail, as Kepler defined the principle of gravitation, in the form of their characteristic experimental expression as "ontologically infinitesimal."

The appearance of this discovery of what became known later as Leibniz's principle of the "ontologically infinitesimal,"

17. In defiance of the common, empiricist Sophistry of de Moivre, D'Alembert, Leonhard Euler, Joseph Lagrange, Laplace, Cauchy, Clausius, Grassmann, et al.

mal," by Cusa, also marks the moment of birth of modern science as modern science, including the science which must be employed to define the principles of the subsumed Biosphere and abiotic domains.

That discovery, as presented by Cusa, marks the rebirth of the same principle implicit in the work of the Pythagoreans and Plato. Cusa, recognizing a systemic error in Archimedes' quadrature of the circle and parabola,¹⁸ first presented the principle of the *comma*, from ancient *Sphaerics*, into the practice of modern European civilization. This notion by Cusa was the foundation of competent development of modern science, as from the discovery of the principle of gravitation by Kepler, the notion of a principle of least action associated with a discovery by Fermat, and the first development of a calculus, by Leibniz, based on the notion of the *ontologically infinitesimal* expression of universal physical principles, as those are rightly premised on the previously stated principle of Kepler for this purpose.

Briefly consider the crucial historical implications of the immediately foregoing statements.

For example: the essential experimental basis for Ein-

18. I.e., Cusa's exposure of the systemic error in Archimedes' quadrature of the circle.

Kepler on Aristotle's Sabotage of Astronomy

Johannes Kepler (1571-1630) refuted Aristotle's geocentric cosmology, and charged that Aristotle held science back for nearly two millennia, until the advent of Copernicus, by rejecting the Pythagorean idea that the Earth moves in an orbit around the Sun ("the fire"). Kepler's full document was published in 21st Century Science & Technology, Winter 2001-02, in a translation by George Gregory. Here are excerpts.

[The Pythagoreans] spoke in a veiled way; by fire they understood the Sun, and I agree with them, that the Sun is in the center of the world, and never moves away from this place, and that, on the other hand, the Earth moves once in one year around the Sun, that is, it revolves around the center position of the world, as otherwise also five other wandering stars [that is, the planets]...

[Aristarchus of Samos (310-ca. 230 B.C.) was accused of blasphemy and threatened with death for endorsing a heliocentric system.] On account of this fear, and on ac-



Johannes Kepler, the founder of universal modern physical science.

count of the reputation of Aristotle, who rejected this teaching (although he did not yet fully understand it), this teaching was suppressed, and particularly because it was difficult to understand, it was nearly forgotten for 1,800 years...

I am as little satisfied with Aristotle, when he thinks it is sufficient to have asked why the Earth remains at the center of the world, and to answer, that nature assigned this

position to it. For it is entirely uncertain, and not conceded by me, that the Earth is in the middle of the world; and were it so, it would be so indeed on account of nature, but in the same way that all things are on account of nature. But one is not satisfied to know that things are according to nature, but one asks why they are that way and not some other way, and what means nature used to bring this about...

stein's celebrated insistence that the universe as a whole is *conceptually finite*, has ancient roots traced implicitly to times prior to the practice of *Sphaerics* by the Pythagoreans:

Sphaerics, as a legacy of very ancient practice of celestial navigation, as with the maritime cultures existing under the conditions of widespread glaciation, toward which the planet is threatened, again, over the long haul ahead, is obviously the relic of seasonal and otherwise repeated celestial navigation over distances as long as thousands of miles; only under those conditions could mankind have discovered the qualitative changes, as distinct from, and opposed to the conception of apparent simple (cyclical) repetition, a discovery which were necessary for the discovery of a reigning principle of qualitative, progressive change in the composition of the navigator's and calendar-builder's celestial array.¹⁹ Astrophysics was, necessarily, the beginning of actually scientific knowledge—of the notion of the actually universal, and, thus, of the *Sphaerics* which the Pythagoreans and others adopted from Egypt-Cyrenaica. That typifies the deep roots of humanity's acquisition of *that quality of universal knowledge which is the only practice worthy of the name of science*.

Since the ancient Classical Greeks, as these are typified efficiently by the Pythagoreans and Plato, the modern European standard for the definition of science was set by Nicholas of Cusa, that done in a series of his works typified by his *De Docta Ignorantia*. A competent form of universal modern science was established by the crucial discoveries of principle developed by Cusa's avowed follower Johannes Kepler. As Einstein emphasized on this same account, modern physical science in its full span, is lodged under the developed form of the work of Bernhard Riemann, but is rooted as a body of physical-scientific practice in the achievements of Kepler. It is with the argument by Einstein, that the concept of physical science was returned, full cycle, to that development of astronomy by ancient celestial navigators, as Bal Gangadhar Tilak emphasized in his review of a relevant selection of combined ancient and modern sources.²⁰

The distinction to be made is between the naive view of science as a fallacy of composition in design of merely repeatable experiments, as in the hoax of Clausius, Grassmann, et al., and science as a discovery of patterns of progressive (i.e., *anti-entropic*, rather than merely cyclical) change of the conditions of experiment under the impact of the discovery of relevant, long-ranging, universal physical principles.

The latter view is forced upon competent observers today,

19. Compare Philo of Alexandria's denunciation of the theology of Aristotle's method, and the echo of Philo's denunciation of Aristotle for astrophysics by Kepler. Note, as most notable, Kepler's exposure of the specifically Aristotelean fraud central to Claudius Ptolemy's fixed system.

20. I.e., *Orion, or Researches into the Antiquity of the Vedas* (1893) and *Arctic Home in the Vedas* (1903).

by the way in which relative potential population-density of the human species has been shaped, uniquely, for the human species: by the effects of willful progress of human practice to higher states of potential relative population-density, that through discovery and adoption of those higher principles of change which Aeschylus' Olympian Zeus forbade. *As I have already emphasized here, this development within the Noösphere reshapes the physical geometry of that Biosphere in ways which are to be seen as the effects of the changes which are effected in, and radiated from the higher realm of the Noösphere.*²¹

In the span of the known history of the known cultures centered on the Mediterranean, the kind of society which that Olympian Zeus's policy prescribed, is known to scholars as "the oligarchical model," under whose reign most people are reduced to the likeness of cattle by imposition of rules of no-change ("zero growth") which are reflected, typically, in Malthusian fads, and fascist political systems today. This oligarchical model has been the persisting origin of the degenerative crises, such as the present one, which mankind has experienced in known history.

Riemann & the Principle of Hypothesis

Thus, the implication of the revolutionary advance in physical science introduced by Bernhard Riemann, as first introduced in his 1854 habilitation dissertation, has led to the recognition that we must consider our universe as finite, that in the specific sense of being "finite but unbounded"—"self-bounded." This quality of finiteness, is expressed by mankind's expanding knowledge of sets of discovered universal physical principles, as each such principle is to be defined by the model of Kepler's discovery of gravitation.

A true universal principle is never itself an object of the senses, but is a principle which is shown, experimentally, as Kepler proved the case of gravitation in his *The New Astronomy* and the *Harmonies*, combined, as underlying (i.e., confining) the physical geometry of the relevant universal class of actions.

For that reason, the universe is known to be finite in the sense that any such universal physical principle is self-bounded (and therefore not externally bounded) as to relative magnitude "1," and that its local expression, as an efficiently acting universal physical principle, is therefore that of an ontologically infinitesimal quality of that action upon its subjects, as the work of Kepler's *Harmonies* shows. Thus, we have, contrary to the empiricists and positivists, Leibniz's derivation of the ontologically infinitesimal calculus from

21. Consider the impact of what are largely "transuranic" isotopes of specifically biological significance, a present line of development which echoes Vernadsky's impact on Russian geological science since the visit of Prince and later Czar Peter the Great to the site of the Freiberg academy (near Dresden).

Kepler's discovery of universal gravitation.²²

Thus, since the time since the immediate post-World War II period, since the deaths of Vernadsky and Albert Einstein, evidence from the domains of physical chemistry has defined three clearly defined domains: First, and lowest, the abiotic domain; second, the Biosphere; and third, the subsuming power of the Noösphere. These domains are familiar to us by comparing the known patterns of growth of the latter two domains, the Biosphere and Noösphere, relative to the portion of the Earth's crust which is apparently not a product of physical-chemical changes done by living processes. Generally, the Biosphere and its residues are growing, in ratio to the mass of the crust, and the mass of the Noösphere (human activity and its specific products) relative to the Biosphere.

Vernadsky rooted these distinctions in methods of a Riemannian practice of physical chemistry. Those methods, with their suitable enrichment, should be considered the implied authority to which I refer in this report.²³

The distinctions include the specifications, that: 1.) Without the principle of life, there is no development of the Biosphere within the Earth as a whole; 2.) Without human cognitive activity, there is nor further development of the Noösphere within the Biosphere. From the standpoint of physical chemistry, those distinctions signify the notion of man and woman as made in the likeness of the Creator, relative to the Biosphere.

Hence, the "teleological" feature of the universe so defined. Without a universal principle of life, there is no biology; without a universal principle of human creative reason, lacking in all lower forms of life, there is no Noösphere. Thus, the abiotic Solar system (and beyond) is necessary for the expression of life, and living creatures are a necessary precondition for expression of the distinctive quality of human life; but, the

22. As in the authentic discovery of a quantum principle by Max Planck (the adversary of the Machian positivist ideologues) later, Kepler's discovery of the organization of the system of gravitation of the Solar system, depended upon rejecting a purely visual (sense-perceptual) notion of the organization of the Solar system, by making the ontologically paradoxical juxtaposition of the notion of visual and aural sense-perception ("sight" and "sound"). There is no "empty space" in the organization of nature in the very small or very large. The hysteria exhibited, in defense of a childish blind faith in sense-certainty, by what were otherwise leading scientists, on the subject of the indispensable role of harmonics in defining universal gravitation, has continued to be a crucial, leading barrier to the progress in physical science today. The wild attack on Max Planck by the German and Austro-Hungarian dupes of Ernst Mach and Bertrand Russell, during and following World War I, should be compared with the common, and usually wildly lying hysteria against Kepler on the same account of "sense-certainty." In both cases, Kepler and Planck, the crucial issue is ontological: the refusal of the opponents to realize that the human sense-readings are merely the reactions of instruments which present us what are, so to speak, the mere shadows of reality: this to such effect that the paradoxical evidence of sight and sound, rather than the evidence of one alone, must be treated as, for example, Kepler did in defining the harmonics of gravitation itself, and Planck in his great discovery.

23. The argument, by Vernadsky, to which I referred in my "Vernadsky & Dirichlet's Principle," op. cit.

principle of the Noösphere subsumes all. We must think of these principles as universal physical principles in the same sense as Kepler's uniquely original discovery of universal gravitation, but as of the quality of a different such universal principle. All three principles, including gravitation, share the character of being immortal *as principles*.

"Sense-Uncertainty"

The root of the functional quality of mental disease called reductionism, is the notion of "sense-certainty": that is to say, the notion that we are obliged to accept certain fancifully false notions of space, matter, and time, such as definitions, axioms, and postulates, without further investigation, this on the premise that this represents acceptance, *a-priori*, of the stubbornly persisting evidence of our sense-perceptual apparatus as such. This systemic error is met in ancient through modern European traditions as the basis for that variety of Sophism method associated, successively, with the doctrine of Aristotle, as this variety of Sophism is echoed by the followers of Aristotle in the celebrated *Euclid's Elements*.²⁴

We do not know the actual time and place of the crucial breaking-point in mankind's experience, at which actual science displaced the pathetic worship of "sense-certainty." We do yet know that what is to be rightly seen as the history of science today, which can be identified as emerging in the time and place in the history of man's discovery of astrophysics, whatever were exactly that time; it became, thus, apparent to ancient masters of celestial navigation who recognized that the starry skies above did not represent a simple system of repetitive cycles, but expressed the existence of a universe in endless qualitative development, from relatively simpler to more complex, higher-order (anti-entropic development of) systems of the universe as a whole. This fact has been made clear to those among us who actually think according to that

24. Essentially, the main body of content of the *Elements* is in the form of systemic reification of hypotheses and theorems which had been defined earlier by, notably, the circles of the Pythagoreans and Plato. As the relevant principle was most famously clarified by Archytas' purely constructive demonstration of the duplication of the cube, Classical Greek physical science, as in the Egyptian-Pythagorean *Sphaerics* echoed in the work of Thales and Heraclitus. The characteristic of that Classical physical science of the Pythagoreans and Plato, was the same notion of underlying physical principles as expressed essentially by the experimental methods associated with the concept of the same ontologically infinitesimal represented by Kepler's discovery of the harmonic, rather than naive visual-space-like basis for a measurable value of organization of the Solar system. Our various specific sensory powers are of the quality of instrumentation of our experience, presenting our minds with what are the shadows which reality prompts as perceived sensations. The contrast of two opposing qualities of perception, such as vision and hearing, was indispensable for Kepler's discovery of the quantifiable principle of gravitation. However, although this principle of anti-Euclidean geometry was already clear to such predecessors of Riemann as the great Eighteenth-Century mathematician Abraham Kästner (and, actually, if secretly, Carl Gauss), it was not until Bernhard Riemann's explicit expulsion of all reductionist method from physical science, that the problem had been placed in clear focus for modern science.

realization of the implications of Bernhard Riemann's fundamental revolution in physical science, a realization which is best represented today by the fundamentals of the work of Academician V.I. Vernadsky and Albert Einstein. Thus, no longer can science be considered competent, if it proceeds on assumptions based on interpretation of experience of what is esteemed as being contained within the abiotic. Competent science always looks from the top of the evolution of the changes within the universe, to the lower qualities of its organization. Competent science today is premised on Einstein's conception of a Riemannian universe of Kepler and Kepler's precedents, proceeding always from the foundation of science found only in those cognitive powers of the individual human mind whose typical achievements are sampled in the Riemannian universe, as that has been defined in exemplary fashion by Vernadsky and Einstein.

The great curse of prevalent modern science dogma, is that it is essentially empiricist, or, in its far more degenerate expressions as either positivism, or, even worse, existentialism.

Thus, competent science today proceeds from the origin expressed by the specifically creative powers of the human individual mind. Science must define itself as our knowledge of the universe as the progress of man's power to control, and to develop his universe; this shows us what the universe demands of us, and what it will tolerate from us as the practice, expressed through man's power in and over that universe, as that power is increased in such expressed terms as systemic increase of the potential relative population-density of the human species.

2. Anti-Entropy: The Principle of Creation

Thus, the secret of our universe is, that only beasts, or bestialized human beings, such as, in the worst cases, Malthusians like former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore, fail to recognize that, among all living species, mankind, and only mankind, is creative by its true, willful nature. For the competent human individual, there is no law of "entropy" in this universe, but only the misleading appearances represented as effects of a cultivated habit of stupidity, or worse, among some unfortunate people, sometimes very many people. For that faulty habit, do not blame humanity indifferently; blame some relevant people, including those wretched Sophists, such as those of the legendary press which were responsible for the policy behind the minting of that *New York Times* style book which has ripped the true Pythagorean *comma* of human creativity from its pages.

The crucial theme here can be summed up in a single statement, thus: *The universe, viewed, properly, top-down, is the habitat of the reign of the Noösphere!*



Strelka (left) and Belka, Soviet dogs who orbited the Earth in 1960—the first animals to survive orbital flight. LaRouche agrees with Soviet space scientists of that time, that dogs are more intelligent than chimpanzees. But there's something essential here that Al Gore fails to grasp.

Dogs, Apes & Humans

Those who recall the U.S.A. vs. Soviet rivalry in "the space-race" of the 1950s and 1960s, may also recall a debate, whether dogs were more intelligent than chimpanzees (the Soviet policy). Frankly, dogs won that contest. The crucial fact of the matter, is that dogs have a better potential for *relevant* qualities of seemingly *human-like intelligence* than *adult* chimpanzees. (Any dog-lover also familiar with the traits of the adult chimpanzee, can be attracted to this fact.) To settle the issue, it were sufficient to consider a candid debate of this matter, between a trainer responsible for managing adult male chimpanzees, and the proud and insightful human companion of a pet dog.

Let us seem to cheat just a bit, but that only for a pedagogical purpose. Let us compare adult pet male chimpanzees with adult dogs raised as household pets. We really are not cheating in doing this. When we compare the behavior of animal species, we must consider the relevant qualities for humanity of the adult representative of the species, as by comparing adult male chimpanzees who had been pets as "children," with the adult development of the household puppy when it has become an adult.

Actually, contrary to the opinion of some children and adults, a dog does *not* develop actually *human* intelligence; the pet dog acquires what might be described as an "echo" of human intelligence.²⁵ Here, the dog out-classes the chimpanzee.

25. My wife and I have "owned" a number of dogs: several Irish Setters, two Great Pyrenees, and one West Highland White Terrier. There are "breed" characteristics, but there are also developed "personalities," which are manifest as expressed "insight" specific to the dog and to the household into which it is assimilated while a puppy.

zee. The pet dog develops what appears to be something resembling a human form of personality; that dog tries to simulate (“imitate”) the personality of be a human being, perhaps regarding its owner as representing, in ethical and family terms, the kind of authority due its mother, father, or human sibling.²⁶ The relevant distinction was noted by the Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, who reported this kind of apparent simulation of human intelligence among animals. *Thus, the Noösphere “educates” the Biosphere.*

For purposes of an introductory, exploratory discussion of such matters, we might say that the dog’s simulation of what seems to have been the behavior of the higher order of living species, the human individual, is “programmed,” although—*God forbid!*—never “digitally” programmed. Cusa compared God to the “soul” of man, as man to the “soul” of the animal, that in appropriate terms of reference.

The content of those preceding paragraphs is to be treated as a necessary, brief, playful, but nonetheless a valid, introductory discussion, that as a matter of providing a background orientation for the discussion of the “hard point” which I am about to introduce thus.

The Folly of Sense-Certainty

Among all known species existent within our Solar system, the form of human mental performance which is specific to the conception of the *ontologically infinitesimal* principles of physical science, such as Kepler’s discovery of gravitation (and also of the discovery, as by J.S. Bach, of true Classical artistic composition), is unique, among all species, to human individuals. Thus, to the extent that the human brain might be considered, wrongly, by some, as merely a higher order of development of animal brains, that assumption leaves no basis for a truly noëtic intellectual creativity of the quality expressed by the modern cases of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, Kepler, Fermat, Leibniz, Riemann, or of J.S. Bach, W.A. Mozart, and Ludwig van Beethoven, creativity which is not so encountered in the biological mental-perceptual apparatus of the brain-function of mammals in general.

The clue which points toward a solution for the relevant mystery, may be found through examining a certain systemic quality of paradox in Kepler’s discovery of the harmonic organization of the Solar system. The specific quality of that discovery, by Kepler, which has driven even many serious, if somewhat misguided scientists into a fury, is that Kepler’s solution involves the principled, *musically* defined, *Lydian, Florentine bel canto* faculty of hearing. Whereas, as a matter of contrast, the scientist who was heavily indoctrinated in the Sophistry of Aristotle-Euclid, will tend, with rare exceptions, to react with his or her own personal performance of some

sort of a “freak show,” when confronted with the implications of the indispensable function of hearing, as Kepler was confronted: when confronted with the paradox which threatens the peaceful contemplation of any merely visual conception of organization of space-time.

“Tuning” is an extremely useful piece of scientific pedagogy for the purpose of defining the experimental subject, when confronting that acutely paradoxical fact. It is a related fact, that all evidence available indicates, that *there is nothing intrinsic to the apparent physiological organization of the brain-function of the mammals which accounts for the unique role of the individual human mind in reproducing the phenomena of the Noösphere.* There is something, related to the notion of “tuning,” as defined by Kepler’s discovery, and by J.S. Bach, which accounts for this unique species of experimental fact.

The relatively more obvious point made by that sort of “thought experiment,” is that a sane reaction to Kepler’s treatment of the paradox of harmonics in defining the measurable effect of the principle of gravitation, compels the seasoned experimentalist to accept the fact that his, or her own sense-perceptual apparatus is an array of instrumentations, to such effect that the sundry “meter readings” from that inborn array of experimental apparatus must be treated as just that. So, what seems almost self-evident, almost Euclidean or Cartesian, if only one of the human senses is being considered, may be transformed into the inducing of a state of stark confusion in the mind of the unwitting, when two, or more, different human senses, such as sight and hearing, are being applied to define a single common image of the common experimental subject.

For example:

In the relatively simpler case, the naive student “believes” it to be more or less self-evident, that astronomical space is defined by discrete objects, such as planets, moons, and sundry forms and sizes of intra-Solar-system particles, each and all appearing to float when such phenomena are assessed as being within a background-medium of what is presumed to be, in its own nature, as Cartesian empty space. Similarly, the Max Planck-hating dupes of Ernst Mach, such as Ludwig Boltzmann, may proffer a childish misreading of what he considers, on principle, as reducible, conceptually to a percussively organized gas system.

In these cases, the experimental validity attributed to the mechanistic representation, is to be recognized as the result of interpreting what may be, within limits, experimental phenomena viewed in terms of a mechanistic fantasy derived from the a-prioristic, mechanistic methods of Aristotle and Euclid. As long as ideologues continue to interpret the evidence, axiomatically, on reductionist presumptions, they may be self-satisfied with their formulations. This may continue until they are faced with the experiment which presents what they must view as profoundly anomalous results, as Riemann’s 1854 habilitation dissertation shows, or as

26. We had a Great Pyrenees, who accepted a West Highland White Terrier as a puppy of the family, but seemed, over years, to grow increasingly troubled by the fact that that puppy never seemed to be growing up.

Kurt Gödel, in 1931, demonstrated the fraudulent character of Bertrand Russell's *Principia Mathematica*.²⁷

Such childish Euclidean-Cartesian fantasies as those of the followers of Mach and dupes of Russell, are precisely the source of the confusion of the physicist experiencing a banshee-fit when being presented with Kepler's harmonic composition of the gravitational, wrongly presumed "action-at-a-distance" field of the Solar System,²⁸ or in that domain of Planck's work which the radically reductionist dupes of the positivists (e.g., radical empiricists) such as Mach, or one like Bertrand Russell, misidentified as quantum "mechanics." At that point, a few words from a Kurt Gödel or Albert Einstein are sufficient to send the radically reductionist cult-followers of Mach, Russell, Norbert Wiener, John von Neumann, et al., into howling fits worthy of the dismay which might have been expressed, at the close, among the suffering characters of H.G. Wells' *The Island of Dr. Moreau*.

The alternative to reductionist fantasies of "sense-certainty," is to consider physical space-time as a true continuum of existence-in-motion. That means that the exclusion of the notion of something existing which must yet be moved, in favor of the accepting the realization of that "motion," motion otherwise recognized as action in the sense of a continuing process of development, must be accepted as the intrinsically ontological quality of existence. This means *dynamic* existence, not in the sense of the reductionist's nonsense word "thermodynamics," but as in the method of the ancient Pythagoreans and Plato, or the modern followers of Cusa, Leonardo da Vinci, Kepler, Fermat, Leibniz, Riemann, et al.

Rejection of sense-certainty does not mean rejecting the role of our senses; rather, we must recognize that the senses are indispensable in the two respects indicated here below. What must be rejected, for the sake of competent science, is the hedonist's blind faith in "sense-certainty."

27. Kurt Gödel, "On formally undecidable propositions of *Principia Mathematica* and related systems," (1931), in *Kurt Gödel Collected Works*, Vol. I (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 144-195.

28. The case of the Crab Nebula should, therefore, drive him wild!



Library of Congress

Helen Keller's accomplishment in overcoming both deafness and blindness, shows that cognition is not based at all upon sense-certainty. Here, she is exploring the shape of a statue.

of Aristotle, Euclid, and Descartes. We then learn to use those senses, both those given to us by birth, or instruments we adopt as supplements to the senses, to discover more and more of the nature of the actual universe which we inhabit, and, in that manner, and in that process, discover the most precious among all of the secrets of science, the true identity of ourselves, and our place in this Riemannian universe at large.

Riemann Again

In treating the mental disorder called "sense-certainty," we must take into account, from the outset, that the problem of sense-certainty as it has confronted us in European culture, persistently, since approximately the death of Plato, is a product of the rise of what is known as the form of European Sophistry attacked by Plato's dialogues. This means attacking, specifically, the form of Sophistry which ancient, medieval, and modern Sophistry have inherited from Aristotle and such among his notable followers as Euclid.

I repeat: there is crucially significant, surviving evidence to the effect, that the great trans-oceanic maritime cultures whose experience is reflected to us from the ancient Egypt known to Solon, the Pythagoreans, and Plato, possessed a scientific method, identified as *Sphaerics*, which was largely free

of those fallacies of sense-certainty which I have ridiculed in the opening pages of this present chapter of the report. Also, we must recognize, that there have been traces of the scientifically healthy, pre-Euclidean scientific world-outlook radiated by Plato, as by currents of Judaism and Christianity typified by Philo and the Apostle Paul, at various times and in various locations, over the course of ancient and medieval European times prior to the great work of Nicholas of Cusa in founding modern science.

In all modern European history, there was a great struggle, from the time of Kepler, Fermat, and Leibniz, until that of Riemann, during which a lunatic, so-called Cartesian and Newtonian view of science, that of the *a-priorism* of Aristotle, Euclid, Galileo, and Descartes, was made prevalent, either through the imperial influence of the Habsburg and other Inquisitions, or by the influence of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal imperium; *until Riemann broke open the doorway to truth with his 1854 habilitation dissertation.*

On this account, it must be recalled, that the echoes of Cusa, Leonardo da Vinci, and Kepler, were expressed in the mid-Seventeenth Century of France, under the leadership of Cardinal Mazarin, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, and Gottfried Leibniz, until this progress was interrupted by the emerging primacy of a modern Liberalism which emerged during the Anglo-Dutch Liberal wars leading into the February 1763 launching of the neo-Venetian form of the world's presently continued, British empire-in-fact. So, despite the later great Eighteenth-Century Renaissance led by Abraham Kästner, Gotthold Lessing, Moses Mendelssohn, Friedrich Schiller, and the Monge-Carnot Ecole Polytechnique, the Jacobin Terror and the reign of the predator Napoleon Bonapart, crushed, once again, the new, late Eighteenth-Century Classical Renaissance.

That tyranny of the Habsburg Inquisition of Grand Inquisitor Tomas de Torquemada, on the one side, and that of the Anglo-Dutch Liberalism of Paolo Sarpi and his followers, on the other, had already established the massively corrupting influence of Paolo Sarpi's system of Liberalism over science, art, and politics. The British imperial tyranny over the Vienna Congress's Europe, and the British deployment of the early-Nineteenth-Century Spanish monarchy's continuation of British John Locke's earlier promotion of the trans-Atlantic slave-trade, continued to dominate science until the circles of that great organizer Alexander von Humboldt succeeded in unleashing the great revolution in physical science of Wilhelm Weber, Lejeune Dirichlet, and Bernhard Riemann. Once more, that same Liberal sophistry dominates our modern European culture, with its schools, universities, and popular opinion, still today.

It was upon the signal contributions of the later geniuses, such as the great, later achievements of such exceptional geniuses as Vernadsky and Albert Einstein, on which the net progress of science has chiefly depended. During the entire sweep of the 1854-2008 interval to date, the uttering of Riemann's 1854 habilitation dissertation, has become the great

long wave of revolution on which the greatest net achievements of science have, subsequently, thus far depended.

Thus, as great as was the revolution which Bernhard Riemann launched in his 1854 habilitation dissertation, there was nothing essentially new to European civilization's science in the great principle through which Riemann shattered the darkness of Euclidean superstition. Once the 1854 habilitation dissertation is understood, its origins, its outgrowths, and its implications for now, were, already, essentially grounded in fact.

Since Riemann's habilitation dissertation, the principal source of moral rot in modern physical science, has been that great hoax, called "thermodynamics," as crafted by the scientifically and morally decadent circles of Clausius, Grassmann, and Kelvin. This corruption is typified, to the present date, by what has become that implicitly mass-murderous, Machian hoax and fraud of modern mechanics, the hoax named "The Second Law of Thermodynamics."

That much said this far, the considerations which I have outlined up to this point in the report, have taken us, repeatedly, during the preceding pages, up to the verge of the great conclusion standing before us: the notion of *the ontological infinitesimal.*

The Noösphere as Such

The development of the concept of the Noösphere has depended essentially on the insight into that evidence from that approach to physical chemistry by Mendeleev and Harkins, which Academician Vernadsky summarized in the middle of the 1930s. Although there is often a temptation by some reporters to locate the discovery of a principle of life by Pasteur, rather than crucially significant phenomena expressed by living processes, Pasteur himself rejected a precocious conclusion in the matter; he did so correctly, on the premises of his knowledge of what a proper scientific method must require as adequate proof.²⁹ We, still today, must show similar caution in stating claims pertaining to the Noösphere; however, as much of what we know to have been proven respecting the implications of the proven existence of the Noösphere must be accepted, despite deeper issues yet to be defined.

Today, as I have emphasized the implications of the questions implicitly posed by the referenced work of Woese et al., we must be concerned with a higher order of challenge, the Noösphere, as Vernadsky clarified the questions respecting the Biosphere. Living processes express a different physical chemistry than non-living processes, thus defining a specific phase-space known as the Biosphere. Then, how shall we approach the higher order of subject, the Noösphere?

We know that the Noösphere has been discovered by (actually) Academician V.I. Vernadsky. We also know from crucial experimental evidence, that the Biosphere is dominated functionally by the Noösphere: that to such effect that the Noösphere contains the Biosphere functionally, such that no

29. LaRouche, "Vernadsky & Dirichlet's Principle," op. cit.

generalizations respecting the Biosphere can exclude the superior role of the Noösphere.

We must recall, that the proof of the discovery of the hypothesis by Vernadsky was supplied by the evidence of the growth of the accumulated mass generated by the Biosphere's phase-space as products specific to the effects and residues of the masses of living processes. The growth of the Biosphere, so defined, relative to the phase-space generated as supplied by non-living processes, supplied the proof needed, even though we have yet to receive a competent experimental definition of "historical" origins of life as such.

The same standard required to define the Biosphere is to be applied to the case of the Noösphere, with one very distinct qualification. Crucial is the evidence on which any competent science of physical economy depends: that the percentile of the mass of our planet representing products of human cognitive activity not otherwise produced by the processes of the Noösphere itself, has been increased through, chiefly, the effects of scientific and related advances in the goals and technologies of human societies.

The crucial fact thus emphasized, is that this increase of the relative mass of the Noösphere, is, uniquely, the now well-defined product of what is termed *noësis*. This pertains to activities, which are expressed uniquely by their ontologically infinitesimal expression (as I have already emphasized at earlier points of this report), as those processes of discovery of true universal physical principles which have no place in the reductionist methods of ancient Sophists such as Aristotle and Euclid, or in modern empiricism and related practice.

*This distinction of the Noösphere confronts us, at least typically so, with its evidence of the paradoxical type of case, an anti-entropic case, in which the future determines the present.*³⁰

For example: in the case of the Biosphere, we have had the relative advantage of being able to define the Biosphere by reference to the higher state of organization in the universe which contains the definition of the Biosphere, the Noösphere. We can not approach the subject of the Noösphere with such an available kind of advantage. The paradoxical effect is more or less limited to the fact that it is the discovery of a principle which often serves as the cause of a qualitative change in the quality of effect of human action (for example) on the universe. This, in turn, confronts us with the factual existence of the discovery of a necessary truth of practice (i.e., Classical



NASA-JPL-Caltech/R. Gehrz

The Crab Nebula presents an array of paradoxes to the scientist. It is rapidly changing, even pulsating—yet it is presumed to be immensely large. The changes that occur in its structure take place synchronously throughout it, seemingly like waves propagating at a velocity faster than the speed of light! Such anomalies drive the reductionists and Cartesians crazy.

Platonic hypothesis), this even before the relevant, new experimental principle of action was *discovered negatively*.

To illustrate the existence of such points: such an anomaly is suggested, although not otherwise known to have been proven, yet, by the evidence of the ostensibly anomalous ordering of certain kinds of changes which occur in the Crab Nebula.

Take, for example, the related fact that it was Fermat's remarkable, unique discovery of the principle of least action, which prompted Leibniz to overthrow the authority of Huyghens' cycloid, and to base a universal physical principle of least action on the analog functions which led to this revolution in defining the notion of actual physical principles.

These and related considerations lead us toward three great paradoxes.

First, that the greatest moments of scientific discovery are those in which a revolutionary change *in the future change of the ordering in our universe of practice* appears to some human mind as an inevitable consequence of evidence, a universal principle, yet to be employed in practice. How has this been possible?

Second, what is the mysterious, yet undeniable power of

30. This has been the "secret" of my unique, current success as the most successful long-range forecaster in economics.

the individual human mind's design which permits an individual human being, but no animal, to make such a type of valid discovery of the necessary change in principled modes for shaping of the future?

Third, how does the individual human mind manifest such a unique power, with no precursor for this in the Biosphere as such?

Is it some principle of "tuning?" Has the development of the human mental-biological apparatus taken the human species to a point at which it is "tuned into" a higher power in the universe, a higher power which is not only expressed as truly anti-entropy, as defined by the great Eighteenth Century mathematician Abraham Kästner, but a supreme universal physical principle of anti-entropy? So, Philo of Alexandria condemned the Aristotlean's theological insistence on the self-inflicted, permanent impotence of the Creator, and did so on the basis of the strongest quality of argument in evidence against such an absurd theology, and, implicitly, against an absurd, Aristotlean, Claudius Ptolemy-like misconception of science.

There are two cases of such crucially significant behavior. In one case, there is the universe in the large, as governed by an anti-entropic principle driving the universe into successively higher qualitative states of organization as a universe. In the other case, as posed in *Genesis* 1, mankind acts upon its place in the universe to similarly anti-entropic effect. In the other aspect of the matter, we have the evidence that the human mind has a potential quality which, by sheer weight of definition, is not a product of its biology as we define biology today, but the "tuning" of the human form of thinking to agreement with cognitive powers which have never been shown to exist in lower forms of life. Yet, as is shown by the growth of the Noösphere, relative to the Biosphere, this power of the human mind is fully efficient within our universe.

As Nicholas of Cusa presented the case, as our Creator of the universe is to man, so man mimics that Creator in man's spiritual power over, and obligation to caring for dogs.

The more modest point to be proffered in this context, is the evidence that the universe is intrinsically anti-entropic, and that the obligation which mankind must meet if mankind is to survive, is to act in the way the Creator of our universe has governed. We are properly "tuned" to be creatures devoted to the service of anti-entropy, such that those who express a contrary view, such as the Malthusians and former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore today, are therefore evil in what they do in service of entropy.

With respect to the great question which has been the subject of my report here, we are in a predicament with practical implications like those confronted by Louis Pasteur on the matter of life. We do not have the true solution; but, we must not avoid the implications for the present practice of science, of the unanswered, stubbornly persisting question which it would be incompetence to avoid. In science, until we pose the question, as I have proposed we do here, we will never begin to discover the answer.

Fermat and Least-Time

Descartes Did Not See the Light

by Jason Ross,
LaRouche Youth Movement

In early 1637, René Descartes submitted a copy of his *Dioptrique* for publication. In it, Descartes (1596-1650) announced his formulation of the laws of reflection and refraction, using analogies of moving balls, the walking stick of a blind man, and wine grapes being trampled in a vat, to make his meaning clear. (He mentioned no actual experiments with light, however.) With ballistic analogies, he made the case for the equality of angles in reflection. The case of refraction was more difficult, requiring the motion of a ball to make one part of his demonstration, and the blind man's walking-stick, to solidly prove that light moves more forcefully in water than in air, and then using the example of wine dripping out of a vat, to sketch out the instantaneous motion of light, notwithstanding the different vigors of motion that it had in different media. He even refers in one diagram (by means of analogy, perhaps) to a tennis racket appearing from nowhere to hit the ball downwards as it reaches the surface of water, to explain its increased vigor in the water after moving through air. From these bizarre reasonings come the law of refraction: The sines of the angles of incidence and refraction are proportional to the different ease of light's passage through the two media.

A copy of this masterpiece was given to M. Beaugrand, the King's Secretary, who was in charge of approving all books for publication. Sometime in the Spring, Beaugrand "borrowed" Descartes' writing, and passed it around. Fermat (1601-65) was one of the beneficiaries (if you can call it that) of Beaugrand's kindness, and in September, shortly after receiving the *Dioptrique*, Fermat wrote a letter to Mersenne to tell him what he thought about the work. (If you read it, you may wonder if Fermat is being coy by expressing reservations about Descartes without expounding his own idea of light taking the least time. The simple explanation is that Fermat was not born with that discovery, and would not make it for another two decades.) Descartes responded to Fermat via Mersenne. Fermat wrote one more letter to Descartes, which was the last letter between the two of them dealing primarily with light, although a major dispute over Fermat's *Method of Maxima and Minima* was about to begin. Three letters of this time



Pierre de Fermat's (right) "new idea"—that shortest time, rather than shortest distance—was the principle at work in the refraction of light, overturned Descartes' (left) "ballistic" explanation.

period offer short remarks between the two men on the subject of refraction.

A New Idea

In 1657, Marin Cureau de la Chambre wrote a book titled, simply, *Light*, which he sent to Fermat to read. In this book, de la Chambre states his disagreement with those who seek to explain the motion of light ballistically (as Descartes does), saying instead that in the case of reflection, equal angles are not made due to some principle that creates equal angles as such, but rather because nature does everything by the simplest means, and that the equality of angles in reflection was merely a necessary result of light taking the simplest (shortest) path. He gives a geometric proof, like that of Heron of Alexandria, that least-distance results in equal angles. He was stumped, however, on the question of refraction, which violated this law of shortest distance, a violation that de la Chambre attributed to all that pesky material in the medium, preventing light from having "liberty" to move in the shortest distance. Fermat soon wrote back to de la Chambre, telling him that he was in agreement that nature takes the simplest means to achieve its ends, but that distance should be considered only when time is not a consideration. But since light takes time to travel, the path of effort must include the amount of time required to traverse that path. Shortest time, rather than shortest distance, was the principle at work!

Now, although Fermat felt confident that his hypothesis was correct, he was troubled by the fact that experiments performed by one M. Petit, among others, had repeatedly

confirmed the ratio of sines that Descartes had expounded as the law of refractions. Also, the calculations required to determine the actual angles that would result from his principle—calculations made according to his method of *Maxima and Minima*—would be rather involved. Amazingly, it took almost half a decade before he performed the necessary calculations!


In the meantime, he got into a protracted dispute with Claude Clerselier, the head Cartesian and publisher of the works of the then-deceased Descartes. Clerselier's initial letter to Fermat is, unfortunately, lost. Fermat's first two letters to Clerselier, written in 1658, go after the axioms underlying Descartes' demonstrations—the separation of what Descartes calls the "determination" to move from

motion itself, and then the out-of-the-blue physical ideas that Descartes draws upon to make his conclusion work. Clerselier's response contains a defense of the skeptic that Fermat used in his last letter, a defense which rests on using the (actually non-existent) distinction between movement and the determination to move. Clerselier's friend, an M. Rohault, also responds to the letter Fermat wrote to Descartes in December 1637, in a remarkably condescending letter.

After this initial bout, another round commenced, with Fermat writing two letters. In the first, a masterpiece of Socratic reasoning, Fermat combines the assumptions Descartes uses in reflection with the different assumptions he uses to explain refraction, to create two paradoxes: reflection occurring at unequal angles, and a case of refraction where light (or Descartes' ball) literally gets stuck when it encounters the new medium, requiring a "passport" to be given it by the friends of Descartes so that it may leave this "fatal point." He is quite blunt in the second letter, resolving the problems he had made for the ball in his previous letter by saying that a moving ball and the refraction of light "only resemble each other in the imaginary comparison of M. Descartes," and that the only geometric result of Descartes's composition of motions is a "dialectic circle."

Clerselier flips his wig when he receives these Fermat's letters, and makes an exhaustive response, in which he accuses Fermat of making ridiculous assumptions (Fermat had assumed that a ball could lose half its speed when it encounters a surface just as easily as, in Descartes's thinking,

FIGURE 1



Fermat concluded that for light to move in the least time, the sines of the angles of incidence and refraction must be in the same ratio as the speed of light in the two media!

its speed could be increased when it enters a new medium by an imaginary tennis racket hitting it!), and that he should not “marvel [that] from an assumed impossibility an absurdity follows.” Further, whenever people doubt Descartes, they should assume that they are wrong and work harder to understand the meaning of the Master!

A Coincidence of Opposites

After prompting by others, and after considering that Descartes’ formula could give results very near the true principle without actually coinciding with it, Fermat finally screws up his courage and delves into the equations. They really aren’t all that bad, which he realizes when he gets into the work of calculating. He was shocked to find that his principle of shortest time resulted in exactly the formula that Descartes had published almost 25 years earlier: Fermat concluded that for light to move in the least time, the sines of the angles of incidence and refraction must be in the same ratio as the speed of light in the two media! He excitedly wrote to de la Chambre again, on New Year’s Day, 1662, giving an account of his discovery. He likens Descartes’ “discovery” to the surrender of a fortified location to an enemy, based solely on his reputation: Nature surrendered her principle to Descartes without ever being forced to by any demonstration on the

part of Descartes: such is the power of the reputation of M. Descartes!¹

M. de la Chambre had not yet accepted that light could take time to travel, and Fermat makes another appeal to him at the end of the letter, including another way to think about the resistance light encounters in its travel, even if de la Chambre insists on thinking that it moves in an instant. The demonstration that Fermat attached to his letter to de la Chambre was printed in the *Works of Fermat*, as part of his writing on *Maxima and Minima*, as the penultimate section.

Clerselier throws a tantrum at this insult, writing a scathing letter in which he huffs that Fermat’s principle “is merely moral, not physical,” and cannot be the cause for anything. He blusters that Fermat’s idea that light moves more quickly in air than in water is wrong, citing an experiment that Clerselier clearly never performed of throwing a rock into a pond. His roasting letter even insults Fermat in Latin, something for which he is forced to apologize in a later, somewhat conciliatory letter. Clerselier has lost, and he knows it. Fermat’s last letter to Clerselier is quite short—and he says that he will give up the fight for physics, if he may only be left with his “pure and abstract” geometric proof. His last writings indicate that he is not really sincere about giving up.

Posterity

The last piece of Fermat’s correspondence found in the *Works* was written in 1664 to an unknown person, for whom Fermat summarizes the entire history of his thoughts on refraction, and includes a demonstration of the truth of his principle. It is remarkable that two people setting out on completely opposite paths should arrive at the same truth: Descartes had assumed light to move more easily in water, while Fermat believed it to have greater facility of motion in air. The Cartesians should be content with splitting the victory: Descartes discovered the formula, and Fermat proved that it is actually true! He writes that although “the opinion of M. Descartes on the proportion of refractions is quite true. . . . His demonstration is quite false, and full of paralogisms!” Parodying a criticism Clerselier had made of him: that Nature could not take the time to think about and decide between two easy paths—one of shortest distance and one of shortest time—Fermat writes to future generations that it will be up to posterity to judge between Descartes’ path to knowledge and his own.

Translations of all the sources referenced in this article, as well as more about Fermat, are available at: www.wlym.com.

1. In section 22 of his *Discourse on Metaphysics*, G.W. Leibniz considers whether Descartes ever could have gotten the law of refraction from his way of thinking, and asks whether Descartes learned the ratio from Snel in Holland.

World War III Has Begun!

Those who are waiting for the next war to start—just like those who are waiting for the election—are dooming humanity to destruction. The British Empire has already started World War III.

Look at the situation in Africa, the Middle East, the destabilization targeting China. These are already acts of war, carried out by direct British pawns, and aimed at the total destruction of the nations under assault. Even more direct is the warfare being led by the British, and NATO, against Russia, with a policy of encirclement and provocation that can't be missed.

Are these situations in which any sane person would want to wait for the outright shooting war to start? Back in 2002-03, we already warned that an attack against Iraq, orchestrated, you will recall, by the British imperialist Tony Blair, would lead to a clash of civilizations between the aggressors, and the Muslim world. Those who thought the U.S. and Britain were just starting a war against Iraq were insane! A process was unleashed, which becomes harder and harder to stop.

We are now in a new phase of this war process. The same British imperial forces who launched that armed conflict are more desperate than ever, because their financial system has crashed. They *insist* that the war which they launched against the Muslim world then, now be extended to the Chinese, to the Russians—in fact, to every nation state with the determination, and significant degree of power, to defend its sovereignty, and challenge the empire. They are pursuing *world* war, a war that, unless stopped, will devastate all humanity for generations to come.

A look at the confrontation being pursued against Russia should further illuminate the nature, and stakes, in this war. With the expansion of NATO, the promotion of separatism, the determination to deploy missile “defenses” which could knock out Russian defenses, and the threatened assault on Russia's close allies in Southwest Asia, like Syria and Iran, the world's second greatest nuclear power is being put in an extremely critical strategic situation. What would one expect the Russian government to do?

Fools will say that, with the replacement of President Putin by the allegedly more “liberal” Medvedev, the Russians will fail to take harsh action to confront the aggressors. Don't believe them. Strategic analyst Lyndon LaRouche, who knows the Russian mind intimately over the last decades, has concluded that the continued British imperial thrust will force the Russians into launching global irregular warfare of their own. By its very nature, irregular war is not limited to the battlefield, or a variety of places “over there.” It is coming to our own front door.

LaRouche is not exaggerating in the slightest when he says that World War III has already been declared—and is underway.

There is yet another aspect of the British global war that should arouse the passion of every true American patriot. The crucial nation-state which the British imperialists are determined to destroy is none other than the United States! This is true with military and economic policy. For example, the United States is as much the target in the war against Iraq as is Iraq; look at the destruction of the U.S. military. Even more crucial is the British deployment to destroy the United States economically and culturally, through the manipulation of a whole passel of dupes and agents who are determining our economic policies.

The British hand is everywhere you look. It is a *British* free trade policy that has destroyed our manufacturing, and our currency. It is a *British* cheap labor policy which is destroying our productive labor force. It is a *British* cultural policy which is turning our educational systems into means for destroying the minds of young children, through video games and other anti-human measures.

As the one nation on this planet that has defeated the British Empire, the United States has the cultural, as well as material, means to destroy the current British onslaught against the world's nation-states, and populations. We are the *only* nation which can effectively stop the war—by organizing the alternative solution, a revival of FDR policies and the New Bretton Woods.

Patriots, arise! Crush the British Empire!

See LaRouche on Cable TV

INTERNET

- LAROCHEPUB.COM Click *LaRouche's Writings*. (Avail. 24/7)
- MNN.ORG Click *Watch Ch.57* Fri: 2:30 a.m.
- RAVITELVISION.COM Click *Live Stream*. Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- SCAN-TV.ORG Click *Scan on the Web*. Sat 2 pm Pac
- WUWF.ORG Click *Watch WUWF-TV*. Last Mon 4:30-5 pm (Eastern)

ALABAMA

- BIRMINGHAM BH Ch.4: Wed 11 pm
- UNIONTOWN GY Ch.2: Mon-Fri every 4 hours; Sun Afternoons

ALASKA

- ANCHORAGE GCI Ch.9: Thu 10 pm

CALIFORNIA

- BEVERLY HILLS TW Ch.43: Wed 4 pm
- CLAYTON/CONCORD CO Ch.26: 2nd Tue 7 pm; AS Ch.31: Tue 7:30 pm
- CONTRA COSTA CC Ch.26: 2nd Tue 7 pm
- COSTA MESA TW Ch.35: Thu 5:30 pm
- HOLLYWOOD TW Ch.24: Tue 4:30-5 pm
- LANCASTER/PALMDALE TW Ch.36: Sun 1 pm
- LONG BEACH CH Analog Ch.65/69 & Digital Ch.95: 4th Tue 1-1:30 pm
- LOS ANGELES TW Ch.98: Wed 3-3:30 pm
- LOS ANGELES (East) TW Ch.98: Mon 2 pm
- MARINA DEL REY TW Ch.98: Wed 3 pm; Thu/Fri 4 pm
- MIDWILSHIRE TW Ch.24: Tue 4:30-5 pm
- ORANGE COUNTY (N) TW Ch.95/97/98: Fri 4 pm
- SAN FDO. VALLEY (East) TW Ch.25: Sun 5:30 pm
- SAN FDO. VALLEY (NE) CC Ch.20: Wed 4 pm
- SAN FDO. VALLEY (West) TW Ch.34: Wed 5:30 pm
- SANTA MONICA TW Ch.77: Wed 3-3:30 pm
- WALNUT CREEK CO Ch.6: 2nd Tue 7 pm; AS Ch.31: Tue 7:30 pm
- VAN NUYS TW Ch.25: Sun 5:30 pm

COLORADO

- DENVER CC Ch.56 Sun 10 am

CONNECTICUT

- GROTON CC Ch.12: Mon 5 pm
- NEW HAVEN CC Ch. 23: Sat 6 pm

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- WASHINGTON CC Ch.95 & RCN Ch.10: Irregular Days/Times

FLORIDA

- ESCAMBIA COUNTY CX Ch.4: Last Sat 4:30 pm

ILLINOIS

- CHICAGO CC./RCN/WOW Ch.21: Irregular
- PEORIA COUNTY IN Ch.22: Sun 7:30 pm

- QUAD CITIES MC Ch.19: Thu 11 pm
- ROCKFORD CC Ch.17 Wed 9 pm

IOWA

- QUAD CITIES MC Ch.19: Thu 11 pm

KENTUCKY

- BOONE/KENTON COUNTIES IN Ch.21: Sun 1 am; Fri Midnight
- JEFFERSON COUNTY IN Ch.98: Fri 2-2:30 pm

LOUISIANA

- ORLEANS PARISH CX Ch.78: Tue 4 am & 4 pm

MAINE

- PORTLAND TW Ch.2: Mon 1 & 11 am; 5 pm

MARYLAND

- ANN ARUNDEL Annapolis Ch.76 & Milleneum Ch.99: Sat/Sun 12:30 am; Tue 6:30 pm
- P.G. COUNTY CC Ch.76 & FIOS Ch.38: Tue/Thu 11:30 am
- MONTGOMERY COUNTY CC Ch.21: Tue 2 pm & Fri 11 pm

MASSACHUSETTS

- BRAINTREE CC Ch.31 & BD Ch.16: Tue 8 pm
- BROOKLINE CV & RCN Ch.3: Mon 3:30 pm; Tue 3:30 am; Wed 9 am & 9 pm;
- CAMBRIDGE CC Ch.10: Tue 2:30 pm; Fri 10:30 am
- FRANKLIN COUNTY (NE) CC Ch.17: Sun 8 pm; Wed 9 pm; Sat 4 pm
- QUINCY CC Ch.8: Pop-ins.
- WALPOLE CC Ch.8: Tue 1 pm

MICHIGAN

- BYRON CENTER CC Ch.25: Mon 2 & 7 pm
- DETROIT CC Ch.68: Irregular
- GRAND RAPIDS CC Ch.25: Irreg.
- KALAMAZOO CH Ch.20: Tue 11 pm; Sat 10 am
- KENT COUNTY (North) CH Ch.22: Wed 3:30 & 11 pm
- KENT COUNTY (South) CC Ch.25: Wed 9:30 am
- LAKE ORION CC Ch.10: Mon/Tue 2 & 9 pm
- LANSING CC Ch.16: Fri Noon.
- LIVONIA BH Ch.12: Thu 3 pm
- MT. PLEASANT CH Ch.3: Tue 5:30 pm; Wed 7 am
- PORTAGE CH Ch.20 Tue/Wed 8:30 am; Thu 1:30 pm
- SHELBY TOWNSHIP CC Ch.20 & WOW Ch.18: Mon/Wed 6:30 pm
- WAYNE COUNTY CC Ch.16/18: Mon 6-8 pm

MINNESOTA

- CAMBRIDGE US Ch.10: Wed 6 pm
- COLD SPRING US Ch. 10: Wed 6 pm
- COLUMBIA HEIGHTS CC Ch.15: Wed 8 pm
- DULUTH CH Ch.20: Mon 9 pm; Wed 12 pm, Fri 1 pm
- MARSHALL Prairie Wave & CH Ch.35/8: Sat. 9 am
- MINNEAPOLIS TW Ch.16: Tue 11 pm
- MINNEAPOLIS (N. Burbs) CC Ch.15: Thu 3 & 9 pm

- NEW ULM TW Ch. 14: Fri 5 pm
- PROCTOR MC Ch. 12: Tue 5 pm to 1 am
- ST. CLOUD AREA CH Ch.12: Mon 9:30 pm
- ST. CROIX VALLEY CC Ch.14: Thu 1 & 7 pm; Fri 9 am
- ST. LOUIS PARK CC Ch.15: Sat/Sun/M/T Midnite, 8 am, 4 pm
- ST. PAUL CC Ch.15: Mon 10 pm
- ST. PAUL (S&W Burbs) CC Ch.15: Wed 10:30 am; Fri 7:30 pm
- SAULK CENTRE SCTV Ch.19: Sat 5 pm
- WASHINGTON COUNTY (South) CC Ch.14: Thu 8 pm

NEVADA

- WASHOE COUNTY CH Ch.16: Thu 2 pm

NEW HAMPSHIRE

- MANCHESTER CC Ch.23: Thu 4:30 pm

NEW JERSEY

- BERGEN CTY TW Ch.572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- HADDON TWP CC Ch.9: Sun 10 am
- MERCER COUNTY CC Trenton Ch.26: 3rd & 4th Fri 6 pm Windsors Ch.27: Mon 5:30 pm
- MONTVALE/MAHWAH CV Ch.76: Mon 5 pm
- PISCATAWAY CV Ch.22: Thu 11:30 pm
- UNION CC Ch.26: Irregular

NEW MEXICO

- ALBUQUERQUE CC Ch.27: Thu 4 pm
- LOS ALAMOS CC Ch.8: Wed 10 pm
- SANTA FE CC Ch.8: Thu 9 pm; Sat 6:30 pm
- SILVER CITY CC Ch.17: Daily 8-10 pm

NEW YORK

- ALBANY TW Ch.18: Wed 5 pm. TW Ch.572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- BETHLEHEM TW Ch.18: Thu 9:30 pm
- BRONX CV Ch.70: Wed 7:30 am
- BROOKLYN CV Ch.68: Mon 10 am TW Ch.35: Mon 10 am TW Ch.572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- CHEMUNG TW Ch.1/99: Tue 7:30 pm
- ERIE COUNTY TW Ch.20: Thu 10:35 pm
- IRONDEQUOIT TW Ch.15: Mon/Thu 7 pm
- JEFFERSON/LEWIS COUNTIES TW Ch.99: Irregular
- MANHATTAN TW & RCN Ch.57/85 Fri 2:30 am
- ONEIDA COUNTY TW Ch.99: Thu 8 or 9 pm
- PENFIELD TW Ch.15: Irregular
- QUEENS TW Ch.35: Tue 10:30 am; TW Ch.572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- QUEENSBURY TW Ch.71: Mon 7 pm
- ROCHESTER TW Ch.15: Sun 9 pm; Thu 8 pm
- ROCKLAND CV Ch.76: Mon 5 pm

- SCHENECTADY TW Ch.16: Fri 1 pm; Sat 1:30 am
- STATEN ISLAND TW Ch.35: Thu Midnite. Ch.34: Sat 8 am. Ch 572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- TOMPKINS COUNTY TW Ch.13: Sun 12:30 pm; Sat 6 pm
- TRI-LAKES TW Ch.2: Sun 7 am, 1 pm, 8 pm
- WEBSTER TW Ch.12: Wed 9 pm

NORTH CAROLINA

- HICKORY CH Ch.3: Tue 10 pm
- MECKLENBURG COUNTY TW Ch.22: Sat/Sun 11 pm

OHIO

- AMHERST TW Ch.95: Daily 12 Noon & 10 pm
- CUYAHOGA COUNTY TW Ch.21: Wed 3:30 pm
- OBERLIN Cable Co-Op Ch.9: Thu 8 pm

OKLAHOMA

- NORMAN CX Ch.20: Wed 9 pm

OREGON

- LINN/BENTON COUNTIES CC Ch.29: Tue 1 pm; Thu 9 pm
- PORTLAND CC Ch.22: Tue 6 pm. Ch.23: Thu 3 pm

RHODE ISLAND

- E. PROVIDENCE CX Ch.18: Tue 6:30 pm
- STATEWIDE RI I CX Ch.13 Tue 10 pm

TEXAS

- HOUSTON CC Ch.17 & TV Max Ch.95: Wed 5:30 pm; Sat 9 am
- KINGWOOD CB Ch.98: Wed 5:30 pm; Sat 9 am

VERMONT

- GREATER FALLS CC Ch.10: Mon/Wed/Fri 1 pm
- MONTPELIER CC Ch.15: Tue 9 pm; Wed 3 pm

VIRGINIA

- ALBEMARLE COUNTY CC Ch.13: Sun 4 am; Fri 3 pm
- ARLINGTON CC Ch.33 & FIOS Ch.38: Mon 1 pm; Tue 9 am
- CHESTERFIELD COUNTY CC Ch.6: Tue 5 pm
- FAIRFAX CX Ch.10 & FIOS Ch.10: 1st & 2nd Wed 1 pm; Sun 4 am. FIOS Ch.41: Wed 6 pm
- LOUDOUN COUNTY CC Ch.98 & FIOS Ch.41: Wed 6 pm
- ROANOKE COUNTY CX Ch.78: Tue 7 pm; Thu 2 pm

WASHINGTON

- KING COUNTY CC Ch.29/77: Tue 10 am
- TRI CITIES CH Ch. 13/99: Mon 7 pm; Thu 9 pm
- WENATCHEE CH Ch.98: Thu 1 pm

WISCONSIN

- MARATHON CH Ch.10: Thu 9:30 pm; Fri 12 Noon
- MUSKEGO TW Ch.14: Sat 4 pm; Sun 7 am

WYOMING

- GILLETTE BR Ch.31: Tue 7


M50 Codes: AS=Astound; BD=Beld; BR=Bresnan; BH=BrightHouse; CV=Cablevision; CB=Cebridge; CH=Charter; CC=Comcast; CX=Cox; GY=Galaxy; IN=Insight; MC=MediaCom; TW=TimeWarner; US=US Cable. FIOS=Verizon FIOS-TV.

To get The LaRouche Connection on your local cable TV system, call Charles Notley at 703-777-9451, Ext. 322. For more information, visit our Website at <http://www.larouchepub.com/tv>.

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online



EIR Online gives subscribers one of the most valuable publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today. Through this publication and the sharp interventions of the LaRouche Youth Movement, we are changing politics in Washington, day by day.

EIR Online

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



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

(e-mail address must be provided.)

- \$360** for one year
 - \$180** for six months
 - \$120** for four months
 - \$90** for three months
 - \$60** for two months
- Send information on receiving **EIR** by mail.

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

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

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

Name _____
 Company _____
 Address _____
 City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____
 Phone (_____) _____
 E-mail address _____

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order
 Make checks payable to
EIR News Service Inc.
 P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
 Please charge my MasterCard Visa
 Card Number _____
 Signature _____
 Expiration Date _____