EIR
Executive Intelligence Review
February 22, 2013 Vol. 40 No. 8 www.larouchepub.com $10.00

In Wake of Meteorite Hit, a Call for Defense of Earth
LaRouche: Glass-Steagall Now, or the World Goes to Hell
Food/Ag Fact Sheet: End Famine-Depopulation Agenda

The Rebirth of Our Nation: Reviving Strategic Defense

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) *is published weekly (50 issues), by EIR News Service, Inc., P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390. (703) 777-9451*

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany
Tel: 49-611-73650
Homepage: http://www.eirna.com
e-mail: eirna@eirna.com
Director: Georg Neudecker

Montreal, Canada: 514-461-1557

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, Ave Morelos #60-A, Col Barrio de San Andres, Del. Azcapotzalco, CP 02240, Mexico, DF. Tel: 5318-2301, 1163-9734, 1163-9735.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement #40683579

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

EIR

From the Managing Editor

The meteorite that came hurtling through the morning sky in Russia's Chelyabinsk region on Feb. 15 woke a lot of people up—and not just Russians who were sleepily commuting to work that morning. What *EIR*, a few scientists, and high-level Russian spokesmen have been warning about for some time, suddenly became a life-and-death matter for many who had previously disregarded those warnings. Lyndon LaRouche's short memorandum, "The Rebirth of Our Nation," situates the matter of Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE) within the broader questions of epistemology and national survival. "There is, of course, much more to come," he promises. "This is only the beginning of a new issue to be answered. Call it, for example, 'Science for Shakespeare and also Bach.' Wilhelm Furtwängler had already pioneered in such directions."

In the *Science* section, we take up the scientific and political challenges of an SDE program, relating these to LaRouche's efforts in the 1970s and '80s that led to the SDI.

The surprising recent cosmic developments, together with growing recognition of the threat of hyperinflation, have brought us into a new strategic geometry, as Jeffrey Steinberg and Helga Zepp-LaRouche report. LaRouche's Feb. 15 Friday webcast (in *Economics*) brings this to focus around the issue of what the banksters will do now. He startled his audience with the forecast that the era of bailouts is coming to an end: We will either implement FDR's Glass-Steagall standard or the British-based financial elite will let their erstwhile junior partners go bankrupt, while they build a new, smaller system to their own benefit—killing off most of the world's population in the process.

Accompanying articles spell out the process of hyperinflationary explosion, and new developments in the fight for Glass-Steagall in France and the United States.

To further the organizing efforts for Glass-Steagall, Marcia Merry Baker has prepared a "Food & Agriculture Crisis Fact Sheet" (*Physical Economy*). Free-market monetarism and Greenie biofoolery are leading to food shortages that will mean genocide if continued.

And in the *National* section, we put Obama in the hot seat, documenting the growing demand in Congress for answers on Benghazi and the unconstitutional drone killings.

Susan Welsh

EIR Contents

Cover This Week

YouTube/Courtesy: Fedor Potapov

Feb. 15 meteorite explosion over Chelyabinsk, Russia.

4 The Rebirth of Our Nation
By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. Although this piece was composed nearly a week before the Earth-shaking events of Feb. 15, LaRouche recalls the process leading up to his proposal for the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which is of immediate relevance for dealing with the Defense of Earth today. "Had we succeeded in the promising developments for SDI since the formation of the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF)," he writes, "the world would not have entered the presently endless collapse of the physical economy of the trans-Atlantic sector of the world."

To avert such a calamity today, LaRouche again addresses the question of the human mind, and its inherent potential for creative discovery. We must think like Cusa and Kepler, such that we are no longer the prisoners of sense-perception.

6 General MacArthur's Inchon Flank

Science

11 In Wake of Meteorite Hit, a Call for Defense of Earth
In response to the Feb. 15 meteorite explosion over the Russian region of Chelyabinsk, which shook the region and injured over 1,100 people, Russian Deputy Prime Minister Dmitri Rogozin reiterated his 2011 call for U.S.-Russian collaboration for a Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE).

12 Feb. 15 Asteroid Flyby: A Warning to Us from the Solar System
A transcript of "SDE Update: Asteroid 2012 DA14 Flyby," a 25-minute LaRouchePAC-TV video posted on Feb. 14, featuring Ben Deniston of the LaRouche science team.

Economics

19 LaRouche: Glass-Steagall Now, or the World Goes to Hell
In Lyndon LaRouche's opening remarks to his regular Friday evening webcast on Feb. 15, he presented an image of what the world will look like, if the Glass-Steagall banking separation which he has fought for over the last years is not rapidly put into effect: The hyperinflationary bailout will explode, and the result will be genocide.

22 The Hyperinflation Is Unsustainable

23 Is the Global Financial System Becoming a Supernova Explosion?
By Helga Zepp-LaRouche. In a stark wake-up call posted on the website of the investment giant PIMCO, founder Bill Gross writes that the entire financial system is a giant "chain letter" of unlimited money accumulation, and it will soon explode like a "supernova."

26 Glass-Steagall in the U.S. Congress
The Obama White House is actively opposing motion in Congress to reinstate Glass-Steagall. But LaRouchePAC is upping the pressure to get a bill passed without further delay.

27 Is the German Economy as Robust as Claimed?

Physical Economy

28 Food & Agriculture Crisis Fact Sheet: Restore National Sovereignty; End Famine-Depopulation Agenda
The United States is faced with a food crisis which threatens mass starvation, unless there is a radical change in the system of economics and finance in the immediate weeks ahead. This 25-item Fact Sheet documents the dimensions and causes of the crisis, who is to blame, and the specific areas of emergency action to be taken. Marcia Merry Baker reports.

International

41 Asteroid, Financial Blowout Redefine Strategic Threat
Policymakers are now caught between the Scylla of the bailout-fueled hyperinflation of financial markets, and the Charybdis of the potential for a thermonuclear confrontation erupting over one or more of the many global conflicts.

43 Cheminade on French TV: Only a Glass-Steagall Policy Will Succeed
The former French Presidential candidate and longtime LaRouche associate, appeared on the popular TV talk Show, "This Evening or Never."

45 Norton Mezvinsky: The Destructive Effects of Religious Extremisms

National

50 Obama Still on the Hook for Drone Killings, Benghazi
President Obama's obstruction of Congress, in refusing to release documents pertaining to his killer drone policy and the Benghazi atrocity, has met significant resistance in on Capitol Hill.

52 Obama, Brennan Set Up Ambassador Stevens for Murder in Benghazi
A book review of *Benghazi: The Definitive Report,* by Brandon Webb and Jack Murphy. The new eBook should contribute to stopping the confirmation of John Brennan as CIA Director, and lead to the impeachment of President Obama.

Editorial

56 Time for a Super-NASA

A MEMORANDUM TO OUR STAFF:

The Rebirth of Our Nation

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

February 9, 2013

"Some among you know how to keep excellent track of the fact that this is Saturday; but, just can't seem to remember which decade this is!"

In fact, shortly before the time of the death of President Franklin Roosevelt, who died April 12, 1945, OSS director "Wild Bill" Donovan had held his last meeting with that President. Another OSS officer, who would be, later, a close collaborator of mine, had accompanied Donovan into the White House anteroom to the President's office.

Donovan, walking out from the President's office, had turned to the prominent OSS officer who had accompanied him to and from that visit, then murmured to his companion: "It's over."

About a quarter-century later, as I came to know it at the beginning of the formation of what was about to become the Presidency of the elected Ronald Reagan, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, much of the "inside history" of what had been the OSS became known to me, largely through the then confidential nature of my own, various, later obligations respecting the tradition of the organization and development of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which came to me in my then continuing role as among the founders of the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF). On this account, now more than thirty years since my part in launching the SDI, more than the matter of age has now determined, that I am presently among the last of those still functioning as leading representatives adhering to that same original and continuing dedication.

There had been, and remain what were sundry currents of development leading into the formation and establishment of the SDI among which my own association with some veterans of the OSS, had played a particular leading role in the part I had played since during my visits to

National Archives and Records Administration

FDR Library

Shortly before President Roosevelt died in April 1945, his wartime intelligence chief, William J. ("Wild Bill") Donovan, anticipating the future under a Truman Administration, murmured preciently to a companion, "It's all over." FDR is shown here in a 1942 Fireside Chat on the "Progress of the War."

Europe beginning the late Summer and early Autumn of 1977. The channels leading into this development, had included such an institution as that with which I had become prominently associated as the FEF (The Fusion Energy Foundation: Thermonuclear Fusion) in the U.S.A.

What became my own relatively unique, special role in such matters, paralleled, and later converged upon the process of development leading to what was to become Present Ronald Reagan's adoption of what was to become known as the "Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)," an initiative which had featured leading strategic organizations ranging from such as U.S. notables, and veteran French Gaullist, German, and Italian leaders, and touching India, most of whom had qualified as strategic specialists of senior military and functionally related rank throughout many nations of the planet. I had found myself playing a leading role in the assembly of such an international commitment for war-avoidance, including, prior to the unfortunate choice of a new Soviet chief, veteran influentials from many nations in Europe, and elsewhere, that up to the point of President Ronald Reagan's resolve to adopt a commitment to the SDI, a mission which he maintained to the close of his Presidency, and, implicitly, at least, to his retreat toward retirement.

Had we succeeded in the promising developments for SDI since the formation of the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF), the world would not have entered the presently endless collapse of the physical economy of the trans-Atlantic sector of the world (most emphatically), a collapse which had been threatened since the moment of the infamous "cover-up" of the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and, later, his brother Robert.

I know with an exceptional degree of precision, that it was the Soviet officials, such as the inherently failed leaderships of Yuri Andropov and Michael Gorbachov, who had intervened, on their part, to oppose the SDI from the Soviet side, and who have been the particularly most notable, among those, from several leading nations, who had misled the world away from safety, to the present threshold of threatened thermonuclear extinction, a connection with the past which is still presently a greater threat than ever before, today

Worse, for the greater part, many among them still lack a needed quality of insight into that past history, still today.

As that true genius, Douglas MacArthur, had proven at Inchon, and still later in his role in the matter of opposing the foolish entry into an Indo-China war, that in warning against the specific nature of the trap which that prospect of war represented: reason, rather than unkempt passions, are, in the end, the only road to a truly attainable victory for mankind in general. Foresight into future developments and related actions, had

been a notable quality of true genius met in the work of MacArthur, as in the success of the Inchon landing.

Therefore, nonetheless:

Actually, for me today, it all goes back to OSS Director Donovan walking down the hallway from President Franklin Roosevelt's office, muttering, softly, his insightfully prophetic: "It's over. It's all over."

Donovan was right. Truman's Presidency had, from its beginning, been a stroll into the prospect of sheer Hell, a prospect crafted under the ties of President Truman to his then-master Winston Churchill. As a result of that trend in history since, we have now reached the brink of what that history has portended on this account, that during the entire span since "Wild Bill" Donovan had muttered so prophetically, "It's all over." Real history, as opposed to the merely pompous gossip, is often, even usually like that.

However, despite all that, and more, history has

General MacArthur's Inchon Flank

On June 25, 1950, ten divisions of the North Korean Armed Forces, backed by 1,643 heavy guns and Soviet tanks, streamed across the 38th Parallel and attacked the Republic of Korea.... Meeting in emergency session on June 25, and again on June 27, the UN Security Council called for the use of force "to repel the armed attack."

On July 10, Gen. Doulgas MacArthur was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the UN forces in Korea. But even as U.S. ground troops that had been stationed in Japan were fed into the conflict, the North Koreans continued their advance southward. Morale among the allied troops was low and sinking, as they suffered repeated battlefield setbacks and steadily retreated toward what, in late July, was finally established as the Pusan Perimeter.

The 'Three Battles of Inchon'

On July 23, MacArthur cabled Washington with his audacious proposal for a two-division corps (30,000 troops) amphibious flanking assault at Inchon—a surprise landing hundreds of miles behind the North Korean front lines. MacArthur recognized that the Pusan beachhead/perimeter could not be maintained indefinitely, for both political and military reasons. So he decided to remedy the situation with a bold counterstroke. The surprise landing at Inchon was conceptualized as a blow which would relieve the pressure on Pusan, and secure victory, *in a single stroke*:

"...I am firmly convinced," he wrote, "that early and strong effort behind [the enemy's] front will sever his main lines of communications and enable us to deliver a decisive and crushing blow.... The alternative is a frontal assault which can only result in a protracted and expensive campaign."

The "Second" Battle of Inchon was waged against the North Korean Armed Forces during and after the landing.

The "Third" Battle of Inchon was against President Truman and the U.S. State Department, following MacArthur's victory over the North Koreans on the battlefield.

The battle which MacArthur had to conduct against the Joint Chiefs in order to secure their grudging and belated authorization for his Inchon design, is paradigmatic of what the distilled essence of warfare actually is—combat in the realm of ideas.

MacArthur was convinced, that the enemy had not properly prepared Inchon for defense: "Surprise is the most vital element for success in modern war."

The key to the seizure of Inchon and nearby Seoul, was that *it would cut the enemy's supply lines, and seal off the entire southern peninsula*. MacArthur's troops at Inchon would become the anvil, against which the hammer of Gen. Walton Walker's advancing Eighth Army would be wielded.

The first assault wave did not suffer a single fatality, as the element of surprise was complete.... By Sept. 28, Seoul was liberated. In the two weeks after Inchon, over 130,000 North Korean soldiers were taken prisoner, as the gigantic pincer movement between Inchon and Pusan was completed, just as MacArthur had conceptualized it....

Adapted from an article by Steve Douglas, EIR, Dec. 10, 2004.

not yet come to an end, and probably never will, at least for so long as the prospect of a continuing future for mankind still exists. That fact, and that alone, must be the conclusion for this history I am presenting here and now. No mere calendar from the past could predetermine the unfolding of future history. Some of us, who understand real history better than most do, are not fooled in the fashion which most putative leaders of our United States, recently, have made fools of themselves, on one occasion, or another, in their misunderstanding of history, until now. Hopefully, the awesome peril now descending upon us all, must be, and can be turned into an escape from the present virtual hopelessness of the fate of nearly all of our citizenry at the present time.

It is under circumstances more or less as threatening as global thermonuclear warfare now, that only a few are able to muster themselves into an urgently needed mission-orientation, one so urgently needed presently. The rest do not know what they are doing, whatever their supposition might be.

Hence, that much said this far, here is what follows.

1. Persons & Weapons Which Depend Upon a Higher Order of Insights

What I have found to be the greatest among the common errors of judgment of not only people of the northerly trans-Atlantic region, in particular, is the substitution of the desire for what might be merely considered as a personal success, rather than primarily a needed success for present and future humanity alike. In the end, we all die; therefore, if our personal gratification is our primary issue, or even that of our immediate household, we have failed to have secured a real meaning for what had been our life, because we had not adequately considered those whom we will not know during generations yet to be delivered to us. Most among us mistake that which we expect, for what must be brought into existence in times beyond those during which we have actually lived.

The practical importance of the principle which I have just described, if continued as an intent for what will have happened even after we are deceased, is a fact more or less easily stated as a matter of the use of the spoken word. Yet, there is a touch of hypocrisy in asserting such a spoken promise of an intention, if there is a lack of the true passion for creating that actual future which we must craft, even as if at all costs.

It is one thing, for a soldier to assert the existence of a future value more important than the continuation of his personal life, and, another thing, not to wish that death, but accept the termination of that life, if that life, even if terminated, has a durable meaning for the necessary future of mankind. Death as such is certainly virtually inevitable for the individual member of the human species, ultimately, but it should be neither desired, nor feared, in and of itself.

The argument which I had just so stated on that account, must not be read as an a-priorist quality of presumption. The needed quality of argument, without which the stated commitment would possess no true commitment to the future needs of our human species, is that which must be considered above all other opinions. For the purpose of truth, the otherwise merely affirmed commitment must bind practice long since the person were not deceased. A mere "oath" were not sufficient; the commitment must be in the likeness of an efficiently sworn and realized set of obligations to the relatively immortal future benefits for the human species on that specific account. How could anyone sincerely promise to contribute what they neither have, nor could be able to discover in reality?

Ah! But once we have agreed to such stipulated commitments, what would make that which is otherwise merely stated, efficient in and of itself?

Actually, we must conclude, provisionally, at least, that the great majority of the presently living could not yet actually fulfill such a kind of promise. Simply, most of them are not yet made sufficiently competent to foresee the actual future. That widespread, popular quality of deficiency, is lodged, in fact, in the commonplace inability of most living human individuals to foresee the actual future in which they might wish to be realized, a future which they should have recently expected to perform as their act of willful entry into a newly created future of, probably, their own intentions.

Most human individuals whom we might expect to encounter today, have no serious form of such a comprehension.

However, there are numerous actual cases which do conform to such a prescribable intention, although the experiencing of such a commitment by the putative giver, is very rare. The reason is the inability to supply what would seem to be the promised gift, since they do

not know a nameable such existence, nor the reality of a promised soul. How could anyone know, or, honestly claim anything which they are not yet capable of actually knowing? This paradoxical thing has certain varied, sometimes useful implications for practice. The essential point in all this, is, could the considered persons actually know the object which they are attempting to promise to deliver?

The essential point to be emphasized, is that the "absolute present" is that which does not actually exist. All is caught, as if in midstream-motion, between past and future, as a celebrated ancient philosopher, Heraclitus, for one, has strongly emphasized. Only the realization of the willfully create-able future, really exists. It is, therefore, the induced obsession with the idea of the future as a series of fixed objects, a notion famously rejected by that Heraclitus, which needs correction. Or, better said, truth exists, actually, only in a process of ongoing creation.

What Those Facts Mean

That is not a mere recipe. Those who should be recognized as actually representing "creative minds" such as the cases of Max Planck and Albert Einstein (as in full rejection of the likes of Bertrand Russell and his dupes), typify the proper answer to the types of questions which I have presented above.

Whereas, creative physical scientists who are occupied with making a seemingly endless, simplistic form of flow, represent a typical expression of creativity, the underlying principle of such processes of discovery, confronts us with a still more profound challenge. The remedy for the latter case has been typified by the discoveries of Nicholas of Cusa, as in his exemplary **De Docta Ignorantia**. If we consider Cusa's leading scientific works in their proper role for predetermining an accessible future, we must prove that for ourselves in terms of reference to the crucial discoveries by Johannes Kepler, most notably, the prevalent failure of even most certified scientists to grasp Kepler's rarely understood actual meaning for *vicarious hypothesis*.

As I have spoken and written, now frequently before this point in the report, what should be adopted as an indication of the actual meaning of Kepler's *vicarious hypothesis,* is to be recognized more readily through a deeper understanding of the notion named *metaphor*. That paired set of terms must be recognized properly for their truly appropriate—also physical-scientifically appropriate, meaning, all to the effect that the achievement of a proper experience of a Shakespeare tragedy must be as actually lived by the members of the performance on stage, and also, sympathetically, the audience. On this account, I have rather long been greatly amused by the ironical way in which **Das Spukschloss im Spessart** (German 1960 film comedy) presented the refrain: *"Die Hauptsache ist der Effekt."* ["The main thing is the effect."] For me, the significance is that which implies that the effect is the reality of the experience: thus, the truth of a performed tragedy, when done on the living stage, is the reality of the tragic drama.

The "absolute present" does not actually exist, LaRouche writes. "All is caught, as if in midstream-motion, between past and future, as a celebrated ancient philosopher, Heraclitus, for one, has strongly emphasized." Heraclitus, portrayed here by Raphael in the "School of Athens" (1510-11).

While there is something hilariously funny pervading that named motion-picture production, there is also an echo of a much deeper, bitterly ironical meaning, to be recognized as lurking among the characters played on stage during the precise date of that production on the screen. Irony is sometimes an urgently needed anti-

dote within whose cloak to hide a consuming pain, as, perhaps, for the people of almost any nation which has suffered a terrible recent past, as for Germany in the aftermath of two recent, terrible wars, and now, the presently threatened virtual extermination born of a self-inflicted consent to folly, of, at the best, most of Europe.

However that reference might be a relevant case in point, there is a much deeper meaning which must be considered in the subject of this report.

2. The Prescience of the Actual Future

As I have stressed in some earlier, published reports, the most commonplace, and also most widely accepted of the mistaken judgments respecting the functions of the human mind, have been premised on the profoundly mistaken presumption that the discovery of the ruling principles of the known universe are metrical rules adduced from the merely deductive experiences of sense-perception when it is treated as implicitly self-evident.

The absurdity of such beliefs as that, would perhaps have been recognized as foolishness long-since, except for the fact that no one seems to have recalled where and when that nonsense-belief had been adopted as ostensibly "self-evident." Otherwise, think! Think of the absurdity of believing that the principal knowable "laws of the universe" which we presently inhabit, are to be worshiped as the religious worship of pagan gods which are alleged to inhabit our fields and forests. In fact, the directly opposite logic is the only sane origin of truthful conclusions.

Mankind is, indeed, an inhabitant of a closed set of relationships typical of the habitat which envelops our mortal existence. Therefore, when we seek to locate the principles which govern our existence within such realms as the Solar system, our galaxy, and beyond, it is the laws prescribed by the authority of the universe, which are the actual sources for the authority of our judgment respecting even the possibility of the existence of the planets and more themselves. Or, in other words, the principles of the universe which are, in fact, known to us, are those principles by means of which we can exert control over the preconditions of life on Earth, even the powers presently known to us as being specific to the human mind as such.

For example, the case of Max Planck's collaboration with Wolfgang Köhler respecting the concept of "Mind," demands attention to the distinction of brain from mind. Or, to restate that same point in evidence, the question to be asked, is whether it is the mind which is the fundamental reality, and the sense-impressions merely the shadows cast upon opinion by reality, as relatively merely shadows. The same argument as that, flows naturally from the conviction of reality which is adducible from the experience of a masterful Classical drama, such as some among Shakespeare's. This, for example, is the issue posed by the experience of a wonderfully crafted drama on stage. Thus, we are presented by such quality of drama, as to question which is real: a mere script of the drama, combined with some apparently living parts, or is the shadow-like apparent reality of the experience of the performed drama, the reality expressed as the biological functions, the efficient conception of the true meaning of the principles which govern the ruling processes of the existence of societies? Hence, the enigma of sense-perception as such. Which is the substance, and which the shadow?

The principles of the universe which are, in fact, known to us, are those principles by means of which we can exert control over the preconditions of life on Earth, even the powers presently known to us as being specific to the human mind as such.

If we, as mankind, can control processes among processes in what are classed as Solar or galactic "space," as implicitly discovered principles present us with such ironical forms of evidence, what remains for us as matters of certainty, is the ironical conjunction of part and process of the existences in what we know, as, for example, some large regions within our Solar system. The common feature, which supplies an assurance of sanity to the human so challenged, is the fact that the system works in a lawful manner, to the effect that, whatever else it exhibits, it exhibits as provably willful processes expressed by the success of our willful actions within such domains as nearby aspects of Solar space.

Sense-perception does not enclose space. The space

inhabited by the nearby planets, asteroids, and so-on, is to be defined from experience by the distinction of what man can do to nearby space (within the parts of Earth which we inhabit, and beyond), and what the "kick-back" does. The implications which include cases such as the progress in development of the exploitation of Mars by mankind, present signals which may aid us in sorting out which aspects of experience are shadows or substance of actualities.

That argument which I have just presented, in this fashion, is required now by the implications of the development of human processes operating and developing within and beyond the reach of what is identified as "sense-perception." The importance of emphasis on such points as this, is to be located essentially in the ironical connections between biological and cognitive human processes, as these are demonstrated, for example, by those systemically principled processes at the roots of all that we term "Classical musical composition," such as that of Bach and his successors.

For example, the present challenge to the protection of the continued existence of our human species, brings us closely into the concern known as "the defense of Earth," which, of course, means the efficient defense of Earth by the actions of mankind from Earth. The obligation which that thought, when seriously examined for practice, presents, takes us beyond the previously standard rules for defining efficient human behavior, and to the principles that now requires since the systems of landings on Mars, for change in mankind's outlook. No longer can serious-minded scientists accept the notions premised on an Earth-bound science of so-called sense-perception, when the laws of our Solar system, are not subject to systemic inferences of man's obligation to defend continued human existence, on the higher order of challenge, beyond that of merely the system of experiment-place "Earth," to the larger domain which the case of Mars, in particular, now poses respecting the elementary challenge of the role of Mars in "the defense of Earth."

There is, of course, much more to come. This is only the beginning of a new issue to be answered. Call it, for example, "Science for Shakespeare and also Bach." Wilhelm Furtwängler had already pioneered in such directions.

In Wake of Meteorite Hit, A Call for Defense of Earth

Feb. 18—In response to the Feb. 15 meteorite explosion over the Russian region of Chelyabinsk, which shook the region and injured over 1,100 people, Russian Deputy Prime Minister Dmitri Rogozin reiterated his 2011 call for U.S.-Russian collaboration for a Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE).

According to the Russian Interfax agency, Rogozin said: "I have spoken before about the need for some kind of international initiative, related to establishing a warning and prevention system for dangerous approaches to Earth by objects of extraterrestrial origin." The Chelyabinsk event (in the Russian Urals) confirms the urgency of solving this problem, he added. Neither Russia nor the United States has the capability to knock aside such objects now, Rogozin stressed.

Rogozin recalled that when he first raised the question of the Defense of Earth, while he was Russia's political representative to NATO, the general reaction was one of doubt. RTR Vesti state TV quoted him saying, "The response was skepticism: 'That can't happen, because it can never happen.' There was a certain amount of criticism, and many people laughed."

No one is laughing today. The Russian government has sprung into action, a United Nations Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space is taking up the subject in Vienna, Austria, and Rep. Lamar Smith (R-Tex.), chairman of the House Science, Space and Technology Committee, announced that the committee will hold a hearing in the coming weeks to explore ways to identify which asteroids may pose a threat to Earth in the future.

But, as Lyndon LaRouche pointed out recently, mankind has now effectively lost nearly *three decades* of irreplaceable time in preparing to defend against such threats from space, since President Reagan's initial offer for joint U.S.-Soviet research on anti-missile defense was crushed in the mid-1980s. It will take an extraordinary crash effort to develop the necessary resources, in manpower and physical capability, to put the world on track to protecting the planet from the threat of near-Earth objects.

Russian Mobilization

As could be expected, the Russian government has embarked on an urgent mobilization to create the conditions, and political alliances, for dealing with the dangers from impact of near-Earth objects.

Dealing with the threat from space is an urgent issue for political leaders and statesmen as well as scientists, Academician Andrei Kokoshin told Russia's Itar-Tass in an interview published Feb. 17. "We already have people who have been harmed and injured as a result of the meteorite's fall," he said. "Should a larger celestial body hit the Earth, the effects will be far more devastating, particularly so, if that happens in a large city. And in certain cases, as many scientists have been warning, the fall of an asteroid would spell the end of humanity."

Kokoshin is a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and founder and Dean of the Moscow State University Department of International Politics. He has served in the U.S. and Canada Institute, and was Secre-

tary of the Russian Federation Defense Council, and of the Russian Federation Security Council, from 1997 to 1999. He is also now first deputy chairman of the State Duma's Committee on Science and High Technology.

Now, two days after the meteorite struck, the time is ripe, Kokoshin said, for this to become an international political issue. There should be concerted efforts by the international community, on the basis of decisions by the leading countries of the world having the appropriate scientific knowledge and technologies, Itar-Tass cited him saying. "Such technologies do exist in Russia, the United States, China, the European Union and, to a certain extent, in India," he said. The issue should be discussed in both bilateral and multilateral formats.

"It is high time to create a common international center for monitoring and responding to natural threats from space," Kokoshin said. "The UN may create a special committee within its structure to coordinate efforts by UN Security Council member-states and other UN countries in that field."

Meanwhile, Alexei Pushkov, the Russian State Duma Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman, called for creating an international Anti-Asteroid Defense System (AADS), with the United States cooperating with Russia and China. As reported by *Space Safety* magazine, "The Russian government's foreign affairs committee chief Alexei Pushkov interpreted the 'message' differently, saying 'Instead of fighting on Earth, people should be creating a joint system of asteroid defence.' Pushkov continued, encouraging a multilateral drive for asteroid protection: 'Instead of creating a (military) European space defense system, the United States should join us and China in creating the AADS—the Anti-Asteroid Defense System.'"

Rogozin has been tasked by President Vladimir Putin to develop a plan for action in the short term. But this clearly begs the question of international collaboration, including from the United States.

And the U.S.?

To *EIR*'s knowledge, there has never been a serious response from the United States to Rogozin's 2011 offer to develop a program for the Strategic Defense of Earth. While the U.S has led the way in asteroid detection up to this point, there is still much more to be done.

NASA estimates that there are about 11.5 *million* near-Earth asteroids smaller than 30 meters in diameter, and about 500,000 in the 30-to-100 meter range. Much less than one percent of this population has been found, and there is currently no active program to systemically find these smaller objects.

At a NASA press briefing Feb. 15, a spokesman said that NASA has not been tasked to find even the majority of these asteroids, let alone defend the Earth from them. Currently NASA's hands are tied by the policy and budget of the Obama Administration.

While there are many practical responses now being offered, including those that have appeared in the press, the real issue is what LaRouche has identified: three decades of lost time. It is safe to say that if LaRouche's policy of the SDI had been fully adopted, then this meteor would never have struck the Earth on Feb. 15.

The warning just delivered to the inhabitants of this planet is clear: Dump Obama, and dump the failed economic and strategic policies of the past 30 years. Mankind's future is in international collaboration to develop the capabilities for the strategic defense of Earth, or there will be no future at all.

Feb. 15 Asteroid Flyby

A Warning to Us from The Solar System

This is a transcript of "SDE Update: Asteroid 2012 DA14 Flyby," a 25-minute LaRouchePAC-TV video posted on Feb. 14.

I'm Benjamin Deniston with the LaRouche science team, the Basement Project, and I want to talk about two highly significant events that are occurring at the beginning of 2013.

First, there is the extremely close passage of a near-Earth asteroid on Feb. 15, 2013. I want to discuss that specific situation, and focus on two challenges that that situation expresses and poses to all the inhabitants of this planet. But I want to do it from a rather unique standpoint, which is that March 23, 2013 is the 30th anniversary of Ronald Reagan's announcement of the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative].

Now the SDI, as pioneered by Lyndon LaRouche, as supported by Edward Teller, and as posed to the Soviet Union on March 23, 1983 by Ronald Reagan, was the option for what Teller called "the pursuit of the common

aims of mankind," the concept that nations, and at that time, the superpowers of the world, should actually collaborate in science-driver programs, tackling new challenges. In the case of the SDI, obviously eliminating the threat of nuclear weapons, as Ronald Reagan posed that to the American people in 1983, but doing it in an open, cooperative program with the leading powers of the world. That principle of the SDI was never actually implemented, and we're suffering the effects of that today.

Ben Deniston: "Right now we're basically flying blind through the Solar System, traveling through this dense population of bodies, unaware of when the next collision might occur."

What I want to address with this case of the asteroid flyby, and the questions that this poses to all the inhabitants of the planet, actually goes to the same issue: of nations collaborating to address the questions that threaten the entire planet, all inhabitants of the planet; finding the common challenges that mankind as a whole must tackle, and focusing the scientific, political, and potentially military resources available to nations such as, today, the United States, Russia, and China in particular, and focusing our efforts on overcoming these common challenges. And making that the leading strategic framework of the world.

So I want to take the case of this asteroid, known as 2012 DA14, to illustrate what we're talking about here.

Asteroid 2012 DA14

What you have here (**Figure 1**) is an image of an orbital animation that you can pull up from the NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory website. We have an animation of 2012 DA14, starting in June 2012. And we're going to let the animation play out, to see where the orbit of the asteriod in blue ends up, relative to the Earth.

As I mentioned, on Feb. 15, we have an extremely close pass by the Earth. We know for certain that it's not going to impact the Earth, thankfully. NASA knows that they have a good enough understanding of the orbit of this asteroid, that it will not impact the Earth. But it will come extremely close.

Here's an image (**Figure 2**) of the different satellites' orbital positions around the Earth. In low Earth orbit, you have the International Space Station, for example. There are obviously many, many other satellites and orbiting bodies here. If you move a bit farther out, you get the location of our GPS satellites, which give us our GPS capability on a day-to-day basis. Going out a little bit further, you have what's called the geosynchronous satellites. These are often communications satellites; they orbit the Earth at the same rate that the Earth itself rotates on its axis, meaning that they maintain a position above one location on the Earth, which makes it useful for communications and different things.

So this asteroid, 2012 DA14, is actually going to pass within our satellites. It's going to pass so close to the Earth, that it's actually going to come closer to the Earth than some of our own satellites that we utilize on a day-to-day basis. So when you're watching your satellite television, you're getting a signal from a satellite that's actually farther away from the Earth than this asteriod's going to be when it flies by.

So that's an extremely close pass. There is perhaps a very slight chance that it might impact a satellite (satellites are very, very small targets, so this is not very

FIGURE 1



NASA/JPL

FIGURE 2

likely, but it's worth pointing out that that is a possibility, given that this thing is passing within this range of the Earth system).

This particular asteroid is a relatively small asteroid; it's about 50 meters in diameter. To put that in perspective, the asteroid or comet that we believe led to the extinction, or helped lead to the extinction, of the dinosaurs was about 10 kilometers across. So there's a whole range of scale of objects that you're dealing with. And this particular asteroid is not something that we would be concerned would have an entire global effect. We're looking for objects that could cause an extinction-level event, and that's a big challenge, especially with issues like comets. But this particular asteroid is not something that might wipe out civilization as a whole; but if it were to impact, the location of impact would be devastated. And if that were to have an impact over a densely populated area, it would be incredibly devastating on a local scale.

For example, at Purdue University, some specialists did a study of how much energy this particular asteroid would release if it were to impact, and they think it would be around 4 megatons of TNT, which is a measurement often used for energy release: comparing it to equivalent amounts of TNT. This would be the size of decent-sized thermonuclear explosive device, which is 250 times the energy released by the bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima at the end of World War II. That's 500 times more than the energy of the bomb that North Korea just tested underground. So this is a huge amount of energy, and we do know that objects of this size do impact the Earth, and, speaking on longer time-scales, frankly, relatively frequently.

You have a famous case in 1908, where an asteroid or a comet, which we believe was of a similar size, around 30-50 meters in diameter, came into the atmosphere and impacted the Earth over the Tunguska region of Siberia. This is often referred to as the Tunguska Event, where you had a massive explosion in the atmosphere, and this explosion was due to the fact that this asteroid was coming in so fast, that when it entered the atmosphere, it heated up so quickly, that it literally exploded, and sent a blast wave, an intense blast, down onto the Earth, as depicted in this artist's illustration (**Figure 3**). These things are moving at tens of thousands of miles per hour, at incredible speeds. It exploded before it even had a chance to hit the ground. And the explosion then sent a blast wave down to the Earth (thankfully, this

FIGURE 3

Artist Don Davis's rendition of the explosion of an asteroid or comet over the Tunguska region of Siberia in 1908.

was an uninhabited region of Siberia in 1908). And it leveled trees over an area of 2,000 square kilometers, from the effects of this relatively small asteroid.

Here (**Figure 4**) is one of the images from an early expedition that went out and investigated the effects.

So even these relatively small bodies can have huge effects. And if you take an area of this size, 2,000 km^2, and you impose that over any major metropolitan area—San Francisco, London, New York City—this could devastate an entire metropolitan area if one of these impacts were to occur above a region like that.

We know it's not going to impact the Earth in this case, but we should take it as a warning, and we should know that there are many, many objects out there of this size, smaller, and larger, that we have not yet discovered.

That would be the first challenge I wanted to discuss, being posed to all the inhabitants of this planet, by this close flyby on Feb. 15.

FIGURE 4

This photo, taken in 1927, gives a sense of the damage done over a large area around the Siberian Tunguska region.

Now if we go, again, to NASA's JPL web page, we can pull up close flybys of the Earth. Go to "Close Approaches," and you can generate your own table of when asteroids are going to make a close flyby of the Earth. So to illustrate this, if we take any asteroid that's going to pass within a distance of ten lunar distances—so ten times the distance of the Earth to the Moon—how many asteroids do we know of that are going to pass that close to the Earth within the next year? And you can generate the table (**Figure 5**); and according to NASA's best estimates, we can see here that there are about 13 close approaches over the next year that we know about, the top one being the case of 2012 DA140. So this is our forecasting capability, based on our current understanding of the distribution of asteroids in the inner Solar System, based on how many we know about and how accurately we understand their orbits.

Now, let's do a test. That's our forecasting capability. How does that compare with our "hindcasting" capability? If we take the amount of asteroids that have made this same relatively close pass, within ten lunar distances, over the *past* year, which means that we might have seen them right after they passed by, or two days before they passed by. This would include examples where we didn't necessarily know they were coming two months, three months, four months, a year ahead of time. But maybe right as they passed by, we say, "Oh, there's one flying right by." So this is comparing our forecasting vs. hindcasting capability. And if we generate this table (**Figure 6**), you get a very different result: 219 close passes.

What does this tell you? It tells you that our ability to forecast the asteroid population currently, is not anywhere comparable to what's actually out there. What we can forecast a year ahead of time is nowhere near what we actually observe, let alone what we don't yet observe.

So this is to illustrate the point that we need to dramatically improve our forecasting capability. And to do that, we need to get a better understanding of what the distribution is throughout the whole Solar System, the whole inner Solar System especially. And right now, that is a challenge that nations should be collaborating on and taking up, to expand our understanding of what the total distribution of these asteroids is.

And these are just statistical estimates from a relatively small sample. They think that maybe we've discovered about one half of 1% of the total distribution of near-Earth asteroids that are in this 50-100-meter size range, the Tunguska Effect size range, objects that could have a major effect, that could devastate a small region of the planet if they were to impact. So for every one that we know of, there are about 200 out there that we don't know of. This is a huge challenge that we need to take up. There are literally hundreds of thousands of these bodies out there that we don't know about. And we need to make a serious effort to go out there and find

FIGURE 5

Forecast of Near-Earth Object Close Approaches

NEO Earth Close-Approaches

Between 1900 A.D. and 2200 A.D.
limited to encounters with
reasonably low uncertainty

NEOs (Near-Earth Objects) | no H limit
Sort by date | Ascending Sort
Future (within a year) | Nominal dist. <= 10LD
20 rows per page max. | show full table | Display Table

The table below shows **12** close-Earth approaches by NEOs (Near-Earth Objects) sorted by **date**.
Only those close approaches within **10 LD (Lunar Distances)** occurring **on or after 2013-Feb-16 UT and within a year** are included.

Column headings described below

Object	Close-Approach (CA) Date (TDB) YYYY-mmm-DD HH:MM ± D_HH:MM	CA Distance Nominal (LD/AU)	CA Distance Minimum (LD/AU)	V relative (km/s)	V infinity (km/s)	N sigma	H (mag)
(2013 CE82)	2013-Feb-17 16:39 ± < 00:01	4.6/0.0118	4.6/0.0118	13.17	13.16	401	24.7
(2013 CZ87)	2013-Feb-19 04:51 ± 00:01	7.0/0.0180	6.9/0.0178	6.94	6.92	144	25.9
(2007 EO88)	2013-Mar-18 20:50 ± 01:45	4.4/0.0114	2.9/0.0075	10.65	10.63	1.54e+05	26.4
(2010 GM23)	2013-Apr-13 23:00 ± 2_06:15	3.9/0.0099	0.9/0.0022	13.14	13.12	6.16e+04	24.7
(2006 BL8)	2013-Jul-26 02:35 ± 1_23:55	9.3/0.0239	1.3/0.0034	11.51	11.50	2.09e+03	24.8
(2003 DZ15)	2013-Jul-29 15:56 ± 1_02:32	7.6/0.0196	6.9/0.0178	14.54	14.53	1.17e+04	22.2
277475 (2005 WK4)	2013-Aug-09 05:02 ± < 00:01	8.1/0.0207	8.1/0.0207	8.38	8.36	7.67e+04	20.1
(2011 JY1)	2013-Nov-13 19:49 ± 19:12	8.2/0.0210	4.8/0.0124	12.10	12.09	1.14e+04	24.4
(2001 AV43)	2013-Nov-18 16:43 ± 06:23	2.9/0.0074	2.7/0.0068	3.61	3.51	6.77e+03	24.4
(2011 YD29)	2013-Dec-28 15:35 ± 17:28	6.1/0.0157	6.0/0.0155	6.70	6.68	4.14e+04	26.2
(2012 BX34)	2014-Jan-28 16:07 ± < 00:01	9.6/0.0247	9.6/0.0246	10.00	9.99	6.49e+04	27.6
(2006 DP14)	2014-Feb-10 19:05 ± < 00:01	6.2/0.0160	6.2/0.0160	27.13	27.13	1.16e+05	18.8

FIGURE 6

Actual Near-Earth Object Close Approaches Feb. 15, 2012 to Feb. 15, 2013

The table below shows 200 of **222** close-Earth approaches by NEOs (Near-Earth Objects) sorted by **date**.
Only those close approaches within **10 LD (Lunar Distances)** occurring **between 2013-Feb-16 UT and a year prior** are included.

Next/Last Page (rows 1 to 200 shown) Column headings described below

Object	Close-Approach (CA) Date (TDB) YYYY-mmm-DD HH:MM ± D_HH:MM	CA Distance Nominal (LD/AU)	CA Distance Minimum (LD/AU)	V relative (km/s)	V infinity (km/s)	N sigma	H (mag)
(2012 DW43)	2012-Feb-17 12:07 ± 05:46	9.5/0.0244	8.9/0.0228	8.81	8.79	20.1	26.5
(2012 DJ14)	2012-Feb-19 23:21 ± < 00:01	7.2/0.0184	7.0/0.0180	13.84	13.83	105	25.7
(2012 DY13)	2012-Feb-20 22:43 ± < 00:01	0.3/0.0007	0.3/0.0007	17.21	17.00	910	28.0
(2012 DF4)	2012-Feb-21 07:04 ± < 00:01	3.4/0.0086	3.3/0.0086	16.17	16.15	1.04e+03	25.8
(2012 DX)	2012-Feb-21 18:19 ± < 00:01	2.0/0.0050	2.0/0.0050	10.60	10.55	1.03e+04	27.1
(2012 DJ54)	2012-Feb-22 16:36 ± < 00:01	1.5/0.0038	1.5/0.0038	5.45	5.32	684	28.5
(2012 DZ)	2012-Feb-22 23:03 ± < 00:01	2.5/0.0065	2.5/0.0064	16.46	16.44	469	26.1
(2012 DM32)	2012-Feb-23 03:17 ± < 00:01	6.7/0.0172	6.7/0.0172	8.39	8.37	616	26.2
(2011 CP4)	2012-Feb-23 14:02 ± < 00:01	9.1/0.0234	9.1/0.0234	30.47	30.47	1.18e+07	21.1
(2012 DY)	2012-Feb-24 08:16 ± < 00:01	9.2/0.0237	9.1/0.0235	9.37	9.35	264	26.6

This is only the top part of a large chart, showing 200 actual close-Earth approaches.

them, determine what their orbits are, and track them, to make sure nothing impacts the Earth.

So that's the first challenge posed to the inhabitants of this planet by this flyby.

What Do We Do About It?

Now the second issue is that, say we know one of these is going to impact. Say we're able to determine that we think in some period of time, in a month, in two months, in a year, we think one of these asteroids is actually on a trajectory to hit the Earth. Based on what I just discussed here, our forecasting capability is very poor currently, especially for these smaller bodies. So in all likelihood, the amount of warning time we would have for an object like this is very short—maybe up to a year would be good, but a lot of these things we don't see until right before the flyby, maybe months, maybe weeks before the flyby.

So the challenge posed by this is, what would it take to actually go out and stop an object from intersecting the Earth? If we think it is on an impact trajectory, what would it take to stop that impact? Especially when you have short warning times. When you have long warning times, it's an easier issue to deal with; but if you have short warning times, it becomes much, much more of a challenge.

This is a subject of a study that NASA's conducting, and a couple of people whom we've interviewed on LaRouchePAC TV, have taken up the challenge of how to address this specific issue of short warning times to stop an impact. And the reason this is so difficult, as they discuss, is that the speeds involved are so great—again, imagine something traveling at 28,000 miles per hour, or about 8 miles in one second. Now, if you're trying to hit that object with something, if you're trying to run a spacecraft into it, to slow it down, or if you're trying to hit it with a thermonuclear explosive device, so it doesn't intersect the Earth, you have to intersect something that's moving at 8 miles in one second. Now if that object is only 50 meters across, this poses a very real challenge to NASA and the scientific community, to figure out how to accomplish this.

I'll play a short clip of an interview with two experts (**Figure 7**), a professor at Iowa State University named Bong Wie and a scientist at NASA Goddard named Brent Barbee, who have been deployed by NASA to study how to overcome this challenge:

FIGURE 7

LPAC-TV, http://larouchepac.com/node/24563

Ben Deniston interviews Brent Barbee (center) and Bong Wie about their "Hypervelocity Asteroid Intercept Vehicle" concept, Nov. 14, 2012.

Brent Barbee: For our study, we want to be ready to deal with short warning-time scenarios; we want to be able to launch, essentially, just about any time. So that means that our system has to be designed to come in fast at the asteroid, a high relative velocity at the time that we intercept the asteroid. So we're not going to carry propellant to slow down, because physics dictates that that mount of propellant would be huge. So our system is designed to come in in excess of 5 kilometers per second, 5, 10, 15, 20, up to 30 km per second relative velocity at impact.

Deniston: For our audience, that means tens of thousands of miles per hour.

Barbee: That's right. As a reference point, 7 km per second is on the order of about 20,000 miles per hour. So when we're coming in, the asteroid starts off as this little, tiny dot that the cameras on the spacecraft can barely see, a few million kilometers away, and then within a matter of hours, we're down to the last few minutes and the last few seconds, and we cover hundreds of kilometers within a matter of a minute or so. So there's very little time for the spacecraft to react. So we have to design a robust, onboard guidance, navigation, and control system that can successfully hit the relatively small asteroid traveling in the huge volume of space, traveling at such high relative velocities.

These are the types of challenges that are posed to all the inhabitants of this planet by the close passage of this asteroid on Feb. 15, 2013.

Strategic Defense of Earth

This should be seen in the light of Lyndon LaRouche's work on the Strategic Defense Initiative. Not because this is the same, exact threat as nuclear missiles, which is a threat that mankind still has to overcome, by developing cooperative defensive systems that can eliminate this threat—but because it poses the same principal challenge to mankind. We're living on one relatively small planet, flying through a much more populated region of the Solar System than people even realize.

As I said, there are hundreds of thousands of these near-Earth asteroids out there, most of which we have not yet found. So right now, we're basically flying blind through the Solar System, traveling through this dense population of bodies, unaware of when the next collision might occur. And we're not taking the efforts we could be taking to initiate real science-driver programs, typified by a full expansion of NASA, unleashing NASA to cooperate with other nations, to cooperate with Russia, to cooperate with China, to give mankind the full capabilities needed to tackle these threats and defend the entire planet Earth.

So right now today, that's what this flyby, and that's what the anniversary of Reagan's announcement of the SDI, should be bringing to the minds of people. Is mankind going to take that moral, cultural step to recognize our existence as one humanity, one mankind, on one planetary body, faced with a whole array of common threats? And are we finally going to take *that* as the principle that we have to collaborate and organize international relations around? Are we going to take that as the central issue that will now define international and strategic relations?

We've now been given a warning by the Solar System by this Feb. 15 passage. The challenge now is to actually act upon that warning, and get the type of collaborative program needed to move mankind out into space, and give us the capabilities to handle these types of challenges.

And with that, I encourage you to fight for this program, fight for the type of change that we need, and we will continue to bring you more updates on larouchepac.com about these and related events.

LaRouche: Glass-Steagall Now, Or the World Goes to Hell

Feb. 19—In his regular Friday webcast Feb. 15, Lyndon LaRouche confronted his audience with a picture of what the world will look like, if the Glass-Steagall banking separation which he has fought for over the last years is not rapidly put into effect. The hyperinflationary bailout which the London-centered bankers have been carrying out, *will* explode, and the unsustainable bailouts will end, he said, to the audience's shock. But, if the London-centered financial empire remains in control, the result will be the opposite of a Glass-Steagall-led bankruptcy reorganization: It will be genocide.

LaRouchePAC has begun an international mobilization to circulate LaRouche's message in video form (http://larouchepac.com/node/25513), and supplemented it with documentation, using primarily the monetarist bankers' own figures, on the levels of hyperinflation, which are leading inexorably to the collapse. Here is LaRouche's opening statement.

Well, there are several things to be taken up, which are of notable importance. Of course, one of them is what's happened in Siberia, and all over the press today, so I don't think that really is still news. I think there are aspects of it which are newsworthy, and news-important also.

However, the key thing that faces us internationally, which is still the leading issue throughout the planet, is the question of Glass-Steagall. The relevant crumb-bums have all come out and threatened people over the issue of Glass-Steagall, denying it. Now, the answer is: If Glass-Steagall were to be prevented from being instituted, the result would be the greatest hatred ever conceived against the people responsible. Because what the prevention of Glass-Steagall would cause a general breakdown crisis of the entire trans-Atlantic system.

Now, why do these idiots do that? Why do these criminals do that? Because their life, their ego, their sense of identity, is located in the great speculation which this represents. But we've come to the point that if they should act as they intend to—and I know what they intend to do—anyone should be able to understand what they intend to do; they signaled it clearly to me, and if I know it, I think some other people also know it—that the effect of their not putting Glass-Steagall through would be a general breakdown crisis of the entire world system.

Nastier than Bernanke's Operation

Now, this would include a step which would be the elimination of Ben Bernanke [as head of the Fed]. Because what they would do, is *they would not try to bail out Ben Bernanke and his operation; they would do something much nastier. They would dump Ben Bernanke, dump the existing financial system itself, ignore the system they cancelled, and put in their own new system. Which would mean the vast mass of debt, which*

UN Photo/Devra Berkowitz

Creative Commons

The scheme of the financier oligarchy "goes together with the Queen's project for reducing the population of the planet from about 7 billion people to the order of 1 billion peoplem," said LaRouche. "That's exactly what they have planned." Shown: the Royals. The World Wildlife Fund was co-founded by Prince Philip.

is represented by the monetarist operation, would be cancelled. In its place, they would have a new system of finances, which ignores entirely all the obligations associated with the old! Which would mean that most of the people of the world would be starving to death, quickly.

This has happened before. Certainly you had speculation in the 18th Century—you know, what was going on in the middle of the United States, or what became the United States: the great [Mississippi bubble] speculation. And what happens in a case like this: The amount of debt outstanding on account of this bailout system, a monetarist system—a financial easing, a monetary easing—it's got to be canceled. So, there *will* be no such money available! There *will* be no such reserves. What will happen will be: An international cabal will create a new system of money, which will be much *smaller*, much more feasibly handled than the present one.

What will happen to all the people who are excluded from the use of this more limited quantity of money? *They will starve to death!* And that's the intention behind what this President of the United States presently is doing. That doesn't mean he's the author of it; it means what they've signaled. Because you cannot possibly pull off what they say they intend to do; there's no way you can bail out this system—except by cancelling it, and putting in an absolutely new one.

Now, this has happened before, but on a much more limited scale. So, you can imagine the effect, that if they proceed with this operation, and were to succeed in pushing through the objections to Glass-Steagall, and are forced to unleash the debts which they're trying to hide now, it won't work. What they will simply do, is to replace and cancel the debts outstanding now under the present arrangement, and come in with much more modest ones; but they'll pay them to rich people, which means there will be still less for the people otherwise.

This goes together with the Queen's project for reducing the population of the planet from about 7 billion people to the order of 1 billion people. That's exactly what they have planned. And anyone who is going along with this opposition to Glass-Steagall from here on, is going to be denounced internationally by me and by others as mass-murderers! They'll be the most unpopular people crawling around, or slithering around, the planet. And that's exactly where we're headed.

Now, a lot of people don't want to think of things sometimes, that they think are too frightening. They are easily scared; all these pompous asses are easily scared. Just a little whimper of a donkey's bray, and they'll scatter to the winds. But those who intend to do things, such as the British Queen and other people of that sort, are mass-murderers when they think it's necessary to be so. And that's what we're faced with. So, anybody who's telling you that Glass-Steagall is not to be enacted, is actually acting on behalf of mass-murderers. And most of the people of the United States are the indicated victims, among others.

So, that's where we stand at this date. That's the

issue. They've put the issue on the platter. I know exactly what they're doing, because I know how systems work. And what they're doing, the only way it will work, is to *cancel* the entire bailout system—just wipe it off the plate, and come in with a *new* system, in which people who are privileged will be brought into that system, and they will be given relatively good incomes to live on, but unfortunately the greater majority of the population will have *none*. This is the greatest population-reduction scheme so far in known history. And that's what the policy of the people who oppose Glass-Steagall is—*whether they themselves know it or not*. But they will be held accountable for the effect of that policy. And that's where we stand. And that's the main issue.

Toward a Strategic Defense of Earth

Now, we have other issues, which are of a completely different nature, which are quite popular now, because they suddenly blasted their way into our consciences, and it started in places in Russia, where suddenly, a swooping thing shot through the atmosphere at extraordinary speeds, and made a mess of things for about 1,000 people or more, immediately. What this has shown, is that the entire world system is now subject to something, from outside the immediate vicinity of the Earth, which is shooting across our bow, and requires a very active SDE/SDI [Strategic Defense of Earth/Strategic Defense Initiative] operation in order to defend humanity against effects like that, which were demonstrated in Russia today and yesterday. So, that's the other issue.

So, you've got two issues. One, the key issue is: If the opponents of Glass-Steagall continue to proceed, they're going to be among the most hated people on the planet. And I don't think the hatred will be in any sense mild. When you are taking a mass of human beings and condemning them to death, by starvation and similar means, they ain't going to be happy—and neither will the *new* victims, the ones who are considered guilty of this crime, as complicit in this crime.

So, they'd better get on to Glass-Steagall *real fast*, or there's going to be a terrible amount of bloodshed spread around this planet. And those who are saying and threatening people against Glass-Steagall, are *themselves* the imminent targets of vengeance.

The Hyperinflation Is Unsustainable

Feb. 19—The two graphics here, taken from statistics of the Federal Reserve, with the addition of *EIR*'s estimate of world financial aggregates, make the point that Lyndon LaRouche has insisted upon since the 1999 "wall of money" policy of Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, as well as Ben Bernanke's "helicopter money" policy since the 2007 crash: The U.S. system is headed to Weimar hyperinflation, and an inevitable crash.

The "hyperinflation" chart (**Figure 1**) takes off from the recent admission by PIMCO head William Gross, who, with figures from the Federal Reserve, pointed to the fact that the money-issuance policy of the Fed is becoming a "monster that requires perpetually increasing amounts of fuel, a supernova star that expands and expands, yet in the process begins to consume itself."

But, in coming up with his ratios, of U.S. debt to GDP, Gross only counted official U.S. government, corporate, and household debt. By his own admission, he excluded "shadow debt," which includes the derivatives trade and the vast bulk of total world financial aggregates. Thus, as the graph shows, Gross understates the rate of hyperinflation by a full order of magnitude: The ratio of U.S. debt to dollar of GDP grew by 500% in the last 27 years, but the ratio of financial aggregates to dollar of GDP grew by 5,000% over the same period.

But GDP is a bloated, phony measure of the physical economy. If that were factored out, the growth of financial aggregates to real production would be worse still—by far.

This rapid money-pumping, today called Quantitative Easing, is justified in Congress and elsewhere as "good for the economy." Yet, as **Figure 2** on "Quantitative Easing and U.S. Banking Activity" shows, this emission has been accompanied by a *decline* in bank lending. And, of course, a lot of that lending, as measured by the Federal Reserve, does not go into the productive economy. If that fact were reflected, the collapse of lending would be much, much steeper.

FIGURE 1
Hyperinflation Run Amok
(Dollars of New Debt per Dollar of New GDP)



FIGURE 2
Quantitative Easing and U.S. Bank Activity
(Trillions of Dollars, Cumulative Change)



Is the Global Financial System Becoming a Supernova Explosion?

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Feb. 16—Financial market insiders are extremely nervous right now, because the international financial system is even more tense than immediately before the collapse of Lehman Brothers and AIG in September 2008—with the major difference that the "tool box" for resolving the crisis is now completely empty. What remains is only the choice between a hyperinflationary explosion throughout the trans-Atlantic region, as occurred in 1923 in Germany, or the immediate implementation of the two-tier banking system, in exactly the same form as President Franklin Roosevelt's 1933 Glass-Steagall Act.

Lyndon LaRouche, the only economist whose forecasting success about the financial system is incontestable, warned recently, in the most urgent terms, that this system is about to completely evaporate. Now one analyst has joined him, albeit from the more practical point of view of a market player: Bill Gross, founder and co-chief investment officer of PIMCO, the world's largest asset managers with $1.9 trillion in assets, has come to the same realization. On PIMCO's website, Gross writes that the entire financial system is nothing more than a giant "chain letter" of unlimited money accumulation, and that this system will soon explode like a "supernova."

The website Deutsche Wirtschaftsnachrichten [German Economic News] cites Wikipedia's laconic description: "A supernova (plural supernovae) is the sudden, bright burst of light from a star at the end of its life, caused by an explosion in which the star itself is destroyed. The luminosity of the star increases millions to billions of times; for a short period it is as bright as an entire galaxy."[1] The website adds that the dazzling light we see from it could be the current irrational boom on the international exchanges: "There will be nothing left."

1. From the German Wikipedia.

But if a "supernova explosion" of the hopelessly indebted financial system should occur, there actually would be something left: the greatest social catastrophe that mankind has ever experienced. If the financial system is detonated—either by a chain-reaction collapse within hours, or by hyperinflation which would very quickly destroy the very basis of life everywhere on Earth—millions of people would pay with their lives. Given the already extremely tense strategic situation, it is more likely than not, that wars and a global nuclear war would emerge from the chaos and turmoil. And only then would there be "nothing left."

In many European nations and in the U.S. itself, there is a growing movement for LaRouche's proposed implementation of the same package that Roosevelt used to pull the United States out of the Depression and transform it into the world's most prosperous economy: the Glass-Steagall Act, the Pecora Commission, the New Deal, infrastructure construction, and the real economy. So there is a realistic alternative.

A Tissue of Lies

But the lobbyists for the current globalized system are putting enormous pressure on members of the various parliaments, to keep them from implementing Glass-Steagall. They are using a variety of tactics and lies, mainly taking advantage of politicians' ignorance about economic issues.

Lie #1: "If a two-tier banking system were introduced now, it would destroy the entire global financial system, with catastrophic consequences for the real economy and jobs."

The truth: This financial system is already beyond repair. The central banks' practice of creating unlimited liquidity stopped benefiting the real economy long ago, and has only extended the banks' abilities to continue their speculation in a completely non-trans-

parent market. The system's total debt exceeds the gross national products of all the world's nations by several orders of magnitude; this debt can never be repaid, and the attempt to do so by printing money would result in a short-term hyperinflationary explosion.

Hyperinflation is the most brutal form of expropriation of the general population. After the hyperinflationary devaluation of the debt, a new currency would come into being, and the only ones who would then own anything are today's mega-speculators, those who belong to the "Club."

Lie #2: "The two-tier banking system would not have prevented the collapse of Lehman Brothers, which was purely an investment bank."

The truth: The collapse of Lehman Brothers and AIG, as well as the prior collapse of the so-called dot-com bubble in March 2000, and the U.S. secondary housing market in July 2007, were the result of the deregulation of financial markets. Alan Greenspan, after his appointment as head of the Federal Reserve in 1987, introduced this, step by step. The collapses were also a result of the repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act in 1999, leading to the excesses of derivatives and other "creative" financial instruments. To this day, five and a half years (!) after the outbreak of the crisis, governments have done *nothing* to curb this monster system, which favors the mega-speculators at the expense of the common good, and risks the total destruction of society.



Pimco's Bill Gross writes that the rise in U.S. credit creation since 1971 has created "a monster that requires perpetually increasing amounts of fuel, a supernova star that expands and expands, yet, in the process, begins to consume itself." However, he then assures his nervous clients that "the end of the global monetary system is not nigh." And his solution? He offers Pimco's services to help "transition from financial to real assets."

Lie #3: "The two-tier banking system would put Germany's credit supply at risk, damaging the competitiveness of the German financial sector compared to British, American, and Asian banks, which have no fear of conversion to a two-tier system."

The truth: The only way that the real economy can not only be supplied with credit, but also expanded through a "Marshall Plan" for Southern Europe, the Mediterranean, Southwest Asia, and Africa, is through a credit system in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton, the first Treasury Secretary of the United States; Abraham Lincoln; Roosevelt, and Germany's post-1945

Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (Reconstruction Finance Agency]. That means we need to replace the current monetarist system, based on profit maximization, with a credit system, oriented toward the common good, extended by means of higher energy-flux density in the production process.

The current unlimited, hyperinflationary "supply of credit" by banks, as the central banks generate more and more money, must be replaced by credit lines for well-defined projects in the real economy, creating full and productive employment and improving the quality of life from one generation to the next, and especially making a decent future possible for the younger generation.

The truth is also that the imminent threat of hyperinflation would have the same effect as a world war. Once it has broken out, it will continue to escalate and more, and will only stop when many millions or even billions of people have perished.

Those who defend the current system are guilty not only of the life-shortening consequences of the policy of the Troika [IMF, European Commission, European Central Bank] in Greece, Italy, Spain, and Portugal—not to mention Africa—but also for the consequences that continuing the casino economy will have for the whole world's population.

Only a completely new paradigm, which puts people back at the center of politics, the economy, and culture, can overcome this crisis, which has destabilized all the institutions that we once assumed were safe and guaranteed. The introduction of a real two-tier banking system in the tradition of FDR's Glass-Steagall—and not one of the "ersatz coffee variations" *à la* Peer Steinbrück, Wolfgang Schäuble, the Liikanen Plan, the Vickers Commission, the Volcker Rule, etc.—is the first step.

Mobilize all your friends and acquaintances to remind Members of Parliament (or in the U.S., your Congressmen and Senators) of their duty to defend the general welfare and to be responsible only to their consciences.

It is not only the general welfare that is at stake, but our very lives.

Translated from German by Susan Welsh

Glass-Steagall in The U.S. Congress

by Nancy Spannaus

Feb. 19—*EIR*'s sources in Washington, D.C. report that the Obama White House is moving "pro-actively" to stymie the immediate action on reinstating Glass-Steagall that LaRouchePAC organizers are pushing for. In the face of this campaign, cosponsorships for Rep. Marcy Kaptur's (D-Ohio) HR 129, the Return to Prudent Banking Act, are growing slowly, and have reached only 15 so far,[1]>[1] and no Senator has yet put in a companion bill to the Kaptur legislation.

Yet, it is clear that, unless the U.S. Congress moves *first* to restore Glass-Steagall, and prevent a blowout of the system that will devastate the nation and world, there is no chance of international action to save the economy.

Thus, throughout the nation, LaRouchePAC activists are putting their state legislators, city councilmen, and community leaders on notice that they have to move *now* to force Congress to move. Lobbying campaigns are underway in at least a dozen state capitols, and resolutions calling on Congress to pass HR 129 have been introduced into five state legislatures so far.

The latest of these resolutions, introduced Feb. 5, is in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. It was introduced by Rep. Mark Cohen, a senior Democratic legislator, and has nine co-sponsors. Support for Glass-Steagall, and the other two aspects of LaRouchePAC's three-point program—a credit system and NAWAPA (North American Water and Power Alliance)—is very broad in Pennsylvania, where 25 township councils have debated and passed resolutions in favor of the program over the last six to nine months.

Resolutions have also been introduced into the Virginia, Kentucky, and Rhode Island Senates, and the Montana House.

The Obstacle Is Cowardice

With the threat of draconian budget cuts, including in the form of the sequester, hanging over Washington, D.C., one would think that the option of Glass-Steagall banking separation would be on the top of the agenda of concerned and patriotic Congressmen. After all, Glass-Steagall would *cut off* the bailout flow into the banking system, which is now proceeding at a hyperinflationary rate, and thus dramatically *reduce* the nation's debt burden. That reduction would literally *save lives*, by obviating the proposed cuts into entitlements, and other vital government programs.

Yet, while the idea of cutting off the bailout is broadly popular in the Congress, the urgency of doing so is generally not understood. It is seen as a "banking issue," not a matter of life or death.

For example: a good number of Senators do understand the necessity for Glass-Steagall for a sound banking system. Sen. Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.), who previously co-sponsored legislation with Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) to restore Glass-Steagall, raised the matter in the confirmation hearings for President Obama's pick for Treasury Secretary, Jacob Lew, last week. She asked Lew point-blank: Do you support the reimplementation of Glass-Steagall? As befits his loyalty to his boss, Lew responded by defending Dodd-Frank, and claiming that "Glass-Steagall had, over the years become something of an anachronism, and much of the activities in the financial world have gotten beyond it. . . ." I'll take that as a "no," Cantwell replied, while Lew hemmed and hawed.

Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) took the occasion of a Senate Banking Committee hearing Feb. 14, to sing the praises of Glass-Steagall, noting that it "worked pretty well" for 66 years, but that after its repeal, the financial system had gone into the 2007-08 crash.

The fact remains: There is *no* legislation to revive Glass-Steagall banking separation introduced into the U.S. Senate—and this very fact is being used by members of the House to hold back on their side. After all, 85 of them had signed on to Kaptur's identical bill in the 112th Congress, and the Senate had never moved.

Are the Senators afraid of Wall Street, the President, or both? Regardless, it is the citizenry that must force them to act to save the nation, before it's too late.

1. The Congressional co-sponsors of HR 129 are, in addition to Marcy Kaptur (D-Ohio): Walter Jones (R-N.C.); Michael Michaud (D-Me.); James McGovern (D-Mass.); James Moran (D-Va.); Michael Capuano (D-Mass.); Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-D.C.); Peter Welch (D-Vt.); Lloyd Doggett (D-Tex.); David Cicilline (D-R.I.); Judy Chu (D-Calif.); Daniel Lipinski (D-Ill.); George Miller (D-Calif.); Collin Peterson (D-Minn.); Susan Davis (D-Calif.); Louise Slaughter (D-N.Y.).

Is the German Economy As Robust as Claimed?

by Rainer Apel

Feb. 14—The good news spread throughout Germany on Feb. 7: The economic downturn is over! Exports rose by 3.4% in 2012, as compared to 2011, already a record year, and the trade surplus was the second-highest in Germany's history. Admittedly, exports to other European Union countries, hard hit by the crisis, were down in 2012 by 0.3%, while imports rose by 0.9%. But overall, things "bode well" for 2013, the Economics Ministry said.

However, a national economy is not measured by exports alone. The German export sector includes, in large part, outsourced productions which generate no jobs in Germany, as is the case with the auto industry, and only partially benefits small and medium-sized enterprises, known as the *Mittelstand*, the backbone of the national economy. This sector generally depends on the domestic market, which has teetered between stagnation and recession in the last months.

Even by GDP standards, which are not a competent measure of economic strength, the German economy is at a standstill. The figure for the fourth quarter, with inflation and seasonal adjustments, dropped 0.5%, according to the central statistic office. Industrial investments dropped by 4.4% on a yearly basis.

Domestic investments and growth could restart through infrastructure development. That is actually the key to the "economic miracle" that turned Germany from a rubble field in the immediate post-war period, into an economic powerhouse a mere 20 years later. Measured against that yardstick, where does Germany stand today?

Stuttgart 21: Railroad to Nowhere

Take the case of the Stuttgart 21 railway project, which was designed as a key section of the future high-speed train connection stretching from the Atlantic coast of France to the Black Sea coast, via southeastern Europe. Due to numerous delays of the construction work—for various bureaucratic, financial, ecological, and technical reasons—the completion date will likely be postponed from 2020 to 2023 or 2024, with a rise in costs from EU4.5 billion to EU6.8 billion, experts have warned. The German government representatives in the project do not want to cover the increase in costs, while the state government of Baden-Württemberg and the municipality of Stuttgart, both led by Greens, have rejected increased payments as well. So there is nobody to cover the difference.

Given the different levels of obstructionism and—in the case of the radical ecologists—open sabotage, Stuttgart 21 may be slated for the same fate as other major infrastructure projects that the government has dropped. The maglev lines, Hamburg-Berlin (axed in 1999) and Munich-airport (axed in 2008), were both abruptly cancelled after eight years of debate. And completion of Berlin's new international airport already faces a delay of 2-3 years, with massively increased costs, from its original target date of June 2012. Parts of the airport may even have to be rebuilt from scratch.

If this alliance among the Greenies, the bankers, and the bureaucrats is not broken, large projects have no chance anymore. That is true even for renewable energy projects, such as the envisaged, but critically delayed, construction of several thousand kilometers of "smart grids" for power transmission from the large wind parks in the country's North, to the industrial and private consumers in the South. The panicked government decision in March 2011 to phase out nuclear power completely, and Berlin's obsession with entering the "era of renewables" without having the funds for such costly adventures, spell a future of power emergencies.

At the same time, the increase in energy prices needed to subsidize the highly inefficient renewables threatens to drive energy-intensive industries out of Germany.

Then, there's the case of the shipbuilding sector. It was saved from collapse several years ago when many shipyards were turned into production sites for offshore wind power components (e.g., windmills), but that is now jeopardized by the lack of private investors. Meaningful alternatives, such as building floating power plants for export to developing countries, are rejected by the government.

A paradigm-shift back to Germany's previous commitment to technology and grand projects is long overdue.

FOOD & AGRICULTURE CRISIS FACT SHEET

Restore National Sovereignty; End Famine-Depopulation Agenda

by Marcia Merry Baker

Feb. 15—The United States is faced with a food crisis of unprecedented proportions, one which threatens mass starvation unless there is a radical change in the system of economics and finance in the immediate weeks ahead.

As of mid-February 2013, the U.S. National Weather Service foresees no heavy rains or snowfall on the way, sufficient to relieve the drought in the North American farmbelt. The drought jeopardizes Winter wheat, reduces the soil moisture needed for corn and soy, worsens the acute hay and pasture scarcity, and threatens the entire livestock feed chain (**Figure 1**). There are no food reserves. This situation constitutes a world disaster threat. However, the impact of another "unlucky" crop season does not define the problem. Even if miracle weather now ensues, the crisis remains.

We face severe food shortages on the scale of impending famine because of the actions of the Obama Administration, whose policies are the culmination of decades of laws and practices, which have undermined the food-increase potential of nations. Moreover, these practices, and their

FIGURE 1
U.S. Seasonal Drought Outlook



continuation by Obama, have been deliberately promoted by financial and political circles, best understood as the modern-day British Empire, for which subverting nation-states and causing depopulation are the goals.

What is urgently required, is to restore national sovereignty over food production, and economic activity generally. Only this will cancel the famine-depopulation agenda.

The 25 fact-items below document the dimensions and causes of the food and agriculture crisis, who is to blame, and the specific areas of emergency action to be taken. The focus is on the United States, with summary facts on the world situation.

FIGURE 2
Cereal Production, Utilization, and Stocks

I. Dimensions of the Food Crisis

1. **Declining production**. Worldwide annual production of grains has stagnated in recent years (**Figure 2**). Total output (all types) went from 2,200 million metric tons two years ago to, at best, 2,240 mmt hoped for this year (U.S. Department of Agriculture). The per capita decline is worsening yearly. In the United States, annual grains production is falling, and stocks are plunging. U.S. grains output (all kinds) fell from 398 mmt in 2010, down to 384 mmt in 2011. The USDA "hopes" for 353 mmt in the current 2012-13 crop year. U.S. grain carryover stocks dropped from 57 mmt two years ago, down to 49 last year, and are now barely 37 mmt.

2. **Hunger worldwide** now affects 1 billion out of 7 billion people, or 14%. In the U.S., impoverishment has driven 48 million people—one in seven Americans—onto domestic food relief run by the USDA (SNAP—Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program), which provides a monthly stipend for food purchasing (**Figure 3**). If all American households could afford to go out and buy the types of quality foods they require, drastic food shortages would be instantly evident.

USDA/Lance Cheung

Impoverishment has driven 48 million people—one in seven Americans—onto domestic food relief run by the USDA (SNAP—Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program). Shown: a couple leaving the Tukwila (Wash.) Pantry with USDA food.

3. **No reserves**. The U.S. has no strategic food reserves—no wheat, corn, milk powder, butter, cheese, or vegetable oils. Worldwide, only a few nations have strategic food reserves—China, India, Japan, and Vietnam; and in China, maintenance of reserves and supply levels is dependent on grain and soybean imports, whose availability is plunging. Last year, China imported 12% of its basic food consumption.

High dependence on food imports is now the case for all categories of U.S. food consumption, except basic grains and meat; but now, U.S. beef production is dropping. By food group, the volumes of U.S. imports, as a percentage of domestic consumption, range from over 85%

FIGURE 3
2012 Global Hunger Severity by Nation



Source: IFPRI

for seafood, to 30% for fruits, vegetables, and nuts. Depending on the time of year, as much as 60% of U.S. fresh produce is imported. Overall, 16% of what Americans eat is imported.

The volume of food flows from food-needy nations into the U.S. and Europe is soaring. Examples: grapefruit from West Africa; processed fruit from Egypt; fresh fruits from Kenya and South Africa; mango pulp from Haiti.

4. **Agriculture production capacity is contracting**. There is an acute livestock feed crisis in the U.S., with hay scarcity and lack of pasture, as well as shortages of corn and soy for animal rations. The 2012 U.S. hay production was under 120 million tons, 16% less than the five-year average; and 9% down from 2011. The national cattle herd in the U.S. is now at its lowest number in 61 years, standing at 89.3 million head (all types and ages), which is down 2% in just a year. The numbers of cows and heifers that calved in 2012 is the lowest in 72 years, down to 38.5 million. In Texas, the largest cattle state with over 10 million animals, the herd size dropped by 600,000, or 6%, last year alone.

U.S. beef output for 2013 is expected to fall by 1 billion pounds—i.e., 3 pounds less per capita will be produced this year. It should be noted that U.S. beef production has represented one-fifth of the entire world's beef output in recent years.

The U.S. no longer produces enough milk for domestic needs. This gap is disguised by imports of casein and other milk constituents, from which artificial cheese and other dairy "products" are re-constituted as real. During 2012, dozens of prime dairy herds went under in California, the biggest U.S. dairy state.

The U.S. produced 1% fewer chickens in 2012 than the year before.

5. **Food-processing capacity is declining** in the U.S., under the impact of unprecedented consolidation, and control by private, non-food financial interests. In beef, for example, the Big Four mega-packing companies account for over 80% of all U.S. beef processed. They operate 25 giant slaughter houses, and just a few other packing plants: Cargill, JBS, Tysons Foods Inc., and National Beef Packing. On Feb. 1, Cargill shut down its huge West Texas slaughtering facility, giving barely 10 days termination notice to its 2,000 workers, shocking the 22,000 residents of nearby Lubbock, and leaving the surrounding ranchers in the lurch. Cargill peremptorily cited the decreasing number of cattle available, at prices Cargill said it chooses no longer to pay.

The same cartelization prevails in other foods, from citrus to oilseeds. For example, in dairy products: In the U.S., Dean Foods has over 30% of the fluid market; Kraft dominates cheese. Internationally, seven giant trans-national firms dominate: Nestle S.A. (Switzerland), Groupe Danone (France), Dean Foods (Texas, U.S.A.), Koninklejke Friesland Campina N.V. (Netherlands), Land O'Lakes (Minnesota, U.S.A.), Fonterra (New Zealand), and Lactalis (France).

Internationally, Wal-Mart is the single largest food distributor in the global grocery cartel, with Carrefour (France) second, and very few others. Wal-Mart dictates low prices to farmer-suppliers worldwide. Hedge funds and Big Money of all kinds are in controlling positions throughout the food chain. Warren Buffett this month announced a giant $23 billion takeover of food giant H.J. Heinz, by his Berkshire-Hathaway and 3G Capital Management.

FIGURE 4
U.S. Drought Monitor



6. **Degradation of water and land**. Conditions of depleting water sources, decreasing area of farmland, and declining soil fertility are spreading. As of Feb. 5, the U.S. Drought Monitor map (**Figure 4**), issued by the Federal interagency team, shows that 87% of the High Plains farmbelt region is experiencing drought. Fully 100% of Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, and Nebraska are in drought. Even where there is rain expected over the next few weeks elsewhere in the Midwest, such as in Illinois, agronomists warn that, although this will allow the Spring crop plantings of corn and soybeans, the lack of sufficient subsoil moisture during the Summer growth period may spell disaster.

However, even before our current drought episode—considered the worst in 50 years—large parts of the Southwestern and High Plains states have come to be reliant on more and deeper wells. Pumping of groundwater for irrigation, as of 2005, was three times the volume from wells in 1950. The land area irrigated in the U.S. has been declining since the 1980s.

The water table of the mid- and southern-Ogallala Aquifer region (the Southern High Plains states) has plunged, as has that of aquifers in California, Arizona, and parts of the upper Rio Grande Basin (**Figure 4**). Land subsidence is extensive from Southern California

USDA/Nathan Baggett

There is a huge backlog of work on locks and dams, channel dredging, and other upkeep of the waterway system. As an example, corrosion of the Maumee Dam in Fort Wayne, Ind. (shown here) has produced holes that have caused massive leaks in the structure.

to West Texas. Salination of farmland is worsening, for lack of flow-through of fresh water to flush the soils.

Variations on this same situation are in effect in other breadbasket regions the world over. Added to this, are constraints wrongfully imposed on food production by deliberate government authority. In November 2012, in Australia, a cap was put on agricultural use of water in the highly developed Murray-Darling (Rivers) Basin project, which can produce food for 60 million people. In Canada, in 2005, a cap was placed against further usage-allocation of water for agriculture or any other purpose, in the Lower Saskatchewan River Basin.

7. **Unreliability of transportation**, power, farm inputs, and logistics is increasing. The growing inadequacy of the base grid of rail, surface, and waterway systems is evident this Winter, in the first-time-ever episode of potential shutdown of barge shipping on the mid-Mississippi River channel. Narrowly averted, a potential repeat threat remains, because there is no redundancy of rail to handle the needs of the farmbelt if barge traffic is interrupted, nor the other way around.

There is a gigantic backlog of work on locks and dams, channel dredging, and other upkeep of the waterway system. Some of the Upper Mississippi River District installations are 60 years old; some on the Ohio River District system, even 90 years old. In 2010, a 280-foot stretch of lock wall, at Lockport, Ill., simply caved in.

The U.S. rail system has contracted drastically since its peak in the 1920s. Roadways in rural farming counties have a huge deficit of bridge replacement and repair. Likewise, electricity generation and distribution have not kept pace, since expansion of nuclear power was halted.

Infrastructure to protect against flooding and other weather extremes, in particular, levees, is deficient in many farm counties. For example, nothing has been done about full-scale levees and pumps in the New Madrid zone of Missouri, along the west bank of the Mississippi River.

8. **Seed cartel control.** Monsanto (headquartered in St. Louis) and a few other agro-chemical companies (Syngenta, DuPont/Pioneer, BASF, BayerCrop Science, Dow/DeKalb) operate a global cartel, controlling food-crop traits, bio-techniques, and seed supplies, wrongfully claiming patent rights, on the scale of controlling the means to life. For example, this cartel controls 80-90% of corn and soybean seeds currently used for the U.S. crops. The Big Three—Monsanto, Syngenta, and DuPont/Pioneer—control 50% of all the world's commercial seed market. They similarly have a lock on directions of research, and what crop traits are developed for the future.

9. **Vulnerability to plant and animal diseases**. Research for agriculture advance—in crop and animal genetics, and biogeochemistry in general—has been thwarted for decades, to the degree that, today, we have needless vulnerabilities to outbreaks and epidemics of botanical, veterinary, and zoönotic diseases, as well as constraints to yield potentials.

For example, the wheat rust fungus UG99 (first identified in East Africa in 1999), is now making its

FIGURE 5
FAO Food Price Index



way across Southwest Asia, and constitutes a world wheat crop threat. This danger arises—as was denounced by Norman Borlaug in 2009—because agriculture research was not supported over the past few decades, sufficient to develop fungus-resistant wheat strains, as a standby reserve, in case of mutations and new outbreaks. Now there is a scramble.

Threats to crops and livestock are intensified by the long-distance, free-trade patterns in play under globalization, which spread pathogens. The 1980s Mad Cow disease outbreak, originating in the British Isles, is a costly example. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control estimates that nearly half of the food-borne-illness outbreaks today in the U.S. come from "global-sourced" food, mostly from Asia.

Highly concentrated domestic production also spreads illness widely. The incidence of laboratory-confirmed bacterial food-borne illness in 2011, compared with that of 2006-08, shows a 14% increase of Campylobacter; a 15% increase of Vibrio; a 6% Salmonella increase; and 8% Listeria increase.

10. **Hyperinflation**. Costs are climbing for food, and for animal feed, and food prices are set for take-off (**Figure 5**). For example, the price for a whole chicken was 21% higher in December 2012, than a year earlier ("Livestock, Dairy & Poultry Outlook," USDA, February 2013). The only reason retail beef prices have not soared, is that so many ranchers and dairymen were liquidating their herds. Now the consumer price will skyrocket.

Speculation on agricultural commodities futures in Chicago is going wild. An estimated 80% of this involves "shadow bushels" and similar contracts, which are gambling bets, with no relation to real users of the commodities—wheat, corn, soybeans, etc.—for the food chain. Corn futures went from $5.50 to $8.50 a bushel from June to August last Summer on the Chicago Board of Trade.

11. **Public opinion** is becoming more and more ignorant about science and the economy, in particular, where food comes from. People are ready marks for all kinds of superstitions and manipulation. Delusions abound, including: "local markets" are a solution; eliminate grazing herds to allow the prairies to revert to their "original" state; biofuels are "renewable"; genetically modified foods will kill you; low-tech farming is more "natural." Most evil of all, is the lie that resources are fixed, and population has outstripped agriculture's ability to provide.

II. Causes of the Crisis

12. **The shift to "markets"** and monetarism—valuation in money terms—as the guiding principle for the United States, instead of physical-economic and scientific growth, can be dated to the August 1971 removal of the U.S. dollar from a fixed exchange-rate standard, launching floating currency rates, and decades of casino economics.

The concept of parity-pricing for farmers' output,

which had worked with spectacular success during the World War II years, was dismissed as "outmoded" in the 1970s. The parity-pricing principle was that, by ensuring that farmers' incomes covered their costs of production, plus a decent profit, at the same time ensured that the public would have a secure food supply.

Instead, the ruse was asserted in the 1970s, that citizens must rely for their food security on farmers responding to "market signals" to be induced to produce the right amounts and types of foods to meet national needs.

The ensuing series of five-year U.S. farm laws, in this environment, introduced ever more extreme forms of "markets" orientation for U.S. agriculture, replacing Federal responsibility for food increase. Today, we've reached the phase where markets mumbo-jumbo is expressed as "risk management" (crop insurance and hedge-betting), which ends up as the "high risk" of no food for the population.

A turning point was the 1996 "Freedom to Farm Act," known as the "Freedom to Fail." Over the decades, thousands of family-farm operations were financially ruined. Farm county populations declined; rural towns died out. The productive potential was undermined.

13. **National sovereignty was undermined** by new international treaties and organizations, directly aimed at preventing food reliability:

• **1986-1994.** The GATT Uruguay Round (UN General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), started in Punte del Este, was conducted under the theme, "One World/One Market," to coerce national governments to stop supporting their own farmers, stop using tariffs to protect their own domestic industry, stop controlling their banking, give up their right to tariffs, etc. These nation-building measures are denounced as "trade distorting."

• **1994.** The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) went into effect, making the U.S., Mexico, and Canada one market.

• **1995.** The World Trade Organization (WTO) went into operation, based on the GATT anti-nation-state tenets. There are today 158 member-nations, nominally adhering to the dogma.

14. **Deregulation and globalized ownership** of vital functions of the U.S. economy have been perpetrated in accordance with the "world markets" WTO onslaught, allowing looting and destruction, and furthering concentration of control by cartels, of such

Monsanto and a few other agro-chemical companies operate a global cartel, controlling food-crop traits, bio-techniques, and seed supplies, wrongfully claiming patent rights, on the scale of controlling the means to life.

basics as energy systems, water, and transportation, as well as food processing and distribution, and banking—euphemistically called "financial services" in WTO jargon. In the 1970s, rail and trucking were deregulated. In 2000-01, electricity deregulation began, starting in California.

In 1999, banking was deregulated by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (Financial Services Modernization Act of 1999, Pub.L. 106-102), which discontinued the 1933 Glass-Steagall law, which separated commercial from speculative banking. A year later, the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000 was signed, which discontinued the provisions of the 1936 Commodity Exchange Act, which confined futures trading to regulated venues. A frenzy of over-the-counter betting commenced, on all kinds of wild derivatives, especially credit default swaps. Huge financial bubbles ensued, as well as food-commodities futures speculation. In 2007, the inevitable blowout of the entire monetary system began.

15. **Patent rights to food seeds and lifeform genetics** were wrongfully instituted in the United States, against all stated law and tradition, over the last 40 years.

Today Monsanto is in the forefront of holding and exerting food patent rights, in the U.S. and internationally. Monsanto alone claims to supply 40% of corn and soy seeds in Brazil; and 50% in Argentina.

In 1970, the Plant Variety Protection Act started the process, by granting private "certificate" rights over food seeds, for the first time ever. In the past, new

breeds of flowers had limited protection; but never seeds for food.

In 1985, the U.S. Patent Office ruled that plants could qualify for patent-protection under the concept of the powerful industrial patent, with no exceptions for farmers or researchers.

In 1995, the Supreme Court upheld plant and animal patenting under the Utility Patent Law, no holds barred (December 2001, *JEM Ag Supply, Inc. v. Pioneer Hi-Bred International Corp.*).

The Justice Department anti-trust division has stood aside for years, while U.S. seed control was consolidated, and further, while Monsanto, Syngenta, and others have terrorized farmers, seed dealers and anyone they target. Monsanto's seed-police operations—called "field checks"—seek out situations to file lawsuits, and ruin farmers, on charges of violating its seed- and trait-license privileges.

Monsanto has a case to be heard Feb. 19 in the Supreme Court against Indiana farmer Vernon Hugh Bowman, claiming that he infringed on Monsanto's right to its "invention" of a certain soybean seed, because Bowman bought and planted seed from a grain elevator, which had obtained it in a commodity purchase from another farmer, who originally planted Monsanto seed. The "I win, you lose" implications are clear. Monsanto has reportedly filed suit and ruined farmers in 27 states; won 72 claims, with recorded judgments of $23 million against farmers.

16. **Imposition of Green ideology**. The conceptual origins of the Green movement lie in the history of eugenics and master-race "conservation," centered in the long-lived networks of the British and European oligarchy. The modern greenie actions and laws of the past five decades clearly serve to restrict farming and food. They have locked up land in the false name of "conservation," prevented water management under the excuse of preserving "biosystems," and committed many other crimes.

The core Green tenet, is that resources are fixed and running out; mankind's activities pollute and abet this, to the point of overheating the Earth. Greenism asserts that man is not a creative being, able to create the future by making scientific and technical advances to literally create new resources and potentials; man is on a par with the animals, always at risk of depleting his own ecosystem, and functioning as a "cancer" on Earth (Paul R. Ehrlich, Julian Huxley).

Following World War II, a number of organizations were founded in the U.S. to conduct pseudo-environmentalist campaigns, against farming in particular: 1946, the Conservation Foundation, Washington, D.C.; 1951, the Nature Conservancy, Washington, D.C. (originally, the Ecologists Union, 1946); 1961, World Wildlife Foundation, Washington, D.C.; 1970, Natural Resources Defense Council, New York City; 1974, World Watch Institute, Washington, D.C.

The international kick-off came with the 1972 UN Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm, and its call to assay the detrimental impact of humans on the environment. In 1982, there was the Rio de Janeiro UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), issuing an action plan to limit human impacts. In 1982, the UN General Assembly issued a World Charter for Nature. In 1988, UN agencies founded the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), to issue reports on how humans must restrict their activities in the name of cooling the overheating planet. In 1997, in Kyoto, Japan, nations met and committed to a UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, which went into effect as the Kyoto Protocol, on how to reduce so-called greenhouse gas emissions from 2008 to 2012.

In the U.S., the alien Green outlook was shopped into a series of laws and executive orders over the decades. On Jan. 1, 1970, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) went into effect, to which many future measures were added, to restrict farming and related activity, in the false name of protecting the environment. For example, in 1989, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act was passed, setting out funding for creating and retaining marshes. In 1985, the Conservation Reserve Program was begun, to take farmland out of production. The CRP, started in the 1985 farm law, took a program in the 1954 Agriculture Act, which had assisted farmers in not using highly erodible land (for 1-3 years), and instead, the CRP twisted that principle into a mass set-aside of land (for 10-15 years), as an anti-food program, done in tandem with the thwarting of NAWAPA (North American Water and Power Alliance).

Thus, the Green movement is a mind-control operation, concocted decades ago, to back monetarist measures against nations, and effect depopulation.

17. **Cancellation of NAWAPA** and other land- and water-improvement projects. The continental-scale North American Water and Power Alliance, proposed in the 1960s, for completion by 1990, was shelved,

along with other regional-scale projects, and nuclear-power-associated programs, especially nuclear-powered desalination of seawater. Today's water crisis is directly a result of this obstruction (**Figure 6**).

Had NAWAPA been built, there would have been some 52 to 62 additional million acre feet a year (MAFY), depending on supply, added to the Lower 48 states, which is 13-plus percent of the total water in use there in 2005. For Canada, the additional, organized water supplies through NAWAPA would have allowed for the full development of its rich potential as a sovereign, growing nation.

As it is, any dry spell is an automatic disaster. Today's vulnerability to weather extremes affecting agriculture is also the result of cancellation of upkeep on existing infrastructure (dams, levees, drainage systems).

The nominal arguments against NAWAPA were: 1) it is too "costly" according to money measures; and 2) it disturbs "nature," according to Green ideology.

18. **Burning food for fuel**. The most blatant cause of the immediate grain food crisis, is biofuels. At present, 42% of the U.S. corn crop is being converted to ethanol; 26% of U.S. soy oil is going into biodiesel. This represents the loss of food for millions. The Green lie, is that crops for energy are "renewable."

FIGURE 6
NAWAPA: Parsons Original Conceptual Design, ca. 1960s

The laws and orders which led up to this are straightforward, emanating from the London financial crowd, under Greenie-environmentalist ideology.

In 2002, the U.S. Sustainable Energy Act mandated the development of biofuels as a "renewable" energy source.

In 2005, the Energy Policy Act (PL 109-58) set compulsory levels for annual biofuel production.

In 2007, the Energy Independence and Security Act (PL 110-140) set higher volumes of annual biofuels production, as mandates.

In 2012, over 10% of U.S. gasoline came from corn-ethanol, causing scarcity for livestock feed, food, and exports, given the drought damage to the corn crop. The Clean Air Act has a clause—Section 211 (o)(7)—for waiving the Renewable Fuels Standards yearly mandate, in cases of emergency, but the Obama Administration refuses to do it.

(Note, regarding the quibble that byproducts—dry distillers grains/DDG—from corn-ethanol distilling, can be used for livestock feed, which, argue biofuels advocates, brings down to 25%, not 40%, the usual figure given, of the corn harvest now going for non-food use: Cancel biofuels, and *zero percent* of corn will be burned as fuel.)

19. **Demoralization of farmers** is contributing to allowing the biofuels criminality to continue. Farming communities have been emotionally pressured for de-

cades by Greenism and globalization—suffering wild price swings, debts, monopolistic markets, infrastructure decay, and the shutdown of their towns, churches, schools, and other community institutions. Whereas in the past, U.S. high-technology farmers and farm-state leaders were in the forefront of scientific/economic development and moral policy, across the board, for example, in Rural Electrification, the World War II food-output drive, and nuclear power; now, instead, cornbelt leaders, for instance, cynically defend biofuels as the only way to boost "market demand," so crop growers' output prices and incomes will remain high. They refuse to fight to restore the sovereign prerogative of our Federal government to intervene to support farmers and food, for the general good.

USDA/Steven Vaughn

In 2012, over 10% of U.S. gasoline came from corn-ethanol, causing scarcity for livestock feed, food, and exports, given the drought damage to the corn crop.

III. Deliberate Depopulation Policy

20. **The intent of depopulation**, not mere stupidity, is behind the practices which are undercutting nation-states, their physical economic development, and food production. The policy nexus responsible operates through transnational financial and political circles, centered on London, i.e., the neo-British Empire, or globalization. These are the same networks acting to keep down nations, by deliberately promoting warfare, under expedient, fabricated "concerns," such as preserving human rights, "responsibility to protect" (R2P), the threat of terrorism, etc. In 1999, Tony Blair, then British prime minister, proclaimed this globalist strife-orientation, as the "end of the Peace of Westphalia" policy. Its British imperial lineage traces back centuries, through such episodes as the 1845-49 Irish potato famine, the 1876-78 famine in India under the British East India Co., and the 1943 Bengal famine under Winston Churchill.

21. **Advocates of depopulation**, in their own words:

•**Thomas Malthus**, employee, British East India Co., 1780s: It is a postulate "that the power of population is indefinitely greater than the power in the Earth to produce subsistence for man.

"Population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio. Subsistence increases only in an arithmetical ratio.…

"This implies a strong and constantly operating check on population from the difficulty of subsistence. This difficulty must fall somewhere and must necessarily be severely felt by a large portion of mankind." Malthus recommended the spread of diseases, casting out poor newborns as superfluous, and other population-reduction measures ("An Essay on the Principle of Population," London, 1789).

• **HRH Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh,** 1980s: "You cannot keep a bigger flock of sheep than you are capable of feeding. In other words, conservation may involve culling in order to keep a balance between the relative numbers in each species within any particular habitat. I realise this is a very touchy subject, but the fact remains that mankind is part of the living world.… Every new acre brought into cultivation means another acre denied to wild species." The Prince recommends more disease, curbing human breeding and poverty. "In the event I am reborn, I would like to return as a deadly virus, in order to contribute something to solve overpopulation" (August 1988, to Deutsche Presse Agentur).

• **Bill Gates, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation**, 2000s: Gates' formulation is that fewer people are a necessity, because of global warming. He asserts that philanthropic betterment of health and agriculture will limit the number of people, so that their activities won't emit more CO_2 than the planet Earth can withstand. At a conference in 2010, he said: "The world today has 6.8 billion people. That's headed up to about 9 billion. Now, if we do a really good job on new vaccines, health care, reproductive health services, we could lower that by perhaps 10 or 15%" (speech titled, "Innovating to Zero" at a Technology, Entertainment and Design 2010

FIGURE 7

Average Iowa Corn and Soybean Prices by Marketing Year 1950-2011



Source: USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, Iowa Field Office

Conference, in Long Beach, California).

In May 2009, Gates and 10 others of the "Billionaires Club" (including George Soros, Warren Buffett, and Michael Bloomberg) held a private confab in New York City to discuss "charity" activities to shrink population.

• **British Royal Society,** 2012: Its report, "People and the Planet" (May) asserts that, to avoid "a downward spiral of economic and environmental ills," the world's population of 7 billion, and its consumption must be cut. Praising the Royal Society "analysis," **Paul Ehrlich** (Stanford University and longtime "theorist" of British population reduction, starting with *The Population Bomb* in 1972), summarized its message more forthrightly than the report: "How many [people] you support depends on lifestyles. We came up with 1.5 to 2 billion because you can't have big active cities and wilderness. If you want a battery chicken world where everyone has minimum space and food and everyone is kept just about alive, you might be able to support in the long term about 4 or 5 billion people. But you already have 7 billion. So we have to humanely and as rapidly as possible move to population shrinkage…" (Ehrlich, in the *Guardian*, April 26, 2012).

22. **Barack Obama's actions** to carry out the depopulation agenda, are crimes on behalf of alien British globalism, constituting grounds for impeachment. **Tony Blair** was an official advisor to Obama in 2012. Operatives from the Gates Foundation are in key positions throughout the Obama Administration, including Rajiv Shah, director of USAID (at Gates Foundation 2002-09); **David Lane**, U.S. Ambassador to the UN Rome agencies, including the Food and Agriculture Organization (at Gates Foundation, 2001-07). Obama made Monsanto man **Robert Beachey** (former president of Danforth Plant Science Center, supported by the Monsanto Fund) head of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

In brief:

More food-for-fuel, bioproducts. The Obama Administration is continuing, even expanding, the use of food for biofuels, at a time of extreme food shortages and bad weather (**Figure 7**). On Nov. 16, 2012, the Environmental Protection Agency summarily denied the appeal to waive, even partially, the yearly mandate for ethanol, made by an unprecedented combination of nine governors, and dozens of groups representing livestock, processing, restaurant, grocery, and other food interests. The EPA statement said it "determined that no harm" would come from continuing biofuels.

In fact, what has come to pass is exactly what 12 livestock organizations warned of on July 30, 2012, in their appeal for a biofuels suspension: "The drought-induced reduction in the corn supply [2012-13] means that the mandated utilization of corn for renewable fuels will so reduce the supply of corn and increase its price that livestock and poultry producers will be forced to reduce the size of their herds and flocks, causing some to go out of business and jobs to be lost…."

In June 2012, the EPA legalized public sales pf E15 (gasoline with 15% ethanol), up from the current E10 blend.)

On Dec. 3, 2012, the Obama EPA announced its approval of grain sorghum as a feedstock under the Renewable Fuels Standard of the 2007 biofuels law. In January 2013, the Obama Administration extended the biodiesel tax incentive program for two years, retroactive to January 2012, which will consume more soybeans. This Winter, the Obama USDA reiterated full

EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

In June 2012, the EPA legalized public sales pf E15 (gasoline with 15% ethanol), up from the current E10 blend), thus removing yet more food from Americans' dinner tables.

support to expanding the Obama Biobased Products program across the board, and announced new R&D grants on ways to divert agriculture capacity for for non-food use.

Refusal to support farmers, food supply. The Obama Administration refuses to intervene to prevent the loss of dairy farms in California and elsewhere, the loss of cattle herds, poultry flocks, and downscaling of hog operations. His Administration is allowing unprecedented consolidation and downsizing of slaughtering and food-processing capacity.

Obama's USDA chief economist Dr. Joe Glauber says the U.S. agriculture economy "is strong," because "in aggregate," farm incomes are at new record highs, "in nominal terms." He refers to high row crop prices (corn, soybeans), because of ethanol and scarcity (testimony to the Senate, Feb. 14, 2013). The Obama Administration will not set floor/parity-based prices for the output of farmers and ranchers, to support farm incomes, tamp down price swings, and in particular, set up contingency mechanisms to hold up corn growers' prices, for when corn-ethanol is stopped—because Obama opposes all this.

The Landsat program, for monitoring Earth from space, has barely been preserved; key weather satellite programs are being eliminated. The Obama Green downgrade to more wind, solar, and biomass energy is jeopardizing economic life. Along with opposing full-scale restoration of nuclear power, the Obama Administration has drastically cut fusion power research funding.

Prevention of Glass-Steagall. In 2010, the Obama White House intervened to prevent Congress from considering and acting on bills to reinstate Glass-Steagall, and instead shoved in the dud Dodd-Frank law, a companion to the multi-trillions of Federal bailouts given to Wall Street/City of London banks, from the Bush Presidency through to the present. Obama repeated in October 2012, "There is no evidence that having Glass-Steagall in place would somehow change the dynamic…" (*Rolling Stone*, Oct. 25 interview).

Hyperinflation. The Obama Administration refuses to ban agro-commodity speculation on the Chicago Board of Trade, and other futures and derivatives exchanges, and put on food and feed price caps and controls where necessary at points in the food chain. Obama's actions have set the stage for out-of-control food hyperinflation and chaos in the coming months.

IV. Re-Assert Sovereignty, Cancel the Famine Agenda

23. **The threefold recovery program** for the United States, to end monetarist destruction and restore the economy, is based on re-activating national sovereignty:

(a) **Glass-Steagall**. Immediately, re-instate the 1933 Glass-Steagall law, which separated commercial banking from speculative finance. This will outlaw the protection of gambling as part of our Federally insured banking system, terminating the hyperinflationary bailouts. The bill is ready to go in the House of Representatives, as HR 129 (The Return to Prudent Banking Act of 2013), which in 2012 had garnered co-sponsors (as HR 1489). HR 129 has 15.

(b) **Re-establish ample credit**. Once the banking system is again sound, the Federal government shall issue credit to amply supply nation-serving projects and purposes, including grants and loans to now-bankrupt state and local governments, to enable them to carry out their vital functions.

(c) **Launch the necessary nation-building projects,** foremost of which is NAWAPA XXI, the updated version of the 1960s, Kennedy-era North American Water and Power Alliance. The concept diverts a portion of Arctic-flowing water from the Northwest of our continent, southward through Canada, the western

FIGURE 8
NAWAPA XXI

United States, and as far South as Mexico. This 20-year plan not only alleviates drought, and regulates flows for navigation and all purposes, but creates upwards of 6 million jobs in the U.S., and a demand for heavy manufacturing inputs and a skilled workforce once again. The rolls of 48 million poor Americans dependent on food relief will shrink to zero. Canada and Mexico will prosper.

In tandem with launching NAWAPA XXI (**Figure 8**), start up the other priority tasks, including refurbishing the entire inland waterway system; building storm-surge barriers at key coastal sites, and resuming the development of nuclear energy as the power platform for the future.

24. **Nullify the WTO! Return to collaboration among sovereign nations**. Restoring a future-building focus to the United States opens the way for beneficial relations with other nations, especially Russia, China, and India. The raft of wrongful globalist obligations can be swept aside, beginning with the WTO, making way for mutual-interest trade, and collaboration on intercontinental projects. The multinational cartels dominating food, chemicals, fuels, minerals, and other critical commodities, can be curbed and broken up. In particular, the "intellectual property rights" policing of cartel-owned patent rights to crop and lifeform genetics must cease.

25. **Cancel biofuels**. Institute floor prices—based on the parity principle—for corn and other commodities, to support farm and ranch capacity, to go all-out for plentiful food and fiber. Parity-pricing, as introduced and demonstrated under the Franklin Roosevelt Administration, will support a steady situation for young farmers, and generation-to-generation family-scale farming, instead of the current get-big-or-get-out global-marketing pressure, where farm-syndicates, connected to cartels, end up controlling the food chain and the use of the land.

In the very short term, collaborate with other nations on how to muster the needed emergency rations, to relieve hunger anywhere and everywhere in the world, while economic potential is built up.

marciabaker@larouchepub.com

NASA

The Landsat program, for monitoring Earth from space, has barely been preserved, and key weather satellite programs are being eliminated, as a result of the Obama-Green anti-science agenda.

Asteroid, Financial Blowout Redefine Strategic Threat

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Feb. 17—Between the admission by Bill Gross, the head of PIMCO, the world's largest bond trading company, that the world is facing a "financial supernova," and the events of Feb. 15, when a surprise meteorite explosion over Russia coincided with a near-Earth asteroid pass, the world has entered a new strategic universe.

Most importantly, prominent scientists, led by the Russians, have made clear that there is now a common mission for mankind: to defend the Earth against asteroids, meteors, and comets, which are far more prevalent in our environment than the vast majority care to consider. U.S.-Russian collaboration to this end, of the same type originally proposed in 1983 by President Ronald Reagan with his Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), is now urgent—but it cannot be accomplished without a restructuring of the global financial system, starting with the imposition of Glass-Steagall in the United States.

One of the dangers stemming from the trans-Atlantic bubble and the moves toward U.S.-Russian collaboration—which the British played the crucial role in sabotaging back in 1983—is that the London-centered financial oligarchy will speed up the timetable for war and dictatorship to defend their ever-more-fragile grip on power.

European sources have confirmed that they believe a major financial event has already occurred, and that central bankers are desperately attempting to cover up the damage by releasing a new "wall of money." One London insider noted that Italy's Monte dei Paschi di Siena scandal has already drawn in Germany's huge Deutsche Bank and Wall Street's JP Morgan Chase, and that the buildup of scandals against the big City of London banks—the Libor scandal and recent revelations of massive drug and terror money laundering by HSBC and Standard and Chartered—has put the financial elites on the defensive.

Under these fragile circumstances, the buildup of military confrontations in Southwest Asia and the Asia-Pacific has taken on more ominous strategic dimensions in recent days.

Russia Issues New Warnings

This was highlighted in a number of statements by top Russian government officials, warning about the spread of regional conflicts. Russia's UN Ambassador Vitaly Churkin this week warned the United States that any plans for military action against Iran to halt the country's purported nuclear weapons efforts, would only guarantee that Iran, in self-defense, would aggressively seek a nuclear deterrent. He also warned that Qatar's continuing gun-running to Syrian rebels was driving that situation towards a regional conflict and beyond.

At a major defense-policy review session, sponsored by the State Duma and the Regional Council, on Feb. 14, Gen. Valery Gerasimov, the new Chief of Staff of the Russian Armed Forces, provided a detailed review of Russia's defense modernization program, while warning of the spread of regional conflicts and the likelihood of perpetual wars around the globe, fought over natural resources.

At the same time, discussions between the Russians and NATO members on the U.S. ballistic missile defense shield that threatens Russia's defenses, have hit a brick wall. On Feb. 15, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Alexei Meshkov reiterated that Moscow continues to insist on U.S. and NATO written guarantees that their missile defense systems will not be aimed at Russia's strategic potential. If damage is done to Russia in the process of carrying out the U.S. missile defense program, Russia will take asymmetric measures, he said.

Pacific Tinderbox

In the Asia-Pacific, North Korea's announcement Feb. 12 that it had conducted an underground nuclear test, just months after the D.P.R.K. successfully launched a satellite, put the issue of regional security back in the headlines. Although the D.P.R.K. informed both the Chinese and American governments in advance of the test, Pyongyang's latest step towards obtaining a deployable nuclear bomb has raised the specter of a regional nuclear arms race. It is no secret that both Japan and South Korea each has the ability to build a nuclear bomb in a very short period of time. President Obama contacted his Japanese and South Korean counterparts by phone soon after the North Korean underground detonation, and assured both countries that the United States continued to maintain a nuclear umbrella over the region.

In a sharply worded editorial, the official Chinese news agency Xinhua wrote on Feb. 18 that China would not serve as Washington's "deputy sheriff" in the region, noting that the U.S. policy of aggressive sanctions and threats against the D.P.R.K. had lawfully driven North Korean rulers to seek a nuclear deterrent. A number of leading voices in South Korea and the United States have proposed that North Korea should be openly admitted into the nuclear club, noting that Pyongyang would never launch a nuclear attack, since it would mean instant obliteration in a retaliatory strike, and that a recognized, nuclear-armed North Korea would add stability to the region.

Washington intelligence sources report that the D.P.R.K. has privately approached U.S. officials with a proposal to resume the Six-Party Talks on nuclear disarmament and other regional security matters.

Lyndon LaRouche on Feb. 18 warned that the world is precariously close to a thermonuclear war. He explained that, while no one is openly scheming for such a war of extinction, the momentum towards regional conflicts, centered in Eurasia, could easily lead to a global confrontation. LaRouche noted that every major war, since the ouster of German Chancellor Bismarck in 1890, escalated from more limited conflicts, that quickly spiralled out of control. In every instance, the very forces that should have been pressing for war avoidance, fell into the trap of escalating the conflict, until the point that no side could back down.

Not for the first time since the advent of thermonuclear weapons, we are nearing such a break-point today, LaRouche warned.

Cosmic Shock

The Feb. 15 asteroid near-Earth flyby and the nearly simultaneous meteor explosion over the industrial Chelyabinsk region of Russia has caused a shock to the system that could be a blessing from heaven.

The meteor explosion, as it passed through the Earth's atmosphere, was about 25 times the size of the Hiroshima nuclear bomb, and injured more than 1,000 people. Had such a meteor impact occured over a large city, the loss of life and damage would have been immense.

The issue of Strategic Defense of the Earth (SDE) from such asteroids, meteors, and comets has now suddenly become a matter of urgency for all of mankind.

At a United Nations conference on the peaceful uses of space taking place in Vienna, Austria Feb. 11-22, scientists from around the world were confronted with the unexpected meteor event in Russia, which poses new scientific questions and challenges. The issue of SDE, which has been promoted by top Russian officials, is now gaining international traction, as it becomes clear that the world is not at all prepared to deal with this growing threat.

SDE is an expansion of the original Strategic Defense Initiative, promoted by LaRouche beginning in the late 1970s, and fully embraced by President Reagan in his March 23, 1983 nationwide television address. By the late 1980s, due to the Soviet leadership's intransigence, and sabotage from within the U.S. political establishment, the SDI was, in effect, killed, and along with it, much of the vital work of NASA was virtually shut down.

This week's events—the warnings of a hyperinflationary blowout and the asteroid flyby—call for a radical paradigm-shift in policy, beginning with the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall, to pave the way for a revival of NASA's mission, starting with an acceleration of Mars exploration and the charting of Near-Earth Objects.

Cheminade on French TV

Only a Glass-Steagall Policy Will Succeed

by Christine Bierre

Feb. 19 (PARIS)—On Feb. 12, the very day that the French National Assembly started its first reading of a bill for a very mild separation of banking activities, Jacques Cheminade, the LaRouche co-thinker who has become the reference point in France for a Glass-Steagall policy of strict separation between investment and commercial banks, was one of seven guests participating in Frédéric Taddeï's popular national TV talk show, "This Evening or Never."

Six out of the seven participants were favorable to some form of banking separation. Defending the government's version was Valérie Rabault, a parliamentary deputy and vice chairman of the Financial Commission of the National Assembly, close collaborator of Karine Berger, who submitted the government's bill to Parliament. The others were François Lenglet, a financial journalist who heads the French desk of TV channel France 2; Myret Zaki, a Swiss financial journalist; Olivier Berruyer, a risk manager who is part of a network which has recently supported a strict banking separation, but within a monetarist system; Edgar Morin, a philosopher and sociologist. Representing the banking lobby was Marc Touatti, a former analyst with the highly speculative Natexis bank, and with Global Equities, until the end of 2012.

After a brief introduction on the banking separation being proposed now in several European countries, Taddeï shot his first question at Rabault: Why isn't the government proposing a strict separation of banks?

Rabault insisted that the merits of the French government plan are: 1) It makes France the first country to enact a law, while the American Dodd-Frank Act, which purports to forbid proprietary trading (under the "Volcker Rule") is "inapplicable," with its 3,000 pages of regulations; and the British Vickers Commission model of separation of banking activities will only be applied in 2019; and 2) it introduces the principle that no public money will be used to bail out speculative activities; these will be isolated in a subsidiary operating within a universal bank. "The subsidiaries will not be supported; if they get into trouble, too bad for them; the stockholders will bear the brunt."

Swiss analyst Miret Zaki countered, "How will a bank control a subsidiary that operates in London or New York? Take the example of UBS America: Its headquarters in Zurich had no idea of the speculative activities that were going on in its trading rooms in New York or Stanford, nor did the Swiss regulatory authorities." The Swiss government was forced to save these banks, she said, just as the American taxpayer had to foot the bill for the U.S. government bailout of Citigroup's "outside" balance sheets, when those elements went into bankruptcy.

Other panelists pointed out that, as bankers have happily recognized in various interviews, the activities that will be included in the subsidiary represent no more than 0.75% or perhaps 2% of the total transactions of the universal banks!

Touatti, the only panelist hostile to banking separation, shamelessly proclaimed that "if there was no bankruptcy in France during this crisis, it was precisely

Jacques Cheminade on TV Feb. 12: How can we expect reform from those who caused the crisis in the first place?

because the investment banks were attached to commercial banks," giving the example of his former employer, Natexis, which was saved from bankrupty by Banques Populaires.

"What of it?" asked Taddeï, leading into a new round of attacks by participants against the bailout policy. Berruyer noted that "the money of depositors is not there to sponge up the debts of traders. If they do God knows what, they should take their losses." Zaki blasted the bankers' arguments that they fully reimbursed the State for the bailout money, and even enriched it, because of the high interest rates on the loans. "No," said Zaki, "because there was an incredible recessionary shock between 2007-10, and the enormous indebtedness of governments comes from that recessionary shock caused by speculative finance." Lenglet noted that the Irish government, for instance, increased its debt by 30% in order to bail out its banks.

Cheminade: What's Lacking Is Will

But only Cheminade addressed the problem with full authority, by putting on the table the need for a strict Glass-Steagall standard, many years ago, and especially during the 2012 Presidential campaign, in which he was one of nine candidates.

Cheminade denounced those who, from behind the scenes, are blocking any progress on this policy in the country. "I met M. Ramon Fernandez when he was advising M. Sarkozy, and he is still Director of the Treasury," he said. "I told him my view of how the crisis would unfold, and he answered that there was no need to worry, that finances are a zero sum game, and we will always find the needed counterparties; . . . the agents of the system are wise enough to self-regulate; . . . we have enough shock absorbers in Europe that we can call upon to deal with the crisis." We saw that all that was wrong, said Cheminade.

The real problem, he continued, is "how can we entrust the needed reforms to people who are part of the system, part of the high-level financial hierarchies of France, who saw nothing coming?" He pointed to the traditional ideological problems of French banking, quoting Jean Zay, former minister in the Popular Front government (1936-39), who said, "There is one thing one cannot do in France, and that is to question the power of financiers, who, on the one hand, defend the myth of budget orthodoxy, and on the other, let the banks do whatever they want. There is a total contradiction in that."

Cheminade also addressed the incestuous relations among high-level civil servants, financial powers, and elected officials at all levels. "The problem," he said, "is who are we hiring to analyze a situation and to reform it? The 'experts' of that same world. The Committee on Financial Regulation and Systemic Risk, which was chosen for consultations on the reform, is made up of bankers. Then, these people become 'experts,' judges, advisors to legislators, and even sometimes legislators themselves" (a thinly veiled attack against Rabaul, an economist who, until 2011, headed the Prospective and Market Risk Studies Department of a major universal bank, BPPParibas).

"A whole system is put into place where nobody sees anything coming, and it's considered normal; they have a view from within the system, and people who are coming from outside do what they can. . . . Karine Berger and Valérie Rabault did what they could, but they were forced to think from within a closed circuit. Karine Berger says, sure we are only placing 0.75-2% of the speculative activities inside the subsidiary, but I am giving you a pair of scissors, so that you can cut and paste more speculative activities into the subsidiary [by parliamentary amendments]. I fear that if we stay within the system, that pair of scissors will become nothing more than a paper cutter or a nail clipper!"

Cheminade recommended that listeners read the Angelides Report of the Bipartisan Commission on Financial Regulation of the U.S. Congress, calling it "the best analysis existing today on the crisis." He also attacked the claim, often made by French Finance Minister Pierre Moscovici, that there are no current legislative efforts to reinstate a full Glass-Steagall separation of banks. Cheminade reported on HR 129 of U.S. Reps. Marcy Kaptur and Walter Jones, currently before the U.S. Congress, as well as the debate on the issue within the Iceland government.

The only solution "is an international agreement to go for a policy of public credit," he concluded. "France must defend it; we had it after the war, in the form of the National Credit Council, a national bank, and without savings or rent, we rebuilt France. Roosevelt did the same thing in the U.S. in his time. We can do it, if we have the will to do so; but what is lacking the most today is the will to do something new." Where perils grow, there also grows that which can save us from those perils, he said. This is the time to do so.

Norton Mezvinsky

The Destructive Effects Of Religious Extremisms

Prof. Norton Mezvinsky is president of the International Council for Middle East Studies in Washington, D.C., and professor emeritus at Central Connecticut State University. He addressed a conference of the Schiller Institute in New York City on Jan. 26, 2013. Other speeches from the conference have appeared in the last several issues of EIR.

EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

I thank the Schiller Institute for inviting me to participate in this conference. Having listened attentively to the talks by Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Bruce Fein, and having read the papers delivered at the event at the previous Schiller Institute conference in Germany, I think I understand, and I certainly appreciate, the theme of, and emphasis upon, the need for the paradigm change in our world, in order to stop further chaos and destruction, and to move forward in advancing civilization.

Although many people believe that when most of us grow older, we become more pessimistic, *I*, having recently turned 80, feel not only younger in age, but also increasingly optimistic. Optimistic! [applause] Well, after that applause, let me say that, given what I shall attempt to present to you today, you may think that my statement of optimism is at odds with my presentation. Especially when combined with what Helga Zepp-LaRouche, whom I greatly respect, has presented today.[1]

My area of focus will be on what I term the Middle East, or, more precisely put, Southwest Asia/North Africa. The Middle East, as I use the term, means, of course, the Arab nation-states and the state of Israel. My thesis is that paradigm change, developing from humane movement and economic development, such as that proposed by Hussein Askary at the recent Schiller Institute conference in Germany,[2] and especially today, by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, will be greatly hindered, if not blocked, in the foreseeable future, unless and until expanding religious extremism on various sides is reversed, at least in regard to many of its differing aspects.

I do not say this as an enemy of religion in general, but rather as someone who puts high value on many religious principles, and also as someone who is a member of a Lubavitch Hasidic Jewish congregation, that I, as a member, regard, on balance, as being in the extreme category.

In the few minutes allotted to my presentation, I can, at best, only make a few general points, that will hopefully be seriously considered, and prompt further discussion.

Islamic Extremism

It is perhaps unfortunately not difficult to specify the negative—and that is an understatement—aspects of religious extremism. Obviously, violent extremists, who commit terrorist acts within the context of their interpretation of Islam, first of all, and under their own banners of Islam, however wrong they may be, are killing and wounding human beings, and destroying living essentials. They impede positive development; they are oppressive; they threaten further chaos and destruction. Not only has this been the case in the Middle East in the

1. "Helga Zepp-LaRouche: A New Paradigm To Save Mankind," *EIR*, Feb. 1, 2012.

2. Hussein Askary, "A Revolutionary Development Plan for the Near and Middle East," *EIR*, Dec. 7, 2012.

recent time period, and the not so recent past; it is the case today, from Yemen to Algeria, in Iraq, Libya, and other places, and both the numbers of these extreme militants, and their actions, are increasing.

If we go beyond the Middle East, moreover, into Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Mali, we see more violent actions, terrorism, more killing, more wounding, more destruction, certainly impeding any positive advancements, really any planning, of economic development.

The worst situation in the Middle East presently, as you all know, is Syria. The fastest-growing al-Qaeda is presently in Syria. This terrorist group, using the cover name Jabhat al-Nusra al-Qaeda, has probably become the most lethal element in the opposition to the al-Assad brutal dictatorship. For al-Qaeda, Assad and the Alawis are good targets, since many Sunni Muslims believe the Alawis are a divisionist sect of Islam, which should be suppressed. Jihadist websites every day are saying that new al-Qaeda martyrs, from many countries, have died in, but are continuing to come to Syria—from Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and elsewhere.

The longer the war continues, the more al-Qaeda will benefit from chaos and sectarian polarization. The number of deaths in the Syrian civil war is now well over 60,000—maybe up to 70,000. The number of people displaced, and those who are refugees, is estimated in the many millions, in a country that had a population of 21 million when this started less than two years ago. The situation grows worse every day.

If and when the Assad regime collapses, moreover, the extreme militants are likely to have a major foothold in Syria. That, of course, will be a major problem.

Egypt, the largest Arab country, is a different case. Only yesterday, there were again demonstrations, especially in Cairo, and some violence in the streets, because many Egyptians, who forged a revolution, were reacting against Islamists in the government, whom the people in the street believe, with some justification, were trying to impose a version of Islamic law that would impede, from their perspective—which is probably a correct perspective—positive progress and development in building a new, more democratic government, and a better economy and society.

Positive development in Egypt is at a standstill. If anything, this large but poor country is presently moving backward.

There should be no doubt that governments and individuals from countries outside the Middle East, have contributed to the increase in religious extremism, and to the growing number of militants in the Arab Middle East. These countries include Britain, France, Russia, Iran, and China, in addition to the United States. My greatest concern in this regard is with the United States.

Successive United States governments have, by their actions, often made already bad situations in the Middle East worse. Iraq is, of course, one of the leading examples.

It is definitely easier to justify the problem of Arab religious extremism, a lot easier to do that, than it is to propose what should be done to promote change. Prof. John Olin IV of the University of Virginia wrote an interesting op-ed article that was published in the *New York Times*, on Jan. 6, in which he argued that Islamism is winning out in the Arab Middle East and elsewhere, because it is the deepest and widest channel into which today's Arab discontent can flow. Islamism, from Olin's perspective, especially the somewhat less violent type advocated by the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, has provided a coherent narrative about what ails Muslim society, and where the cure lies.

Far from rendering Islamism unnecessary, as some experts had forecast, the Arab Spring has increased its credibility. The Islamists, after all, have long condemned the corrupt regimes that they have said are destined to fall. The backing and support of corrupt regimes by the United States and other countries, in addition to specific United States military actions that Bruce Fein mentioned,[3] have resulted, as you know, in numerous deaths and other damage to the civilian population. This has, of course, clearly aided the growth and expansion of extreme and militant Islamism. That such supportive actions should be stopped, is almost certainly a necessity.

Jewish Extremism

I wish to turn now to another and different type of religious extremism in the Middle East, which hinders positive progress, and threatens further chaos and destruction. This is a religious extremism that I know very well personally. I have lived partially within its framework, even in opposition to it, for most of my life. I am here referring to Jewish religious extremism.

I underline and emphasize that this Jewish religious extremism stems from only a few of the many interpre-

3. "Bruce Fein: What Is Mankind As a Species?" *EIR*, Feb. 8, 2013.

A faceoff on the occupied West Bank between an Israeli soldier and a Palestinian. The most militant Jewish settlers want to expand the settlements, with violence if necessary, in the belief that God gave the land to the Jews.

tations of the religion of Judaism, and is actually opposed, on balance, by a majority of Jews. This Jewish religious extremism, nevertheless, is influential and dangerous, within the context of the Palestinian-Israeli, Arab-Israeli conflict, and that conflict, as I am sure you know, has, for over six decades, threatened, and at times thwarted, peace and positive advancement in the Middle East. That conflict has resulted in wars, loss of life on many sides, destruction, and confiscation of land, continued oppression by the state of Israel of the indigenous Palestinian population, and lack of security for Israeli Jews.

The Jewish religious extremists to whom I am referring are ultra-Orthodox Jews, whose views and positions are certainly based upon traditional Judaism. Numerous other Orthodox Jews, who may disagree on some points, and many other Jews, who are neither Orthodox nor even religious, support many of the positions and actions of these people. Certainly, some other Jews, even a few other ultra-Orthodox Jews, both inside and outside of the state of Israel, do oppose the positions and actions of the ultra-Orthodox Jews to whom I am referring.

These ultra-Orthodox Jews either are themselves, or are fully supportive of, the most militant Jewish settlers in the West Bank. Those settlers are supported and maintained by the current Israeli government, as well as having been supported by previous governments. The position, or, better put, the belief upon which these ultra-Orthodox Jews base their actions, which are sometimes violent, is that the entire area of present-day Israel, as well as some of the adjacent area, is the holy land that God promised to the Jews. They want Jewish settlements expanded in this area of the West Bank, with violence, if necessary.

There is no question of their belief; it's a matter of theology. And now I want to get a bit deeper into this. Because it's the theology, in a sense, that is terribly important.

These are not ideas that these people have, ideas of this world only. These are ideas that form a deep belief. This is among Jews, but I'm sure you also know, that if we take other groups of people, in other religions, people have unfortunately similar kinds of views.

Traditional Judaism, beginning in the post-Biblical literature, promotes the idea that the divine choice of the Jewish people, God's choice, is "a cosmic act that grants superiority to Jews." In medieval times, this concept was developed more in traditional Judaic theological texts. Within the dualistic approach of the Kabbalah, with its distinction between sanctity and impurity, the non-Jew was often presented as part of the other side. The dualistic concept of the distinction between the divine soul of the Jew, and the animal-like soul of Gentile, became a prominent element of much of this literature.

Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, who was the great patron saint of the Lubavicher Hasidic Jews, of which I said already I belong to one of those congregations, he believed and added—it's not my view—he believed and added to the above differentiation between Jews and non-Jews. And what he said not only represents this one grouping of ultra-Orthodox Jews; it really is within the basis of traditional Judaism. He actually quoted something called the *Book of Tanya*, which is holy scripture for these ultra-Orthodox Jews, and he said, I'm quoting it, "There is a qualitative difference between the soul of the Jew, and the soul of all other ethnicities. The latter possess an animal soul (*nefesh ha-bahamit*), which is located in the left chamber of the heart, whereas the former is endowed with the divine soul (*nefesh ha-elohit*), the spark that emanates from the light of the infinite God, and is located in the brain, as well as in the right chamber of the heart."

Another current rabbi, who is a spokesperson for these people, Yitzchak Ginsburg, has continued to

expand and develop some of those theological approaches. For example, "The Gentile is created, but the Jew is part of divinity itself." He claims, within the context really of, unfortunately, traditional Judaism, that while the Jews are the chosen people, and were created in God's image, the Gentiles do not have this status, and are therefore effectively considered sub-human.

Accordingly, for example, the Commandment, "You shall not murder," does not apply to the killing of a Gentile, since "You shall not murder" relates to the murder of a human, while for Ginsburg, and for many of these ultra-Orthodox Jews, the Gentiles do not constitute human beings.

Now again, this kind of theology is certainly not the theology of the majority of Jews. In fact, if we take Israel, as many of you know, the estimates are that about 75% of Israeli Jews are not religious, let alone, not being traditional Jews who believe in this kind of ultra-Orthodox theology. But even secular Israelis—not all of them, some goodly number of them—still support actions, activities, of the ultra-Orthodox, who therefore have a good deal more influence on the Israeli government and what Israel does, than they should have—well, from the point of view of their numbers.

And that's not the case just today. That has been the case.

Christian Zionism

Now if I then for a moment, go to a companion group, outside of Judaism—not Jews, but a companion group of these ultra-Orthodox—I go to evangelical Christian Zionists in the United States. Well, they don't have the same theology; they don't have the same theology at all. But they have a theology that, from my perspective, is equally horrendous, and that's why they fully and totally support, fully and totally, the state of Israel. They believe, as I'm sure some of you know, that before the Second Coming of Jesus, Jews must have, and will have, either full control of the Holy Land, or some of these Christian Zionists believe, they should be the only inhabitants of the Holy Land.

We have different estimates on their numbers. There was recently an op-ed in the *New York Times* that said evangelical Christian Zionists numbered 20 million in the United States—that's a large number. My research indicates that evangelical Christian Zionists probably number twice that many. And they fully back the state of Israel, but, more importantly, they have created one of the major lobbies in this country. My view is that their lobby, in terms of influence, is at least as effective as the so-called Israel lobby, headed by AIPAC [American Israel Public Affairs Committee] in Washington, and maybe in many ways even more effective, largely because of their numbers, and even including some members of Congress who are part of that group.

Now, in terms of their theology, that's something that they fully and totally believe. Let me just give you this one example. Three years ago, when I was in Israel doing some research on Christian Zionism, I first went to some of my relatives, who happened to be among the most right-wing Israeli Jews you can find. How do they view me, since I've been an anti-Zionist all my adult life? I'll tell you. They say, "Norton"—they still call me a boy, I'm 80 now, but—"Norton is a good Jewish boy, from a good Jewish family, with a good Jewish heart. He just has some wrong ideas."

Anyway, I stay with them when I go back to Israel, part of the time. I asked them what they thought about these Christian Zionists, because, at least since the 1990s, every Israeli prime minister, publicly, usually at the annual conference they have in Jerusalem—Israeli prime ministers have stood up and said, "You are our best friends in the world." And by the way, there's a lot of truth to that. Because that's the most effective lobby in the United States. That's most important for this state, and for the kind of oppression that this state exerts upon the Palestinians.

So I went to my friends, relatives, some of them, and I said: You must know about their theology, because also in their theology, they believe that before the Second Coming, there's going to be an Anti-Christ first, and then most of the people who call themselves Christians, as well as others, are going to follow the Anti-Christ, and then there's going to be Armageddon. What's Armageddon? The mother of all holocausts, that's going to wipe all these people out. And these Christian Zionists, with an exception or two, as I'll mention momentarily, say that in Armageddon, all but 144,000 people who are Jews, will also be killed. They're supporting all these Jews—5.7 million by the last census, Jews in the state of Israel; maybe 15 million worldwide. But they say only 144,000 will be saved.

Where did they get that number? They say they get it from the Book of Revelations! I couldn't find it in the

"The younger generation," said Mezvinsky, "especially in this day and age, which is a different day, and a different age from years in the not-too-far-distant past—that's where the hope lies."

Book of Revelations, but I know what they do. They take the 12 tribes, multiply by 12, and that's 144, and they add three zeroes.

So, of course, the answer I got from my relatives—you get this from almost any Israeli Jew, same answer; it didn't surprise me, but I wanted to hear it—they said, "We consider that theology to be nonsense. Nonsense!" But, of course, as an uncle of mine said, "We're Machiavellian. Look at all the help they give us. Now, we can understand that."

Then I went to three different groups of Christian Zionists who were then in Israel—well, they were all united, but they were separate. They come for periods of time, one month, two months, six months. I went to the three groups, and I asked the same question. I said, "Do you know? You must know, but do you know the views that Israeli Jews, including people in the government, have of your theology?" Now, this is my point. As one of the leaders told me when I asked the question, before I ever used this word, which I got from my relatives—he said to me, "We know they consider our theology nonsense, but we're not supporting them because we're taking orders from them; we're taking orders from [points heavenward]." And that's what he did.

Now, obviously my point, and I'm going to conclude on this, is that when we have groups of people, be they Muslims, be they Jews, or be they Christians—probably other religions as well, but these are the three religious groups that I'm concerned with here—when we have people like that, who sincerely believe that they have the Word of God, and that what they believe, and that what they're doing, all of that comes from God, that's a huge problem. And that's what tends to make me, I don't say pessimistic, for the near future, but that's what tends to thwart my optimism.

Educate the Younger Generation

But I do want to conclude on this note. I'm willing to pick it up from what Bruce Fein said, towards the end, when you said, the most important thing that you would advocate is education. You advocated gaining of knowledge and so on. I want to emphasize that. I'm worried I've been too brief, but I tried to make a point. And I can tell you that even the kinds of people that I've just described, even though they are very devout, I have found, just by my own experience, some by others too, that when you sit and confront many of them, and talk with them, you at least will put questions in their minds.

And so the one thing I would add to what he said, which I'm sure Bruce Fein and the rest of you would agree with, is that the emphasis needs to be, in terms of trying to put different thoughts, if not question marks, in people's minds, to increase knowledge. The emphasis should be on the younger generation. The younger generation, especially in this day and age, which is a different day, and a different age from years in the not-too-far-distant past—that's where the hope lies.

Obama Still on the Hook for Drone Killings, Benghazi

by Nancy Spannaus

Feb. 18—President Obama has only himself to blame for the fact that his choices for heading the CIA (John Brennan), the Department of Defense (Chuck Hagel), and now the Central Military Command (Gen. Lloyd Austin) are currently all on hold, as the U.S. Senate goes on a week-long recess. The "issue" blocking all the confirmations is the withholding of crucial documents by the Obama White House, along with its refusal to answer questions about its blatantly unconstitutional policies.

This point was made explicit during the Feb. 14 debate in the Senate, over whether the confirmation vote on the the President's nominee for Defense Secretary, former Sen. Chuck Hagel (R-Neb.), could go forward. The Senators want answers from Obama.

There are two broad areas of questioning on the table. One is the White House's killer drone policy, which has been responsible for killing U.S. citizens abroad, in clear violation of the U.S. Constitution. The other is the still unexplained set of circumstances around the Sept. 11, 2012 terrorist attack on the U.S. mission in Benghazi, Libya, and the coverup which followed. In both cases, the Obama Administration is dragging its feet, while applying behind-the-scenes pressure to get its way. So far, it hasn't worked.

What's at stake is far more than the fate of the nominees; it's Constitutional government itself. For, if the President of the United States can get away with carrying out a secret kill policy, including against Americans, he is asserting Hitler-like powers contrary to everything the U.S. founding principles prescribed. And if he is to be permitted to cover up for an alliance with known al-Qaeda terrorists—as in the Libyan assassination of Amb. Chris Stevens and three other Americans—the President will be exerting license to act as a traitor to the United States.

The Drone Killingss

The pressure being applied to the White House on the question of the drone killings, is coming from both sides of the aisle. From the Democratic side, Senators Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) and Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), member and chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, respectively, are insisting on the release of *all* the memos that have been produced by the Justice Department on the "legality" of the drone killing policy. Feinstein issued a letter Feb. 13, reiterating the demand, which she reported had been joined by the ranking member of the Committee, Sen. Saxby Chambliss (R-Ga.). Wyden has issued a more forthright threat that the Brennan nomination could not go forward, without the memos being released.

While the Republican Senators have been considerably softer on this issue, maverick Rand Paul (R-Ky.) has also threatened to put a hold on the Brennan nomination, unless he gets an answer to the question of whether the President believes he has the authority to kill Americans on American soil.

Paul, on CNN Feb. 13, said he wants to hear that no one, in the CIA or the Department of Defense, can kill

an American in the United States without some kind of judicial proceeding: "Senator Wyden asked Brennan this. In a committee hearing, he says, 'Can you kill an American on American soil with a drone without a judicial hearing?' And Brennan didn't answer the question."

Paul pointed out that both he and Wyden have asked for an answer to this question in writing. "And we don't have an answer. So if you're not going to answer 'no,' I think that means you're essentially telling us 'yes,' you believe that the President has the power to kill an American in America . . . and that is very scary and worrisome to me that you would strike Americans."

"Do you realize we do 'signature strikes' now?" Paul asked, noting that "we don't even name . . . people we kill with drones. If there's a line of traffic coming out of a camp, and we think that [it] is populated by people who don't like America, we bomb them. Well, is that a high enough standard for Americans, maybe coming out of a city or an encampment somewhere in the U.S., where they're meeting and saying anti-government things? Are we going to have signature strikes in America? I mean, it opens Pandora's Box once you say, you may well kill Americans in America without any judicial trial, with politicians making the decision."

Evasion after Evasion

President Obama went on a Google-sponsored video question-and-answer session Feb. 14, where he purported to answer a question on his authority to carry out drone killings. "There has never been a drone used on an American citizen on American soil," Obama said. "We respect and have a whole bunch of safeguards in terms of how we conduct counterterrorism operations outside of the United States. The rules outside of the United States are going to be different than the rules inside the United States."

What does that amount to? "Trust me."

CIA Director nominee Brennan did answer in writing, but the answer was no more clear. Responding to the question of "Could the Administration carry out drone strikes inside the United States?", Brennan's answer, released Feb. 18, was: "This Administration has not carried out drone strikes inside the United States and has no intention of doing so." This does not answer Senator Paul, who insists correctly that it's not a question of whether the President intends to do so, but the fact that he *cannot* take such action by law

The issue remains to be fought out, and the question remains as to whether the Senators keep their nerve.

Another wild card in the situation of the drone killings is the possibility, reported by a number of *EIR*'s Washington sources, that there is an unreleased Justice Department memo, which the White House rejected, because it either declared the practice unconstitutional, or was ambiguous on the subject. Should this memo come to light, as a result of the efforts of those opposing drone killings—of whom there are many, including in the CIA itself—the heat on Obama would accelerate enormously.

And Benghazi

Pressure from Senators on the unanswered questions on the Benghazi 9/11 atrocity has so far come from Republicans, who have threatened to filibuster the Hagel nomination. Faced with that threat, the White House, on Feb. 14, issued a letter to Senators Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), John McCain (R-Ariz.), and Kelly Ayotte (R-N.H.), in answer to their question about what actions the President took on the evening of Sept. 11, 2012 after he had learned of the attack on the Benghazi compound.

White House counsel Kathryn Ruemmler wrote that President Obama did *not* speak to any Libyan government officials until the night *after* the attack on the Benghazi consulate. It had already been disclosed, in the Feb. 7 Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, that Obama never contacted Defense Secretary Leon Panetta or Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey after the 5 p.m. preliminary briefing on Sept. 11, 2012.

Senators Graham, Ayotte, and McCain are unlikely to be mollified by this partial response. On Sunday morning talk shows Feb. 17, both McCain and Graham provided a long list of questions about the Benghazi events which the White House had refused to answer.

On a slower track is legislation in the House of Representatives to establish a Select Committee on Benghazi, HR 36, which has been introduced, and now has 31 co-sponsors. Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va.) compares the need for such a committee to those established for the Watergate and Iran-Contra scandals—with the obvious implications for the role and fate of the President.

Ultimately, of course, it is not a pile of particular crimes which will "add up" to sufficient reason to oust President Obama, but his assertion of unconstitutional dictatorial powers, against the welfare of the American people.

Book Review

Obama, Brennan Set Up Ambassador Stevens for Murder in Benghazi

by William F. Wertz, Jr.

Benghazi: The Definitive Report
by Brandon Webb and Jack Murphy
New York: William Morrow, February 2013
80 pages, eBook, $2.99

Feb. 16—Published on the very day that the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence held its hearing to confirm the nomination of John Brennan as Director of the CIA, this report by Jack Murphy, a former U.S. Army Ranger and Brandon Webb, a former U.S. Navy SEAL, sets out to expose the role of Brennan, as the person whose secret assassination operation, run with the blessing of President Obama, was ultimately responsible for the fact that Ambassador Chris Stevens and three other Americans were killed in Benghazi. They base their charges largely on interviews with people in Libya.



Although the 83-page eBook does not hold Obama responsible for Brennan's crimes, which Obama authorized, and does not fully explore the inside-outside operation run by the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG) to carry out the terrorist attack in Benghazi, it nonetheless presents a case which should contribute to stopping the confirmation of Brennan as CIA Director, and which could lead to the impeachment of Obama.

In the first chapter, "The Libyan Powder Keg," the authors implicitly point out that Obama has been in an alliance with al-Qaeda in Libya. They identify the LIFG, members of which returned home from Afghanistan with the most radical religious ideas "such as Wahhabi Islam, originally from Saudi Arabia." They also point out that on a per-capita basis, Libya, in particular, the Libyan cities of Benghazi and Derna, provided the greatest number of al-Qaeda fighters against the U.S. in Iraq. These two cities, they write, have traditionally been the home of the "Libyan Fighting Group."

As *EIR* has previously reported,[1] during the "revolution" against Qaddafi, the group supported and promoted by Obama and British Intelligence was the LIFG, which was designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization, and which officially merged with al-Qaeda in 2007. All of the participants in the 9/11 terrorist attack on the U.S. mission in Benghazi were connected to the LIFG, including Ansar al-Sharia, which led the attack, and all of the militias and organizations which were supposed to provide security, including the February 17th Brigade, which was created by the emir of the LIFG, Abel Hakim Belhadj, and Libya Shield, which is run by Wissam bin Hamid, who was identified in an August 2012 Libary of Congess Report as possibly the head of al-Qaeda in Libya.

Importantly, Ambassador Stevens was aware of the threat represented by the LIFG, going back to his stint

1. See *EIR*, Feb. 1, Feb. 8, and Feb. 15, 2013, for previous articles on this subject.

in Libya as Deputy Chief of Mission in 2007-09. From what they report, Stevens clearly recognized the danger inherent in the project to overthrow Qaddafi:

"While Stevens commented on the difficulty faced in dealing with Gaddafi, in regard to African regional issues, he did state outright to General Ward (AFRICOM commander prior to being removed for misconduct) and Secretary [of State Condoleezza] Rice that Libya (pre-Civil War) was a strong ally in the fight against terrorism. He reiterated that Gaddafi feared a 'terrorism belt' that stretched through the Sahel on his southern border from Mauritania to Sudan and was proud of the fact that he's convinced the tauregs in the south to cease smuggling weapons and terrorists through the desert in exchange for economic incentives. Stevens made it clear that Libyan security services took the threat of the Libyan Fighting Group and Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) very seriously. So long as Gaddafi remained in power, these elements were kept in check internally by the dictator."

U.S. Boots on the Ground

The authors challenge Obama's contention that there were no U.S. boots on the ground in Libya, and that therefore, there was no need to seek the consent of Congress, as specified by the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution, to carry out military operations against Qaddafi. They write:

"What we do know is that the British Special Air Service (SAS) landed in Libya at some point—probably the secretive intelligence gathering component of the SAS called 'The Increment,' which works alongside MI-6. Elite counter-terrorist operators from America's Delta Force were delopyed to Libya as 'analysts,' which allowed President Obama to declare that America did not have any boots on the ground but was simply providing air support for the rebels. The reality was that Delta Force had a small contingent instructing the rebels in the finer points of weapons and tactics."

In addition, they report that numerous private military companies (PMCs) were on the ground during the Libyan civil war. "Among the PMCs in Libya at this time were SECOPEX of France, led by Pierre Marziali; Blue Mountain Group of the U.K. [which failed to provide security at the U.S. mission on 9/11—WFW]; AKE, run by former SAS operator Andrew Kain; and Galice Security out of France, led by former GIGN commando Federic Gallis. MVM, a company that had a large number of CIA contracts at the time, also had people on the ground in the aftermath of the civil war.... The possible involvement of other American PMCs with known agency links—such as Xe(Select), Triple Canopy, and SOCMG—is something that needs further investigation."

The authors also reveal the possible involvement of PMCs in the murder of Qaddafi:

"A video showing Gaddafi's body being dragged and sodomized with a bayonet has voices in the background, voices speaking Spanish with a Colombian accent. Could this misplaced Colombian have been working for the UAE's Reflexive Responses?" They go on to say that Relexive Responses was established by Erik Prince of Blackwater infamy, and that the nucleus of this PMC is known to consist of Colombian military veterans. They also point out that it would have been "highly embarrassing" if Qaddafi had stood trial and started talking about which governments he had under-the-table agreements with.

Brennan's Secret War?

The basic thesis of the report is that Obama authorized Brennan as his chief of counterterrorism to carry out a secret war in the Middle East and Northern Africa without the knowledge of the CIA, the Pentagon, or the State Department. Sometime during the Summer of 2012, he carried out operations against al-Qaeda operatives in Libya, which resulted in the retaliatory attack on the mission on Sept 11. Since Brennan's operations were secret, he did not take measures to protect the mission.

Referring to Stevens and the American forces in Benghazi, the authors state that, "They had no idea that Special Operations missions would be kicking the hornets' nest in Libya and therefore could not prepare for the fallout that would result."

The authors maintain that "behind closed doors, President Obama had given his counterterrorism adviser, John Brennan, *carte blanche* to run operations in North Africa and the Middle East.... In 2012, a secret war across North Africa was well underway.... With JSOC (Joint Special Operations Command) Brennan waged his own unilateral operations in North Africa outside of the traditional command structure." These operations were "off the books."

"Sometime prior to September of 2012, this JSOC element was directed by John Brennan to conduct operations in Libya. These operations targeted a high-level Al Qaeda operative who will not be named here

White House/Pete Souza

President Obama authorized John Brennan, then his chief of counterterrorism, to wage a secret war in the Middle East and Northern Africa, which led, according to the Murphy-Morrow book, to the retaliatory attack on the Benghazi mission in September 2012.

out of consideration of operational security.

"In the weeks before the Benghazi tragedy, they most likely hit a known associate of al-Suri in order to get him to 'up periscope' and increase his visibility, which would then make it possible for JSOC to run a targeted operation to kill or capture him."

The authors are perhaps deliberately contradictory as to the target of this operation. They say they won't name the target, but then they name al-Suri, about whom they say the following: "One of the main targets is known to be Yasin Al-Suri, one of the last major league Al Qaeda leaders.... Al-Suri is the architect behind Al Qaeda's current open-front setup, which encourages self-radicalizing cells to work independently in a sort of 'plug and play' strategy."

Although the authors identify al-Suri as Yasin, there are actually two al-Qaeda operatives with the last name al-Suri, Yasin and Abu Musab. Abu Musab is the individual who, better fits their description. Before 9/11/2001, he was the person who took Western reporters to meet with Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan. He was captured by the CIA in late 2005, later rendered to Syria where he was imprisoned until sometime in December 2011, when he was released. His whereabouts are not currently known. He is the author of a 1,600-page book entitled *A Call to a Global Islamic Resistance.*

They also mention senior al-Qaeda operative Abd al-Baset Azzouz, who was dispatched from Pakistan by Egyptian al-Qaeda leader Ayman al-Zawahiri to establish a base of operations in Libya. But they don't mention another al-Qaeda senior operative also believed to be in Libya, Abd al-Hamid al-Ruqhay, alias Abu Anas al-Libi.

While the specifics of Brennan's operation by their nature cannot be confirmed, it is nonetheless known that in June 2012, Obama and Brennan did carry out a drone assassination in Pakistan of Abu Yahya al-Libi, the second-in-command of al-Qaeda, and the younger brother of a founding member of the LIFG in Libya, who is now an official in the Libyan Interior Ministry. It is also known that al-Zawahiri called for retaliation for this drone assassination. And despite the fact that Abu Yahya al-Libi and his older brother were known members of the LIFG and that the mission's security was provided by militias controlled by the LIFG, neither Obama nor Brennan lifted a finger to protect Ambassador Stevens and the mission.

Thus, although the specific mission the authors report that Brennan carried out cannot be confirmed, an operation of the same nature is known to have occurred.

The authors also report that Brennan was directly responsible for transferring weapons to the opposition in Syria and did this behind the back of Ambassador Stevens:

"While it is an open secret that the United States has been facilitating or at the very least allowing, large weapons transfers from Libya to rebel fighters in Syria,

it is unlikely that Stevens was involved in these activities, as they do not fall under purview of a Foreign Services officer in the State Department. Furthermore, Ambassador Stevens did not see eye to eye with White House counterterrorism adviser John Brennan when it came to unilateral military action, which Stevens saw as counterproductive to his mission in Libya."

Thus they write that "Stevens likely helped consolidate as many weapons as possible after the war to safeguard them, at which point Brennan exported them overseas to start another conflict."

They also assert that the forced resignation of CIA Director David Petraeus was a palace coup, and that John Brennan wanted to replace him.

"It is an open secret in Washington, D.C., that John Brennan is a world-class windbag.... He has long had his eye on becoming the Director of Central Intelligence or Director of National Intelligence."

The authors' conclusion is that Brennan should be reined in or fired, but if what they say is true, and there is good reason to believe it is, what they document must be thoroughly probed by the U.S. Congress, and if Barack Obama authorized Brennan's actions, then Obama is impeachable for authorizing the "private war" carried out by Brennan in violation of the U.S. Constitution, which private war led directly to the murder of Stevens and the other Americans.

The authors cite an article by Seymour Hersh written in 1987 entitled "Targeting Gaddafi," which detailed how the White House's National Security Council was exploiting a legal loophole in order to kill him. He wrote in the aftermath of the Iran-Contra scandal that, "Oliver North would emerge in the public's perception as a unique and extraordinary player inside the National Security Council, a hard-charging risk-taker who was different from his colleagues. It is now apparent that North was but one of many at work in the White House who believed in force, stealth and operations behind the back of the citizenry and the Congress. He was not an aberration, but part of a White House team whose full scope of operations has yet to be unraveled."

What Obama has unleashed through Brennan is far worse than Iran-Contra and far worse than Watergate. If Brennan is confirmed, far more Americans will die. But as evil as Brennan is, it is President Obama who has enabled him. If Obama is not impeached, there will be many more Benghazis, some of them without doubt inside the United States of America.

Editorial

Time for a Super-NASA

The warning bell has been struck. With the Feb. 15 close asteroid flyby, and the meteorite explosion in Russia, we have been given notice by the universe that we had better look to the future, and prepare to expand man's power out into space, or else.

That means an immediate reversal of the policy enunciated by President Barack Obama in his 2010 budget message, which eliminated the manned space mission and any long-term vision for mankind's role in space, in favor of privatization and green research. NASA, which has been chronically underfunded since the time of the anti-science paradigm-shift in the mid-1960s, has to be rebuilt into a Super-NASA, with the means for not only protecting our planet, but driving a global recovery for decades to come.

And, as Lyndon LaRouche said at the time, Obama's attempts to kill NASA in its true mission are contrary to our Constitutional commitment to progress. This President must be removed from office.

When NASA was founded in the late 1950s, under President Eisenhower, it clearly had a mission of national defense. But it was with President John F. Kennedy's May 1961 declaration of a mission to land a man on the Moon (and bringing him back safely) by the end of the decade, that NASA took its rightful place in establishing a national mission of a new scientific frontier for the nation—one that addressed the need for progress, not only for our nation, but all mankind.

President Kennedy took on the pragmatists (and budget-cutters) right from the start. This is going to be expensive, he said. It will cost tens of billions, eventually more than 50 cents a week for every man, woman, and child in the nation. But it's not worth doing if we are not going to commit ourselves fully to the challenge of solving the mysteries of space travel.

NASA's budget grew dramatically in the first years, from .2% of the total Federal budget, to a height of 5.5% in 1965, after which, it precipitously collapsed. From that expenditure, the United States created a generation of scientists and engineers who made a technological revolution, and fueled the only leap in productivity in the U.S. economy since the period of President Franklin Roosevelt. Indeed, every major invention of the last 50 years—lasers, computers, you name it—have come from what could be called the NASA Revolution. In the end, as a 1976 study by Chase Econometrics famously concluded, every NASA dollar "paid back" $14 in new jobs, factories, and technologies—and more rapidly than other Federal expenditures.

More importantly, the NASA mission infused the nation with a sense of purpose, a commitment to developing minds and science for the benefit of all mankind, as astronaut Neil Armstrong so eloquently put it in his statement as he put the first human footprint on the Moon's surface.

Today, with mankind facing an unprecedented threat of economic and/or thermonuclear death, we desperately need to turn our eyes to the heavens, and embrace a national mission of Defense of Earth from space. That will require a dramatic expansion of NASA, as well as collaboration with other leading space-faring nations, especially Russia and China. As soon as we put our current bankrupt financial system in the trash can, and implement Glass-Steagall and national banking, we will be poised to invest the resources we need for this vital science-driver.

Dump Obama and build a Super-NASA, now!

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

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

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

(e-mail address must be provided.)

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

☐ Send information on receiving **EIR** by mail.

—EIR Online can be reached at:
www.larouchepub.com/eiw
e-mail: **fulfillment@larouchepub.com**
Call **1-800-278-3135** (toll-free)

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail address _____

I enclose $ _____ check or money order
Make checks payable to
EIR News Service Inc.
P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Please charge my ☐ MasterCard ☐ Visa

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____