

EIR


Executive Intelligence Review

July 2, 2010 Vol. 37 No. 26

www.larouche.com \$10.00

Extraordinary International Dialogue with LaRouche
Gulf Crisis: Priority Is To Study Nuclear Option
Financial Reform Bill Is a Sellout to Wall Street

**LaRouche: We Have To
Change the Forecast!**



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 Editors: Bonnie James, Susan Welsh

Science Editor: Marjorie Mazel Hecht

Technology Editor: Marsha Freeman

Book Editor: Katherine Notley

Graphics Editor: Alan Yue

Photo Editor: Stuart Lewis

Circulation Manager: Stanley Ezrol

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Counterintelligence: Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele
Steinberg

Economics: John Hoefle, Marcia Merry Baker,
Paul Gallagher

History: Anton Chaitkin

Ibero-America: Dennis Small

Law: Edward Spannaus

Russia and Eastern Europe: Rachel Douglas

United States: Debra Freeman

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Bogotá: Javier Almarino

Berlin: Rainer Apel

Copenhagen: Tom Gillesberg

Houston: Harley Schlanger

Lima: Sara Madueño

Melbourne: Robert Barwick

Mexico City: Rubén Cota Meza

New Delhi: Ramtanu Maitra

Paris: Christine Bierre

Stockholm: Hussein Askary

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

Washington, D.C.: William Jones

Wiesbaden: Göran Haglund

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirns@larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Webmaster: John Sigerson

Assistant Webmaster: George Hollis

Editor, Arabic-language edition: Hussein Askary

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly (50
issues), by EIR News Service, Inc., 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: ©2010 EIR News Service. All rights
reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without
permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement
#40683579

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

EIR

From the Managing Editor

Most of you have no doubt watched, or read transcripts of Lyndon LaRouche's webcasts, of which there were an incredible 11 last year, and four, so far this year. Since January 2009, they have included extended dialogues with some of the brightest thinkers among the political and economic intelligentsia in the United States, often referred to, collectively, as the "Stanford Group." You have probably wondered about them, and wanted to know more about what they are thinking and doing, and what their relationship to LaRouche really is.

Well, you are about to get a much clearer idea about that, in our *Feature* this week, "An Extraordinary Dialogue with Lyndon LaRouche." While the April 29 seminar was convened as a private discussion, there was agreement among the participants that, given the gravity of the current global financial and economic crisis, and LaRouche's unique role in providing solutions, it was of the greatest urgency that they be made publicly available. And so, we have done.

Also, from LaRouche this week, our *Cover Story*: an address to a private luncheon in Washington, D.C., in which the best economic forecaster on the planet warned that the United States and the world are *doomed*, as long as we continue under the present U.S. and global system; therefore, the solution is: "We have to change the forecast!"

Changing the forecast means, above all, at this time, dumping Obama: Until he goes, we cannot make the shift that has to be made; witness, the quagmire in Afghanistan. Ramtanu Maitra looks at the deeper questions raised by the cashiering of General McChrystal, and asks: "Does President Obama Need a Hearing Aid?" (*International*).

The bill of indictment is further elaborated by Jeffrey Steinberg in "Obama Must Go! Dodd-Frank Bill Is a Sellout to Wall Street" (*National*). Further evidence is presented in our coverage of Kesha Rogers' Texas Congressional campaign; and in *Economics*: why a peaceful nuclear explosion is now the only solution to the growing tragedy in the Gulf of Mexico.

Over the July 4th holiday, we will be putting together a special double issue of *EIR* (dated July 16), featuring the transcript of LaRouche's June 26 webcast, and his new paper, "This Present Century: The Secret Economy's Outlook."



Cover This Week

Lyndon LaRouche addresses a June 26, 2010 webcast from Northern Virginia.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

4 LaRouche: We Have To Change the Forecast!

Remarks by Lyndon LaRouche to a private meeting in Washington, D.C., on June 23. “What we’re looking at,” he said, “is the threat of a general breakdown crisis of the trans-Atlantic economies. It will be centered in Europe. If the current President of the United States remains in office during this period, it will be a disaster here. And a disaster in the trans-Atlantic region, particularly, the north trans-Atlantic region, will have obviously devastating impact not only in the trans-Atlantic region, but a collapse of the trans-Atlantic region will mean a collapse also in the Pacific region.” What can prevent such a disaster? “What is required, without which we’re not going to get out of this thing, is a general change in the world economy, by putting the world economy, starting with the trans-Atlantic region, into bankruptcy reorganization.”

International

12 Afghan Fiasco: Does President Obama Need a Hearing Aid?

The sacking of Gen. Stanley McChrystal does not signify any change in U.S. policy. That means the grinding war will continue, leading to further destruction of the U.S. military, yielding nothing but more opium from the fields of Afghanistan, and fattening the wallets of City of London and Wall Street bankers.

15 LaRouche: Wipe Out the Afghan Opium Trade

National

16 Obama Must Go! Dodd-Frank 'Financial Reform' Bill Is a Sellout to Wall Street

The efforts by a handful of Congressmen and Senators to restore the Glass-Steagall law was killed by Sen. Christopher Dodd and Rep. Barney Frank before the Senate and House bills were voted on. Dodd and Frank had the full backing of President Obama and his economic team.

18 From the Senate: Obama Is a Liar

20 Rogers Campaign Shows Texas Dems the Future: And It Isn't Obama!

Economics

22 Crisis in the Gulf: Serious Study of Nuclear Option Is Highest Priority

Serious consideration for the design and deployment of a peaceful nuclear explosive to seal the BP oil well is currently mandatory.

26 Sealing the BP Well: Expert Explains Use of Nuclear Device

From an interview by LPACTV with nuclear physicist Dr. Milo D. Nordyke. He is the leading U.S. expert on peaceful nuclear explosions, scientist emeritus of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and a veteran of the Operation Plowshare program for the peaceful use of nuclear explosions.

Feature

28 An Extraordinary International Dialogue with Lyndon LaRouche

On April 29, Lyndon LaRouche engaged in this fascinating conversation with a group that had gathered in New York to discuss various elements of LaRouche's proposed Four-Power Agreement and related issues. The group was comprised of policy-makers as well as academicians from Stanford University, University of California at Berkeley, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton University, and Columbia University. Representatives from Russia, China, and India also participated. A number of journalists were also invited to audit the proceedings, although they did not have speaking rights.

Editorial

48 Who Will Stand Up Against Obama?

LaRouche: We Have To Change the Forecast!

Lyndon LaRouche made the following remarks to a private meeting in Washington, D.C., on June 23.

Well, there are two events, recent historical events, which are significant for any discussion of policy today. First, we've had the breakdown of the international economy, especially, the trans-Atlantic region, is now fully underway. So that these are not easy times. The financial crisis, the breakdown, is going to hit now, and during the early Summer.

What we're looking at is the threat of a general breakdown crisis of the trans-Atlantic economies. It will be centered in Europe. If the current President of the United States remains in office during this period, it will be a disaster here. And a disaster in the trans-Atlantic region, particularly, the north trans-Atlantic region, will have obviously devastating impact not only in the trans-Atlantic region, but a collapse of the trans-Atlantic region will mean a collapse also in the Pacific region.

So, this is now an immediate reality. And only corrective policies will prevent this reality from becoming realized.

What is required, without which we're not going to get out of this thing, is a general change in the world economy, by putting the world economy, starting with the trans-Atlantic region, into bankruptcy reorganization.

Now, what I've proposed on this, for some time, is, I propose that the United States must have a new policy,

a policy which obviously will not occur under this President. But this President, as I shall explain, is not necessarily going to remain President for many more weeks. He's on the countdown to being a non-President. And the question is, what are we going to replace him with. That's crucial.

In Europe, the euro-system is disintegrating. It is doomed. It can not be salvaged in its present form. And the basic problem on these financial problems, is that we've gone through a change in policy in the United States, since 1968, and 1971, in which a corresponding policy was set forth in Britain, under Lord Jacob Rothschild, which became the Inter-Alpha Group. The Inter-Alpha Group of banking, which is British-controlled, nominally Rothschild, controls most of the finances of the trans-Atlantic region, directly or indirectly.

For example, the case of Brazil: Brazil is controlled by the Rothschild group. Brazil is controlled by a highly inflationary policy, on derivatives policy, which is going to rise rapidly, and a collapse of the Brazil relationship, through the Santander bank, which has a Brazilian division, will set off a general chain-reaction collapse in that region. These are the kinds of conditions that exist.

There is a solution, and the solution dates back to the concept of Franklin Roosevelt, President Franklin Roosevelt. By putting the world, or a good part of it, through financial reorganization, on an emergency basis, we can stop the general collapse of the world economy, which is now in process.



Wikimedia Commons/John Burke

Afghan tribal chieftains and a British Political Officer (center right, without headdress) at the Khyber Pass in 1878, during the Second Anglo-Afghan War (1878-80). Afghanistan has been at the center of the British manipulation—the “Great Game” in Asia—for centuries.



Zbigniew Brzezinski, National Security Advisor to President Jimmy Carter, visits Pakistan in 1980. The Soviets had invaded Afghanistan in December 1979, and Brzezinski initiated the deployment of mujahideen to create an “Arc of Crisis” along the U.S.S.R.’s southern flank—a “long war” policy that continued through the Reagan Administration.



DoD/Cpl. Lindsay L. Sayres, USMC

U.S. Marines patrol alongside an opium poppy field in Boldak, Afghanistan, April 5, 2010. President Obama and the British have expressly forbidden the military to destroy the opium crops and processing plants.

The Political Doom of President Obama

Now, to indicate one of the factors here which is relevant: On the 11th of April of last year, I delivered an international webcast in which I laid out the inherent doom of President Barack Obama, that is, the political doom of him. And I did it on the basis of defining his character, his personal character, as that of a modern

imitation of the Emperor Nero. And I focussed that on his health-care policy, as a leading element in his policy.

Now, we’ve come to the point where, inside the United States, at present, there has been, for over a year, among the lower-income brackets, including middle-income brackets in the United States, there has been a galloping breakdown, centered upon a health-care

policy of this President. But other things that correlate with that.

Now the thing has reached the point where the breakdown is imminent. It could happen within the remaining days of this month. It could happen during the early part of July. But we’re presently on the verge of that.

Now, what I want to do is explain something which is fairly important, but it's probably not well known.

Usually, today, people, including leading political circles, assume that the destiny of nations is based on events. In other words, the idea that the occurrence of certain events, or non-occurrence of those events, determine the fate of nations. This is not true. We think back in history, that the great crises that strike nations, had been building up for a period of time, and they were building up, because there was a continuity of a certain trend in *policy*. And so when the crisis broke, when the great events broke, they broke as a symptom of these kinds of policies, over a longer period.

For example, you could go back, too, in United States history. The crucial event in the postwar period, or before, was the death of Franklin Roosevelt. With the death of Franklin Roosevelt, especially with the conclusion of the war, in August of that year, there was a fundamental change in U.S. policy, a very sharp change, from Franklin Roosevelt to Harry Truman. Harry Truman was a British asset, a British-Wall Street asset, who had gotten in as Vice President for certain reasons. But the death of Roosevelt put the fate of the world, away from the policies of Roosevelt. Roosevelt's policy had been an anti-imperialist policy. The minute the war ended, the United States would move to eliminate all colonialism throughout the world.

The turning point was demonstrated in Indo-China, where the United States forces in Indo-China had supported Ho Chi Minh, and Ho Chi Minh had been an ally of the United States, under President Roosevelt. The OSS was deployed in there to assist this operation. The minute Roosevelt died, the policy changed. British policy, in collaboration with Truman, went to Indo-China, and ordered the release of the Japanese prisoners of war, and re-arming of them to occupy Indo-China. That event was a marker of the entire history of the postwar period.

If you look at the Indo-China War pattern, and what it represents; you look at the fact that President Kennedy had opposed this war, and that Gen. Douglas MacArthur had been his chief advisor on opposing the war. MacArthur's policy and Kennedy's policy were "no land war in Asia." That was the policy. The only way they could change that policy, as long as Kennedy was alive, was to wait for Kennedy's death. And Kennedy's death came on time. And with the death of Kennedy, the policy changed. The policy of going into a long, extended land war in Asia, was launched. And since that

time, on the side of the United States, the United States has been perpetually involved, in one form or the other, in silly, foolish, stupid land wars in Asia!

British Policy: Long Wars

This policy of land wars in Asia is not really new. If you look back in European history, go back to the 1890s. Bismarck had been discharged from the position of Chancellor in Germany. Bismarck in this period, after his discharge, indicated what the British policy was. Now, just to indicate the policy, to illustrate what the kind of problem is that we face today:

Bismarck said, that he'd been fired, *by the British*, by the influence of the British monarchy, through the Prince of Wales, and *he'd been fired because he had operated to prevent Russia and Germany from being involved in a war*, centered on the Balkans. And he made arrangements, secret negotiations, between himself as Chancellor of Germany, and the Tsar of Russia, that there would be no German support for the Austrian Emperor in conducting a war in the Balkans.

So, what they did, the British did, is, they got him out of the position of Chancellor. The policy of Germany changed, and now you had the new nephews of the British Prince of Wales—were now at war with each other! They were cousins. They were at war with each other, under the direction of their uncle, who was the Prince of Wales. And so we had *that* long war, the so-called World War II, which actually started with a war against China by Japan, in 1894 and 1895. And that war of Japan, against designated targets then, continued throughout the period until 1945. The attack on the United States by Japan, was planned in 1922, by the British and the Japanese Emperor.

That war continued until 1945. The war was planned in 1922, with the British, and the actual attack on the United States was launched in 1941, and that war again—a long war.

Now, look at the post-war period. With the death of Roosevelt, we had a long-war policy, in Europe. The long war policy was initiated by Winston Churchill, with the support of his flunky, President Harry Truman. We have been involved, up to the time of the fall of the Wall in Germany, we've been involved in a perpetual state of warfare, throughout the planet, which was launched by Winston Churchill, with the support of Harry Truman, then.

What happened then, the destruction of Germany, which was imposed by the French President, by the

British Prime Minister, and by President George H.W. Bush of the United States, that policy of crushing Germany led to the looting of Russia, and adjoining countries who had been part of the Soviet Union. And that has continued to the present day.

So, the phenomenon we're looking at, is not events. We're looking at policies, strategic policies, and cultural policies, which extend over very large periods of time.

We are now, therefore, as a result of these developments—and actually the final step was the election of this President, who is a British puppet—to speak frankly, there's no way to describe him except that he's a British puppet. And we're in a continuation, for example: the case of the war in Afghanistan.

The war in Afghanistan has been going on since when? Since the British and the Saudi government launched the war in Afghanistan, as a booby-trap for the Soviet Union. That war, which became a drug war, the war which launched the Taliban, had been in progress from that time to the present day. So we have, in Central Asia, that kind of a problem.

So, if you look at the problems we have, the key to understanding these problems is looking at the policy of long warfare, which was British imperial policy, since the victory of the British in 1763, at the Paris Treaty, as a result of the long war, the Seven Years War, so-called, in Europe; where the nations of continental Europe destroyed each other, or weakened each other almost to the point of destruction, and the British Empire was declared by the British East India Company.

Events Do Not Determine History

So, it is not events, as such, that determine the long waves of history. It is actually policies of a type which are historic, and have a historic reach. And the most characteristic of these kinds of destructive policies, is the policy of long wars. Long wars which weaken the adversaries, to the advantage of imperial design. The British Empire was always based, from its emergence as an empire, in February 1763, has always been based on getting the intended victims to engage in wars against one another, and thus to weaken one another to the point, that they became the subjects of imperial control.

The nature of the British Empire is not a political division, in terms of political borders. The British Empire is an empire, and Rosa Luxemburg was right,

and everyone else who talked about imperialism back in the last century was wrong. Imperialism is not based on territorial control, political territorial control. It's based on *financial control*. Just the same way that the British won—Napoleon essentially was a British agent, but didn't know it, because he fought long wars in Europe, throughout Europe, with French forces, which destroyed and weakened all the nations of Europe, from 1782 on, the same pattern, the British pattern, and that's how the British Empire was consolidated, in the 19th Century.

It was the United States, under Lincoln, who, by declaring war against a British agency, the Confederacy, turned the tide. It was not the war that turned the tide, as such. The war was necessary. What turned the tide was the Transcontinental Railway system, and similar kinds of development. It has always been the development of nations, and the development among nations, which has led to peace and growth. And the most convenient way of imperialists, since the Roman Empire, and even earlier, in European history, has been to get long wars—like the Peloponnesian War, for example, in ancient Greece—get the intended victims to engage in long wars against one another, and thus, weaken themselves, and make themselves the prey of financial powers, in the ancient times, maritime empire. Maritime power. And the echoes of that are still today.

Now, this is seen very clearly in the history of the United States recently. That is, in my time, it's recent, since the end of World War II, that we have been destroyed, systematically, by the policies which were introduced. We've been destroyed as if by a certain kind of slow suicide, which took over, actually, with the assassination of Kennedy, and our venture into the war in Indo-China. We've been taken over by long wars.

Therefore, we can not judge history, or we can not forecast the important events in future history, from the standpoint of events. We have to forecast events, from the standpoint of strategic, long-term policy, or the long-term implications of an adopted policy.

Now, the crucial thing in the post-war period, came after 1944. Roosevelt, in 1944, had prescribed two things: a fixed-exchange-rate system for the post-war world. This was the famous Roosevelt system, economic system. The second thing, was that Roosevelt committed the United States to destroy colonialism throughout the world. As Roosevelt said publicly, repeatedly: "Winston, when this war is ended, there are not going to be any more empires. Those people whom

you're holding in bondage, as colonial victims, are going to be freed. We're going to use the vast power of our military power, as an industrial power, to help these people get their own freedom. We're going to have a United Nations of freed and present nations, which will cooperate under treaty relationships, and stable relationships."

Unfortunately, the minute that Franklin Roosevelt died, that policy for the postwar period died. That's the long wave in policy.

The Mass-Strike Movement

Now we've come to a time, where this present system, which is typified as an Anglo-American system—because we have a lot of British agents controlling our Wall Street and similar institutions—where this system either goes, or civilization goes. There is no nation in Europe which is not bankrupt. The United States is bankrupt. Most of the hemispheric nations are really bankrupt. They may be able to hide it by paper, but under pressure, that paper becomes quickly worthless.

We're now approaching a point in the Summer of this year, in which the collapse of that system, is inevitable. However, we could free ourselves from this catastrophe, if we could change the policies.

In the United States presently, we have a mass-strike movement, as Rosa Luxemburg described it, identified the mass strike. A mass-strike movement surfaced in August of last year, with demonstrations, mass demonstrations, against members of the Congress in their own districts. This mass-strike movement, which was then confined to ordinary citizens, has now reached a level recently, according to the poll on the question of Glass-Steagall, of about 78% of the adult voting population, is for Glass-Steagall, and is against the policy of the current President.

That's a mass-strike movement, as described by a number of people.

More recently, we have seen the mass-strike movement move up, from the level of ordinary citizens protesting against the policies of the Obama Administration, to a much more extensive one. You see it expressed in the question of the Afghanistan War issue, in which an unlikely personality for this purpose, a certain general, is now on the hot seat, because he correctly, in a sense—I'm surprised and pleased at the fact that he did it—but he himself has denounced the President's policy of a continuing war in Afghanistan.

Because, what is the Afghanistan War now? It's been going on since Brzezinski launched it. Brzezinski launched the long war in Afghanistan. It's gone on from that time. It has been essentially a drug war. Afghanistan is the principal source of opium transactions throughout the world. And one province in Afghanistan, is the principal source of the opium, and its products, which are running through Eurasia. This is the new British Opium War.

The President of the United States, Barack Obama, is an agent in support of this opium war. He has forbidden the military forces of the United States, involved in Afghanistan, to occupy and destroy the drug fields and the processing plants. That could be done very quickly, in a very simple military operation. You could eliminate that one province, of British-controlled, British-protected operations, which is the source of the opium problem hitting much of Asia, and hitting Europe today.

The Russian government has repeatedly stated that. They are *correct*. You have to deal with these drug wars this way, because you can not survive the toleration of a drug war. Because it destroys the morals and confidence of the people. We've been at this for a long time.

And the British are still pushing drugs. *The Queen of England does push drugs!* She's pushing them, officially, in Afghanistan. Russia is saying, "Free us from this thing. We want a treaty agreement to get these things out of the there." We could get rid of this. We could do it overnight. In 24 hours, with a military operation, we could eliminate the entire opium traffic, or the root of it, in Asia.

Why not? Why are we fighting a war *to defend* the opium interests, which are the British interests? Again: policy.

So, we're in that kind of situation. We're at a breaking point in history.

The Personality of the President

Now, the other side of the breaking point is the personality of the President of the United States. On April 11 of last year, I presented an international webcast, in which the principal subject I addressed, was the health-care policies of the President, that is, the current President, and indicated that his health-care policies were identical with those of Adolf Hitler, the same policies that Adolf Hitler introduced into Europe in 1939, with his initial, what became known as the Holocaust. It was the beginning there.

And the policy of President Obama is identical with that of Adolf Hitler in 1939-1940, which later became known as the Holocaust.

Now, I looked at other aspects of his behavior, and presented them, publicly, in this webcast, last year. He has carried out that policy. All his policy-making has been consistent with that characteristic, up to the present time.


Now, the final blow in this thing, so far, has been a British operation in the Caribbean, where a criminal operation has been run with an oil fraud, run by British Petroleum. With the consent and support of this President.

This oil is now about to come out of the Caribbean area—it's a massive flow, 100-200,000 barrels a day—it's coming out of the Caribbean, and it will go in two directions. One direction, as it comes around Florida, it will go into the Atlantic region. You will get into the current which links to the Gulf Stream. When it hits the Gulf Stream, it will move toward Europe, along the Gulf Stream, at 100 miles a day, and will hit Europe. This thing will destroy fisheries, because oil, in this seawater, along those tracks, will destroy living processes in that area, through de-oxygenation.

The President of the United States refuses to deal with this. This is the end of him. He's actually a supporter of the British monarchy, on these and other policies. He is increasingly hated by the American people. He will not remain President for long. He has now reached the end.

And it's not just this crisis. This petroleum crisis, this British Petroleum crisis, which will not only hit the North Atlantic side, it will hit the South Atlantic side. Because when it goes on the other side of the stream, it will take the currents *down* toward the tip of South America. If it hits the tip of South America, it will come around the tip of South America, and will continue to flow in the Pacific region, and you will have a *global crisis, as long as this particular condition is allowed to continue.*

This idea of these deep-well oil sources—these petroleum sources are a nightmare. There is only one way



NFRI

The high energy-flux-density required to meet the needs of mankind requires nuclear and thermonuclear energy. Shown is the National Fusion Research Institute's KSTAR tokamak research reactor, in Daejeon, South Korea.

that we know of, that we could control the situation, in the way it is defined now: And that is, with a peaceful nuclear explosion.

Now, the Russians, in past times, have conducted experiments with that, in terms of gas wells and so forth, in Russia. The technology is well known, but it's not something you can take off the shelf and apply. You have to prepare an explosive charge, which is planted deep in the system, planted actually in the submarine territory, the sub-sea area. A peaceful nuclear explosion, of proper design, can *compress* the entire plate of that area, and stop the leaks.

Presently, we don't know of any other method that will work. But that can not be done without preparation: You have to design the particular PNE, the particular explosive you're going to use, and the instrumentation by which you're going to place it. The Russians did work with this; there are three cases out of four, where they tried this with gas wells in Siberia, and it succeeded, in three of four cases. We don't know why it did not succeed in the fourth case, but we know that this PNE method does work for this.

Now, in other conditions, there is no need, at present, for anyone to risk deep-well petroleum exploitation. What is needed worldwide, for technical reasons as well as others, is, we need an increase in nuclear and thermonuclear sources of power. Because, in order to

meet the needs of humanity, you must have a source of power, which is called “high energy-flux density,” and which you achieve only with nuclear and thermonuclear forces.

On the other side of nuclear/thermonuclear technology, all the important technologies require very high energy-flux-density, which is general available only with nuclear and thermonuclear power. Therefore, the technologies that are needed, for the successful economic development of the nations of the world, and especially those of Asia: I’ll give you two cases, China and India. China is exemplary. China is working in this direction, which a correct direction. We need nuclear/thermonuclear power: Otherwise, we can not get the energy-flux density *necessary* to develop raw materials in a way required for these nations.

You have in these Asian nations, a population in which, generally, 60-80% are very poor, and live in very poor circumstances. And, while large-scale infrastructure projects in China, and similar things planned in India are useful, you can not really succeed without high energy-flux-density power sources. These sources are, principally, nuclear or thermonuclear. We do have some access to thermonuclear power, now, especially for chemical and related applications.

So, to take the 80% or so, of the *poor people* of Asia, and to uplift them, from these terrible conditions, which *we must do*, if we’re going to develop those nations, the nations which have 80% or so poor, very poor, can not be helped *as nations*, unless we’re prepared to assist these nations in developing power sources, which will enable them to overcome the effects of extreme poverty, which prevails in much of Asia.

So therefore, that should be our policy.

We Can Solve Our Problems

What we have to do, is, realize—again—we have been living in the entire period, especially since the death of Franklin Roosevelt, we’ve been living in a long wave of policies which are influenced by considerations, which are contrary to the welfare of humanity, contrary to what Roosevelt had intended. This has



Creative Commons

Wall Street, said LaRouche, has long been the center of British influence in the United States. We’ve come to a time when this financial system goes, or civilization goes.

produced a failure to meet responsibilities for humanity, during this entire period. We have to change our policy, for humanity. If we change the policy for humanity, instead of repression, selective repression of independence, we can survive, we can solve these problems.

These are things which are my specialty in economics: We could, very easily, under agreement with governments, we could *cancel* most of this debt, which is fraudulent debt. We could go back to a fixed-exchange-rate system among nations. We could generate long-term projects, of two generations or so, which have to be included, in order to change the situation of these populations in these nations. We could do that.

What we need is not an event. We need a change in policy, a change in long-term policy, a policy for development of man’s power *in* our planet, per capita and per square kilometer. We need to have an intelligent approach, to applying that policy to the situation in each nation. We need therefore, a global fixed-exchange-rate system among nations, of the type that Roosevelt had intended. We need long-term credit, especially in support of technologies which are needed for the world at large. We need long-term investment, at low borrowing costs, 1-1.5% per annum, in order to fund the kinds of

projects which can reach to the poorest parts of the world's population, and uplift them, so that in one or two generations, you will have transformed and overcome the great, and worsening poverty, in much of the world today.

So, the issue today is policy, it is not events. It is not news-breaking developments. It's getting the concept of what must be done, particularly at this stage, at this point: Because *we are at the end, of this entire phase of history*. Since the death of Roosevelt, to the present time, is a phase of history. It's a phase of history which has been governed by malice, centered in the British influence in the United States and elsewhere, centered in "Wall Street," as we call it, affectionately.

We change that policy, back to a Roosevelt-oriented policy, a Roosevelt-precedent policy: Set up a fixed-exchange-rate system among nations; create a system of international credit, at low-cost credit, for projects, especially infrastructure and development projects, which are necessary throughout the planet; and providing a system of credit to meet the needs of all the nations of the planet: We can within two generations, succeed, come to the point, that we can say, "The evils of the past period, have been put behind us."

We can make progress immediately—we can make significant progress immediately, just by a change in policy. But we can also have a longer-term, by, in two generations, we can change the general orientation of life on this planet. And that's where we are today.

We Have To Rebuild the World System

But we have to understand, there is no way you can work within the *present system*. As long as you're trying to find a solution by compromises within the terms of the present system, *we are doomed*. The doom will explode, *first*, most probably, in the trans-Atlantic region, in the north trans-Atlantic region: That's the most vulnerable area—the United States and Europe—that's the vulnerable area. But if you collapse the northern trans-Atlantic region, then you will collapse the southern trans-Atlantic region. If you collapse the northern and southern trans-Atlantic regions, you will collapse the Pacific region.

And civilization is plunged into a dark age.

That's the importance of making a distinction between trying to shape events, or interpret events, and applying policy. That's where we are now. We are actually, I can say it with confidence, and I've never been

wrong in a forecast of this type; since 1956, I never made a mistake on forecasting of this type. And that's where we are now.

So therefore, *we have to change the forecast!* Not by changing what we interpret as the forecast, but by changing the intent of the forecast: We need to do what Roosevelt had intended for the post-war period. We have to rebuild the world system, on the basis of a system of sovereign nation-states, which enter into a fixed-exchange-rate credit cooperation, a credit system, with which to organize the financing of the large-scale *infrastructure projects*, of major infrastructure, which will supply the stimulus for the development of industry and agriculture. That's our chance!

If we don't do it, and if we don't do it in these months immediately before us, it won't happen. A catastrophe will happen. And we're on the brink of that catastrophe, right now! It could happen this month, it could happen this weekend. It could happen next month. You can not pick a date, necessarily—sometimes you can pick a date, because there's a crucial event that will give you a date—but you can not forecast, or predict by a statistical forecasting of dates.

We're in a period where the situation is such, *this system, in its present form, is coming down*. The crisis is in the trans-Atlantic region, first the northern trans-Atlantic, then the southern trans-Atlantic. When it hits the trans-Atlantic region, just like the oil crisis we're having now, it will then hit the trans-Pacific region, as opposed to the trans-Atlantic. And then, the whole world is plunged into a dark age.

That's where we stand! That's reality! Guesswork, opinions, don't mean anything! This is reality! And what the enemy will do, as they're doing in Afghanistan, is they will continue the process of promoting long wars, ulcerating wars, pitting nations against nations, rather than cooperation; seeking differences, rather than common interest; seeking short-term popularity, rather than long-term success.

We're at that wonderful time, right now, in history, where if you want real events which shape the history of mankind, and the view of the history of mankind from the past, and into the future, *you are fortunate enough to live in the circumstance, where this decision will be made!*

The question is, who is going to have the power, and conviction, to make that decision?

That's where we stand, today. I'll be dealing with that this weekend.

Does President Obama Need a Hearing Aid?

by Ramtanu Maitra

June 25—On June 23, President Obama summarily dismissed Gen. Stanley McChrystal as the U.S. military chief in Afghanistan following the publication of an article based on an extended interview with him in the counterculture magazine *Rolling Stone*. The article featured disparaging remarks by the general and his fiercely loyal staff about some of Obama's senior civilian advisors and Vice President Joe Biden. McChrystal was replaced by Gen. David Petraeus, the present Centcom chief, as U.S. and NATO commander in Afghanistan.

Upon his appointment of Petraeus, Obama, totally oblivious of the ground situation in Afghanistan, issued a statement, in which he said that the change in command of U.S. troops in Afghanistan would not change the Administration's policy in the war, which will enter a transition phase in 2011. Obama said Petraeus "understands the strategy because he helped shape it," adding, "Right now we're losing the tactical-level fight in the chase for a strategic victory. How long can that be sustained?"

No Change in Policy

The appointment of Petraeus made it evident that the counterinsurgency (COIN) policy being employed in the Afghan War, adopted by the Obama Administration last Fall, which has become as destructive as the failed Vietnam War policy of the last century, will be continued. As one unnamed civilian advisor to the U.S. military in Afghanistan told the *Washington Post* on June 23, "the strategy McChrystal put together is a counterinsurgency strategy, and Petraeus is the godfather of counterinsurgency. It's putting Yoda in charge of running the war," he said, referring to the fictional Jedi master in the "Star Wars" universe.

Simply put, the grinding war will continue leading to further destruction of the U.S. military, yielding nothing

but more opium from the fields of Afghanistan; creating more heroin addicts around the world; weakening nations; and fattening the wallets of City of London and Wall Street bankers.

There is a reason why this author wonders whether President Obama needs a hearing aid: One obvious reason, is that McChrystal made these "disparaging remarks," about a policy which has no purpose and is not achievable. In addition, McChrystal was left to fight al-Qaeda, the Taliban, Washington's Af-Pak envoy Richard Holbrooke, Vice President Joe Biden, and U.S. Ambassador to Kabul Karl Eikenberry. The general wanted direct access to the President, but was thwarted by a White House, where, as one Washington source pointed out, duplicity is not just acceptable, it is a necessity. If Obama had cared to listen to, or read, what eyewitnesses have been reporting from the ground, he would have realized that there is nothing to win in this war: Instead, Afghanistan, and the entire region, would lose a lot if it is pursued any longer.

Anyone can see that the COIN policy has failed. That, however, does not mean that the counterterrorism effort, which is being pushed by an other powerful lobby in Washington, has any meaning whatsoever. This was what McChrystal pointed out in the *Rolling Stone* piece, when he said: "The Russians killed 1 million Afghans, and that didn't work." The Russians pursued counterterrorism in Afghanistan for almost ten years, before showing their weary and wounded backs to the Afghans, and trudging back home through the Salang tunnel.

The failure of the COIN program can be seen at Marjah. On Feb. 13, under McChrystal's leadership, the International Security Assistance Forces (ISAF)—a mish-mash of U.S. and NATO troops, with the Afghan National Army (ANA)—began a military campaign, Operation Moshtarak, ostensibly the largest in Afghanistan since the fall of the Taliban, in the southern province of Helmand. The main target of the offensive was widely considered to be Marjah, a small town in the central part of the province, which had been under control of Taliban militants, as well as drug traffickers, for years. With a lot of trumpeting, the campaign to win the "hearts and minds" of the southern Afghan Pushtuns residing there was launched. Afghan troops were given a lead role in the ground forces, comprising about 60% of those troops. Around 8,000 ground forces and 7,000 support troops are involved, when Coalition troops are included.



White House/Pete Souza

Gen. Stanley McChrystal (shown here with President Obama May 19) opened up to Rolling Stone, because he was worried about the “Vietnam Syndrome”—that the military would be blamed for the failure of U.S. policy in Afghanistan, LaRouche explained. Under Obama, U.S. and NATO forces are there only to protect Britain’s poppy fields.

Weakening the U.S. Military

Four months later, the situation in Marjah has deteriorated to the point that the ISAF troops have been confined to a virtual stockade, harassed by a couple hundred of insurgents, shooting at them from all angles. The objective to capture, hold, and administer—the magic words of COIN—has long been given a go-by. U.S. and NATO troops are out there trying to stay alive.

Why has it come to such a sorry pass? That becomes evident from eyewitness reports. For example, C.J. Chivers, writing from Marjah for the *New York Times*, described on June 23, the shattered morale of the troops engaged in this impossible mission. “Young officers and enlisted soldiers and Marines, typically speaking on the condition of anonymity to protect their jobs, speak of ‘being ‘handcuffed,’ of not being trusted by their bosses and of being asked to battle a canny and vicious insurgency ‘in a fair fight.’”

Some rules meant to enshrine counterinsurgency principles into daily practices, they say, do not merely transfer risks away from civilians. They transfer risks away from the Taliban. Before the rules were tightened, one Army major who had commanded an infantry company, told the *Times*, “firefights in Afghanistan had a half-life.” By this, he meant that skirmishes often

were brief, lasting roughly half an hour. The Taliban would ambush patrols, typically break contact, and slip away as patrol leaders organized and escalated Western firepower in response.

Now, with fire support often restricted, or even idled, Taliban fighters seem noticeably less worried about an American response, many soldiers and Marines say. Firefights often drag on, sometimes lasting hours, and costing lives. The United States’ material advantages are not robustly applied; troops are engaged in rifle-on-rifle fights on the enemy’s turf. One Marine infantry lieutenant, during fighting in Marjah this year, told Chivers he had all but stopped seeking air support while engaged in firefights. He spent too much time on the radio trying to justify its need, he said, and the aircraft never arrived,

they arrived too late, or the pilots were reluctant to drop their ordnance.

“I’m better off just trying to fight my fight, and maneuver the squads, and not waste the time or focus trying to get air,” he said. Several infantrymen have also said that the rules are so restrictive that pilots are often not allowed to attack fixed targets—say, a building or tree line, from which troops are taking fire—unless they can personally see the insurgents doing the firing. This has led to situations that many soldiers describe as absurd, including decisions by patrol leaders to have fellow soldiers move briefly out into the open to draw fire once aircraft arrive, so the pilots might be cleared to participate in the fight.

Financing the Killers

In addition, what has been known to the outside world for years, has now been presented to the American people by a Report of the Majority Staff, prepared under the chairmanship of Rep. John F. Tierney (D-Mass.), Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs, in June 2010. The report pointed out that the task of feeding, fueling, and arming American troops at over 200 forward operating bases and combat outposts sprinkled across a difficult and hostile terrain with only minimal road infrastructure, is handled by

what is called Host Nation Trucking (HNT), a \$2.16 billion contract split among eight Afghan, American, and Middle Eastern companies. Most of the prime contractors and their trucking subcontractors hire local Afghan security providers for armed protection of the trucking convoys.

Transporting valuable and sensitive supplies in highly remote and insecure locations requires extraordinary levels of security. A typical convoy of 300 supply trucks going from Kabul to Kandahar, for example, will travel with 400 to 500 guards, in dozens of trucks armed with heavy machine-guns and rocket-propelled grenades (RPGs). The “security” to these convoys is provided by the insurgents, who are paid with American taxpayers’ money, for, later, killing American soldiers or those Afghans who allow the insurgents to take a piece of the pie along the way, also for the purpose of killing American soldiers. This has been allowed to continue because, according to Washington, there is no better way of doing this.

The Afghan War cannot be won, because there is nothing to win. The only legitimate objective that President Obama has, as the Commander-in-Chief, is to wipe out the Afghan opium, which has shown phenomenal growth in recent years, under the British occupation of Helmand, the most prolific opium-growing region in Afghanistan. To infest Afghanistan with poppy, is the policy run top-down from Britain, the old colonial handlers of opium. What the U.S. troops have begun to realize, and speak out bitterly about, is they are being asked to lay down their lives to protect drug warlords and traffickers.

In essence, all that the Obama Administration has done, is to go along with this British imperial policy, by using the U.S. military to protect the drug traffickers, who generate oodles of cash for the bankrupt bankers of City of London and Wall Street. This was pointed out, at least a year ago, by the United Nations Office of Drug and Crimes (UNODC) chief, Antonio Maria Costa.

Obama’s “benign neglect” of the Afghan opium explosion is not only destroying the U.S. military, but is further pushing Afghanistan to the edge of the abyss. Already a depleted nation, fighting for the last 30 years—first, in the war launched by Soviets that lasted for ten years; then the civil war launched by the druglords and warlords, that lasted for another ten years; and, after a respite of two years, the ongoing oc-

cupation by the U.S. and NATO troops since 2001—Afghanistan has no institutions, no infrastructure, devastated agriculture, and hundreds of thousands of opium addicts. The addiction has now become a part of the society, and, as Dr. Bruce Goldberg of the University of Florida pointed out in his recent report, Afghan infants are becoming addicted. The homes of Afghans are now smeared with opium and heroin. In other words, what the Obama Administration is allowing to occur in Afghanistan is sheer criminality.

The elimination of drugs, however, will be the first, and most important step in allowing the Afghans to set up institutions. Without a total eradication of opium, Afghanistan has no hope, and dangers will continue to mount in the region. A recent report by the U.S. Geological Survey shows that Afghanistan has huge stores of iron, copper, cobalt, gold, and critical industrial metals like lithium. These reserves are so big, and include so many minerals that are essential to modern industry, that Afghanistan could eventually be transformed into one of the most important mining centers in the world, U.S. officials believe.

In 2004, American geologists, sent to Afghanistan as part of a broader reconstruction effort, stumbled across an intriguing series of old charts and data at the library of the Afghan Geological Survey in Kabul, that hinted at major mineral deposits in the country. They soon learned that the data had been collected by Soviet mining experts during the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in the 1980s, but cast aside when the Soviets withdrew in 1989. “This will become the backbone of the Afghan economy,” said Jalil Jumriany, an advisor to the Afghan minister of mines.

Ferghana Valley—The Next Target

However, in order to make it the “backbone of the Afghan economy,” the war has to end, and the British-run opium industry must cease to exist. If it is allowed to continue further, it is going to engulf the Central Asian nations touching the borders of Russia and China, two powerful nations. With the riot in southern Kyrgyzstan this month, the drug mafia, and its usual collaborators, have sounded the clarion call. Their target is to unleash a long war in the Ferghana Valley, drawing in Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan, in particular, and cause an Afghan-style opium explosion there. Already, the Ferghana Valley is producing hundreds of tons of opium, besides being one of the

important transit points to get the Afghan heroin to Russia.

The Ferghana Valley was cut up into three pieces following the collapse of the Soviet Union. Such fragmentation gave rise to dissensions among the countries that each got a piece of it. Furthermore, the Valley is the most fertile land where water is plentiful in the water-starved Central Asia. This dissension among the nations over who should own the Ferghana Valley has allowed the foreign NGOs to move in. Drug-legalization promoter George Soros's Ferghana Valley project is at least a decade old.

The Soros Foundation is involved in "supporting and developing the socio-economic infrastructure" of the Osh and Jalal-Abad regions, where, incidentally, riots took place this June. There were reports that the Soros-funded Open Society Foundation had been active financially, in pushing through the now-defunct Tulip Revolution. Soros's Foundation, which promotes the legalization of opium production, "to help ease financial problems of the farmers," has apparently lost out to

the drug mafia. One may also ask: Was the Tulip Revolution organized to hand over southern Kyrgyzstan to the drug mafia? If that was the intent, it has mostly succeeded.

In addition, an alliance between the drug mafia, headed by the younger son of the ousted Kyrgyzstan President Kurmanbek Bakiyev, Maksim Bakiyev, and the British forces has been established. Maksim has ownership in a British soccer club, the Blackpool Football Club, which like most British sports clubs, depends on drug money to pay its players. Maksim Bakiyev fled to Britain seeking asylum, and he is now under protection of the British Border Forces.

Under the circumstances, all insidious forces continue to grow stronger. The massive amounts of opium and heroin flowing in from Afghanistan have not only strengthened the drug mafia, the bankers, and others associated with those cash-generating criminals, it has also strengthened the hands of the Islamic fundamentalists, represented by Hizb ut-Tahrir, who are headquartered in Britain.

LaRouche: Wipe Out the Afghan Opium Trade

June 26—Lyndon LaRouche emphasized in discussions with colleagues last week that the military revolt, represented by Gen. Stanley McChrystal's ouster as commander of U.S. forces in Afghanistan, following his highly publicized break in *Rolling Stone* magazine, with U.S.-NATO policy there, is yet another indication that the Obama Presidency is on the ropes. The mass strike that began last August in town hall meetings across the country, has now "trickled up" to the top military brass.

LaRouche said that McChrystal, like many other American military commanders, was worried about the "Vietnam War Syndrome"—the idea that the military will be blamed for the failure. "There is a dynamic within the military command, that extends far beyond General McChrystal. They see Afghanistan, increasingly, as a hopeless case. They want to get out."

LaRouche provided his own assessment: "We should go in and do what has to be done: Wipe out the opium trade, at every level. The problem is that Obama is unwilling to do that—because it is not British policy to wipe out the Afghan opium business. Russia would work with the U.S. to accomplish this, India would help, for their own reasons. And even Pakistan would see such an action as an opportunity to free themselves from the London/Saudi problems."

LaRouche warned that it would be crucial to "watch out for the Israeli screw-up factor. Israel, under Netanyahu, is totally run by the British. Israel hates to hear it said, but they are a puppet of London, and they would be used, potentially, to sabotage any serious effort to do the one thing that would change the Afghan situation for the better: Wipe out the dope trade."

LaRouche observed that, while he totally disagreed with the Petraeus/McChrystal Afghan counterinsurgency strategy, he viewed the McChrystal affair as an indication of the military institutions' frustration with Obama. "And that is totally understandable."

OBAMA MUST GO!

Dodd-Frank 'Financial Reform' Bill Is a Sellout to Wall Street

by Jeffrey Steinberg

June 27—One of the very rare honest comments uttered by President Obama since he took office 17 months ago, was issued in brief remarks from the White House Rose Garden, on June 25, following the all-night House-Senate conference committee session that produced the so-called Dodd-Frank financial reform bill. Obama proudly declared that the final product “represents 90% of what I proposed when I took up this fight.”

That much was true: The bill had Obama written all over it. And Wall Street. And London. The rest of his prepared remarks on the Dodd-Frank bill were the kind of pathological lies that only a man suffering from severe narcissism could deliver with a straight face. “We are poised to pass the toughest financial reforms since the ones we passed in the aftermath of the Great Depression,” the President declared, adding that the threat of “too big to fail” banks had been eliminated.

The reality of the situation could not be more radically different. The final bill that emerged from the marathon conference session, stripped out the few sections that were opposed by the Obama White House and by Wall Street, particularly Sen. Blanche Lincoln’s (D-Ark.) Article VII, which would have forced the Big Six banks to divest their swap desks and cease derivatives trading with Federal government-insured and -lent funds.

And the efforts by a handful of Congressmen and

Senators to restore the Glass-Steagall separation of commercial banks from investment banks and insurance companies, was killed by Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.) and Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.), before the Senate and House bills were voted on. In that move against any meaningful reform, Dodd and Frank had the full backing of President Obama and his economic team. There was not an iota of the Franklin Roosevelt-style crackdown on the power of Wall Street in Dodd-Frank bill, which has already been appropriately labeled the “Dudd bill.”

The fact that the bill was released the very same day that the Senate gave up on passage of a fund to extend unemployment insurance by \$35 billion over ten years, indicated just how much the current House and Senate—along with the Obama White House—are owned, lock, stock and barrel, by Wall Street and London. As the result of that action, 2 million Americans will have been kicked off the unemployment insurance rolls by mid-July, with millions more to follow. The message from Washington: The too-big-to-fail banks will live on, while the American people can drop dead!

When the reality of what just happened dawns on the American people over the immediate days ahead, the mass-strike process, which began in August 2009 in reaction to Obamacare, is going to reach a new explosive level. For President Nerobama, Rome is already burning.

‘The President Is a Liar!’

In his June 26 international webcast, American economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche made clear, repeatedly, that Obama must go. Until the President is forced out of office—Nixon style—the United States stands no chance of reversing the economic breakdown collapse, and returning to the kind of recovery that President Franklin D. Roosevelt led, the last time that the United States faced such a total crisis.

LaRouche’s strongest statement, to that effect, came in response to a lengthy question from the office of a U.S. Senator, who provided a detailed account of how the President, on behalf of Wall Street, wrecked any chance at serious action.

“Despite overwhelming revulsion of the U.S. population to the bailout of Wall Street and of the banks,” the Senate spokesman said, “and despite the fact that our President said repeatedly that he would veto any measures that did not include reining in derivatives, the fact is that exactly the opposite occurred. And, in fact, I do very much regret to report that it seems that the President is a liar.”

After giving a detailed account of what happened during the House-Senate conference deliberations (see excerpts, below), particularly, how the Lincoln derivatives ban was stripped out of the final bill, the questioner asked: “It seems to be a great contradiction. If the President of the United States said he would veto any legislation that did not rein in derivatives, then why did he send half of the White House to Capitol Hill to make sure that those derivatives were not reined in?”

Indeed, the *Wall Street Journal* reported, just hours after the Dodd-Frank bill passed out of conference on strictly partisan lines, that the final wording, permitting the Big Six Wall Street banks—Goldman Sachs, JP Morgan Chase, Morgan Stanley, Bank of America, Citicorp, and Wells Fargo—to maintain their trading in foreign exchange derivatives, interest rate swaps, and most credit default swaps, was actually written by Treasury Department officials on the night of June 24!

As the conference members closed in on final language, Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, and a team from economic advisor Larry Summers’ office at the White House, hovered around the Senators, lobbying to strip the bill of any last vestiges of real regulation.

The final version that came out of the conference, in

fact, guaranteed that taxpayers will foot the bill, again and again, for the Big Six banks, and even tightened the grip of these megabanks over the U.S. financial system.

An Open Secret

The stealth action by Team Obama, to kill off any shadow of Glass-Steagall, did not go unnoticed. On June 25, *Newsweek*’s Michael Hirsh warned, under the banner headline, “Financial Reform Makes Biggest Banks Stronger—The too-big-to-fail monster lives: How the Dodd-Frank bill maintains the status quo”:

“Glass-Steagall, meet Dodd-Frank.... The nearly 2,000-page bill marshaled through Congress by Sen. Chris Dodd and Rep. Barney Frank falls short of that earlier, Depression-era standard. Whereas Glass-Steagall substantially altered the structure of the financial system and required the creation of brand-new kinds of firms, Dodd-Frank effectively anoints the existing banking elite. The bill makes it likely that they will be the future giants of banking as well. Legislators touted changes that would restrict proprietary trading by banks and force them to spin off their swap desks into separate capitalized operations. But banks get to keep the biggest part of their derivatives business, which is dominated by interest-rate and foreign-exchange swaps. Some 80 to 90 percent of that business will remain within the banks, and JP Morgan, Goldman Sachs, Citigroup, Bank of America, and Morgan Stanley control more than 95 percent, or about \$200 trillion worth of that market.”

Hirsh quoted a former Treasury Department official, who lamented: “The bottom line: this doesn’t fundamentally change the way the banking industry works. The ironic thing is that the biggest banks that took the most money end up with the most beneficial position, and the regulators that failed to stop them in the first place get even more power and discretion. We’ve consolidated the position of the five banks that were most central to the crisis. In my mind, they created six new GSEs [government-sponsored entities like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—ed.]. These mega-institutions are now the nodes of the financial system.”

‘Close to the Cliff-Edge’

Last month, LaRouche issued a chilling warning: The entire global financial system is heading into a new

breakdown phase, by mid-July. This means that the intervention by the Obama White House and Treasury Department, on behalf of Wall Street and London, to block the return to the Glass-Steagall Law, will have immediate and devastating consequences for the United States and the world.

LaRouche is not alone in this assessment. On June 27, the *Daily Telegraph's* Ambrose Evans-Pritchard reported that the Royal Bank of Scotland's credit chief, Andrew Roberts, has been circulating an advisory to the bank's clients, warning that the Federal Reserve is soon going to have launch another "monster" taxpayers' bailout of the banks. "We cannot stress enough," Roberts warned, "how strongly we believe that a cliff-edge may be around the corner, for the global banking system (particularly in Europe) and for the global economy. Think the unthinkable."

Royal Bank of Scotland is a flagship of the Inter-Alpha Group, the Rothschild-created Europeanwide banking consortium, at the very center of the onrushing European collapse. Roberts told the bank's clients that the "solution" to the imminent crash is a combination of monetary hyperinflation and murderous austerity.

The Rothschilds, who serve the British monarchy, are notorious for profiteering when there is "blood in the streets," which will surely result from the megabailout they are demanding.

LaRouche's Alternative

For the United States, there is an alternative, which can alter the direction of the entire planet: Restore Glass-Steagall, as LaRouche has demanded since the eruption of the crisis in the Summer of 2007.

As last week's actions on Capitol Hill make clear, for that to happen, President Obama is going to have to go.

As LaRouche said, in response to the question from the Senator's office: "We have to understand, if we want to have a nation—and if we lose this nation, we'll lose civilization too, for a long time to come—Obama has to go. I've described exactly how he has to go. Get him out of there. To get him out of there, we have options. Don't talk about the conditions under which you get him out; get him out! Just don't shoot him. We don't want that mess. Just get him out of there. That's the issue. Are you willing to get rid of Obama? Or do you want a moustache on your lip too?"

From the Senate: Obama Is a Liar

This question, edited for EIR, was submitted to LaRouche's June 26 webcast from a U.S. Senator's office. It provides an inside view of the White House role in getting the financial "reform" bill that Wall Street wanted. The question was read by moderator Debra Freeman.

"Mr. LaRouche, I think it's very important that the people who are listening to your webcast understand exactly what occurred in the Conference Committee that produced this legislation. Because what is right now in the press is disinformation. Because despite the overwhelming revulsion of the U.S. population to the bailout of Wall Street and of the banks, and despite the fact that our President said, repeatedly, that he would veto any measure that did not include reining in derivatives, the fact is, that exactly the opposite has occurred. And in fact, I do very much regret to report that it seems that the President is a liar.

"First of all, Senator Levin was employed to introduce the so-called 'Volcker Rule' as a substitute for a different amendment, which was the re-introduction of Glass-Steagall, as you well know. Now, Glass-Steagall was, without question, preferable, and the Volcker Rule was flawed. But, President Obama opposed Glass-Steagall, and claimed to have supported the Volcker Rule. But, even with all of its flaws, the fact is, that the Volcker Rule, originally, as Senator Levin introduced it, banned banks from using their own taxpayer-backed cash to speculate in the financial markets.

"And as everyone does know, the Federal government stands behind bank deposits, and banks have access to cheap funds from the Federal Reserve. And former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker argued that the banks should not be allowed to use that subsidy to speculate. And presumably, President Obama supported that.

"However, on Thursday afternoon, the Senate conferees confirmed that their so-called compromise was that the banks could invest up to 3% of their tangible common equity in hedge funds, and private equity

firms. (Tangible common equity is considered the strongest form of bank capital, and it is basically comprised of shareholder equity.) That was bad enough, but a few hours later, that proposal was amended further, after lobbying by both the Administration and Wall Street. The adjustment changed the metric from tangible common equity, to what's called Tier One capital.

"Bankers and banks have a lot more Tier One capital, than they have tangible common equity. So changing the requirement to this weaker form, allowed banks to invest even more of their cash in hedge funds and private equity funds. This was also enthusiastically endorsed on the House side, by Barney Frank.

"Now, this is a complicated issue, obviously, for the average citizen. So just to make it clear, I want to give you a couple of examples of what this means in practice.

"Using JP Morgan Chase, which is the nation's largest bank, by virtue of their assets, let's look at this. JP Morgan Chase reports assets of more than \$2.1 trillion. The bank would be able to invest an additional 40% of its cash, or an extra \$1.1 billion, for a total of \$4 billion in the activities that Volcker supposedly wanted to prohibit banks from engaging in, according to this new legislation.

"For the Bank of America, which is the nation's largest bank, with more than \$2.3 trillion in supposed assets, the change—the so-called tightening under this Volcker Rule—allows that firm to invest more than \$4.8 billion in hedge funds and private equity funds, which is an increase of 80% over what they currently have invested.

"Morgan Stanley can invest \$1.4 billion, which represents a 58% increase.

"Goldman Sachs can invest \$1.9 billion. That's an increase of just 10%, but we all know that Goldman Sachs is in trouble.

"This was strongly opposed by various members of the Committee, but they were ignored.

"On the question of derivatives, which is an area that the population is much more familiar with, and which President Obama has talked about repeatedly, Sen. Blanche Lincoln had a proposal that would have compelled the nation's big banks to move their swap dealing units, which deal and trade in a type of financial derivative product, into a separately capitalized institution, within the larger bank holding company. The affected firms collectively would have to raise tens of bil-

lions of dollars to protect their swap desks in case their bets went bad. Or, and this would be preferable, they could disband the activity altogether.

"According to Wall Street, such a measure would threaten U.S. banks and make it difficult for them to compete with foreign banks. This is absolutely not true. The nation's largest domestic banks control the swap markets in the U.S., and they do so by a very large majority. . . ."

The questioner is saying that if Lincoln's proposal had been left in there, it would, at the very least, mean that, if these bets went sour, taxpayers would be saved from having to move in to prop up the banks, just as they did in 2008.

And she adds, that a Glass-Steagall proposal would do what Blanche Lincoln's proposal did not do, which is that it would deal with the already existing derivatives. But, she says, be that as it may, Lincoln's measure was important enough, that three regional Federal Reserve presidents, in a very unusual move, came out and supported it.

However, she reports, at midnight on Friday [June 25], Collin Peterson came out and announced that he believed that a deal had been made on Blanche Lincoln's measure, which he described as a "divisive" measure.

"I think it's important to point out to people—because really, the American people have the right to know this—that, during these extraordinary all-night negotiations, despite the fact that you had three Federal Reserve presidents supporting Blanche Lincoln's bill, the Fed's Board of Governors, led by the nation's central banker, Ben Bernanke, along with FDIC Chairman Sheila Baer and Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner, joined with the nation's largest banks in spending all night with the joint Conference Committee.

"It seemed to be a great contradiction: *If the President of the United States said he would veto any legislation that did not rein in derivatives, then why did he send half of the White House to Capitol Hill to make sure that those derivatives were not reined in?* And, in fact, although the negotiations were not public, the announcement now is. Rather than banks being forced to spin off their swap desks, they would be allowed, Collin Peterson announced, to keep those units, dealing with the biggest part of all derivatives trading.

"My question to you is really a very simple one. . . . How do you think we should proceed? . . ."

Rogers Campaign Shows Texas Dems The Future: And It Isn't Obama!

by Harley Schlanger

June 28—Delegates attending the Texas Democratic Party State Convention in Corpus Christi June 25-26 were confronted with an existential dilemma: If they stick with President Barack Obama, then the Party, and the nation, will go down with him; however, if they can muster some guts and imagination, the future looks bright, as Congressional nominee Kesha Rogers and her campaign supporters offered them a pathway to that future. Despite the efforts of party hacks to keep delegates away from Rogers, her powerful representation of the LaRouche Youth Movement, and the historic presence of Lyndon LaRouche among Texas Democrats, offered them hope, in what was, otherwise, a dismal affair.

From the outset, a wide gulf within the party was apparent, between rank-and-file delegates, who are aware of the failure of the Obama Administration to address the collapse in living standards among the lower 80% of family income brackets, on the one hand; and the party bureaucrats and hacks, who have sold their souls to Obama, on the other. Many leading Democrats from the grassroots level were delighted to give Rogers an opportunity to address their caucuses, despite sinister warnings from official party circles that she was to be a “non-person” at the convention.

In fact, her name did not even appear in the official Convention program, which left the 22nd C.D. candidate's name vacant, in protest against Rogers' decisive victory there, in the March 2 primary. This especially angered delegates from the 22nd C.D., over the fact that the state party is willing to hand the seat back, without a fight, to incumbent Republican Pete Olsen, who once served as an aide to the discredited former Sen. Phil Gramm. Rogers won the primary with nearly 53% of the vote, and is well-known in the district, due to her role in spearheading the battle to remove the corrupt Tom DeLay, who formerly held the seat.

The efforts made by state party officials to shut

down the organizing by Rogers' team, was, at times, almost comical. After seeing the strong response to her on the eve of the Convention, the constable was deployed to tell campaigners that they could not wear “Kesha for Congress” t-shirts, nor could they pass out campaign literature. The t-shirts, which feature Kesha's famous slogan, “SAVE NASA, IMPEACH OBAMA,” on the front, have an even more provocative message, for party officials, on the back: “Proudly Not Endorsed by Democratic Party Hacks”!

Later, in a spiteful response to the strong positive reaction of delegates to the choral presentations made by the Rogers organizers, the hacks ruled that singing by non-delegates was no longer allowed!

Nevertheless, campaigners continued to organize, under the watchful eyes of the constable's friendly security forces, making it known that Kesha Rogers would not be stopped by administrative fascism!

Little Support for Obama

In presentations to the Progressive Hispanic Caucus, the Veterans' Affairs Caucus, and the Tejano (Mexican-American) Democrats, Rogers received both rousing introductions from caucus leaders, and strong ovations from the hundreds attending. The strongest applause came when she demanded that the Wall Street Democrats be kicked out, so that the Party could return to the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt, which she and Lyndon LaRouche represent. When she spoke of how the Administration sabotaged attempts to restore FDR's Glass-Steagall regulations, in support of the City of London and Wall Street financial institutions deemed “Too Big To Fail,” attendees at these caucuses were eerily silent, as Rogers was saying publicly what was on many of their minds, but they were not yet ready to openly acknowledge.

The Rogers campaign organizers reported that there were very few who would defend Obama, though there were still some who pulled Rogers aside to say that they do not like the poster with Obama wearing a Hitler



LPAC videograb

Kesha Rogers, the elected Democratic Party Congressional candidate in the Texas 22nd C.D., challenged fellow Democrats at the State Party Convention: If you tolerate the party hacks, you will lose your voice, your party, your nation, and your future. . . . Join me to rebuild our party and our nation.”

mustache! With the accelerating collapse of the economy, his abject failure to deal with the BP disaster in the Gulf of Mexico, and his plans to scrap the manned space program—which is dear to most Texas Democrats—what is there to defend?

There was, in fact, a concerted effort to keep Obama from being an issue in Texas politics, as he is so unpopular in the Lone Star State, with some polls showing him at 33% approval. Even those media outlets which have defended Obama in the recent past, such as the *Houston Chronicle*, were compelled to report that “Obama-mania is not burning hot at this year’s Texas Democratic Convention,” adding that “Texas Democrats were not talking much about President Barack Obama, and not at all about U.S. House Speaker Pelosi.”

Instead, all attention was focused on Bill White’s campaign for Governor, against the incumbent Bush-leaguer Rick Perry. White, a former Deputy Secretary of Energy under President Bill Clinton, and former Mayor of Houston, did not even speak the name “Obama,” during his address to the Convention.

The ‘Lesson of Corpus Christi’

The disappointment and anger toward Obama emerged in discussions that Rogers’ campaign representatives had with delegates, on the need to return to Glass-Steagall regulations, to halt the speculative monetary policy which has bankrupted the nation, and to place banks and financial institutions into bankruptcy reorganization, as FDR did in 1933, to dump the toxic assets currently held on their books, protected by the Bush-Obama bailout.

There was broad support for Glass-Steagall, but some delegates expressed an initial hesitation to sign, because the name “LaRouche” appears in the resolution, and some delegates were wary that they might “get in trouble,” if they showed support for LaRouche. Delegates engaged in fruitful back-and-forth dialogue with Rogers’ campaign team members on substantive issues of economic policy—which is exactly what should occur at a political party’s conven-

tion, if that party wishes to remain relevant, in a mass-strike period!

In these discussions, organizers discovered that delegates, when informed about it, were more angry about Obama’s sabotage of the Cantwell-McCain Glass-Steagall amendment to the otherwise despicable Dodd bill, than they were worried about the possible backlash from being associated with LaRouche. In the end, about 150 endorsements of the petition calling for restoration of Glass-Steagall were received from delegates, with many pledging to bring it up back home, with their local county organizations and clubs.

As the Convention ended, organizers defiantly put their Kesha t-shirts back on, and walked through the Convention hall, singing and leafleting. A second Kesha for Congress leaflet was distributed, “Will Texas Dems Learn the Lesson of Corpus Christi?” in which Kesha left the delegates with something to think about, on their way home: “The lesson of Corpus Christi is that if you tolerate the hacks, you will lose your voice, your party, your nation, and your future. There is an alternative. Join me to rebuild our Party, and the nation.”

CRISIS IN THE GULF

Serious Study of Nuclear Option Is Highest Priority

by Laurence Hecht

June 26—Serious consideration for the design and deployment of a peaceful nuclear explosive to seal the gushing BP well in the Gulf of Mexico must now be a highest-level priority. On the basis of information available in the public domain, such preparation is mandatory. This was the conclusion reached by U.S. statesman Lyndon LaRouche, and communicated to associates earlier this week.

Testimony from the leading U.S. expert on peaceful nuclear explosions as to the efficacy of using a nuclear device to seal the BP well is now in the public domain. Evaluations of the probable compromised condition of the well bore and seafloor come from reliable professional sources, who point to the possibility that the relief well effort may fail, and therefore, another solution must be in preparation now. These are matters which can be checked by competent authorities acting in the U.S. national interest. But, BP's presentation of the situation must neither be believed, nor tolerated.

The political problem, LaRouche said, is that we have a President who is not in the real world. The very existence of the United States is endangered by the President's determination not to offend the British



U.S. Coast Guard

A peaceful nuclear explosion (PNE) is now the only possible way to close the damaged BP oil well (shown here), which continues to spew hundreds of thousands of gallons of oil into the Gulf of Mexico. Professor Nordyke states that, "there's essentially no concern that you would have radioactivity released to the surface of the ocean."

Empire, Wall Street, or both. But we can't let that stop us from saving the United States from a horrible fate. We can't wait two elections to save the United States from an incompetent President.

The prospect of massive flow of oil into the Atlantic,

possibly as early as the first week in July, according to a projection by the National Center for Atmospheric Research, will make this a global disaster. There might be debatable features of such estimates, but lying by BP and its apologists is so severe, that we cannot base policy on such vast and portentous cover-ups, LaRouche said. The moment that this massive oil leak enters the Atlantic, it is a point of no return for North, and possibly South America, and will rapidly move on to become a European and a global crisis.

This has become a major national security question, the only one more dangerous, being the President himself, LaRouche concluded his evaluation.

The Nuclear Option

Detonation of a low-yield nuclear device, under a rock depth of 6,000 feet or greater, is a proven technique for sealing runaway wells. It was used five times in the Soviet Union, between 1966 and 1981, to control burning gas wells. Four wells were completely shut down, and pressure was reduced in the fifth.


The nuclear explosion produces a compression wave, which crushes, and then squeezes the surrounding rock, pinching the well shut (**Figure 1**). The United States has ample experience in preparing and calculating the effects of such explosions, from the hundreds of underground nuclear explosions carried out through 1992.

According to Dr. Milo D. Nordyke, scientist emeritus at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and the leading U.S. expert on peaceful nuclear explosions (see *Interview*, below), the preparations for such an effort would have to begin now, in order to have such an option ready, in the event that other efforts fail. There would be no danger of radioactive release at the depths at which the device would be deployed, Nordyke says. In the worst-case scenario of an accidental release, the amount of radioactive material released into the sea would be insignificant.

The depth of placement of the device would depend upon precise information about the geological strata, which is known from the drilling record. This would also permit precise calculation of the seismic effect. At depths greater than 6,000 feet, the felt effect would be minimal or non-existent.

No competent objection to Nordyke's proposal has been raised, nor is likely to be. According to knowledgeable sources, the nuclear option was considered by the Obama Administration early in the crisis. It was

FIGURE 1
An Animation of a PNE Closing a Damaged Oil Well



LPACTV videograb

From an animation of a Soviet documentary on the closing of the runaway gas well at Urtabulak in 1966. The Soviets sealed four burning, runaway gas wells, and reduced pressures in a fifth, by placing a nuclear device near the well bore at depths of 6,000 to 8,000 feet. The nuclear devices, one as small as 3.8 kilotons, were put into position through relief wells drilled for the purpose.


rejected not for any technical reason, but for political reasons.

The Hurricane Threat

As the hurricane season begins in the Gulf, some new threats have arisen. As of this writing, Tropical Storm Alex, now located off the Yucatan Peninsula, has increased to a wind speed of 55 knots. The present track would keep it in the southern Gulf, on a course to the coast of Mexico. Alex is the first, in what is forecast to be a severe season of storm and hurricane activity.

In analyzing the likely effect of a hurricane on the massive oil spill, some meteorologists have pointed to the possibility of a phenomenon known as *explosive intensification*. During hurricane season, the warm waters of the Gulf Loop Current (**Figure 2**) can produce a

FIGURE 2
The Gulf Loop Current



From the South, the Gulf of Mexico is fed by a current of warm water from the Caribbean, forming the Gulf Loop Current, which curves east and south along Florida's coast and exits through the Straits of Florida. There are fears that a significant circulation of oil in the Loop Current would darken the water surface, warming the water, and contributing to rapid, or even explosive, intensification of any tropical cyclone passing over.

sudden decrease in the atmospheric pressure of a tropical cyclone, a phenomenon known as rapid deepening, or rapid intensification. The lower the pressure, generally, the higher the winds will be, and the more destructive the effect of a storm.

The fear is that a significant circulation of oil in the Loop Current would darken the water surface, warming the water and contributing to rapid, or even explosive, intensification of any tropical cyclone passing over. The National Weather Service defines rapid deepening, or intensification, as a decrease of 42 millibars, in less than 24 hours. If the pressure drops at a rate of at least 2.5 millibars per hour, for a minimum of 12 hours, it is known as explosive intensification. The fastest recorded rate of intensification was in 2005, when Hurricane Wilma dropped 53 millibars in less than six hours. That same year, Katrina and Rita also underwent extremely rapid intensification.

This hypothesis is disputed by official statements from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

It is certain that storm winds and effects would drive oil-laden waters significantly inland in low-lying areas. A storm passing to the west of the oil slick area will tend to drive more oil to the coast, because of the coun-

ter-clockwise rotation of tropical cyclones in the Northern Hemisphere.

The Kill Zone

Intelligence sources report that the effect of the ongoing oil leak, has been to create a killing field for marine life in the Gulf of Mexico. Zones of zero or low oxygen have been created, where marine life has been eliminated. As with other aspects of the crisis, the full extent of this problem has not yet been revealed.

Satellite images are showing traces of oil from the British Petroleum gusher a few miles off the coast of Cuba, and off Jacksonville on the east coast of Florida, according to Bill Hogarth, the Dean of the College of Marine Science at the University of Southern Florida.

The oil is in the Loop Current, the transmission belt of water that originates in the Gulf of Mexico, transits

the Florida Strait, and then moves up the East Coast of the United States, as part of the Gulf Stream in the Atlantic Ocean. "Some of the tar balls may start showing up on the East Coast as far as Jacksonville," Hogarth said. He stressed that as the oil continues to gush a mile underwater, and the hurricane season proceeds, the impact is bound to be bad for Florida. "Things are very delicate right now," he noted.

The Gulf Stream is part of the global ocean conveyor system which circulates through all the world's oceans, with the exception of the Arctic.

According to a computer-generated oil-flow map from the National Center for Atmospheric Research, the oil slick could hit the southern tip of Florida in early July. From there, it would be picked up by the swift ocean currents, which would speed it up the Eastern Seaboard of the United States, in a thin band, maybe 100 miles offshore, and would move northeastward toward the coast of Ireland and northern Europe, at a rate of about 100 miles per day.

The Failure To Go Nuclear

The push to ever deeper and riskier offshore drilling sites is itself a result of the failure to go nuclear. Had U.S. nuclear development continued, as it should have,

after the 1979 sabotage of the Three Mile Island plant, the U.S.A. would, by now, have achieved real energy independence. Abundant electricity, hydrogen, and hydrogen-based synthetic hydrocarbons would have provided all the fuel we need for industry and transportation. Instead of transporting oil thousands of miles across oceans, a locally produced source of fuel would be ours at a reasonable price. We would by now have built the first commercial plants generating thermonuclear fusion energy, and be designing fusion-powered spacecraft capable of achieving the continuous 1g acceleration needed for manned space exploration

Newly uncovered evidence shows that the Three Mile Island plant was sabotaged by the introduction of two blind flanges and an undersized pipe into a critical feed-water system. According to a knowledgeable source, the sabotage may have occurred during a repair job carried out by personnel associated with the Halliburton Company. Despite the effort, the plant containment system held, and no health danger to the population occurred. However, hysteria created over the Three Mile Island accident, combined with a high interest-rate regime intended to crush industry, put an end to U.S. nuclear plant construction for almost three decades now.

The energy derived by nuclear fission from uranium and thorium fuel is millions of times greater than that contained in an equal weight of oil or gas. The surface area required to produce nuclear energy is hundreds of times less than that required for producing and transporting oil and gas, and tens of thousands of times less than that needed for wind or solar energy.

But beyond these advantages, nuclear energy represents a revolutionary capability for economic development which could never be achieved by conventional energy sources. There are two areas of interest here: the production of isotopes in controlled nuclear reactions, and the production of directed energy from nuclear explosions. The latter has, so far, been utilized largely for weapons applications. For example, we know how to transform some of the nuclear explosive output into x-ray laser beams sufficient to destroy hundreds of missile warheads in a single blow; how to generate tuned microwave pulses, particle beams, and spin polarized neutron beams. Enhanced Radiation and Reduced Residual Radiation devices (ER and RRRs) are early cases



Sandia National Laboratory

Project Plowshare was the U.S. program for peaceful use of nuclear explosions, directed by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. From 1959 to 1975, Plowshare conducted 35 nuclear tests, as well as numerous high explosives experiments simulating nuclear excavation. The 1968 Project Buggy test detonated five separate 1-kiloton nuclear devices simultaneously, creating a 900-foot-long ditch, 300 feet wide and 80 feet deep. This, and other experiments, furnished information on nuclear excavation techniques to be used in a proposed new Panama Canal project. The illustration is a detail from a Project Plowshare poster titled "Nuclear Excavations."

in point. The tuning range of nuclear explosives is virtually transfinite compared to that of chemical explosives, as Charles Stevens of *21st Century Science & Technology* noted.

Applying these effects of radiation to the tasks of economic development would mark a new stage in man's development. It would put an end to all arguments about the limits to growth. Stopping development of nuclear fission and fusion power has, therefore, been a main objective of the British empire forces, committed instead to global population reduction.

It would be a great irony if the worst ecological disaster in history should require the deployment of a peaceful nuclear explosion for its solution. Yet, it is appearing increasingly likely that such might be the case. With or without the use of a nuclear device to seal the well, the shift to a nuclear fission- and fusion-based economy is the only path to a true economic recovery for the globe, the only alternative to a descent into a new Dark Age. To achieve it will require the rapid removal of Britain's tool in the White House. Nothing positive shall come, so long as he remains.

The author is the Editor of 21st Century Science & Technology. He can be reached at: hecht3@verizon.net

Expert Explains Use of Nuclear Device

June 21—*Nuclear physicist Dr. Milo D. Nordyke is the leading U.S. expert on peaceful nuclear explosions (PNEs). He is a scientist emeritus of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and a veteran of the U.S. Operation Plowshare program for the peaceful use of nuclear explosions. He authored a 100-page study of the Soviet program for peaceful explosions, which included use of nuclear devices to seal four runaway gas wells and reduce pressure in a fifth.*

Dr. Nordyke was interviewed at his home in Livermore, Calif., on June 14, by Alli Perebikovsky of LPACTV (www.larouchepac.com). The following is excerpted from a longer discussion.

LPACTV: So, just to focus in on what's going on with British Petroleum, and the crisis there ... It's almost like a "slow Katrina," where you really do have, not only the environmental disaster, but you have some estimates say, 100,000 gallons of oil leaking out every day.

Nordyke: Well, it's an economic disaster as well: It's an ecological disaster *and* economic disaster for the region. And it really has to be brought under control in some way.

The present scheme that they're using seems to have some partial control, but it's kind of difficult to find out exactly how well it's working. Maybe it's 10%, maybe it's 50% that it's containing. But, in any case, even if it were 100%, it would only be a temporary fix, because you have to have something there which will survive hurricanes and all other things like that.

And so, the relief wells, right now, are the primary source of the solution. They're drilling down wells from a few thousand feet away, and then tapering them so that they will, hopefully, intersect the well at a depth of 15,000 feet or so, and be able to intercept the well, and divert the flow from the well up through the relief well, to the surface; or, perhaps, try to stem the runaway well.

They may or may not be successful. That's some-

thing that they have done, I think, sometimes in the past, but it's difficult. And that is what really led the Russians to carry out their experiments and their projects.

The first well was one that was a runaway well for some three years, and was putting out a tremendous amount of gas—it was just gas, it wasn't oil, and it was not beneath the ocean, it was just on the surface. But it was burning, and you could see it from 50 miles away. It was very obvious; it was out in the middle of the desert, so you didn't have a large ecological disaster associated with it, but it was wasting a tremendous amount of energy. That was the problem. And they tried intercepting the well, and, because they didn't know where the original well may be—I don't know quite why they weren't able to intercept it for a three-year period.

And so, finally, they got the idea of putting a nuclear explosion *near* the escaping well. And that sealed it off. It squeezed the escaping well shut, and of course, all the rock around it was crushed and then squeezed, to put out the well within 30 seconds or so. And they did that another four times, of which three of them were successful. The fourth one, they've never really said why it wasn't successful.

In none of these cases was radioactivity detectable at the surface. You're talking about explosions which are thousands of feet beneath the surface of the Earth, and, in the case of the Gulf one, it would be thousands of feet beneath the bottom of the ocean. You would probably be down to—you know, the well itself is like 18,000 feet, and so, you would probably go down to a depth of 15,000 feet, which would be 10,000 feet beneath the bottom of the ocean. And so, there's essentially *no* concern that you would have radioactivity released to the surface of the ocean.

The only concern that one has, and it would have to be addressed, is the seismic result. If there are other wells close-by—but I don't think there are—it could damage them, and it could cause a small ripple in the Gulf. That certainly is something that can be calculated beforehand, to see what the extent of the concern would be.

The Rio Blanco Experiment

LPACTV: Now, for the BP spill, we would basically use the Russian model? Or have we made studies ourselves for setting off these nuclear explosions under the water?



LPACTV videograb

Prof. Milo D. Nordyke is the leading U.S. expert on the use of peaceful nuclear explosions.

Nordyke: Well, there's not much to be learned from the Russian experiments: They did it, and it worked. And it's pretty simple. One of the difficult problems is, you have to have an explosive which will be workable at these pressures and temperatures. We did develop explosives that would take 7,000 psi [pounds per square inch], at 250 degrees, for the Rio Blanco experiment [see below]. So, we have designs for such things, and it could be made, but that would take some time.

LPACTV: What was the Rio Blanco experiment?

Nordyke: Rio Blanco was a gas-stimulation experiment, in which we put three 30-kiloton explosions down to depths of, like, 5,500, 6,000, and 7,000 feet beneath the surface in Colorado.

LPACTV: And then, also, how would we actually get the nuclear explosive down there?

Nordyke: Well, you could perhaps use one of the relief wells.

LPACTV: Right.

Nordyke: If they're large enough in diameter, I would guess it wouldn't take a very large diameter. The Rio Blanco explosive was 7.8 inches in diameter, so it

was relatively small. Most of the holes, I think, are like a foot, or so, in diameter.

LPACTV: The other thing that someone was telling me about, is that it's possible that there are submarine devices that can shoot a nuclear warhead, essentially, down through water: that they'd actually shoot it down at high velocities through liquid into the well itself.

Nordyke: Well, but you have to get thousands of feet beneath the bottom of the ocean. And nothing which you do like that would go down to thousands of feet.

How Would It Work?

LPACTV: So, if we were to actually—and we should—begin immediately, preparations to use this type of option [PNEs], do we have the capability at Livermore or the Army Corps of Engineers? What would we have to do, essentially, to make this happen? How soon could we begin?

Nordyke: Well, number one, you would have to make an explosive, that we would use for that. It's possible you could use an existing artillery shell, or something like that, but my guess is that you would have to build one to sustain the pressure and temperature that you're going to have at the depth of 15,000 feet. You would have to carefully look at the possible effects, the seismic effect on the region of the well, as we said. And, you would have to follow the relief wells, to see how they were doing. If they aren't big enough—if they're only three or six inches, then, you would have to drill another well. That's about the amount of preparation we would have to do. I mean it's just a straightforward type of function.

LPACTV: This is leaning to immediately pretty much expropriate BP. And use our, in a sense, government intervention to do this, this kind of experiment, this kind of solution.

Nordyke: Well, this would certainly be a government-controlled project.

LPACTV: Right. Do you think it can be done by the scientists at Livermore or Los Alamos?

Nordyke: Well, I think Livermore has the most experience in this area.

An Extraordinary International Dialogue With Lyndon LaRouche

On April 29, Lyndon LaRouche engaged in an extraordinary dialogue with a group that had gathered in New York to discuss various elements of LaRouche's proposed Four Power Agreement and related issues. The group was comprised of policy-makers as well as a distinguished group of academicians from leading American universities that included Stanford University, University of California at Berkeley, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton University, and Columbia University. Representatives from Russia, China, and India also participated. A number of journalists were also invited to audit the proceedings, although they did not have speaking rights.

Although the seminar was convened as a private discussion, there was common agreement among the participants that, given the intensity of the current global financial and economic crisis, and the extraordinary nature of LaRouche's remarks, it would be nothing less than a travesty to not make those remarks publicly available. What follows is an edited transcript of the proceedings. The moderator was Debra Hanania Freeman, who serves as Lyndon LaRouche's national spokeswoman.

N.B.: Prior to Mr. LaRouche joining the group live, participants listened to a briefing that LaRouche had delivered to associates on April 24, entitled "The Case

of Arkadi V. Dvorkovich: Free Russia from the Pirates of the Caribbean!" which is available on the LPAC site (www.larouchepac.com), and in EIR, April 30, 2010.

Freeman: Lyn, the first question came up as a result of some things that went on here this morning. As you know, yesterday, there were two events in Washington: one was the first meeting of the Peterson Commission, this austerity commission, and there was also the economic summit that was pulled together under the auspices of the Peterson Foundation. During the course of that discussion, former President Bill Clinton made a couple of points that were outrageously distorted in the press.

One of the things that came up in Clinton's remarks, which the press erroneously portrayed as a defense of Goldman Sachs, when in fact, it is quite clear that that was not the intent of his remarks; what he did say, is that under the current conditions, under the current legal structure, in which just about everything has been deregulated, that he was not entirely certain that they actually broke the law—with the obvious implication being that we are living in a somewhat lawless universe when it comes to these kinds of antics.

He said that the actual issue, and the more important issue, is that these transactions really have no intrinsic value or usefulness to the economy as a whole. And



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon LaRouche engaged in a wide-ranging dialogue with a group of policy-makers on April 29. LaRouche is pictured here on June 20, at a celebration of Robert Schumann's 200th birthday.

that, from the standpoint of those of us who are policy-makers, that his view is that it was much more important to address that issue.

One of the questions that came up here, was whether or not, prior to this deregulation craze, and the various measures around first, junk bonds, and then derivatives, and everything that has kind of come since then, was there ever a time that Wall Street investment represented something that did have some actual relationship to the physical economy, something that had real intrinsic value?

And this came up precisely because of, on the one hand, Clinton's remarks and how they related to what we need now in terms of actual regulation, but also in terms of remarks that you have made quite frequently in the past year, especially, that Wall Street as a whole

should just be shut down, that it has no value whatsoever. And people here are asking if this has always been the case, or if it is a product of the insanity of the post-World War II period?

LaRouche: Well, on the last point, the issue in the Wall Street case is the institutions which are Wall Street, especially the leading institutions, like the case now of Goldman Sachs, and the AIG scandal, mean that Wall Street has been taken over by institutions which no longer have the faintest resemblance to something any decent person would want on our territory. So therefore, the thing to do, is wipe out Wall Street

It is easy to wipe it out, by just convicting it of thievery, and its waste. What we are going to have to do is, the first step toward any recovery of the U.S. and world economy, is to apply a Glass-Steagall standard, not only in the United States, but globally. In other words, it should be an integral part of the treaty agreements of various kinds, which nations should adopt among each other. That means that before we can go into any recovery program, we have to start with a Glass-Steagall process.

Now, what that means, we would, therefore, simply wipe out firms like Goldman Sachs. They would go out automatically, because they can not be classified as legitimate enterprises, consistent with the intention of our Constitution.

Now, the other side of this thing, is, look at the way the laws are written. We have this crazy bill coming out of Connecticut, out of the Senate. It's crazy. You have enormous pieces of legislation, like this one, which has no statement of intention in it. It's a bill which is trying to be rushed through, with all these pages, with no coherent statement of principle, or intention, just a package of, like a caddisfly larva, which has picked up all kinds of stones and bits of dirt and so forth, in order to pupate.

So, this kind of legislation must cease to exist. All the important legislation, under Franklin Roosevelt, for example, was simple, in terms of quantity. You stated a principle, and you stated the manner in which the execution was intended. That was sufficient. But we don't have that any more. This bill, the present bill, is all these pages. It has no statement of intention; there is no reason for the bill to exist, according to itself: It doesn't state a reason why this bill should exist! And the bill itself has no coherence.

The bill itself will never be read and studied in its entirety, competently, by any members of Congress. They don't know what they're voting for. And it's a bill that has no competent statement of intention. It has no relationship in terms of its design, to the principles of the Federal Constitution. And someone says it's not unconstitutional.

It's nothing. It should not exist. If it's not constitutional, specifically, it shouldn't exist.

We can modify our Constitution, by the same method by which we created it. But the Preamble of the Constitution is also a principle. The Preamble of the Constitution is what this nation was founded on. So these considerations come in.

So, therefore, the first thing to do is not have any large-scale legislation. We don't need it. Competent legislation, understood by the members of the Congress—and most of the legislation which has gone through recently, this large legislation, was not understood. And if you put in long legislation, and demand it be considered immediately, without examining it, you are committing a fraud against the nation. The legislation is inherently unconstitutional, because it does not conform to a statement of intent, and it has a lot of garbage in there, which simply has no relevance.

It should cease to exist.

Now, if we do that, which means we have to go to a Glass-Steagall thing, and we have to have an intention among nations, with a fixed-exchange-rate system. Because, as we know, the cessation of the fixed-exchange-rate system, meant that no longer could nations take credit from other nations, and hope that the original terms of the loan would be honored. Because the value of the currency fluctuated, on the world market. And therefore, we would quickly put whole countries virtually out of business, by this kind of lending process. And Roosevelt understood this, and the people behind him understood it.

We need to stick to the U.S. Federal Constitution, as, itself, a governing intent. And I don't think anybody has come up with anything new that would change the essential intent of the Constitution, as it was sworn, and as updated in that process.

Therefore, that's the first thing.

Secondly, we can not have world trade and a recovery without a fixed-exchange-rate system. Which means the world has to go through a fixed-exchange-rate system. It has to eliminate all this garbage, which is the Wall Street garbage of today, and go to a banking

system, and a standard of management. And we should probably eliminate the Federal Reserve System, by assimilating its assets, and due responsibilities, into the creation of a national bank.

Because our banks have been ruined, by the legislation which went through, and other reforms, since 2007. It's been wrecked.

We no longer have a competent banking system. We have elements of competent banking, *inside* some banks, but that means we have to have a bank reform, by a Glass-Steagall standard.

Now, that means that we're going to need something to replace what is already a bankrupt Federal Reserve System.

Strictly speaking, the Federal Reserve System is corrupted beyond repair. It has elements which are essential, and which must be defended, because they have intrinsic value, or intrinsic claims—just claims. Therefore, we're going to have to take the garbage out of the Federal Reserve System, by this same method: Reconstitute the commercial banks, which we used to have, under regulation—state and Federal banks. And we have to create a vehicle, in the form of Hamilton's system of national banking, which covers the relationship of the Federal government and the economy in general to the banking system.

These measures are absolutely indispensable before coming out. On that basis, that means we have long-term, fixed-exchange-rate relations with nations. We have to fix that up quickly. We have to have a Glass-Steagall-type of standard for international affairs, as well as within nations. We have to then design large-scale credit agreements, which will enable us to develop, essentially, the basic economic infrastructure of the kind of world economy you want to come into being. And we need the mechanisms, which are essentially Roosevelt-style mechanisms, but designed for the present condition.

In other words, we had the happiest condition under Roosevelt, as long as he lived. We do not have that kind of condition of the world we had then. Therefore, we have to take into account the ruined condition of the world, especially the Transatlantic section of the world, and we have to understand the needs of the western Pacific rim region of the world.

And I think, in my terms, what we need is an agreement, with these features, as a treaty agreement, among the United States, Russia, China, India, and associated countries, such as, for example, Japan, South Korea, and so forth. We need that kind of reform.

We have a mission-oriented reform, to save the world economy. Which means we're going to invest—most of the emphasis will be immediately on basic economic infrastructure: mass transportation; high-energy-flux-density power; water-management systems; educational systems; restore a Hill-Burton system of health care, instead of this AIG thieving version of health care.

Go back to that.

We have to have these kinds of agreements among nations, and I think the United States, Russia, China, and India are the absolutely imperative founding elements of such an international agreement. Under this kind of approach, I am *certain*—because I would know how to do it—I am certain we can organize a rapid recovery of the world from this mess. It will take us two generations, to achieve these objectives, but we can start to do it quickly.

And on the other side, we have a general collapse. The general collapse of the economy of Europe, the euro-economy, is disintegrating. Under Russia's present policies, under British influence, it is also disintegrating. So, therefore, this action is immediately needed. I think it's relatively simple—it's simple for me anyway, because I've lived with these ideas so long. But I'm sure it will work.

Anyway, that's enough to say for the beginning.

Freeman: The next question comes from one of our friends, who is here representing Russia. He qualifies his question by saying that this is not necessarily his view, [it is] a question that is raised by many people in his own country, regarding your remarks on Glass-Steagall.

He says that he understands absolutely, the necessity for a Glass-Steagall type of arrangement inside the United States, because our financial system has become such an unbelievable catastrophe. But, he takes issue with your call for a *global* Glass-Steagall. He says that he doesn't necessarily think that it's a bad thing to have this kind of regulation; but, he asks, isn't this really a typically American proposal? And, by that, I mean, rather self-serving to the United States, since the United States right now suffers the greatest indebtedness. It would essentially serve to wipe out the U.S. debt, and isn't that something that some of the countries that are on the receiving end of this, would legitimately object to?

LaRouche: It's quite different. The size of the U.S. debt is a reflection of the size of the U.S. economy, and its role in the world. The greatest mass of debt is in the

British empire, as expressed by institutions such as, from the British side, Mr. Rothschild's organization, the Inter-Alpha Group. It's one of the worst pestilences on this planet.

There are also, of course, in terms of Russia—there's a problem, which is that there's a policy conflict in Russia itself. Russia is among the most promising nations, but also the most destitute one. I'm extremely sympathetic to the efforts of Prime Minister Putin, and his efforts, and to the programs for the development of infrastructure. I think what I've heard otherwise from other sources in Russia, which generally represent the interests of useless firms, listed as principal Russia firms, operating in the Caribbean—which I refer to as “the pirates of the Caribbean.” And if Russia does not go with large-scale investment in basic economic infrastructure, and the development of manufacturing and agricultural industry, as well as the things that go with this, Russia is going to go the way Europe is about to go now.

There's a crisis there. I know there's a policy difference within Russia. There are those who are for long-term infrastructure, which is sanity. It's the only way that Russia is going to be rebuilt, be built out of the rape that was done to Russia in the immediate post-Soviet period. That's Russia's bigger problem. But the idea of going with that kind of program, is doomed, and if Russia were to stick with that kind of program, it would be doomed. And I'm concerned that Russia not be doomed: that Russia would benefit as much, or more, from Glass-Steagall as the United States.

The big parasite on the planet is the British empire, and British interests, typified by this Rothschild group, which was created in 1971, at the same time that the British interests induced the United States to drop the Bretton Woods system, the fixed-exchange-rate system.

So, I know there are sentiments within Russia which want this other kind of thing. We had a representative, a special representative of the Russian President, here in the United States, and what he said, what we heard, was for me, absolute insanity. Those policies he proposed, or on which he put emphasis, would destroy Russia.

The idea of setting up, you know, a Silicon Valley in Russia, is lunacy. A Silicon Valley is a farce. It was a creation of the U.S. government in a certain period, which was a bailout operation, which former President Clinton understands very well, what this was, what he experienced. As also, the Bush Administration earlier, which started this process. It was a farce, it was a failure. And the collapse of this crazy thing in California,

the dot-com system, was the result of the fact that the U.S. government ceased to bail out a swindle, a swindle which almost ruined our economy—from which we've never recovered since.

No, the greatest debt in the planet is the British, the British system, as extended. As typified by the Rothschild interest, which is actually the interest of the British monarchy.

And, it also is, in the Russian case, that Caribbean pirates, of Russian denomination, are also representative of that same interest. And I see that Russia, as well as other countries, would be doomed by a continuation of that process.

So, I know that people in Russia get this story that the United States is the big debtor and we're trying to bail out the United States at the expense of other countries. That's nonsense.

The United States is the driver, if we have a President who's competent—the United States is a driver for the recovery of the world planet. And without that driver, the world as a whole is going down the tubes. As we see the disintegration of the euro system, as we sit here today.

Freeman: Lyn, more on Russia from an individual who was on site during Mr. Dvorkovich's recent visit to Stanford University. He says: Lyn, there were many things that surprised me about our Russian friend's remarks during his visit to the West Coast. But what really startled me was the concept of establishing Silicon Valleys in various places in Russia. It is obvious to anybody who lives here in the United States, particularly to anybody who lives on the West Coast, that Silicon Valley would be better named Death Valley. It's a complete wasteland right now. Yes, it's true that in the short term it produced a hell of a lot of money, for a hell of a lot of people, but some of those people are now roaming the streets of San Jose, as homeless lunatics.

I was more startled by his plea for venture capitalists to come into Russia, to expedite this process. And again, in the current global environment—and I'm not just talking about the stuff with Goldman Sachs—but look at what unfolded, just a few months ago, in Dubai.



The idea of setting up a Silicon Valley in Russia, as proposed by Arkadi Dvorkovich, is lunacy, LaRouche stated. As one participant noted, today, "Silicon Valley would be better named Death Valley." Shown: the skeletons of empty office buildings in Silicon Valley, following the blowout of the dot.com bubble.

Again, the product of these various funds and venture capitalists, and what happens when you let your country become the staging ground of bigger and better gambling casinos.

But, to get to the point, I was sufficiently disturbed by all of this, that I went on the Internet to learn more about the people who were advocating this. I read a number of interviews with some of the people who are involved in this initiative, and who were part of a much larger group that spoke at MIT before Mr. Dvorkovich came out to California.

And what amazed me was to find these people in interviews praising not only Adam Smith, but [Friedrich] von Hayek.

Now, I can't understand this. This runs totally contrary to everything I have thought up to now about the thinking about economics in Russia. And I would appreciate it if you would shed some light on this for me. And please, let me be clear: I'm not asking the question out of any hostility toward our Russian associates here, but I'm really trying to understand this. It seems to me to be an incredible dissonance.

LaRouche: The great opportunity for Russia, and the great thinkers of Russia were actually involved, even under the Soviet period, with certain parts of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

And the core of the Russian Academy of Sciences, apart from the mineralogical aspect, which is not incon-

sistent with the other, was the work of Academician Vernadsky, who was one of the greatest geniuses of the last century.

We today, we are entering a new kind of economy, in terms of technology, in which cosmic radiation, as studied by people such as Vernadsky and his followers, is the key to great changes on Earth; but also, is indispensable the minute we start talking about transporting human beings from Earth to, say, Mars.

First of all, we do not yet know the solution for some of the problems, or even the problems themselves, that are involved in accelerated flight, from Earth orbit—i.e., from the Moon—to Mars orbit, which would take, say, 300 days otherwise, and you would have jelly, rather than people, in the craft, if you did that sort of thing, under ordinary conditions.

The challenge of the Mars journey, a journey which should be completed by human beings before the end of the present century, is the marker of the long-range perspective which is required to build economy in the world.

But the other side of Vernadsky, it's not just that. His work is very relevant to that. We are now working, ourselves, on the question of a revision of the Periodic Table, to take into account the implications of cosmic radiation. And very little has been done on it. The weaker fields in cosmic radiation are extremely important, because they pertain largely to living processes, which is what human beings ought to be concerned about.

So, these kinds of concerns are absolutely necessary.

So, I think that the destiny of Russia, economically, since Peter the Great, who may not have been a perfect individual, but his policies set Russia on the road to greatness, coming out of the conditions of earlier centuries. And Vernadsky typifies, together with his predecessor Mendeleev, the great genius in Russia, which enabled Russia to achieve great things as Russia, under certain tsars, before the war, and afterward, in the Soviet Union.

The world has not changed in physical principle since that time. And the idea which comes from Bertrand Russell, and IASA [International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis]—these ideas are not only stupid, but they are malicious. Because remember, IASA and the Club of Rome are founded by one and the same operation. And their conception of economy is incompetent.

And the question you ask about these conditions, of the design of the policy, Adam Smith, is completely an

aspect of that. Marx claimed that he was Adam Smith's apostle—I don't think that's quite true. It was true in some degree. But this thing, this idea of Bertrand Russell, and the positivist insanity of Bertrand Russell and his followers, have to be contrasted with the genius of great thinkers such as Vernadsky. And today, when you think about what is the role of Russia: Russia's a large nation; it's a Eurasian culture, rather than just a European culture. It has vast resources in its fields, in Siberia, for example, some areas which are very difficult to handle, which Russian scientists have understood how to deal with.

Below there you have China, Mongolia, India, and so forth, which have an insufficiency of resources. Now, China is doing an excellent job in mass railroad development—it's crucial. Its efforts to succeed are noble. India is moving in a similar direction. Both China and India have many poor people, a large portion of poor people between them. Well, you have a natural relationship, on the one hand, between Russia, which has the science, the scientific background, and the other qualifications for supplying the necessary minerals, and other kinds of things, to China, to Mongolia, to India, and to other countries of the Southern rim.

We have the cooperation available for this purpose, from nations such as Japan, which is eager to assist in the Siberian development process, for this thing. We have South Korea, which is extremely interested in this process. So, the destiny of Russia lies, from a physical economic standpoint, in the development of Russian science. Russian science as applied to these needs. Typified by the role of Russia in contributing to the nuclear power development, and its application on the planet.

That's where the future of Russia lies, and that has to be understood.

Now, Russia can not do that without contractual relations, with the United States, and with what we hope can be salvaged from Western Europe. With cooperation with India, with China, with Japan, with Korea, and other countries.

So, we need a system, a fixed exchange-rate system, purged of everything that smells like financial derivatives.

Remember, the Inter-Alpha Group is largely based on the swindle of these kinds of financial derivatives. You will not bring Russia out of Hell, which it's headed toward now, under those trends—opposed to those of Putin—you will not bring Russia out successfully, without cleaning this mess up, and getting rid of these ideas

from Bertrand Russell and others.

Look, what happened is, it was Bertrand Russell and his influence which wrecked Russia to begin with, especially during the 1980s. Russia did not have to collapse then. There were solutions available for Russia, with cooperation. But some of the influences of leaders in Russia, which shifted *against* the traditional Russian tendency, like the Vernadsky tendency, wrecked Russia, and opened Russia to being looted by the British, and those Americans who were part of the British operation.

We have to learn this lesson of history. And what we have to realize is, we are going into a period where the future of humanity does involve space development. Russia has been a pioneer in space development. Those things must be revived, and retained. Large-scale infrastructure projects must be built, as a way of developing the economy of Russia. The economy in Russia must be developed rapidly. Russia's survival depends, as a nation, on having constructive relations of benefit to China, to India, and to other countries, in that vicinity.

Russia is a key in reviving a Western and Central Europe which is now being wrecked by the British influence, established in 1990, where the euro system was imposed by [British Prime Minister Margaret] Thatcher, by [French President François] Mitterrand, and by George H.W. Bush. Russia was looted and ruined under British direction, from 1990 on, in this way. And there has been an effort to revive Russia; and there are people who are in Russia who want to do the right thing.

And my belief is that the United States must treat Russia, not as a trading partner, but as an ally. Must treat China as an ally. Must treat India as an ally. And must hope that we have Western Europe recover from the euro disease, the euro which is now breaking up, and to be a partner in this process.

And there are great projects, and great aims, for mankind on this planet, otherwise. And this combination of nations, the four great nations, combined with what we can salvage of the nations of continental Western Europe, as partners: This is the key to the future of humanity. And without this kind of future, there is not going to be much humanity.

Freeman: I have some questions relating to what you've discussed regarding Vernadsky. But, first, I want to entertain one of the questions that came up, specifically related to the Inter-Alpha Group, and that is the question of the BRIC [Brazil-Russia-India-China]. Earlier today, this was being rather hotly debated between

our friends from the Stanford Group, and our Russian guests.

Here's the question: We have had extensive discussion of the Four Power agreement among the United States, Russia, India, and China, and while our friend from Stanford says, given the current behavior of the United States, I understand why right now, the current alliance among Russia, India, and China, while still in a nascent phase, seems to be proceeding forward—although I would contend that it can't function without the United States, for reasons that Mr. LaRouche has addressed in tremendous detail over the course of the time since he first made the proposal.

But, my question has to do with this BRIC business, which I'm trying to understand. It would seem to me that there was some effort to take the United States out of the Four Power agreement, and to somehow replace it with Brazil. Now, I may be wrong about this, but that is what it appears to be to me, and it makes absolutely no sense. While I have the utmost respect for Brazil as a nation, it ain't no U.S. And I was wondering, Lyn, if you could talk a little bit about this whole BRIC configuration, because the only way I can understand it, is to see it as something that has been put on the table, and promoted, inside Russia, taking advantage of what is probably some justified hostility toward the United States right now, given the behavior of this administration, and the one before it.

I understand why it might be seductive, except that, in practical reality, I don't see it working. But it does seem to be something that was put on the table specifically in opposition to the Four Power agreement that we are working on.

LaRouche: Okay, first of all, the BRIC was not launched by the Russians. The BRIC was launched by Goldman Sachs, and it was launched by Goldman Sachs' collaboration with the Rothschild Inter-Alpha Group. The first surfacing of the BRIC came in a meeting steered and controlled by Goldman Sachs, in Modena, Italy.

This was the meeting which led to the process of Russia's distancing itself from association with the United States, in terms of economic cooperation.

The BRIC includes, of course—Spain and Portugal are BRIC countries. The major country in the BRIC operation, by the British, which is by the Inter-Alpha Group of the Rothschild interests, is Brazil. In Brazil, which is a divided country, because you have some very poor people, and very not-so-poor people, who are vir-

tually at war against each other, under a controlled state of virtual warfare. So, it's not an integrated, stable country. It's not a democratic country by any means. It has some good qualities in it, some good people, some good industrial talent, and so forth, but it's a divided country, which anyone who's been there, and seen the terrain, sees cities at war against each other, under temporary no-fire agreements.

Now, what the function is—and this starts from an old Spanish firm, which was actually a British asset, and has been a British asset, part of the British Empire. The whole operation is Rothschild, Lord Jacob Rothschild and his associates, which are the key bankers for the British monarchy. They set this thing up.

Now, what does it do in Brazil? What it does in Brazil, is, it runs a carry trade. The highest-leveraged carry trade in the world. And this is a fraud. The whole thing is a fraud.

But for various political reasons, largely British—because you had a lot of people who left Russia after 1989, and they went to where? Among the places they went was to Antigua, to the Cayman Islands, to other hot spots of great virtue, among the pirates of the Caribbean. And these Russians, who were boosted by the British—many of them were trained by the British, such as [Anatoly] Chubais, and so forth. They operate on the basis of: Their interests lie outside Russia, in enterprises whose offices, whose home offices are in the Caribbean. Which have damn little care for what happens to Russians on Russian territory back home.

So, there is a division. It's obvious to me. A division of perception of interests between Russian ex-patriots, who have more British citizenship than Russian sentiment. And Russians, as I think Putin has tried to do during his Presidency and his prime-ministership, who are trying to develop Russia.

So, I think the people who have policies which are dedicated to developing Russia, along the lines I've indicated, for the purposes I've indicated—there is a clear interest of Russia.

It's clear to me, it's clear to anybody who understands the world: Russia's a Eurasian nation, with a large territory, with very special missions and opportunities. And it needs to get back, to rebuild, on the basis of the Russian Academy of Sciences, its great ones, especially the great departments, in the tradition of Vernadsky. And that's Russia's vital economic interest. It's the existential interest of Russia.

The opposite kind of policy, what is called the BRIC,

which is of the great swindler who created the BRIC—not Brazil, not Russia, it was Britain that created the BRIC, with Goldman Sachs, as the Modena case illustrates.

So, that's what you have to understand. We have a war, we have virtually civil war, in various parts of the world, between those who are for this kind of swindle, which the BRIC represents. There's no intention. It does not represent the interests of India, or China, or Russia. It represents the interests of the Caribbean pirates, who are steered by Lord Jacob Rothschild's operation, under the Queen in Britain. And once you understand that, there's no real mystery.

What has caused the world crisis is, in the United States, as well as outside it, has been this.

What happened? Roosevelt died in April of 1945, and Truman, his successor, made a deal with Churchill, to effectively destroy the United States. And started a war with the Soviet Union, or a threat of a war with the Soviet Union, and similar kinds of operations. The entire Cold War was totally unnecessary from the standpoint of U.S. or Russian interests. And many people in the Soviet Union understood that. They understood that Franklin Roosevelt typified a United States, whose existence coincided with the future existence of Russia, or the Soviet Union at that time. The same thing for China. And this is the opposite side.

And you have people in Russia who represent the opposite side, who represent the British side, more than they represent the Russian interest. And you have people in Russia who are patriots, who are enraged, and justly so, at what I, among others, saw happen to Russia, with the looting operation by people like Chubais, who is one of the figures behind this operation, back in the 1990s.

I saw Russia raped. I went into a great machine-tool plant at that time, back in 1994, which had been one of the great machine-tool plants. And in that plant, I watched people, Russian workers, at their machines. Aged! These were the Russians who had worked in Moscow during the siege by the Nazi occupiers around Russia. And here they were, aged, continuing at their jobs. And shortly after I visited this plant, they shut it down. One of the great machine-tool plants. Did it have aging features in it? Yes. But it still had the skills, the human skills, the human orientation, to rebuild a country which was damaged by the way the Soviet Union collapsed.

I think these are the kinds of terms you have to start to discuss this issue in.



National Science Fdn/Kristan Hutchinson

LaRouche described the tragedy that befell Russia following the collapse of the Soviet Union, when its economy was raped, its industries shut down, on orders from London, by the "pirates of the Caribbean." Here, a machinist works aboard the Russian icebreaker Krasin, 2005.

Freeman: Lyn, the next question comes from one of the leaders of our group out there on the West Coast, and she's been doing a lot of good work, but she wanted to preface her question with this. She says: You know, back in 1998, in the Summer of '98, there was a terrible crisis in Russia, with the crash of GKO's. And at that time, I was still in the process of washing the muck of Washington, D.C. off my body, but I was still privy to a good deal of what was going on, and I think it's just useful to point something out here. Because I'm sure most of the Americans here, are completely unaware of this.

But, one of the things that did occur—and I think this relates directly to Lyn's remarks on the rape of Russia by this crowd—is that at the first sign that this GKO thing was going to explode, or rather implode, what happened? Well, there was old Goldman Sachs, who managed, with the help of the same Mr. Chubais, to organize the conversion, if you will, of the devalued GKO's that Goldman Sachs clients were holding, into what were essentially dollar-denominated Russian government bonds.

Now, I may be off in my numbers, but, as I recall, it was worth about \$4 billion, which is a significant sum of money. But what was most notable about this restructuring—and, at the time, I was amazed that Mr. Chubais would buy into something like this, because it seemed to be of no benefit to Russia at all, because this

dollar-denominated restructuring—these \$4 billion in bonds, were exempt from the forced restructuring that later took place.

So, Goldman Sachs' clients did just fine, and basically, Russia ate it. So the fact that, today, you'd have any willingness to invite the likes of Goldman Sachs into Russia, is something that I find rather amazing. Certainly, it's not my place to raise the issue, but I do wonder if anybody has looked closely at this, and looked closely at Mr. Chubais's actions at that time. Because when Debbie was out on the West Coast, and was ranting and raving about how these people might have Russian surnames, but that essentially, they were the enemies of Russia, everybody here thought she had temporarily lost her mind. But when you look at the role

that some of these people have played, there are questions that I think are worth looking at.

It certainly raised questions in my mind, and therefore, I think that it would raise questions in the minds of some of our friends in Russia. Okay, now that I've probably created a diplomatic incident, let me get on to my actual question here:

Lyn, I found particularly interesting, some of your statements in the videotape presentation that we had listened to before you came on live, where you talked about how monetary systems, and how they developed, were intrinsically imperial, that they were intrinsically based on the notion of empire. Because, as you know, we've had a particular discussion and it took us a long time to get a firm handle on this question of a credit system versus a monetary system. But I did not really think of it before, in quite these terms, and I find this very interesting.

But I think that the next step that we have to take—and this did come up very specifically in some of our discussions with our friends from Russia—it's not only organizing a monetary system versus a credit system, but really I think that it gets right to the heart of the question of what is national economy, and I don't think that there is a clear understanding of this at all.

If we take, for example, this back and forth with Russia—you know, when the Russian President formed

this modernization commission, on paper, I thought it was right on the mark. It was a call for greater investment in high technology, in high-technology energy production, infrastructure, etc. But then, this gentleman [Dvorkovich] came to the West Coast—and I don't know if this is the Russian President's conception—but his conception of high tech was translated into this Silicon Valley thing.

Now, aside from the fact that Silicon Valley was a miserable failure, in terms of simple profitability, the question that it poses to me, and that I posed to him, is really, how does it add to national economy?

Let me just say, I'm the mother of a young man who loves the Internet, and I think eBay is swell, and it's where I buy my "Jimmy Choos" because I couldn't afford them otherwise. I'm not inclined to shut it down, but I don't particularly view it, when I sit down, and try to map out the direction of U.S. policy, and the direction of the U.S. economy, and the same applies to any other nation—I don't figure that in to my overall perspective.

But, getting back to where I started, in order to move away from this imperial conception that's implicit in any monetary system, it would seem to me, that what is necessary for any nation, and what has to be their first point of concern, is the ability to not only produce goods internally, but to be able to move things internally. And from that standpoint, I think the question of the development of railroads, in particular, and today, obviously, high-speed rails, seems to be absolutely essential, not only from the standpoint of economy, and national economy, but really from—I'm having trouble thinking how I want to articulate the question—just from the standpoint of the security and the sovereignty of a nation, these kinds of projects are crucial.

And obviously, there's no need for them to stop at national borders, but first and foremost, it seems necessary—I think one of greatest problems that we see in Africa, for instance, is that they have no capability to move anything within their own countries, let alone on the continent as a whole.

And similarly, in studying the history of the United States, what was integral to true U.S. independence, and the development of the U.S. economy, was the development of the continental railway system.

And therefore, I would think that, just in terms of defining what it is that constitutes a national economy, and what it is that really is the business of government, as opposed to the business of entrepreneurial people who want to set up eBay-type ventures, this is

a very—you have to apply some litmus test.

And I think about Russia—this incredible landmass, that has so many different features to it—the fact that the government would concern itself with the expansion of Facebook and Twitter, rather than figuring out how to build high-speed rails everywhere—I don't want to keep dwelling on the Russian question, and I know it's a very big issue for all of us here, because of what's gone on over the last few weeks—but I'm really posing this question more generally, from the standpoint of what defines national economy, versus just day-to-day commerce that somebody might make a buck off. So, I'd like you to address this a little bit more.

LaRouche: Well, in terms of modern economy, starting with the 15th-Century Renaissance, and with people such as Brunelleschi, who was the first to discover the application of a non-geometric curve, that is, a non-Euclidean curve, the catenary; who constructed the dome of Santa Maria del Fiore in Florence, based on the use of the catenary principle as an active principle of construction. And then following him, Brunelleschi, Nicholas of Cusa. And Nicholas of Cusa is actually the founder of modern science, in his term, as well as the other things he did.

So, you have then the development, which leads through things like Kepler, Johannes Kepler, who is the first one who extended this to the generality of a general principle of physical science, especially with his *Harmony of the Worlds*. Then you have the things of the 17th Century, in which the work of Leibniz was based, Kepler and Leibniz.

So that, actually, when you look at the way the economy of Europe, of western and central Europe and beyond, developed, coming out of the New Dark Age of the 14th Century, it was always a physical principle of economy, which determined successful economy. And it was those who suppressed technological and scientific progress, who caused the great catastrophes, by various means, including wars.

So, then you had the influence of Leibniz, despite his opponents, in the 18th Century, and you had the emergence of France as a great productive nation. You had the emergence in Germany; also Russia, of course, is developed in this period. In Germany, during that same period, the 19th Century, especially under the influence of Bismarck. And all of this development was—including the great development of the United States from its founding, from the Massachusetts Bay Colony—was always physical development. The de-

velopment of the physics of production, and the nature of the design of the product, and the design of the manufacturing of the product. With the system of transport of the product, and people.

So that physical economy is actually the basis.

Now, the other side of physical economy, the new part, which came into being significantly at the end of the 19th Century, was the idea of physical chemistry. And since that time there has been a very significant difference among, on the one hand, mathematics, so-called mathematical physics; physics as such; and physical chemistry.

Now, take two figures, one an American—William Draper Harkins—and Vernadsky, sort of contemporary. And they represented a new dimension in the development of economy, because of their contributions to physical economy, as opposed to physics as it's taught, as a mathematical subject, or mathematical physics, which is not quite as good, and not quite as useful.

And you look, of course, at this case we mentioned Russia before, at Vernadsky. Vernadsky was one of the great—he and Harkins were two of the greatest geniuses in developing the science of physical economy, and of mathematical physics as such, physical chemistry, in the century.

So, the way we have survived, as people, as nations, the way we have increased the potential population density of the human population, where this has happened, and where we had the greatest increases in productivity of labor and standards of living—improvements of that sort—has always been in terms of the application of physical chemistry. And Vernadsky, in the case of Russia, for example, typifies that.

Probably, he is the most important figure in the science of physical chemistry, in history. He and his followers. And his discoveries are one of the greatest sources of benefit in terms of health care, in terms of agriculture, in terms of about everything, including the present science, which is a shift in science occurring today, in terms of the cosmic radiation problem. He was a part of this process, as was Harkins.

So, the actual increases of the productive powers of labor, of society, of the nation, depend upon the application, by man's mind, of developing principles of physical chemistry, through the problem of supplying mankind with the means of existence. There is no intrinsic value in money. Money is simply a certificate of something. And when we run an economy well, we stick to what we might call physical economy, the econ-

omy based on physical production, or physical transportation, the physical conditions of life, physical conditions of health care.

And it is the improvement in man's power in physical chemistry, in terms of per capita, per square kilometer increases of power of mankind, increases in the population density of mankind: These steps of progress have always been made in this way.

So, that what we're doing in economy, is translating the benefits of applied physical economy; that is, today, looking back at this history since the Renaissance, the 15th-Century Renaissance: We're transforming society, transforming the economic policy of the economy of the nation, by these methods, methods which are essentially physical chemistry methods.

Thus, when we know what the physical chemistry is that's required, then we put a corresponding value on the elements of the economy.

We determine, first of all, what is it worth to us, as mankind. We're comparing that with what it costs us, to perform this function, which produces that which is of worth to mankind.

Most of the problems of economy have come from the idea of monetary economy—the extension of monetarist economy, as opposed to physical economy. Monetarist economy assumes that there's a statistical relationship among financial events, which defines the way economies function. It doesn't. Not true. It's false.

What we need, as the American System typifies this, as Hamilton's influence typifies this, as Franklin before that, or the Massachusetts Bay Colony before it was crushed by Andros—always our experience in economy has been based on this. And we had the highest rate of gain, in terms of economy, of any nation on this planet, except when we were under British influence. Always.

We always understood that you do not want a monetarist *system*. You want a system of credit, which is the basis of your use of currency and so forth, and sales. But you want to adjust the system of money, as credit—you want to adjust that to two values: one, the cost of producing it, or supplying it, of delivering it, against the physical cost of producing it; and what its value is to mankind, according to the benefit it represents—the relative value it contributes to mankind. Including health care.

So, that's where our problem lies. Those are the terms we have to think in terms of.

The idea of an area like Russia, of trying to say that we're going to use innovation, games like Facebook, or

things like that, silly things like that as having economic value, they have *no* economic value whatsoever. They're a swindle, a waste of time. And we have to go to this concept of physical economy. That everything we should spend money for, has a physical basis.

And what we're concerned about always, is the increase of the physical productive powers of labor, and, at the same time, with the physical benefit of those powers—including the social benefit.

So, what we've come into, increasingly, since the death of Roosevelt, but especially since the insert of Alan Greenspan in charge of the Federal Reserve System, we have become clinically insane, and criminal in our practice of economics, internationally, under these influences.

That's what happened to Russia during the 1990s. Criminal behavior. By whom? Well, by the British. Partly by the French. By Americans. Russia was *raped*. How was it raped? Well, the rape was continued as a Caribbean phenomenon. You couldn't get a hotel room in Antigua unless you spoke Russian, because the thieves robbing Russia, under British direction, who are of Russian origins, were betraying and raping their own country.

Then they come back, in the form of people like Chubais, who is typical of this; and they come out, and now they tell us how Russia must be run. And you look at what they proposed; if you're an economist and understand how economies work, you see that Chubais is still a thief. He's a robber. He's a rapist of his own people, in his own nation.

But he's not the only one. The present Administration of the United States, under Obama, is equally evil. What has happened since de Gaulle, in many cases in France, has not been too good either. What's happened recently in Germany, is rape. What's happened to Italy, repeatedly, is rape. What the British do to their own people repeatedly, is automatically rape, and sometimes the British say they enjoy it.

But that's where the problem lies. That's where you have to come down on this thing.

Goldman Sachs is what? Goldman Sachs is a part of the British imperial system. It's nominally American, but it's not really American—it's Wall Street. And Wall Street has never really been a patriotic part of the United States. Wall Street was the British East India Company branch inside the United States, by traitors to the United States. And that's why I consider some of these people in Russia to be traitors to Russia, as they were, in some

cases, to the Soviet Union. Like Chubais.

They raped their own country and betrayed it, and took up residence of their assets and parked them in the Caribbean, in a tax-free zone, or a quasi-tax-free zone, and paid nothing back to the country which they were robbing. And this is what we do to ourselves in the United States, what is done to the nations in Europe, and otherwise. And we have to establish a system which recognizes these things as crimes, crimes against humanity. Like Hitler's crimes against humanity. And we have to say we are going to stop this criminality.

We are going back to a system where countries work and cooperate, to improve the conditions of life of their nation, and other nations. And once we decide we're going to do that, we'll do just fine. As the United States did; every time we did that in the United States, we had a great benefit. As under Benjamin Franklin's leadership; under the Massachusetts Bay Colony in the earlier period; under Lincoln, under McKinley, under Franklin Roosevelt.

Every time we've followed these principles, we've prospered. And we have also been a benefit to other nations of the world. And that's the basis for economy.

Freeman: The next question touches some of these points, but on a very different level, and the questioner says: You know, after the last webcast, when you answered the question about math versus physics in economics, a number of us were very excited by your answer. And, as you may know, there is a little bit of a—to call it a split among us would be an exaggeration—but there's a difference in orientation among us, that comes largely from training, and also just from the focus of what different people work on. A lot of us are people who have, at various points, spent a lot of time working on domestic policies, and how to finance domestic policies, and they will probably take out their guns and try to shoot me, but they tend to take a more sociological approach to some of these questions.

Not in a bad way, but it's just, that's what they work on, and they've done stints in Washington, and stuff like that. But for others of us here: We have long grappled with this conflict between mathematics and physics, and have been fascinated, really from the outset, although we have only recently begun to discuss some of the issues you've raised about Vernadsky. And there is a group of us—it's not a large group—but about six of us are fluent in Russian, and we have gone back, and we have looked at some of this stuff. And we are still at a much earlier

stage than you are, obviously, in looking at this, but it's something that we agree is critical to the underlying methodology of long-term economic development.

But, one of the things that now has come up as a new source of debate—and we have different views of it here—is the question of Vernadsky versus Oparin. My own view—and everybody is going to accuse me of shaping the question in my favor, to get you to say something that will support my position—and they can ask their own questions if they want to. But the bottom line is that I see Vernadsky and Oparin as representing—I don't know if I would go so far as to say opposite views—but I don't see them as kind of *sympatico*. It's kind of like the difference between Plato and Aristotle.

I'd like you to talk about this a little bit, because it will not simply resolve the debate where I actually know I'm right, but also, because I think it will be very useful in guiding the future work of this little group of us who are pursuing this. Unless you just think it's too internal for this discussion, in which case we can ask you in a smaller setting.

LaRouche: No, it's relevant. Oparin was a Marxist, who was strongly influenced by circles in Britain, circles which, in part, were associated with [Bertrand] Russell's circles. And he was also a chemist. And he tried to get a definition of life, from reductionist chemistry. Under Stalin, he had very few opportunities to attack Vernadsky, except on one notable occasion, but, probably, some other occasions that I've missed, or have been missed by people I've consulted. But his thing was intrinsically incompetent, and remains incompetent today. Because he assumed that you can get a living form out of a non-living process. That you can get it out of a simple chemistry, a cookbook chemistry, almost.

He made an argument on this thing—it's well-known—and some of the chemistry that he referred to does occur, and does appear as a phenomenon, in the living processes. But it does not *generate* living processes, and life is defined by its developed generating life. Vernadsky understood what this meant, and understood also that chemistry, true chemistry, has three categories, from the standpoint of experiment, from the standpoint of investigation and practice.

One, we have the non-living processes, those things which are chemically distinguished as being non-living in their characteristics.

Then we have things that are residues, of living

processes, or things that were living processes, like residues.

And thirdly we have human life.

Now, the universe as a whole is creative. In other words, the universe was not—argued against the Aristotelian tradition by a very famous Philo of Alexandria, on the question, God did not *die* when He created the universe, contrary to Friedrich Nietzsche. But rather the universe is inherently creative. Its existence is creative. It is not fixed. It is not dead.

And so, for example, as Harkins emphasized, you can have evolution of atoms, which occurs not with radioactivity, but by a kind of tunneling process, where a proton gets slipped in on something else, and changes the chemical composition of something, by slipping a proton in the right place, in terms of an atom.

The universe *is* creative. The universe we know now, is essentially cosmic radiation, of all kinds. And from this soup of cosmic radiation, the other forms of expression of material existence, and experience, come up.


But on top of this. . . But life is peculiar in the sense that only the human life, is actually conscious. We have the development of successive orderings of species of animal life. We have the ordering of plant life species in general. We have the ordering of the non-living, the non-living aspects of life. They all are there. But only in mankind, with the creative powers of intellect, which are consistent, shall we say, with the image of Albert Einstein, do we find, as Vernadsky points out—only then do we find human life.

And our concern is two things: life, the difference between non-life and human life. These are systemic differences. They belong to entirely different categories. You can not jump from non-life to life. Only life produces life. Only life generates life. Only human life generates willful evolution of the universe to higher states of existence.

This is all in Vernadsky. And the reductionists, who were tied to usually British ideology, as was Oparin—these are problematic cases.

But this is essential to understand economy. What do we want to do? We want to reproduce and strengthen the condition of human life. In order to create an environment for human life, we have to promote the increase of life.

For example, we want more carbon. Because it plays a crucial role in developing living plants. And we need living plants, so we want more of this stuff. Better quality of it. We don't want grasses, we want trees. Grasses



One of LaRouche's interlocutors raised a question about the great Russian biogeochemist V.I. Vernadsky (left), versus the Soviet scientist Alexander Oparin (right), suggesting the difference between them was like that between Plato and Aristotle.

convert about 1-2%, at most, of solar radiation into biomass. Trees will go up to 10%, in terms of consumption ratios, converting solar radiation into biomass. Trees, especially, even grasses in part, make a more moderate climate, as opposed to a desert, which has an abundance of solar radiation, but no means to convert solar radiation into something useful to life.

And therefore, these are the parameters to which we must refer, even in a primitive way, a classroom way, of indicating what the principle of economy is. It's mankind's powers of creativity, which enable man to make a revolution which changes the physical chemistry of the human environment, which is really the root of production. And when you think in those terms. And you have to think of something else. You have to think of what is human creativity. In other words, you can not get human creativity out of mathematics. Mathematics is not creative. You use mathematics as a tool in this process of production. But the most important thing is the environment of human creativity. The kind of human innovation, typified by the personality of Albert Einstein, one of the best to typify this, or earlier, Nicholas of Cusa, or if you go through the detail work of the discoveries of Kepler—you get the same kind of thing. Leibniz on dynamics gives you the same image.

So that, if you understand these things, you understand what the reality of economy is, as opposed to the appearance of experiencing economy. And my purpose in life has become—because I liked this, is why I did it—and I have come to look at it as more than something I like, but as a profession, a devotion, as a result.

That's the way you have to think about things. You have to realize that the Vernadskyian categories are, as far as we know, valid. That what we are beginning to find out more and more, in studying cosmic radiation, and its relationship to living processes, and other things,

informs and strengthens our views in this connection. When we think about trying to get a man safely to Mars and back, and not as a piece of glob, then we also think in these terms.

What is required to create the necessary biophysical conditions for man living in a reduced gravitational environment, or in these other kinds of problems that you get when you go into a long-term—you know, it's about 300 days to travel by ordinary propulsion to Mars. The hard goods can make it nicely, the human beings not. You might end up as a blob of jelly by the time they got there.

So, we have to get to Mars faster than that method, which means we need acceleration. We need acceleration of the rate of speed—acceleration, deceleration—to get people quickly, theoretically, it might be two days to Mars, something like that.

But these are the kinds of directions in which we have to think, and think back from, when we start thinking about how what we're doing today, will affect humanity with a span of a lifetime, which now today is about 70, 80 years, or longer, of life. What can a human life contribute, in a span of existence between zero, from birth, to the termination of life, perhaps somewhere before 100 years of age? And we should think

about the consequences of what we're doing *today*, in terms of where we're taking humanity, the humanity of our grandchildren.

Many investments today are long-term investments. You invest in something which has a useful life of a century, like a great water system, as China recently built. Or a railway system, or the equivalent. Or new kinds of industries, which involve a lot of long-term investment. So, we have to think in terms of two decades at a time, or two and a half quarter decades at a time. We have to think about our life, and what is going to come out of our life. Not just for us, but for our role in society, which spans the better part of a century.

So, we should be thinking from the beginning of the birth of a child, to the child's maturity, and approaching death, of a mission in life, which takes that child, and gives a continuous meaning to the development of that human being, and that generation, for nearly a century to come. Therefore, you must adopt goals of change, goals of increases of man's power to exist, to reach out in the universe, which go up to a century.

And it's the physical development of economy, to that effect, which, for me, is crucial.

Freeman: This makes the next question very appropriate. Because the questioner, who is part of our Stanford group, says, one of the issues that came up in the discussions both with Mr. Dvorkovich, when he was out at Stanford, but which also has come up today in some of our discussions—and I know that it's a persistent problem among Americans, in terms of discussion—is this issue of infrastructure. And when I say infrastructure, I'm not just talking about paving a highway, or something, but I'm talking about long-term infrastructure investment, as, in fact, the space program was. And various people argue that the space program was not part of infrastructure, and I really rather emphatically disagree. But one of the things that Mr. Dvorkovich said, he said, well, infrastructure is nice. We all like infrastructure. But the problem with infrastructure is that it takes a long time. It takes a long time for it to be built, and it takes a long time for it to be "profitable."

And it was kind of ironic, because my own view of infrastructure investment, and why it represents such a significant stimulus to economic growth, is precisely the opposite of that. Because it is an investment in a long-term project, not just that it then creates jobs for a long time, but that you're investing in something which is not only useful in this moment, but which, if it's based

on advanced notions of science and technology, is something which is useful long into the future.

But what it raises, and what came up in the discussion, certainly not in the discussion with Dvorkovich, because I don't think this is his area, but we've been discussing this question of energy-flux-density, as a measure of what actually constitutes human progress, since, presumably that's what we're all devoted to. That's why we got into this business in the first place.

And if, in fact, the question of increases in what you've uniquely identified as energy-flux-density, is what constitutes progress, the actual carrying capacity of this planet, and the capacity of life on this planet to explore the Solar System as a whole, then it seems that when you are trying to shape national policy, the pre-eminent question is how do you increase—I may be wrong on this, which is why I'm asking the question—but, it would seem that the immediate question that you deal with, the thing that somehow is your measure, and I guess this goes back to the earlier question that was asked about national economy—but it seems to me that what you use as kind of your test, and the question you're constantly answering, is: How do you increase energy-flux-density? And, if that's the case, then my conclusion is really: Infrastructure is what does that.


But, I'd ask you to comment on it, Mr. LaRouche.

LaRouche: On this question, you have to go back to a discussion of Leibniz at the end of the 17th Century, the last decade in particular, when he introduced the concept of dynamics.

Now, the term dynamics in Leibniz has no resemblance to the common use of the term dynamics today, on the street, or even in the universities. They mean compulsion or impulsion, and that's not the measure.

Dynamics refers to the fact that as we live in the universe, say, the universe as we describe the cosmic radiation—that's where we live. And, as in mass movements, in politics, for example: Politics is based, politics in the broad sense, is based on the influence of the impact of an idea, or something that has the expression of something like an idea, on a broad area of people, and of the effects of this action. That's what Leibniz defined dynamics to be.

Shelley, for example—I've often referred to this—Shelley, in the conclusion of his "A Defence of Poetry," describes a similar form of dynamics, or mass action, as Rosa Luxemburg, for example, described it: mass action, which moves a people, even despite their contrary tendencies. And in studying the dynamics of soci-



NASA

Another participant asked LaRouche about whether increases in “energy-flux-density,” are what constitutes progress, and the capacity of life on this planet to explore the Solar System as a whole. Shown: an artist’s concept of our Solar System.

ety, you’re looking actually at dynamics in that sense—in the same sense that “A Defence of Poetry” that Shelley describes this process. And also you get the same thing with other great poets, and so forth, who recognize this phenomenon, as a social phenomenon.

So, when we talk in terms of dynamics, as Leibniz uses the term dynamics, not the way it’s commonly used today, which is a sort of illiterate abomination, then, what you’re looking at is the relationship between a change in the environment, in some sense of environment, and the potential performance of, for example, human society. The potential improvement of the conditions of life, or the potential productivity of a society.

And therefore, in this process, we install improvements, such as basic economic infrastructure, which is necessary for community life, to improve the standard of life, and also with machinery, modes of production, to improve the productivity of labor. Or simply a countervailing action against the depletion of a resource, where it takes more effort now to get the same benefit that you got earlier, before you depleted this type of resource. So you have to go to a higher level of technology, or energy-flux-density, to solve the problem.

So, the ability of mankind to survive, does not depend upon man walking around, as on a plate or something, but man in an environment. How does that environment, including the environment of work, the environment of

life, affect the productive powers of labor, per square kilometer, per capita? When we make investments in new processes, we increase the productive power of labor, and we calculate the ratio difference between this improvement in the productive powers of labor, in society, and the benefits, as compared with the investment that has to be expended to provide this factor which causes that improvement to occur.

And we’re always depleting society. If we stand still, with the same technology, without technological progress, without capital-intensive improvements, we are depleting society. We’re

using up the richest lodes of natural resources, for less rich lodes. But we make up for that by going to a higher level of technology, usually in the order of an increase in energy-flux-density of the process involved.

And that’s the way we progress. If we don’t do that, we’re going to Hell. So, these improvements include infrastructure, real infrastructure: mass transportation; freshwater systems; clean air; better quality of food; availability of foodstuffs, more cheaply, more accessible. You don’t want super-large cities, and countrysides at a distance. You want medium-sized cities, and you want the medium-sized cities permeated by parks, and other things which give you a quasi-rural effect, and you want your agricultural development in the surrounding area, or forests and agriculture immediately surrounding this medium-sized city.

And you don’t want to have everything concentrated in one part of an entire continent. You want to have plots all across the entire continent you’re developing, which have these benefits: an efficient transportation system, high-speed transportation system, so freight and people can move efficiently, at low cost to themselves, in terms of lost time; and comfortably.

So, production is distributed over a wide area, rather than being concentrated in a great slum, or a slum-like operation.

So, the concept that you referred to, as some peo-

ple's concept, is idiotic, and it shows one thing: That the person that makes such an argument has no competent knowledge whatsoever, of city planning, of designing machinery, designing a productive process, determining the cost of a productive process in human terms. All these essential things which should be the natural talent of a professional economist, largely in the area of physical economy.

Also, you consider the social environment, or the psychological environment, which is just as important for human beings as the physical environment. You want schools that are not overcrowded. You want a program of activities in the schools which promote the development of the creative powers of the people, of the students, things like that. You want to be on the frontier of science. You want to have a human being who's developed in the educational process, as a *creative* human being, not some dullard who knows how to repeat what he was taught, but a person who will spontaneously tend to contribute the ideas which lead to a qualitative improvement in mankind's potential.

The other side, which is also morally important, as well as physically: We can live, today, about a span in modern society, with decent health care, and decent conditions of life, we can live up to 100 years. And that is within the reach of mankind, if we can reverse some of this nonsense about health care. Get rid of Obama's health care, and go back to a Hill-Burton system in the United States. We can keep people generally alive and functional, up to the age of 100. That doesn't mean it's going to work for every case, but that can be the trend, that can be the standard.

And on something else: What's the motive in living? What's the human motive in living? You're born. Eventually, inevitably, you're going to die. Well, what keeps you together as an individual in that span? The fact that you are going to die, means that there should have been a purpose in your life, which made that life's existence worthwhile to future humanity. And since we're social people, we like to think of that. And we like to think in terms of our grandchildren. We like to think of old friends. We think of their children. We like to think of cities and towns which have been improved, and somebody on the verge of death, can look around them, and see the improvements that have been made, partly through their help.

And then they say, mankind has a mission in the universe.

And we have participated in that mission. And there-

fore progress, including scientific and technological progress, is a moral value in its own right. Because there's a difference between a human being who considers himself a rat, who's born to die, and not much else—and a human being who can live three or more generations, and live with the intention that their life will have meant something in a continuous way, to the time beyond their death.

Then they say, our existence, as human existence, has a purpose. It has a mission. And we are, therefore, motivated to choose decisions, which contribute to that effect. The notion of being good, means that you think that mankind, as such, has a mission in existence. A mission which reaches beyond their mortality. And they will choose the course of life, and the behavior, according to their desire to represent that kind of immortality. The immortality of having a meaningful thing that you have contributed to the future of mankind, while you were still alive. And you don't want that destroyed. You don't want that denied.

So, you have the two aspects. First of all, you have to have a moral society. And a moral society is one that cares for humanity as being a very special part of creation. And humanity which has a limited life, about three generations of potential for life for any newborn human being in a decent society. But what is that person going to do with those three generations?

They're going to mature, of course, and they're going to make some contributions, develop to make those contributions, but they're going to have a sense of purpose.

For example, when you think of other nations, they speak a different language. They have different habits than you do. But why should you care about them?

Because they're part of humanity.

What then should humanity do? If you care about the fact that the other nations, cultures, are a contribution to the outcome of your existence, and therefore, you look at that other nation, not as a competitor. You may compete, but you don't look at them as merely a competitor. You look at them as complementing your role in creating the future of mankind, in this universe.

You go to space. Why? Because you're going to get kicks out of it? No. You go into space because you know this is important for humanity, in future generations. And that's the kind of thinking that's required. And that's the way a really competent economist will tend to think anyway. You think of the edifices you build, the

goals you achieve, the goals you make possible.

Like in space: I am not going to be on Mars. I will never live long enough to land on Mars. But I would hope that I would be represented in man's landing and development of Mars. Because what I'm doing now will help to contribute to that end.

Therefore, my life has a purpose and that purpose controls my morality, and my intention. And that's the way a real economist has to think.

Freeman: Thank you, Lyn. I'm going to ask you one last question just to wrap things up, and we're going to try to work out another discussion.

This last question kind of brings things back to the issue of the Four Power agreement. The questioner says: Yesterday, before this fiscal summit that occurred in Washington D.C., and then in greater detail later on, President Clinton blew everybody away by insisting that if we're going to get out of the current mess that we're in, if we're going to get out of the current financial-economic crisis, he said that, along with everything else that we've been discussing, he's absolutely convinced that we have to increase immigration; that it's essential for America's economic future, but that it's also essential for just the global strategic situation.

And he raised it from a couple of different standpoints. He said that it's obvious to him—and he said he felt very strongly about it—that there's no way out of this current mess, unless that's part of the strategy. He referred to the collapse of the machine-tool sector in the United States, but he said, not only in the United States, but in the advanced sector as a whole. And in doing that, he referred to the average age of a machine-tool designer right now. And he said that he feels that one of the difficulties that we face, is that we're dealing with an aging workforce—of which he included himself as one—but that bringing young talent in was crucial.

And he said that he's very aware of the fact that this completely flies in the face of popular opinion, but that he feels strongly about it, and he's willing to defend it. And he said that he's always been convinced that one of the things that has allowed America to compete globally, and to progress as rapidly as we did, is that, unlike



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

One participant reported that former President Bill Clinton, speaking to a Washington, D.C. fiscal summit in April, “blew everybody away, by insisting that, if we’re going to get out of the current mess . . . he’s absolutely convinced that we have to increase immigration,” that it’s essential for both America’s economic future, and the global strategic situation.

some other countries, which, in fact, are great countries, is the fact that the U.S. developed really as a coalition of more than one country, and that—the way that he put it is, he said, we've got somebody from everywhere here, and we manage to make it work.

But he then went on, in terms of the discussion of the Four Power agreement, and this is what I really wanted you to comment on, because this came up especially with some of our international guests, is, he really stressed that what was being discussed in terms of the Four Power agreement is not a diplomatic arrangement. That it's not a diplomatic compromise that will kind of keep the world peaceful, although he said he thought that it would. But that really, what it is, and what it represents, is something really on a different level; that it's a long-term commitment to collaboration on a common goal, for the entire planet. And that that is something which he sees as very different.

He said it's not—because some people said, isn't this just a new form of globalization?—he said, absolutely not. What it is, is it's a question of totally sovereign nations, working together, collaborating together, on a common end, which is good for everyone, he said; and that's not merely a diplomatic initiative, although it does have, it's diplomatic in the sense that it will pro-

mote, it will definitely promote world peace, and it will stabilize what is otherwise an unstable situation.

But I thought that it was important for him to put that on the table, because I think that, especially people who have not been involved in this discussion from the beginning, tend to kind of reduce—you know, there are a million different diplomatic initiatives going on, most of which I find to be pretty useless, but this is something that we've all gotten involved in, because we do see it as different. And since you're the author of the policy, I thought that it would be very useful if you'd just put forward your own thoughts on it, especially for our guests here.

LaRouche: Well, let's take the case of the SDI, which was, as I've documented this for people in other locations: It was my baby. I got into this mess, as I've indicated, because Brzezinski and company were planning a nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union, and I knew we had to stop it. And so, I had the evidence in my hand, knowing that this is what that crowd had intended, and I did something to scandalize the issue. And then also, having scandalized the issue, which we did prevent *that* particular form of horror by Brzezinski, but we got the other kind, and they wanted to kill me over my opposition to that thing, at that time, from around Brzezinski.

So, I realized that I had only addressed part of the problem. To avoid the nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union, we had to have some positive measures to reverse what had been started by Truman, and the British, after Roosevelt's death.

We had to get the relationship between Russia and the United States, in particular, on a basis which was consistent with that of Franklin Roosevelt's intention.

So, I looked at possibilities in terms of technology, and so we came up with, with the aid of some very capable scientists, we came up with an approach as to what we could do. I discussed, with the permission of the U.S. government, the relevant people, the security-intelligence department, secured the go-ahead.

We had, in the meantime, a report from a Russian military person, assigned to the United Nations, we had a suggestion that they wanted to talk to the new Reagan Administration, and wondered what I could do for them. So, I passed along the message from this Russian gentleman, and took it to the relevant people in the incoming Reagan Administration. And said I strongly recommend that this be followed up. And they said back to me, from the security department, why don't you do

it? You initiate this. So I did. And I had a certain amount of knowledge at that time, on how to deal with this, what the Strategic Defense Initiative would be, and so I went ahead with it.

Now, I was able to recruit leading military figures, top-ranking military figures, from Germany, from France, from Italy, and elsewhere, and from the United States. And also from the ranks of my own contemporaries, who had been in the OSS, for example, or similar institutions during World War II. I hadn't known them then, but I got to know them very quickly when I met them, because we had the same temperament, the same outlook. And so therefore, we made the offer, the proffer, to the Soviet representatives.

The responses were, at that time, at that stage, positive. The feasibility was acknowledged on both sides. Even at the end, when they said, we are not going to do it, because you will win. And I said, that's not what our objective is, to win a military conflict. Our objective is to avoid it, to prevent it, because there are other people, like the British on this planet, who are evil, who will get us to start a war with each other, unless we put this thing under control. And we succeeded.

But then Andropov came in, and President Reagan, who adopted the policy, which was my policy, and presented it. And the important thing was that the Russians knew that what Reagan was presenting, was a carbon copy of what I had negotiated with the Russians. So, nobody was fooled, on either side. Reagan fully understood what he was doing, and he made a proffer directly to the Soviet government, which Andropov turned down, as a shock to many Russians who had seen this as a very viable alternative, to get out of this Cold War nonsense, with all its nuclear threats involved.

But then, there was a crowd from England, which had taken over, the Bertrand Russell crowd. He was now dead, which is the good side of the thing, but his influence still prospered. And the British were able to organize this by playing upon various characteristics of our military. Some people in the defense industry said, well, you're going to destroy our *defense* posture, if you get into this kind of agreement with Russia. We won't be making war against each other. We won't have a Defense Department. Some of this was just plain greed, just plain greed for defense contracts, and money, and getting rich and so forth.

So that went on.

And Gorbachov, who was really much worse, to my liking, than his predecessor, was really a fanatic, and

actually called for my assassination, through his wife's channels. Called publicly for my assassination by the United States government, and there was an attempted assassination of me, from U.S. sources, which came in response to this pressure from Gorbachov. So the man is a stinker.

And we went through this process.

But in the meantime, the Russian population had been conditioned by the propaganda of, first of all, Andropov, and then Gorbachov, to believe that this was a terrible thing. But then the terrible thing which I tried to prevent, *did* happen. It happened that Russia was crushed. If Russia had accepted this, and it had many opportunities to accept it, including 1986, when Reagan was still President. He made the offer, in Iceland—he made the offer. We could still have done it.

And the destruction of Russia, which was orchestrated chiefly by the British monarchy, with assistance of a French President, would never have happened.

And yet, there were silly people in Russia still today, who thought that my SDI proposal was terrible. And many of the people who are now talking about the same kind of thing, that is, the same attitude toward the United States and its people, and toward me too, are the fools who typify those people in the Soviet system, which, when the opportunity to avoid all this trouble was on the table, with a feasible operation, which we're now discussing again with Russia—implicitly. We're still discussing missile defense, ballistic missile defense. We've got the threat of Israel launching an attack on Iran, which can lead to all kinds of hell. We're still talking about defense against this kind of horror show, and how we deal with it. Without getting into a conflict between Russia and the United States.

So, what we have to do in diplomacy, we have to understand that the importance of national sovereignty lies in national culture. In a national culture which contains the dreams and stories and language and so forth, and everything, of a nation-state of people. Because we have to bind the people together from childhood, that is, each nation has to bind itself together through the *children*, the education, the culture of the children of that nation. To bring them to common aims, and common ends. As was one of the discussions between [Edward] Teller and the Soviet representatives at Erice, on the common aims of mankind.

So, therefore, what we need is, we need sovereignty of national cultures: You need the sovereign nation-state, perfectly sovereign nation-state, because you

must have the people functioning with one will, on crucial issues. And on their own development. But you must also have partnership. You must have a sense of need, and comradeship, among nations, which are different. Which have different customs, and different behavior, but we have common ends. And when you look up at the Moon, and you say, well, we have a shortage of helium-3, and if we're going to go to Mars, or something like that, we need helium-3. And it's up there—parked on the Moon. We'd better get up there and get it. Because we need it on Earth, as well as in space.

Therefore, we need to set up a whole Moon industrial project, on the Moon, in which various nations participate, commonly, and share the development of industries and facilities, to this purpose.

Because mankind has a common mission beyond Earth, and beyond petty quarrels on Earth. Mankind has a mission in the universe. First, in the Solar System, and then in the universe.

And we have to have that kind of attitude. We have to have the joy of sharing the goodies we create. We've got to organize around common goals, which take a child from birth, until death, as an adult, and give them a purpose in the course of their life, which gives them satisfaction at the time of their death, that their life continues to *mean* something, long after they're dead, for having lived that life.

That is the kind of morality we must have.

And in economics, in my way of thinking about economics, it's elementary. You can have quarrels with nations, you can have differences, but you must also, at the same time, since you're human, you must have common human ends, which become the standard of negotiation, of projects, shared projects, and difficulties, among nations: a shared intention for all mankind, in terms of what happens to our generation, when it dies out.

What kind of a world are we creating? What has been the meaning of our life, or our existence, at the time we die? Are we just something to be thrown down in the wastebasket, because we die? Is our culture to be thrown down in the wastebasket when we die? Or should there be a purpose in life, which transcends the borders of death, in the sense of a purpose for all humanity, so that mankind can, in his soul, look back and say, "We helped do this, in our time. We contributed this. It's now good; it's here. Our life, and the troubles we took in it, was all worth while."

That's good economics.

Who Will Stand Up Against Obama?

By this time, it should be clear that President Barack Obama has only one real passion: the defense of his highly inflated ego. And that ego is being served by his ramming through fascist legislation, starting with the health bill, which is dedicated to cutting costs on those lives that, as the Nazis said, are deemed “not worthy to be lived.” Currently, the same method used to get the Hitler health bill through—bribery, blackmail, threats—are being applied to the banking “reform” bill as well.

You don’t see such strong-arming being used to extend unemployment benefits, of course. That action is not what Obama’s sponsors in London and Wall Street want.

So, as the question was raised at LaRouche’s webcast June 26: What can be done in the face of the President’s lying service to Wall Street?

He answered: “The problem is the following, the practical problem. As long as this man is President, you will never change the direction. It’s a fact. That’s why he was made President. He’s a British patsy, who fits the profile of the Emperor Nero, as I said last April. He is a carbon copy of the mentality of the Emperor Nero. He has always, since I made that declaration, behaved in a manner consistent with that—not because I predicted it, but because that’s what it was.

“Therefore, you have to get him out. We have various means of getting him out. We have the Chicago scandals, all kinds of scandals. And the best chance is right now—the kind of thing you’re looking at today. You’ve got what’s happened, as a by-product of this process—you had the unemployed, over the coming weeks, at least now scheduled—2 million are cut off from their compensation checks. Now this is deliberate murder. And these are the kinds of issues you have to deal with.

“See, the problem with the Democrats, and also the Republicans, is they will try to think of taking a position which will not hurt them in their relationship with the President, or the Presidency, in terms of things they want to deliver to their constituents. I think the shocker is, we’re going to have to see what the effect is, of this cut of, essentially, in the coming period of weeks—2 million people are being thrown out, into destitution, as a by-product of this legislation process.

“Because it’s going to take tough measures, and you’re going to have to fry the rear ends of a lot of politicians to get this thing moving.

“And any Democratic leader who does not do that, should obviously be targeted, to say: ‘You are out. We don’t want you ever back again.’ You have to make it very clear.

“You see how we’re dealing with things, as in the case in Texas, in the 22nd District Democratic Party. The leadership of the Democratic Party in Texas is not all bad people. But the orders are coming from Obama by way of Chicago, and similar places, that these things will happen. And Obama is trying to run a reign of terror. And we’re short of people, who are willing—in positions of power—to stand up against Obama.

“We have to understand, if we want to have a nation—and if we lose this nation, we’ll lose civilization too, for a long time to come—*Obama has to go*. I’ve described exactly how he has to go. Get him out of there. To get him out of there, we have options. Don’t talk about the conditions under which you get him out, get him out. Just don’t shoot him. We don’t want that mess. Just get him out of there. That’s the issue. Are you willing to get rid of Obama? Or do you want a mustache on your lip too?”

See LaRouche on Cable TV

INTERNET

- BCAT.TV/BCAT Click BCAT-2 4th Fri: 10 am (Eastern Time)
- LAROCHEPUB.COM Click *LaRouche's Writings*. (Avail. 24/7)
- LA36.ORG Click on The LaRouche Connection. Select desired show.
- MNN.ORG Click *Watch Ch.57* Fri: 2:30 a.m. (Eastern Time)
- QUOTE-UNQUOTE.COM Click on Ch.27. Tue. 6 pm (Mtn.)
- SCAN-TV.ORG Click *Scan on the Web (Pacific Time)*. Ch.23: Wed. 7 am Ch.77: Mon. 11 am
- WUWF.ORG Click *Watch WUWF-TV*. Last Mon 4:30-5 pm (Eastern)

INTERNATIONAL

THE PHILIPPINES

- MANILA Ch.3: Tue 9:30 pm

ALABAMA

- UNIONTOWN GY Ch.2: Wed, Thu, Fri: 6 am

ALASKA

- ANCHORAGE GCI Ch.12: Thu 10 pm

CALIFORNIA

- CONTRA COSTA CC Ch.26: 2nd Tue 7 pm
- COSTA MESA TW Ch.35: Thu 5:30 pm
- LANCASTER/PALMDALE TW Ch.36: Sun 1 pm
- ORANGE COUNTY TW Ch.95/97/98: Mon 3 pm
- SAN FRANCISCO CC Ch.29: 2nd & 4th Sat 9 pm

COLORADO

- DENVER CC Ch.56 Sun 10 am

CONNECTICUT

- GROTON CC Ch.12: Mon 5 pm
- NEW HAVEN CC Ch.27: Mon & Wed: 6 am; Sat: 6 pm
- NEWTOWN CH Ch.21: Mon 12:30 pm; Tue: 6 pm
- NORWICH CC Ch.14: Tue 8 pm
- SEYMOUR CC Ch.10: Tue 10 pm

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- WASHINGTON CC Ch.95 & RCN Ch.10: Irregular

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 & Tue: Midnight
- JEFFERSON COUNTY IN Ch.98: Fri 2-2:30 pm

LOUISIANA

- ORLEANS PARISH CX Ch.78: Sun 11 pm; Mon 5 pm; Tue 4 pm; Thu 12:30 pm; Fri 12:30 am

MAINE

- PORTLAND TW Ch.2: Tue 10 pm; Thu 1 am; Sat Noon

MARYLAND

- ANNE ARUNDEL CC Ch.99; FIOS Ch.42: Tue & Thu: 10 am; Fri & Sat: midnight
- P.G. COUNTY CC Ch.76 & FIOS Ch.42: Mon 10:30 pm, Thu 11:30 am

MASSACHUSETTS

- 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
- GREAT FALLS CC Ch.17: Irregular
- QUINCY CC Ch.8: Pop-ins.
- WALPOLE CC Ch.8: Tue 1 pm

MICHIGAN

- BYRON CENTER CC Ch.25: Mon 1 & 6 pm
- KENT COUNTY CC Ch.25: Mon 6:30 am
- KENT COUNTY (South) CC Ch.25: Wed 9:30 am
- LAKE ORION CC Ch.10: Irregular
- LANSING CC Ch.16: Fri Noon
- LIVONIA BH Ch.12: Thu 3 pm
- MT. PLEASANT CH Ch.3: Tue 7 am
- SHELBY TWP CC Ch.20, WOW Ch.18, UV Ch.99: Mon 11 pm
- WAYNE COUNTY CC Ch.16/18: Mon 6-8 pm

MINNESOTA

- ALBANY AMTC Ch.13: Tue & Thu: 7:30 pm
- CAMBRIDGE US Ch.10: Wed 6 pm
- COLD SPRING US Ch. 10: Wed 6 pm
- COLUMBIA HEIGHTS CC Ch.15: Tue 9 pm
- DULUTH CH Ch.16: Irregular. Ch.29: Wed Midnight; Fri 1 pm
- MARSHALL Knology Ch.67: & CH Ch.35/8: Sat. 8:30 am
- MINNEAPOLIS CC Ch.16: Tue 11 pm
- MINNEAPOLIS (N. Burbs) CC Ch.15: Thu 11 am & 6 pm
- NEW ULM CC Ch.14 & NUT Ch.3: Sun 6 am, Tue 9 pm
- PROCTOR MC Ch.7: Tue after 5 pm.
- ST. CLOUD CH Ch.12: Mon 5 pm
- ST. CROIX VALLEY CC Ch.14: Thu 1 & 7 pm; Fri 9 am
- ST. PAUL CC Ch.15: Wed 9:30 pm
- ST. PUAL (N.Burbs) CC Ch.21: Mon 7 pm, Tue 3 am & 11 am.

- ST. PAUL (S&W Burbs) CC Ch.15: Mon, Wed, Fri 9 am
- SAULK CENTRE SCTV Ch.19: Sat 5 pm
- WASHINGTON COUNTY (South) CC Ch.14: Thu 8 pm

NEVADA

- BOULDER CITY CH Ch.2: 2x/day: am & pm
- WASHOE COUNTY CH Ch.16: Thu 9 pm

NEW HAMPSHIRE

- CHESTERFIELD CC Ch.8: Wed 8 pm
- MANCHESTER CC Ch.23: Thu 4:30 pm

NEW JERSEY

- BERGEN CTY TW Ch.572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- MERCER COUNTY CC Trenton Ch.26: Irregular
- WINDSOR Ch.27: Irregular
- MONTVALE/MAHWAH CV Ch.76: Mon 5 pm
- PISCATAWAY FIOS TV Ch.40, CV Ch.15: Thu 11:30 pm
- UNION CC Ch.26: Irregular

NEW MEXICO

- BERNALILLO COUNTY CC Ch.27: Tue 2 pm
- LOS ALAMOS CC Ch.8: Wed 10 pm
- SANTA FE CC Ch.16: Thu 9 pm; Sat 6:30 pm
- SILVER CITY CC Ch.17: Daily 8-10 pm
- TAOS CC Ch.2: Sat: 10 pm

NEW YORK

- ALBANY TW Ch.18: Wed 5 pm.
- BETHLEHEM TW Ch.18: Tue 6 am
- BRONX CV Ch.70: Wed 7:30 am
- BROOKLYN 4th Friday: CV Ch.67: 10-10:30 am TW Ch.34: 10-10:30 am RCN Ch.82:10-10:30 am FIOS Ch.42:10-10:30 am
- BUFFALO TW Ch.20: Wed & Fri 10:30-11pm
- CHEMUNG/STEUEN TW Ch.1/99: Tue 7:30 pm
- ERIE COUNTY TW Ch.20: Thu 10:35 pm
- IRONDEQUOIT TW Ch.15: Sun 10 am
- JEFFERSON/LEWIS COUNTIES TW Ch.99: Irregular
- MANHATTAN TW, RCN Ch.57/85, Verizon FIOS-TV Ch.35: Fri 2:30 am
- ONEIDA COUNTY TW Ch.99: Thu 8 or 9 pm
- PENFIELD TW Ch.15: Sun & Tue
- QUEENS: 4th Sat monthly 2 pm TW Ch.56, RCN Ch.85, Verizon FIOS-TV Ch.36
- QUEENSBURY TW Ch.18: Mon 7 pm
- ROCHESTER TW Ch.15: Irregular
- ROCKLAND CV Ch.76: Mon 6 pm

- SCHENECTADY TW Ch.16: Fri 1 pm; Sat 1:30 am
- STATEN ISLAND TW Ch.35: Tue 8:30 am & Midnight
- TRI-LAKES TW Ch.2: Sun 7 am, 1 pm, 8 pm
- WEBSTER TW Ch.12: Wed 9 pm
- WEST SENECA TW Ch.20: Thu 10:30 pm

NORTH CAROLINA

- HICKORY CH Ch.6: Tue 10 pm
- MECKLENBURG COUNTY TW Ch.22: Fri 12:30 am

OHIO

- AMHERST TW Ch.95: Daily Noon & 2 pm
- OBERLIN Cable Co-Op Ch.9: Thu 8 pm

PENNSYLVANIA

- PITTSBURGH CC Ch.21: Irregular

RHODE ISLAND

- BRISTOL, BARRINGTON, WARREN Full Channel Ch.49: Tue: 10 am
- EAST PROVIDENCE CX Ch.18; FIOS Ch.24: Tue: 6 pm
- STATEWIDE RI INTERCONNECT CX Ch.13; FIOS Ch.32 Tue 10 am

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

- BRATTLEBORO CC & SVC Ch.8: Mon 6 pm, Tue 4:30 pm, Wed 8 pm
- GREATER FALLS CC Ch.10: Mon/Wed/Fri 1 pm

VIRGINIA

- ALBEMARLE COUNTY CC Ch.13: Sun 4 am; Fri 3 pm
- ARLINGTON CC Ch.69 & FIOS Ch.38: Tue 9 am
- CHESTERFIELD COUNTY CC Ch.17; FIOS Ch.27: Mon 1 pm
- FAIRFAX CX & FIOS Ch.10: 1st & 2nd Wed 1 pm; Fri 10 am; 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.77: Mon Noon BS Ch.23: Mon Noon
- TRI CITIES CH Ch.13/99: Mon 7 pm; Thu 9 pm

WISCONSIN

- MARATHON COUNTY CH Ch.98: Thu 9:30 pm; Fri Noon
- MUSKEGO TW Ch.14: Sun 7 am, Mon & Thu: 5:30 pm
- SUPERIOR CH & MC Ch.7: Tue after 5 pm.

WYOMING

- GILLETTE BR Ch.31: Tue 7


MSO Codes: AS=Astound; BD=Beld; BR=Bresnan; BH=BrightHouse; BS = Broadstripe; CV=Cablevision; CB=Cebridge; CH=Charter; CC=Comcast; CX=Cox; GY=Galaxy; IN=Insight; MC=MediaCom; NUT=New Ulm Telecom; SVC=Southern Vermont Cable; TW=TimeWarner; US=US Cable; UV=AT&T U-Verse; FIOS=Verizon FIOS-TV.

Get The LaRouche Connection on your local cable TV system! Call Charles Notley 703-777-9451, Ext. 322. Visit our Website: www.larouche.com/tv.
[updated Jan. 26, 2010]

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)

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 _____

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail address _____