

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

October 2, 2020 Vol. 47 No. 40 www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

Lock 'em Up!



Founder: *Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. (1922–2019)*
Editor-in-Chief: *Helga Zepp-LaRouche*
Co-Editors: *Marcia Merry Baker, Paul Gallagher,*
Robert Ingraham, Tony Papert
Managing Editor: *Stephanie Ezrol*
Editorial Staff: *David Cherry, Charles Notley*
Technology: *Marsha Freeman*
Transcriptions: *Katherine Notley*
Ebooks: *Richard Burden*
Graphics: *Alan Yue*
Photos: *Stuart Lewis*
Circulation Manager: *Stanley Ezrol*

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Asia: *Michael Billington*
Economics: *Marcia Merry Baker, Paul Gallagher*
History: *Anton Chaitkin*
Ibero-America: *Dennis Small*
United States: *Debra Freeman*

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Berlin: *Elke Fimmen*
Copenhagen: *Tom Gillesberg*
Lima: *Sara Madueño*
Melbourne: *Robert Barwick*
Mexico City: *Gerardo Castilleja Chávez*
New Delhi: *Ramtanu Maitra*
Paris: *Christine Bierre*
Stockholm: *Ulf Sandmark*
United Nations, N.Y.C.: *Richard Black, Leni Rubinstein*
Washington, D.C.: *William Jones*
Wiesbaden: *Rainer Apel*

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirms@larouchepub.com
www.larouchepub.com
www.executiveintelligencecivereview.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.*,
P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.
(571) 293-0935

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH,
Bahnstrasse 4, 65205, Wiesbaden, Germany
Tel: 49-611-73650
Homepage: <http://www.eir.de>
e-mail: info@eir.de
Director: Georg Neudecker

Montreal, Canada: 514-461-1557
eir@eircanada.ca

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

Mexico City: EIR, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz 242-2
Col. Agricultura C.P. 11360
Delegación M. Hidalgo, México D.F.
Tel. (5525) 5318-2301
eirmexico@gmail.com

Copyright: ©2020 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.

Signed articles in *EIR* represent the views of the authors,
and not necessarily those of the Editorial Board.

Lock 'em Up!

EDITORIAL

August 15, 1997

The ‘Pearl Harbor Effect,’ Or How Paradigm Shifts Operate

by Lyndon LaRouche

These brief remarks from Lyndon LaRouche, never before published, were communicated to the staff of EIR and other of his associates, on August 15, 1997. He frequently referred to his personal experience of what he called the Pearl Harbor effect.

In a 2001 interview, LaRouche described that: “So now we’ve come to a Pearl Harbor effect. As I saw in that famous Sunday in December 7, 1941, as I was walking the streets of New York that morning, Manhattan, and it was a strange atmosphere in the streets. It was Sunday. The streets were largely deserted. I walked into a hotel lobby where I had a business appointment, and I found out what was happening—Pearl Harbor had been struck. And during the rest of that day, people were running looking for the recruiting offices, military recruiting offices. In panicked mobs. ‘I want to join up, I want to join up.’ So, that was a Pearl Harbor effect which changed the behavior of the American people in one day.”

In the behavior of both individual persons, and of



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

large components of entire populations, or, also, entire populations, the relation between the emotions and judgment is crucial. However, this is a matter as much misunderstood, as it is important. During upcoming developments, this will be the crucial issue, which determines, in large degree, whether or not the planet as a whole plunges into a “New Dark Age.”

The immediate issue is the following:

The world at large, which, curiously, includes the state of virtual reality known as the minds of the U.S. population, has entered a “boundary layer,” a kind of “transonic” region which separates the preceding 30 years from that entirely new order of things, for better, or for much worse,

which lies beyond what we shall experience as the increasing turbulence within this boundary layer.

From the evidence of expressed opinions among leading strata of the population around us, but also among our own ranks, there is virtually no evidence that the crucial political effects produced by this boundary layer, are recognized at all. That is: the processes

which govern sudden, traumatically induced, “cultural-paradigm shifts.”

Summarily, therefore:

Given: a large array of possible choices among sets of axiomatic principles of belief (e.g., such as the dimensions of a Riemannian form of n -dimensional manifold), the way in which the emotions controlling the individual’s mind select some of those principles, and avoid others, will determine the way in which opinions and actions are selected by that individual mind.

Thus, a sufficiently powerful trauma, such as the manifest collapse of the international monetary-financial system, is capable of inducing extremely radical transformations in the set of axiomatic assumptions underlying the formation of individual belief. This could be produced as a by-product of the suppression of some axioms and the activation of others which had been, so to say, “slumbering.” It is also the case, that, under such circumstances, a new axiom (e.g., transforming the manifold of axioms available from n to $n+1$) may be

introduced.

Generally, the way in which the selection from the $n+1$ array will be formed, will be based upon the relative optimism, or pessimism prevailing. The factor of optimism is aroused by confidence in the new belief-system as either the basis for generating useful theorems of belief for action, or a conditional confidence, conditional upon some available leadership for formulating and directing appropriate forms of action.

For me, it is a warning-sign of looming disaster, wherever I see the appreciation of such emotional considerations put to one side, in favor of a mechanistic reliance upon existing trends in opinion. Without addressing ourselves to the sudden disposition for extremely radical changes in axiomatics underlying the opinion of populations, anything said about strategy and tactics for this period, by us, respecting our own actions, or any influential other institution respecting its own, would be thoroughly incompetent, even for that reason alone.

Cover This Week

*President Obama
and Vice-
President Biden
in the Oval Office
of the White
House, February
9, 2015.*



White House/Pete Souza

LOCK 'EM UP!

2 EDITORIAL

The 'Pearl Harbor Effect,' or How Paradigm Shifts Operate

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.
August 15, 1997

I. Obama-Biden Crimes Against Gen. Flynn

5 The British Empire Is Attacking the President—Weaponize the American System!

by Gerry Rose

10 BOMBHELL DISCLOSURES OF FBI/DOJ Crimes in Trump/Flynn 'Investigations' by Barbara Boyd

16 LAROUCHE PAC TOWN HALL New Coup Plot Exposures Define Central Issue of U.S. Election as War or Peace by Harley Schlanger

24 Edward Dickinson Baker: Organizing the Republican Party on the Pacific Coast by Andrea Ingraham

II. Schiller Institute Youth Conference: Exonerate LaRouche!

Schiller Institute International
Youth Conference

The World Has a Choice: Extinction, or Era of LaRouche September 26, 2020

PANEL 1

The World Needs the Exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche

36 Where Might Humanity Have Been Today? Recapturing the Lost Ground with the Power of Reason by Megan Dobrodt

38 Lyndon LaRouche: His Ideas and Initiatives by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

48 1995 Hearings: 'Too Big for My Britches' by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

50 My Experience with Lyndon LaRouche, a Great and Loving Human Being by Dr. Jozef Mikloško

I. Obama-Biden Crimes Against Gen. Flynn

The British Empire Is Attacking the President—Weaponize the American System!

The following are edited comments, delivered by Gerry Rose, on the September 24, 2020 weekly Thursday night LaRouche PAC Fireside Chat. The full audio of that two-hour program, with questions from the live audience, is available [here](#).

I want to present this in the sense of a strategic study, because a new book produced in 2018, called *Giants: The Global Power Elite* by Peter Phillips, provoked me—and often this happens—provoked me in a number of ways. First of all the book is useful. It's not a great book, because it does a sociological analysis of what Phillips calls the power elite or the transnational capitalist class which is ahistorical. He's really looking at the impact of the British Empire, and for reasons I'm not going to go into, he's muddled on the question. But the book is useful in giving the extent of the magnitude of what we're up against.

The first, most salient thing that hit me was that the 17 largest hedge funds, banks, wealth funds, other things, the 17 largest, control \$41 trillion worth of so-called assets—\$41 trillion. Just to give you a sense of what that means, if you take the gross domestic product of the United States, of Russia, of China and of India, that is \$38 trillion. These 17 institutions that he references here, control \$41 trillion, and that's just the 17 largest. And therefore you're dealing with a power and a concentration of power that no individual nation state could deal with, as an individual nation-state. This is the British Empire.

The Modern British Empire


A famous video documentary called, *The Spider's Web: Britain's Second Empire*, which you can get on

YouTube—and I recommend people look at it—indicates that the British Empire morphed into what was called “the Spider's Web.” It was the offshore banking empire run by the City of London, which is not even Britain; it's not even London. The “City of London,” is a private corporation, which created these offshore banking facilities in the Cayman Islands, Antilles, and other places.

One of the authors of this piece actually had penetrated Deloitte, which is one of the biggest accounting firms, and he got involved in one of these offshore so-called tax havens. And 99 of 100 cases he looked at, were involved in illegal activity. In the most famous case, the HSBC in 2012 laundered \$880 million in one account for the Sinaloa drug cartel, which was exposed at the time by Sen. Carl Levin of Michigan. Not one of the officers of HSBC—and this is hard drug money—went to jail, and in fact Eric Holder, Obama's Attorney General, covered the whole thing up, and gave them a fine. The argument was, if HSBC goes down, with its leveraged trillion-plus, then the whole banking system goes down. The banking system of the central banks of Wall Street and the City of London are nothing but corruption.

This was not a mistake; this was not somebody who was led astray. An exposé came out on Deutsche Bank, in which 6,000 transactions were unregulated, but actually much more; in one of the banks it was 6,000 transactions that were unregulated.

So the British Empire is largely a financial empire. To give you a sense of the concentration of power—and this is in this book *Giants*—the richest 1% of the world population has more resources than 50% of the lower part of the world's population. The top 30% of this fi-



financial elite owns 95% of the world's wealth. The remaining 70% of the world has 5% of the world's wealth. And this goes on and on. What you're dealing with here, is a financial and political leviathan.

They financialize everything, they securitize everything. They invest in military budgets, because it's a safe return, because governments pay for that. They invest in, as you know, the famous mortgage-backed securities, and they have brought to ruin the actual physical economies of the world. In other words, if you want to invest in long-term infrastructure over a ten-year period, or a 15-year period for the payback, this financial system will actually make it impossible to do. They will not do it. And unless you break the powers of the British Empire, then there is no way you can have long-term capital investment, long-term improvement.

They say to the nation states, "We're too big to fail, you cannot put us under law; we will loot, we will steal, we will destroy." And they say to the United States, Russia, China, India, and other nations that have any self-respect, "If you stop us, we will bring the system down." You must have a very clear, precise answer to that threat.

These guys have names. They have institutions, they are committed, and they are quite insane. I'll give you an example: In roughly 2007-2008 when everything went haywire and we were able to put on the table the Glass-Steagall question before the House, and we had sponsors and everything else, both Sandy Weill, who is quite insane himself, of Travelers and Citicorp (he's the guy who brought down Glass-Steagall), and Warren Buffett, and sections of Goldman Sachs, said, "well, we might have to live with a financial reorganization under Glass-Steagall, because this thing has gotten completely out of control."

But Jamie Dimon of Chase, which is one of the 17 largest, and Larry Fink of BlackRock, the largest in the world, overruled Buffett, Weill, and sections of Goldman Sachs and they just said, "It's not going to happen," and



Flickr/Håkan Dahlström



Wikimedia



WEF



Wikimedia

Heading two of the largest financial institutions on the planet, Larry Fink (left) and Jamie Dimon (right) represent a concentration of power no individual nation-state can deal with, as an individual nation.

in fact, Fink said you have to privatize the Social Security fund, and let Fink and Dimon and the British Empire run Social Security. That's what they actually proposed.

The Power of Sovereign Nations


The only way you can deal with this, as Lyndon LaRouche had said, you have to have, between the United States, Russia, China, and India and others, Japan and others, you have to get an international financial agreement that the speculative bubble will be dried out with a Glass-Steagall arrangement. You have to create a capability to issue credit. These guys say, "We will bring down the system," but the system already is down! For 95 percent of the people on this planet, this system is down.

There has to be a combination of financial reorganization under Bretton Woods agreements, and there have to be, as LaRouche represented very forcefully, early on

in 2008 and repeatedly after then, his [Four Laws](#). He said, you have to have a Glass-Steagall separation, you have to have national banking, you have to have a science driver policy, and in fact, it's the science driver policy that drives everything, to propel the physical economy of each nation on the planet. This is what Roosevelt had proposed in 1941, in preparing to go to war against the Nazis. He said, "every nation in the world"—the United States included, and Russia included—that every nation in the world has to have a physical economy, and "freedom from want," and "freedom from fear," as he did in the Four Freedoms speech.

There is no coexistence now with the British Empire and its rapacious, insatiable appetite. Every year this \$41 trillion has to bring a 3-5% return. Wall Street can not and will not invest in long-term infrastructure development and long-term energy and long-term science, it cannot and will not do it!

Therefore, avoidance of this problem will bring chaos, no matter how well-intentioned President Trump is. See the reason they hate Trump, Xi and Putin, and they hate them equally for the same reason, is that they are committed to the future of their own people and they will fight any banking system, any arrangement that destroys the future of their people. The nation-state was based upon that idea.



Attributed to John Taylor



Wikipedia

In his history plays, Shakespeare (1564-1616), at left, provides insight into the destruction of Europe during the 100 Years' War and the Wars of the Roses in England, and the positive power of the nation-state. At right is King Henry VI of England (r. 1422-1461 and 1470-1471).

Lessons from the Past

What the *Giants* book does usefully is to give the magnitude of the crisis, but not the command structure. Barbara Boyd and others are giving a real, hands-on sense of what the command structure of this thing is. That command structure is now deployed against Xi, Putin, and Trump.

The author of *Giants* references what's called the "new feudalism." However, to appreciate a more profound understanding of that term, let's look at it a little deeper.


To me it's the fact that the oligarchy of France and the oligarchy of Britain, in the 14th century at the height of the Black Death, were warring with each other. These

guys had no sense of the population or commitment to the population. It was a rapacious destruction of Europe, through the combination of the Black Death and the unleashing of war between oligarch and oligarch. This became the subject of one of the most brilliant insights into the nature of the power of the nation-state. It was done by William Shakespeare in his famous *Henry VI* and *Richard III*—they were one piece. They were his first attempt at what today are called his "history plays."

What Shakespeare understood—which is very reminiscent of Homer, and very reminiscent of Dante—was that from Edward III to Richard III, England had suffered through the 100 years of continuous war between England and France. So the ending of that, the bringing

to power of the Tudors, which began with Henry VII, was Shakespeare's purpose in drafting these history plays. In the start of *Henry VI*, Henry V is brought in dead, that's how the play starts. He had conquered France and became the so-called "King of France," from England. He had a very distant claim. Anyway, he was bad. His father Henry IV told him to "consolidate the realm." He had no legal right to be the king, because he had usurped the throne from Richard II, so in order to unite the kingdom, they had a war on France. So, Henry V is brought in—he's dead. Joan of Arc is beginning to liberate France from this oppression, and later this leads to Louis XI.

At Henry V's death, his son, Henry VI, is only 9 years



Equestrian statue by Paul Dubois, 1889



Jean-Léonard Lugardon

King Louis XI of France (r. 1461-1483), inspired by Joan of Arc (d. 1431), at left, forged a unified nation, outflanking the petty princes and barons of the realm.

old. The Lancasters, who are in charge of the war on France (Henry V was a Lancaster), say, “We’ll go to France and reconquer it.” But a messenger arrives and says, “We’ve lost this town, this town and this town,” all to the rival House of York. So the famous Wars of the Roses begins and leads to mass slaughter inside England. Margaret of Anjou, who was Queen of England, beheads Richard of York, who had briefly been made king, and then, ultimately, Henry VI is killed. It’s a fratricidal war, which destroys England. This leads to the ascendancy of Richard III, who was a devious, evil person. Because of the way he got into power, nobleman after nobleman deserts. They have no one to unite around.

So from France, the House of Tudor, which had a claim to the throne, asked Henry Tudor of Richmond to lead the fight to reunify England. And in the famous *Richard III*, Henry Tudor of Richmond defeats Richard and unifies England. For the 15 years he was in power, he never fought a war: he refused. He wanted to unite the kingdom in peace, because he had an idea of the “Commonwealth.” Under Henry VII you had Thomas More, you had John Colet, you had others, and they went to Italy to learn ancient Greek at Ficino’s Academy. You had Erasmus in Europe setting off a mass education movement, which later leads to the mass education movement

in England leading into the time of Shakespeare, and fueled by his work.

England became the second nation-state based upon the principle of the development of the Commonwealth. Wars were anathema to any Commonwealth. This was an offshoot of the development of Louis XI in France. I want to read you something to understand the power of the nation-state, because the first two nation-states in history, based upon these principles, were Louis XI’s France and Henry VII’s England.

This is from the famous letter of Louis XI, near his death, to his son, Charles VIII, called *The Rosebush of War*. Louis XI defines what an actual monarch or leader must be:

The Prince must provide for the maintenance of public works and edifices, and make improvements and repairs on the roads, the bridges, the ports, the walls,

the moats, and other things in his towns and castles which are necessary....

Consider the duty of Kings and Princes and their cavaliers, that their estate and vocation is to defend the common good, both ecclesiastic and secular, to uphold justice and peace among their subjects, and to do good....¹

Inspired by Joan of Arc, this genius consolidated France, outflanking the petty princes and barons of the realm, and forged a unified nation. Simultaneously, he fostered industrial development. He promoted the industries of the time; he wanted the cities to involve themselves in industry; he defended agriculture. By the end of his reign—Stephanie Ezrol has written a very interesting [article](#) on this—there was a 300% increase in the wealth of France. Real physical-economic wealth.

What Louis XI and Henry VII demonstrated was the power of the nation-state to break the back of oligarchism, of this overweening, mad obsession with power. They broke the back of it. Later, the case of Franklin

1. *The Rosebush of War*. [Excerpts](#) translated by Katherine Notley, the first translation into English of any portion of this work to be published as of 1995, appear in *Fidelio*, Vol. IV, No. 3, Fall 1995, pp. 42-48.

Roosevelt illustrates this in the most dramatic way. Because the commitment of the nation-state is to the common wealth. It is to the people. That's why the oligarchs hate Trump! He said at the UN, we're going to end this global empire. He said, every nation should be proud of itself, should develop itself, to become as great as it can. This was a declaration of war against the British Empire, and the British understood it as such. The only power to break this international British Empire, is to return to national banking, is to impose Glass-Steagall, is to concentrate on the physical and economic well-being of the whole population against this rapacious looting!

Roosevelt

I want to end with Franklin Roosevelt, because it leaps out at you. Look at recent developments. During this months'-long COVID crisis, the Wall Street and London banks have received \$3 trillion dollars in bail-out financing, but those banks—particularly the Wall Street banks—have lent nothing to the physical economy! Their deposits went up, but their lending to industry went down by \$700 billion, even though they got bailed out for \$3 trillion.

After the 1932 crash, and Roosevelt and Jesse Jones, using the Reconstruction Finance Corp. (RFC) recapitalized the banks. The RFC bought preferred stock, refinanced the banks, and recapitalized them. They didn't give them loans like they do now; they said we're going to buy preferred stock and you're going to use that money to invest in the physical economy. Well, Wall Street—Morgan in particular—would not invest in the U.S. economy after they got recapitalized, so Jesse Jones of the RFC and Roosevelt said, "If you won't do it, then, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, we will directly fund industry, agriculture, physical wealth, and infrastructure."

What they created wasn't a Bank of the United States, but *the Reconstruction Finance Corp. became one-third larger than the total of Wall Street altogether*, in terms of lending and long-term lending, through



NARA



Department of Commerce

President Franklin Roosevelt (left), with Jesse H. Jones at the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (right), got the physical economy going again.

mortgages—Jones said those were the best. They lent to farmers, they stretched it out; the farmers said, "You care about us; this is a debt of honor," and every single mortgage got paid back! The Civilian Conservation Corps was funded by the RFC; the Export-Import Bank was funded by the RFC.

Roosevelt intended for the physical economy of the country to get moving, and no Wall Street banker was going to stand in his way! He created an agreement with Congress that for every single worthy project, if the banks won't lend, then we will. That's also what President Trump said pretty much around this Covid pandemic: "If I need the Defense Production Act, I'm going to use the Defense Production Act."

This is the power of the nation-state to break the back of the oligarchical rule! The key is sovereign commitment to the future. With globalization, the bankers, the Wall Street banks, the London bankers said, "Get it where it can be made the cheapest, get the runaway shops, do what you have to do." Globalization. It's complicated with respect to China, because China did something they didn't expect; they didn't expect what China did [with the Belt and Road Initiative]; they went really bonkers on China.

Reversing this lies in the sovereign power of the nation-state. You must break the power of the British Empire! It must be bankrupted. Its banks must be reorganized, as LaRouche's Four Laws indicate, and you must have a Bretton Woods policy so that if some nutcase at HSBC says, "We'll bring the system down," we'll say, "OK. It's already down anyway, it doesn't function. We've got a new system."

Crimes in Trump/Flynn 'Investigations'

by Barbara Boyd

Sept. 25—Thursday, September 24, featured new bombshell disclosures concerning the illegal investigation and continuing coup d'état run from Barack Obama's White House war room against Donald Trump from early 2015 through the unhinged witch hunt conducted by Special Counsel Robert Mueller.



idence of bias, along with other previously undisclosed exculpatory information, in the case against Lt. Gen. Michael Flynn. Attorney General William Barr assigned Jensen to review the Mueller prosecution file on

Michael Flynn following clear indications that the prosecution was illicit and “unmoored.” By May 7, Jensen had produced more than 80 pages of exculpatory evidence which was never produced previously to Flynn's defense by Mueller's legal jihadists. This is what led the Justice Department to move to dismiss the charges against Flynn.

Jensen's new 40-page disclosure was filed in the



Institute of Politics/ Kristyn Ulanday

Obama's team coordinators in the operation against Lt. General Michael Flynn (far left) and President Trump.

The day saw three significant disclosures. First, U.S. Attorney Jeffrey Jensen for the Eastern District of Missouri turned over even more ev-

Flynn case Thursday afternoon, by Flynn's attorney Sidney Powell, ahead of the scheduled hearing before Judge Emmet Sullivan the following Tuesday, Sept. 29, concerning whether Sullivan will finally dismiss the case against General Flynn. Judge Sullivan has resisted dismissing the case even after the mountain of previously undisclosed exculpatory evidence showed that Flynn is completely innocent, and even after the Justice Department moved to dismiss the charges and said it will not further prosecute. Sullivan is a close friend of

self-described Obama “wing-man,” former Attorney General Eric Holder.

Also on Thursday, Attorney General Bill Barr sent a letter to Sen. Lindsey Graham, disclosing that the primary source for British agent Christopher Steele’s filthy “dossier” about Donald Trump and Russia was known to the FBI as a possible Russian intelligence agent as early as 2009. That source, Igor Danchenko, also told the FBI in January of 2017 that Christopher Steele’s filthy narrative about Trump and Russia was entirely bogus. These facts, of course, were never disclosed to the FISA court in the applications for surveillance warrants obtained on Trump campaign volunteer Carter Page, which allowed surveillance of Donald Trump’s campaign and transition. Those warrants were wholly grounded in the dirty British intelligence Steele dossier. The filthy Steele dossier was also at the center of the international media campaign tarring Trump as a compromised pawn of Putin.

The Barr letter to Senator Graham notes: “I have also alerted the Director of National Intelligence to certain classified information in the possession of the intelligence community, also brought to my attention by Mr. Durham, which bears upon the FBI’s knowledge concerning the reliability of the dossier.” It is anticipated that John Ratcliffe, the Director of National Intelligence, will declassify and release this information as early as Monday, September 28.

Finally, on Thursday evening, September 24, the Justice Department filed, on the Flynn case docket, an interview of FBI agent William J. Barnett, the FBI case agent on the Michael Flynn investigation, and, subsequently, an FBI agent working on Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s “team.” This is the most explosive disclosure of all.

Barnett chronicles, in detail, a



U.S. Attorney Jeffrey Jensen, assigned by Attorney General Barr to review the Mueller prosecution of Michael Flynn.

DOJ


“get Trump” attitude toward the entire Flynn and Trump investigations in both the DOJ and in Robert Mueller’s inquisition. Clearly a straight shooter, Barnett repeatedly told everyone he could that there was absolutely no basis for the Flynn investigation, and threatened to quit or go to the Inspector General over illegalities. As a result, he was repeatedly shut out of major decisions concerning the case. The interview of Barnett was conducted on September 17 by U.S. Attorney Jensen. It demonstrates that the investigation being conducted by U.S. Attorney John Durham has now expanded to include the Special Counsel and his team of legal zealots.

The immediate question raised by the disclosures is, of course, whether they will lead to criminal indictments of those involved by U.S. Attorney John Durham, or at least a report on what Durham has found so far, ahead of the November election. Durham has been investigating the entire Obama Administration spying and information warfare operation against Donald Trump.

These disclosures are being made in the middle of a full-scale insurrection against the government of the

United States led operationally, for the most part, by lawyers and billionaires, using the uneducated and labile young, and the poor and dispossessed, as so much cannon fodder. The judiciary has been fully penetrated by this insurrection, particularly the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, where Judge Sullivan sits and where, many believe, any prosecutions resulting from the Barr/Durham investigations would have to be brought.

It is abundantly clear that if Donald Trump is not re-elected by a significant margin, these illegalities will go unchallenged and completely unpunished. This means that the “rule of law” will have vanished from the United States,



*U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Connecticut
Attorney John Durham, tasked by Attorney General Barr to determine if the Russiagate intelligence collection operations were criminal and prosecutable.*

having been completely emptied of any meaning and paraded around as nothing but a sophistical phrase by the insurrectionists. If the senile Joe Biden is elected, we will be subject to the soft totalitarianism of the Obama/Biden Administration and a declared plan from Obama's national security officials, assembled in the groups, Security Action and the Transition Integrity Project, to "neutralize" those who voted for the current President. [See](#) "Sitrep U.S.A., Part III: President Trump Declares An All-Out Culture War."

We will now examine, in turn, each of these disclosures of gross perfidies against the Constitution of the United States.

The New Christopher Steele Disclosures

Igor Danchenko has been disclosed as the primary source of Christopher Steele's fabricated dossier about Trump and Russia. Danchenko, a Ukrainian-born and Russian-trained lawyer, was an employee of Steele's Orbis Business Intelligence stationed in the United States. When interviewed by the FBI in January of 2017, Danchenko disclosed that the Russia/Trump collusion claims made by Steele in his dossier were largely barroom talk and outright gossip from Russian expat circles and former college friends of Danchenko in Russia.

Nonetheless, the FBI and the intelligence community continued on its jihad against Donald Trump, painting the President as a pawn of Putin, for over three years—a jihad which was legitimized and spun endlessly through the Russiagate investigation of Robert Mueller. After spending \$32 million in taxpayer dollars, undermining the presidency of the United States and ruining many lives through legal fees and unhinged prosecutions, Mueller concluded what had already been known when the investigation started, that there was nothing to the Trump/Russia narrative.

We know that at least as of January 2017, when Danchenko told the FBI the Steele/British dossier on Trump was so much cow pucky, the so-called Trump/Russia collusion claims had gone up in smoke. We also know now that at least by December of 2017, when CrowdStrike's Shawn Henry testified to the House Intelligence Committee, that it was well known the WikiLeaks files on the DNC and John Podesta did not come from a Russian hack of the DNC servers. Shawn Henry told the House what the intelligence community already knew, that no information allegedly hacked by

the Russians ever left the DNC servers. Further, if John Durham does his job and traces the targeting of Trump back to British intelligence and Obama, it is probable that he will find that a "Get Trump" defamation operation, smearing the insurgent candidate as a pawn of Russia while imperiling U.S./Russian relations, was already in full operation as of the late fall of 2015.

According to the summary of Danchenko's 2009-2010 FBI investigation, the operation was triggered when Danchenko approached "a research fellow for a prominent foreign policy advisor in the Obama Administration" and another Brookings Institution employee, and indicated that if the two individuals at the table "did get a job in the government and had access to classified information" and wanted "to make a little extra money," Danchenko knew some people to whom they could speak.

As opposed to what Sen. Lindsey Graham is reporting, the FBI investigation did not conclusively determine that Danchenko was a Russian spy, although it did establish that he had contacts with known Russian intelligence operatives. The FBI investigation ended when Danchenko left the country temporarily in 2011. Danchenko worked at Brookings for Fiona Hill, who, infamously, went on to assume the Russian chair on Donald Trump's National Security Council. Given the British pedigree of Steele's operations, it is just as likely that Danchenko was pimping for the British or some other intelligence agency.

Graham, a devoted, geopolitical Russia hater, who conspired with Senator John McCain to spread the original Steele dossier on Trump and Russia, has much to protect in pumping the claim that Danchenko is a Russian agent and hence, that there was Russian interference in the election, justifying his and other Senators' nefarious actions. The Senate Intelligence Committee, under Senators Richard Burr, Marco Rubio, and Mark Warner, has been a central hub in the ongoing coup against Trump.

The FBI identified Danchenko as Steele's main source and also the subject of its own previous investigation, in December 2016. Obviously, disclosure of the fact that Danchenko was the target of an investigation concerning whether or not he was a Russian agent, would have proved fatal to the Carter Page FISA application and much of the media spin provided to the filthy Steele British MI6 fabrication about Donald Trump and Russia.



Peter Strzok, FBI Deputy Assistant Director, has been caught editing and falsifying original FBI 302 reports on Gen. Flynn's White House interview.

C-SPAN

The Flynn Disclosures

Even prior to Thursday's filings, previous disclosures from U.S. Attorney Jensen's investigation of the Mueller prosecution files had demonstrated that Flynn was completely innocent of wrongdoing in his conversations with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak, and that FBI lovers Peter Strzok and Lisa Page edited and falsified the original FBI 302 report of Flynn's January 24, 2017 White House interview. It is the alleged lies which Flynn told FBI agents Strzok and Joe Pientka during that interview which form the basis of the charges against Flynn.

Despite the ambush interview of Flynn at the White House through a dirty and constitutionally illicit scheme concocted by FBI Deputy Director Andrew McCabe, David Ignatius of the *Washington Post*, and Obama's White House, the original 302 reported that Flynn was telling the truth about his interactions with Russian Ambassador Kislyak. The FBI/Obama scheme was designed to "get Flynn to lie" in the words of former FBI counterintelligence director Bill Priestap, so that he could be prosecuted and removed from the Trump Administration. Flynn had planned to completely reform the corrupt U.S. intelligence community and his knowledge gained earlier as the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency would surely have uncovered the Obama Administration's illegal campaign against Donald Trump during the 2016 presidential campaign and transition.

The new 40 pages of disclosures to Flynn's defense team largely consist of FBI agent discussions with one another on the internal FBI communication system about the case. They also include more of the infamous Peter Strzok/Lisa Page conversations about preventing Trump's election and ginning up a case against Trump.

The discussions show that FBI agents were completely conscious that they were engaged in wrongdoing. The agents note that if a FOIA request is ever filed about the case there will be big trouble.

They note that they are taking out professional liability insurance because they are sure to be sued. They state that the CIA personnel working for John Brennan on the case are also taking out liability insurance.

They shine a spotlight on the January 5, 2017 White House meeting involving Comey, Susan Rice, Obama, Joe Biden, and Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates, in which it was decided to prosecute Flynn no matter what. It is both stated that Obama had been briefed and that "the White House" was now running the Flynn case. There are repeated comments about the deliberate leaks of classified and confidential information concerning the Flynn case, with agents attributing the leaks to the White House or Obama's CIA daily briefers. [See](#) the "Third Supplement in Support of Agreed Dismissal" filed 9/24/2020.

When FBI case agent William Barnett moved to close the Flynn investigation, dubbed Crossfire Razor, in January of 2017, based on the fact that all investigative leads had been exhausted and there was no derogatory material on Flynn, Barnett was instructed to keep it open and investigate a "Logan Act" violation with respect to the conversations between Flynn and Ambassador Kislyak. The FBI didn't even have a code for the Logan Act, a centuries-old, never-enforced statute long ago abandoned as unconstitutional. It prohibits private citizens from corresponding with foreign governments under certain circumstances. Barnett concluded that the Logan Act was completely inapplicable.

Barnett investigated every aspect of the claims against General Flynn in 2016 and found them without substance. He repeatedly told his supervisors, both

before and after General Flynn's discussions with Russian Ambassador Kislyak that there was "no there there" to the Russia/Trump collusion investigation concerning Donald Trump and General Flynn.

Soon, Barnett figured out that Andy McCabe was personally running the Flynn investigation out of his headquarters office and immediate staff. Barnett was not told of the plans for the ambush interview of General Flynn at the White House, although normally the case agent, Barnett, would conduct such an interview. He became so personally uncomfortable about what he learned and observed that in February 2017 he asked to be removed from the case. He told his supervisors that the Flynn case was problematic and could result in "an IG investigation."

Nonetheless, he rationalized that if the Deputy Director was running the investigation backed by DOJ lawyers, in this case the now-indicted Kevin Clinesmith, he could continue to work on the case so long as he did not learn that anything was illegal. He did observe that another FBI analyst who was skeptical of the entire theory of the Flynn case, was removed from the team.

Barnett joined Mueller's team after Peter Strzok pleaded with him to do so and after he had again sought through superiors to be removed from the case following the firing of FBI Director James Comey. He told the Mueller team, specifically Jeannie Rhee, that there was no evidence of a crime by Flynn. Rhee dismissed Barnett's briefing and demanded that he drill down further on Flynn. Barnett states he concluded that Rhee was "obsessed" with Flynn and Russia and "had an agenda."

He notes that there was a per-



Andrew McCabe, Deputy Director of the FBI (2016-2018), personally ran the Flynn investigation.

FBI

vasive "Get Trump" attitude on Mueller's team and that lawyers competed with each other to come up with theories of crimes which they pursued relentlessly, rather than attempting to develop the case by pursuing facts and evidence and determining whether or not they constituted a crime. The roles of investigating agents and lawyers were reversed in Mueller's investigation. The lawyers presented ideas of possible crimes and tried to rig the evidence to fit their views, using agents administratively, to sign off on search warrants and to take other procedural steps normally assigned to investigating agents.

When Flynn's assistant, K.T. McFarland, was interviewed by Mueller's team and did not support one of their Trump/Russia collusion theories, Barnett was prevented from asking clarifying questions, leading him to believe that prosecutors were trying to intimidate and rig McFarland's testimony simply to fit their theory. He was barred from interviewing McFarland further until he threatened to go to the Inspector General.

Barnett said the situation was so extreme that he and other agents joked that it was like a game which they called "Collusion Clue."

"In the hypothetical game, investigators are able to choose any character conducting any activity, in any location, and pair this with another character and interpret it as evidence of collusion." See "Interview of William J. Barnett," filed on 9/24/2020.

Earlier this month, it was disclosed that members of Mueller's team appear to have deliberately wiped their cell phones after word arrived that FBI Inspector General Michael Horowitz was looking at the FBI and DOJ investigation of the Trump campaign. This has resulted in a new investigation to determine whether the lawyers in-



Kevin Clinesmith, a former FBI lawyer, now indicted.



The September 24 disclosures concerning the Trump/Flynn “investigations” have cut the heart out of those particular operations to destroy the U.S. presidency.

involved obstructed justice. Barnett reports that he overheard members of Mueller’s team joking about wiping their phones.

What is now extremely clear is that everyone knew there was no Trump/Russia collusion before the Mueller investigation even started and that this was known by Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein when he appointed Mueller to investigate this wholly fake construct. The entire game was to try and trick the President into obstructing justice by creating a minefield of

staged legal atrocities, starting with the ambush interview of Michael Flynn at the White House, continuing with the raid and assault on his lawyer, Michael Cohen, followed by the Swat Team search and arrest of his friend, Roger Stone, and highlighted by the continuous investigation of his son, Donald Trump, Jr. and other family members. These events coupled with continuous inflammatory and false narratives, were designed to entice the President to react, to fire Mueller, or otherwise take their bait.

They stretched this game out as long as they could in order to do maximum damage to the legitimacy of the Trump presidency while protecting key intelligence officials, Congressmen, and Senators—up to their ears in crimes against the Trump Campaign—from discovery and appropriate investigation and prosecution.

As a result of the full spectrum information warfare operation accompanying this faux prosecutorial campaign, they created a world in which their criminality was neutralized and protected and their crimes against the sitting President were transformed into rage against him. The ability of the present insurrection to function is a direct result.

Thursday’s developments mean that the patriots have finally begun the counter coup and have begun the fight to take the country back.



The Jan. 27, 1989 Jailing of Lyndon LaRouche Defined an Era, Which Now Must End

[Watch](#) The LaRouche Case video

[Watch](#) the LaRouche Memorial video

[Sign](#) the **Petition** to Exonerate LaRouche at lpac.co/exonerate

New Coup Plot Exposures Define Central Issue of U.S. Election As War or Peace

by Harley Schlanger

This is the edited transcription of Harley Schlanger's presentation to the LaRouche PAC's Town Hall, September 19, 2020. Subheads and embedded links to sources have been added.

It's absolutely urgent that people get the context as was presented by Dennis Speed, who [spoke](#) before me. Many people are studying the "connectos": What did Clapper say? What did Brennan do? What did Comey do? What's Pompeo up to? All these specifics. People get confused because, first of all, there's a brainwashing effort underway from the mass media, which is part of the corporate control over people. There's also the destruction of education. A loss of the sense of the dignity of man. The people who are committed to reducing the world's population have no commitment to the idea of creative human beings as representing the solution to the problems.

The Process Behind the 'Connectos'


What we've been doing is to give people an understanding of what's behind these things. I think the last two weeks, these extraordinary [Schiller Institute] conferences which brought together people from all over the world to discuss it on September 5th and 6th, and then specifically the American patriots, Bill Binney, Kirk Wiebe, and Col. Richard H. Black (USA ret.) who identified, in the case of Wiebe and Binney, the role of the security-state



USGCA



FBI



DoS

Former intelligence chiefs from among the coup plotters: James Clapper, Director of National Intelligence (2010-17); James Comey, FBI Director (2013-17); John Brennan, CIA Director (2013-17).

apparatus, both in the coup, but also in controlling the population. And then, secondly, retired Colonel Black's exposé of the military forces being organized to carry out a military coup against President Trump, assuming the election is not conclusive on November 3rd, and that if the President insists that all the votes be counted, that this will be seen as an obstruction, and that he must be removed by military forces.

All of this would seem like a plot worthy of a Dalton Trumbo story. But it's actually occurring!

What we want to do is give you an understanding of what's behind it; that this is not just about Donald Trump being a "bad person," or "someone who's trying to wreck the Constitution," or "a racist," or "a white supremacist." It's not just about Joe Biden being "possibly senile," and "representing bad networks."

A process has been underway, and to understand it, you have to go to the work of Lyndon LaRouche. Because, in order to get a summit, we're going to have to free the President in a way that the American people will support him meeting

with President Vladimir Putin, President Xi Jinping, and others, to work out these problems and avoid war. A summit is an urgent necessity, not after the election, but as soon as it can take place.

At the same time, the summit will be opposed, vigorously, by the coup plotters. We have to make sure people understand the nature of the coup, the intent of the coup

plotters. Again, it's not that they just don't like Trump, or that he's doing this wrong or that wrong; their whole post-Cold World system, which can be traced back to the assassination of John F. Kennedy, but especially after 1989 and the fall of Communism, this whole system has been about using the U.S. military to impose a bankers' dictatorship against and over and above sovereign nations, on behalf of a handful of global international bankers, cartels, and insurance, big pharma, the grain cartels, and so on.

LaRouche's Warnings and Forecasts

In order to get this context, we really have to take a look at what Lyndon LaRouche was doing, especially from 2001 forward.

Just to give you a little bit of background: In his forecast of January 3, 2001, LaRouche came from a point of having viewed the previous 30 years, going back to August 15, 1971, as a succession of steps taken by people like George Shultz, like Felix Rohatyn, like Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and others, acting to bring the United States as a military force to impose this globalized system.

From the beginning, before August 15, 1971, LaRouche was onto this, was warning about it, and was taking people like me, who were young people looking to try and do some good in the world but getting confused by what was going on at that time—the Vietnam War, the rock-sex-drug counterculture—wondering how to position ourselves in such a way as to not just be brought into some sort of clownish reaction, but actually pose something serious. And that's what we found in LaRouche.

I want to now take the two presentations of LaRouche from 2001 to sort of bracket what we're dealing with, when we are dealing with the crises today—the global financial breakdown, the COVID crisis, the so-called climate change crisis, and, most importantly, the danger of war breaking out, because of the efforts of the same people who



DoS/Michael Gross

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo is actively sabotaging Trump's relations with Russia.


are behind the coup, who are targeting Russia and China, and in fact are carrying out the coup because Trump was trying to work with China and Russia, when he first came in as President.

Now, LaRouche's forecast on January 3, 2001 came out of a very clear picture of what happened leading up to that, and I'll just give you some of the highlights.

The Strategic Defense Initiative

Lyndon LaRouche was involved in organizing the Reagan Administration to support what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative, an idea of developing an anti-missile ballistic defense system that could be shared with Russia [the Soviet Union]. It would have two benefits: One, it could make nuclear missiles "impotent and obsolete," as President Reagan himself said. But secondly, for LaRouche, of utmost importance, was bringing new physical principles through scientific research and development to the forefront of economic policy. This was a reflection of what John Kennedy did with the NASA program, which triggered the longest period of sustained, real productive growth of the economy up through the Johnson Administration—no thanks to Lyndon Johnson, but because of what Kennedy did with NASA.

This was seen as a threat to the global system that



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon LaRouche was involved in organizing the Reagan Administration to support what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. Here, LaRouche and Reagan at an NRA-sponsored presidential candidates' debate in Concord, New Hampshire in 1980.



Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation

President Ronald Reagan announces the Strategic Defense Initiative to the nation, March 23, 1983.


was being brought into place. This was what LaRouche was attacking when he first went onto the campuses in the late '60s, not just against the Vietnam War, but what was brought in with it, what became the counterculture and how that counterculture became the dominant culture of the country.

Now, in the period of Ronald Reagan first coming in, we were headed toward a confrontation with Russia [the Soviet Union]. There was the Ogarkov doctrine, the Soviet plan based on the idea that they were losing the opportunity, because of U.S. technological advance in the defense sector, to take [over] Europe.

[Chief of the General Staff, Marshal] Nikolai Ogarkov and some of his people came up with a plan for defeating the West in Europe, possibly taking West Germany. Military action was involved in it; the launching of the nuclear freeze movement in Germany was very important. That's when the Schiller Institute was set up, to try and keep the U.S. and Europe on the same course. But LaRouche's idea was that we have to go bigger than that:

Soviet Union, there was no SDI.

So the Reagan recovery was largely a product of heavy defense spending on existing technologies, which is not a good plan for an economic future. At the same time, the Russians [Soviets] tried to keep up with that spending, and it led to the collapse of the Soviet Union which Lyndon LaRouche had forecast.



EIRNS

The Crash of '87: Speculators waiting for the NYSE to open on October 29, 1987, one day after Black Monday, when the Exchange lost 22.6% of its value, the largest drop in its history.

We have to end the era of Mutual and Assured Destruction [MAD] and Reagan liked the idea.

Unfortunately, Reagan's colleagues in the Republican Party didn't like it. They wanted something cheaper, something not involving science. And on the Democratic [Party] side you had absolute, total obstruction, where you had people like Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the Senator from New York, arm-in-arm with Henry Kissinger, and what did they demand? That Reagan not be in any way associated with Lyndon LaRouche. They also went to the Russians [Soviets] and organized them to go after LaRouche. And, because of the opposition in the United States, and in the

Now, when the SDI was stopped in the United States, what was introduced was a bubble, a series of bubbles. And Lyndon LaRouche in the beginning of 1987 forecast that this would blow up in October 1987. And there was a stock market crash in October 1987!

What was the response to that? Develop a new bubble!—but what facilitated that was the collapse of the Soviet system and the communist governments of the Warsaw Pact in Eastern Europe, in the period of 1989 and 1990. This was a unique opportunity for the West to establish, not a “superiority,” an arrogance by saying “You have to copy what we did.” Instead, they could have reached out: This was the proposal that was coming from Lyndon La-

Rouche and his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche for an industrial Productive Triangle, for extending technology development to the now-unemployed workers in the Warsaw Pact countries and Russia [the Soviet Union].

The ‘End of History’: Globalism and Free Trade

Instead, there was a theory put forward by a man named Francis Fukuyama—many of you have probably heard of him. He came up with the idea of “the end of history.” It’s not a particularly brilliant philosophical idea; it actually came from people like George Shultz, who argued that the collapse of communism proved, not just that communism was no good and didn’t work—which was obvious; but that the alternative system is the only system that should be allowed on the planet, the neo-liberal economic policy, which would be a globalization system, a deregulation system, a speculative system that would be enforced by Western military supremacy, especially that of the United States.

Now, when you talk about the “military-industrial complex” or the “deep state,” that’s what you’re talking about. But, where did this idea come from? It came from the British Empire, because it merged British geopolitics, which is constant warfare, constant division between East-West, between North-South, between smaller states and bigger states; it involved at the same time, neoliberal economic policies which took away the power of elected governments from acting for the good of their people. In other words, this is what the bankers’ dictatorship is! They’re even saying it now, they’re talking about it! Why let elected governments determine economic policy, so-called fiscal policy? That should be in the hands of the bankers, the bankers should control credit policy *and* spending policy. And that’s what’s been presented, going back to the Jackson Hole, Wyoming meeting in 2019—literally, a bankers’ dictatorship.

Now, this whole idea of Fukuyama and the people who were working with him, including at the time George Herbert Walker Bush, this is what Bush called the “new world economic order.” What was it? It’s the idea that we now have a single world empire, controlled by the City of London and their junior associates on Wall Street. This would be a policy of globalization and free trade—which means outsourcing, which means looking for the cheapest raw materials, cheapest labor policy, and, at the same time, free market neoliberalism: reduce government, reduce the power of governments to interfere with the free market—that is, with the globalists—setting the terms of trade.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

The UK Prime Minister, “Iron Lady” Margaret Thatcher, and President George H.W. Bush announce their new world economic order of globalization and free trade in a single world empire, controlled by the City of London and its junior associates on Wall Street.

This should have been familiar to Americans because this is what we fought against in the American Revolution. It’s an imperial policy. And what they were doing was trying to make this imperial policy, the policy of the United States. Now, at the same time, it was to be backed up by U.S. military force: a unipolar world empire. If any country resisted this, on the basis of defending its population, it had to be crushed. No national sovereignty was to be allowed.

I want to just give you a sense of one aspect of this: There was a book written by Walter Wriston [Chairman and CEO] of Citicorp/Citibank, one of the most important people building up what’s called the “banks too big to fail.” He wrote a book in the mid-’80s called *The Twilight of Sovereignty: How the Information Revolution Is Transforming Our World*. That was the policy being applied through [Chairman] Paul Volcker at the Federal Reserve, later by [Chairman] Alan Greenspan, and by the major banks internationally. That was [UK Prime Minister] Margaret Thatcher’s policy. And that was the Bush presidential policy.

Now, it differed a little bit from Bill Clinton. Clinton created new bubbles in order to protect his popularity. He was told by Greenspan, “Build up the stock market,” and so we had stock bubbles, and they crashed. We had an Asia crisis in 1997; the Russian bond crisis in 1998

nearly collapsed the financial system with the collapse of Long-Term Capital Management, basically a speculative fund.

All of this, then, was addressed with the so-called “Y2K crisis,” where there was pumping of money by the Plunge Protection Team, money going to the speculators, to build up a new bubble. And, where did it go? Into the dot.com sector.

LaRouche Forecasts a new ‘Reichstag Fire’ Event

It’s in that context that you look at Lyndon LaRouche’s [comments](#) on January 3, 2001. They’re very short. Here’s what he said, in answering a question during a webcast on January 3, 2001:

We’re going into a period in which either we do the kinds of things I indicated in summary to you today, or else, what you’re going to have, is not a government. You’re going to have something like a Nazi regime....

What you’re going to get with a frustrated Bush Administration, if it’s determined to prevent itself from being opposed—its will—you’re going to get crisis management. Where members of the Special Warfare types, of the Secret Government, the secret police teams, and so forth, will set off provocations, which will be used to bring about dictatorial powers, and [evoke] emotions, in the name of crisis management.

You will have small wars set off in various parts of the world, which the Bush Administration will respond to, with crisis-management methods of provocation. That’s what you’ll get. And that’s what the problem is, and you have to face that.

Now, this was a warning of a Reichstag Fire type event, which would be used to bring on line a police-state that would enforce the United States moving into a series of wars. This is exactly what happened, nine months later on 9/11.

When LaRouche was on Jack Stockwell’s radio show [on September 11], he made the following comments—without knowing anything, without having read a single thing, or hearing a single thing; just having seen the events of that day, because he was on the radio *as* the World Trade Center was coming down. And what LaRouche said is that this is not a coincidence, it’s a systemic operation.



Lyndon LaRouche on January 3, 2001: “You will have small wars set off in various parts of the world, which the Bush Administration will respond to with crisis-management methods of provocation.” Shown: Eight months later, American Airlines Flight 11 about to crash into the North Tower of the World Trade Center in New York City.


If they’re snatching planes ... if all three of these planes—the two we have from New York and this thing on the Pentagon—to get that kind of thing, to snatch planes like that ... This means that there’s been some kind of either incompetence or fix on the whole security operation, because you *can’t* get this kind of thing without a real goof-up, on the security side. So, somebody in charge of security was really not very effectively in charge.

Bill Binney and Kirk Wiebe pointed out last week that just as LaRouche knew this was coming in his January 3, 2001 webcast, people in the National Security Agency had figured out in July and August of 2001 that something was coming, and they were discussing it, and they were reporting it. Wiebe said this was brought by Tom Drake to the attention of the White House, someone in the White House, and it was dismissed. In other words, this was the *intent*: to use 9/11 to bring in, not just the security state, but every aspect of the security state including the total reorganization of the U.S. economy to fit in with this globalized system, to fit in with this new, imperial system. And that’s exactly what happened at that point. This was the dream of Walter Wriston and the bankers.

Living Off the Labor of Others

Then, what was this? The triumph of the “new economy” was being proclaimed. What was the new economy? The so-called “information age,” “artificial intelligence,” “the weightless economy”—in other words you don’t have to produce anything! You get some other poor schmo in another country, who can work for almost nothing, who has no benefits, and have him do the production.

Meanwhile, what do people do in the United States? The *service economy*. And what is the service economy? It’s living off the labor of others for the things you actually need, like food and material goods, and then trading things back and forth, which are increasingly related to the internet, including at a certain point, changing what you think you need, so you can participate in a social networking experiment, which takes away



Laurene Powell Jobs bought The Atlantic magazine to attack Trump, while her online news site, Defense One, carries stories about military people preparing to coup him.



CC/UNclimatechange

everything that goes into the creativity of a productive population, and turns it instead into a bunch of people looking for thumbs up on Instagram, for their latest little trick.

Now, underlying this idea of a “weightless economy,” is anti-growth, the idea that growth is bad, growth is a problem. This is the “manmade climate change” argument: that because human beings consume so much, we’re heating up the atmosphere. Forget that the atmosphere is shaped by things that are much larger than all the combustion engines on the planet; forget that there are such things as solar radiation and tilts of the Solar System, and things of that sort; forget, also, that there was global warming and global cooling before there was a single automobile on the planet, before there was a single factory, probably before there was a single human being!

No, you inculcate this theory that says, “our con-

sumption is what’s causing the problem.” This is the green agenda, and what underlies it, is an anti-human view, that human beings—or most human beings—are useless eaters, and therefore, there has to be a way to limit the number of useless eaters. We need enough of them to protect the lifestyles of the rich and the [top] 1%, but not too many of them!

At the same time that this theory was being propagated, you had the advances of the so-called “security state.” And this is what Bill Binney and Kirk Wiebe and their team were reacting to, around 2001. This is why they left the National Security Agency, because they saw that the collection of metadata, as opposed to *targeted* cyber-investigations, would be used, not just to keep track of what everyone’s doing—whether they’re talking politically about what they’re going to do—but to start shaping an environment where everything you

The Atlantic

do is controlled; where people know what you buy, where you shop, what you look at on the internet, what music you listen to, what movies you see, what foods

you order, where you go to restaurants—all of this is then used to help shape an environment which is controlled by Yahoo, Google, Amazon, and so on.

And these are not ordinary companies. They’re integrated into the military-industrial complex. A perfect example—I’ll give you two perfect examples, simple ones: Jeff Bezos and his company, Amazon. He owns the *Washington Post*. His company, Amazon, has a contract to run the cloud computing operations for the Central Intelligence Agency. You think they’re not looking at everything you buy and everything you look at when you go on Amazon?

Here’s another example: The widow of Steve Jobs, Laurene Powell, from Apple Computer. She is the person who bought *The Atlantic* magazine, which has been running these stories attacking Trump to turn the military against him, claiming that he said people who die in wars are “losers.” And at the same time, she owns

Defense One, which has been writing stories about the coup, that military people are preparing for a coup against the President.

So here you have two prime companies of the information age, Amazon and Apple, that are integrated into this coup process.

‘The New Left, Local Control, and Fascism’

Now this is what Lyndon LaRouche was warning about in his 2001 statements. This is the world we’re facing. And, in fact, if you go back and look at LaRouche, this is what he was talking about in late ’60s, early ’70s. He wrote an incredible [piece](#), the first piece I read by Lyndon LaRouche, which was called “The New Left, Local Control, and Fascism.” We used to joke that what he was saying is that the people who are proposing local control of police and things of that sort, what they really wanted to do was control their own garbage cans, because that’s all they would be allowed to do! They essentially would live in deteriorating cities, under declining conditions, where they would no longer have anybody to call to protect them.



cc/Brett Weinstein

A “protest” riot over the killing of George Floyd in Washington, D.C., May 30, 2020.

What do you think we’re seeing now, as the spinoff from the Antifa and Black Lives Matter? What are they saying? “We want to control our ‘turf’.” They don’t control it! The banks control it! The corporations control it! They may control who sets a police car on fire—they may not even control that, because people are acting out of impulses that are being directed from *somewhere else*. By the way, I don’t know if you saw this the other day,

but on Fox News, when Newt Gingrich brought up the role of George Soros, he was shut down! So the censorship is a central part of this.

All of this escalated under President George W. Bush—Bush, Jr.,—and then under President Barack Obama. The deindustrialization escalated! The growing gap between the small number of wealthy and the larger number of poor, including the collapsing middle class—all of it continued: globalization, free trade, and so on. And regime change wars: We had Iraq, we had Libya, there was Ukraine, there’s Syria.

Rejection of the Establishment Parties Internationally

It was in this context that you had the victory of Donald Trump. What Lyndon LaRouche said when Donald



CC/Aimaina Hikari

Protesters attack police troops in Kiev, Ukraine, February 18, 2014.

Trump was elected was that this was not just an American event. It's a reflection in the United States of what's going on internationally, the rejection of the establishment parties. I see this throughout Western Europe. You know, in Germany, the two leading parties, the coalition partners, the Christian Democrats and the Social Democrats, had their worst showings in the last election in years. The Christian Democrats, the lowest percentage vote since the end of World War II; the Social Democrats had the lowest percentage since the time of Otto von Bismarck in the 1880s. Now—they're still the government!

In Italy, you have a complete mess, as the European Union is doing everything it can to destroy those forces that were fighting for an Italian government that could make determinations of where it would invest. It's not allowed to do that because that goes against the anti-sovereignty of this globalized system.

The Trump election, in a sense, was the world turned upside down: All of a sudden, the Americans who were supposed to be at the center of this "end of history," this new, neoliberal, neoconservative, globalist order, said, "No! We don't want Hillary Clinton! We don't want Barack Obama II. We want something different."

And Donald Trump understood this. The most effective part of this campaign was his attack on the regime-change wars, the endless wars, his attack on the anti-growth Green policy—he pulled us out of the Paris Climate Conference; his attack on the unfair trade agreements such as the gold standard that Hillary Clinton was calling for, the "Asia Pivot" of Obama, which was essentially economic warfare against China—Trump opposed that, and he pulled us out of the Trans-Pacific Partnership; and the possibility that he could break with Wall Street, that he was calling for the return to Glass-Steagall banking separation, which was a major issue LaRouche had been raising, since its repeal by Republicans and Democrats was signed into law by Bill Clinton, in 1999. Trump had in the Republican Platform of 2016, restoring Glass-Steagall.

So, if you were sitting in the City of London and you saw this fellow come in, you weren't worried about whether he was a sexual pervert, or whether he was a nasty guy: You were worried about the fact that he had articulated a program *against* the policies of this British imperial doctrine, the neoliberal policy, the geopolitical war policy—he was opposed to all that. He was trying to bring the United States back to the tradition of the American System.

The Fight We're in Today

And that's why Russiagate was launched, the Ukraine coup, the impeachment, the social insurgency today financed by the same people. And what you have to realize, is that the people behind Russiagate, are the same people saying that we should go to war with Russia, we should go to war with China. The idea of the military-industrial complex is that it's not simply about arms procurement and purchases, it's not just about money for corrupt corporations. It's about controlling a whole system, and the elements of it include all of what I've presented here, including the so-called dot.com companies, the artificial intelligence, the Yahoos and others, as well as the arms producers, as well as Big Pharma, the insurance companies.

It was Big Pharma and the insurance companies, and the for-profit hospital policies pushed by Bush and Obamacare, which tore apart the public health services in the United States, which made us susceptible to the coronavirus pandemic. President Trump was saying that initially, before he got pulled into this anti-China line. The same people pushing the anti-China line are the ones pushing the war policy and the regime-change policy in the United States.

So this is not just about an "election in November": It really is about crushing the imperial forces that have been engaged in a fight that does go back to 1945, to control the United States.

The idea of the summit as a weapon against these imperial forces has a historic background to it: When the American Revolution was being fought, it wasn't just the American colonies against the British Empire. There was support for America for something called the League of Armed Neutrality; and one of the leading players in that was Russia. The French were there, also.


Imagine, if we had a summit which brought together these great powers, today, which are needed to overcome the power of the City of London, that's why it's so urgent that in order to defeat the coup and to end the war danger, a summit take place—and a series of summits, which bring the world back to the era before the "twilight of sovereignty" was declared by Walter Wriston, back to a time when nations had governments which acted in the interests of their people, and worked with other nations for their joint, common concerns.

That's the fight we're in today.

Edward Dickinson Baker: Organizing the Republican Party on the Pacific Coast


by Andrea Ingraham

The subject of this article is Edward Dickinson Baker, arguably Abraham Lincoln's closest friend and political ally. What makes this story critically important is the battle that President Donald Trump is now waging to create a new political majority in the United States, with the life and principles of Abraham Lincoln as his guidepost. This is most clearly enunciated in Trump's September 17 [speech](#) at the National Archives, as well as in his September 22nd [Executive Order](#). Edward Baker's efforts in California and Oregon, between 1852 and 1860, are compelling in their relevance to the political and cultural fight of today.



Mathew Brady

Abraham Lincoln on Feb. 27, 1860, the day of his Cooper Union speech. Three months later, the Republican Party nominated him to be its Presidential Candidate.



Col. Edwin D. Baker

Edward Dickinson Baker, Lincoln's best friend and collaborator, led the fight on the west coast to organize the Republican Party.

Sept. 25—As *EIR* has recently documented,¹ in the 1850s Abraham Lincoln led a brilliant and successful effort to organize the new Republican Party in Illinois, as a real answer to the chaos existing in the United States. Simultaneous with Lincoln's efforts, his best friend and collaborator, Edward Dickinson Baker, led a parallel fight on the west coast of the United States. At that time Oregon and California were both new states, with California attaining statehood in 1850 and Oregon in 1859. Both were also experiencing explosive population growth, with Oregon going from only 12,000

people in 1850 to 52,000 in 1860, and California growing from 93,000 to 380,000 during that same decade.


Politically, in the 1850s, California and Oregon were dominated by a virulent pro-slavery wing of the Democratic Party, and the breakdown of political parties and descent into chaos and violence was as intense, or more so, than anywhere else in the country. California politics was dominated by the southern-minded Democrats under the direction of sometime Senator William McKendree Gwin, a slave owner from Mississippi; and in Oregon, Joe Lane from North Carolina was Territorial Governor, and later U.S. Senator. This pro-slavery clique maintained its power in both places due to the Federal patronage of the Pierce and Buchanan administrations.

In California, David C. Broderick, a New Yorker and Free-Soil Democrat, led an heroic battle for control of the Democratic Party and for defining a new political direction. When Broderick was elected to the U.S.


1. See the [article](#), "How Abraham Lincoln Created the Republican Party," by Robert Ingraham, *EIR*, Vol. 47, No. 37, September 11, 2020, pp. 43-49.



LoC



Mississippi Department of Archives and History



Brady-Handy collection

The pro-slavery clique of William Gwinn (center, in California) and Joseph Lane (right, in Oregon) maintained its power in both places due to the Federal patronage of the Pierce and Buchanan administrations. They denounced David C. Broderick (left), who agitated, unsuccessfully, for an anti-slavery direction within the California Democratic Party.

Senate in 1857, he proved his moral courage by denouncing the Buchanan administration, which he had helped to elect, over the question of the fraudulent pro-slavery Lecompton Constitution of Kansas. This led to bitter denunciations of him from the Gwin wing of the party in California, and a split into what became known as the Lecompton Democrats, a.k.a. the Administration Democrats, vs. the Broderick "Anti-Lecompton" Democrats. The sad culmination came in September of 1859 when, after a highly acrimonious election campaign, the Broderick wing was defeated and Broderick himself was murdered in a duel at the hand of a leading southern Democrat a week later.

While most people in the West did not intend to own slaves, they fell prey, as today, to the popular narratives promoted by leading newspapers and Democratic politicians. Then it was "avoiding the slavery agitation," by promoting laws to ban all blacks, and similar approaches, appealing to people's prejudices and economic uncertainty. This laid the groundwork for the proposal of a separate "Pacific Republic," which would be promoted by the end of the decade in the face of looming southern secession.

In 1848, Baker and Lincoln had both written to President Zachary Taylor, requesting that Baker be appointed the Whig representative to organize the Whig Party in the newly acquired California territory. That job was instead given to a southern Whig. Baker then emigrated with his family to California in 1852 and immediately undertook organizing the rough, mostly young male population on many fronts. He was re-

nowned as a captivating speaker, one who could sway even a hostile crowd. He was a lifelong follower of Socrates, and applied that method, drawing out the best in people in any forum, be that public speeches, jury arguments, funeral orations, campaign speeches, recruiting military regiments, speeches in Congress, or debates in the Senate. These efforts built the foundation for what would become Republican victories in 1860 and continuing through the Civil War.

California

In 1855 Baker ran for State Senate on the Whig ticket and lost, the Whig Party generally disappearing that year. The following year he campaigned up and down California for the first Republican Presidential campaign slate. Under the banner "Free speech, free press, free territory and the Pacific Railroad," he stumped the mining towns and along the coast. On August 30, he addressed a large crowd at Marysville. The Marysville *Daily Herald* reported:

For two hours and a half he held the immense audience spellbound. Ever and anon he drew forth, even from his adversaries in the crowd, the unmistakable evidence of his power as a public speaker—for even they could not help joining the Republicans in their shouts of acclaim.... The peroration was sublime beyond description. The "Apostrophe to the Spirit of Liberty" ... completely carried away the vast auditory, and simultaneously they burst out in loud and long applause.

Baker's itinerary for October included Camptonville, Yuba County, October 18; Marysville, Yuba County, October 20; Auburn, Placer County, October 21; Stockton, San Joaquin County, October 25; Sonora, Tuolumne County, October 27; and Columbia, Tuolumne County, October 28. Baker traveled these many miles on horseback, on mountainous dirt roads.

At Camptonville it was reported, "for more than two hours he held the largest audience ever assembled in this place, to listen to a political address, chained and enchanted by the power of his eloquence." And so it went, place after place.

Baker was also attacked by the pro-slavery Administration Democrats, with the *Marysville Express* denouncing him as an ultra-abolitionist and an enemy to the institutions of the country.


The November 4, 1856 election was a Democratic sweep in California: For President, James Buchanan won with 52,000 votes, with Millard Fillmore, running as a Know-Nothing, receiving 35,000 votes and John C. Frémont, the Republican, 30,000. Two Democrats were elected to Congress and the state legislature was completely Democratic. But after only one year of existence, the Republican Party was now a force to be reckoned with, largely due to Baker's efforts.

The Atlantic Cable Address

In September 1858, celebrations were held all over the country on the occasion of the completion of the first telegraph cable across the Atlantic in August. San Francisco was no exception, and Baker was the featured speaker at a mass rally and parade on September 27. In this address, which includes his oft quoted apostrophe to science, his knowledge of, and love of science shines forth. He noted that there had never been such an expression of popular delight as on this occasion, and painted a profoundly optimistic picture of the future and the unique role the Pacific Coast would play, where "all people and all tongues shall meet," and thereby "form a more perfect civilization":

The transmission of intelligence by electric forces is perhaps the most striking of all the manifestations of human power in compelling the elements to the service of man.... Nowhere in the history of man is the power of Art—action directed by Science—knowledge systematized—so signally and beautifully obvious....

O Science, thou thought-clad leader of the company of pure and great souls, that toil for their race and love their kinds! measurer of the depths of earth and the recesses of heaven! apostle of civilization, handmaid of religion,



The Illustrated London News
Paying out the land end of the Atlantic Cable from the stern of the USS Niagara, 1857.

teacher of human equality and human right, perpetual witness for the Divine wisdom—be ever, as now, the great minister of peace. Let thy starry brow and benign front still gleam in the van of progress, brighter than the sword of the conqueror, and welcome as the light of heaven!...

Yet, more than this, we turn with wonder and delight, to behold on every hand the results of scientific method everywhere visible and everywhere increasing; but amid that wonder and delight we turn to a still greater wonder—the human mind itself! Who shall now stay its progress? What shall impede its career?...

But, amid all these wonders, it is obvious that

we stand upon the threshold of new discoveries, and at the entrance to a more imperial dominion. The history of the last three hundred years has been a history of successive advances, each more wonderful than the last....

There is no reason to believe that the procession will be stayed, or the music of its march be hushed; on the contrary, the world is radiant with hope, and all the signs in earth and heaven are full of promise to the race. Happy are we to whom it is given to share and spread these blessings; happier yet if we shall transmit the great trust committed to our care undimmed and unbroken to succeeding generations.

I have spoken of three hundred years past—dare I imagine three hundred years to come? It is a period very far beyond the life of the individual man; it is but a span in the history of a nation, throughout the changing generations of mental life. The men grow old and die, the community remains, the nation survives. As we transmit our institutions, so we shall transmit our blood and our names to future ages and populations. What multitudes shall throng these shores, what cities shall gem the borders of the sea! *Here all people and all tongues shall meet. Here shall be a more perfect civilization, a more thorough intellectual development, a firmer faith, a more reverent worship.*

California already had the most ethnically diverse, multi-lingual population in the world. But how many recognized that this would lead to a more perfect civilization? How many could imagine 300 years into the future? He ended:

Perhaps, as we look back to the struggle of an earlier age, and mark the steps of our ancestors in the career we have traced, so some thoughtful man of letters in ages yet to come, may bring to



Abraham Lincoln speaks in a debate with Stephen Douglas, seated on his right.

light the history of this shore or of this day. I am sure, fellow-citizens, that whoever shall hereafter read it, will perceive that our pride and joy are dimmed by no stain of selfishness. Our pride is for humanity; our joy is for the world; and amid all the wonders of past achievement and all the splendors of present success, we turn with swelling hearts to gaze into the boundless future, with the earnest conviction that it will develop a universal brotherhood of man.²

The 1859 Campaign

At the time of Baker's Atlantic Cable Address, Lincoln was debating Douglas in Illinois, while the battle over Kansas was raging in the Congress. President Buchanan had endorsed the fraudulently contrived pro-slavery Lecompton Constitution for Kansas, proclaiming that slavery existed in Kansas by virtue of the Constitution. David Broderick, now a Democratic U.S. Senator from California, had fiercely denounced President Buchanan's efforts to bring Kansas into the Union as a slave state. By the end of 1858, the California Democratic Party had split, convening two separate conventions, into what would become known as the Lecompton or Administration Democrats vs the Anti-Lecompton Democrats. It was at a Lecompton Democratic Convention in June of 1859 that Supreme Court Justice David

2. As reprinted in *Masterpieces of E.D. Baker*, Oscar T. Shuck, edit., Published by the Editor, San Francisco, 1899.

Terry set the trap for Broderick that would lead to a fatal duel.

When the Republican state convention met in Sacramento on June 8, Baker led the fight for a unity ticket with the Anti-Lecompton Broderick Democrats. He was defeated in this when the majority of Republicans demanded a straight party ticket.

On June 29, Baker was the featured speaker, kicking off the campaign at a Republican mass meeting in Petaluma. Baker spent much of the speech, and succeeding speeches of that campaign, reaching out to the Anti-Lecomptons to join with them.

Identifying himself as a Republican now, and a Whig formerly, he vehemently attacked the tyranny of the Buchanan Administration and praised the Broderick Democrats for standing up to that tyranny:

I am a candidate for Congress expecting to be beaten. [Laughter] ...

I feel that I am doing something to unite the public sentiment of which I have spoken against the tyranny of the power at Washington. I am in that sense an Anti-Lecompton man and of that organization—yet a Republican at the same time. I bid, in that view, God speed to all Anti-Lecompton men and say: Hurrah for you! You are doing nobly! You have come out from amongst them; you have given up chances for honor, place, and power.... I know and praise what McKibbin and Broderick, our Representatives in Congress, have done. I wish them God speed, and if I really believed my running for Congress would be in their way for a moment, I would get out of it before that moment expired.

On his conception of the Republican Party he elaborated:

The history, the poetry, the invention, the literature, the learning of this Union is Republican. The books your children read and your grandchildren will read are Republican. The inventions that give beauty to your hearths and brilliancy to your homes are the inventions of Republicans. The stimulus that Republican inventions give to free labor serves you with uncounted blessings. The men who do great deeds

and those who record them are alike Republican.... And the great men of the past, whether Homer, who said: "When you make a man a slave you take away half his value"; or all others good and wise, from Cicero, Plato and Demosthenes to Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Clay and Webster—all the noblest thoughts—"Thoughts that breathe and words that burn"—that fell from their lips were wrote for freedom. Who ever wrote a poem to slavery? [laughter] There have been men venal enough, amid the perfume of proud courts, to sing praises to monarchs and princes, but never a man base enough to write a poem to slavery. [cheers]

Principles Shall Prevail

After reiterating that others may be elected in his stead, he stated his real purpose:

But at last when I am dead—when principles shall prevail—.... these thoughts will remain. They will go forward and conquer; they are gathering now into a stream; they are spreading into a rushing, bolding and bounding river; they are controlling men's minds; they are maturing lives; they are kindling men's words; they are freeing men's souls; and as surely as the great procession of Heaven's host above us moves east in its appointed plan and orbit, so surely shall the proud principles of human right and freedom prevail.—[cheers] I may not be there to witness that great glory; I may not see the great edifice of the American Republic placed upon so firm and stable a basis that no recreant hand can rise to shake it.

He concluded:

In that day when the names of the great, the wise, and the good are called, will not some generous comrade, remembering this hour and this sacrifice when my name shall be mentioned—half forgotten though I be—remembering I did my best in my day and my generation say of me as was said of another soldier in another struggle: "fallen upon the field of honor!"³

3. *Sacramento Daily Union*, July 2, 1859.

Reiterating those themes, Baker would speak at more than twenty meetings and rallies throughout the state in the following two months, from San Francisco, to Columbia, where 3,000 gathered, to Chinese Camp to Dutch Flat. On July 8, at Musical Hall in San Francisco, he added a lengthy history of the Democratic Party, asking how it became so strong, and why, “when coupled with slavery, it is now so weak”? He ended that speech with praise of Broderick and the Anti-Lecompton Democrats:

I see that the Anti-Lecompton men are opposing the Administration; they agree with me in this, and if they are going anywhere else I am very much deceived. I have a better opinion of their leader—their leader Broderick—I read that in his last speech, I read it in his votes in Congress. He may not be eloquent, in the usual sense of the word, but he is direct, firm, honest, unwavering, unfaltering.... He is the Richard Coeur de Lion, who, with his battle ax, cut down everything that dared to cross his path or meet him face to face. [Cheers.] He illustrated from Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*, where “although the Giant fought strong and lustily, yet, strong in the cause of right, Great Heart conquered.” And so I verily believe will Broderick, the Great heart of the Anti-Lecompton party, ... will conquer the half way opposition of a Despair, or a more full opposition of our Lecomptonism, until he reaches the great goal of the ambition of every American. [Loud Cheers.]⁴

The Broderick Oration

On September 16, 1859 Democratic Senator David Broderick was murdered in a duel, at the hand of David Terry, a leading Democrat. Two days later it was the Republican Edward Baker who would deliver the lengthy oration over his body at a mass gathering in Portsmouth Square:

What was his public crime? The answer is in his own words: “I die because I was opposed to a corrupt administration, and the extension of slavery!” Fellow citizens, they are remarkable words, uttered at a very remarkable moment;

they involve the history of his senatorial career, and of its sad and bloody termination.

Baker reviewed this senatorial history, and how he had stood up to the Buchanan Administration:

When in his judgement the President betrayed his obligations to his party and country—when, in the whole series of acts in relation to Kansas, he proved recreant to his pledges and instructions—when the whole power of the Administration was brought to bear upon the legislative branch of the Government, in order to force slavery upon an unwilling people—then, in the high performance of his duty as a Senator, he rebuked the Administration by his voice and vote, and stood by his principles. It is true, he adopted no halfway measures. He threw the whole weight of his character into the ranks of the opposition. He endeavored to arouse the people to an indignant sense of the iniquitous tyranny of Federal power, and kindling with the contest, became its fiercest and firmest opponent. Fellow citizens, whatever may have been your political predilections, it is impossible to repress your admiration, as you review the conduct of the man who lies hushed in death before you....

He concluded:

But, fellow citizens, the voice of lamentation is not uttered by private friendship alone—the blow that struck his manly breast has touched the heart of a people, and as the sad tidings spread, a general gloom prevails. Who now shall speak for California? Who be the interpreter of the wants of the Pacific Coast? Who can appeal to the communities of the Atlantic who love free labor? Who can speak for masses of men with a passionate love for the classes from whence he sprung? Who can defy the blandishments of power, the insolence of office, the corruption of administrations? What hopes are buried with him in the grave?

But the last word must be spoken, and the imperious mandate of Death must be fulfilled. Thus, O brave heart! we bear thee to thy rest. Thus, surrounded by tens of thousands, we

4. *Sacramento Daily Union*, July 15, 1859.

leave thee to the equal grave. As in life, no other voice among us so rung its trumpet blast upon the ear of freemen, so in death its echoes will reverberate amid our mountains and valleys, until truth and valor cease to appeal to the human heart.

Good friend! True hero! Hail and farewell.

Baker's eulogy of Broderick would become, as one contemporary described it, "a rapier that split the Democratic party beyond hope of reconciliation in the 1860 election."

Oregon

In the autumn of 1859, Oregon, which had become a state that year, was overwhelmingly Democratic. Its rabidly pro-slavery and pro-states' rights Senator, Joe Lane, would soon become the Vice-Presidential running mate of John Breckinridge. Some emigrants from the south had brought slaves into Oregon with them. But a split in the Democratic Party was occurring, similar to what had happened in California.

Meanwhile, a small group, led by Illinoisans, had formed a Republican Party. Dr. Anson Henry, a friend of Lincoln and Baker from Illinois and later Lincoln's personal physician at the White House, led an effort to persuade Baker to move to Oregon and apply his oratorical magic toward turning the state Republican. Another key figure was Simeon Francis, editor of *The Oregonian*. Formerly the editor of the Springfield, Illinois *State Journal*, he was long an ally of Lincoln and Baker.

Baker moved to Oregon in February of 1860, and on April 19, he was officially asked to stump the state in the coming canvass. A few days later, in Salem, he advised the Republicans of Marion County to hold off nominating a ticket, saying:

The canvass will drive into opposition those Democrats who are really with us in principle, whereas, if we fall in with them at the election they will almost be compelled to unite with us to save themselves from defeat by the friends of the Buchanan Administration.

Thus he campaigned for the Republican principles and program, not candidates. He covered a large part of the state, mostly on horseback or wagon, sometimes by

river steamer. On May 5 he spoke in Portland; May 7, Astoria, 100 miles downstream; May 8 St. Helens; May 9 Lafayette; May 16 Corvallis and Brownsville; May 17 Harrisburg; May 19 Eugene. Later in the month he spoke in The Dalles, 200 miles east. In the words of a contemporary:


A great change came over the country after the advent of the Colonel [Baker]. For the accommodation of the people who came to see him, he had to keep open house, and this being insufficient, a part of the day, he held court at the largest hotel in town [Salem], and in a few weeks had seen and captured all who met him, and knew more of the social and political condition of the state than any man in it.

In a June 5 legislative election, the Administration Democrats elected 19 legislators, the Douglas Democrats 18, and the Republicans 13. The Republican Party, which heretofore was insignificant, now held the balance of power.

Uniting the Pro-Union Forces

After this election, Baker returned to San Francisco to help organize the Republican campaign for Lincoln there. Lincoln had been nominated for President at the Republican national convention in May. Baker wrote to congratulate Lincoln and brief him on the new prospects for victory on the west coast, on the possibility of a Republican Senator from Oregon and possibly California:

I am happy my old friend to write you a letter on such a subject, the reward that fidelity and courage find in your person will infuse hope in many sinking bosoms, and new energy in many bold hearts. As I write I am reminded of a great many things in our earlier career, which in the events lately thronging around you, you may scarcely remember. I am proud as a personal friend and a party man to feel that among them all, there has been nothing which would not confirm my loyalty as a partisan and my confidence as friend. You will not wonder that in the great distinction you have won and the great usefulness which I believe awaits you, I feel an interest which later friends can hardly know. The seed which you



Edward Baker's 'American Theater' speech. A few days later, Lincoln carried California and Oregon.

planted in the fields we tilled together ripens in the sunshine of your later life, at a great distance. I rejoice in the luxuriance of the harvest. My whole heart is with you in the great battle, if we win here, my whole soul will go out in the struggle.

In Oregon he succeeded in doing what he had attempted in California the previous year: uniting the pro-Union Democrats with the Republicans. Despite an attempt by a band of Lecomptonite Democrats to prevent a quorum of the State Senate by hiding out in a barn, they were discovered, forced back to their seats, and on October 2, 1860, the Republican Baker and the Douglas Democrat James Nesmith were elected to the United States Senate.

On October 6, an editorial in the *Oregon Argus* quoted Baker:

Republicans of Oregon! You have achieved a glorious victory! Pursue the retreating enemy,

and in November the Republican Star will blaze over both of the new states of the Pacific Coast!

Shortly thereafter Baker left for Washington D.C., via San Francisco.

The American Theater Speech

On October 19, the ship carrying the Bakers steamed into San Francisco Bay, greeted by a hundred-gun salute at Fort Point and a tumultuous crowd at the wharf. A week later, at the American Theater in San Francisco, Baker would deliver perhaps the greatest public speech of his life. It would swing California for Lincoln two weeks later and play a major part in keeping California in the Union. People came from around the state. Stores and offices closed early. The crowd began gathering by afternoon. By seven o'clock there were 12,000 present, while the theater held only 4,000. When the presiding officer introduced "the Honorable Edward D. Baker, United States Senator from the State of Oregon," people jumped from their seats, cheering, waving. They seemed to forget they had defeated him the year before.

After preliminary greetings, Baker first tackled the accusation that the Republicans were a sectional party:

They used to say that we were a sectional party.... I saw a letter last week from a very honest and a very good man by the name of Abraham Lincoln [tremendous applause], and he, in thus communicating with a friend, said that it was very queer he should be called sectional by certain politicians when it was a fact that he got more votes from the South in the Chicago Convention than Judge Douglas did in the Baltimore convention. "Yet the party to which I belong is said to be sectional while that of Judge Douglas claims to be national." ... Whose fault is it? You won't let us go down South and make Republicans or we would soon have a host of converts in that latitude....


Who, then, is national? Breckinridge will get no State at the North, and the Bell and Everett men say he will get none at the South. [laughter].... Freedom can't be sectional; it must be national.... If we are not yet represented in every State, whose fault is it? [laughter] If it is sectional not to get many votes in one section, how many will Breckinridge get in New

York? All he will get there will be by pretending not to run. [laughter] How many votes will he get in Illinois? Will he get half as many votes in Illinois as Lincoln will in Missouri?...

Southern people claim the right to go wherever they choose with their property. I say in reply that the Negro is not property in the general sense; he is property only in a sort of qualified sense. A Negro can be property only in the face of the common law, humanity, religion, literature, and philosophy—for all these claim that black or white, rich or poor, high or low, “*a man’s a man for a’ that.*” [great cheering.] It is true that there are certain compromises of the Constitution affecting this question, which we all agree to abide by; but we deny that the Negro is by common law a slave. He is such slave only by local law; and we say, catch him where you can, keep him where you can, hold him where you can; but when he gets away from your local law, he is free, by every instinct of humanity, and every principle of the common law. [Applause.] We deny, then, that he is “property” which you have a right to take into the Territories, and you shall not carry him there against the common sentiment of the men among whom you go. Is not that fair? Can you overcome the argument? [Applause.]

Freedom

The normal condition of the Territories is freedom. Stand on the edge of the Sierra Nevadas, or upon the brow of any eminence looking down into the Territories




Mathew Brady

John C. Breckinridge, the Democratic party's candidate for President in 1860.

beyond, and what do you behold?... Western man goes into the Territories with his family, his horses, his oxen, his ax and other implements of labor. The Southern man goes with his slave. The Western man says, “I can’t work by the side of the slave—he degrades my free labor.” And the Irishman or German (who don’t go South to find employment) says, “I can’t work by the side of the slave either—it degrades my labor.” ... But the Southern man says, “No, you don’t! I’ve got the Dred Scott decision in my pocket, which holds that neither Congress nor the Territorial Legislature, nor any human power can remove human slavery from the Territories; that it goes there pro-

ected by the Constitution of the United States, and there it must remain; and now, therefore, I tell you Irishman, and German, and Western man, that your ideas of popular sovereignty and free labor are all humbug!”

So says the slave-owner. Now, you Douglas Democrats, what are you going to do about this? Some of




Harper's Weekly/Theodore R. Davis

“A Slave Auction in the South,” July 13, 1861.



Edward D. Baker, 1860.



Mathew Brady

President Abraham Lincoln, 1863.

you say you don't care. I say you do care, for you can't help caring; first, because you are a man, and you feel that whatever affects humanity affects you. It is absurd to say that you don't care. There are four million slaves, and they are increasing. The fell influence of slavery is paralyzing the interests of freedom and free labor, and checking the advance of the whole country. It denies us legislation; it defeats our Pacific Railroad, and withholds the daily overland mail.... What will you Douglas men do? Will you hear the music of the march of freedom, and stand idly by, or turn a deaf ear? We have the right and duty thus lawfully and peacefully to reverse a decision which puts a construction upon the Constitution that is higher than the Constitution itself, especially when that decision relates to personal liberty. I say that a decision which claims that by the Constitution slavery goes everywhere the flag goes, there to be and remain forever, is treason against human hope. [Tremendous applause.] You Douglas men, you will vote for popular sovereignty, will you? Now, how will you do it? What State will you carry? Perhaps California [cries of "No, No!"] and Missouri. [Missouri was in fact the only state Douglas carried.] What good will that do you? You can accomplish nothing. Come to us, then, and we will do you good.

There are people who talk as though we Republicans were doing the South some grievous wrong. How? When? Where? They forget that freedom and free labor

are the great interests of the country. There are only about 270,000 white men who have a direct interest in human slavery. Will legislating, then, for 30 million of free white men, instead of for the exclusive interest of 270,000, be a cause for disunion? There are poor white men in the South as well as in the North, who have an interest in this question of free labor, and we stand for the interests of free labor everywhere the world over, wherever a bright eye sparkles, or a bright idea gives forth its light!

Our Light Cannot Be Hid

We are a city set on a hill.

Our light cannot be hid. The prayers and tears and hopes and sighs of all good men are with us, of us, for us. [Applause.] As for me, I dare not, I will not be false to freedom! [Applause.] Where in youth my feet were planted, there my manhood and my age shall march. I am not ashamed of Freedom. I know her power. I glory in her strength. I rejoice in her majesty. I will walk beneath her banner. I have seen her again and again struck down on a hundred chosen fields of battle. I have seen her friends fly from her. I have seen her foes gather around her. I have seen them bind her to the stake. I have seen them give her ashes to the winds, regathering them that they might scatter them yet more widely. But when they turned to exult, I have seen her again meet them face to face, clad in complete steel, and brandishing in her strong right hand a flaming sword red with insufferable light. [Vehement cheering.] And I take courage. The Genius of America will at last lead her sons to freedom! [Great applause.]⁵

Baker had spoken for two and a quarter hours.

The *Sacramento Daily Union* reported that "Senator Baker retired amid a wild storm of applause and cheering." Elijah Kennedy, a reporter and Republican from Marysville, described how the audience had been transformed:

5. *Masterpieces*, op. cit.

The scene defies description. The excited multitude were disinclined to leave the place. Long they continued cheering and shouting and singing. Deeper even than this manifestation was the feeling of many, who, touched by their hero's words of farewell and the pathos in his voice, wept, and even sobbed aloud. When, at last the thousands had departed they went out in a mood quite different from that in which they entered the hall. Then they were expectant; now they were full of courage and confidence, which spread abroad with the speed of thought.

The shorthand notes were transcribed, typeset, and printed overnight, ready for the outgoing steamboats and stagecoaches that were to distribute the pamphlet to every corner of the state. In many places, crowds assembled to hear the entire speech read. Elijah Kennedy read it aloud in a public hall in Marysville, reporting, "It was like the effect of mountain air."

A few days later, on November 6, 1860, Abraham


Lincoln carried California with a plurality of 614 popular votes. In Oregon, Lincoln won by 270 votes. Fewer than 900 votes gave the two states to the Republican ticket!

One year earlier, the Republicans and Broderick Democrats had been crushed in California, and a bill had passed in the legislature and was signed by the Governor to divide California in half, so that the southern territory would pave a way for slavery to extend to the Pacific. In Oregon, a constitution had been voted up banning Blacks from emigrating to the state and their pro-slavery Senator Joe Lane was now the running mate for John Breckinridge on the southern Democratic presidential ticket. Now and for the duration of the Civil War, Republicans and pro-union Democrats in both states unified behind Lincoln for the defense of the Union, and crushed efforts by southern Democrats and Copperheads to pull those states out of the Union.

The lesson to be learned? People are not fixed; they are not animals; they are human, after all. Thus, there is great cause for optimism today.

LYNDON LAROCHE Collected Works, Volume I

This first volume of the Lyndon LaRouche Collected Works contains four of LaRouche's most important and influential works on the subject of physical economy:



- *So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics?*
- *There Are No Limits to Growth*
- *The Science of Christian Economy*
- *The Dialogue of Eurasian Civilizations: Earth's Next Fifty Years*

So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics? was first published in 1984 and has become the single most translated of LaRouche's books.

There Are No Limits to Growth first appeared in 1983 as a direct response to the Club of Rome's *The Limits to Growth*, thoroughly refuting the latter's unscientific Malthusian argument, which underlies the "green" environmentalist movement today.

The Science of Christian Economy (1991) is a groundbreaking study written by Mr. LaRouche during the five-year period he was unjustly incarcerated as a political prisoner in significant measure for the arguments he sets forth in this book.

The Dialogue of Eurasian Civilizations: Earth's Next Fifty Years (2004) follows in the footsteps of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa to establish the scientific, cultural, and theological basis for a true dialogue of civilizations, in order to successfully address the existential crises facing humanity today.

\$50

* At this time we are only able to ship to locations in the United States via our online store. Please contact us directly for inquiries about international orders: info@larouchelegacyfoundation.org.

II. Schiller Institute Youth Conference: Exonerate LaRouche!

Schiller Institute International Youth Conference

The World Has a Choice: Extinction, or Era of LaRouche

September 26, 2020

PANEL 1

The World Needs the Exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche

Speakers List, in order of appearance

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Founder and Chairman, Schiller Institute

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. (*Video excerpt from 1995 Independent Hearings on Misconduct by the U.S. Department of Justice.*)

Paul Gallagher, Economics Editor, *EIR*; Former Political Prisoner

Odin Anderson, Esq., Lead Defense Attorney, LaRouche Alexandria Trial. (*Video excerpt from 1995 Independent Hearings on Misconduct by the U.S. Department of Justice.*)

Ramsey Clark, Former U.S. Attorney General. (*Video excerpt from 1995 Independent Hearings on Misconduct by the U.S. Department of Justice.*)

Dr. Jozef Mikloško, Former Deputy Prime Minister, Czech and Slovak Federative Republic

Theo Mitchell, Former State Senator, South Carolina

Dr. Natalia Vitrenko, Chairwoman, Progressive Socialist Party of Ukraine; Former Presidential Candidate

Marino Elsevyf, Attorney-at-Law, Dominican Republic

Dennis Small, Ibero-American Editor, *EIR*; Former Political Prisoner

Note: We present here an overview and the edited transcripts of three of the speakers at the first of two panels of the Schiller Institute conference. A fuller report on second panel, “The Science, Culture, and Great Projects of a Global Renaissance,” will be published in a future issue. The videos of the conference are available [here](#).

Where Might Humanity Have Been Today?

Recapturing the Lost Ground with the Power of Reason

The reason why the complete exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche is synonymous with the fate of the United States, lies both in the threat which his opponents pose to the very existence of the U.S.A. as a republic, and thus for the entire world, and also in the implications of his ideas for America's future survival.

—Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Where might humanity be today if Lyndon LaRouche—and his ideas—had not been unjustly imprisoned through what has been described as “deliberate and systematic misconduct and abuse of power” and a “tragic miscarriage of justice”?¹ If his ideas had been allowed to be heard without prejudice in national and international policy debate, perhaps we would have already developed a scientific colony on the Moon, ended poverty for good, and mastered fusion power, leading to a global economic and scientific renaissance.

Today, the need for his exoneration is perhaps more urgent than ever. Helga Zepp-LaRouche has warned that if civilization is to survive the current breakdown crisis gripping the entire globe—the COVID-19 pandemic, looming financial blowout, growing famine, and threat of war—then we must succeed in creating a new paradigm, an entirely new system, which is as different from the current system as the Renaissance was from the Middle Ages that preceded it. Such a change in system would be akin to a creative act: humanity choosing to reject the old mode, and beginning to establish its activity, including relations among nations, upon a new, truthful set of beliefs and principles.

Of such truthful quality are the ideas and policies of Lyndon LaRouche.

But how to achieve such a monumental change within a global dynamic that seems to be moving with such momentum toward chaos? The only way to break from the current trajectory is to intervene into it by letting the future shape the present: build a youth movement which will rapidly qualify themselves to lead.

1. Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who joined LaRouche's legal team during the appeals process, wrote the serving Attorney General, Janet Reno, a letter in 1995 in which he called the LaRouche case “a broader range of deliberate and systematic misconduct and abuse of power over a longer period of time in an effort to destroy a political movement and leader, than any other federal prosecution in my time or to my knowledge.”

Liberate LaRouche's Ideas

To that end, on September 26, 2020, the Schiller Institute convened an extraordinary online conference on the subject of LaRouche's exoneration. Participants were young people from more than 25 countries on all continents of the world. The case for LaRouche's exoneration was presented to them by some of those who knew its nature best: LaRouche's widow, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, leaders who fought for his parole and subsequent exoneration—Jozef Mikloško, Former Deputy Prime Minister of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic; Marino El-sevyf, Attorney-at-Law in the Dominican Republic; and Theo Mitchell, former State Senator from North Carolina—and collaborators of LaRouche who were sent to prison with him, Paul Gallagher and Dennis Small.

Video clips of LaRouche's lead attorney Odin Anderson, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, and Lyndon LaRouche himself discussing the LaRouche case at the Independent Hearings on Misconduct by the U.S. Department of Justice in 1995, filled out the picture of the crimes committed.

All of the panelists touched on the political motivation for the frame-up of LaRouche. Panelist Marino El-sevyf expressed it thus:

My observation in this process was that the facts which led to the jailing of Lyndon LaRouche were a charade, or procedural fraud, to carry out a witch-hunt against the ideas and anti-Establishment protests of citizen Lyndon LaRouche. The universal principles that he called for in his writings and speeches, as well as the conferences that he held across the U.S. and the world, opposed and exposed the nonsense and the failure of the economic policies in the U.S. and world. The Renaissance approach of Lyndon LaRouche, as well as having revived the ideas of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, of Kepler, of Leibniz, of Riemann, confronted the free trade system and the false competition of neo-liberalism, otherwise known as the savage capitalism of globalization.

Former political prisoner Dennis Small highlighted the contrast between the thousands of leaders who signed in support of LaRouche's exoneration in the 1990s and the few though very powerful people whom

LaRouche had crossed, by referencing “the great intellectual ‘crimes’ which got him the attention of Kissinger and the British establishment,” and then asking:

What is it, one might ask, that earned him being so beloved of so many people around the world—not just in the United States, but in every single country he visited? It was because he always fought, from a totally selfless standpoint, for the common good of all mankind.

The effect of the powerful presentations, which established the fraud of LaRouche’s imprisonment on moral as well as legal grounds, was expressed by one young participant, who said:

The real crime is the fact that his work was hidden and buried, and the real victims are people like me! How frustrating it is to know that there was someone screaming from the mountaintop about this concept of moral and intellectual genius, and he was shut up.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche ended her remarks with a challenge to the young participants. After stating that the world today would be a much more beautiful place had LaRouche’s ideas been implemented, she charged the participants: “That task is now yours. *You* will be the people who have to design a new era of mankind.”

A New Generation of Statesmen and Thinkers

The second panel of the conference, “The Science, Culture, and Great Projects of a Global Renaissance,” had two effects: Its presentations gave a taste of what the world could look like if LaRouche’s policies and ideas were implemented—from large scale infrastructure building to develop the world, to reviving a scientific method of creative discovery, to replacing the culture of digital addiction with one of beauty—and they also demonstrated how to build a qualified youth movement; the presentations were given *by* young people *to* young people in a worldwide process of dialogue and deliberation on matters of great import to the future of civilization.

A series of presentations discussed specific infrastructure development proposals and accompanying policies that would have a transformative effect on the productivity and prosperity of each presenter’s respective region. Among the projects discussed were the Bering Strait connection, the NAWAPA and PLHINO/PLIGON water projects in North America, the refilling

of Lake Chad in central Africa, and the maglev train and fusion research projects in Europe.

In her presentation on the Bering Strait connection, Anastasia Battle made clear her understanding of the geopolitical implications of such a project:

What if we could get the United States and Russia to break on this geopolitical game? How would that change the global dynamic?... If we can organize the United States and Russia around this proposal and force that change of thought, this would radically change the whole geopolitical atmosphere, not just between the U.S. and Russia, but globally.... That’s what I want to see. In my country, in other countries—I’m an American—I don’t want to see the United States being used as a pawn for manipulating other nations into war, or for our nation to go into war. I want to see a new chapter of humanity: a new system.

Participants asked the presenters quite serious questions: How do we enable smaller countries to finance such large projects? What about the objections to growth raised by those who see it as a threat to the environment? Why and how have oligarchical forces moved to stop big development projects?

A second series of presentations took a close look at the culture, both artistic and scientific. A challenging presentation by Chérine Sultan took on the pandemic of digital addiction, and addressed—

[the] victims of digital technology who recognize very well that they can no longer restrain themselves when they give in to the temptation to connect to a screen: “We know it’s not good for us, we know, but we do it anyway.” Yes, we can see that we are less creative when we fall into this addiction, and that’s exactly the purpose of the oligarchy. We’ll see how consistent the digital giants are in using an anti-creative means for an anti-creative purpose.

And yet, she offered an antidote in the inborn spark of curiosity and creative hypothesis which exists in each human mind. But how to foster that?

Presentations challenging the idea that human beings know things via their senses, one on music and one on science, gave examples of how the playful activity of the mind can be fostered through investigating paradoxes. Central to LaRouche’s recruitment of young people has

always been to create a culture of education of youth through rediscovery, rather than memorization of facts. In that way, the student has certain knowledge of the truth of something for him or herself—for example, that the Earth goes around the Sun, rather than the other way around—instead of accepting it on “good authority.”

Asuka Burke introduced her group’s presentation by stating, “Today, we are inundated with information and opinions, but how do we know which opinion is right? What is the method by which you might come to know anything? As Lyndon LaRouche pointed out repeatedly in the past, a German astronomer, Johannes Kepler, presents us with a crucial insight into that question of knowledge.”

The panel ended with a discussion by Madison Hirst

of LaRouche’s “Four Laws to Save the USA Now,” and the principle of credit: creating the ability to *build* the future that our nations and humanity as a whole require.

Perhaps more important than any of the particular topics presented, or the particular questions asked, was the nature of the process that unfolded: On Saturday, September 26, dozens of young people from six continents and more than two dozen nations came together for six hours to deliberate on profound matters that will determine whether or not there will be a future for civilization. These young people come from all walks of life. They are just the beginning of what is now emerging as a growing youth cadre that is qualifying itself to design and lead a new era of mankind.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Lyndon LaRouche: His Ideas and Initiatives

This is the edited transcription of Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s keynote address to the International Youth Conference of the Schiller Institute on September 26, 2020. Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche is the founder of the Schiller Institute. Subheads and embedded links have been added.

The purpose of this event today is to make the name and person and ideas of Lyndon LaRouche known to many young people around the world. His ideas are key to the world being able to get out of the present crisis. Given the fact that he was my husband for 41 years, and I was one of his many political associates for about half a century, what I’m saying now is not merely a statement, it is being said with the deepest conviction of my own soul and mind: He has been, and in one sense because of his immortality, is still the most beautiful soul and the most creative person of his time.

There is no greater discrepancy between who Lyn really was and is, and the kind of picture which is being painted about him. From the standpoint of universal history, if you judge individuals on how much they bring the development of all of humanity forward, I think he is one of the most outstanding figures of all of history. On the other side, the almost unmatched violence—and that says a lot, especially in contemporary America—with which his



Schiller Institute

Helga Zepp-LaRouche

opponents went after him, vilified him, demonized him, really gives you a sense of the degree to which they were absolutely terrified of him.

One of the great German natural law philosophers, [Friedrich August] Freiherr von der Heydte, said that the LaRouche case reminded him of the Dreyfuss Affair in France. And former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, in speaking to a commission investigating the so-called LaRouche case in 1994, said:

The LaRouche case represents a broader range of deliberate cunning and systematic misconduct over a longer period of time, utilizing the power of the Federal government, than any other prosecution by the U.S. government in my time, or to my knowledge.

Leadership to Save Humanity from World War III

What was behind that, or who was behind that, is what people nowadays call the Deep State, or better, the Anglo-American intelligence apparatus; the same kind of apparatus which is behind the coup attempt against President Trump since 2016, behind Russia-gate, behind the demonization of Presidents Putin and Xi Jinping, and the people who are now in an all-out push to

get war going, maybe even before the U.S. election, or at least drive the containment against Russia and China up to the point where it could go all wrong and we could have World War III.

The effect of these people having been relatively “successful”—and I mean that ironically—is the reason that we are now on the verge of World War III; that we have an out-of-control pandemic; that we are still threatened with the danger of a financial collapse of the entire system; and that we have famine especially in the developing countries which could quickly reach Biblical dimensions.

If we want to overcome these dangers—even at this very late stage of affairs—it will depend—and we can discuss it, but it is my deepest conviction—it will depend on our ability and your help to free Lyn’s name from the lies, slanders, and distortions, and to implement Lyn’s solutions, which really have practically taken care of every single problem which is an existential threat to humanity today.

In a very beautiful [paper](#) called, “The Historical Individual,” which I would urge you to read, he saw two major missions for himself. One, he said, I want to get you safely through the worst of the presently onrushing world and national crises. And secondly, to foster a new leadership from among the ranks of our young people, which will understand the systemic features of history, and therefore, will be much less likely to make the same mistakes as the foolish members of the recent two adult generations have made until now.

That fostering is directed towards you. You are the young people who are the future. Therefore, it is up to you to develop out of your ranks the kinds of leaders who will make a difference in history.

Lyn said, in that paper, when every nation, every culture is in a tragic moment of great crisis, it is “gripped by the need for a sudden and profound change in the quality of its leadership.” Then survival depends upon its “willingness to choose a new quality of leadership,” and not leave the fate of humanity to those narcissistic leaders who occupy leading positions now, who are only concerned about their performance, but not about the well-being of their nations or the world. You have to have the aspiration to become, all of you, true great statesmen. You have to take as your examples, according to whom you want to orient your life, such people as Benjamin Franklin, or Abraham Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jeanne d’Arc, or Martin Luther King; and, I would like to add, Lyndon LaRouche.



Lyndon LaRouche addresses a conference of his movement in 1976.

An ‘Ugly Duckling’

We have now the greatest danger that the world is run by leaders around the world who are mediocrities—there are very few exceptions—who are really not fit to lead the world out of this crisis. This is at a moment when you would need intellectual and moral giants. So, the indispensable leaders for such times as these, Lyn says in this paper, are those people who succeeded, practically from childhood, to let themselves be taken over by the natural potential for the sublime. The sublime—that is, that quality described by Friedrich Schiller where a human being attaches his or her identity to higher values than even our physical existence, and becomes not physically safe, but morally safe.

Such a person rejects the banality of popular culture and taste. Such a person rejects the world of sense certainty, the pleasure in the here and now, and develops the innate power of that quality that is described in *I Corinthians* 13—*agapē*. A profound, passionate love for mankind, without which, the world will not get out of this crisis.

Those relatively free souls among us, Lyn says, are the “ugly ducklings,” those who are mistakenly called “eccentrics” because they don’t fit the mainstream popularly accepted taste of the social clubs of that kind of paradigm which got us into this crisis. Lyn jokingly, but not so jokingly, called himself many times an “ugly duckling.” But I can assure you, his mind was the most beautiful swan you ever could see.

The Young Lyndon LaRouche

As a young man, Lyn studied, all on his own, the ideas of Leibniz, and he listened to Classical music. He



LaRouche told the truth about what it meant for the nation and the world when President Nixon took down the Bretton Woods system on August 15, 1971, and further drew out that meaning in a debate with economist Abba Lerner on December 2 of that same year.

rejected Kant—especially his ideas about aesthetics—that there was no meaning in beauty, and that beauty was arbitrary. He rejected Kant’s idea that there was no knowable, universal truth.

Lyn then joined the Second World War, participating in the India-Burma theatre. He told us many times of his experiences in the Calcutta riots of 1946. This was a very decisive moment in his history because he saw firsthand the brutish character of the British Empire in action. It was clear in his mind from that point on, that the natural course of affairs would be that after the Second World War, the Americans would return and develop India and other developing countries, as was the intention of Franklin D. Roosevelt to develop the developing countries with American technology.


Lyn was shocked when he heard that Truman would replace Roosevelt and told his contemporaries in India that a great man had been replaced by a very little man. And he was completely appalled when he then returned to the United States and saw how people who had developed a certain greatness in fighting Nazism and in fighting fascism and being in World War II, how they became petit bourgeois; going into the suburban life of American cities. Lyn developed a healthy contempt for that kind of lifestyle.

Then, in his function as a business consultant, he came across the theories of Norbert Weiner and John von Neumann. He studied information theory and systems analysis, and immediately recognized that these systems were not capable of describing real economic


processes of physical economy, which he had started to develop into his own system based on the ideas of Leibniz.

He developed the idea of physical economy, which became the basis for him to become the most successful economic forecaster of the recent period. His love for Classical music—Bach, Beethoven—had given him the appreciation for the importance of the cognitive potential of each individual. From that standpoint, he was one of the very few people in the 1960s—when most everyone was mesmerized by the hippies, by “flower power”—he immediately recognized that this paradigm shift, which was induced by the oligarchy, would destroy the cognitive potential of the population in the long term. He started an unceasing campaign against the danger of drugs and the rock-drug-sex counterculture.

Then, I think the most important point in this early period was that Lyn recognized what it meant when Richard Nixon, on August 15, 1971, decoupled the dollar from the gold reserve standard, and introduced floating exchange rates. Lyn understood that what Franklin D. Roosevelt had intended with the Bretton Woods system—which had partially survived what Churchill and Truman did with it—was then being totally destroyed. Lyn said, prophetically, that if that monetarist tendency were to continue, it would inevitably lead to the danger of a new depression, a new fascism, and the danger of a new world war, unless it were replaced by a just, new world economic order.



LaRouche countered the Malthusian idea that there are limits to human population growth.



Malthusianism Refuted

Immediately following this, in 1973, Lyn created a Biological [Holocaust] Taskforce to study the impact of austerity imposed by the IMF and World Bank on the developing sector—the infamous IMF conditionalities that had prevented the developing countries from investing in infrastructure and health care, forcing them to pay their artificially inflated debt instead. Lyn said that if that were to continue, it would inevitably lead to the outbreak of old diseases and new pandemics. He had the foresight that epidemics and pandemics would develop, and they did: AIDS, SARS, MERS, Ebola, and now COVID-19. None of this would have had to happen if Lyn's policies for the development of the developing countries had been implemented.

From that perspective, Lyn also immediately recognized the absolute devastation of the implementation of the Malthusian policies of the Club of Rome, and how the paradigm shift occurred at the beginning of the 1970s: From the idea that it was natural that eventually all developing countries would develop, as expressed in the development decades of the 1950s and '60s of the United Nations, to its replacement by the infamous theories of the Club of Rome: the idea that there are limits to growth, the idea that population is not a good thing; that the “population bomb” is the greatest threat to humanity; that there is overpopulation.

Basically, Lyn knew that was completely wrong; that this was completely against the laws of the actual physical universe. He developed one of his most important conceptions, which was the idea of relative potential population-density. Meaning that it is a law of the

universe that the number of people must increase; they must develop more abilities to have longevity in order to be able to have more people be able to develop more skills which require longer education. And that the effect of this would be limitless development. He also knew that the premise of the Club of Rome was completely ridiculous. The Earth is not a closed system; the whole assumption of the Malthusians is wrong.

Naturally, his image of man was that man is not an accountant who manages limited resources, and for sure not a parasite as the Greenies today say. But the discoveries of man can again and again show him new physical principles that are part of the development of the universe, as a matter of fact, are the most developed part of it.


The First of Eight Runs for President

Because Lyn saw the danger the Malthusian ideas represented for humanity, he decided, as an individual, as somebody who was not backed by Wall Street or the City of London, to run for President of the United States. He did that first on the Labor Party ticket, a party he founded in 1973. He was the Labor Party's candidate in the Presidential campaign of 1976, fighting against the Trilateral Commission and all their rotten ideas, the danger of nuclear war, and the urgent need for the industrialization of the developing sector.

This was a very bold idea. Lyn meant it; he went in for winning the Presidency. The U.S. Presidency is probably the most powerful institution in the present world; this is due to the American Revolution, the idea of the Declaration of Independence, that life, liberty,



By 1974, the British Empire began to regard Lyndon LaRouche as the greatest threat to its system, as LaRouche continued to identify its agencies and agents.



and the pursuit of happiness are the inalienable right of all human beings, given to them by the Creator. This Constitution of the United States defined it as the task of the government to protect those inalienable rights of all human beings.

Therefore, it was the first time that there was actually a form of government which was the complete opposite of the oligarchical model which existed in the monarchies and other forms of government in Europe, where the ruling idea was that the purpose of the government was to protect the privileges of the elite and keep the mass of the population backward.

So Lyn, as an independent, decided to go against this plutocracy, the control of the Democratic and Republican parties by Wall Street, and fulfill the promise of the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution. Lyn ran for President eight times, in 1976, and then from 1980 to 2004 as a Democrat. He had the concept that he had to wage this battle to turn the United States into a force for good, as it was intended by the Founding Fathers.

How the International Development Bank Will Work

In the year before he started the first campaign, in 1975, he developed a revolutionary conception—the [International Development Bank](#) (IDB). It was the idea that it should replace the IMF; that it should be an incredible credit institution for technology transfer to industrialize the so-called Third World.

He developed also in 1975, the [Oasis Plan](#), which was the idea to develop Southwest Asia; develop new


water, green the deserts. He developed with his associates, a plan for the industrialization of Africa.

Naturally, immediately, the establishment regarded Lyn as the greatest threat to their system. Because what became known only later, in 1974 Kissinger had developed a paper called NSSM 200 [National Security Study Memorandum 200: Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and Overseas Interests], which was a blueprint for population reduction. It quite brazenly defined the raw materials in some of the most populous of the developing countries—13 countries—as belonging to the strategic interest of the United States. Therefore, their population should be reduced, because too many people in these countries would consume too much of their raw materials. This scandalous paper was only made public in the 1990s, but obviously every word that Lyn was saying went completely against these ideas.

Then, we published the [proceedings](#) of a conference on the Industrialization of Africa we had in 1979 in Paris when Lyn's Presidential campaign was already in full gear.

I was in Paris organizing a one-week diplomatic seminar with a group of Arab ambassadors who had planned to invite Lyn to come to Paris and give them a one-week course on the Oasis Plan, on his economic theory.

This was really a major event. But what happened? On the day that the seminar was supposed to start, Lyn had just arrived from the United States. I got a phone call from the Iraqi ambassador, who said, unfortunately, I must tell you that Mr. LaRouche has to develop a “dip-



Frederick Wills, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Guyana.



José López Portillo, President of Mexico.



Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India.

lomatic flu.” He must basically say he’s sick and therefore cannot participate in the seminar. Lyn was supposed to have been the main speaker, the main teacher. As it turned out, Henry Kissinger, himself, had just flown into Paris that day, to personally pressure the French government and all the ambassadors to cancel this event all together.

By 1976, we had already organized for one full year in many countries around the world, to implement the International Development Bank. We had talked to many embassies of the Non-Aligned sector, of Africa, of Latin America. In the fall of 1976, the Non-Aligned Movement practically adopted that plan for a New World Economic Order at its Colombo conference in Sri Lanka.

So we were extremely happy. I called up all the media in Germany and asked, “When are you reporting this?” They said, completely arrogantly, “We are not reporting this, because this is not newsworthy.” I said, “What? Three-quarters of the human species want a New World Economic Order, and you say this is not newsworthy?”

Well, that was the first major lesson about the control of the media. Then, what happened was a tremendous backlash, where leaders of the Third World, Indira Gandhi, Mrs. Bandaranaike, President Bhutto, were all destabilized, and also General Juan Velasco Alvarado from Peru already in 1975, he was one of the leaders of this movement. They all were ousted or killed. This all happened on the orders of the IMF and the State Department. But Fred Wills, the Foreign Minister of Guyana, [introduced](#) the IDB conception to the UN Gen-

eral Assembly in 1976.

In 1976, Lyn was running for President of the United States, and I was running for Chancellor in Germany. I thought that was necessary because the alternatives were Helmut Kohl and Helmut Schmidt—Kohl being your typical mediocre conservative, and Schmidt, who had some good features, but he had also endorsed Hjalmar Schacht, the Finance Minister of Hitler, or his policies.


I thought it was necessary to fight for an alternative. That double candidacy brought Lyn and me much closer, and in 1977 we got married. This was then the beginning of a truly beautiful marriage, which is very precious to me.

Immediately, death threats started. The so-called Red Army Faction, Baader-Meinhof groups. The Red Army Faction is RAF, which is also short for the Royal Air Force of Great Britain. So, it causes one to wonder. Some of the so-called third generation of that terrorist RAF probably never actually existed. The enemies of Lyn’s conceptions were determined to suppress his ideas.


Lyn continued his Presidential campaigns. In 1980, he campaigned against George Bush, Sr., and ruined Bush’s Presidential ambitions at that time, which got him the lifelong hostility of the Bush family. But it also made him an acquaintance of President Reagan, which turned out to be very fruitful later on.

Operation Juárez

In 1982, we did an enormous number of things. López Portillo, the President of Mexico, who had gotten



Lyndon LaRouche addressing a “Beam the Bomb” conference in Washington, D.C., April 13, 1983.



to know our youth movement in Mexico, was completely intrigued by the fact that there would be young people who would fight for such ideas. So he wanted to find out about LaRouche. When the peso was under massive attack, and there was a huge capital flight organized out of Mexico, he invited us to come to Mexico City. He asked Lyn to help him defend the sovereignty and the currency of Mexico.

Lyn immediately wrote a [program](#), not just for Mexico but for all of Latin America. This was called *Operation Juárez*. It was the idea of an infrastructure development plan, a debt reorganization, and basically developed credit mechanisms for long-term real development of the entire Latin American continent. At that time, Latin America had a \$200 billion debt. They had paid that debt many times over; this is what we call “banker’s arithmetic,” but \$200 billion—which is now proverbial peanuts in terms of all these quantitative easing trillions being pumped into the system. But \$200 billion in 1982 was regarded as enough to bring down Wall Street and the City of London.

When López Portillo implemented that policy on September 1, 1982, it just happened that Lyn and I, on that day, were in Frankfurt, Germany, meeting with the management of the Credit Institution for Reconstruction [*Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau*]. At 11 a.m., we were just standing there, talking. One of the biggest currency traders rushed into the room and said, “This is it! Wall Street is finished! This is a debt bomb by the Latin American countries. This is the end of the system!” Lyn just smiled and said, “No, don’t worry.” It’s just a way to save these banks; because if you reor-


ganize them in an orderly fashion, that’s the only way they can actually be saved. That was really a remarkably interesting moment. However, the establishment thought that was the end of their system and increased their resolve to go after Lyn.

In the same year, we went to India and met with Indira Gandhi. We worked with her on a forty-year development plan for the development of India, which also was part of Lyn’s conception to develop the whole world. The programs together, the Mexico program, the India program, Latin America, Asia, Africa—it basically would have meant that the entire Malthusian order as it was then developed, would have been undone.

The same year, Lyn started to work on another grand design for the change of the world, which was that since the end of the 1970s, we had found out that the Soviet scientists were developing beam weapons. They had developed a point defense system for the city of Moscow.

A Science Driver: Technology from New Physical Principles

Lyn was convinced that the biggest danger of nuclear war would arise when one side—either NATO or the Warsaw Pact—would be able to develop new weapons systems based on new physical principles, making nuclear weapons obsolete. In that moment then, the one side would feel encouraged to use nuclear weapons while they were still usable. You also had the development of the medium-range missile crisis, where in Europe you had the Pershing II and SS-20 missiles directed against each other, with only three or four min-



The LaRouche movement holds a Beam the Bomb rally in support of President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, Washington, D.C., September 15, 1983.

utes' travel time until they would hit their target. They were always on launch-on-warning status, and at that time, you had a gigantic peace movement of people who knew that we were on the verge of World War III.

Lyn developed a conception of how the two superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union—would not enter a new arms race, but instead develop these new systems jointly—develop and implement such systems jointly, and for the first time, make nuclear weapons technologically obsolete. The defense would be less costly than the offense. An absolutely brilliant design. It was not what the media claimed in calling it Star Wars. Rather it was a viable and brilliant conception of how to technologically make nuclear weapons obsolete.

For one full year, we organized conferences—in Rome, in Paris, in Bonn (at that time, Bonn was the capital of Germany), and in Washington. Out of that developed negotiations between Lyn and the representatives of the Soviet Union in a so-called “back channel” discussion, in which the Soviet Union seriously studied whether to adopt that policy.

After one year, in February 1983, the Soviet representatives sent a message from Moscow that the idea was rejected because, they said, it would give the West more advantages. Later we found out the reasons—namely that the Ogarkov plan had completely different objectives, and they therefore rejected it. But, on the 23rd of March, President Reagan announced that very policy to be the official U.S. strategic policy, naming it the SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative.

A little bit later, Lyn developed what that policy

could have been. Namely, in a protocol for the superpowers, he described how the development of these new technologies based on new physical principles would lead to a science driver in the military field. And that if they were applied in the civilian sector, they would lead to an incredible increase of the productivity of the economy. Then, if the two superpowers would work together, they could dissolve the military blocs of the Warsaw Pact and NATO, and jointly make a technology transfer to the developing sector, ending the character of these countries as proxies in a superpower confrontation, and really go in the direction of overcoming poverty and the development of the so-called Third World.

President Reagan adopted that policy. He wrote two official letters to the Soviets, offering American help to apply these technologies in the civilian sector. That is generally not discussed, but we were very close to establishing a completely human world order.

At that time, the determination of the oligarchy to really go after Lyn escalated. Because Lyn was not only able to define conceptions which would have changed the world for the better, but he got heads of state to *implement* these ideas—López Portillo, Indira Gandhi, President Reagan. So then, when the Soviet Union rejected Reagan's offer in 1984, he said if the Soviets keep their existing policy, they will collapse in five years. Now, they did collapse, as you know. In 1989, when the [Berlin] Wall came down, his prediction was fulfilled.

In 1982, when all of this became very clear, that Lyn was having these impacts, Henry Kissinger, in May,



Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche at the founding conference of the Schiller Institute, 1984.



Lyndon LaRouche with his friend Norbert Brainin, first violinist of the Amadeus Quartet.

made an infamous speech at Chatham House in London, where he admitted that he always followed the orders of the British Empire much more closely than those of the United States government.

Kissinger, in August 1982, wrote a letter to the FBI Chief of that time, William Webster, and demanded that there should be an investigation of Lyndon LaRouche as a Soviet agent of influence. Nothing was further from the truth, but that is where basically the entire apparatus, which was completely upset after Reagan started to put the SDI on the agenda, went completely wild. Bush, Schulz, that faction.

Founding of the Schiller Institute

However, this was a period when we did so much. In 1984, we started the Schiller Institute. It was my idea, but Lyn was completely supportive. Very quickly, the Schiller Institute, which had the idea that you needed to replace the present policy with a foreign policy based on statecraft, and that nations should relate to each other by referring always to the best of the other. The best culture, the best traditions. That you needed to fight for a new world economic order and a renaissance of Classical culture. So, in the 36 years since, the Schiller Institute has become a very influential institution on five continents.

Also in 1985, we had a beautiful conference honoring Krafft Ehrlicke, one of the great space visionaries and rocket scientists, who had not only developed beautiful conceptions about colonizing the Moon and the development of Mars, he developed the idea of the “extraterrestrial imperative.” The idea that mankind would

completely transform its nature through space travel. He was a very good friend of both of us.

In all these years, Lyn was incredibly productive. He had already developed in the 1970s key conceptions about the fundamental laws of the universe. He had developed the Riemann-LaRouche economic model, which was based on the physical principles of the real universe, and not on the sense-certainty perception of the mere shadows, which was one of the ways he became the best forecaster on the planet. He made clear the fundamental difference between the Platonic and Aristotelian traditions in European history.

Classical Music and the Fusion Energy Foundation

He initiated a beautiful campaign for the protection of the principles of Classical music, the so-called Verdi tuning, which was endorsed by all major singers of that time, and many instrumentalists. Lyn developed out of this work a close friendship with Norbert Brainin, who was the first violinist of the famous Amadeus Quartet. Once Norbert spent two days in our house in Virginia. He and Lyn spoke for hours and hours—two full days about music—at the end of which, Norbert said, “Well, you know so much more about music than I do.” I think this was a correct characterization. Lyn also developed beautiful friendships with such singers as William Warfield and Sylvia Olden Lee; with Piero Cappuccilli, with Carlo Bergonzi.

In 1974 Lyn founded the Fusion Energy Foundation, which was a scientific institution fighting for the frontiers of science, including the life sciences, and

which also engaged in putting forward large-scale development projects. We had assembled around us in the 1980s more than a hundred top scientists who agreed with us to build three private universities, one in Peru, one in America, one in Germany, to teach Lyn's scientific method.

That was all interrupted with the infamous raid of our home, and in Leesburg, our offices, and the prosecutions which followed. The life of this organization was completely changed. Up until 1986, we were building, we were optimistic, we were only engaged in productive concepts of how to make the world better. But after this raid, we had to really defend ourselves, and obviously with the prosecution of Lyn and him being innocently in jail, this organization had really to fight for our existence. They wanted to get rid of us all together.

But before the jailing of Lyn happened, again completely prophetically, he wrote an article in 1987, in which he said, if I become President in 1989, I will make sure that there will be a unification of Germany with Berlin as the capital. That idea that Germany should be unified, and that Germany should have a peace treaty, was also part of our wedding agreement. We had said that Lyn would be President of the United States for eight years, and then I would be Chancellor of Germany for eight years. So, this was sort of a joke, but not totally. It was also meant seriously.

Then, in 1988, Lyn held the famous [press conference](#) in the Kempinski Hotel in Berlin, where he predicted that Germany would soon be unified, and Berlin would soon be the capital of Germany. Again, as with Lyn's prognosis that the Soviet Union would collapse, which he had said in 1984, in 1988, *nobody* thought that Germany would be unified. But when the Wall came down one year later, we were the only ones who had a conception of what to do. Lyn was already sitting innocently in jail, but we immediately worked together on the Productive Triangle: the idea to develop Eastern Europe with the help of modern technology.

When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, we immediately expanded our conception to become the Eurasian Land-Bridge: the idea to connect the population and industrial centers of Europe with those of Asia through development corridors. We promoted that conception in literally hundreds of seminars and conferences. I'm absolutely sure that that whole effort very much influenced what then became the Chinese New Silk Road, the Belt and Road Initiative.

The Task is Now Yours

The most important thing Lyn contributed however, was a method of thinking. He opened access to ideas which had been completely forgotten, pushed aside by the rewriting of history and the history of ideas through the oligarchy. He again made it possible for people to understand the spiritual power of the mind for hypothesis. A method which, if it were applied by young people all over the world, would simply mean—and it has to mean—that many of the young people of the world will have a way to access how to become a genius. Many of you will become outstanding leaders who can change the world for the better.

So, what is the lesson of all of this? Will we give up just because Lyn's opponents have made such a mess of the world? They have the questionable success that they succeeded; therefore, we are on the verge of World War III, famine, epidemic, and general collapse.

But consider—and we will hear about it for the rest of this event—that if Lyn's ideas had been implemented for the past 40 years, we would have Africa as a blossoming garden. We would have Latin America completely developed. You would have many countries who would be not less developed than China is today. You would have Europe not being the culturally relativistic mess it is right now; Europe would have revived the beautiful culture of the Golden Renaissance and the German Classical period of Schiller and Beethoven. The United States would be a force for the good, where people around the world would be happy to be friends of that great country.

I think history will, for sure—if there is going to be a history—record that Lyn's enemies were the worst scoundrels, on a par with all the previous scoundrels in the world, among them Hitler and others. And that the world would have been such a more beautiful place if Lyn's ideas had been implemented.

That task is now yours. You will be those people who have to design a new era of mankind. If you think that job is too big, I think you should be confident. Because the entire history of mankind is the proof that Leibniz's conception that we are living in the best of all possible worlds is true: Every great evil will generate an even greater good. I think that that is exactly what we can do, and it absolutely depends on whether there are enough people who have the potential to be truly great leaders. That is what I want you to become.

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

1995 Hearings: 'Too Big for My Britches'

This is the edited transcript of a selection from Mr. LaRouche's presentation to independent hearings convened by the Schiller Institute to investigate misconduct by the U.S. Department of Justice, August 31 to September 1, 1995. A video of this selection was played at the International Youth Conference of the Schiller Institute, September 26, 2020.

In 1982-83, there were two things which greatly excited my enemies. Number one, I had been involved, in 1982, in presenting a proposal which was based on my forecast in the spring of 1982, that a major debt crisis would break out in South America, Central America, and the expectation that Mexico would be the nation that would have a debt crisis.

I'd been involved with many of these countries and personalities in them, in projecting alternatives to this kind of inequitable system, where the "colonial nation" had been replaced by the term "debtor nation." And the debt of South America, Central America was largely illegitimate, that is, it was a debt which had not been incurred for value received, but had been done under special monetary conditions, under the so-called floating exchange rate system, where bankers would come to a country, the IMF in particular, and would say, "We just wrote down the value of your currency; we're now going to re-fund your financing of your foreign debt, which you can no longer pay on the same basis as before."

Operation Juárez

So I proposed that the debt crisis be used as the occasion for united action by a number of governments of South and Central American countries, to force a



Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Schiller Institute

reform in the international debt relations, and to force a reform within international monetary relations. This [report](#) was titled *Operation Juárez*, largely because of the relationship of President Lincoln to Mexico during the time that Lincoln was President, with the idea that it was in the interest of the United States to accept and sponsor such a reform, to assist these countries in the freedom to resume development of the type which they had desired.

This report was published in August of 1982, ironically a few weeks

before the eruption of the great Mexico debt crisis of '82. It was presented also to the U.S. government and the National Security Council, for the President's information at that time. There was some effort, on the part of the President of Mexico, to implement my proposal in the initial period of the debt crisis. He had, at that time, some support from the President of Brazil and the government of Argentina. But under pressure from the United States, the governments of Brazil and Argentina capitulated, and President José López Portillo, the President of Mexico, was left, shall we say, "hanging out to dry."

As a result, in October of 1982, he capitulated to the terms which were delivered to his government and people around him, by people such as Henry A. Kissinger, who made a trip to Mexico at that time, to attempt to intimidate the Mexicans to submitting to these new terms. This was one issue between me, and Kissinger and his friends.

Back-Channel Discussions with the Soviet Union

The second issue was that sometime about December of 1981, a representative of the U.S. government

approached me, and had asked me if I would be willing to set up an exploratory back-channel discussion with the Soviet government, because the Soviet government wanted, according to them, an additional channel to discuss things. I said I didn't reject the idea, but I said I had an idea on this question of nuclear missiles. It was becoming increasingly dangerous, forward-basing, more-precise missiles, electromagnetic pulse, we're getting toward a first strike; it would be very useful to discuss what I proposed in my 1980 election campaign, with the Soviet government, to see if they'd be interested in discussing such a proposal. This might prove a profitable exploratory discussion.

And so, from February of 1982, through February of 1983, I did conduct such back-channel discussions with representatives of the Soviet government in Washington, D.C. Those were somewhat fruitful, but ultimately abortive. Kissinger and others became aware of this discussion, during the summer of 1982, and their circles were very much opposed to that. The general view expressed, was that I was getting "too big for my britches," and I had to be dealt with—on the question of debt, which some of these people were concerned about, and on this question of strategic missile defense, where I had this proposal, which the President adopted, at least initially, in the form of what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. When the Strategic Defense Initiative was announced by the President on March 23, 1983, there were a lot of people out for my scalp....

We have, in my view, a system of injustice whose center is within the Department of Justice, especially the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice. The problem lies not with one administration or another, though one administration or another may act more positively or more negatively. You have permanent civil service employees, like Deputy Assistant

Attorneys General Jack Keeney and Mark Richard, who are coordinators of a nest of institutions in the Criminal Division, which show up repeatedly as leading or key associates of every legal atrocity which I've seen.

This is the case with the so-called Fröhmenchen operation, which is largely an FBI operation, but which cannot run without ... cooperation of these people.... We have an out-of-control Justice Department, in my view, where the rot is not in the appointees, as much as it is in the permanent bureaucracy. We have a permanent sickness, in the permanent bureaucracy of part of our government.

In my case, when the time came that somebody wanted me out of the way, they were able to rely upon that permanent injustice in the permanent bureaucracy of government, to do the job. As in the Fröhmenchen case, the Weaver [Ruby Ridge] case, the Waco case, the case of Kurt Waldheim, the case of John Demjanjuk, and other cases: Always there's that agency inside the Justice Department, which works for contract, like a hitman, when somebody with the right credentials and passwords walks in, and says, "we want to get this group of people," or "we want to get this person."

My case may be, as former Attorney General Ramsey Clark described it, the most extensive and the highest level of these cases, in terms of the duration and scope of the operation.... So my case is important, in the sense it's more extensive, it's more deep-going, long-going. But when it came to getting me, it was the same apparatus that I find, in my opinion, was used in these other cases, and that until we remove from our system of government a rotten, permanent bureaucracy which acts like contract assassins, using the authority of the justice system to perpetrate assassination, this country is not free, nor is anyone in it.

That's my view of the matter. Thank you.

My Experience with Lyndon LaRouche, A Great and Loving Human Being

This is the edited transcription of the pre-recorded presentation of Jozef Mikloško to the International Youth Conference of the Schiller Institute, September 26, 2020. Mr. Mikloško is a former Deputy Prime Minister of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic. Subheads have been added.



Schiller Institute

Jozef Mikloško

Greetings from Slovakia, a small country in the heart of Europe. We were under totalitarian Communism for 40 years, and now, for the last 30 years we are free—with various problems, but free! Fantastic!

For 27 years, I was a mathematician, and then after the 1989 Velvet Revolution, I entered federal government as a Vice Premier, and then served in three parliaments—Slovakia, Czechoslovakia—and served for five years as Ambassador of Slovakia to Rome. Now I am a writer. I have written eight literary books. And always I mentioned LaRouche because my memory of him is very strong.

If you allow me then, I shall try now to speak of my experiences with Lyndon LaRouche.

I became familiar with Lyn's "case" in 1990, after the Velvet Revolution, when I was serving for two years as Vice Premier for Human Rights in the post-Communist federal government. I quickly understood the many irregularities of his political persecution. It was a tragedy that at the time of the fall of the Berlin Wall, when it was possible to change history, Lyndon LaRouche was in jail and could not watch his forecasts about the West and East being fulfilled.

I met him for the first time in August 1993. I had never met such an educated, creative, and modest person. He was a politician, economist, mathematician, and musician, with a great knowledge of history.

He had perfect knowledge of the Bible. He introduced Christian moral principles into politics and economics. He was a fighter for moral renewal and the saving of Christian civilization. I was always surprised

about his knowledge about Mozart, about Beethoven, about supercomputers, calculation of elliptical functions, the situation in Eastern Europe, Russia and China, about religion and concrete economic projects, the protection of life, culture and education. His speeches left no grey area: Compromise with evil was not possible. Lyn was a hard fighter, but also had humor and tenderness, when speaking about love, agapē and God. He was a real generator of new ideas, associations, and alternatives for the present

world system.

His political program was the need to produce, not speculate. Moral principles must be established in politics and economy. His proposals to reform the financial system. He predicted a crisis, especially due to the destructive impact of speculation in derivatives. Printing money with no backing in the United States and Europe today is called "quantitative easing": Interest rates are being lowered and money pumped into the old system in areas of crisis. Bad banks are being rescued, and the current financial system has been torn away from a productive economy. I've visited the United States six times because of the LaRouche movement. I've lobbied in Congress, in the Senate, in universities, and many conferences.

My old American friend Nina Ogden, from the Schiller Institute, who always accompanied me in America, is not any more with us. She became a Christian, and she had a personal contact with Mother Teresa from Calcutta, who told her: "We are praying every day for Lyn and Helga."

An Innocent Genius Imprisoned

Lyndon LaRouche was sentenced, for nothing, on December 1, 1989, in a political trial, to 15 years in prison; his five associates to a total of 209 years. The trials of him and his colleagues in the late '80s had so many irregularities that the broad international commu-

nity at this time, including myself, protested many times against it. I wrote several letters of protest to top U.S. leaders; I visited the U.S. repeatedly with former politicians, and several countries.


I visited most of the American prisons where LaRouche and his collaborators were imprisoned. I am proud that I, too, contributed to his parole in 1994 and later to the release of the entire “Virginia Five”—Mike Billington, Anita and Paul Gallagher, Laurence Hecht, and Donald Phau. I remember especially a meeting with Mike Billington, sentenced to 77 years, and before as well with his brave wife Gail. Both also visited Slovakia. They were here in our church, and my son and daughter sang for them the *Ave Maria* of Gounod. We have many pictures from it.

Our friendship began in August 1993 at the prison in Rochester, Minnesota, where I visited him. For him, a sentence of fifteen years was a death sentence. He met me in the prison with a smile and optimism—we spoke for six hours.

In December 1993, I attended the conference of the Schiller Institute in Germany. It was before Christmas, many lights shone, and we waited with painful anticipation for his freedom. I am proud that I was probably the first person on the Earth to know that Lyn would be free.

Our next meeting was in February 1994 in the United States. Amelia Robinson, a big fighter for human rights, welcomed him with the words: “This is a day which was given us by the Lord.... If God selects somebody as a leader, nobody can destroy him.” We all stood with long applause and Lyn said: “Five years in jail was a long time.... It was necessary to suffer, but we are now stronger.... The main power is the power of ideas.... We must lead an American revolution to the end by the authority of truth.”

I was very glad that in August 1994, Slovakia was the second country (after Russia) that Lyn visited following his release in 1994. We met in Smolenice Castle, home to the Slovak scientists of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. There are many pictures of this, hundreds, and 120 young people from 17 countries of the world showed that mankind can tend toward unity. I remember the tears in Lyn’s eyes when, at the fire, we sang folk songs from all over the world. I was proud, when he told me: “In Slovakia, I spent one of the most beautiful



Jozef Mikloško visits with Lyndon LaRouche in federal prison, Rochester, Minnesota, August 1993.

and happiest weeks in my life.”

In May 1995, I met Lyn in Leipzig, Germany at the concert of the boys of the Thomanerchor. In this historical cathedral of Bach, while listening to the singing of these boys—educated on Lyn’s principles—I saw tears in his eyes for the second time. Then, Lyn and Helga went to see Beethoven’s opera *Fidelio* in Berlin, in which another heroic woman freed her husband from prison.

Our next meeting was in Washington in September 1995, during the hearing. It was the investigation of the misconduct of the Department of Justice. With a Commission representing about 15 million black voters in the United States, we fought for the exoneration of LaRouche, and for the freedom of his five collaborators, still in jail on long sentences.

The case was referred to International Tribunal of Prominent Judges and Lawyers, for example, by Ramsey Clark, a former U.S. Attorney General in President Lyndon Johnson’s government. The Commission concluded that there had been a gross abuse of inquiry and criminal violence in this trial.

Imago Viva Dei

Lyn, at a following Schiller conference, said: “Man is created as *imago viva Dei*. This is a quality, which can be seen in the eyes of each newborn child: the quality which makes brothers and sisters of all people.”

At a conference in the USA in February 1996, after I asked him a question publicly, Lyn began a beautiful

speech about God as the highest Goodness. The same situation occurred later in Wiesbaden, Germany where Lyn spoke for almost three hours: “The new wine I bring cannot be in old skins..., the culture of death is a scandal..., we must start a new revolution based on love toward our neighbors.”

Lyndon LaRouche, the Sakharov of America, was a politician with original views. Many of his ideas are today widely accepted and represented by many people.

On his second visit to Slovakia in 1996, he wrote to me: “Slovakia is a happier country than others. She has a sense of spiritual values and has not lost her national identity. She needs honorable leaders.”

Lyndon LaRouche was a universal, educated man. I have often been actively present at debates in which he has answered dozens of disparate questions. He was a Christian who spoke with enthusiasm about his faith.

When Lyn was 75 years old, on September 8, 1997, a gala was held in the United States with prominent singers, musicians, and politicians. I was the Master of Ceremonies, and I probably till the end of my life, will never again be in such a society of great personalities.

Lyndon LaRouche was an American politician, an economist, mathematician, writer, and musicologist; I hadn’t met a more educated person in my life. He has written dozens of books and thousands of articles. He was a generator of new ideas, a warrior to save Christianity, family, and life. I’ve met him 17 times, including three times in Rome, when I was there as Ambassador of Slovakia for five years.



Lyndon and Helga LaRouche with Jozef Mikloško on the Austria/Slovakia border in 1995.

scientists, there are many pictures of this, hundreds, and 120 young people from 17 countries

In my book, *Very Top Secret—How We Were Free*, published in 1999, I devoted about 80 pages to him and to the results of the Schiller Institute.

At the end of my speech I am happy to introduce some of LaRouche’s important spiritual ideas:

- Man is created in the image of God and has a highly positive worth.
- Everything is decided in childhood: children need to be brought up to learn creativity by discovery.
- Today, no one has time for children: their television and the internet are depressing. By protecting the family, we protect society.
- The main thing is the knowledge of classical music, history, mathematics, and religion.
- Money, counterculture, and borderless freedom produce people in the U.S. for prisons.
- Compromise with evil and tolerance for evil must end; commentary on lies is a lie.
- Let’s start a revolution on Christian love, without thinking about ourselves, like a Good Samaritan.
- What is the goal of man? You come into the world like an angel, you should leave the world like an angel.

Till the end, I will tell of the honored memory of Lyndon LaRouche, and I hope for his fast exoneration and rehabilitation.

All the best. I’m sorry that my English is not as good as it was. I’m a little bit better in German, Italian, and Russian, but my words are from the heart, and I will very much remember, to the end of my life, fond memories of Lyndon LaRouche.



Lyndon and Helga LaRouche with Jozef Mikloško at the Beethoven Pavilion in Dolná Krupá, Slovakia, where the composer once lived.

see Beethoven’s opera Fidelio in Berlin, in which another heroic woman freed her husband

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 Movement, we are changing politics worldwide, day by day.

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

EIR DAILY ALERT SERVICE

EIR's new Daily Alert Service provides critical news updates and analysis, based on EIR's 40-year unparalleled track record in covering global developments.



SUBSCRIBE (e-mail address must be provided.)

EIR Online

- ☐ \$ 360 for one year
- ☐ \$ 180 for six months
- ☐ \$ 120 for four months
- ☐ \$ 90 for three months
- ☐ \$ 60 for two months

EIR DAILY ALERT SERVICE

- \$50 one month (introductory)
- \$150 three months
- \$300 six months
- \$600 one year (includes EIR Online)

For mobile users, EIR and
EIR Daily Alert Service
are available in html

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

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
☐ Discover ☐ Am Ex

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____

EIR can be reached at: www.larouchepub.com/eiw

e-mail: fulfillment@larouchepub.com Call 1-800-278-3135 (toll-free)