

Perkins' Exposé Shows Free Trade Enslavement

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. addressed the Denmark LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) weekend training seminar by telephone on Nov. 20, 2004. Besides Danes, the group included Swedes, Germans, Africans, and Russians. The transcript of his opening remarks follows.

Now, many of you have probably seen the Morning Briefing for the past two days, which featured something which I've taken up, which was called to my attention, and I've analyzed it. We've gone through it, and we've have feedback from us, on this subject in the Briefing. I think most of you there, have probably either seen it, or noticed it, or wondered what it was.

I'll explain. We have a fellow, John Perkins; he's from the Boston area, and by his self-description in a radio interview which I audited, he probably is the family of Perkins of the famous, or infamous Perkins Syndicate, which is a subject of history written in large part by Tony Chaitkin among us, and also by Graham Lowry, in particular; and some others.

Now, what this fellow did, he described himself in a book,


which is called *The Confessions of an Economic Hit Man*—just to review the case for those who don't know it: During the 1960s, according to his account, when he was a student at a business school, which probably was a graduate business school such as Harvard Business School, he was recruited by the National Security Agency, which is a spin-off of the U.S. Department of Defense, the U.S. military, which was the so-called signals section of U.S. military intelligence, and this was broadened to cover other areas. This was the agency that was supposed to spy on everybody, and their conversations from around the world.

Anyway, he was trained by the National Security Agency, according to his account, and then was farmed out, under the title of "chief economist" to a number of private organizations, one in particular from the Boston area, who did what he called the functions of "economic hit man." The term, according to his account, was generic; that, among people who did this sort of thing, the term "economic hit man" was used as a term of self-description, and also amusement among themselves. Because, that's what they did. But it was so absurd in the eyes of the average person that anybody would do it, that they would chuckle every time they described themselves as an "economic hit man"; nobody's going to believe it.

Anyway, so, he worked together, as he described it, with major companies, such as those headed by George Shultz, who you may recall was a key figure in the Nixon Administration; he's one of the fellows who shut down the Bretton Woods system of the United States under Nixon, in 1971; and



Said former economic hit man John Perkins: "When 9/11 struck, I had a change of heart. I knew the story had to be told, because I know what happened at 9/11 is a direct result of what the economic hit men are doing."



The economic hit men and their “jackals” were behind the assassination of world leaders who stepped out of line, including (left to right) Panamanian chief of state Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera, Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, and German bankers Alfred Herrhausen and Jürgen Ponto.

Shultz, as such, went on in the Azores Conference in 1972, to lead in destroying the post-war Bretton Woods financial-monetary system—which is what we’re fighting about today.

And, in the course of time, he did a number of things, as a member of this team, in manipulating governments, manipulating nations, and relations among nations, in a very ugly way. And when he, or his type, would fail to persuade a government, or a leader of a government to submit to the will of institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF, which he describes as the key thugs in running these operations against developing and other countries, that then, he would say, the “jackals” would come in. And these would be intelligence community-authorized hit men, killers, who would come in and kill heads of state, and others, for the pleasure of these financier organizations, which he describes as the private organizations, but government-linked, of economic hit men.

Perkins Makes His Activities Public

Now, he has just published a book on this, as I described it. The publication date is November 2004, this month. It is published by a house on the West Coast. And I got, through our people, who got it from someone else, a tape recording or a disk recording, of a radio interview he did with a radio interviewer, on a feature called “Firehouse,” in which he de-

scribes what he did.

Now, the key thing that he said, in this thing, which was crucial, for me, was—I quote from him, his statement. “But,” after describing why he covered up this stuff for years, he says, “But, when 9/11 struck, I had a change of heart. I knew the story had to be told, because I know what happened at 9/11 is a direct result of what the economic hit men are doing.” Talking about his profession; and talking about a profession which worked under the direction of people like George Shultz and Caspar Weinberger—Caspar Weinberger, one-time Secretary of Defense of the United States in the 1980s. And they worked as directors of companies, such as Bechtel Corp. in the United States, and, of course, the Halliburton company, which is Cheney’s company.

This is all clear to me. There’s no question about this. What he describes—I know many of the cases he describes; I know his description of many of the events and the *issues* as such, of the events, to be true. For example: the killing of Chief of State Omar Torrijos of Panama. I can not confirm that he was killed by a bomb inserted in a tape recorder on his plane. But I can verify all of the issues, personally, which were involved in his being killed. And what the policy changes were, as a result of his being killed. Because, at a later point, I was working with people in Japan, who had been

the contractors to build the sea-level canal, through Panama. And it was Torrijos' insistence, on going ahead with that contract, with Japan, to build the sea-level canal, that got him killed.

I know similar cases in Ecuador; similar cases in Mexico—crucial cases; and so forth and so on. So, this I know.

I also know the history of this kind of organization's operations against me, particularly from 1978, where very specific operations directed against me, personally, by the people he identifies as the "economic hit men."

I can also tell much of the history of the world: For example, the assassination of Aldo Moro, the former Prime Minister of Italy, is part of this. Many other assassinations of heads of government and state, or figures of that prominence, are part of this. This is part of the operations *against us, and against me*, over particularly the past 30 years, or more.

So, we're familiar with this.

Now, it's laying on our plate. What's the problem? I haven't seen the book itself. I've audited this 13-minute audio interview, with him. I've gone over it carefully. The story is there; it's an important story, it's a valid story. He names names in the interview, like Stone & Webster in New York, in Boston, and so forth; firms like that, that he worked for, which were engaged in this. I know them. I know the Boston operation, of which he was a part, the Boston-based operation: It's called "the Vault." It was the organization which controlled the Dukakis governorship of Massachusetts. And it was over this issue, that I ran *against* Democratic pre-candidate Dukakis, in 1988: Because I knew he was, and had been, a tool of the Vault, which is one of the organizations *behind* the group, which this fellow describes as the "economic hit men," for whom he worked, out of Boston in particular.

So, we know much of this thing.

What Perkins' Story Leaves Out

Now, what's wrong with the story, insofar as I've seen it, so far, is, essentially: While what Perkins describes in this interview, is true—that is, this is the way things happen; this is the way important things have happened; these are some of the organizations, which, to my personal knowledge, have done these things that have happened. So, the story he's telling is essentially true. I don't know to what degree there may be some fictionalization, from my standpoint, or error, honest error, included in his total story. But, the essence of the thematic feature of the story he tells is true.

What's wrong, is this: The tenor of his report alleges, essentially, that there are powerful people inside the United States, inside our government, who use our government for their personal advantage, and that the IMF and World Bank are two of the thugs responsible for much of the kinds of killing, and other causes of death, which are done by the so-called "economic hit men."

But, he's got it backwards, historically. And it may have to do with his family background, because he identifies himself as a member of *the* Perkins family. That's the Perkins

Syndicate family, which you can read about in *Dope, Inc.*, and also, more specifically in *Treason in America*, by Tony Chaitkin. It refers to a process, which is referred to in a different way by Graham Lowry, the historian who died a short time ago. So, we know this. What's wrong is, that it's in the direction of showing that the corruption in the U.S. government, and the corruption in international institutions, through the U.S. government and associated interests, is the story.

It's not the story. The story is—which now it comes back to Denmark and Europe in general: The story is, the evil is centered not in the United States, but in Europe!

What is the story? Well, you go back to over 1,000 years ago; you go back to the time that the Norman chivalry had been developed as a force, after being initially deployed against the political system of Charlemagne, by Byzantium, by forces among the Byzantines. Now, about that time, about 1000 A.D., the power of Byzantium began to disintegrate. It was no longer able to manage things in a way—and the Ottoman Empire was really a continuation of Byzantium. It was just the same Byzantine Empire, the second Roman Empire, under nominally Muslim management; and the methods were very much the same. And it lasted for a long time, because the Roman methods used by Byzantium were fairly effective.

They manipulated people, more than tyrannized them. And by manipulation, they got people to do, what they wanted. Because they made in their own interests, apparently their immediate interest—to do what Byzantium wanted. And that way, Byzantium was able to control all the subordinate features. And that's what the Ottoman Empire did.

So anyway: So, at that time, about 1,000 years ago, once the Norman chivalry had established itself as a power, not only in Denmark, from whence it came—in Jutland; so, be careful about Jutland, what they might find up there! There may be a few berserkers left up there.

But, these guys were not Danes; they were a collection of Saxons and everybody else, who had driven themselves, for various reasons, and because they were pirates, and thugs, and gangsters—driven themselves to this area, where they functioned as seagoing pirates, and thugs in general. And Byzantium developed these people, as a force, and used them as a force, from Norway, from Denmark, and so forth—used them as a force, to try to destroy the Saxon kingdom, or the Saxon system of kingdoms, in England. That was the objective, because they [the Saxon system of kingdoms] were Christians, and this crowd were not in favor of Christianity, except the Satanic variety.

The Venetians Succeed Byzantium

So therefore, about that time, in the course of 1,000 years ago or so, to 900 years ago, you had a transformation in Europe, in which the power of Byzantium diminished. And Venice, which had been, in a sense a vassal—a part of the Byzantine system—began to emerge as a major financier oligarchical maritime power. It used this position of emergence from the weakened Byzantine Empire, to make a coali-

tion with the Norman chivalry: And then they began to destroy France and England.

The Albigensian Crusade in France was part of this operation. The Buggers were not much; they are Gnostics in this truest sense. But, they were slaughtered by a crusade, as a “get-going” operation. And then, of course, they organized the Norman Conquest of England, to eliminate Christianity from England—which I think, from my experience, they pretty much succeeded in doing. It’s very hard to find a Christian in the British Isles, these days.

So therefore, this crowd, this alliance between Norman chivalry, otherwise identified in history with the Crusaders—who were a real bunch of Satanic thugs, and were called “Crusaders”—working under the coordination of Venice’s financier oligarchy.

Now, this system went through a great crisis in the 14th Century. It was a Dark Age: Probably half the population died out, during the period beginning about 1339, when England declared bankruptcy, and the House of Bardi went belly-up. It was a chain of collapse, of the type that threatens us today: That is, when a world system, or a semi-world system, is in the control of a monetary-financial system, with an element of physical tyranny in it; and the system itself collapses on itself, what happens is, the lack of any capability of putting up an alternative system, to replace the collapsed system, results in a winding down of civilization.

So, in this period, probably half the population died out. But, as a net result of new births, at the end of the period of the so-called 14th-Century Dark Age, the net loss of population levels had been a level of one-third. Whereas, at the same time, *half* the parishes of Europe disappeared from the map, during this period.

In the aftermath of that, it was possible for those who had opposed the Venetian/Byzantine/Norman system, to come back in the form of the 15th-Century Renaissance, which was a return from a Roman tradition to a Classical Greek tradition. The Christian church was reborn, after a period in Hell called the 14th Century, where one Pope was more Satanic than the other, virtually.

But then, Venice came back. And by a deal with the Ottomans, to take over Constantinople, the power of the Venetians resumed. The Venetians then launched, beginning with Torquemada’s persecution of the Jews in 1492 in Spain, a wave of religious warfare, which continued until 1648 with the Treaty of Westphalia. In that period following that, toward the end of the 17th Century, the power of Venice was greatly diminished—the power of Venice as a state. But the power of Venice as a financier oligarchy remained.

And what they did is, they changed their name, and their language, from a peculiar kind of Italian spoken up there in the northern Adriatic, into becoming known as Dutch and English. In other words, you had a reincarnation, often of the same Venetian families, their reincarnation as Dutch, English, Danish, etc. families! Along the former Hanseatic League area.

Anglo-Dutch Liberal System Emerges

So, you had, in the North of Europe, beginning at the end of the 17th Century, the emergence around the Dutch East India Company, and later the British East India Company, of a maritime power, whose core was a bunch of financial families, financier oligarchy, which controlled the operation. That thing, in 1763, as a result of the Seven Years’ War in Europe, became the dominant power in Europe, despite the fact that the Habsburgs and similar types were still running around loose. But, gradually over the period from 1763 to 1848, the power of the Habsburgs and their type, as an independent operation, vanished. And the Habsburgs continued to exist, but essentially as controlled assets, dominated by this Anglo-Dutch Liberal system.

And it’s the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system which dominates the world today, in terms of the financial system.

The American Revolution, actually, was an organized revolt, largely by Europeans, using a base existing in North America—especially English-speaking North America, but also some part of the Spanish monarchy of that period—to create a new republic in North America, for the purpose of trying to turn the situation in Europe around, to create Europe as a system of sovereign nation-state republics.

Now, that failed, because the British orchestrated the French Revolution, which was entirely run—that is, directly: the direction, and planning, and control, of the French Revolution was from July 14th, 1789 to the present day, its relics today, was a Venetian operation; but it was a British—Anglo-Dutch, British—operation. It was run right out of London out of the British Foreign Office, under Jeremy Bentham.

Now, the result is this: We had the United States emerge as a power, gradually. It became a world power of significance—it became an intellectual power, immediately. And the objective, of the British, and the others in the French Revolution, was to crush the existence of the United States as a republic. That was the mission, for which Europe was put through Hell—called the Napoleonic Wars—to consolidate again, the power of the Venetian-style oligarchy, or now, the Anglo-Dutch Liberal oligarchy.

With Lincoln’s success over the British puppet, the Confederacy, the United States emerged, as a great power. From that point on—we should say the period from 1863 through 1876, the period of the first centennial celebration of the American Republic in Philadelphia—the United States emerged as the world’s leading nation-state, in terms of rate and level of economic development. The most powerful nation-state on the planet, which had become a continental power, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a growing one; and there was no individual nation-state on the planet, which matched the United States in this kind of power.

But, the British Empire, which was not a nation-state, the British Empire as the focal point, the leading feature of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system, controlled the world financial-monetary system still. And it was only, essentially, under Franklin Roosevelt, over the period 1933 through 1945, that



Mexican President José López Portillo was targeted for ouster by Wall Street in 1982, when he took up LaRouche's "Operation Juárez" plan for a debt moratorium and a new global financial system.

the United States, reached the position of challenging and taking over, temporarily, the direction of the world monetary-financial system, in a way consistent with the American System. Now, this was not something that was not desired by many people in Europe, but it was the United States representing that policy, which enabled things in Europe to occur, as in the reconstruction of war-torn Europe, during the period from 1945 through about 1964-65. So, the reconstruction of Europe, is a gift of the Americans.

Anglo-Dutch Financier-Oligarchic System Works Through 'Economic Hit Men'

Now, the result is this: Since then, the right wing, which is, in a sense identified by this fellow Perkins, when he talks about "economic hit men," these are the typification of the private interests, which are essentially *Venetian financier-oligarchical types of family interest*: private interests, which control the inside, at the top, of the present world monetary-financial system. They've dominated the world, in one form or another, for over 1,000 years—the most powerful force in the world. They dominate it, in the form of what is today, the financier-monetary system, the financier-oligarchical system: the so-called Liberal system, the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system. What you're taught as economics in universities and so forth, is this crap. It's a continuation.

The United States was, therefore, subverted and crushed, from the moment that Roosevelt died. Truman was an agent of the enemy. Not an agent against the United States in the formal sense, but an agent in terms of the interests he worked for: These were the people who had backed Hitler, in the early 1930s—Americans who had backed Hitler, again, with Europeans who had backed Hitler in the 1930s, were the forces *behind Truman* in the United States.

That's my personal history. I came back from the war. I

came back in 1946, from overseas duty, and I saw the United States as I had known it under Roosevelt, going right wing. And the people who were driving it right wing, were people like Harriman. And it was Harriman, who had led the New York bankers in the funding of Hitler, to put Hitler into power in the 1930s. He is now running, together with his like, Truman, the President. And we were on the way down.

The power of the revolution that Roosevelt had made, during the war, was such that they could not get rid of the American System immediately, the so-called Bretton Woods system. The Bretton Woods system in its original form, was actually an American system; it was imperfect and so forth, but it was an American system. They couldn't get rid of it.

But gradually, they got rid of it. And the right wing, particularly after the assassination of Kennedy, began to consolidate its power in the form of the Indo-China War; and then, 1971-72, the change to a floating-exchange-rate monetary system, which was really a *reconquest* of the world, *against* the United States, by this bunch of financiers, who are the Anglo-Dutch, Venetian-style Liberal oligarchy today.

Now, it is for that reason that Europe, in facing the present crisis, world crisis, is impotent without a leading role by the United States. The reason that Europeans in the 18th Century, looked emphatically toward North America, the idea of building a republic in North America, as a necessary project for Europe, was to create a power across the ocean, across the Atlantic, which could then become the stimulant *for freeing Europe* of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system.

We never succeeded.

We have made great reforms, particularly after Lincoln's victory; between 1863 and 1876, there began a series of very important reforms, in Europe, on a high scale: Germany, 1877, adopted the American industrial model, resulting in a transformation of Germany. Japan, in 1877, adopted the

American System of the United States as the model for the development of Japan from a so-called feudal nation. France, after 1872, under its 1872 freedom from Napoleon the Turd, also made changes in that direction. There was a renaissance of a kind in Northern Italy, based on the same thing. Russia: From 1877 on, Russia under Alexander II, the Czar, under the influence of Mendeleyev, adopted the American System for the development of the Russian economy. And the achievements of the Russian economy since that time, with all the other changes, have been largely based on Mendeleyev's conveyance of the principles of the American System to Czar Alexander II; and Count Sergei Witte was also a representative of that [Friedrich] List-American System.

So, what has happened is, we have had a war all these years, these decades, between the American System, which was a creation of Europe, but a creation of Europe with the intention of freeing Europe to do the same thing. Europe has never developed a stable system of republics. What you have in Europe, today, are financier-oligarchical-controlled parliamentary systems. And every time there's a great crisis, the parliamentary system takes a right-wing turn, or is overthrown, and something like a dictatorship comes back to replace it. Who does it? The bankers!

For example, 1931: In the result of the attempt to push through the Young Plan, to handle the great debt problem left over from World War I, they formed a new banking center in Basel, Switzerland, the Bank for International Settlements [BIS]. This bank was then used to orchestrate such achievements as putting Hitler into power in Germany. And Schacht was a key agent of that process.

So, you have repeatedly, that these financier interests, financier-oligarchical interests, move in times of crisis to take their joke-system of freedom, the parliamentary system, overturn it, in the interest of bankers, under the influence of a so-called central banking system—an independent central banking system, which is really a bunch of pirates, called bankers who control the central banking system—who use the power in a crisis, to turn governments in Europe, into right-wing horror-shows, or something like that.

Why Europe Is Different Than the United States

So therefore, since Europe has not recognized that institutional, self-destructive characteristic, of the so-called Liberal system of parliamentary democracy, Europe has proven itself, repeatedly, impotent, to deal with that problem. Whereas, the United States, despite making the same kind of mistakes, is constitutionally of a different form: that, under the U.S. Constitution, which is anti-Liberal, under the U.S. Constitution, we have come back repeatedly, as most notably, under Abraham Lincoln and under Franklin Roosevelt. Europe has not developed, despite the noble efforts of Charles de Gaulle in France, during the Fifth Republic period, up until 1963—Europe has not succeeded in producing a durable form of



Sir Winston Churchill, in order to preserve the British Empire, engineered a right-wing turn in the NATO countries immediately after Franklin Roosevelt's death, using former Nazi Party elements to do it.

government which will not capitulate to these right-wing forces, in a time of crisis.

That's the situation we face, today.

So, what we're looking at, is: That the aim of the international financier oligarchy, the same crowd that was behind Hitler—it was called the Synarchist International, back between the 1920s, 1930s, 1940s—the Synarchist International, which is a bunch of bankers of this Venetian type, is once again moving toward world dictatorship, a more nasty one than ever before. The chief enemy and chief target of this operation, is not Europe; the chief target is the United States itself. Because, the danger is, to these bankers, that *a new Franklin Roosevelt would emerge* in the United States, and would use the Constitutional power embedded in the United States, as an institution, to lead the world, to make the kind of reform that Franklin Roosevelt made the last time around.

Therefore, that's been the effort.

So, what you have is international forces, centered then around the friends of Winston Churchill in London: The minute that Roosevelt was dead—matter of fact, overnight!—*the following morning, after Franklin Roosevelt's death, through stooge Truman*, a stooge of what Churchill represented as the British Empire, *moved to launch a right-wing*

turn, using former Nazi Party and Nazi SS elements, to do it! And they brought them into the NATO system. And they became the right wing. When you're looking at the right wing in the United States today, you're looking not only at an *imitation* of the Nazi system, you're looking at a *direct continuation* of it.

And that's the problem you have in Europe, today—the same thing. You see the Nazi International, Blas Piñar in Spain, Le Pen in France, the group around Alessandra Mussolini and her cronies in Italy—the same crowd; the same crowd that killed Moro, the same Nazi crowd that killed Moro. Then you have two groups in Germany which are uniting, which are the *tools* of an attempted Nazi operation. And you have also in the rest of Europe, various scattered organizations, which are part, actually, of a re-emerging Nazi International: Which is now—as the nation-states of Europe faced with a financial crisis can no longer form what's called “liberal governments” of any stability, as we see in the threat to the Schröder government in Germany, the inability of Germany to have a clear shot at getting a government directly, which can deal with this German crisis. There are forces in Germany which could do it, but they have to be brought together, and they have to be brought together in a certain way, to assert the national interest of Germany against this operation. But, it's not happening yet. There's a struggle in that direction, which is commendable. In other parts of Europe, the same thing.

But, unless the United States turns to assist in freeing Europe, and other parts of the world, from the legacy of this financier-oligarchical system, we're going to Hell.

And that's what we're fighting against. We're not fighting individual issues, in various parts of the planet. We're fighting for a planetary system, based on respectively sovereign nation-state republics, a system of republics, which understands its common interest; and cooperates, as sovereign republics, and as movements of sovereign republics, to create the kind of order in the world, in which we can live.

Now, what you're looking at, in terms of what Perkins describes as the “economic hit men,” you're looking at what *he* describes, accurately, as saying the basis for the operations, of the tyrannical, murderous, operations of the post-war period, have been the taken-over institutions such as the World Bank and IMF, which are effectively the instruments of fascism on the planet, today. And *murderous* fascism! That's what he's saying! He says, as a member of this operation, this is what's happening. Then, in this interview, as I indicated—he said, after all these years, knowing this was going on, working within it, being corrupted by the personal advantages of being part of it, he says, then: *But! When 9/11 struck, I had a change of heart.* I knew the story had to be told: Because, I know what happened at 9/11 is a *direct result* of what the economic hit men are doing.

‘Economic Hit Men’ Control Osama bin Laden

That *is* what happened in 9/11, in the United States. It was not Osama bin Laden. Osama bin Laden was working for the economic hit men. He was part of the operation! Guess why the U.S. troops moved *away from* relevant operations in Afghanistan, into Iraq at a certain point? So they wouldn't take out Osama bin Laden. This was referred to by Senator Kerry, during the campaign.

So, this is the kind of world we live in.

So therefore, the problem is this: Now, Europeans will say, “You're saying Europe is incapable, is incompetent to defend itself. Europe is incompetent to provide world leadership.” That, in a sense, is true. *But*, as we've seen in the past, Europe and the United States represent, at their best, a new system, which finally came into being with the 15th-Century Renaissance, with the founding—for example, of France, as a nation-state. The first modern nation-state, was France under Louis XI of France. The second modern nation-state, led by a fellow called Richmond, who was active in the court of Louis XI of France, who overthrew the tyrant Richard III and established England under Richmond himself, then known as Henry VII, as the second modern nation-state.

Immediately, there was the attempt to destroy this, led by the Grand Inquisitor of Spain, who was a real Satanic, Nazi-type—as a matter of fact, it was on the model of the Grand Inquisitor Tomás de Torquemada that Napoleon Bonaparte was designed! Bonaparte was not an accident: He was *designed*, specifically by a fellow named Joseph de Maistre—

Now, Are You Ready To Learn Economics?



The economy is crashing, as LaRouche warned. What should you do now?

Read this book and find out.

\$10

Shipping and handling: \$4.00 for first book, \$.50 each additional book. Virginia residents add 4.5% sales tax.

We accept MasterCard, Visa, Discover, American Express.

ORDER NOW FROM

Ben Franklin Booksellers
P.O. Box 1707 Leesburg, VA 20177
1-800-453-4108 toll free
or 1-703-777-3661
www.benfranklinbooks.com
e-mail: benfranklinbooks@mediasoft.net

who educated Napoleon; that is, influenced him, educated him, into what role to play. And Napoleon Bonaparte was a creation of this Martinist sect, run from London, which chose Torquemada, as the model for Napoleon. And then, later, when Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany, he was modeled on Napoleon! And why did he kill the Jews? The Jews were a great asset to Germany, why should they kill them? They killed them, in memory of Torquemada, who started that form of anti-Semitism in Europe. From Spain. And the right wing in Spain is defending the same thing. The right wing of the Catholic Church is polluted with this stuff! With real Nazism, and the Torquemada tradition, which is the same thing.

So, what we're dealing with here, is a continuing struggle, for the kind of republic, for which Europe mobilized to make possible the establishment of the United States as a constitutional republic.

So, what we have in European civilization, in particular, the following picture: We've come to the point in the planet, where there are essentially two basic cultural currents on the planet overall. One, is the cultural current of European civilization, which dates from the birth of Classical Greece, or the Classical Greek tradition out of Egypt. The influence of Egypt, which gave Greece the foundation of its cultural development. And that's European civilization. European civilization is traced from Thales, Solon, Pythagoras, and Plato: That's European civilization, the heart of it. And then, the enemies of that, within Europe, are also part of European civilization. So, we have this fight, within what's called "European civilization."

But, however, we are distinct from the other dominant current on this planet, which is called, "Asian cultures." This includes India, China, Southeast Asia, and so forth. These people do not have, despite the influence of European culture, they do not have a specifically European cultural matrix.

Now, the great challenge of the planet today, to bring about a constructive peaceful order, which will solve the problems before us, is to realize that this great cultural divide of the planet, between the dominant role up to now, of European culture, European civilization; and on the other hand, a group of cultures which is known as Asian cultures, or similar kinds. They call it, in the Asian group: China, India, Japan, Korea, so forth. So therefore, the problem today, is to create a system of republics—or to have a commitment to a system of republics—which incorporates both Asian cultures and European cultures. And to come to an accommodation, a functional accommodation, between the two, which is the basis for the positive evolutionary development of the culture of the planet as a whole.

The planet has become very crowded, not because it's smaller. It has not shrunk. But, the actions taken on one part of the planet, hit other parts of the planet more rapidly than ever before; so that distance and so forth, do not insulate one

part of the planet from what happens in another part. What happens in one part of the planet, more rapidly hits every part of the planet, than ever before in human existence—and this is qualitative. Especially since World War II, this has been the case.

Why We Need the Nation-State

So therefore, we can not let this kind of mess go on. We have to, number one, be committed to establish a system of sovereign nation-states. We have to have a system which includes Asian cultures, as well as European cultures.

Now, there's a third factor here: Human beings are not animals. Human beings have a creative power, of discovering ideas, such as universal scientific principles. No monkey can do that. Only human beings can do it. Now, this quality which distinguishes a man from a monkey though sometimes we question some of our leaders as to whether they are men, or monkeys), is the ability of the individual human mind, to make an experimentally validatable discovery of a universal physical principle. These principles are two types; they're both provable, both types. One, we call physical principles, the physical scientific principles. The other, we call cultural principles; these, also, are provable. Some are right, and some are wrong. The ability to distinguish between the two, is a quality of the human mind, a potential of the human mind. And therefore, in order to develop people, we have to take the cultures they have, the national language-cultures, and the traditions associated with that; we have to treat those cultures as we would treat a work of art, in which the people in that society are given the opportunity to exercise their creative powers, to understand the errors and achievements in the specific language-culture that they represent. And it is by this basis, that we elevate the individual citizen from being like a cow, who just does what he does, or she does—and then, dies; into an individual who participates in the development and transmission of those ideas on which civilization and its progress depend.

Therefore, we need the nation-state, the language-culture-based nation-state, as the basic institution of organization of society. We need, therefore, a system of cooperation among nation-states of that type, as a way of running the affairs of the planet. That's what we should be fighting for.

The hit men, which Perkins describes, are nothing more than the equivalent of two bums from the 14th Century, called "Biche" and "Mouche," who were banking agents for the House of Bardi, who, like the economic hit men of the post-1945 period, run around the world, organizing wars; organizing the financing of wars; organizing the looting of the countries which financed the wars; organizing the looting of the defeated by the predators, and so forth and so on: All to the greater name and glory of financial usury.

And we, like fools, praise this system. *We call it "free trade." Free trade, in human bodies.*

Okay. That's what I have to say: Now it's up to you.